

THEOLOGICAL DISSERTATION on HOLY SCRIPTURE (THE FIRST)

Which,

WITH THE DIVINE MAJESTY'S INSPIRATION,

at the UNIVERSITY OF FRANKFURT,

under the MOST MAGNIFICENT RECTOR,

THE SERENE PRINCE AND LORD,

LORD CHRISTIAN ULRICH,

DUKE OF WÜRTTEMBERG, TECK, AND IN SILESIA

OELS, COUNT OF MONTBÉLIARD, LORD OF HEIDENHEIM,

STERNBERG, AND MEDZIBOHR,

etc. etc.

under the PRESIDENCY of

LORD BARTH. HOLTZFUSS,

SS. THEOL. DOCTOR & PROF. PUBL. ORD.

his ever-to-be-venerated Patron and Teacher,

IN THE MAJOR AUDITORIUM

On the 18th Day of June, in the Year of our Redeemer 1705,

for public discussion, proposes

FRANCISCUS MAJOR KOCSIENSIS,

a Hungarian.

FRANKFURT on the VIADRUM (Oder),

Printed by the Letters of CHRISTOPH ZEITLER.

CHAPTER I.

SUMMARY

Column 1

- §. 1. God most clemently revealed Himself to Man through His Word.
- §. 2. For 2453 years, the Word of God was unwritten.
- §. 3. Whether the Patriarchs before Moses wrote anything, and for what use?
- §. 4. Synonyms for Scripture in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin.
- §. 5. Various acceptations of the word "Scripture."
- §. 6. Definition of Scripture.
- §. 7. The Efficient Cause of Scripture: God, and indeed by Inspiration and Command.
- §. 8. What is the proegumenic (antecedent) and procatarctic (preliminary) Cause?
- §. 9. The Ministerial Cause.
- §. 10. The matter from which. Diverse opinions on the modern Hebrew Letters and on the Points.
- §. 11. The matter about which.

Column 2

- §. 12. The External and Internal Form.
- §. 13. The End, *per se* and *per Accidens*.
- §. 14. The Parts of Scripture are the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament. Which are those of the Old Testament?
- §. 15. The Author of the Canon of the Old Testament was Ezra with the Men of the Great Synagogue. The authentic Exemplar of Ezra does not survive.
- §. 16. Arguments of the Evangelicals for the Canonical books of the Old Testament.
- §. 17. On the Apocrypha. Arguments for the Protestant opinion.
- §. 18. The Canonical Books of the New Testament are recounted.
- §. 19. Certain Doubtful and Spurious books are named.
- §. 20. The Books of the New Testament were written in Greek. Wherein on the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, the Latin of Mark, and the Hebrew Epistle to the Hebrews.
- §. 21. The Time and Order of the Writing of the Books of the New Testament.

§. I.

Since God, the Thrice-Best and Greatest, such is His ineffable Goodness, created Man for a supernatural End, namely eternal Life, He also, out of His infinite wisdom, ordained the necessary Means, by the use of which Man, otherwise uncertain and fluctuating, can attain this End proposed to him: eternal salvation. The principal of these Means is the Word of God, by which God most clemently willed to reveal Himself and His Will to man, and to invite and lead him by the hand to the acknowledgement and Worship of Himself, suitable for a rational Creature, and through this Worship and sincere obedience, to eternal Life.

§. II.

This Word of God for approximately 2453 whole years, or according to Calvisius and others 2454 years, was unwritten (*ἀγγραφον*) and was propagated by the living voice. At which time, the celestial doctrine could be conserved whole without the written Word: 1. on account of the fewness of faithful men, and therefore the narrowness of the Church; 2. on account of the longevity of the Patriarchs; 3. on account of the more familiar conversation of God or of Angels with men. These things having ceased, God willed that His Word be committed to letters by Moses and other holy Men, and in that pact to provide for the imbecility of men. Whence it is established: 1. That the Word of God, unwritten and written, do not differ really, and that this Distinction of the Word is not of a Genus into its Species, nor of a Whole into its Parts, but of a Subject into its Accidents. 2. That this Distinction of the Word into Written and Non-Written is not to be estimated from the present time, as if there still existed one written Word of God and another non-written one, but with respect to the past time, antecedent to the age of Moses.

§. III.

There are not wanting, indeed, Authors both Ancient and Recent who hand down that letters and Characters were granted to Adam himself. Among whom the Jews imagine that on the eve of the Sabbath ten things were created: namely, the Rainbow, Manna, the Well of the Rock, the Pillar of Cloud and of Fire, the Scripture or the Characters of letters, the Tablets and the Rod of Aaron, as Munster relates on Genesis. They also wish that Adam wrote, to which pertains that Talmudic saying, produced by R. Abraham, that Adam wrote a book on the Divinity, and that Abel wrote certain things. There exists the *Sefer Yetzirah*, the Book of Creation, which some wish to be Adam's, others Abraham's, but on the same, that is, a false or non-existent, foundation (Walton, *Bibl. Appar.*, Proleg. 2, §. 2). Josephus relates in lib. 1 of *Antiqu. Jud.*, c. 2, that Seth and his sons, mindful of the twofold destruction of the world predicted by Adam—by a deluge of waters and by a conflagration of fire—erected two columns, one of brick and one of stone, and inscribed on each the doctrine of the celestial motions and other inventions of the arts, so that if it should happen that the brick one be destroyed by the deluge, the stone one, surviving, would provide men with the opportunity to learn and exhibit for viewing what it contained inscribed. Josephus adds that it still existed in his own time in Syria. Because

Moses passed over these things, we leave them in the middle. Not a few writers, both Ancient and more recent, attribute Writings to Enoch, both Philosophical—especially Mathematical—and Sacred. To the Sacred they count that Prophecy, a fragment of which they judge is read in Jude v. 14, 15. But although we do not think it is to be simply denied that the most Ancient Patriarchs already had characters of letters before the deluge, yet their use seems to have been more political and economic than Theological and Ecclesiastical. But if they also wrote sacred and Ecclesiastical things, this was done more for the use of the Church of that time than for the Canon of the future Church, the beginning of which was at last made by Moses. The Book of Enoch, because it contains certain things contrary to the sacred letters and to reason, is rightly suspect to the Learned. Concerning which, see Sixtus of Siena, *Biblioth. Sanct.*, l. 2, p. 65; Drusius in his *Henoch*, c. 22, and also *Quæsit. per Epist.*, Ep. 102, p. 192, ff.; Cunaeus, *de Rep. Hebr.*, l. 3, c. 1; Hottinger, *Thes. Philof.*, L. 1, c. 2, Sect. 2, and also *Ennead.*, p. 9; Aug. Pfeiffer, *Decade Exerc. Sacr.*, Dubiis Vexatis Annexa, Exerc. 2, c. 4, §. 3, 5, 6. Nor does Jude v. 14, 15 affirm that Enoch wrote what he asserted concerning the final Judgment of God, but that he prophesied, and therefore said it, which the Apostle could have had from Tradition and divine Inspiration. It therefore remains established that up to the time of Moses, the celestial Doctrine was handed down by the living voice, and the beginning of Canonical Writing was made by Moses.

§. IV.

The Hebrew Synonyms for the written Word or Scripture are: מִקְרָא (mikra), Reading; תּוֹרָה (torah), law; כְּתָב (kethab) or מִכְתָּב (miktab), a Writing; הַכְּתוּב (hakkathub), this Scripture; כִּתְוֵי הַקְּדוֹשׁ (kithvei haqqodesh), the Holy Scriptures; סִפְרֵי הַקְּדוֹשׁ (sifrei haqqodesh), the Holy books; דְּבָר (dabar), this Word; מְגִלָּה (megillah), a Volume, Sacred or Holy, because in antiquity books were not bound, but were rolled up. עֶשְׂרִים וָאַרְבָּעָה (esrim ve'arba'ah), Twenty-four, because the Hebrew Canon consisted of that many books. פְּסוּק (pasuk), a Verse, and also Verses by Synecdoche. Eulogies are: מִקְדָּשׁ (mikdash), Sanctuary or Holy Place of the Lord; בֵּית מִקְדָּשׁ (beth mikdash), House of the Sanctuary, which title the Venetian Bibles bear on their frontispiece. כַּלָּה (kallah), Bride. See Hottinger, *Thes. Phil.* l. 1, §. 2, Sect. 3, p. 88. The Greek Synonyms for Scripture are: γραφή (graphie), Joh. 2:22, C. 7:38, 42, c. 17:12, c. 19:37; Act. 8:32; γραφή θεόπνευστος (graphie theopneustos), 2 Tim. 3:16; γραφαί (graphai), Joh. 5:39, Matth. 22:29, Marc. 14:49, Luc. 24:27, 32; Act. 17:2; Rom. 15:3; ἁγία γραφαί (hagiai graphai), Rom. 1:2; γραφαί προφητικάί (graphai prophetikai), Rom. 16:26; γράμματα (grammata), Joh. 5:47; ἱερά γράμματα (hiera grammata), 2. Tim. 3:15; προφητεία γραφῆς (propheteia graphēs), 2 Pet. 1:20. Other Synonyms, partly Encomiastic, are: τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ (ta logia tou theou), the sayings or Oracles of God, Rom. 3:2; λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (logos tou theou), Luc. 11:28, Joh. 17:6,14,17, etc.; the Word of Truth, Ps. 119:43; the Book of the Law, Josh. 1:8; the book of the Lord, Is. 34:16. The Latin ones are: *Scriptura* (Scripture), κατ' ἐξοχὴν; *Verbum Dei Scriptum* (the Written Word of God); *Sacræ Literæ* (Sacred Letters); *Sacra pagina* (the Sacred page); *Biblia* (the Bible, a neuter plural, although not only Thomas à Kempis, but also certain other Ecclesiastical and Scholastic Writers have used it as a Feminine singular, less accurately). Augustine calls it the "Codex of God."

Tertullian, against Marcion, l. 4, c. 3, calls the Gospels "our Digests." Cassiodorus and Bede call Scripture "our Pandects," using terms common to Jurists. Basil compares it to a "most well-instructed workshop," containing all kinds of remedies against any diseases. Gregory in Epistle 84, lib. 4, calls it "a certain Epistle of the Omnipotent God to his creature." In his book *de Speculo Monachorum*, it is called "the Well of Jacob," from which are drawn the waters which are poured out in Prayer, and the "peeled Rod of the same," by the sight of which we produce various offspring of Good Works. It is also called a "fiery Chariot," by which we are carried to attain the celestial heritage; also "Mount Zion," in which the commands of the celestial King are handed down; a "Fountain and a River": a Fountain, says Lyra, as to the Articles of Faith; a River, as to those things which are deduced from them, and also because it perpetually wells up and flows into the gardens of the Church, etc.

§. V.

It is taken: 1. most generally and improperly, broadly and abusively, by certain Writers, for the Writings also of the Fathers, the Canons of the Councils, and the Decrees of the Pontiffs. 2. generally, for all the books contained in the Biblical Code, both Canonical and Apocryphal. 3. Specially and properly, for the Canonical books of the Old and New Testament. Furthermore, it is taken either Materially, for the letters, Characters, Syllables, and Words by which the Scripture is read consigned, or formally, for the divine sense expressed by the letters, syllables, and Words, or conjointly and complexly, for both the material and the formal, the sign and the thing signified, the word and the sense, the Style and the mind, which signification is that of this place. Finally, it is taken either *μερικῶς* (partially) and distributively, for the individual sentences, sayings, and books of Scripture, as in Marc. 15:28, Luc. 4:21, Joh. 17, c. 19:37, or *ὀλικῶς* (wholly) and Collectively, for the universal Holy Scripture, for all the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, which sense is especially regarded here.

§. VI.

Holy Scripture is, therefore, the Word of God, consigned to letters by the breath and Inspiration of the Holy Spirit through the Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles, so that from it sinful men may be instructed in the true acknowledgement of God and of His true worship through Christ, and by living according to its norm may be led to eternal Life.

§. VII.

The Efficient Cause of Scripture is God, regarded *ἐσιოდῶς* (essentially), 2 Tim. 3:16. God the Father, Hebr. 1:1. The Son, Joh. 1:18; Matth. 28:19. The Holy Spirit, 2 Sam. 23:2; 2 Pet. 1:21; Joh. 14:26, c. 16:13. This is to be held: 1. against the Simonians, Basilidians, Marcionites (in Irenaeus, l. 1, c. 20, 22, 29) and against the Manichees (in Epiphanius, Hæres. 66; Augustine, *contra Faust. Manich.*, l. 14, 18), and also the Bogomiles (in Euthymius, *Panopl.* Part. 2, tit. 23, c. 1), who are said to have attributed the Old

Testament to some evil God. 2. against Porphyry, Celsus, and Julian the Apostate, who denied that God is the Author of the New Testament. God is indeed the Author of the whole Holy Scripture, partly by Internal Inspiration, partly by external Command. That God is the Author not only of the Old but also of the New Testament by internal Inspiration, we shall prove below; nor do the Doctors of the Roman Church deny it. For so Bellarmine says in *de V. D.*, Lib. 4, c. 3, p. 169: "No Catholic has ever taught that God established that the New Testament should not be written." And after a few words, *ibid.*: "Nor do we deny that the Apostles wrote what they wrote with God willing and inspiring." The same deny that the Apostles wrote by express Command. For so Bellarmine says, c. 1: "It is false that God commanded the Apostles to write. For we read in Matth. ult. a command that they should preach the Gospel, but that they should write, we nowhere read. And so God neither commanded expressly that they should write, nor that they should not write." We believe that both the Old and the New Testament were written by divine command. Which, with respect to the Old Testament, we prove: 1. from the Example of God, who with His own finger inscribed the ten Precepts on stone Tablets (Exod. 31:18; c. 32:15, 16; Deut. 10:2,4). 2. from the Special command in Exod. 17:14, "And the LORD said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book." C. 34:27, "Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel." Deut. 31:19, "Now therefore write ye this song for you, and teach it the children of Israel." Is. 8:1, "Moreover the LORD said unto me, Take thee a great roll, and write in it with a man's pen." Jer. 30:2, "Write thee all the words that I have spoken unto thee in a book." Hab. 2:2, "Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it." In Deut. 17:18, the King is ordered to write out a copy of the written law. 3. The Scripture of the Old Testament is approved by Christ in all those places where Christ cites the Scripture of the Old Testament, for example, Matth. 4:7, 10, C. 22:29, 31, C. 24:15; Luc. 4:17-19, c. 10:26, c. 19:46, c. 24:27. And by the Apostles in Act. 1:16; Rom. 15:4; 1 Cor. 15:3; 2 Tim. 3:15, 16; 2 Pet. 1:19, 20.

Concerning the Scripture of the New Testament there exists (1.) a general command of teaching all nations given to the Apostles (Matth. 28:19; Marc. 16:15), which includes a special command of writing, since they were unable to teach all nations and peoples without Scripture. But the effect of Scripture is that where the foot of the Apostles did not reach, there nevertheless their voice has reached. (2.) John in c. 20:31 affirms that his Gospel was "written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name," which could not have happened without the will of God. (3) John in Apoc. 1:11 is declared by a special command: "What thou seest, write in a book, and send it unto the seven churches." also v. 19. In Cap. 2:1, 8, 12, 18, the command is repeated: "write" to the churches of Asia. In Cap. 3:1, 7, 14: "write" to the churches of Asia. C. 14:13, "And I heard a voice from heaven saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord," etc. c. 19:9, "And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb." c. 21:5. in which places not only visions, but also certain dogmas are ordered to be written; and if visions, how much more ought the dogmas to have been written. (4.) The Office of

testifying concerning Christ is enjoined upon the Apostles (Joh. 15:27; Act. 1:8; c. 10:41, 42), which office they ought to have performed not only by preaching, but also by writing. Hence John says of himself in c. 21:24, "This is the disciple which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things." also 1 Joh. 1:3, 4, "That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you... And these things write we unto you," etc. 1 Joh. 2:1, "these things write I unto you, that ye sin not." v. 7, "I write no new commandment unto you, but an old." v. 8, "Again, a new commandment I write unto you." v. 12, 13, 14, "I write unto you, little children... I write unto you, fathers... I write unto you, young men... I write unto you, little children... I have written unto you, young men." V. 21, "I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth." (5) The Apostles did not dare to speak any of those things which Christ did not effect through them, "to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed," as Paul testifies in Rom. 15:18. Therefore, neither did they write without a command. Thus Peter in Act. 10:19, 26, was not willing to preach the Gospel to the gentiles without a peculiar Revelation; much less, therefore, would he have written without a command. (6) No less the New than the Old Testament was written by divine inspiration (2 Tim. 3:16; Joh. 14:26), which, as an internal instinct and an occult command, is more powerful than an external command, since it not only excites to Writing and commands it, but also procreates it. Whereas in an external command God only commands men, but in Inspiration He speaks in men and through men. Whence (7) Irenaeus in *de Hæres.*, l. 3, c. 1, says: "The Apostles and bringers of the Gospel, what they first preached, they afterwards by the will of God handed down to us in the Scriptures, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith." And Augustine in *de Consensu Evangel.*, c. 35: "Whatever Christ wished us to read of his sayings and deeds, this he commanded them (the Apostles) to write, as with his own hands," which simile Costerus approves in *Enchir.* c. 1, p. 41. The Occasions offered to the Writers of the New Testament were not at all fortuitous, but were supplied by divine Providence and directed to the end proposed by God for Himself.

§. VIII.

The *προηγμένη* or internally moving cause is the inexhaustible Goodness of God, by which God, pitying the lapsed human race, willed to come forth, as it were, from the abstruse Seat of his Majesty, and to reveal His Will and Word to men, so that provision might be made for the ignorance of men, and that they, by the acknowledgement and Worship of the True God, might be eternally saved. The *προκαταρκτική* or externally moving cause is our ignorance and Misery, which was so great that, if God had not communicated His Word with us, we would have had to perish eternally.

§. IX.

The Ministerial Cause in the Old Testament were Moses, Samuel, David, the Prophets, Ezra, and other Holy men of God, who for that reason were called the Mouth of God (Is. 1:20; c. 30:2; Jer. 15:19; 2 Sam. 23:1,2). But Ezra is called by the peculiar name of "swift Scribe" (Ezra 7:6). Luke in c. 1:68, 70 emphatically says: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel... As he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world

began." And in Act. 1:16, "this scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake." also Act. 4:25, c. 28:25. In the New Testament, the Evangelists and Apostles (Luc. 1:1,2,3,4; Joh. 21:24; Act. 1:1; C. 2:1,2,4), who thence, with the Prophets, are rightly called sacred Writers, Amanuenses, and Notaries of God.

§. X.

The matter *from which* are the Letters, points, Syllables, Words, and the canonical books of the Old and New Testament consisting of them. Concerning the Letters of the Old Testament, it is usually inquired: Are the modern Hebrew letters those ancient and original letters with which Moses once wrote the law, and the other Prophets their prophecies? Concerning which question there are two opinions. The first states that the modern square letters are the true and genuine ones, which Moses and the Prophets used. This is defended everywhere by the Lutherans, and among them especially Matth. Wasmuth; from the Reformed, Buxtorf, Johannes Leusden, and others. The latter states that the ancient letters with which Moses and the Prophets consigned the Scripture of the Old Testament were Samaritan, and that our modern ones, as being Chaldaic, were at last received during or after the Babylonian Captivity. This opinion is favored by Joseph Scaliger, Drusius, Gerhard Joh. Vossius, Grotius, Casaubon, Amama, Bochart, Ludovicus Cappellus, Waser, Majer, Burmannus, and others. From the Pontificians, Bellarmine, Arias Montanus, Sixtus of Siena, Serrarius, Villalpandus, Guido Fabricius, Johannes Morinus, Johannes d'Espieres, Huetius, Richard Simon in his *Critical History of the Old Testament*, and many others, to whom from the Lutherans has acceded the Philologist Henricus Kipping in *Exerc. 13 de Scriptura*, Dist. 1, ff., *Instit. Pol.* l. 2, c. 6, §. 10, also c. 16, §. 2.

Concerning the Points likewise, three opinions are circulated: The first wishes that the Points are coeval with the letters. The second states that the Points are not indeed coeval with the letters, but were added to the letters by Ezra, during or after the Babylonian Captivity, so that the Jews might have a certain Reading. The third states that the points were at last added to the letters about 500 years after the birth of Christ by the Tiberian Masoretes, to which at last Ben Asher & Ben Naphtali applied the final hand. The first Opinion is defended by most Lutherans, especially Matth. Wasmuth in a peculiar Work, written against Cappellus and his followers, Johannes Benedictus Carpzovius, and others, as well as certain Reformed. The second is admitted by, among others, Johannes Buxtorf, Lightfoot, Leusden, and from the Lutherans Andreas Sennertus, who indeed would wish to prove that the Points are coeval with the letters, but if this may not be hoped for, they contend that they were at least added by Ezra. The third is that of many Learned Men: Elias Levita, Jerome, Luther, Zwingli, Fagius, Mercer, Munster, Pellicanus, Calvin, Beza, Joseph Scaliger, Gerhard Joh. Vossius, Grotius, Casaubon, Drusius, Schickard, Piscator, Chamier, Ludovicus de Dieu, Zwinger, Prideaux, Amama, Cunaeus, especially Ludovicus Cappellus, Erpenius, Brian Walton, Friedrich & Ezekiel Spanheim, Burmannus, Johannes Claudius, Johannes Braunius, and others; and of the Doctors of the Roman Church everywhere: Salmeron, Bellarmine, Sixtus of Siena,

Genebrard, Serarius, Villalpandus, Huntlæus, Morinus, Joh. d'Espieres, Muis, Huetius, Richard Simon, etc. whose principal reasons are: 1. Because the copies anciently used by the Jews in the Synagogues lacked vowel points, which however were without doubt most accurate. The Jews would not have used copies of this kind in the Synagogues if they had believed either Moses or Ezra to be the Author of the points. 2. because the Jews employed their *Chazzanim* or Inspectors in the Sabbath reading, to take care that one vowel Point not be substituted for another and be read improperly. They think there would have been no need for this caution if the Codices had been pointed. 3. Because the most ancient Jews, besides the High Priest, did not know how the Tetragrammaton Name should be pronounced, which ignorance would have had no place in pointed Codices. 4. Because Christ, having omitted mention of the Points, which are without controversy the smallest things, said in Matt. 5:18: "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law," and would have named the points if at that time the Vowel Points had been added to the letters. 5. Because neither the LXX Interpreters, nor the Chaldean Paraphrasts, nor the Author of the Vulgate, used pointed Bibles in adorning their Versions, which is established from the fact that they sometimes read otherwise than the Points bear, who yet without doubt would have used pointed Codices if they had existed. 6. Neither Origen nor Jerome had pointed Codices, because they sometimes read otherwise, sometimes doubted of the true Reading, but never made any mention of the points. Leusden asserts and defends the contrary opinion concerning the Antiquity of the Points in *Philol. Hebr.*, Differt. 14, and impugns the reasons adduced here in Differt. 15 & 16. We do not make this Controversy concerning the Hebrew Letters and Points our own.

Just as concerning the letters and Vowel Points, so also concerning the Partition of the Old Testament into Verses, there are two different opinions, one of which asserts that the Distinction of the Verses of the Old Testament is either from the Authors of the books themselves, or at least from Ezra and the Men of the Great Synagogue. The other, from the opinion of Elias Levita and certain other earlier Rabbis, states that the whole Law was formerly as if one Verse, one sentence, and one Word. It is the concordant opinion of the Authors that the Partition of the Old Testament into Chapters is not from the Authors themselves, but is more recent. Bale attributes it to Stephen Langton, but many more probably attribute it to Hugo of Saint-Cher, a Cardinal Priest, around the year 1240 or 1254, and the Scholastics of his age, Alexander of Hales and Albertus Magnus, whom Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas followed. The Jews themselves also approve and commend this Division into Chapters. The Sections and *Parashot* have their origin from certain curious Scribes of the Jews. Three repeated letters (פ) signify a major Section or a Sabbath Reading, and indeed the three *pēs* stand for *Parashah* or Section; but the three *samekhs* indicate *Seder* or Order, but in the same sense, since they only note the Readings to be run through and completed annually. The matter of the New Testament are the Greek Letters, Syllables, Words, Verses, Chapters, and the Canonical Books of the New Testament consisting of them. The Division of these into Chapters is not from the sacred Writers themselves. Whence the Doctors of the Primitive Church

were accustomed to cite the Scripture of both the Old and the New Testament not by an enumeration of chapters, but by allegations of particular Histories. But the division of the books of the New Testament is either more ancient or more Recent. The more ancient, and more numerous, was made into *τίτλοι καὶ κεφάλαια*, that is, into Titles and Chapters. For the ancients, according to the testimony of Casaubon, divided individual books into *τίτλοι* or Titles, and individual Titles into *κεφάλαια* or Chapters. They called the major divisions Titles, the minor ones Chapters, and one Title contained several Chapters. Thus Matthew formerly contained 58 Titles, but 355 Chapters; Mark, 48 Titles, 233 Chapters; Luke, 83 Titles, 348 Chapters; John, 18 Titles, 232 Chapters. From which it is clear that for them a *κεφάλαιον* was almost what a verse is for us today. See Daniel Heinsius, *Aristarch. Sacr.*, c. 13. At what time that more ancient custom of dividing ceased is not so certain. The more Recent and today used Division of the New Testament into Chapters most probably has the same Author as the Division of the Old Testament, namely Hugo Cardinalis, with the Scholastics of his age, Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus, whom Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas followed. And the Latins were accustomed to distinguish the Chapters of the Old and New Testament by the letters of the Alphabet, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, which they ascribed to the margin of the Chapters. See on this Partition of both the Old and New Testament, Sixtus of Siena, *Biblioth. Sanct.*, Lib. 3, p. 158 & Lib. 4, p. 254; Genebrard, on the Year 1243; Hottinger, *Hist. Eccles.*, Part 3, Cap. C, Seculo 13, p. 347, 348; Leusden, *Philol. Hebr.*, Diss. 3, n. 2. The distribution of the N.T. into Verses is owed to Robert Estienne, the Father of Henri Estienne, adorned between the years 1550 and 1555. But the Authors vary concerning the Antiquity of the Greek Spirits and Accents of the N.T., with some opining that the Spirits, Accents, and minor Distinctions were added by the sacred Writers themselves; others more probably stating that the most ancient Codices of the N.T. were written without Spirits, Accents, subscribed Iotas, inter punctuations, and indeed with the words not spaced from each other, so that what the Hebrews, especially the Kabbalists, say of the Law, that it is one Period, the same could be said not absurdly of the Gospel. Which ancient Exemplars confirm.

§. XI.

The Matter About Which, or the Object of Scripture, are God and divine and sacred things universally, to be believed, to be done, to be hoped for: the Doctrine of Faith and of Obedience, the Law and the Gospel. But the Nucleus, Center, and Scope is Christ, promised in the Old Testament, and revealed in the New Testament (Ps 40, v. 8; Joh. 5:39; Act. 3:18, 24; 1 Pet. 1:10, 11, 12). Whence Tertullian rightly says: "All things speak of Christ, all things through Christ."

§. XII.

The Form is either External or Internal. The External consists in the Character, phrase, style, idiom of the language, and expression of divine and sacred things, most wisely accommodated to the human capacity. The Internal is the Sense, not only the Grammatical and external, but also the internal, spiritual, and divine, or the harmony or

consensus of the Truth revealed in Scripture with the Concept of the Divine Intellect concerning the Dogmas and divine things and our salvation. For the Subject to which Holy Scripture is destined and by which the sense of the Divine Word—not the external and Grammatical only, but also the internal, spiritual, and Divine—is to be perceived, are all Men promiscuously, either Called by the Word, or to be Called (Joh. 5:39; 2 Tim. 3:15, 16; Col. 3, v. 16; Rom. 15:4).

§. XIII.

The End of Scripture *per se*, with respect to God, is the Acknowledgement of God, internal and external Worship, and worthy Glorification. For to this end God willed His Word to be written, that from it, as from a Principle of Knowing, He might be rightly acknowledged and now and eternally celebrated, and that through it, as through a Principle of operating, Faith, Repentance, and true Sanctimony, and by these means, eternal Life might be produced (Rom. 1:16; Jac. 1:21). With respect to Men, the Intermediate End is 1. Subordinately, Institution, Conversion, Regeneration, the production of Faith, Sanctification, and leading by the hand to eternal life (Ps. 19:9; Joh. 17:17; Rom. 15:4; 2 Tim. 3:15, 16). The ultimate end is eternal salvation (Joh 5:39, c. 20:31; Act. 13:26). The End *per Accidens* or the Event, with respect to many, namely the incredulous and impenitent, is Blinding, Hardening, and eternal damnation (2 Cor. 4:3, "But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them." 2 Cor. 2:16, "For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: To the one we are the savour of death unto death; and to the other the savour of life unto life." Luc. 2:34; 2 Pet. 2, v. 7, 8; Joh. 12:37-40).

§. XIV.

Scripture is usually divided into Canonical and Apocryphal Books. But, because according to Protestants the Apocrypha do not properly pertain to Canonical Scripture, on this hypothesis this Division is not accurate. The Parts of Scripture, therefore, are the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, which are so called from the word *Kanón*, Rule, because among Christians they constitute the Norm of faith and morals. The Books of the Old Testament have long been numbered by the Jews as עשרים וארבעה, Twenty-four, so distributed by the Great Sanhedrin itself, which number also obtained in the time of Jerome. Although for the sake of compendium and to aid the memory, from ultimate Antiquity many distinguished the Codex of the Old Testament into 22 Books, according to the number of Hebrew letters. Among these is Josephus, Lib. 1, *contr. Appion.*, p. 829; Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* l. 3, c. 10; Jerome, *Prolog. Galeat.*; Isidore, *Originum*, l. 6, c. 1. Hence the Verse: "Of the ancient covenant there are Twenty-two Books, And there are just as many little letters for the Hebrews." who numbered the book of Ruth with the books of Samuel, and Lamentations with the Prophecy of Jeremiah, whence the consensus of both opinions is apparent. See Sixtus of Siena, *Biblioth. Sanct.* l. 1, p. 2, whose words are rightly praised by Hottinger, *Thes. Phil.*, l. 2, c. 2, Sect. 3, n. 8, p. 101, 102.

These XXIV Books are divided by the Jews into three Parts, of which the first is תורה, in Greek *πεντάτευχος*, in Latin Pentateuch. 2. נביאים, Prophets. 3. כתובים, Hagiographa. To the first pertain Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, collectively called in Hebrew חמשה חומשים, the five fifts. The Second Part contains the Prophets, the ראשונים, Former—the Book of Joshua, Judges, 2 Samuel, and Kings—and the אחרונים, Latter, namely the 4 Major and the 12 Minor. The Major are Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, whom the Jews, however, count not among the Prophets, but among the Hagiographa. The Minor are Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zacharias, Malachi. The Hagiographa constitute the Third Part, and are: Psalms, Proverbs, Job, the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, the Volume of Esther, (Daniel), Ezra, Nehemiah, 2 Chronicles. Some of which books were written by the Authors whose names they bear, with some small parts excepted, for example, those in which the Author's death and what followed his death are described. But some, as Annals, were written successively by sacred Authors and Scribes and Prophets, and then were brought into the Canon by divinely inspired Men. Of the Author or Authors of the Psalms, it should be noted that St. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine (l. 17, *de C.D.*, c. 14), and also Bede, Euthymius, and Cassiodorus think that David is the Author of all the Psalms in general. To whom, with some premises, accedes Bellarmine, *Præf. in Psalmos*, and also Torriellus, A.M. 1964, n. 14, who wish that Asaph, Jeduthun, Ethan, and the sons of Korah were only the Singers. Others indeed disagree about the persons of the Authors, but define about ten Authors, such as Nicolaus, R. Gedaliah, R. Solomon Jarchi, David Kimchi, some of whom also count Adam himself, Melchizedek, Abraham, and Ezra among the Authors of the Psalms. But others, like Aben Ezra, Athanasius, Hilary, Jerome, and from the more recent, Sixtus of Siena, *Biblioth. Sanct.* l. 1, p. 9, 10, 11; Morinus, Drusius, Rivetus, Hottingerus, Leusdenus, etc., attribute most of the Psalms indeed to David, but the rest to other Authors, and in general state ten Authors, namely: David, Moses, Solomon, Asaph, Ethan, Heman, Jeduthun, the three sons of Korah, namely Asir, Elkanah, and Abiasaph. See Hottinger, *Thesaur. Philol.* L. 2, C. 1, Sect. 3, p. 489, 490; Leusden, *Philol. Hebr. Diff.* 7, §. 3, whose opinion we also admit as more probable, yet so that we state that Psalm 137 and a few others were composed by Ezra or the Church of Israel of his time. The Psalms are numbered differently in the Hebrew Codex, differently in the LXX, and in the Latin Version, and also among the Fathers. The Latin has contracted Psalms 9 and 10 into one, and also Psalms 114 and 115. But so that the number of 150 Psalms might nevertheless be completed, it has divided Psalms 116 and 147 into two. The Septuagint Interpreters, the Syriac, and the Arabic translation of Sionita indeed have 151 Psalms, but with this caution added: "This Psalm (151) is peculiar to David, and is outside the number; when he alone contended against Goliath (he said it)."

§. XV.

Ezra collected this Canon of the Old Testament with the Men of the Great Synagogue, some of whom were Prophets. Finus Adrianus Ferrariensis, in *Flagellum Judæorum*, L. 9, c. 2, affirmed that the Authentic Exemplar of Ezra itself survives today and is preserved in Bologna in the Church of St. Dominic. We hold that that Codex of Ezra no longer

exists, nor has it been in anyone's hands since the devastation of the Second Temple. The reasons are: (1) Because the Jews, even the ancient ones, in their Writings, have not made mention of this Exemplar. (2) Because the public places in which it was preserved have several times been ruined and devastated by fire. (3) Because the Syriac, Egyptian, and Palestinian Fathers would either have seen it, or would have commended it as seen by others. (4) Because the affirmers themselves render their faith suspect with false and foolish Fables. See Hottinger, *Thes. Philol.*, l. 1, c. 2, qu. 2, p. 115, 16. Hence Our Theologians and Philologists state that it was burnt up with the Temple of Jerusalem. More on which below in Chap. 2, on Adjunct VI.

§. XVI.

That these XXIV Books are Canonical we prove: 1. because they were written by Prophets and the Prophetic Spirit through immediate inspiration (Luc. 17:29; Rom. 1:2; Eph. 2:20; 2 Pet. 1:19, 21). 2. Because these books were written in the Hebrew Language, at that time Prophetic and Vernacular to the Jews. 3. because they contain the infallible Truth, consistent with itself through all things. 4. because the Jewish Church has always held these alone as Canonical Books, with the exclusion of others. 5. Because these books were cited and commended by Christ and by the Apostles. 6. Because in Rom. 3:2, with respect to these books it is said that to the Jews "were committed the oracles of God." 7. Because they were acknowledged by the primitive Church as Canonical and have been transmitted to us as a rule of faith and of morals. Whence 8. Bellarmine himself in *de V.D.*, L. 1, c. 4, p. 10, constitutes three Orders of books, and says of these books of the first order (to which, however, he ought to have added the Book of Esther): "Concerning their authority, there has never been any dispute among Catholic men." Which most of the Roman Catholics also confess. See especially Sixtus of Siena, *Biblioth. Sanct.*, l. 1, p. 2, whose words are adduced and rightly commended by Hottinger, *Thes. Phil.*, l. 1, c. 2, Sect. 3, p. 101, 102.

§. XVII.

The remaining Books, published as the Economy of the Old Testament was declining, such as are the Book of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus or Sirach, Baruch, and the two of the Maccabees, are counted among the Canonical Books by the Council of Florence, Decree 7, and the Council of Trent, Decree Sess. 4, and therefore by the Roman and Greek Church today, which is also apparent from the second Synod under Parthenius of Constantinople, held in An. 1643 against Cyril Lucaris, after Cap. 18, p. 131. Which Books, however, the more moderate Doctors of the Roman School call only Deutero-Canonical, and contradistinguish them from the Proto-Canonical. So that this might obtain, Genebrard in his Chronology makes a threefold constitution of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, published by as many Synods. He refers the first to the times of Ezra, around the Year of the World 3610. The second to the time of Eleazar, the Brother of Simeon, around A.M. 3860, at which time the second Canon of the Hebrews was established and to the 24 or 22 books of the first Canon, the Book of Judith, Tobit, and Ecclesiasticus were added. The third to the Times of John Hyrcanus

around A.M. 3950, at which time he thinks the books of Judith and Tobit were confirmed, but those of the Maccabees were then first brought into the Canon, and thus the third Canon of the Hebrews was established. Serrarius follows him, as does Bailius, who in *Catech. Controv.*, Appendix, Qu. 13, Tract. I, constitutes two Canons: one More Ancient, which Ezra, using the counsel of the Elders, arranged; the other More Recent, composed by later Jews, not much time before Josephus, into which the Controverted Books were brought. Which opinions differ little.

The Evangelicals do not hold these books as Canonical, but as Apocryphal, which are so called either from *ἀπὸ* and *κρύπτη*, that is, an ark or chest, because they were not placed in the sacred ark or Chest with the Canonical ones; or rather from *ἀποκρύπτω*, I hide, I conceal, not because their Authors were unknown—for the Authors of some of the Canonical books were also formerly unknown and are unknown today—but because their authority was obscure and occult. The reasons why we hold these books as non-canonical and Apocryphal, though broadly so called, are the following:

1. because they were not written by a Prophet, but after Malachi, who is called by the Jews *הַנְּבִיאִים הַסֵּתֶרֶת*, the Seal of the Prophets, concerning which time it is said in 1 Macc. 9:27, "And there was great tribulation in Israel, such as was not since the day that a prophet was not seen among them," while the Writings of the Old Testament are called the "Scripture of the Prophets" (Rom. 16:26).
2. because they were not written in the Prophetic language, i.e., Hebrew, in which the Canonical Books of the Old Testament were written, but in Greek. They are indeed found, either all or some, in Hebrew or Chaldaic, but not originally so written, but recently translated. On which matter see Hottinger, *Thes. Phil.*, lib. 1, c. 3, Sect. 3, qu. 7, p. 314, 315.
3. because they were never placed in the ark, in which the Canonical books were stored.
4. because they were never acknowledged as Canonical by the Jews, to whom however were committed the oracles of God (Rom. 3:2), nor are they so acknowledged today, as Becanus (*Man. Contr.*, l. 1, c. 1, qu. 1) and other Pontificians everywhere confess. Indeed, the Jews accuse the Christians of having added to the Canon of the Old Testament these books, which they call *גזוּזִים* (hidden), wherefore R. Gedaliah in *Schalschelet hakkabbala*, p. 68, says: "It is worth your while to know that the Nations of the Age have multiplied the writing of other books in the Collection of books, which are not in our hands." and R. Azarias in *Meor Enaim*, p. 175: "They have been received by them, but not by us."
5. because they are nowhere cited by Christ and the Apostles. On the contrary, Christ in Luc. 24:44, distributing the Canon of the Old Testament into the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, approves the opinion of the Jews, and not obscurely excludes these controverted Books from the Canon.
6. because the matter and Style of these books smacks of something human.

7. because the Primitive Christian Church did not number them among the Canonical books, which is clear from the Council of Laodicea, c. 59, which was approved by the Sixth General Council of Constantinople, Can. 2 (in Caranza, p. 470, 471). It is also established from Athanasius in *Synops. Scripturæ Sac.*, Tom. 2, p. 55, ff., and also *Epist. Heortast.*, Tom. 2, p. 38, 39; from the Epistle of Melito of Sardis to Onesimus (in Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, l. 4, c. 26); Origen (in Euseb., *Hist. Eccl.*, l. 6, c. 25); Gregory Nazianzen, *Carmines* 33, Tom. 2; Epiphanius, *Hæres.* 8, which is of the Epicureans, and *lib. de Ponderib. & Menfur.*, p. 533; Amphilochius of Iconium; Jerome in the *Prolog. Galeat.*; John of Damascus, *de Orthod. Fid.*, l. 4, c. 18. Indeed, in the Apostolic Canon 85, these books are numbered among the Canonical. But we respond: 1. in the same Canon also the two Epistles of Clement and his Constitutions are recounted among the Canonical books of the New Testament, which, however, are not Canonical even to the Roman Church itself. 2. Franciscus Turrianus himself, in his *Additions to Caranza's Summa Conciliorum*, not only notes on the Title of the canons, p. 1, that this last canon is most manifestly supposititious, but also warns at the End of the canons: "It is certain that this last canon is apocryphal and added. For the Epistles of Clement were never held as Holy and Canonical Scripture, just as his Constitutions were not." Not to touch here on the 3. Controversies concerning the Apostolic Canons. The 3rd Council of Carthage recounts these books, which are non-canonical to us, as *κεκανονισμένοι* or Canonical, in Can. 47, but 1. those words are not had in the Greek Codices, nor in the Latin of Basel, nor in the Parisian of Tiliius. 2. in an Addition to that Canon, mention is made of Pope Boniface, who lived much later, since this 3rd Council was celebrated in the time of Pope Siricius, which the Binnian Edition and some preceding ones acknowledge. Hence Surius attributes this Canon not to the 3rd of Carthage, but to the 7th, which things can beget a suspicion of Corruption. 3. it can be understood there of Ecclesiastical Reading, not precisely of a Canon of Faith and Morals, since at the beginning of the Chapter it is said: "It has been decided that besides the Canonical Scriptures nothing in the Church be read under the name of divine Scriptures," and at the End it is added: "because we have received these from the Fathers to be read. It is also permitted to read the Passions of the Martyrs when their anniversary days are celebrated." For the word Canon can be taken in two ways: either broadly, for a Canon of Ecclesiastical Reading, or strictly, for a Canon of Faith and morals. In the former sense they can be called Canonical, because, bound in one Volume with the Twenty-four, they were read in the Church, and because they are necessary for knowing the History of those times, and useful for forming morals, and indeed for confirming dogmas already known. We deny that they are Canonical in the latter sense. If the Doctors of the Roman Church would call the XXIV books recounted in the preceding section Proto-Canonical in this latter sense, but the rest Deutero-Canonical in the former sense, they would not have us as Adversaries here. Augustine seems to be so explained, who makes two Orders of canonical books: one of those which have been received by all

Churches without Controversy, and concerning which there has never been any doubt; the other of those which have been admitted only by some, and concerning which there was still doubt, which in the meantime were however bound with the others and were publicly read in the Church, not indeed of the same authority as those, but of great authority for the edification of the people, "but not for confirming the authority of Ecclesiastical dogmas," as Jerome says in his Preface to Proverbs. Thus Augustine, concerning the Scripture of the Maccabees, L. 2, c. 23, against the 2nd Epistle of Gaudentius, says: "It has been received by the Church not uselessly, if it is read or heard soberly, especially on account of those Maccabees, who for the law of God, like True Martyrs, suffered such unworthy and horrendous things from their persecutors." See the same, l. 18, de C.D. c. 36, also de Doctr. Christ. l. 2, c. 8. See also Turretin, Inst. Theol. Elencht., Loc. 2, qu. 9, §. 6, 7, and William Beveridge, Codicem Canonum Eccles. Primit. vindicatum ac illustrat., L. 2, C. 9, §. 1, 2, 3, p. 241, ff.

Strictly and κατ' ἐξοχήν called Apocryphal are: the Prayer of Manasseh, the 3rd and 4th book of Ezra, the Appendix of the 2nd book of Paralipomenon, the Appendix of the book of Esther, the Appendix of the book of Job, Psalm 151, the 3rd and 4th book of the Maccabees, the Preface to the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and the Additament to Ecclesiasticus, which are also held as Apocryphal by the Roman Church.

§. XVIII.

The Canonical Books of the New Testament are divided into three Parts. The first comprehends the Historical Books, namely the Gospel of Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, and the Acts of the Apostles. The second comprehends the dogmatic Books or twenty-one Epistles, namely: Ten of Paul to whole Churches, viz., 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, one to the Hebrews; Four to certain Persons, namely, two to Timothy, one to Titus, one to Philemon; Seven of the other Apostles, namely, One of James, two of Peter, three of John, and one of Jude. The Third Part contains the Prophetic book, i.e., the Apocalypse of John. Concerning a few of which there was for some time doubt, but afterwards, the doubt (concerning the Authors rather than the doctrine) having been removed, they were admitted into the Canon with unanimous consent.

§. XIX.

Therefore spurious and Pseudepigraphal are: the Gospel of St. Peter, the Proto-Gospel of James, the Gospel of the Ebionites, of the Nazarenes, of the Encratites; the Gospel of Thomas, Bartholomew, Philip, Matthias, Thaddeus, Andrew, Paul, Nicodemus, Judas Iscariot; the Gospel according to the Hebrews, according to the XII Apostles, according to the Egyptians. Also the Acts of Peter, Andrew, Paul and Thecla, Thomas, Philip, John, Paul, Peter and Paul, and Abdias. Also the Epistle of J. Christ to Abgar, Prince of Edessa; of St. Mary to Ignatius, to the Messenians and Florentines; of Paul to the Laodiceans, his

third to the Corinthians; his 6 Epistles to Seneca and Seneca's 8 to Paul; the Epistle of Barnabas. Also the Apocalypse of Peter, Paul, Thomas, and Stephen.

§. XX.

The Books of the New Testament were originally written in Greek. Many formerly believed, and believe today, that the Gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew. From the Ancients, Papias, Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, and Theophylact stated this. From the more recent, Baronius, Bellarmine, Sixtus of Siena, Possevinus, Maldonatus, Huetius, Elias du Pin, Richard Simon, Munster, Bullinger, Salmasius, Grotius, Cave, Sandius, and others, who rest mostly on the authority of the Ancients cited here. We think that Matthew, like the other Writers of the N.T., wrote in Greek: 1. because in this Gospel Hebrew things are explained in Greek, for example, Matth. 2:23, c. 27:46, which would have been superfluous if this Gospel had been written in Hebrew. 2. because it is not probable that, when all the Authors of the N.T. wrote in Greek, Matthew alone would have written in Hebrew, especially since at his time the Greek language was not unknown to the Jews. 3. because in that Hebrew Gospel not a few things alien to Matthew's Gospel are added and stitched to it, some things also are cut out, and some are changed, which give faith that it is not the genuine Gospel of Matthew. Gomarus exhibits some such places in his Dissertation on the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew. Jerome not obscurely hints that this Hebrew Gospel is that which the Nazarenes and Ebionites used. As for what pertains to the Testimonies of the Fathers, they are not universal, nor suitable and worthy of faith. They are not universal, because not all affirmed it. Among the affirmers, Chrysostom shows that he has it not from certain knowledge, but from fame, saying: "It is said," which word Eusebius also uses in H.E. l. 5, c. 10. Nor were there wanting those who counted this Gospel among the adulterated, as Eusebius testifies in l. 3, c. 25: "And now also some have numbered the Gospel, which is according to the Hebrews, among these (adulterated things), in which those especially delight who from the Hebrews have received Christ." Bede has similar things on Luke. Those Testimonies are unsuitable because the Fathers, induced by Papias, a Doctor indeed most ancient, but who was *μικρὸς τὸν νοῦν*, "of small judgment," as Eusebius testifies l. 3, c. 39, said these things. That Mark wrote in Latin in Rome and rendered it into Greek in Aquileia cannot be proven by a suitable testimony, nor was there need: for the Greek language was not so unknown at Rome at that time; hence Paul wrote to the Romans themselves in the Greek Language. We say the same of the Epistle to the Hebrews: for it does not follow that because this Epistle was written to the Hebrews, therefore it was written in Hebrew, since it is established that the Jews at that time were not utterly ignorant of the Greek language, from which they took the name of Hellenists. The Hebrew Epistle to the Hebrews which exists today has been translated from the Greek into Hebrew. We gather thence that the whole New Testament was written in Greek.

§. XXI.

The Order of the Writing of the Books of the N.T. is doubtful. We prefer the conjecture of Theophylact, stating that Matthew wrote in the 8th year after the Ascension of Christ, Mark in the 10th, Luke in the 15th, and John last of all in the year 57. From whom Nicephorus dissents, who refers the Gospel of Matthew to the year 15. But Irenaeus in l. 3, c. 1, and Eusebius in l. 5, c. 18, reject it to around the year 60, when, that is, Peter and Paul were teaching at Rome and founding the Church. Others opine that he wrote in the year of the vulgar Era 39, others 41, others 48. Others think that Mark wrote around A.D. 43, Luke around A.D. 53, or 56, or 58, and John at last toward the end of the first Century. The Acts of the Apostles are thought to have been written by Luke around A.D. 58 and comprehend a History of 28 Years. Of the Epistles of Paul, Theodoret at the beginning of his commentary on the Epistles of Paul establishes this order: The 1st is 2 Thessalonians; 2nd, 1 Thessalonians; 3rd, 2 Corinthians; 4th, 1 Corinthians; 5th, 1 Timothy; 6th, to Titus; 7th, to the Romans; 8th, to the Galatians; 9th, to the Philippians; 10th, to the Ephesians; 11th, to the Colossians; 12th, to Philemon; 13th, to the Hebrews; 14th, 2 Timothy, which he teaches was written shortly before the death of the Holy Man in Chap. 4, v. 6. In the Catholic Epistles, the Latins put Peter first, the Greeks James, and some John. All consenting, the Apocalypse of John closes the Canon. See Henr. Alting's *Theologia Historica*, Loc. 2, p. 116, 117.

The Affections or Adjuncts of all the books of the Old and New Testament are either Primary or Secondary. The Primary are: Divine Inspiration (*θεοπνευστία*), Truth, Authority, Perfection, Perspicuity, Interpretation, the Faculty of being a Norm, and Efficacy. The Secondary are: Necessity, Integrity, Purity, Communicability for Reading through Versions. More on which in the following Chapter.

CHAPTER II. On the Attributes of Holy Scripture

SUMMARY

Column 1

- §. 1. The first Adjunct of Scripture is Necessity, not absolute but hypothetical.
- §. 2. Scripture is necessary not only for Beginners, but also for the Progressing and the Mature.
- §. 3. Not only the Scripture of the New, but also of the Old Testament.
- §. 4. The second Adjunct is Divine Inspiration (*θεοπνευστία*); where Spinoza's view is noted and refuted.
- §. 5. Not only the things, but also the words are inspired.
- §. 6. Yet with a diverse Style of the Writers.
- §. 7. Whether there are Barbarisms and Solecisms in the New Testament.
- §. 8. The simple Style of the N.T. is asserted, with Barbarisms and Solecisms excluded.
- §. 9. The third Adjunct of Scripture is Truth.
- §. 10. The fourth Affection of Scripture, Divine Authority. The Testimony of the Church is necessary.
- §. 11. The external and internal Criteria of Scripture.
- §. 12. On what does the Authority of Scripture depend with respect to Us?
- §. 13. The fifth Affection of Scripture is Integrity. All exemplars of the Bible were not burned in the destruction of Jerusalem and miraculously restored by Ezra.

Column 2

- §. 14. That with respect to its integrating parts, the Scripture of the O.T. is whole; i.e., no canonical books have perished.
- §. 15. That from the N.T. no Canonical book has been lost.
- §. 16. The sixth Adjunct of Scripture is Purity. The Scripture of the O.T. is not corrupt.
- §. 17. Nor is the N.T. corrupt.
- §. 18. The seventh Adjunct of Scripture is Perfection or Sufficiency.
- §. 19. To Scripture also pertain those things which are deduced from it by Consequence.
- §. 20. On Traditions: the opinion of the Jews, Greeks, and Pontificians.
- §. 21. On Traditions: the opinion of the Protestants.
- §. 22. Private visions and revelations are weighed.
- §. 23. The eighth Affection of Scripture, Perspicuity.
- §. 24. The Causes of the Obscurity of certain places of Scripture.
- §. 25. The ninth Adjunct of Scripture, Interpretation. The Means of Interpretation.
- §. 26. Is the Sense of Scripture twofold or single?
- §. 27. The tenth Affection of Scripture, the Faculty of being a Norm.

- §. 28. Scripture is also the Norm of Controversies.
 - §. 29. The eleventh Adjunct of Scripture, Communicability for Reading by all.
 - §. 30. Hence Versions are licit and necessary. Among other Versions, the Chaldaic Paraphrases are eminent.
 - §. 31. The Version of the Septuagint Interpreters.
 - §. 32. The Vulgate Version; whether it is authentic.
 - §. 33. Versions into the Vulgar languages. A recent French version prepared for Converts is noted.
 - §. 34. The twelfth Adjunct of Scripture is Efficacy for the Faith and Conversion of men.
-

§. I.

The first Adjunct of Holy Scripture is Necessity, not an absolute one, as if God could not have propagated and conserved the Church without Scripture. For just as God before Moses for several Ages conserved the Church by the living voice without Scripture, so without doubt He could have conserved it in the following times. Therefore, it would be a war of words between Protestants and Roman Catholics—namely Bellarmine, *lib. 4, de Verbo Dei, c. 4, p. 172*—if they were here denying only the absolute Necessity of Scripture. But the Necessity of Holy Scripture asserted by Protestants is only hypothetical, which is an Affection of Scripture by which, from the most wise Will and ordination of God, the Word of God necessarily had to be consigned to letters, and having been written, must be conserved until the end of the world. And this Necessity is proven by: I. The most wise Will and Ordination of God, by which, with immediate Revelation having ceased, He wills His Church to be informed by means of Scripture. Luc. 16:29, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." 2 Pet. 1:19, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed," etc. "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." 2 Tim. 3:15-17, "from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." See Joh. 20:31; Rom. 15:4.

§. II.

II. The Cessation of Divine Revelation made by Apparitions. III. The condition of Men, and indeed: 1. the multiplication of men and the propagation and dilation of the Church, and its diffusion not only into more families, but into Nations and peoples, in which the celestial Truth can be better conserved in writing than by the living voice. 2. The fallibility of human Memory. 3. The brevity of human Life. 4. the propensity of men to errors. IV. The proclivity of Satan to deceive and dement men. V. The unfaithfulness of Tradition in the vicissitudes of the world, its easy and multiple corruption and uncertainty. VI. The necessary Duration, Solidity or Immobility, and Constancy of the celestial Doctrine. VII. The firmness of our Faith (Phil. 2:1). Alphonsus Salmeron rightly writes, among other things, in *Tom. 1, Commentar. in N. T., Proleg. 5, on the Gospel, p. 391*: "Since the Church of Christ was to endure for a long time, and the memory of men is not very tenacious and faithful, it was necessary for the memory of such useful and Holy things to be conserved in writings." See also Possevinus, *Biblioth. Select.*, lib. 2, c. 31.

§. III.

Nor is Scripture useful and necessary only for beginning Christians, as the Enthusiasts, i.e., the "inspired" and "divine," wished—Spirituals, who called the rest Psychics and Animals; the Montanists, the Messalians or Euchetes, i.e., the Praying ones; Thomas Müntzer, Theophrastus Paracelsus; the Schwenckfeldians, Libertines, Weigelians, the

Brethren of the Rosy Cross, Böhmites, Quakers—who taught and teach that Scripture is indeed necessary for Tyros and Beginners, whom they therefore called "Literalists" and "Vocalists," but that for the Progressing and the Adult, Scripture being put aside or held in low esteem as the "dead letter," Visions, private revelations, raptures, apparitions, dreams, and internal, divine or Angelic, colloquies are to be expected. But also for the Progressing and Adult, who have the Spirit of Christ and walk in the Spirit, the Meditation of Holy Scripture is not to be neglected and set aside, but is to be continued to the end of life. For in Deut. 6:6,7,8, Moses in the name of God commands the Israelites: "And these words... shall be in thine heart: And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up. And thou shalt bind them for a sign upon thine hand, and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes." David, in Ps. 1:2, declares that man blessed "whose delight is in the law of the LORD; and in his law doth he meditate day and night." And in Ps. 119:105 he says of himself: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." In Is. 8:20, it is declared to adults also: "To the law and to the testimony." In the N.T., Christ in Joh 5:39 bids to "search (*ἐρευνᾶν*) the scriptures," which can be done salutarily only by Progressing and adult Christians. Peter in his 2nd Epistle, 1:19, writes to the faithful of his time: "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; 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." And Paul in Col. 3:16 exhorts: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs." This is confirmed 2. because all who have had true Revelations, Visions, and internal divine colloquies have confirmed it by their own examples, as they did not cast away the divine Scriptures, but constantly meditated on them. 3. because the spirits are to be tested, whether they are of God (1 Joh. 4:1), which must be done according to the rule of the Written Word, because otherwise 4. anyone could boast of such a Spirit and Visions, and 5. this Principle being admitted, there would be as many Spirits as Heads, as many private Revelations, and hence as many Senses and Religions.

§. IV.

Nor is only the Scripture of the New, but also of the Old Testament useful and necessary for the faithful today, and from it also the dogmas of faith and the institutes of life can and ought to be sought and proven. For although the Old Testament, as to the Mosaic Economy and the Levitical dispensation, has been taken away and abrogated, it yet endures as to its doctrine. Which we prove against the Anabaptists and Socinians: 1. from Matth. 5:17, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." V. 19, "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven." 2. Luc. 16:29, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." 3. Joh 5:39, also of the Scripture of the Old Testament it is said: "Search the scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me." 4. Rom. 15:4, "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we

through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." 5. because Christians in Eph. 2:20 are "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets." Whence the Prophetic is no less necessary than the Apostolic. 6. 2 Tim. 3:15-17, "the holy scriptures (of the O.T.) are able to make thee wise unto salvation... For all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 7. 2 Pet. 1:19, "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; 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." The words "until" and "unto" do not always exclude the Future, but are Continuative, which Examples prove, for instance, Gen. 28:15; Matt. 28:20; Gen. 8:7; 2 Sam. 6:23; Matth. 1:25. 8. because the Old Testament is the Foundation of the New, but the New is the Complement of the Old. The demonstration of which thing validly confirms the faithful in the faith. Wherefore of Paul in Act 26:22 it is said that he taught "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." 9. because, the Scripture of the Old Testament being set aside, it cannot be validly demonstrated against the Jews that Jesus of Nazareth is the promised Messiah.

§. V.

II. An Affection of Holy Scripture is *θεοπνευστία*, or Divine Inspiration, by which the things contained in Holy Scripture—both those utterly unknown by nature, and those knowable indeed by nature but in reality unknown—were consigned by the Holy Authors, with the Holy Spirit not only assisting and directing, but also dictating, inspiring, and suggesting; but those things that were known were consigned with the Holy Spirit exciting and directing. This is denied by: 1. Benedict Spinoza in *Tract. Theol. Polit.*, Cap. 1, p. 14, where he writes: "the Prophets perceived the things revealed by God only by the help of the Imagination, that is, by means of Words or images, and those either real or imaginary." Cap. 2, p. 15: "the Prophets were not endowed with a more perfect mind, but with a more powerfully vivid faculty of imagining." Especially *ibid.* p. 16, where he writes that "the prophecies varied not only according to the reasoning of the imagination and the Temperament of the body of each Prophet, but also according to the reasoning of the opinions with which they had been imbued." *ibid.* p. 18, "Revelation varied in each Prophet according to the disposition of the Temperament of his Body, of his Imagination, and according to the reasoning of the opinions which he had embraced. It varied according to the reasoning of the Temperament in this way," he says: "If a Prophet was cheerful, victories, peace, and whatever else moves men to Joy were revealed to him. If on the contrary he was sad, wars, punishments, and all evils were revealed to him; and so according as a Prophet was merciful, gentle, wrathful, Severe, etc., to that extent he was more apt for these than for those revelations." 2. In part, the *Meditationes paradoxæ de Inspiratione* (whose Author is thought to have been Natalis Albertus de Versé, a Frenchman, Author of the book *le Protestant Pacifique*, and who translated Richard Simon's *Critical History of the Old Testament* into Latin), which asserts that not the words, but only the things of certain books were so inspired by the Holy Spirit, that

yet the Sacred Writers often did not know they were prophesying, have lapsed in memory in languages and names, and have admitted true contradictions in Historical circumstances, for example, Matth. 27:5 and Act. 1:18. 3. Richard Simon himself also, hiding under the name of the Prior of Bolleville, concedes that the Prophets often did not understand what they said, and needed no inspiration as to the words; in the things themselves, he acknowledges sometimes an unequal, sometimes no inspiration of the kind that is commonly required, and by the word "inspiration" he understands not an Immediate suggestion, but only a prophylactic and antidote against error. See *Acta Eruditor. Lips.*, Month of Sept., A. 1686, p. 439. 4. Socinus thinks that "in light matters and those pertaining nothing to salvation, and also those which pertain to the circumstance of a fact, in narrating and consigning them, God left the Writers of the Sacred books to their human condition and fragility, and that these things were added by them, with the instinct of the Holy Spirit ceasing, by their own attempt and motion, and so it could happen that in some things the Holy Writers erred lightly." 5. Grotius also, in *Animadverf. in Riveti Animadv. de Canonicis Scripturis*, p. 110, 111, denies Divine Inspiration with respect to certain Writers, writing thus against Rivetus: "D. Rivetus is much deceived when he thinks that all those books of the Old Testament which exist in the Hebrew Canon were dictated by the Holy Spirit. Ezra, according to all the Hebrews, was neither a Prophet, nor did he have the Holy Spirit. But his books and the whole collection of the more Ancient Books made by him were approved *παρὰ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς μεγάλης* (by the great synagogue), in which were also some Prophets, although the Hebrews say that there was hesitation concerning the book of Ecclesiastes, but that the Opinion of those who received it prevailed. Luke also wrote most true things, but from whence he drew them, he himself said in his Preface." And in *Voto pro Pace*, p. 135: "I have truly said that not all the Books which are in the Hebrew Canon were dictated by the Holy Spirit. I do not deny that they were written with a pious motion of the soul, and this is what the great Synagogue judged, on whose judgment the Hebrews stand in this matter. But there was no need for Histories to be dictated by the Holy Spirit. It was enough for the Writer to be strong in memory concerning things he had seen, or in diligence in describing the Commentaries of the Ancients," etc.

Against these we confirm our Thesis with these indubitable testimonies of Scripture: 2. Tim. 3:16, *πᾶσα γραφή θεόπνευστος*, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine," etc. 2. Pet. 1:21, "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." 2. Sam. 23:2,3, David, near death, confessed of himself: "The Spirit of the LORD spake by me, and his word was in my tongue. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." Whence the Writings of the Old Testament in Rom. 3:2 are called *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*, the "oracles of God." To the Apostles or Writers of the New Testament, Christ promises in Joh. 14:26, "the Holy Ghost... shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." Joh. 16:13, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth," etc., etc., and that this was fulfilled the Apostle preaches in 1. Cor. 2:10,11,

"But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit: for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." v. 16, "For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ." Whence the Word of the Apostles is called the Word of God, 1 Thess. 2:13, "ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God." Nor is Spinoza's opinion solid, that the Prophecies varied according to the reasoning of the Temperament, and that joyful things were revealed to the sanguine and cheerful, sad things to the melancholic and sad, and threats to the choleric and wrathful. For the examples prove the contrary: For Moses, the meekest of mortals, proposed to the people of Israel not only the Blessing and Life, but also the Curse and death. Isaiah predicted both joyful things, for example, concerning the liberation of Jerusalem from Rezin King of Assyria and Pekah King of Israel, and also concerning the Liberation by the Messiah to come, and other things, as well as sad things. See c. 40, 60, 61. Jeremiah, sad and mournful, announced not only the Calamities of the Jews and the Babylonian Captivity, but also the Liberation from the same and the Advent of the Messiah. Daniel likewise, sad and lying in sackcloth and ashes fasting, prophesied not only of the four Monarchies, but also of the Nativity and benefits of the Messiah and other joyful things. Nor did revelation vary concerning the same Objects according to the diversity of the Temperament of the Prophets. For the Prophetess Huldah would have announced the same promise of divine Mercy to Josiah, in the name of God, which she made in 2 Chron. 34:27, as the most mournful Jeremiah, captured by a great weariness of life, would have announced, if he had been consulted on the same matter, since divine Truth is always similar to itself, and contrary things cannot be revealed about the same thing, at the same time, and in the same circumstances.

§. VI.

Nor did the Holy Spirit inspire only the things and the sense of the Words to the Sacred Writers, but He also put the Words themselves in their mouth, and so directed them that they not only did not err in the Words, but also expressed the divine things with suitable words, and committed no error. This is clear, besides the places adduced in the preceding Thesis, from Is. 51:16, "And I have put my words in thy mouth." Jer. 1:9, "Behold, I have put my words in thy mouth." cf. Deut. 18:18; Num. 23:5. On which formula of God's speaking, Wolfgang Musculus in his Commentary on Is. c. 51:16, comments thus: "To put words in someone's mouth is not simply to command the thing itself, but also to prescribe the very words with which it is to be uttered. So much did Divine Providence take care lest anything be in the will of the Prophets, that it also put the very words in their mouths. Thus nothing was left to them in the ministry of prophesying except the organ of the mouth. Not only the thing to be uttered, but also the very Words were of God." To which pertains the asseveration of Christ in Matth. 10:20, "For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you," cf. Marc. 13:11; Luc. 12:11,12. If this could have place before tribunals and Sanhedrins, much more ought it to be fulfilled in the Consignation of the Word of the Gospel, which is the Rule of Faith and of Morals.

The Apostles provided an illustrious example on the first Pentecost of the N.T., Act. 2:4,11, where, filled with the Holy Spirit, they spoke and preached the great works of God in various tongues, to the stupor of all, and indeed in v. 6, to each nation in its own dialect (*τῆ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ*), not at their will, but "as the Spirit gave them utterance." Hence Christ in Matth. 5:18 and Luc. 16:17 says, "till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." And hence is that common and universal Consensus of all Sects, of distinguishing Versions proceeding from men from the Original text and of appealing from them to it, as that on which our faith more safely rests.

§. VII.

Although the Sacred Writers also took their words, with which they expressed Histories and sacred things, from the custom of the people and from the usage of daily speaking, and also used a diverse Style, yet divine Providence most wisely directed a business of such great moment and so attempered itself to the genius and kind of speech and Style of each Writer, that although some used a more sublime, others a more plain Style and kind of speech, all nevertheless exactly attained the intention of the Holy Spirit and accurately expressed the intended thing. Specifically, Theologians observe of Isaiah that, because, as a noble Man of Jerusalem, born of the tribe of Judah and of Royal Blood, namely the son of Amoz the brother of Azariah King of Judah, he was educated in the court, he surpassed the other Prophets in the beauty of his speech, the elegance of his diction, the sublimity of his Style, and the weight of his matters. Of Jeremiah, originating from the village of Anathoth, three miles distant from Jerusalem, that he used a simpler, easier, and more rustic kind of speech, while yet being equal to the others in the weight of his matters and the majesty of his senses, which simplicity of Style is thought to have adhered to him from the Place in which he was born and educated. Of Ezekiel, that his Style is mediocre, not indeed so eloquent, nor yet rustic, but mixed and tempered from both. Job, because he lived in a region bordering Arabia, hence not a few Arabic and Syriac words and phrases occur among the Hebrew in the Book of Job, which can with difficulty be understood without the subsidy of these languages. In Ezra, Nehemiah, Jeremiah, and Daniel, because they lived in the time of the Babylonian Captivity and had commerce with the Chaldeans, Chaldaisms everywhere occur, and indeed some parts are in Chaldaic. See on the Style of Sacred Scripture, Jerome in his Preface to Isaiah; Glassius, *Philol. Sac.*, lib. 1, Tract. 3; Hottinger, *Thesaur. Philol.*, lib. 2, c. 1, Sect. 2, p. 470, 471; Quenstedt, *Syst. Theol.*, Part. 1, c. 4, Sect. 2, qu. 4, p. 75, 76; Leusden, *Philol. Hebr.*, Diff. 6, §. 5, 6, 7.

§. VIII.

Hence also it is apparent what should be responded to that idle Question, which some have moved: "Are there Barbarisms and Solecisms in the New Testament?" Namely, the Stoics, according to Diogenes Laertius, *de Vitis Philosoph.*, l. 7, Segm. 59, defined these two vices of Speech thus: "*βαρβαρισμὸς ἐκ τῶν κακιῶν λέξεις ἐστὶ παρὰ τὸ ἔθος τῶν εὐδαιμονόντων* (vel ut Vossius 1. 1. c. 1. *de Vitiis sermonis legendum putat, εὐδοκιμούντων*) *ἐλλήνων. Σολοικισμὸς δὲ ἐστὶ λόγος ἀκαταλλήλως συντεταγμένος.*" he adds from Suidas: *ὡς τὸ ἐγὼ*

περιπατῶν, ὁ τοῖχος ἔπεσεν. i.e., "Barbarism is a diction contrary to the custom of the fortunate (or, as Vossius thinks should be read, 'approved') Greeks. Solecism, however, is Speech incongruously constructed," as in "I walking, the wall fell." Quintilian in Lib. 1 of his *Instit.*, c. 5, defines a Solecism thus: "A Solecism is, in a single comprehension of Speech, an inconvenient position of following and prior parts among themselves." Donatus: "A vice in the context of the parts of Speech made against the Rule of the art." Theodorus Gaza in lib. 4 of his *Grammat. Introduct.* teaches that a Barbarism is a *ἀμάρτημα περὶ μίαν λέξιν*, a "vice in single words," but a Solecism is *περὶ τὸν λόγον*, a "vice committed in the Composition and construction of words."

The proposed Question, "Are there Barbarisms & Solecisms in Scripture, especially the New Testament?" was affirmed with an incensed and hostile spirit by the Gentile Philosophers and Orators, who blamed the Christians in general, and the sacred writers, especially of the New Testament, for expressing the senses of their soul with a rude, barbarous, and unpolished style, and that their books, even the Sacred ones, were written in an uncultured, rustic, and indeed insipid, kind of speech and abounded with Barbarisms & Solecisms. For which cause they held the sacred books in ridicule and contempt. Thus the Gentile in Arnobius, l. 1, says of the monuments of the Christians: "They were written by unlearned and rude men, and therefore are not to be believed on a facile hearing." also: "your things are covered with Barbarisms and Solecisms and polluted with the deformity of vices." Justin Martyr relates similar things in his *Apology* 1. In Origen, *adv. Celsum*, lib. 3, the Gentile laughs at the *ἰδιωτικοὺς λόγους* (common speech) of Scripture; in lib. 6, at the "tenuity in eloquence" of Scripture, and in l. 7, he attributes to Christ himself *λόγον ἀγροικότερον* (a rather rustic speech). Which is confirmed by Lactantius, l. 5, *Instit. Divinarum*, c. 1, and also lib. 6, c. 21; Theodoret, *de Curandis Græcor. Affect.*, lib. 1 & 9; Jerome, in his Preface to Eusebius's *Chronicon*; Isidore of Pelusium, l. 4, Epist. 28, 27, 30, 205. Augustine himself, not yet baptized, disdained the Holy Scripture on account of the simplicity of its Style, which he confesses and deplors in *Confessions*, lib. 3, c. 5.

Some of the Fathers also call the Evangelists and Apostles—especially in their Apologies against the Gentile Detractors, but with a good intention—*ιδιώτας, ἀγροίκους, ἀμαθεῖς, ἀγραμματάτους* (common men, rustics in speech, unlearned, illiterate, and rude), and call their diction rustic (*ἀγροικιζομένην*), barbarous (*βαρβαρίζουσαν*), solecistic (*σολοικίζουσαν*), and common (*ιδιωτικὴν*). Which denomination, among others, was also familiar to Jerome. But they do this 1. from the hypothesis of the Gentile Detractors. 2. comparatively to the affected Eloquence and the bedecked words of the Sages and Sophists of the heathens, whose whole worth consisted in the polish of their Style, while sometimes being destitute of weight of content, while on the contrary the Sacred Writers and other Doctors of the Church had a greater care for things than for words. This is clear from the words of Chrysostom on Paul's words in 1 Cor. 1:17: "The accusation itself is an encomium; and when the Pagans have said that the Apostles were rustic, let us add and say that they were unlearned and illiterate and poor, vile and foolish and obscure. These

are not maledictions against the Apostles, but their glory: that being of this kind, they were more famous than the whole circle of the earth. For these rude and rustic and unlearned men conquered the wise and the powerful and the Tyrants, who offered themselves with riches and glory and all external things, just as if they were not Men." And Theodoret against the Greeks, lib. 5: "We mourn the insanity of these (Gentile Sages), who, when they see that men of barbarous speech have surpassed the eloquence of Greek elocution, and that skillfully adorned fables have been utterly profligated, and that Attic Syllogisms have been dissolved by the Solecisms of a Fisherman, yet they are not ashamed, nor do they hide themselves in concealment, but impudently fight for a lie and falsity." Jerome on Ps. 81:8: "That Paul, who makes Solecisms in speaking, carries the cross of Christ, and as if triumphing, captures all; he has subjugated the whole World from the Ocean to the red sea."

Erasmus, following these, especially Jerome, wrote in his Annotations on Act. 10:46 that the speech of the Apostles is sometimes solecistic. While the most Learned Beza offers some necessary corrections against him in Act. 10:46, he himself also on p. 54 says: "I acknowledge the highest Simplicity in the Apostolic Writings; I do not deny hyperbata, anantapodota, and even Solecisms." But that by these words he wishes not only nothing to be detracted from the Style of the sacred writers, but also to commend it most highly and extol it with praises, is shown both by this whole Discourse, in which he wishes not only the things themselves but also the words to have been Inspired to the Sacred Writers, and teaches that God so moderated their tongue that not even a word escaped them rashly, and that they said all things so plainly, aptly, and appositely, that it could never be said more plainly and better by anyone concerning these things, and especially by these words of his: "But why that simplicity rather pleased than an ornate eloquence, the Apostles had most grave causes; and indeed why they thought that they should sometimes even stammer, and indeed commit solecisms. Thus it pleased God to confound the wise of this world. Then, their business was for the most part with rude and plebeian men, whose speech, if anyone should exact it according to the precepts of the Grammarians or Rhetors, he would certainly do so ineptly." From which it is clear that Beza admitted Solecisms only comparatively, and with respect to the Grammatical Rules of the Gentiles, and hardly even in this respect. Nor in any other sense did Salmasius use this name of the Style of the sacred writers in *de Lingua Hellenistica*, especially p. 260. There also came forth a Tractate of a certain Anonymous author, under the title, *Innocentia Hellenistarum*, in which he more freely calls the Style of the Sacred Writers barbarous and solecistic (*βαρβαρίζοντα και σολοικίζοντα*), which Johannes Musæus defends in part in his *Disquisitio Philol. de Stylo N. T.*, in which he modestly examines Jacob Gross's *Triada Propof. & Observat. Apol.*, where see Sect. 2, Artic. 2, §. 13, 16, & Artic. 3, §. 19, 20, etc.

§. IX.

We declare our mind in four Positions.

I. The Style of the New Testament is for a great part pure Greek, and indeed such that not even the profane Greek Authors themselves would be ashamed of it.

II. The Sacred Writers, however, by a most wise counsel of God, used not a sublime, elegant, and ornate, but a simple, humble, and common, yet perspicuous and plain, kind of speech in the books of the New Testament. Paul himself confesses this and explains the reason for the fact, namely, lest the world seem to be converted to Christ by the power of human Eloquence, 1 Cor. 1:17, "For Christ sent me... to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." v. 19, ff., "For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe," etc. 1 Cor. 2:1,2, "And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God." v. 4, "And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: That your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God." 2 Cor. 11:6, he says: "but though I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge."

III. The Text of the N.T. contains Hebraisms, Chaldaisms, Syriacisms, and even Latinisms, which Thomas Gatakerus in *de Stylo N. T.*, and also Johannes Vorstius, Georg Pasor, D. Johannes Olearius, etc., etc., have demonstrated against Sebastian Pfochen's *Diatriba de Linguae Græca N. T. Puritate*. Here the singular Providence of God deserves to be adored. For just as the sacred writers of the N.T., to conciliate faith and Authority for their doctrine with respect to the things themselves, taught nothing beyond those things which Moses and the Prophets had spoken would be (Act. 26:22; also 1 Pet. 1:10, 11, 12), so also in the Style itself and the quality of their speech they had to inflect their diction to the genius of the Hebrew language of the O.T., and therefore admit Hebraisms, so that neither might the Jews suspect Novelty, nor the Gentiles diversity, and neither might doubt the Agreement of both Testaments or complain of obscurity. For thus also it would be shown, both with respect to the things and the Words, that the Old Testament is the foundation of the New, but the New the complement of the Old, and thus in Christ, our Peace, τὰ ἀμφοτέρα, both, might become one, and the middle wall of partition being broken down and the enmity being taken away, Hebrews and Greeks might be reconciled to God by the cross and both coalesce into one Body (Eph. 2:14, 16).

IV. Although indeed the Style of the Evangelists and Apostles is not as polished and ornate as was that of the Greeks when Greece was flourishing, we nevertheless do not think it should be taught that it abounds with Barbarisms and Solecisms. 1. because in Act. 2:4, filled with the Holy Spirit, they "began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." 2. because, illuminated from heaven by the Holy Spirit, they had such a knowledge of the Greek language that they were an admiration even to the Greeks themselves (Act. 2:6,7, ff.). It ought not, therefore, to be said of them that they

committed Barbarisms and Solecisms. 3. If Graecisms used by Latin Authors are not held to be Barbarisms and Solecisms, Therefore neither ought the Hebraisms, Chaldaisms, etc., used by the Apostles to be held as such. 4. especially since the sacred writers admitted Hebraisms not from ignorance, but knowingly and for a good reason; since even sins in the Arts committed on purpose are not held to be errors, according to Aristotle, Nic. Eth. l. 6, c. 5, ἐν τέχνῃ ὁ ἐκὼν ἁμαρτάνων, αἰρετώτερος, "he who sins voluntarily in an art is to be preferred" to him who does so involuntarily. And Seneca, Ep. 95, "A grammarian does not blush at a Solecism if he does it knowingly; he blushes if he does it unknowingly." See Augustine, de C.D. l. 4, c. 16. Much less, therefore, ought the Writers of the N.T. to be accused of the Vices of Barbarism and Solecism on account of the Hebraisms used with the best counsel. 5. It would be contumelious to the Holy Spirit if the Sacred Authors, moved by the Holy Spirit, were to be accused of Solecisms and Barbarisms.

§. X.

III. An Adjunct of Scripture is Truth, which is its Affection by which Scripture is free of all error. For although the Apostles and other sacred Authors could have erred, and actually did err, in their private life and otherwise, which is clear from Act. 10:14, C. 15:6, 7, Gal. 2:11, ff., yet in the Consignation of the canonical books, being moved by the Holy Spirit, they were free of error. Although also not all sayings contained in Scripture (such as are those related as uttered by the impious) are true approbatively, yet these also have the Truth of History or of historical Relation, and are true recitatively. The Author of the *Systema Præadamiticum* has violated the Truth of Scripture in lib. 4, c. 1, p. 178, writing: "in the sacred books most things are everywhere obscure, confused, and troubled; indeed, some things are mutually conflicting, as cold with hot and dry with humid." *ibid.* c. 2, p. 179, he says: "To elucidate what is obscure in the sacred pages which we handle, to order what is confused and troubled in them, to recall what is omitted, to restore what is lacking and mutilated, to reconcile what is conflicting, is not granted to my perspicacity." *ibid.*, "Nor indeed is it hidden from me that tares and thistles grow up with the neat crops of the Lord, and that among His sowing, unhappy darnel and sterile oats dominate; I know that in the harvest of the Lord a greater supply of chaff and of husks is confused with the grains of wheat," etc. 2. Socinus in his book *de Autoritate scripturæ*, c. 1, p. 14, concedes that "in some few things which are of no weight, it could have happened that one Writer held the truth of such things better than another, and perhaps wrote somewhat or even much differently from another." p. 15, "in themselves false or nothing is found, or, if anything of the kind is found, it is of so little moment that it ought to diminish nothing at all of the faith of those writers in those things which are of any weight." c. 4, p. 71, he says that "it could have happened that the writers of the N.T. erred lightly." See Smalcius *contra Franz.*, p. 81. 3. Weigel in *Gülden Greiff*, p. 57, admits that the sacred Authors were not immune from all error in dogmatic matters. 4. Erasmus in his Annotations on Matth. 2 & 27 holds that the Evangelists, not taking their testimonies of the O.T. from books but trusting to memory, sometimes lapsed. 5. Which Episcopius also thinks, *Instit.* l. 4, Sect. 1, §. 4. 6. Most Doctors of the Roman Church indeed think rightly

here, but some, from a zeal for extolling the Testimony of the Church, have written that, the Testimony of the Church being set aside, it remains uncertain whether some places of the sacred writings are true or false.

We prove the all-encompassing Truth of Holy Scripture: 1. because as Peter testifies in his Ep. 1:21, "holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and 2 Tim. 3:16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God." 2. because in Joh. 16:13, the Apostles also were "guided... into all truth." 3. because in Ps. 119:43, the Word of God is the "Word of Truth," also Jac. 1:18, 2 Cor. 6:7, Eph. 1:13, Col. 1:5. Whence Christ in Joh. 17:17 says, "thy word is truth." 4. from the Truth of the things written. For Scripture hands down both what is known by nature and what is unknown. The former confirm the Truth of Scripture, because Reason itself here acknowledges the Truth. The latter bring forth the Truth of Scripture, as when revealed they are either immediately understood to be true, or if they contain a Mystery, although they are above Nature, they are nevertheless detected not to be against Reason, and teach that the Author of Nature can, by his divine indwelling power, act above the powers of Nature. Which is also required by the nature of a Principle and Rule of Faith and of Morals, such as Scripture could not be unless it were true through and through. For a Principle of Knowing ought to be everywhere true, self-believing (*αὐτόπιστον*), certain, and immobile, but a Rule ought to be infallible and immutable, because otherwise other things could not be measured and exacted by it, nor could the pravitous be corrected. 6. because otherwise our Faith would vacillate, which therefore ought to rest on a certain foundation. The Contradictions which are asserted are not truly such, but only apparent.

§. X.

IV. An Adjunct of Holy Scripture is Divine Authority, which is an Affection of Scripture by which it is divine both in itself and with respect to us. By which, because it is Divine in itself, it has the force or right of obligating us, and does obligate us, to render assent and obedience to Scripture. For all things comprehended in Scripture have the authority (*ἀθεντίαν*) either of a Norm, or at least of a History. Which Authority is founded in the highest dignity which Scripture possesses, by which it surpasses any other books whatsoever by infinite leagues, because it has God Himself as its Author, and is a certain emanation (*ἀπορροή*) and fragment (*ἀποσπασμάτιον*), a particle, effect, and as it were an efflux or derivation of the divine Wisdom, and reveals to us the Will of God concerning our salvation. And thence it has a Divine Authority in itself and with respect to us. Chamierus and Amyraldus indeed reprehend this distinction of the Authority of Scripture as less accurate, for this reason, that since Authority bespeaks a relation to another, and is referred to others, as Dominion bespeaks a relation to subjects, no Authority is given except with respect to us. But Johannes Claude rightly observes in Tom. 5 of his *Oeuvres Posthumes*, Epist. 44, p. 507, that these Learned Men have reprehended this Distinction in vain. For although Authority is of the genus of Relations, yet that Authority can be considered in three ways: either as it is in remote potential, or as it is in proximate potential, or as it is actually obtained. In which respect scripture

ought to be regarded in three moments: in the first, when it is still unknown to us; in the second, when it has been sufficiently proposed to us, and therefore can be known by us as divine; in the third, when, having been known by us, it is received. In the first, although unknown to us, it yet has in itself a divine Authority—for it is no less divine because it is ignored by us, and therefore not acknowledged—yet that Authority, relative to us, is in remote potential, because as long as it lies hidden from us, it cannot exercise its Divine Authority upon us. In the second moment, it obligates us in law and in proximate potential. In the third moment, namely having been known and received, it obligates us in act and has Authority with respect to us in reality, because we render assent to it and perform obedience. See Joh. Claude, c. 1.

So that that divine Authority may be obtained, the Testimony of the Church is altogether required, as an introductory (*εἰσαγωγικόν*), inductive, suasive, and ministerial Argument or Motive. For ordinarily the divine Authority of Scripture is not accustomed to become known to us except through the Church and its members: our Parents, Preceptors, and Pastors. And in this sense Augustine rightly said in *Contra Epist. Fundam.*, c. 5: "I would not believe, or would not have believed, the Gospel, if the authority of the Catholic Church did not move me." For which cause Paul calls the Church the "Pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15), not in an Architectonic but in a Political sense.

§. XI.

But to those reading the Scripture, there immediately occur certain Characters impressed upon Scripture, or external and internal Criteria. The External Criteria are: I. The Condition of the sacred Authors. For they were 1. Good Men. 2. Present at the deeds written by them, like Moses and the Apostles (1 Joh. 1:1,2,3). 3. They wrote with many being conscious of it, but not acting in compact with them, but with some of these sometimes rising up against them, who could easily have detected an imposture. 4. They were not induced to deceive either by promises or by threats. 5. Indeed, rather, on account of the testimony of the truth, they were exposed and subject to many hardships, the hatred of many, persecutions, and the peril of death. 6. Although remote in places and times, they yet handed down the same things. 7. They did not hide their own sins (Num. 20:12; 2 Sam. 11:1; Matth. 26:69-74; Luc. 24:21, ff., 25; Gal. 2:11, 14). 8. They were praised by their very enemies as cultivators of Virtue (Apion in Josephus, l. 1, p. 828; Strabo, *Geograph.* l. 16; Pliny, *Epist.* l. 10, Ep. 97). II. The consensus of almost the whole world. III. The happy and sudden propagation of the Christian doctrine through the circle of the earth, without arms, without the protection of secular erudition and Eloquence, by simple men, fishermen, and weavers (See here §. 7, p. 33, 34), and the admirable success of the Conversion of the gentiles by the preaching of the Gospel. On which Tertullian, *Apologet.* 2 says: "We are of yesterday, and we have filled all your things: cities, islands, Forts, municipalities, meeting-places, the very camps, tribes, decuries, the palace, the Senate, the forum. We have left you only the Temples." Augustine, l. 22, c. 8, *de Civ. Dei*: "Whoever still inquires for prodigies so that he may believe, is himself a great prodigy, when, with the whole world believing, he does not believe." IV. The admirable

reverence for scripture, excited among so many nations without iron and force, notwithstanding the severity of its dogmas, which are repugnant to reason, the flesh, and the blood. V. The constancy of so many thousands of martyrs, in their veneration of scripture, amidst the most exquisite torments. VI. The admirable conservation of this word against the most powerful and most savage enemies, attempting to excise it with iron and fire. VII. The clarity of its Miracles. VIII. The confession of the Gentiles, Jews, and Mohammedans. IX. The tragic end and divine punishment of the hostile persecutors and contemners of Scripture, such as Antiochus, Herod, the Jews, Nero, Maxentius, Maximinus, and Julian the Apostate. See Lactantius, *de Mortibus Persecutorum*.

§. XII.

The internal Criteria of Holy Scripture are: I. The Majesty of God speaking of Himself, which Dionysius Longinus acknowledged in Moses in his Book *on the Sublime genre of speaking*, Sect. 9, saying: "So also acted he who established the laws for the Jews, a Man of by no means common genius, as one who had worthily both conceived and spoken the power of God, writing this at the very beginning of his Laws: 'God said,' he says. What? 'Let there be Light; and there was light. Let there be earth; and there was earth.'" II. The sublimity of the Matters and Mysteries. III. The Sanctity of the Dogmas and precepts. IV. Antiquity above all the writings and monuments of the Gentiles. V. The singularity of its Speech. VI. The admirable Variety of its Divine Visions. VII. The most exact harmony and stupendous Consensus of the Old and New Testament. VIII. Its Divine efficacy for calling Men back from vices and reducing them to a better fruit, i.e., for converting men. IX. Its constant Duration. X. Its Divine Effects: the Cessation of Idols, the change of morals. See Grotius, *de Verit. Relig. Chr.*, l. 2, §. 9, 11, 12, 18, 19, & lib. 3, §. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9; Spanheim, *Syntag. Dispp.*, Vol. 1, Disp. 6, §. 9, p. 28, 29; Quenstedt, *Syst. Theol.*, Part. 1, c. 4, Sect. 2, qu 9.

The Authority of Scripture, therefore, depends on the Testimony of the Church as an introductory, inductive, suasive, and ministerial Argument and Motive; on the external and internal Criteria as a Persuasive, Convictive, and authoritative (*κυρίως*) Argument. Hence 1. those eulogies are attributed to Scripture by which it is compared to Light: Ps. 19:8, "The commandment of the LORD is pure, enlightening the eyes." Ps. 119:105, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." 2 Cor. 4:4, "the light of the glorious gospel of Christ." 2 Pet. 1:19, "a light that shineth in a dark place." by which is signified that just as light proves itself to the eyes by itself, so Scripture by its indwelling Characters conciliates authority for itself. 2. The same is proven by the places where the Word of God is called Seed: Luc. 8:5; 1 Pet. 1:23, "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever." For just as a Seed contains in itself a plastic force, so Scripture, attentively read, contains the Virtue of proving itself. 3. The places where the Word of God is compared to savory foods, honey, wine, milk, and water: Ps. 19:10, "the judgments of the Lord... are sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb." Ps. 119:103, "How sweet are thy words unto my taste! yea, sweeter than honey to my mouth." Is. 55:1, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come

ye to the waters... come, buy wine and milk without money." 1 Pet. 2:2,3, "As newborn babes, desire the sincere milk of the word... If so be ye have tasted that the Lord is gracious." Just as these foods prove themselves savory, so Scripture, devoutly read, commends itself by its efficacy. 4. The same is proven by the places where Scripture is compared to gold, gems, silver, pearls, and a Treasure: Ps. 19:10, "More to be desired are the judgments of the Lord than gold, yea, than much fine stone." Ps. 119:127, "Therefore I love thy commandments above gold; yea, above fine gold." Ps. 12:6, "The words of the LORD are... as silver tried in a furnace of fire." Matth. 7:6, "neither cast ye your pearls before swine." Matt. 13:45, 46, "the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant man, seeking goodly pearls: Who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it." 2 Cor. 4:7, "But we have this treasure in earthen vessels." For just as gold, silver, and gems, by their innate price, cause themselves to be esteemed, so Scripture, by its impressed Characters, acquires for itself Dignity and assent.

To this pertains 5. Joh. 7:17, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." Hebr. 4:12, "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword," etc. Which confirm that the Word of God, duly admitted, declares itself divine from its indwelling Criteria. 6. to which is added the reason sought from the nature of Scripture: For just as a Law does not have its authority from the subaltern judges, nor from the Herald who promulgates it, but from the Prince alone; and as a Testament does not have its value from the Notary, but from the Testator; and as a Rule has the power of regulating not from the artisan, but from its innate virtue, so Scripture, which is the Law of the highest Prince, the Testament of the celestial Father, and the Rule of Faith and of morals, does not have its principal authority from the Church, but from itself and its divine Criteria. 7. especially since the Church (Eph. 2:20) is built upon the Scripture, and borrows all its authority from it. Thence it can indeed offer an inductive and suasive testimony to Scripture, and exhibit other ministries, but cannot conciliate a principal authority for it. But that authority depends on the Characters impressed upon Scripture.

To which is added the Operation of the Holy Spirit and his intrinsic Testimony, as productive and operative of Faith; not by revealing and proposing new Objects, Mysteries, and dogmas, in which way it operated in the divinely inspired Men, but by impressing the Objects contained in Scripture on the minds of the faithful, declaring their sense, and eliciting our assent, according to the Promise of Is. 54:13, "And all thy children shall be taught of the LORD," also Joh. 6:45; 1 Joh. 2:27; 2 Cor. 4:6, "God... hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 2:12, "Now we have received... the spirit which is of God; that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God." An example is provided by the Disciples on the road to Emmaus, Luc. 24:45, "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures." And Lydia, in Act. 16:14, whose heart the Lord opened as she attentively heard the Scripture. Hence David in Ps. 119:18 prays: "Open

thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law." See Jer. 31:33, 34; Joel 2:28.

Therefore, just as formerly Pharaoh believed through the Butler (Gen. 41:9, ff.), the Queen of Sheba through fame (1 Kings 10:1), Naaman through the Israelite maid (2 Kings 5:1,2), and the Samaritan Citizens through the Samaritan woman (Joh. 4:28, ff.), not on account of the Butler, or fame, or the maid, or the woman, but afterwards were convicted by the evidence of the things themselves—as the Samaritans testify in v. 42, saying: "Now we believe, not because of thy saying: for we have heard him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world"—so We, through the Church and its members (Parents, Preceptors, Ministers, Elders), believe the Scripture, not on account of the Church, but on account of the very evidence of the things contained in Scripture, which Faith the Holy Spirit confirms. Otherwise, 8. if the Testimony of the Church were the principal motive for the Authority of Scripture with respect to Us, our Faith would rest on human Testimony, and would ultimately be resolved into it. Nor do we here commit a Vicious Circle, as if we proved Scripture from the Spirit, and the Spirit from Scripture. For here four distinct things occur: 1. The thing to be believed. 2. The Argument or Motive of faith, on account of which we believe. 3. The Faculty by which the act of Faith is elicited. 4. The Principle and force from which the intellect is elevated to elicit this act. 1. The thing to be believed or the Credible Object is the Authority of Scripture. 2. The inductive and suasive Argument is the Testimony of the Church; the Persuasive and Convictive argument are the Criteria impressed on Scripture. 3. The Faculty by which the Act of Assent is elicited is the human Intellect. 4. The Principle or Force from which the intellect is reshaped and renewed to elicit the act of this salutary Assent is a supernatural light or the operation of the Holy Spirit, which, as the efficient Cause of this Faith, ought not to be confused with the Motive for believing. Hence the accusation of committing a Circle is accustomed to be retorted, when the Authority of Scripture is proven from the Church, and the Authority of the Church from Scripture.

§. XIII.

V. An Adjunct of Scripture is Integrity, which is an Affection of Scripture by which it consists of all its parts, and has suffered no defect pernicious to the Canon. This Integrity can be regarded 1. with respect to the whole Biblical Body, either of the Old Testament only, or of the Old and New Testament together. 2. With respect to its integrating parts, or certain Canonical Books. With respect to the whole Biblical Body of the Old Testament, this must be weighed: Whether in the Destruction and Conflagration of the City of Jerusalem and of the Temple, excited by the Chaldeans, the Holy Scripture of the Old Testament was burnt up along with the conflagration of the City and Temple, which, having been burnt, was dictated anew by Ezra from a divinely illustrated memory to five Amanuenses chosen for that purpose, and, not without the Majesty of the Divinity, was most faithfully restored within 40 days? This is affirmed by the Book of 4 Esdras, c. 14, v. 21, ff. to the end of the chapter. And on the faith and Authority of this,

many Fathers, undoubtedly Basil in his Epistle to Chilon, Augustine in *de Mirabil. Script.*, Lib. 2, and Theodoret in his Preface to the Commentary on Canticles. Indeed, Irenaeus (l. 3, c. 25), Tertullian (*de Habitu Mul.*, c. 3), and Clement of Alexandria (l. 1, *Stromat.*) are cited by Baronius for this opinion, but as Bellarmine confesses (l. 2, *de V.D.*, c. 1), they do not openly teach it, but only that Ezra restored the Sermons of the Prophets. And although neither the Jews nor the Pontificians admit the Book of 4 Esdras as Canonical, yet the Rabbis everywhere, as well as the Doctors of the Roman Church, affirm this opinion of the Scripture of the Old Testament having been burnt. See Alphonsus Tostatus, *Comm. in 2. Paral.*, c. 8, quæst. ult.; Johannes Driedo, l. 1, *de Catal. S. Scriptur.*, c. 1, p. 3; Sixtus of Siena, *Bibl. Sac.*, l. 1, c. 1, p. 11, & l. 2, c. 2, p. 76; Possevinus, in *Apparat. Sac.*, in voce Esdras. Whence Alphonsus Salmeron, Tom. 1, *Comm. Evangelic.*, Proleg. 4, p. 37, & Proleg. 9, p. 93, calls this opinion the "Common opinion of the Doctors." But Bellarmine feels the contrary, *de Verbo Dei*, lib. 2, c. 1, p. 69, 70, 71. With whom the Protestants indeed admit that the autograph Exemplar of the Law and the Prophets, which was preserved in the Ark, was burnt up, but that the Apographs, faithfully expressed from the autograph, which were used in the Synagogues, or were in the hands of private faithful individuals—Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zachariah, Haggai, and Ezra himself—were preserved by divine providence. We prove this opinion from Neh. 8:2, 3, where Ezra is said to have "brought the law before the congregation both of men and women... and he read therein before the street... from the morning until midday, before the men and the women, and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book." Dan. 9:2, Daniel says of himself: "In the first year of his reign I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the LORD came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem." In 2 Macc. 2:2, 3, 4, 5, it is read that Jeremiah brought the ark with the Law and other Sacred things into a cave of Mount Nebo and blocked the entrance. Furthermore, the Silence of the Canonical Scripture also refutes this opinion. For since this Scripture solicitously describes and deploras in conceived words the pollution of the Sanctuary, the carrying away of the vessels, and the fire of the city and Temple, it yet nowhere relates the burning and complete abolition of the sacred Scripture. As for what pertains to the testimony of the Book of 4 Esdras, that book is Apocryphal not only to Protestants, but also to the Roman Church itself. Concerning which Bellarmine in *de V.D.*, Lib. 2, c. 1, p. 69, writes: "This Book is not only Apocryphal and never received by the Catholic Church, but also in many places smacks of Jewish fables, and in this very chapter 14, it speaks no differently of certain occult and more perfect books than all the Talmudists do of their Kabbalah." Wherefore the testimony of this book rather detracts from the faith of this opinion than asserts it, and nothing such is gathered from the canonical books.

§. XIV.

As for what pertains to the integrity of Scripture with respect to its Integrating Parts, or certain canonical books, it is out in the open when we name the Canonical Books. The conversation, therefore, is not about Historical, Political, Chronological, Genealogical,

Physical, or Moral books, written by human study and Counsel, which could perish and be lost, and some without doubt have been lost. Nor is it asked, 2. Whether any canonical Book could be lost, considering the carelessness, negligence, or malice of men, but whether it has actually been lost, considering the providential Care of God. Indeed, according to some, 3. not even this comes into question: Whether (the will of God being posited, i.e., if God had permitted it) we could lack certain Canonical Books without the loss of our salvation. For just as God, such is his goodness, for the conservation of our natural life, has so abundantly supplied us with nourishments necessary for life, and indeed for food and clothing, that we could lack many of them, so the same most benign God for beginning, conserving, and continuing the spiritual life, and for acquiring and obtaining Celestial life, has so copiously and effusively bestowed and given all things in the Books of Scripture, that there is no Book, if you perhaps except one or two, which the Church cannot lack without peril of salvation. But this is asked: Whether any Canonical Book, destined for the salvation of the Church, and in reality brought into the Canon, has actually been lost? Chrysostom affirms this in Homily 9 on Matthew and Homily 7 on 1 Corinthians, as does Bellarmine, l. 4, *de Verbo Dei*, c. 4, p. 173-174, saying: "Many truly sacred and Canonical Books have perished." With whom agree Gretser, Pererius, Becanus, Pineda, Bonfrerius, Bailius, and others; Richard Simon in *Historia Critica* V. T., L. 1, c. 4, 5, p. 29, 35. From the Reformed themselves, Wolfgang Musculus and Whitaker in *de Ecclesiæ Autorit.*, L. 2, Sect. 7, affirm it of certain Books of the Old Testament, but with the perfection of scripture saved, which they measure not by the number of Books or quantitative perfection, but by essential perfection, or the plenitude of dogmas necessary for salvation, which survives in the remaining ones. But just as among Protestants the more common, so also the safer opinion is that by which the integrity of scripture is so asserted that it is denied that any Canonical Book has perished. This is proven 1. from the Providence of God, which has prohibited so great a loss. 2. from Matth. 5:18 & Luc. 16:17, "till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." If not even a jot or a tittle ought to perish, much less books destined for the salvation of men. 3. from the diligence of the Jews, to whom in Rom. 3:2 were "committed the oracles of God," in guarding the Canonical Books, who for that reason are called by Augustine the "book-keepers" (*capsarii*) of the Christians. 4. from the testimony and consensus of the Jews, that there were never other or more Canonical Books in the Old Testament, whence not more were translated by the 70 and the Targums. 5. from the end of the canonical books, which is, as the word itself indicates, that it be a Canon or Rule of faith and of life (Gal. 6:16; Phil. 3:16). A Canon will therefore be Perfect, or it will cease to be a Canon. 6. from the lack of proof for the contrary opinion. 7. from the Silence of Christ and the Apostles. Indeed, mention is made in Scripture of some Books which, because they do not exist today, are thought to have perished. But those cited Books either were not Canonical, or have not perished. The "Book of the Wars of the Lord" (Num. 21:14) was most probably a Historical Book, and could be lost without loss of salvation. 2. The "Book of Jasher" (Jos. 10:13; 2 Sam. 1:18) is thought by some to still exist and to be Canonical. For certain Jews and Lyra opine that this Book is the book of Genesis, in which the deeds of Abraham, Isaac, and

Jacob, Men just above others, are praised. Others wish it to denote Exodus, others like Radak and Rashi the entire Pentateuch, but falsely, since that miracle could not have been written before it happened. Others, no less falsely, think that the two Books of Samuel are signified, others the twelve minor Prophets, to which, however, the book of Joshua is more ancient. More rightly, therefore, others state that the book was not Canonical and has perished, some of whom, like Arias Montanus and Sanctius, wish that it was a rational and Ceremonial book, "on the Right and the Just," or on Right, Law, and office. Grotius holds that it was an *epinikion*, a victory ode composed after the victory over the Gibeonites was reported. Huetius thinks it was an Adhortatory Book for living piously and holily. Masius, Polanus, Junius & Tremellius, and also Joh. Claudius in Ep. 41, p. 315, understand the Annals of the Things done by the Israelites up to the times of David and beyond, continued by various Authors. 3. The "Book of Nathan the Prophet" and the "volume of Gad the seer" (1 Paral. 29:29) were most probably the two Books of Samuel, the part of which which could not be written by Samuel was written by Nathan and Gad. Therefore, under another inscription, these Books exist in the Canon. 4. The Doctors of the Roman Church also commonly think that the books of Kings were conflated and collected by Ezra from the "Books of Ahijah the Shilonite" and the "books of Iddo the seer" (2 Paral. 9:29). 5. The "Book of the Law of the Kingdom," namely of the Judaic kingdom (1 Sam. 10:25), seems to have been a Political Book, which contained the laws and customs of the Judaic Kingdom. 6. The "Book of the words of the days of Solomon" (1 Reg. 11:41) seems to have been the public Acts, in which the deeds of Solomon were diffusely described, which perished without detriment to the Canon, especially since a Compendium of these deeds has been related in the Books of Kings and Paralipomenon. 7. The "Book of the Days of the Kings of Judah and of the Kings of Israel" (1 Reg. 14:19, 29; also C. 15:7, 23; 2 Paral. 32:32, C. 33:18, c. 35, ult.) were also public forensic Acts, or Diaries of the deeds of these Kings. 8. From the three thousand Proverbs of Solomon and his one thousand and five Songs (1 Reg. 4:32,33), the Proverbs of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, and the Song of Songs were brought into the Canon; the remaining moral and Physical sentences, and indeed the Songs, because they were not Canonical, have been lost. Whence Solomon in c. 1 is said not to have written them either, but to have spoken them. Salmeron agrees (Proleg. 9, p. 92, 93) that no canonical book has perished.

§. XV.

From the New Testament, Bellarmine believes that the Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans has been lost (Lib. 4, de V.D., c. 4, p. 174), as does Becanus (*Manual. Controv.*, L. 1, c. 1, qu. 5, n. 16), on the occasion of the words of Paul in Col. 4:16, "And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea." Epiphanius relates that it existed (Hæres. 42), and Sixtus of Siena testifies that he not only heard of it but also saw it in the Paduan Library, and he exhibits it verbatim, as do Leusden in *Philol. Hebr. Græco.*, Diff. 4, p. 26, 27. But we respond: 1. The Vulgate reads, "and that ye likewise read the one which is of the Laodiceans," according to which reading is signified not an Epistle of Paul to the

Laodiceans, but an Epistle of the Laodiceans to Paul. 2. which opinion the Greek reading confirms: *τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας*, "the one which is from Laodicea." whence 3. Theodoret, Chrysostom, Justinian, Baronius, Gagneus, and others understand it as an Epistle of the Laodiceans to Paul. II. Some think that a certain Epistle to the Corinthians has perished, which they gather from the words of 1 Cor. 5:9, "I wrote unto you in an epistle" (*ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ*). So Ambrose, Haymo, Lyra, Thomas, Bellarmine, Estius; from the Lutherans, Mylius, Ægidius Hunnius, Lucas Osiander, Gesner, Rungius, Asselmannus; from the Reformed, Calvin, Beza, Marloratus, Pareus, Drusius, Deodatus. Where it should be observed, however, that these Authors of both Communions, the Evangelical, add that this lost third Epistle to the Corinthians was written not for the perpetual Canonical use of the universal Church, but only for the temporary Canonical use of the Corinthian Church. But others more rightly deny that the loss of any Epistle can be proven from the cited words. For 1. either this very first epistle to the Corinthians can be understood here, which is the will of Theodoret, Chrysostom, the Author of the Commentaries attributed to Jerome, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Photius, and many Recentiores, Polanus (*Syntagm. Theol.*, L. 1, c. 46), Sixtus of Siena (*Biblioth S.*, l. 2, p. 88), Cornelius à Lapide, and Johannes Claudius (Epist. 41). So that *ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ* is the same as *ἐν ταύτῃ ἐπιστολῇ*, "in this Epistle." Where in v. 1,2, the Apostle had said: "It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned, that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you." and in v. 5 he had ordered "To deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." Thence in v. 9, with the words here to be weighed, he says: *ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ*, "I wrote to you in the Epistle," i.e., in this Epistle, "not to company with fornicators." and finally in v. 11, *νῦν δὲ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν*, which they think should be translated, "but now I have written unto you not to company." But if it does not seem probable that in so small a moment as had passed between verse 2, 5 and 9, Paul in v. 9 would have said, "I have written to you in this Epistle," and that all these things should be uttered in the present rather than the past tense, it could be said, 2. as others prefer, that Paul in v. 9, with the words, "I wrote to you in an Epistle," points his finger to the second epistle to the Thessalonians, which is thought to have been written before the Epistle to the Corinthians, where in chap. 3:14 he uses the same word for "companying" which he also used in 1 Cor. 5:9, and declares: "And if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed." Although also this Epistle was inscribed and sent not to the Corinthians but to the Thessalonians, it was nevertheless destined for all the faithful, and therefore also for the Corinthians, according to that which is read in 1 Thess. 5:27, "I charge you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." Which opinion labors under this one doubt, that 2 Thess. 3, especially v. 14, does not deal precisely with fornicators. But whichever of these three opinions you choose, it will be false that any canonical Epistle to the Corinthians has been lost. The monument of Enoch, conserved by tradition and memory and related in the Epistle of Jude, v. 14, was not Canonical up to those times, and therefore its loss does not prove that a part of

Canonical Scripture has perished. But Paul in Eph. 3:3, "As I wrote afore in few words," refers to c. 1 of this same Epistle, as Vasquez himself feels in his Paraphrase, p. 107.

§. XVI.

VI. An Adjunct of Scripture is Purity, which is an Affection of Scripture by which it is denied to be corrupt. This is harmed by those who state that the Scripture is Corrupt. In their number are the Pontificians, who, however, can be distributed into three classes. For some of them affirm that the Jews, on purpose and from malice and hatred of Jesus of Nazareth and of the Christians, have corrupted the Hebrew Text. Such are Melchior Canus, *Loc. Theol.*, Lib. 4, c. 13, p. 94; Alphonsus Salmeron, Tom. 1, *Comm. in N.T.*, Proleg. 4, p. 29, ff.; Wilh. Lindanus, Leo Castrius, and others. Some indeed deny that it was by the malice of the Jews, but affirm that the Old Testament has been corrupted by the carelessness and lack of skill of the Librarians, like Bellarmine, Lib. 2 *de V.D.*, c. 2, p. 72, and Johannes Morinus, Exerc. 1, c. 4, p. 39. Driedo, lib. 2, *de Ecclesiast. Scriptur. & Dogmat.*, c. 5. Some wish that the sacred Codices have been corrupted and changed partly by the carelessness and negligence of the librarians, partly by the malice of the Jews, not indeed in many, but in a few places, like Nicolaus Serarius, *Proleg. Biblic.*, c. 12, qu. 2; Adam Contzen, *Polit.*, Lib. 5, c. 24; Jacobus Tirinus, *Synops. sive Indice Controv. Fid.*, Controv. 2, de V. D., n. 5; Jacobus Bonfrerius, in *Præloq. in Scriptur.*, c. 13, Sect. 2, 3, & 4. II. The Socinians, among whom Socinus himself in his Book *de autoritate S. Scripturae*, especially of the N.T., c. 1, n. 3, p. 26, distinguishes between the depravation of a whole history or of a doctrine in general, and that of some singular places, from which the history itself or the doctrine is not changed. Which distinction being posited, he asks: "But if the depravation is of some singular places, from which neither the doctrine nor the history is changed, what moment does this have?" III. The Remonstrants, who restrict the Purity of Scripture only to those things which pertain to the essence of Religion. Episcopius, *Instit. Theol.*, lib. 4, Sect. 1, c. 5; Curcellæus, *Relig. Christ. Inst.*, L. 1, C. 9, §. 3 & 4, rightly teaches that neither the Hebrew Text could be corrupted by the Jews, nor the Greek by the Heretics; yet in §. 5, p. 17, he adds this: "I would not wish, however, to deny that the LXX Interpreters and the Author of the Vulgate Latin Version had Exemplars in some places more correct than those which we use today, so that from their Translations the Hebrew and Greek Text, if the series of the oration and other Circumstances should altogether demand it, can altogether be emended. For it is apparent that they themselves not once read otherwise in their books than we now have in Ours," etc. IV. Vossius, in his published Book on the Version of the LXX Interpreters, states that the modern Hebrew text, especially in Chronological matters, has been depraved, so that Biblical Chronology cannot be sought from the modern Hebrew Codex. Thence in another book, *de Vera Ætate Mundi*, he has tried to show that the natal time of the world anticipates the vulgar era by at least 1440 years. Georgius Hornius and Christianus Schotanus, and others, have impugned him; but an anonymous French Pontifical Author has followed him in his book: *Antiquité des temps retablee & defendue contre les Juifs & les nouveaux Chronologistes*. We indeed do not deny that by the injury of time and the carelessness of librarians some light errors have crept into many

codices; yet we deny that all codices have been so corrupted that they can no longer be the Norm of Faith and of Controversies, and the Rule for Versions.

And we prove this Purity of Scripture: 1. from the Special divine providence, vigilant for its word for the utility of the Church, and not permitting that it be depraved or changed to the detriment of our Faith and Salvation. 2. from the consideration of the Time, either preceding or following the Nativity of Christ and the function of His Prophetic Office. For if the Codices of the Old Testament were corrupt, they were corrupted either before or after the function of Christ's Prophetic Office. But not before, because then the Jews had no cause for corruption, nor would Christ and the Apostles have dissembled it, but would have warned of it. When on the contrary Christ affirms that not one jot or one tittle will perish from the law (Matth. 5:18; Luc. 16:17) and bids them search the scriptures (Joh. 5:39). See Matth. 23:2,3; Luc. 10:26, C. 16:29; Act. 13:27; 1 Tim. 4:13. Nor after, because the sacred Oracles dealing with the Messiah and his Advent (which the Jews, if they had induced their mind to attempt anything here, would have either utterly removed or changed) still exist whole today in the Hebrew Codices, just as they are cited by Christ Himself and the Apostles in the New Testament. And the Hebrew often confirms the Christian truth more than the Greek and Latin. For example, Ps. 22:17, the Septuagint and the Vulgate have "Apprehendite Disciplinam" (Seize discipline); but the Hebrew text has "Osculamini filium" (Kiss the son). Jer. 53:4, the Vulgate reads: "Et nos putavimus cum quasi leprosum, & percuffum à Deo" (And we did esteem him as a leper, and smitten by God). The Hebrew Text: "Nos putavimus, eum plaga affectum, percussum à Deo & afflictum" (We did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted), as Bellarmine himself advises, Lib. 2, de V.D., c. 2, p. 73.

3. from the incredible Zeal and religion of the Jews in conserving the sacred Books. This Zeal is so great that they would sooner undergo not one, but a thousand deaths, if it could be, than endure that anything forbidden be done, or that anything in the law of God be changed, as Philo testifies in *de Legatione ad Cajum*, p. 1022, which Josephus confirms in *contra Apion.*, l. 1, p. 830. Of which thing Philo adds the reason in the same chapter, saying: "For all Nations gladly preserve their ancestral rites, but the Jews above the rest. For since they believe their Laws to have been produced by oracles and learn them from boyhood, they carry around in their souls expressed images of them, and always admiring them by beholding them as most honest, they also embrace the observers of them from other nations as their own Citizens, but hold the haters and vituperators of them as enemies, and so much do they abhor any thing forbidden by their laws, that they cannot be induced to prevarication by all fortunes and human felicities." Nor have the posterity of the Jews remitted anything from this religion, but rather up to superstition they still love the sacred Codex. Hence it happens that if any Exemplar of the Bibles has a single error of any note, they cast it away as illegitimate; but if they observe more than four errors in it, they bury it, so that it may be removed from the use of men with some honor. Hence also it happens that if an emended Codex has fallen to the earth, they proclaim a fast, and fear lest the university of things relapse

into the pristine Chaos. See Hottinger, Thes. Phil. l. 1, C. 2, qu. 4, p. 140-143. So far are they from having wished to corrupt or interpolate the sacred books formerly, or wishing to today.

4. from the impossibility of committing so great a sacrilege. After the second destruction and fire of Jerusalem and the Temple, perpetrated by the Romans, the Jews were dispersed through the whole circle of the earth. By what pact, therefore, could they have conspired for a universal corruption of all the Hebrew Codices, which were not even all in their power? Such a conspiracy and consensus of all the Jews would have been necessary, however, if they had wished to admit so great a crime, which argument Augustine uses in lib. 15, de Civit. Dei, c. 13.

5. from the study and diligence of the Masoretes, who, to conserve the sacred Text whole, numbered all the letters, most of the words, all the verses, and other things. Whence any corruption whatsoever would have been immediately detected by the Masorah and the Masoretes. Hence the Masorah is called סֵפֶר לְתוֹרָה, a "fence for the law," because it has preserved the law whole from corruption.

6. from the vigilance and fidelity of the Christians in conserving the sacred books. For after the Nativity, death, Resurrection, and Ascension of Christ, many Codices of the Old Testament were in the hands of Apostolic men and other Christians, which at least the Jews, even if they had wished, could not have corrupted. Nor were there wanting among the Christians Men skilled in the Hebrew Language, such as were Origen and Jerome, who would have accused the Jews of sacrilege and falsification if they had laid sacrilegious hands on the sacred Books. It remains, therefore, that the Jews neither wished nor were able to corrupt the Scripture of the Old Testament.

7. from the Consensus of the Hebraists of the Roman Catholics, such as are Sixtus of Siena, Arias Montanus, Genebrardus, Santes Pagninus, Simeon de Muis, Ferdinandus de Escalante, Huetius, and in part Bellarmine himself, l. 2, de V.D., c 2, p. 72, ff. The passage of Ps. 22:17, many who otherwise champion the Purity of Scripture think is corrupt, and that in place of כָּרוּ, "they have pierced," כְּאַרְיֵי, "like a lion," has been substituted. Among whom are Genebrard, Bellarmine, Tirinus, Simeon de Muis, Joseph Scaliger, Junius, Polanus, Forster, Hunnius, Chamier, Broughton, Voetius, Fuller, Hulsius, Claude, and others, who think that for כְּאַרְיֵי, one should read כָּרוּ or כָּרוּ by apenthesis. But if the Conjecture of the most Learned Men Jacob Alting and August Pfeiffer is received, that כָּרוּ is read for כְּאוּרִים by Apocope, not even this place should be called corrupt. See the Dissertations of Jacob Alting and August Pfeiffer on this Word.

§. XVII.

The Manichees formerly taught that the New Testament is corrupt, as is to be seen in Augustine, *contra Faustum*, l. 11, c. 2, and also lib. 33, c. 3, 6, & 7. And Helvidius, according to the testimony of Jerome in the book which he wrote against him. Irenaeus relates that Marcion also circumcised the Gospel according to Luke, and had a truncated Gospel (l.

3, c. 11, p. 284, 287). We have related the milder opinion of Socinus here in the preceding section, p. 51. The Author of the *Disp. contra Judæos*, Resp. ad qu. 21, p. 110, writes: "Many traces of corruption or depravation, admitted by the fault of the Scribes, exist in the New Testament." also Resp. ad qu. 24, p. 115. Sixtus of Siena in *Bibl. Sanct.* l. 7, haeresi 1, p. 576, attributes to the Anabaptists and Servetians that they confess indeed that the books of the N.T. were Written by the Apostles, but say that they were afterwards falsified by heretics and contaminated with many errors, and that the same errors have always endured in the N.T. up to this day. Some of the Pontificians state that the text of the New Testament is corrupt in various places, partly by the carelessness of the librarians, partly by the fraud of the ancient heretics, and consequently that that text is not so suitable for engendering faith, unless the authority of the Church accedes, which are the very words of Jacobus Gordon Huntlæus, *Epit. Controver.*, Controv. 1, de V.D., c. 12, p. 42. With whom agrees Johannes Stephanus Menochius, *Præfat. Annot. in Bibl.*, c. 14, and Johannes Morinus, lib. 1, Exerc. 1, c. 7, p. 61, & Exerc. 2, c. 1, p. 66, where he says: "The Greek sources flow very turbidly, and the modern Greek codices everywhere abound with innumerable variations of the greatest moment." For which opinion Canus is also cited, *Locor.*, lib. 2, c. 13, and Stapleton, *Relect. Controv.* 5, qu. 3, Art. 2. But some assert that the Greek codices in general and entirely are not corrupt, but yet are not everywhere incorrupt or pure, but that some errors have crept in either by the lack of skill of the amanuenses or by the negligence of the Typographers; Bellarmine, l. 2, *de V.D.*, c. 7, p. 88; Tirinus, *Indice Controv.*, Contr. 2, de V.D., num. 7. We think that it cannot be denied that by the lapse of time and the carelessness of Scribes and librarians various Readings have crept into various Exemplars. For Experience testifies to this, and the manuscript and outstanding Exemplars of the New Testament of Robert Estienne, Curcellæus, and the Oxford editors prove it. But notwithstanding these, the Greek text of the New Testament is not Corrupt, so that it cannot be the norm of Faith and of Morals, and also the Rule to which all Versions ought to be exacted and examined. For that it is so incorrupt is proven: 1. by the most vigilant Providence of God. 2. by the diligence and faith of the Christian Church in Custody of this most precious deposit, which is therefore called the "pillar and ground of the Truth" (1 Tim. 3:15), which would easily have noted and blown away sacrilegious hands. 3. from the End of the Scripture of the New Testament, which is that it be a perpetual Rule of Faith and of Life, which, if corrupt, it could not be, and therefore it ought to have been conserved pure and incorrupt. Nor from the hypothesis of the controversy concerning the Mutation of the Samaritan letters into Chaldaic, and the Novity of the Hebrew Vowel Points, does anything detract from the Purity of Scripture, since the Authors of this opinion suppose that the Vowels have always existed with respect to their power or value, sound, and sense, and in this sense make them essential and coeval to the Language, Speech, and Reading, and indeed the soul of Reading, although they deny that they have existed with respect to their sign, character, and external figure; and so they firmly believe that the true Reading and sense have been conserved from the tradition of their ancestors, by continual use and the custom of reading, by the help of the three letters which they call the mothers of Reading. See Walton's Proleg. 7 in the *Biblia Polyglotta*, §. 24.

§. XVIII.

The seventh Adjunct of Scripture is Perfection or Sufficiency, which is an Affection of Scripture by which it sufficiently contains all things which are necessary to be known, believed, done, and hoped for salvation. We do not, therefore, attribute to Holy Scripture an absolute Perfection, containing every divine and supernatural knowable thing, but a limited and restricted one to those things which we have said. Nor 2. a Perfection and Plenitude such that it comprehends all the sayings of the Prophets, Christ, and the Apostles, but a Perfection as we have described it above. Nor 3. an explicit and immediate Perfection, as if it explicitly, literally, and immediately comprehends all things in itself, since those things are also held in it which are virtually and implicitly contained in it, and can be deduced from it by the power of legitimate and good Consequence. Nor 4. a Sufficiency excluding the Ministry of Explication and Application, but including it. Not 5. for determining indifferent rites and Ceremonies; nor 6. for deciding Scholastic questions; but for drawing from it necessary dogmas of Faith and precepts of morals, and for ending questions and controversies of faith. We prove this Sufficiency and Perfection:

1. from Deut. 4:2, "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." C. 12:32, "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it." See Deut. 5:32; C. 17:11; C. 28:14; Jos. 1:7; c. 23:6. Apoc. 22:18,19, "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book," etc.
2. from Ps. 19:8, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." Ps. 119:9, "Wherewithal shall a young man cleanse his way? by taking heed thereto according to thy word."
3. From the affirmation of Christ, that He, partly by Himself, partly through the Holy Spirit, has revealed all truth. Joh. 15:15, "all things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you." Joh. 14:26, "the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." C. 16:13, "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth," etc. etc.
4. From the sayings of the Apostles, by which they profess to have fully announced the Will of God to men. Act. 20:26, 27, "Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." 1 Cor. 15:2, "By which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you." Hence God is also said in Rom. 2:16 to be "judge the secrets of men... according to my gospel."
5. From 2 Tim. 3:16, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

6. From the End of Scripture. Joh. 20:31, "But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." which End could not be obtained if Scripture were not perfect.
7. From the sayings of the sacred letters, by which the true felicity of man is said to consist in the Meditation of Holy Scripture and in a Life according to its Norm. Such are Ps. 1:2, "But his delight is in the law of the LORD; and in his law doth he meditate day and night," etc. Ps. 119:1,2, "Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the LORD. Blessed are they that keep his testimonies, and that seek him with the whole heart." 2 Tim. 3:15, "from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus."
8. because Scripture is the Canon and Rule of Faith and of morals (Gal. 6:16), but a Rule ought to be perfect.
9. Because it is the Testament of God to Men, in which the Will of God concerning the salvation of men, and concerning those things which are to be believed, done, and hoped for by men, is most fully contained. To which Testament, therefore, no one ought to add anything (*ἐπιδιατάσσεσθαι*) (Gal. 3:15).
10. Because the sacred letters are the Tablets of the Covenant of Grace between God and men, in which the conditions of our salvation are most fully inscribed.
11. because Scripture is the Epistle of the Creator to His rational creature, man, which he is therefore bound to read in order to perceive the Will of God from it.
12. from the Consensus of the doctors of the primitive Church, which the *Catholicus Veterum Patrum Consensus*, annexed to the *Syntagma Confessionum*, Art. 1, C. 2, exhibits.

§. XIX.

To the Perfection of Holy Scripture pertain not only those things which are read *ἀπολεξεί, κατὰ τὸ ῥητόν*, verbatim or literally, in so many letters and Syllables in Scripture, but also those things which are held there *κατὰ τὴν διάνοιαν*, according to the matter and meaning, in such a way that they can be deduced from there by good and legitimate consequence. Which observation avails not only for refuting the Mennonites, who disapprove of the use of Consequences in matters of faith, but also for eluding the attempts of certain Doctors of the Roman Church, who, to overturn the Protestant opinion concerning the Sufficiency, Plenitude, and Perfection of Holy Scripture, require from them that they prove not only their positive dogmas, but also their negative articles, from the express Words of Scripture. Jacobus Gonterius the Jesuit and his Colleagues required this in the Colloquy of Durlach in the year 1612, attempted rather than held with the Theologians of Baden, where Gonterius wished nine controversial Propositions, which he had conceived almost negatively, to be proven from the express Words of Scripture, for example, "That there is no Purgatory," "That the Mass is not a Sacrifice," "That Matrimony is not a Sacrament." Which Method, in France, Cardinal Perronius in his Reply against King James of Great Britain, and Franciscus Veronius, from

whom this Method is accustomed to be called the Veronian, made their own in their Disputations against the Protestants. In Germany, the Wallenburg Brothers did the same.

Against whom we assert the use of evident and necessary Consequences in Theology:

1. From the Example of Christ and the Apostles. For in whatever way they deduced and demonstrated the dogmas of Faith from Scripture, in that way also they are rightly demonstrated today. Now, Christ in Matth. 22:29, ff., by Consequence from Exod. 3:6, deduced the Resurrection of the Dead, and with that kind of proof he shut the mouth of the Sadducees. In the same place, v. 42, ff., from Ps. 110:1, he demonstrates against the Pharisees that the Messiah is not only the Son of David according to the Flesh, but also the Lord of David according to the Godhead. In Luc. 24:25,26,27 & v. 44-47, he rebukes the Disciples because they did not educe the Arguments concerning the Passion, death, and Resurrection of Christ from the Old Testament Writings, which yet were not extant there in so many words concerning Jesus of Nazareth. There would have been no place for which reprehension if He had not deemed the use of Consequences licit. See Matt. 11:13, etc. Wherefore also in Joh. 5:39, He commends the Searching of the Scripture, for *ἐρευνᾶν* signifies to seek with singular delay and care, to investigate, to trace out, such care as metal-diggers are accustomed to apply in searching the bowels of the Earth, or as Hunters and Sagacious Hounds in driving wild beasts from their lairs. The Apostles everywhere prove that Jesus of Nazareth is that Messiah promised in the Old Testament, although the Name Jesus of Nazareth was nowhere extant in the Old Testament. Thus Paul in Act. 17:2,3, "reasoned with them out of the scriptures, Opening and alledging, that Christ must needs have suffered, and risen again from the dead; and that this Jesus... is Christ." In Act 15:8,9,16,17, from Amos 9:11,12, Peter and James demonstrate that Circumcision is not necessary for Salvation, and hence it is not to be imposed on the Gentiles with the rest of the Ceremonial Law. In Act. 26:22, Paul testified that he taught "none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come," who yet in Act. 20:21 publicly and from house to house required from the Jews and Gentiles "repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ," which things were contained in the Old Testament not *ἀντολεξεί* (verbatim), but only virtually. Thus in Rom. 3:10, from Ps. 14:3 & 53:3, he proved the universal guilt of the Jews and Gentiles. In Rom. 3:21,22, he taught that it is proven by the testimonies of the Law and the Prophets that "the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe." In Rom. 4:3, from Gen. 15:6, where it is said that "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness," he proves that Abraham was not justified by the Works of the Law. In the same, v. 5,6,7,8, from Ps. 32:1, he infers that Faith is imputed to the believer for Righteousness. All of which, however, were not said literally in the cited places, but were deduced from them by legitimate Consequence. Thus in 1 Cor. 15:3,4, he teaches that "Christ died for our sins... and

that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures," although there is no mention in so many words in the Old Testament of either Jesus of Nazareth or of a Resurrection made on the third day. See 1 Cor. 9:8,9; C. 10:26, 28, etc., etc.

2. From the End and use of Scripture, which, as Paul testifies in 2 Tim. 3:16 and Rom. 15:4, is institution in good, refutation of the false, correction of evil, and also consolation, which end cannot be obtained without the use of Consequences.
3. From the Wisdom of God. For just as a wise man, when speaking, wishes all that to be said and understood which is contained in his words and can be legitimately deduced from them, so also the most wise God wishes that to be held as His Word which is contained in it and can be legitimately elicited from the same.
4. From the rational nature of man, which consists in this, that it does not stick in the surface of Words, but penetrates to the very marrow, gathers one thing from another, and ratiocinates.
5. From the Consensus and Practice of the Doctors of the Primitive Church, and of the Doctors of the Roman Church themselves, of whose number Bellarmine in Lib. 4, *de V. D.*, c. 9, p. 193, writes: "Nothing is of Faith, except what God has revealed through the Apostles or Prophets, or what is evidently deduced from thence."
6. From the contrary Practice of the Heretics, who disapproved of the use of Consequences, like the Arians and Macedonians.

§. XX.

Hence it is easily gathered what is to be stated concerning Ecclesiastical Traditions, required besides Scripture as a Norm or Rule of Faith and morals. As for their name, they are called by the Jews in Hebrew תורה שבעל פה (Torah she-be-al peh), the Oral Law, which they contradistinguish from the תורה שבכתב (Torah she-bi-khtav), the Written Law. And because this Oral Law was to be kept in the mind and memory, so that at its proper time it might be handed down by mouth and the living voice to posterity, it also has the name קבלה (Kabbalah), "Reception." In Greek they are called παραδόσεις (paradoseis), Matth. 15:2,3,6, and also δευτερώσεις (deuteroiseis). In Latin, *Traditiones*. As for the thing itself, the Jews admit Traditions. For the Jews believe, with the Samaritans, Sadducees, and Karaites contradicting, that Moses on mount Sinai received a twofold Law, one to be written and Written in the five books of Moses, the other Oral, to be handed down and propagated by mouth. For the sake of this latter Law, Moses was detained by God on the mount for 40 days, so that he might commit that oral Law to memory. Moses handed this down to Joshua, Joshua to the Judges, the Judges to the Prophets, the Prophets to Ezra and the other Men of the Great Synagogue, these to the Sages and Scribes, Antigonus of Sokho, Joshua ben Perachiah, Hillel, and Shammai, until at last, with the City and Temple having been overthrown by Titus Vespasian, for fear of its loss, it was collected by Rabbi Judah the Holy and referred to the Talmudic Tablets. See *Pirke Avoth*, c. 1, §. 1. They call this law the foundation of the Written Law and prefer it to the Written

Law. Whence they compare the Biblical Text to Water, the Mishnah to Wine, the Talmud to Spiced wine; also the Law to Salt, the Mishnah to Pepper, and the Talmud to Spices. See Buxtorf, *Synag. Jud.* c. 3, p. 53, 54, and also *de Abbreuiat. Hebr. & Recens. Operis Thalm.* p. 191, ff.; Joh. a Lent, *de Mod. Theol. Jud.*, c. 2, §. 16.

The Greeks also require Traditions for the Rule of Faith and Morals, as is to be seen in the Second Synod under Patriarch Parthenius of Constantinople, held against the Confession of Cyril Lucaris in A.D. 1643, c. 2, p. 119. The Roman Catholics especially hold that Traditions are necessary for the Rule of Faith and of Worship, and have decreed that they are to be received and venerated with an equal affect of piety and Reverence as the Sacred Scripture (Council of Trent, Sess. 4). But they divide Traditions into Divine, Apostolic, and Ecclesiastical. They call Divine Traditions those institutes which, as they think, Christ himself taught and instituted, besides those which are found written in the Gospel, which therefore have an equal authority with Scripture, i.e., a Divine one. A Tradition of this kind for them is the Sacrament of Confirmation, to be administered with oil and balsam, and also the Sacrament of extreme Unction, since the Sacraments ought to have Christ as their Author. They call Apostolic Traditions the dogmas and Institutes of the Apostles, of which indeed there is no mention in the Writings of the Apostles, to which, however, on account of the same divine Inspiration, they attribute an equal authority with the Apostolic Writings. A Tradition of this kind for them is the Lenten Fast and Pedobaptism. Sometimes, however, they use these Words promiscuously, and also call Apostolic Traditions Divine and vice versa. Ecclesiastical Traditions, according to them, were introduced by the Prelates after the times of the Apostles, which indeed do not have an equal authority with the Apostolic, but yet have an Ecclesiastical authority and are rightly observed. Besides these, much is attributed to Traditions by Marcus Antonius de Dominis, *de Rep. Eccles.* Grotius in his Annotations on the Consultation of Cassander approves not only the Ritual ones (ad Artic. 7, p. 52, 53), but also the Dogmatic ones in his Additions to the Consultation of Cassander, Chap. "on the Sufficiency of Holy Scripture and the Authority of Traditions," where on p. 221, among other things, he writes: "Every Word stands in two Witnesses, in Scripture and in Tradition, which mutually shed light on each other. For we believe the written books by the testimony of the Church, as Augustine truly said, that is, on account of Tradition, and Scripture commends the Apostolic Traditions, and Tradition interprets Scripture, as custom interprets a written Law." which he confirms in his *Animadversions on the Animadversions of Rivetus*, p. 114, 115, and champions in *Voto pro pace*, p. 137, f. 138-144, and *Discuss. Apologet. Riveti*, p. 173-191.

§. XXI.

We observe: 1. that Tradition can be taken either actively and formally, for the very act of handing down or of tradition, or Passively and materially, for the thing or doctrine handed down. Concerning the act of handing down, no one doubts that, besides Scripture and its tradition in Writings, a Tradition made by the living voice is also necessary in the Church and has always been used; indeed, tradition by the living voice

was prior to tradition made in writing. 2. the word Tradition sometimes signifies generally any doctrine, whether it was communicated with us by the living voice or by writing, and therefore handed down to us, which, however, was afterwards consigned to writing by the Evangelists and Apostles and handed down to us. In which sense Paul admonishes in 2 Thess. 2:15, "therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word, or our epistle." Thus the Jews in Act. 6:14 say: "For we have heard him say, that this Jesus of Nazareth... shall change the customs which Moses delivered us." Thus Paul in 1 Cor. 11:2, "Now I praise you, brethren, that ye... keep the ordinances, as I delivered them to you." and v. 23, "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you." No one has ever denied, or denies today, that such Traditions are to be admitted and to be handed down by the living voice of the Doctors of the Church. Furthermore, Protestants distinguish Traditions into Historical, Ritual, and Dogmatic. They receive the Historical and Ritual, for example, at what time Easter or the Feast of the Nativity of Christ should be celebrated, or whether Baptism should be administered by a triple or a single immersion. Indeed, they do not simply reject the Dogmatic, inasmuch as they only explain and confirm the Doctrine handed down in Holy Scripture. Indeed, not a few of them teach that what, according to the Rule of Vincent of Lérins in his *Commonitorium*, has been believed and received always, everywhere, and by all, in the first five or six hundred years from the birth of Christ, is to be believed and received. Among whom is D. Gregor. Francus, *de Gradibus Necessitatis Dogmatum Christianor.*, §. 83, where he commends the universal and notorious Consensus of the first six Centuries from the birth of Christ. D. Johannes Bergius, in *der Apostolischen Regul*, C. 1, p. 24, 25. The Declaration of Thorn, in the 1st General Profession, also the Writings of the Reformed Party at the Convention of Thorn, lit. N. 4, fac. 2, & lit. T. 4, V. X ad Y. See also Urbanus Rhegius, *Præfat. ad Regulas Caute loquendi*, p. 14, 15, & *ibid.* c. 12, p. 62, ff. Chemnitz, Part. 1, *Exam. Concil. Trid.*, on the 4th & 6th Genus of Tradition, p. 67, 71. But they repudiate only those Dogmatic Traditions which contain a Doctrine plainly different from that which is handed down in the Scriptures, and have no foundation in the Scriptures.

We prove this opinion: 1. by the reasons and Arguments with which we have proven the Sufficiency and Perfection of Scripture. 2. by the words of Paul in Gal. 1:8, 9, "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." 3. by the words of Christ in Matt. 15:1, ff., where, to the Scribes and Pharisees asking, "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread," He responded: "Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God by your tradition?" Where indeed He specifically rebukes the Traditions of the Pharisees, yet in general He rejects all Doctrines different from Scripture, when obtruded as necessary to be observed. Which is still more evident from what Christ subjoins in v. 6,7,8, "Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition. Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain they do worship

me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." See Marc. 7:5, ff., where in v. 8 it is added: "For laying aside the commandment of God, ye hold the tradition of men, as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do." 4. from the Nature and quality of the Traditions, which is such that they are either Contrary to the word of God, or Uncertain and doubtful, or less necessary. The Traditions concerning the worship of Images of God, of Angels, and of men are Contrary to the Word of God (Ex. 20:4, ff.; Deut. 5:8, ff.). Concerning the denying of the Chalice to the Laity in the Holy Supper (Matth. 26:27; Marc. 14:23). Concerning the Mass being an expiatory Sacrifice, to be offered daily still for the living and the dead, when Scripture on the contrary teaches that Christ, by one single offering, made once, has expiated the sins of men, so that there is no need for any repeated, properly so called, offering (Heb. 7:26,27; C. 9:11,12,25-28; C. 10:10,12,14). Certain Traditions, which are nevertheless called Apostolic, are Uncertain and doubtful, for example, concerning the Lenten Fast, which is observed with admirable variety, as Bellarmine confesses, Tom. 4, *Controv. de Bonis Oper. in partic.*, Lib. 2, c. 15. For St. Irenaeus, in Eusebius, l. 5, C. 24, relates that some defined the Ante-Paschal Fast as one day, others as two, others as more, others as forty. See more in Bellarmine, c. 1. And yet all provoked to Tradition. Thus concerning the Celebration of Easter, when a contention arose whether it should be celebrated on the fourteenth of the Moon, or on the Sunday after the 14th, and the Easterners embraced the former opinion, but the Westerners the latter, Polycrates and other Bishops of Asia praised the Tradition of John and Philip, but Victor, the Roman, and other Bishops of the West, praised the Tradition of Peter and Paul. Persuaded by which, Victor excommunicated the Churches of Asia, as Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 5, C. 23, 26, and Socrates, lib. 5, c. 22, relate. The like can be said in the Controversy of Stephen Bishop of Rome with Cyprian and other Bishops of Africa concerning the Rebaptism of those baptized by Heretics; also concerning immersion in Baptism, whether triple, which the Catholics promiscuously used, or single, which in the 7th Century the Bishops of Spain used on account of the Arians, with Gregory the Great and the Fourth Council of Toledo, Can. 5, approving. The Traditions brought forth besides and outside of Scripture and usually boasted of are less necessary, because no Argument of the Necessity of such Traditions could yet be produced, and because all necessary things are contained abundantly in Scripture. Joh. 16:12,13, Christ promises that the Disciples, after the effusion of the Holy Spirit, would be more fully informed in the more sublime Heads of Christian doctrine, for example, concerning the quality of the Kingdom of Christ, not worldly but celestial and Spiritual, concerning the abrogation of the Levitical Rites and of Circumcision, concerning the Vocation of the Gentiles to the Kingdom of Christ, etc., which they had not yet been able to bear, or of which they were not suitable Hearers.

§ XXII.

No less from this is it clear what should be thought of the opinion of the Enthusiasts, who have taken for themselves the name of Spirituals, but have called the rest of Christians Psychics, i.e., Carnal, and who, besides or outside the written Word, which they call a dead letter, require ecstasies, or internal revelations, Visions, or apparitions

and conversations of Angels, or dreams and premonitions of future things, etc. And they were either Ancients: Cerinthus, Montanus, with his prophetesses Priscilla and Maximilla (and from Montanus they were called Montanists, also Cataphrygians and Pepuzians, because Montanus was from a village in Phrygia and called the humble village of Pepuza, Jerusalem), Adelphius, the Messalians or Euchites; and the Donatists; Or the more Recent: Nic. Stork, Thom. Münzer, Casp. von Schwenckfeld, Theophr. Paracelsus, Coppinus and Quintinus in Picardy; David Georgius, Val. Weigel, Paulus Nagelius, Paul. Felgenhauer, the Brethren of the Rosy Cross, Henr. Nicolai, Cornbertus, Jac. Böhme, the Quakers, Barclay, etc. See Frid. Spanheim, Syntagma of Disputations, Part 2, Disp. 16. Th. 1. & Disp. 17. Th. 4. p. 281, 288, 289. Hoornbeeck, Summa of Controversies, lib. 6. Joh. Crocius, Antiweigel. Quenstedt.

Quenst. Syst. Theol. Part 1. c. 3. Sect. 2. p. 48. Concerning whose opinion, it must be placed beyond controversy that the illumination, instruction, and guidance of the Holy Spirit are most necessary for all Christians. Ps. 51:12-14. Ps. 143:10. Jer. 31:34. John 14:26. C. 16:13. 1 Cor. 2:14. Gal. 5:16, 25. Whence Paul in Rom. 8:9 emphatically teaches: "If anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His." and v. 14, "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God." And Jude v. 19 blames carnal men "not having the Spirit." It is equally indubitable that for the saving Understanding of the sacred writings, the illumination of the divine Spirit is required, as by whose Authority they were once written; yet the Holy Spirit, given to the faithful, impresses upon the minds of the faithful and inscribes upon their hearts the dogmas and Objects to be found in Scripture, but does not reveal new dogmas, Mysteries, and Objects not contained in Scripture, and therefore the falsity of the opinion of the Enthusiasts appears 1. from the Perfection of Scripture, §. 17, here p. 56, 57, proven, 2. from the clear sayings, Is. 8:20, "To the Law and to the Testimony." John 5:39, "Search the Scriptures." Luke 16:29, "They have Moses and the Prophets; let them hear them." 2 Pet. 1:19, "Pay attention to the prophetic Word." Gal. 1:8-9, "But even if an angel from heaven should preach a gospel to you other than what has been preached, let him be accursed." 3. from the lack of a Promise. In Luke 16:29, the rich man is rebuked because he sought revelations from the dead for his surviving brothers. 4. from the fraud and fallacy of the Devil to be feared in such revelations and dreams. 5. from the need to avoid Contempt for the Ordinary Ministry; and the introduction of various impostures, errors, heresies. 6. from the Condition of those revelations, which are mostly doubtful, obscure, convoluted, ambiguous, dangerous, often sought without judgment from Ezekiel, Daniel, the Apocalypse. 7. Those revelations either contain the same as what is in Scripture, or something different; If the former, they are superfluous; if the latter, they are not to be received, Gal. 1:8-9.

§ XXIII.

VII. An Adjunct of Scripture is Perspicuity, which is an Affection of Scripture, whereby it is in itself clear and open in those things which are necessary to be known, believed, done, and hoped for salvation. Concerning this Affection of Scripture, some err in Excess, and some in defect. In Excess err some Socinians, also the more recent

Remonstrants, asserting that even an unregenerate man, by the aid of his intellect alone, without the internal illumination of the Holy Spirit, can understand Scripture with fruit, and conceive Faith from it. If they understand this of a literal understanding acquired by the help of legitimate means of interpretation, and of Dogmatic or historical Faith, it can be admitted; but if they understand it of a saving understanding and salvific Faith, it is false; by the argument of the passages, 1 Cor. 2:14. C. 12:3. Ps. 119:18. Acts 16:14. Luke 24:45. John 17:17. 2 Cor. 4:6. Eph. 1:16-17. In defect err (1) the Jews, who accuse the Law of obscurity. See Menasseh ben Israel in his Conciliator, qu. 50 on Exodus, p. 169, & Buxtorf, Synagoga Judaica, c. 3, p. 49. 2. The author of the Preadamite System, Lib. 4, c. 1, p. 171-172, writing: "They were written with such carelessness and in such darkness, that nothing for the most part can be read that is more intricate, nothing more obscure." and p. 172, "Whatever (God) said, was a parable, and for the most part He led His hearers around with various circumlocutions of speech. If, then, in speaking face to face with men, God spoke perplexedly and enigmatically, it is not an dissimilar conjecture to think that He wished the same things, transmitted in writing, to be passed down to posterity more perplexedly and more knottily." (3) The Swenckfeldians and Weigelians, who call Scripture not only a dead, killing letter, but also two-handed, flexible in speech, a sealed enigma, a book closed with seven seals, an obscure lamp, a sheath, not the sword of the Spirit. Joh. Croc. Antiweigel. c. 1. qu. 2 & 3. (4) The Pontificians, some of whom have compared Scripture to a nose of wax, to a flexible, leaden Lesbian rule, as Pighius, Hierarch. c. 2 & 4. Costerus, Enchir. c. 1, p. 43, compares it to a sheath that admits any sword, not only of steel, but also of lead, wood, or bronze. Tannerus in Exam. Colloq. Ratisb. c. 2 & 29, calls it the fount and Source of heresies and of Babylonian Confusion. Although these things, said and understood with complaint about the Abuse of heretics, and thus attributed to Scripture accidentally, may in some way be excused, they are nevertheless not to be rashly imitated; the same ones indeed acknowledge that many things in the sacred writings are perspicuous, but that all are of such a kind as to be understood by anyone without labor, Costerus says in Enchir. c. 1. p. 50 seq., that those places which contain the Dogmas of Faith conflict with experience, which clearly involves something alien to the state of the Question and conceded by both sides. Bellarmine has similar things in lib. 3 de V. D. C. 1, 2. Greg. de Valent. lib. 5. Anal. Fid c. 2. Becan. Manual. Controv. lib. 1. c. 1. qu. 4. p. 8 seq. Jac. Gord. Huntlaus Epit. Controverf. Controv. 1. c. 21. p. 84. seqq.

When we attribute Perspicuity to Scripture in itself, 1. we distinguish between Subjective and Objective Perspicuity, i.e., as it is in itself; and as it is considered in relation to the readers or hearers, by whose fault it can be and often is obscure, just as those whose eyes are dim cannot see the light of the sun, by the fault not of the Sun but of their eyes. 2. between the mode of transmission, i.e., the clarity of the words by which the revealed things are signified, which we assert in things necessary for salvation; and between the evidence of the things, i.e., the dogmas themselves, which are proposed in the Scriptures, among which are Mysteries hidden for ages, Eph. 3:9, Col. 1:26, and manifestly great, 1 Tim. 3:16, and therefore sublime and abstruse, which surpass our

comprehension. i.e., some things hard to understand, 2 Pet. 3:16. 3. between the entire Code of Scripture, in which there are certainly many difficult and obscure things, suitable for exercising Doctors, e.g., Chronological, Topographical, Genealogical, Onomastic, Typical, Prophetic matters: and between the dogmas of Faith and the precepts of morals necessary for all, i.e., Historical matters, in respect to which we affirm Scripture to be perspicuous. 4. between a Perspicuity that excludes legitimate means—prayers, reading, meditation, study, i.e., the Ministry of Explication and Application; and a Perspicuity that includes these means. We acknowledge and defend not the former but the latter, with the following Arguments: 1. By the words of Moses, Deut. 30:11 seq. "This command which I command you today, is not above you (it is not hidden from you), nor is it far off, nor is it set in Heaven, that you might say: Who among us is able to ascend to Heaven, to bring it down to us?" etc. "But the word is very near you, in your mouth and in your heart, that you may do it." Ps. 19:8, "The precept of the Lord is clear, enlightening the eyes." Ps. 119:105, "Your Word is a lamp to my feet and a light to my paths." Prov. 6:23, "The commandment is a Lamp and the Law a Light." 2 Pet. 1:19, "We have a more sure prophetic word, to which you do well to pay attention, as to a lamp shining in a dark place." 2 Cor. 4:2-3, "If our Gospel is veiled, it is veiled to those who are perishing: in whom the god of this age has blinded the minds of the unbelievers, so that the illumination of the Gospel of the Glory of Christ, who is the image of God, might not shine on them." 2. From the Purpose of Scripture. Rom. 15:4, "Whatever things were written were written for our instruction." But Scripture could not teach, if it were not perspicuous in necessary things. Cf. John 20:31. Rom. 16:25. 1 Cor. 2:9-10. Col. 1:26-27. i.e., because it is the Rule of Faith and morals, which ought to be perspicuous in things pertaining to Faith and morals. 3. from the nature of the Author of Scripture, who, not like some Apollo, has shown himself ambiguous, but according to his goodness, as the Father of Lights, both wished to, and, according to his wisdom, could speak clearly and perspicuously. 4. From the principal Matter of Scripture, which is the Law and the Gospel, the sum of which is comprehended in the Decalogue, and the Apostles' Creed and the other heads of the Christian Religion; to which if you add the Histories of the O. and N. T., also other precepts of morals, Promises and threats, you will have to confess that no small part of the sacred writings is perspicuous. 5. because Scripture contains the Tablets of the Paternal Testament, and of the Covenant between God and men: and is the Edict of the King to his subjects, all of which it is right to be perspicuous. 6. from the Consensus of the Fathers, of whose number Augustine, in lib. 2 de Doctr. Christ. c. 6, says: "The Holy Spirit has wholesomely so modified the Holy Scriptures, that in the more open places He might meet hunger, and in the more obscure He might wipe away disdain. For almost nothing is drawn from those obscurities which is not found elsewhere said most plainly." Coster agrees, Enchir. c. 1. p. 48.

§ XXIV.

The Causes of Obscurity in certain passages of Scripture are the following: 1. that we may be reminded of our innate Blindness. 2. that our Pride, Self-love, and arrogance may be subdued. 3. that our ardor and diligence in searching the Scriptures may be more and

more kindled. 4. that disdain and Contempt for divine things may be avoided. For "What comes easily, we hold easily and negligently; What hope and fear have twisted, it is a joy to have." 5. that the illuminating and sanctifying Grace of the Holy Spirit may be more humbly and ardently implored by us; knowing that Scripture cannot be savingly understood without that Spirit by whom it was once inspired. 6. that the desire for the other Life and the Celestial Academy may be more vehemently kindled in us, by the example of Melanchthon, who before his death left written on a small page, among other things: "Do not fear death; because you will come into the Sight of God and there you will learn the secret Mysteries of God, which in this life you could not attain." 7. that we may be fed by the open, exercised by the obscure, in the one hunger is driven away, in the other disdain, according to Augustine, de Verb. Dom. Serm. 11. For Scripture is a sea in which the Elephant swims, the Lamb wades, as Gregory teaches.

§ XXV.

IX. An Adjunct of Scripture is Interpretation: The Pontificians wish the infallible interpreter of Scripture to be either the Church or the Pontiff, and him either alone or with a Council, and thus the Representative Church. Others wish the Interpreter of Scripture to be either Sound Reason or Philosophy; of the former opinion the Socinians are accused. Some years ago a Paradoxical Exercise was published: Philosophy, the Interpreter of Holy Scripture; Since its Author was addicted to Cartesian Philosophy, many have attributed this opinion to the Cartesians indiscriminately; but the Cartesian Theologians rightly do not admit that opinion. See Burmann, Synops. Theol. l. 1. c. 12. §.49. Wittich, Theol. Pacif. C. XI. §.133. Braun. Doctrin. Fæd. Loc.1. C.5.§.5. The true Power of Interpreting Scripture is either public or Private. The Public, which has the judgment of Decision, is either Supreme or Ministerial. The Supreme Interpreter is God, supremely wise and the Author of Holy Scripture, and especially the Holy Spirit, by whose guidance and Authority Scripture was consigned: hence David in Ps. 119:18 prays: that God would open his eyes to understand the wonders of the Law; But because God and the Holy Spirit do not explain the sense of Scripture to us immediately; therefore, the Public faculty of Interpreting, bound to the Rule of the Word, belongs to the Church and its Ministers. Mal. 2:7, "The lips of the priest shall keep Knowledge, and they shall seek the Law from his mouth." Eph. 4:11-12, "He gave some as Apostles, some as Prophets, others as Evangelists, others as Pastors and Teachers for the perfecting of the Saints for the work of the Ministry, for the edification of the Body of Christ." 1 Cor. 14:29, "Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others judge." Act. 15:22, "It pleased the Apostles and the elders with the whole Church to choose men from among them and send them to Antioch." Which is usually called a definitive Judgment. The private power of interpreting belongs to every Believer, by which he is bound to investigate the sense of Scripture, to discern the true from the false, and to judge and apply it to the direction of his own Conscience. Matth. 7:15, "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing." 1 Cor. 10:15, "I speak as to prudent men; judge for yourselves what I say." 1 Thess. 5:21, "Test all things; hold fast what is good." 1 John 4:1, "Do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits, whether they are of God." Act. 17:11, "The Bereans daily searched the

Scriptures to see if these things were so." Cf. John 10:3, 5. This is called a discrete Judgment, whose Instrument is Reason, instructed by the word of God; its Principle, Revelation or the Light of the Holy Spirit; its Norm, Holy Scripture. Which we prove from 2 Pet. 1:20, "knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation," 2. From Neh. 8:8, Ezra and his colleagues read in the book of the Law of God distinctly and clearly, and by explaining the sense they gave understanding through the Scripture. 3. From the Perspicuity of Scripture proven here in §.23. 4. From the Opinion of Christ in John 5:39, "Search the Scriptures." (5) From the Nature of a Testament; For as the mind of a testator is known from nowhere else than from the testament itself: so the mind and Will of God is gathered from Scripture. (6) from the absurd: otherwise Scripture would not be the Rule of Faith and morals. 2. we would be sent away to it in vain, and we would read it in vain. 3. there would be nothing certain in the Church. (7) from the Custom of Jurists, who seek the sense of Laws from other Laws. (8) From the Consensus of the Fathers and Roman-Catholics; which see in the Catholic Consensus of the Ancients, annexed to the Syntagma of Confessions, Art. 1, c. 2, and in Quenstedt, Syst. Theol. Part 1, cap. 4, Sect. 2, Qu. 14, p. 141. The Medium for Interpreting Scripture according to the sense of the Roman and Greek Church, after praying for divine Illumination, is the Knowledge not only of Scripture but also of Tradition, which contains the Decrees of Councils and Pontiffs and the consenting Interpretation of the Fathers.

The means of interpretation according to the Evangelicals are: 1. Ardent Imploration of the Holy Spirit to impart the true sense of Scripture. For by whose Authority and guidance it was once written, by His illumination also it must be explained. 2. The setting aside of Prejudices. 3. Skill in the Hebrew and Greek languages. 4. Knowledge of Logic and Rhetoric. 5. Devout and assiduous Reading and meditation of Scripture. 6. Attentive Consideration of the scope. 7. observation of *συναφεία*, i.e., of the coherence of the Text, or of the antecedents and consequents. 8. Diligent collation of parallel passages. Act. 9:22. 9. Consideration of the Analogy of faith. 10. Observation of the literal sense. 11. Explanation of the more obscure from the clearer, of the fewer from the more numerous. 12. Investigation of the opinions of other Doctors, and especially of the Fathers; whom we state should certainly be consulted, although we do not hold them as infallible Interpreters, or even for that reason, because besides Jerome and Origen hardly any knew Hebrew and Greek. Whence it is not surprising that they sometimes erred. The Pontificians admit that individuals erred, but they wish the consensus of all to be infallible. But if individuals erred, all together could also have erred. Cf. Dissert. Praesid. de Theologia §. XI. p. 29-30. Reason is indeed a Medium and an Instrument by which we apprehend even sacred things, understand, compose, divide, compare various Passages, infer one from another, conclude, and discern the true from the false: Whence Scripture exhorts us to the use of Reason, Ps. 32:9. Matth. 10:16. 1 Cor. 10:15. 1 Thess. 5:21. 1 John 4:1. Rom. 12:1-2. 1 Cor. 14:20. 1 Tim. 1:7. 2 Tim. 2:7. Tit. 1:9-10. However, it can be neither the Principle nor the Infallible Medium of the Interpretation of Scripture.

§ XXVI.

Concerning the Sense of Scripture, the opinion of the Pontificians is that the sense is twofold: Literal or Historical, and Mystical or Spiritual. This they divide into Allegorical, Anagogical, and Moral, or Tropological; the Allegorical corresponds to Faith, the anagogical to hope, the moral to charity; which matter they express in these Verses: "The Letter teaches the deeds; what you believe, the Allegory; The Moral, what you should do; where you are heading, the Anagogy." See Thom. Summ. Theol. Part. 1. qu. 1. Art. 10. Salmeron. Commentar. in Evangel. Hist. Proleg. 7. p. 68. feqq. 73. 74. Bellarm. Lib. 3. de V. D. c. 3. p. 140-141. Becan. Manual. Controv. lib. 1. C. 1. qu.3. and they think that Jerome excelled in the literal Sense, Ambrose in the Allegorical, Augustine in the Anagogical, and Gregory in the Moral. Salmeron, however, c.l. p. 73, writes: "But it should not be ignored that the ancient Fathers acknowledged only these two senses, and indeed the Holy Spirit Himself has revealed them to us; namely, the literal and the Spiritual," and p. 74, "That the Spiritual or Mystical Sense is truly subdivided into a threefold one, namely, the Allegorical, Tropological, and Anagogical, seems to be new and handed down by later Fathers." Our Opinion is that the literal Sense of Scripture is the One and Only, which contains the true declaration of the matter, which the Holy Spirit, the Author of Scripture, intends through the words according to the proper, or Tropical, signification of the terms; and it regards Histories, Dogmas, Precepts, Promises, and Threats. It is, however, either Simple or Composite. The Simple is either Proper, which arises from proper words; or Tropical or Figurative, which arises from improper and Tropical words, as "Herod is a Fox," "the Rock was Christ." 1 Cor. 10:4. Where it is to be noted that one should not rashly nor without necessity depart from the proper literal sense, but only then when the words, taken properly, either produce no, or an absurd or contradictory sense, or are repugnant to the Analogy of Faith, or violate the precepts of Charity, as Matth. 18:8, Col. 3:5. The Composite or Mixed has its place in Oracles having the nature of a Type, of which part is in the Type, part in the Antitype, which do not contain two Senses, but two parts or a different application of one sense intended by the Holy Spirit. e.g., Exod. 12:46, "You shall not break a bone of it." John 19:36. also Num. 21:9 & John 3:14, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness: so must the Son of man be lifted up." By the Fathers it is called Spiritual and Mystical; to which the Allegorical, Moral, and Anagogical can be referred; where, however, it must be observed that the Allegorical, Moral, and Anagogical sense is only an Extension and various Accommodation and Application of the literal Sense, and not so much the Words, as the thing signified by the words, is transferred elsewhere. We have examples of this matter in Gal. 4:24, concerning Sarah and Hagar signifying the two Testaments, Deut. 25:4 and 1 Cor. 9:9, concerning the ox treading out the grain, whose mouth is not to be muzzled. Ps. 95:11 and Hebr. 4:9, where God swears that the disobedient will not enter into rest; there literally the land of Canaan, here Heaven. 1 Cor. 10:3-4, the Rock and Manna signify Christ. 1. Pet. 3:21, the Flood and the Red Sea indicate Baptism. Where the matter itself indicates that one should not indulge in Allegories rashly; nor is it lawful for Anyone to transfer sacred things at will. Nor does the Mystical sense, whether Private or

Ecclesiastical, but the Sacred Mystical sense intended by the Holy Spirit, have the force of proving Theological dogmas. In this sense only is that trite saying to be taken: Symbolic or Parabolic Theology is not Argumentative. The unity of the literal sense is proven 1. from the Veracity and Sincerity of God; Therefore, he does not speak ambiguously. 1. Thess. 5:24, "He who called you is faithful, who also will do it." 2. from the Perspicuity of Scripture; for what admits various senses is not perspicuous. 3. from the Solidity, Firmness, and Certainty of Scripture: "We have a more firm Prophetic Word," 2 Pet. 1:19, which Certainty could not consist with a variety and multitude of senses in one and the same place of Scripture. 4. from the Purpose of Scripture, which is our information and instruction, Rom. 15:4, 2 Tim. 3:15, John 20:31, which purpose a multitude of senses would greatly impede. 5. from the nature of Signification and Sense; for the signification and sense is the form and soul of words; but just as the form of anything is but one, so also of any biblical saying there will be but one sense. 6. from the unity of Truth. Of one individual thing there is one truth; for one and true are convertible. But there would be more than one truth, if several literal senses of one saying were established. 7. from the Office of the Holy Spirit, which is to lead into all truth, John 16:13, but this cannot be done by ambiguous words, which indeed distract the intellect rather than render it certain, disturb rather than inform. 8. from absurdities. 1. The Word of God would be ambiguous, doubtful, and like the Word of Apollo, ambiguous and therefore deceitful. 2. no certain and firm argument could be sought from the Holy writings: For the words would always be of doubtful signification, not univocal, but equivocal; but Equivocation is always the mother of Errors.

§ XXVII.

X. An Adjunct of Scripture is the Power of a Norm, which is its Affection, by which Scripture is the perfect Rule of Faith, Morals, and Hope, to which all things to be believed, done, and hoped for are to be required. We prove that Scripture is the Rule or Norm of Faith and Morals 1. from the Requisites of a Rule, both the Common ones; such as, that it must be 1. Known, 2. certain, 3. Perfect, 4. Constant and Unchanging, etc., since otherwise other things cannot be measured and required by it; and the Proper ones, e.g., that it be 1. θεόπνευστος, divinely inspired. 2. of divine Authority and Truth, and therefore able to beget divine Faith. All of which are perspicuous from the aforesaid. 2. because it is expressly called κανών and Rule in Gal. 6:16, "And as many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." Phil. 3:16, "Nevertheless, to the degree that we have already attained, let us walk by the same rule, let us be of the same mind." 3. from the Affirmative sayings of Scripture, e.g., John 20:31, "These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in His name." Rom. 15:4, "For whatever things were written before were written for our learning." Ps. 119:9, "How can a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed according to Your word." i.e., v. 4, 5, 105, etc. John 17:17, "Your word is truth." which is confirmed by all the places where Scripture is called the Word of Truth, as in Ps. 119:43, Jas. 1:18, 2 Cor. 6:7, Eph. 1:13, Col. 1:5. Cf. 1 Tim. 3:16, 2 Pet. 1:19-20. 4. from the Preceptive sayings of Scripture, Is. 8:20, "To the law and to the testimony." John 5:39,

"Search the Scriptures;" etc. Luke 16:29, "They have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them." Col. 3:16. Deut. 6:6, 7, 8. 5. from the Example of Christ, Matth. 4:4, 7, 10, "It is written." Matth. 22 in the Dispute against the Sadducees, v. 24, 29, 31, 32, and the Pharisees, v. 35, 36, 37, i.e., 42 seqq. Luke 24:25 seqq. & 44 seqq. 6. from the Example of the Apostles, Act. 2:16, 25 seqq. c. 9:22, where Paul συμβιβάζων, i.e., by comparing passages of Scripture, taught that Jesus is the Christ. Act. 13:32-33 seqq. c. 17:2-3. C. 15:8, 9, 16, 17. C. 26:22. Rom. 3:10, 21, 22. C. 4:3, 5, 6, 7, 8. c. 15:8-9 seqq. 1 Cor. 15:3-4. See here §.19, p. 59. 7. from the Example of the Bereans, Act. 17:11. 8. from the Consensus of the Fathers, i.e., of Latin, Greek, etc. Christians; for although some wish Tradition to be added, they nevertheless do not deny that Scripture is the Rule of Faith and Morals. To this Norm, therefore, even the Confessions, Catechisms, and Symbolic Books of the churches are to be examined and required; but Scripture is not to be interpreted and explained according to these, or required by them. For if this were done, Scripture would be wrongly constituted not as the Norm and Rule, but as that which is to be normed and regulated.

§ XXVIII.

Indeed, Scripture is the Norm not only of Faith and Morals, but also of religious Controversies (not properly the Judge but) the Norm, according to which the Judge ought to judge and pronounce. This is proven (1.) because it is the Canon of Faith and Morals, Gal. 6:16, Phil. 3:16. See the preceding §. (2.) because God wishes nothing to be added to this Rule, nor anything to be taken away from it, Deut. 4:2. (3.) because God sends us to this Rule alone, Deut. 6:6, 7, 8; Is. 8:20; Luke 16:29. (4) because Christ acknowledged no other Norm, but appealed to this in Disputes, Matth. 4:4, 7, 10, "It is written." also Matth. 22:29 against the Sadducees: "You are mistaken, not knowing the Scriptures." V. 31, "Concerning the Resurrection of the Dead, have you not read what was said by God?" &c. and against the Pharisees, *ibid* v. 36, 37, 41, 42, 43. likewise the Apostles, who not only always appeal to Scripture, but, having been taught from Scripture, also say in the rendering of a verdict, Act. 15:28, "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us," and they profess to say "nothing beyond those things which Moses and the Prophets said would come," Act. 26:22. Repeat more from the preceding §. (5) from the words of Christ, John 12:48, "He who rejects Me, and does not receive My words, has that which judges him; the word that I have spoken will judge him in the last day." John 5:45, "There is one who accuses you—Moses, in whom you trust." But as to what pertains to the Judge, it should certainly not be doubted that God, Christ, or the Holy Spirit, as the Author of Scripture, is the Principal, Supreme, ἀνοκροατορικόν i.e. Authoritative, Infallible, and therefore ἀνυπέυθυνον, absolute and Independent, Judge of all controversies of Faith, who judges primarily, αἰθεντικῶς καὶ ἐξοχικῶς, and infallibly. But since the Holy Spirit does not judicially hear the litigating parties here on earth, nor take cognizance of and decide Cases, in such a way that each of the litigating parties can understand that the sentence has been passed either for or against them; Hence among Christians, divided from one another by Schisms, it is asked: Who is today in the Church the supreme, infallible, and Authoritative Judge of religious Controversies? The Socinians respond: Sound Reason is

the Judge, inasmuch as it examines whether that which is disputed agrees with the Norm of the sacred writings or not. See Joach. Stegmann, de Judice & Norma Controv. Fidei, c. 2, p. 55-56, & c. 3, p. 82, c. 3, p. 83 seqq. Andr. Wissowatii, Relig. Rational. p. 8 seqq. With whom the Remonstrants here agree, Curcellæus, Rel. Christ. Inst. l. 1, C. 16, §. 6, p. 36 seqq. Phil. a Limborch, Theol. Christ. l. 1, C. 12, §. 4, p. 42. The Roman-Catholics assert that such a Judge is either the Church, according to the Council of Trent, Sess. 4, decr. 2, or the Pope, and this either alone from the Chair of St. Peter, or with a Council, and thus, the Representative Church. Bellarm. l. 3 de V. D. C. 3, p. 142, and others passim. And many of them today consider this Controversy to be the principal one between the Church of Rome and the Evangelicals. For just as Perronius, Gonterius, Veronius, Arnoldus, also the Walenburg Brothers urged the Exclusion of Consequences; Antonius Faber, Nihusius, Marcellius, the Augustinian Method or Defensive Method, or the Way of Law and the Law of Prescription; Jansenius of Ypres and the Walenburg Brothers, the Postulation of the Mission and Vocation of the Protestants; Arnaldus, the Perpetuity of the Faith, especially concerning the Eucharist; Masenius adopted the Demonstration of the dogmas of the Roman Church from Scripture, in imitation of the Protestants: So Perronius, Richelius, Valerianus Magnus, Nouet and others, having dismissed the Way of Discussion and Examination of Dogmas, chose and preferred to other Methods the Way of Authority and Submission, concerning the Rule of Believing, as being shorter and easier, both for keeping their own in obedience, and for reducing the Protestants into the Bosom of the Church of Rome. We deny that after Christ's Ascension into Heaven, there remains in the militant Church a Supreme, autocratic, Infallible, unaccountable, absolute, and Independent Judge, who has the supreme, infallible, and Praetorian Power and Authority of interpreting Scripture and of judging and deciding controversies of Religion and Faith. (1.) because Holy Scripture has nowhere indicated such a Judge to us. (2.) because on the contrary Christ in Matth. 7:15, bids us to beware of false prophets; John in 1 John 4:1, forbids believing every spirit, and bids to test the spirits whether they are from God. Paul in 1 Cor. 11:19, predicts that there will be heresies, so that those who are approved may be made manifest. The same in Hebr. 5:14, requires in every faithful person senses exercised for the discernment of good and evil. See here §. 25, p. 71, which would be superfluous if an infallible Judge remained in the Church. (3.) because the faithful are sent back to the examination of Scripture, John 5:39. (4.) because men are fallible, Ps. 116:11, nor do they always allow themselves to be led by the Spirit of God; but they often resist the Holy Spirit, Act. 7:51. (5.) the same is proven by the Requisites of an Infallible and Supreme Judge; of which the 1st is, that he be ἀναμάρτητος, Infallible. 2. that he be αυτοκρατορικός, from whom no appeal is given. 3. that he be just and ἀπροσοπολήπτης, who is led by no partiality. 4. that he possess universal Jurisdiction over the litigants. 5. that he be instructed with coercive power, so that the parties may embrace the sentence passed. From which one may judge, whether such a Judge remains in the Church, militant on earth, and whether he is the Roman Pope. Whose Infallibility seems to be held rather as a Secret of the Empire among the Roman Catholics themselves, than as a dogma of Faith, lest anyone should oppose his Decrees, and that there may at last be an end to Controversies. Concerning Councils and the

Fathers, as well as the Infallibility of the Popes, see Dissert. Praesid. de Theologia & Relig. C. 1, §. XI, and here C. 2, §. 25, p. 72. Although the Militant Church, on this earth, does not have a visible Infallible Judge, who is autocratic, God has nevertheless sufficiently provided for his Church by giving His Word as a Rule of Faith, Morals, and Hope, and by giving a Ministerial Judge, bound to the Norm and the written Law. The Doctors and Ministers of the Church are instructed with this kind of power of judging, by the argument of the passages cited here §.25, p.70, f.71, to which add Matth. 28:19, "Go, teach all nations." Mark 16:15, "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Luke 10:3, "Behold, I send you." John 20:21, "As the Father has sent Me, I also send you." Luke 10:16, "He who hears you, hears Me; he who rejects you, rejects Me." Act. 20:28, "Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, among which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers, to shepherd the church of God which He purchased with His own blood." Cf. 1 Tim. 4:13. 2 Tim. 4:2. Tit. 2:1. Act. 15:28, "It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us." Hebr. 13:17, "Obey those who rule over you, and be submissive, for they watch out for your souls, as those who must give account. Let them do so with joy and not with grief." And such a Ministerial and Subordinate Judge, and bound to the Law, was also the High Priest of the O.T., Deut. 17:11-12. These Subordinate Judges are to be heard when and inasmuch as they propose the Doctrine of the Law and the Gospel, or nothing repugnant to the same, Matth. 23:2, C. 18:17. and their Judgment is usually called Decisive, but with the reservation of an Appeal to a superior. The Discretive Judgment belongs to every Believer, by virtue of the texts of scripture alleged here §.25, p. 71, and in this §. 28, p. 78, since to him belongs the power of investigating the true sense of the sacred writings, of discerning the true from the false, and of judging and applying the true sense for the direction of his own Conscience. See the Consensus of the Ancients at the end of the Syntagma of Confessions, Art. 1, C. 2, especially p. 12, 13, 14, also Optatus of Milevis, l. 5, on the schism of the Donatists. Moreover, the requisites of a Judge investigating the Truth are: 1. Immunity from preconceived opinions. 2. Maturity of age. 3. The Spirituality of the person, 1 Cor. 2:14-15. 4. True Humility of Heart, Matth. 11:28; 2 Cor. 10:5. 5. Resignation to the Will of God, John 7:17. 6. The help of subsidiary means; such as the Knowledge of Philosophy and the Original Languages.

§ XXIX.

XI. An Adjunct of Scripture is its Communicability for Reading, which is its Affection, by which it can and should be proposed for reading to all adults, not only Clerics but also Laity, for the salvation of the soul. The Council of Trent, in the Index of prohibited books, Rule 4, wishes the Reading of Scripture to be granted to the Laity only under certain Conditions and Limitations, saying: "Since it is manifest from experience, if the holy Bibles in the vulgar tongue are permitted everywhere without distinction, more harm than usefulness arises from it, on account of the rashness of men, in this part it is left to the judgment of the Bishop, or the Inquisitor, so that with the counsel of the Parish priest or Confessor, they may grant the reading of Bibles translated by Catholic Authors in the vulgar tongue to those whom they understand can derive from such reading not harm, but an increase of faith and piety; which faculty they should have in

writing. But whoever shall have presumed to have or read them without such a faculty, cannot receive absolution for sins, unless the Bibles are first returned to the Ordinary." Stapleton distinguishes between Places where the battle line of the Church is disturbed, i.e., where Roman-Catholics are mixed with Evangelicals; there, he says, vernacular Bibles may be permitted under the said conditions; and between places where the battle line of the Church is ordered, i.e., where only Roman-Catholics live, there, he contends, Bibles in the Vulgar Tongue should not be permitted. We state that Scripture should be read by all promiscuously and without distinction. 1) From the express general sayings of Scripture, Deut. 6:6 seqq. "These words shall be in your heart, and you shall tell them to your sons, and you shall meditate on them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, when you lie down and when you rise up." Ps. 1:2, "Blessed is the Man, whose delight is in the Law of the Lord, and who will meditate on His Law day and night." John 5:39, "Search the Scriptures," &c., which words, whether rendered imperatively, with Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Augustine, Theophylact, Luther, the Genevans, and others; or indicatively, with Cyril, many Pontificians, and from the Reformed, Beza, Piscator, Tossanus, Cameron, Georg. Bull; from the Lutherans, Brenz, Erasmus Schmid, nevertheless confirm our opinion. Col. 3:16, "Let the Word of the Lord dwell in you richly, in all wisdom." 2 Pet. 1:19, "We have a more sure prophetic word, to which you do well to pay attention," Apoc. 1:3, "Blessed is he who reads and hears the words of this Prophecy, and keeps those things which are written in it." 2. From the special command given to Kings, Deut. 17:18-19, to whom it is decreed that they should write for themselves a copy of the Law in a Volume and have it with them and read it all the days of their life, that they may learn to fear the Lord their God. Josh. 1:8, "Let not this Volume of the Law depart from your mouth, but you shall meditate in it day and night, that you may observe and do all that is written in it." Likewise to Fathers, Sons, and adolescents, 1 John 2:13-14. hence the Epistles of the Apostles, written to all, Rom. 1:7; 1 Cor. 1:1-2; Eph. 1:1; Phil. 1:1; 1 Pet. 1:1, are commanded to be read by all. Col. 4:16; 1 Thess. 5:27. 3. from the purpose of Scripture, John 20:31, "These are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing, you may have Life in his name." 2 Tim. 3:16-17, "That the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly equipped for every good work." Rom. 15:4, "Whatever things were written, were written for our doctrine, that through the patience and comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope." 4. from the praises of Scripture: For in John 6 is the Word of Life; Rom. 1:16, it is the power of God for salvation, to everyone who believes; Eph. 6:17, it is the sword of the Spirit, with which we can repel the Devil and all his assaults, and his fiery darts, by the example of Christ, Matth. 4:10-11, deprived of which sword, they are exposed unarmed to the snares and frauds of the Devil. 5. because in Scripture is contained the Testament or last Will of God, concerning the Inheritance of men and the way to attain it; it will therefore be the part of the Heirs to unfold it, and to inform themselves from it about the reasons for their salvation. 6. because Scripture is a Letter from the Creator to His creature, who is therefore bound to read it, to perceive the Will of God from it. 7. from the Praised examples of those who have read Scripture, as in Act. 8:27 seqq., the Eunuch of Queen Candace is praised because he read the Prophet Isaiah on the way. Act. 17:11,

the Bereans, because they searched the Scripture, to see if what was said by Paul was so. Act. 18:24-25, Apollos, as a Man mighty in the Scriptures. 2 Tim. 3:15, Timothy, because, from the Instruction of his mother Eunice and his grandmother Lois, he had known the holy writings from infancy. 8. from the Practice of the Jews. Neh. 8:2-3, "Ezra brought the Law before the multitude of Men and women, and all who could understand, and he read in it openly." from Luke 4:16 and Act. 15:21, it is clear that the Jews publicly read the Scripture in the Synagogues on the Sabbath days; hence James in Act. 15:21 says: "Moses from ancient times has in every City those who preach him in the Synagogues, where he is read every Sabbath." That heads of families also had, read, and inculcated the Law at home to their sons and other domestics, is clear from Deut. 6:6, 7, 8, 9; Ps. 1:2, which Custom still thrives among the Jews. 9. from the Practice of the Primitive Church, in which the Reading of the Sacred Writings was recommended to all the faithful promiscuously. Cf. the Catholic Consensus of the Ancients, Art. 1, c. 2, appended to the Syntagma of Confessions. That Heresies have sometimes arisen, or do arise, from the promiscuous Reading of Scripture, this is accidental and from abuse, on account of which the use should not be taken away. 2. Most Heretics were Clerics, such as Arius, Photinus, Macedonius, Nestorius, Eutyches, Donatus, Pelagius, &c. If, therefore, that Argument were worth anything, the reading of Scripture should rather be forbidden to Clerics than to the Laity.

§ XXX.

From the necessary Reading of Scripture follows the necessary Version of the same: For since most are ignorant of the Hebrew and Greek languages, in which the Word of God was originally written, hence Versions of Scripture into the vernacular languages of each nation are not only lawful and useful, but also necessary. 2. to which end, in Act. 2:4, the Apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in various tongues. 3. which is confirmed by 1 Cor. 14:6, "Brethren, if I come to you speaking in tongues, what will I profit you, unless I speak to you, either in revelation, or in Knowledge, or in Prophecy, or in doctrine?" v. 9, "unless you utter a clear speech by the tongue, how will what is said be known?" v. 19, "in the Church I would rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue." 4. which the Practice of both the Judaic and the Christian Church has approved. For before the birth of Christ, the Old Testament was translated into the Greek language by the LXX, and into Chaldaic by Onkelos and by Jonathan son of Uzziel, with the knowledge and approval of the Jews. After the birth of Christ, Aquila of Pontus, around A.D. 137, under Emperor Hadrian; Theodotion around A.D. 184, under Commodus; Symmachus around A.D. 197, under Antoninus and Aurelius Verus, apostates, translated the Old Testament into Greek, with Christians not disapproving. The Jericho version around A.D. 220, under Caracalla, found in a jar near Jericho; the Nicopolis version A.D. 230, under Alexander Severus, found near Nicopolis; from all of which joined together, Origen prepared the Tetrapla, Hexapla, and Octapla. The Version of Lucian the Martyr followed around A.D. 310, who emended the preceding ones, approved by the Constantinopolitans; that of Hesychius, which the Egyptians and Alexandrians are said to have embraced. In the Latin

Church, the Itala or Vulgate Version was famous, which contained the Old and New Testament. This was followed by the Version of Jerome, who also translated the Scripture into the Dalmatian language. Chrysostom translated the same into Armenian; Ulfilas, Bishop of the Goths, who was present at the Council of Nicaea, into Gothic. The most ancient Version of the New Testament is the Syriac. By this laudable example, the Sacred Writings were also translated into Arabic, Samaritan, Ethiopic, Persian, Russian, and other languages, vernacular to each nation.

Among the Versions, the Chaldaic Paraphrases stand out, which are called Thargumim in Chaldaic from the word "he interpreted, he expounded." The occasion for these was the ignorance of the Jewish people in the Hebrew language, which they had consigned to oblivion in the Babylonian Captivity; so that their Piety might nevertheless be consulted, the Chaldaic Paraphrases were composed, and they exist for all the Books, except for Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the Books of Chronicles. And indeed I. the Targum of Onkelos, who translated the Pentateuch into Chaldaic and is thought by some to have lived at the time of Hillel the Elder, about 40 years before the birth of Christ, under Hyrcanus, and to have been a contemporary of Jonathan, another Paraphrast, as Rabbi Azariah testifies in Meor Enaiim c. 45 and other Rabbis, cited by others. Differing from these are those who believe he was contemporary with Gamaliel and the nephew of Vespasian from his sister. II. The Targum on the former and latter prophets (excepting Daniel) was translated by Jonathan Son of Uzziel, a disciple, as they think, of Hillel the Elder and a fellow student of Simeon the Just, who, before his death, took the Infant Jesus in his arms; and also of Gamaliel, Paul's Preceptor. These Paraphrases are held in the highest esteem among the Jews, both on account of their Origin, because they believe that Jonathan received his Paraphrase from the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi; and Onkelos from R. Eliezer and R. Joshua; and on account of the Miracles which are said to have occurred especially around Jonathan's Translation: For they believe that the land of Israel was moved for 400 leagues; and a Daughter of a Voice was heard from Heaven, asking, who is he who has revealed my secrets to the sons of men? To which Jonathan is said to have responded: "I am he," &c. "But it is known before you, that I have not done it for my own honor, nor for the honor of my Father; but for your honor, that disputes might not be multiplied in Israel." And lest he be impeded in the work undertaken, flies that were about to settle on his Body or the Paper were burned without any harm to his Body and the Paper. Angels also descended from Heaven to listen when Jonathan was intent on his work. That he was inhibited from proceeding in adorning the Paraphrases by the Daughter of a Voice, who said: "It is enough for you!" and to his asking: "why?" she is said to have responded: "because in it is the end of the Messiah!" III. The Targum of the five scrolls, Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther; and IV. the Targum of the Hagiographa was composed by an uncertain Author at an uncertain time. V. The Jerusalem Targum on the Pentateuch, falsely attributed by some to Jonathan, was composed several Centuries after the Paraphrase of Onkelos and Jonathan Uzziel, and only about 100 Years ago.

§ XXXI.

Among the Greek versions, the first place is held by the Version of the LXX Interpreters, about 300 years before the Birth of Christ, procured not by Ptolemy Lagus, as Justin M., Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria believed, but by Ptolemy Philadelphus, King of the Egyptians, so that he might also enrich his most well-stocked library with this Book, containing the Laws and Prophecies of the Jews, at the instigation of Demetrius Phalereus, and prepared from a pure Hebrew of the best note, not, however, from a Samaritan Codex, by seventy-two Elders (who are called seventy by a round number), not enclosed in cells, but gathered in a single Basilica, who, having held a conference among themselves, not indeed as Prophets, but as Interpreters, yet with wonderful agreement translated all the canonical books of the Old Testament. In memory of which event, on the Island of Pharos, for a time, an annual feast day was celebrated every year, as Philo reports, in book 4 of the Life of Moses. Its authority, both among the Jews and among the ancient Christians, was very great: For throughout all of Asia, Greece, and Egypt, it was publicly read in the synagogues, and was even cited by Christ himself and the Apostles, if not always, at least for the most part, and thus it was handed down to the Christian Church, which (both Latin and Greek) received it alone for more than 400 years, used it both publicly and privately, illustrated it with Commentaries, and composed Versions from it. Today, concerning its Authority, some err in Excess, some in Defect: In Excess; those who wish it to be Authentic and that the Authors of this Version were Prophets rather than Interpreters. Also those who prefer it to the current Hebrew Text, such as Joh. Morinus; and J. Vossius, about whom see here §. 16. n. 4. p. 51-52. In defect err those who deny that it still exists today. The Middle and our Opinion is that this Version indeed survives today, but in many places, due to both the injury of time and the negligence and malice of men, it is so corrupt that it cannot be equated with the Hebrew Sources, much less be preferred.

§ XXXII.

Among the Latin versions, the first place is held by the Vulgate Version. Concerning which we briefly observe; that once before the times of Jerome and Augustine, several Latin Versions existed, translated not from the Hebrew text, but from the LXX Interpreters; among which, however, one stood out and was more celebrated than the rest, which was called the Vulgate by Jerome, the Itala by Augustine, and the Old by Gregory. But when Jerome observed so many dissonant and in many ways faulty Versions of Scripture, he himself also translated the Bible into Latin, and indeed the Old Testament twice; first from the LXX, then from the Hebrew text. He did not translate the New Testament, but emended the Old version; which Version of Jerome offended not a few, including Augustine, yet was received by many with great applause and called the New, and indeed, with the offense gradually removed, it was finally received in the Latin Church. After Gregory, with the others gradually vanishing, only one survived, which is also in use today in the Roman Church. Concerning this, there are three opinions, the 1st of which wishes the modern Latin to be that most ancient Vulgate; which was the

opinion of Stapleton. The 2nd thinks that the modern Vulgate is the Interpretation of Jerome, like Augustinus Steuchus Eugubinus. The 3rd, more common, states that the modern Vulgate is a Mixture from the Old Vulgate and the Interpretation of Jerome; which Sixtus of Siena, Bibl. S. l. 8. p. 670, and Driedo, Dogm. Eccles. l. 2. C. 1, Baronius Tom. 2. ad A. 251. n. 41, Bellarm. de V. D. l. 2. c. 9, and many others hold, with whom most Protestants agree. The Council of Trent declared it Authentic in Sess. 4, Dec. 2. Which Decree some, however, understand absolutely, as if it were declared free of all error whatsoever, and that it is not permitted to depart from it or appeal from it, even on the pretext of the sources; as Ludovicus de Tena, whose words Amama has in Antibar. Bibl. l. 1. c. 6. p. 43, also Joh. Sacroboscus, Pineda, Azorius, Ribera, Valentia, Menochius, Tirinus. Others, however, accept it in a qualified sense and only in a certain respect, namely, in respect to other Versions and insofar as it agrees with the Sources, and also with regard to the doctrine of Faith and precepts of morals, as Isidorus Clarius, Andreas Vega, Andradius, Sixtus of Siena, Genebrardus, Driedo, Bellarminus, Mariana, whose words, as well as those of Bannes, Amama in Antibar. Bibl. l. 1. c. 6. p. 40-41, relates how serious the Contentions on this matter were in Spain; But so that there might be less doubt about the Authenticity of this Version, Sixtus V and later Clement VIII had it revised and emended; whose Bulls Amama presents in Antibar. Bibl. l. 1. C. 14. p. 98 seqq. and p. 114 seqq. But, even if we deem this Version, used for so many Centuries in the Christian Church, not only not to be scorned, but also to be held in the highest regard, we nevertheless do not believe it to be Authentic. 1. because it was translated by an Interpreter, not indeed by a θεοπνεύστος (divinely inspired) and infallible Author. 2. because every Version must be measured against the Original Text. 3. because it still abounds in not a few errors; which Bellarmine does not deny, writing to Lucas Brugensis: "I would have you know that the Vulgate Bibles have not been most accurately corrected by us; for we have deliberately, for just reasons, passed over many things which seemed to need Correction." 4. because only the Hebrew Text in the Old and the Greek in the N.T. is Authentic. See also Paolo Sarpi's Hist. Concil. Trid. l. 2. p. 254-255 seqq.

§ XXXIII.

By the same reasons that it was lawful for the Chaldeans, Greeks, and Latins to translate the Sacred Writings, it was also lawful and is lawful today for other Nations and Peoples to translate the same into their own Languages, so that every Tongue may praise the Lord, and in all Tongues the great works of God may be preached. Where the Requisites of a Good Interpreter are chiefly two. 1. Skill both in those languages from which he must translate, and in that language into which he must translate, lest he so much convert as pervert: to which should be added Knowledge of divine matters, comprehended in the Sacred writings. 2. Faithfulness, that he may translate accurately and exactly, and take care lest he say more or less than is had in the Original text; nor insert his own hypotheses into the Version. These were not observed in Xavier's Persian History of the Gospel, into which certain apocryphal fictions were inserted; Nor in the French Version of the New Testament by the Theologians of Louvain, which was printed

in Bordeaux in A.D. 1686, with approbation, for the use of recent Converts; into which certain dogmas of the Roman Church were inserted, e.g., Act. 13:2, "As they were offering to the Lord the Sacrifice of the MASS." 1 Cor. 3:15, "He himself will be saved, yet so as through the fire of PURGATORY." 1 Cor. 7:10, "to those who are joined by the Sacrament of Marriage..." 2 Cor. 6:14, "Do not be joined by the Sacrament of Marriage with unbelievers." 1 Tim. 4:1, "The Spirit says clearly, that in the last times some will separate themselves from the Roman Faith," 3. "Condemning the Sacrament of Marriage, the abstinence from foods, which God created for the faithful." 1 Cor. 11:26, "this living bread," V. 28, "this living bread." 1 John 5:17, "There is some sin which is not mortal, but venial." Hebr. 11:30, "After a Procession." Chap. 13:16, "For one merits with God by such Sacrifices," &c. Which are not read in this way in the Original Text.

§ XXXIV.

XI. An Adjunct of Scripture is Efficacy, by which Scripture preached, heard, read, and considered, by the Ordinance and Will of God, has the force and efficacy to convert, regenerate, and eternally save men. Which is to be held against the Swenckfeldians, Weigelians, &c. Where it is manifest that the discourse is about the formal, not the material efficacy of the words; against certain Women in the primitive Church, who attributed a Virtue, similar to Magic, especially to the Gospel of John, so that they might promise themselves certain peculiar effects from carrying it, or suspending it from the neck, or from the pronounciation of some things from it. Against which abuse Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine, and others wrote. Nor do we speak of a merely Objective, representative, or Significant Efficacy, which it has in common with every word, but of a real and effective Virtue, from the Will and Ordinance of God, with respect to all Readers and Hearers, so that, being read, heard, and considered, it always has the conjoined efficacy of the Holy Spirit, for the illumination, Conversion, Faith and Regeneration, Sanctification and Salvation of men, to be effected gradually, which is proved by Is. 55:10-11, "As the rain and the snow come down from Heaven, and do not return there, so shall My Word be, it shall not return to Me void, but it shall accomplish what I please, and it shall prosper in the things for which I sent it." Jer. 23:29, "Is not My word like a fire? says the Lord, and like a hammer that breaks the rock in pieces?" Luke 10:9, "The Kingdom of God has come near to you." Rom. 1:16, "The Gospel is the Power of God, for salvation to everyone who believes." I Cor. 1:18, "The word of the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved, it is the Power of God." Hebr. 4:12, "The Word of God is living and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the division of soul and spirit, and of joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." 1 Pet. 1:23, "being born again, not of corruptible seed but incorruptible, through the word of God which lives and abides forever." Jas. 1:21, "receive with meekness the implanted Word, which is able to save your souls." Cf. 2 Cor. 3:6; 2 Cor. 4:3-4; 1 Thess. 2:13; C. 5:24. This Adjunct is required by the Nature of the Covenant of Grace, which not only demands the Federal Condition, but also graciously confers the strength to perform it, 2 Cor. 3:6. Sanctify us, O God, in the Truth; Your Word is Truth!

S. D. G.