

On the Norm of Faith

William Whitaker

EDMUND CAMPION.¹

Indeed, many things reveal the deficiency of our adversaries in this cause, but nothing so much as the most sacred majesty of the Bibles being most foully violated. For those who, after having despised the voices and testimonies of all other witnesses, are reduced to such a state that they cannot stand unless they lay violent hands upon the very divine books themselves. They truly show themselves to be contending in extreme fortune and, with affairs now desperate and lost, to be willing to attempt the harshest and final measures. What cause drove the Manicheans to reject the Gospel of Matthew and the Acts of the Apostles? Desperation. For by these volumes they were tormented—both those who denied that Christ was born of a virgin, and those who pretended that the Spirit first descended from heaven upon Christians when their own Paraclete, that most wicked Persian, had burst forth. What drove the Ebionites to repudiate all the Epistles of Paul? Desperation. For with these maintaining their dignity, circumcision—which they had revived—was rendered obsolete. What drove Luther, that wicked apostate, to call the Epistle of James contentious, swollen, dry, and straw-like, and to deem it unworthy of the Apostolic spirit?

Desperation. For by this writing the wretched man was crushed and shattered when he established righteousness in faith alone. What drove Luther's whelps, with the same calumny, to suddenly expunge from the genuine canon Tobias, Ecclesiasticus, Maccabees, and many others hated by them? Desperation. For by these Oracles they are most eloquently refuted whenever they dispute about the patronage of angels, about the freedom of the will, about the life of the faithful departed, and about the intercession of holy men. Is it truly so? So much perversity, so much audacity? When they had trampled upon the Church, Councils, Sees, Fathers, Martyrs, Empires, peoples, Laws, Academies, Histories—all traces of antiquity and soundness—and had proclaimed that they wished to settle controversies solely by the written word of God, did they then maim that very word which alone had stood firm, tearing out from the whole body such great and splendid parts with their pincers and tongs? *For indeed, the Calvinists cut out seven entire books from the Old Testament (to say nothing of

¹ <https://books.google.com.pe/books?id=2MxjAAAACAAJ&pg=PA2#v=onepage&q&f=false>

minor differences);* and Luther even rejected the Epistle of James and, out of envy for it, five others about which there had sometimes and somewhere been controversy. To these the most recent Genevans also add the book of Esther and almost three chapters of Daniel, which indeed the Anabaptists—disciples of these men—had long since condemned and derided. How much more modest was Augustine who, weaving together the sacred catalog, set up as his rule not himself, nor the Hebrew Alphabet (as the Jews do), nor a private spirit (as the Sectaries do), but that Spirit by which Christ animates the whole body of the Church—which Church, as the guardian (not the mistress, as heretics cavil) of this deposit, publicly claimed this entire treasure (which the Tridentine Synod embraced) for the most ancient Councils long ago. The same Augustine, specifically disputing about one portion of the Scriptures, could not bring himself to believe that the book of Wisdom—which even then by the Church's reckoning, through the succession of times, the testimony of the ancients, and the consensus of the faithful had obtained firm and canonical authority—ought to be thrust out of the canon by anyone's rashness or stealth. What would he say now if he lived on earth and beheld these Luther and Calvin as craftsmen of Bibles, who with their polished and elegant file have shaved both Testaments old and new, and have segregated not only Wisdom but also very many others from the order of canonical books; so that whatever has not proceeded from their workshop is spat upon by all with a frenzied decree as uncultivated and horrid? Those who have descended to this so dreadful and execrable refuge are certainly—though they may flit about in the mouths of their followers, hawk priesthods, declaim in assembly, and sharpen sword, rack, and cross against Catholics—nevertheless conquered, abject, squalid, and prostrate; since having seized the censorial rod as if honorary arbiters sitting in judgment, they obliterate the very divine tablets if any did not suit their stomach. Who is there, even moderately instructed, who would fear such subterfuges of enemies? These enemies, as soon as they are detected in your assembly of learned men resorting to such venerable arts as to a familiar demon, should be met not with verbal abuse but with a clamor.

I would ask them, for example, by what right they mutilate and plunder the body of the Bible. They respond that they do not cut out genuine writings but sift out spurious ones. By what judge? The Holy Spirit. For this response is prescribed by Calvin so that he may evade the judgment of the Church by which spirits are

examined. Why then do some tear apart what others do not, when all glory in the same Spirit? The Spirit of the Calvinists accepts six Epistles that do not please Luther's spirit; yet each relies on the Holy Spirit. The Anabaptist calls the history of Job a fable mixed with tragic and comic laws. How do they know? By the Spirit teaching. Castellio esteemed that mystical Song of Solomon—which Catholics admire as a paradise of the soul, as hidden manna, as sumptuous delights in Christ—as no more than a song about a little girlfriend and an amorous conversation with court attendants—that venereal rogue! From where did he draw this? From the Spirit. In the Apocalypse of John, whose every point Jerome affirms sounds something lofty and magnificent; yet Luther, Brentius, and Kemnitius desire something—I know not what—as difficult Aristarchuses do, leaning indeed toward having it expelled. Whom did they consult? The Spirit. Luther preposterously pits the four Gospels against each other and, far preferring Paul's first three Epistles, decrees that henceforth only John's Gospel should be called beautiful, true, and principal—indeed he would willingly have enlisted even the Apostles as partners in his quarrels if he could. By what teacher? The Spirit. Moreover, that little brother did not hesitate to assail Luke's Gospel with a petulant style because good works of virtues are more frequently commended in it. Whom did he ask? The Spirit. Theodore Beza dared to translate that secret word from Luke chapter twenty-two—"This cup is the new testament in my blood, which (cup) shall be shed for you"—as corrupted and vitiated because this expression admits no exposition except concerning the wine of the cup converted into Christ's true blood. Who indicated this? The Spirit. Finally, since each believes his own spirit, they lie with horrible blasphemy in using the name of the Holy Spirit. Do they not betray themselves by doing so? Are they not easily refuted? Are they not held and constrained with minimal effort in an assembly of such men as you Academics are? Should I fear to dispute for the Catholic faith with those who have handled not human but ethereal utterances in worst faith?

I say nothing here about what they have perverted in translating (though these are intolerable things I could accuse). I preempt nothing from Gregory Martin, my most learned colleague in languages, who will perform this more learnedly and fully; nor from others whom I understand already have this task in hand. The more heinous and foul crime I now pursue is this: That there have been found petty teachers who with a kind of drunken impulse have rushed upon the

heavenly charter; have condemned that very thing in many places as mutilated, defective, false, and surreptitious; have corrected some parts; have erased some; have torn out some; have changed every bulwark by which it was fortified into Lutheran spirits as into ramparts of phantoms and painted walls; lest they fall completely silent when they dash against the Scriptures hostile to their errors—as if they could no more easily manage than swallow sparks or chew stones.

This therefore was a strong and just reason for me: it has shown everywhere that the adversarial parties are shadowy and broken; it has certainly added courage to a Christian mind both strong and exercised in these studies to contend for the diploma of the eternal King against the remnants of vanquished enemies.

WILLIAM WHITAKER

The fact that you have added the utmost zeal in this cause which you defend, and have brought forth spirits, I know not what, more than Jesuitical, Campian, so that, having emerged from the hovel in which you have lain hidden for several years, you declare war on us all, and challenge the bravest among us to combat, you say was chiefly because you perceived our diffidence in the cause. For why indeed should you, a most confident man, not provoke and pursue with fierce warfare adversaries who are timid, evasive, daring to take a stand nowhere, and lacking confidence in themselves? But in what matters, pray tell, have you sensed our diffidence? There are many things, you say, that speak of the adversaries' diffidence. If indeed as much audacity could be employed in attacking religion as in waging war—which sometimes avails in storming an enemy city—we would rightly have to dread those most furious assaults of yours. For whatever rage, fury, and savagery could accomplish for a long time now, that you have wholly employed in this contest. But by these weapons religion and truth are not moved in the least, nor do they allow themselves to be dislodged from their place. And although we have not been as eager and prompt in the best cause as we ought, and as the matter itself demanded, nor have we yet routed your battle line, which ought to have been defeated long ago, nevertheless we have never yielded to you, never retreated a step, never fled from the field of battle. Tell me, Campian, if you can, and recall past times: have we ever shunned any learned disputation, refused any contest, evaded your conditions and choices? But how often have we engaged with you openly and publicly? How often have we refuted your sophisms repeated a hundred times?

What writing have we not refuted, or what mode of combat have we rejected? Cannot so many disputations at Wittenberg, Regensburg, Augsburg, Speyer, Worms, Bern, Poissy, London, Cambridge, Oxford bear the richest witness with what spirit, what learning, what truth we have defended our religious cause? What sign of timidity and diffidence could you ever find here, rather than what you perceived as a mark of true and supreme confidence? Indeed, this is wholly your way: when it comes to the matter and the fight, to sweat, turn pale, tremble in every limb, betray your diffidence, and testify to the baseness of your cause. Therefore you are greatly mistaken, Campian, if you think any advantage lies for you in our diffidence. For if we have always most bravely resisted your predecessors—with whom you are in no way to be compared—we assuredly shall never yield to you, nor shall we fear your manner of fighting, which all understand how childish it is. But that diffidence which you allege—tell me in what it consists and how widely it extends. Doubtless we distrust the Scriptures and most sacrilegiously violate the holy majesty of the Bible. This indeed is a great charge you make, and a certain proof of diffidence; for those who can never defend the religion they have undertaken unless they lay violent hands on the Scriptures themselves and break the sacrosanct authority of the divine books must necessarily have a very bad and ruinous cause. And so I grant you that there was a certain desperation in a most monstrous cause: as the Manichaeans rejected the entire Old Testament and mutilated the New; as Ebion cut off all the Epistles of Paul; other heretics also did the same. For nothing was more fitting for them to defend those monstrous opinions than to condemn those sacred books of Scripture. But how do you apply this to your cause, Campian? Or what similarity do we have with those heretics you mention? It is not worthy of your wit or elegance to slander and undeservedly impose upon us the hateful crimes of ancient heretics. If we are like the Manichaeans or Ebionites, prove it; if we are not, the Lord will punish your shameless slander and audacity and will defend our integrity and innocence. For who ever thought or spoke more honorably, more reverently, more augustly about the sacred letters than we, who receive and venerate all Scripture as θεόπνευστος (God-breathed), as the very voice of God speaking; who make it the sole teacher of faith and religion; who acquiesce in it; who demand nothing further as a necessary aid to salvation? If it had not been defended by us more accurately and religiously than by you, it would long ago have lost its dignity and lain as if dead. For what have we done these years with greater effort and contention than to uphold the majesty and

esteem of the sacred letters, most unworthily injured by you? And yet you dare compare us to Manichaeans and Ebionites, who are known to have assailed the sacred books and laid upon them most impure hands full of wickedness. But you say: Luther calls the Epistle of James contentious, swollen, dry, straw-like—the wicked apostate—and deems it unworthy of the apostolic spirit. Unless you slander Luther, you will have spilled all your oil and wasted your effort. For it is characteristic of a Jesuit such as you are to rail shamelessly and boldly, especially to tear Luther apart with most bitter reproaches. This is your art, this your school; this you have undertaken; this alone you do. Happy is he whom the Lord has deemed worthy of such honor that he has the most wicked men as his enemies. For he must be an outstanding man whom dishonest men pursue with such deadly hatred. You charge Luther with apostasy. Take care lest this crime touch you more closely, Campian; for either you are an apostate or you have splendidly feigned religion. But if to desert apostates is to be an apostate, Luther was certainly an apostate. For he left thieves, heretics, apostates; he separated himself from that Church in which a long-standing apostasy of religion—which the Apostle foretold would come—had taken deep root. Therefore those who do not wish to be apostates ought utterly to flee that apostasy of yours.

Luther speaks of the Epistle of James with little honor. It is well that this entire charge touches the Epistle of James. Luther does not violate Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Paul, or Peter even with a word; he only criticizes the Epistle of James somewhat. Was this solely Luther's fault? Did all antiquity never embrace the Epistle of James, and did Luther alone reject and repudiate it? By no means. For it was not unknown to Luther what the ancient Church felt and judged about this Epistle. Eusebius did not hesitate to write explicitly about that Epistle: "which are spurious," that is—I wish all to know—the Epistle ascribed to James is adulterated. What could be written more openly? But perhaps Eusebius does not please you. Tell me why then? Therefore, hear Jerome, whom you know was a presbyter of the Roman Church: "The Epistle of James is published by someone else under his name." One confirms it was spurious, the other writes that it is considered not to have been written by the Apostle but by some other person. Why then are you angry with Luther, whom you see did not begin to doubt that Epistle suddenly and rashly, but followed the testimony and judgment of the ancient Church? For from these it is sufficiently clear that in the first times of the Church, the reliability and authority of that Epistle were uncertain and doubtful.

But you will say, it was subsequently received: which Jerome also affirms. I will not ask by what right it could be received through the succession of time, which was once repudiated, so that what initially had little credibility gradually obtained it through the silent judgments of men. Nor will I dispute the authority of this Epistle: such as can belong to any book. Indeed, we accept it and number it among the canonical books. For whatever Luther or anyone else decided about this Epistle, and however much they detracted from it, our churches nevertheless gladly embrace it and judge it to have been written either by an Apostle or by a man of apostolic character; certainly they recognize apostolic and spiritual doctrine in it. Calvin says: "I, who see no sufficiently just cause for rejecting it, gladly embrace it without controversy." Therefore, cease to cast upon us the harsher judgments and words of others, by which we are in no way constrained. For what others think about this Epistle does not concern us, who do not diminish any part of it or desire to deprive it of full authority.

But where did Luther write those things which you now recall? Produce the passage for us, so that we may examine your reliability. You doubtless point to some preface to the Epistle of James, which I think is not very well known to many; for it is nowhere found among Luther's own works. Yet I have by chance come upon that preface and read it through entirely, in which there is absolutely none of those things which you mention. It is easy to conjecture what kind of credibility we shall have from you in the rest, whom at the very beginning it did not shame to lie so notably. Thus Luther begins that preface: "Although this Epistle of St. James was rejected by the ancients, nevertheless I praise it and hold it as useful and convenient." And in the book "On the Babylonian Captivity," he writes thus about that Epistle: "I omit that many very probably assert this Epistle is not by the Apostle James nor worthy of the apostolic spirit." These things Luther wrote most gravely and modestly about the Epistle of James, whom he never called contentious, or arid, or swollen, or straw-like, as you affirm. Although I confess Luther was of that opinion, that he greatly doubted both the author and the argument of this Epistle. But it was your duty to examine also the reasons of him whose opinion you accuse.

Erasmus writes explicitly that this Epistle does not savor of apostolic authority. Luther judged more moderately about this Epistle than Erasmus did. However it may be, Luther had in this judgment the agreement of the first and purest antiquity of the Church; and yet we, setting Luther aside, judge no differently

about this Epistle of James than you yourselves do; and we attribute to it as much as you think ought to be attributed. This I pledge and promise to you in the name of all of us: whatever you bring from this Epistle in this contest which you have now entered, we shall most willingly receive it all, nor shall we elude it in the way you suspect. We approve all the sayings of this Epistle. For what you add about faith alone is a miserable and putrid sophism. That dogma of ours is most true and most holy: that man is justified by faith alone. Paul teaches this most plainly, although he does not explicitly mention faith alone. Thus the ancient Fathers explain and interpret Paul. Ambrose: "They were justified by faith alone, by the gift of God." Basil: "Justified by faith alone in Christ." Nazianzen: "Righteousness consists in faith alone." Why should I mention the opinions of other Fathers? This is evangelical, this is apostolic doctrine; if James or an angel from heaven disapproves of this, he is impure and wicked and to be devoted to all curses.

But James denies that man is justified by faith only and affirms that he is justified by works. He speaks of feigned, dead, empty, simulated faith, which many boasted of and falsely persuaded themselves that they were justified by it. This faith—which may more truly be called a corpse of faith—James denies is sufficient for salvation by itself, and teaches that he who is justified ought to be justified by works; that is, that the just man is approved, declared, demonstrated: for faith ought to be living and fruitful, which works necessarily follow, so that all may understand and perceive that you are endowed with true faith. Thus James agrees excellently with Paul, while Paul argues from the cause, James from the effects. Paul establishes righteousness in faith as in the proximate cause; James writes that man is justified by works; that is, that each just man is recognized by his works as by the clearest testimonies, while works, which are manifest, reveal and attest to faith, which no one can see. Thus you see there was no reason why Luther should either reprove or fear James on this account. And Augustine reconciled James with Paul in this way, so that you may understand nothing new has been brought to us: "Therefore," says Augustine, "the opinions of the two Apostles, Paul and James, are not contrary to each other when one says man is justified by faith without works and the other says faith without works is vain; because Paul speaks of works that precede faith, James of those that follow faith; thus Paul himself also shows in many places."

Therefore James neither wished nor ought to detract anything from the righteousness of faith alone, which Luther learned from Paul; and all Papists and Jesuits may sooner be torn apart than that opinion of Luther concerning faith alone be shaken.

You turn your speech from Luther to Luther's whelps: for thus you yourself, most impure dog, call men outstanding in all ornaments: why you do this I do not understand, unless because they have never ceased barking at your bishops and monks and other thieves very like yourself. But what have those whelps done? That they suddenly removed Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, Maccabees, and several other books from the canon. Suddenly, you say, Campion? Are you such a stranger to the monuments of the ancient Fathers that you do not know these books were once excluded from the Canon? Therefore look at Jerome, and from him recover the memory of antiquity: "That we may know," says Jerome, "whatever is outside these is to be placed among the apocrypha. Therefore Wisdom, commonly inscribed to Solomon, and the book of Jesus son of Sirach, and Judith, and Tobit, and the Shepherd are not in the Canon." Can you, little brother, place these books in the Canon which Jerome—following both the opinion of the ancient Church and truth itself—denies are in the Canon? Recognize his very words: "They are not in the Canon." From the Canon, you say, they removed them. Why should we not remove them—to use your word—for they are not, says Jerome, in the Canon. Do you desire anything more? Epiphanius agrees with Jerome. For when he had made mention of certain books which you complain were removed by us from the Canon, he writes thus: "They are indeed useful and beneficial but not placed in the number of the genuine."

The books of the Maccabees are counted among the Apocrypha. They were placed in the ark of the covenant when it was deposited in the temple. These words Cornarius translated as follows: "These books are indeed useful and convenient, but they are not included in the number of the received books. Therefore, they were placed neither in the ark of Aaron nor in the ark of the Testament." But hear still clearer words from Jerome: "Therefore, just as the Church reads the books of Judith, Tobit, and the Maccabees but does not receive them among the canonical scriptures, so also let it read these two volumes, namely Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, for the edification of the people, not for confirming the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas."

If you were unaware of these testimonies of antiquity, Campion, you are a novice in this cause in which you wish to appear very experienced. But if you understood these things, you are exceedingly unjust and troublesome, who reproach us with some sort of desperation, since we do not admit those books into the canon of Scripture which antiquity declares were neither admitted nor ought to be admitted.

Indeed, Cardinal Cajetan did not hesitate to affirm that the book of Maccabees is false in a certain prophecy of Daniel. But the Holy Spirit is never accustomed to err in interpreting Scripture. For as often as you pretend that we are refuted by these oracles whenever we dispute about the patronage of angels, about the freedom of the will, about the life of the faithful departed, about the intercession of holy men, you ought first to teach that firm arguments from these books can be taken to confirm the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas—which Jerome denies, and you will never be able to prove, however many Jesuits you bring to deliberation—before you refute us with these.

This indeed argues your most wretched desperation, who, when you cannot establish the principles of your faith from the canonical books, flee to the Apocrypha, whose faith in the Church has been and will forever remain ambiguous. The Lord committed His will and word to writing and entrusted it to His Church. We most diligently and most reverently cherish those writings; we are content with them; we defend their sufficiency. At last, set aside the doubtful, obscure, apocryphal books, and contend with us about religion from these. But your religion has long since flowed beyond the banks of sacred Scripture and has emanated into some manifold superstition. Hence it happens that you not only equate apocryphal books but also traditions gathered from everywhere without authority with the sacred Scriptures of God, than which nothing more audacious and intolerable could be done. But why should I remind you of these things, who have long since been least ashamed to violate all human and divine laws?

Therefore, understand thus: if you prove that any book or any part of a book, which is agreed to have been written and fortified by divine authority, has been condemned or rejected by us, I do not object that we may seem to have utterly lost the whole cause. But if indeed we most faithfully guard the entire body of Scripture and separate true books from false and vindicate and preserve

uncorrupted the heavenly truth of God, why do you, my poor little brother, shout about our desperation? You yourselves are so cast down by desperation that your entire salvation consists in the depravity and destruction of sacred Scripture.

Now, as you say, we are refuted by these oracles as often as we dispute about the patronage of angels, about the freedom of the will, about the faithful departed, about the intercession of holy men. These things have been discussed by us a thousand times and most accurately judged from the true oracles of God. Scripture sets before us the patronage of angels, from which we are taught that God has appointed His angels over certain peoples, places, and men. That this is true in general we do not at all doubt: that such duties were committed to angels by the Lord to guard the salvation of men. And so we by no means deny them a certain patronage, and we attribute to them as much as the Lord Himself taught ought to be attributed. We willingly ignore your hierarchies, your multiple orders of angels, and we leave all this knowledge to you to whom Dionysius revealed these mysteries—"vainly puffed up," as I may use Paul's words. But you defend another patronage of angels: you decree that they are to be worshipped and invoked by us, which Scripture most expressly prohibits. For Paul condemns "the worship of angels," and an angel recalled John once and again from this kind of worship: "See that you do not do it; I am a fellow servant with you and your brothers; worship God." But we are not at all moved by that Raphael in Tobit, nor do we acknowledge those seven angels whom he mentions. This whole thing is alien from the canonical scriptures—what is mentioned by that Raphael—and it smells of some superstition.

I care little about the passage in Ecclesiasticus, nor would I believe in freedom of the will although it affirms a hundred times: "Before men are life and death." For Scripture teaches that man's freedom was lost through sin; the holy Fathers teach it; each one's own experience teaches it. Although those words can be understood concerning the human race as it once was in Adam. For he wrote earlier: "He made man from the beginning and left him in the counsel of his own will." If he speaks about the first state of man and that whole and incorrupt nature in which we were created by the Lord, he sets forth a true opinion; but if he makes it free for us now—such as we now are by nature—to choose either life or death according to our own will, I am bound by no authority of testimony

from this book so as not to appeal from this apocryphal saying to the examined oracles of God.

But I certainly care less for this book of Maccabees which Jerome, Epiphanius, Athanasius, Cyprian rejected, and which the very Council of Laodicea repudiated. Then what is narrated concerning sacrifice offered for sins is entirely supposititious and fictitious. For neither in Josephus in Greek is any such thing found, nor in Joseph ben Gorion in Hebrew—who nevertheless wrote the same history—is there any mention there of this sacrifice; nor was it commanded or established as a custom for Jews to make sacrifices and prayers for the dead. Finally, there is such confusion of words in the Greek copy that you can scarcely elicit a whole and true meaning. Consult that very passage in a Greek codex: if you can conveniently render it to me so that each part fits appropriately, I will confess you more skilled in Greek than I thought.

Shall I be bound by the authority of a saying from this book to make sacrifices with you for the dead? You are exceedingly foolish, Campion, if you think our academics could have been moved by these things. You ought to bring other and stronger arguments if you wish to flow into our ears and minds; for we have long since loathed and rejected these things of yours.

But does this passage confirm the intercession of saints which you produce for us from the book of Maccabees? Who besides you ever said this? It is one thing to offer sacrifices for the dead; another that saints intercede for us. For I pass over that dream of Judas concerning Onias which we read in 2 Maccabees 15 as a dream. But it matters little whether you understand intercession or sacrifice for the dead: both are yours; both are false.

Now you cry out more vehemently: "Is it really so? So much perversity, so much audacity?" Neither, Campion: we have done nothing perversely, nothing audaciously. And I marvel that you are so perverse and audacious that, relying on horrible perversity and audacity, you introduce as a defense into the canon—against God's will, against the holy Fathers, against the very books themselves—those books which God Himself does not at all acknowledge as His own, and which pious antiquity has separated from the canon.

You say: "The Calvinists have cut out seven books from the Old Testament." Impudent little brother, did not Jerome cut out these same books a thousand

years before Calvin was born? Why, having dismissed Jerome, do you quarrel with Calvin, when they are both in the same cause? Hear Jerome again: "Whatever is outside these is to be placed among the Apocrypha." The seven books which you number, and which you falsely accuse us of having cut out, are outside those which Jerome mentions; therefore they are to be placed among the Apocrypha.

Concerning most of them we have responded above. Jerome testifies that Baruch is neither read nor held among the Hebrews, and he rejects the others from the canon and writes frankly: "Those which are not held among them, nor are of the twenty-four elders, are to be rejected." But you Jesuits are "always children," as the Egyptian priest replied to Solon concerning the Greeks.

But why have you been silent about the third and fourth books of Ezra? Perhaps you were ashamed of them, since Jerome writes that they are full of dreams, and yet your Church has been accustomed to hold each of them in singular esteem. And from these books the holy Fathers sometimes cite testimonies. Do you now, Campion, suddenly strike them from the canon? If you think they should be left in the canon, why do you not attack the Calvinists, from whom all understand that these were cut out from the Old Testament? Why, when you enumerate the sacred books of the Old Testament received by the Calvinists, do you omit these? Or if these are Apocryphal, why should we consider the others to be canonical? I certainly desire to know your judgment concerning these books.

"But the Lutherans," you say, "have also cut out the Epistle of James and five others out of envy for it, concerning which there was once and somewhere controversy." Therefore you cannot deny that there was once controversy concerning these Epistles, both somewhere and at some time. For the very light of history, most clear, has forced this word from you. But by whom was it controversial? Was it only by heretics? Then number Eusebius and Jerome among heretics, who reported their own and the Church's judgment concerning those Epistles. Can you show that those who removed these Epistles from the canon were considered heretics in the first and pure times of the Church?

Concerning the Epistle of James, enough has been answered to you; we neither reject it nor any of those which you accuse the Lutherans of having cut out. This charge is not ours, whom you know are not Lutherans at all; direct this quarrel to

them. We will never evade by any cavil the testimonies of these Epistles. What more or fairer can you demand?

Now cease to accuse us of some sort of desperation, I know not what, and of perversity and audacity. We take up, admit, and approve your books, which you yourself are to use in disputing; we are willing to stand by their judgment; if by these you refute us, you prevail.

What you add concerning the book of Esther and three chapters of Daniel is full of calumny. We place the book of Esther in the canon as far as it was written in Hebrew by divine authority; that fragment which is commonly attached to the sacred history of Esther we cannot deem worthy of such honor. But those three chapters are not Daniel's; read, if you please, Jerome's preface to Daniel. Thus you will find that they were condemned and derided not only by Anabaptists but also by ancient Jews. But why do you trifle, Campion? Do you greatly rely on the authority of these books? Are the defenses of your faith placed in them? Why then do you try to stir up envy against us from these books? Even if they were most canonical, they would still not help your cause at all.

You praise Augustine's modesty, who wove the sacred catalog much more correctly than either Jews or Scaliger. I wish you Jesuits were a little more modest, so that you could be more like Augustine. For all speak and complain that your insolence borders on impudence. But Augustine numbered among the canonical those books about which we think otherwise. Indeed, I do not do this. What then? Does Augustine contradict Jerome? For Jerome expressly denies that those books are to be placed in the number of canonical ones; Augustine, about to survey the whole canon of Scriptures, takes them up and adds them. There seems to be a great discrepancy of judgments. For those which Jerome denies are canonical, Augustine affirms.

Augustine: both men great, and most deserving of the Church. What then do we reply to Augustine, whom Campianus sets against us? Precisely what is true: for the terms "Apocryphal" and "Canonical" were used differently by Jerome and Augustine. Jerome leaves among the Apocrypha those books which are not written in Hebrew. Augustine, although he does not disagree in substance and judgment, nevertheless applies this name especially to those books which were full of falsehoods and fables, such as many that were circulated at that time. Thus he writes in Book 15, Chapter 23 of *The City of God*: "In the Apocrypha,

even if some truth is found, yet because of many falsehoods they have no canonical authority." Therefore, he counts the book of Judith, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, and others of the same kind among the canonical books, because they were of greater reliability and integrity than those fables scattered and cast aside in the streets.

Thus Augustine takes the term "canonical writings" more broadly than Jerome, and "apocryphal" more narrowly—unless perhaps we should think that Augustine deliberately wished to disagree with Jerome on a matter of no great importance. And that Roman Cardinal, whom we mentioned before, writes that these books were called canonical by some councils and by Augustine because rules of conduct, not doctrine, could be derived from them. As for Augustine's strong insistence that the book of Wisdom ought by no means to be excluded from the canon, let Augustine himself see to that. This book Jerome specifically excluded, which you Jesuits are accustomed to prefer to Augustine. And from this very passage where Augustine confirms the authority of this book, it can be sufficiently understood that it was generally not received into the canon. For when Augustine had cited a testimony from that book: "He was taken away, lest wickedness should alter his understanding," some of the brethren who were present objected that it had not been taken from a canonical book. They certainly would not have done this, nor would they have rejected the argument of this saying if the authority of that book had always held canonical weight in the Church. And yet I do not deny that it could have happened that antiquity regarded this book more honorably than the other Apocrypha. For indeed I observe in Eusebius that Melito, Bishop of Sardis, in a certain letter to Onesimus, in which he carefully collected and described the number and order of the sacred books of the Old Testament, included this book among the canonical ones, and none other of those which we call Apocryphal—not Tobit, not Maccabees, not Judith, not Ecclesiasticus, nor the others for which you contend so greatly. Yet he says that he took pains to accurately learn the ancient books and professes that he thoroughly learned it: μαθὼν ἀκριβῶς τὰ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης, ὑποτάξας ἐπεμψά σοι. Hence perhaps Augustine attributed a little more to this book, yet it does not follow from this, as you say, that this book obtained firm and canonical strength by the vote of the Church. For by Augustine's own testimony it was not approved by the vote of the Church; nor indeed, even if the

Church had gathered all its votes, could it have conferred that strength upon it unless it had beforehand possessed its own proper strength divinely given.

But you who boast so greatly about antiquity, about the vote of the Church, about councils—what will you finally answer to the Council of Laodicea, in which we are forbidden to read books that are outside the canon, and are commanded to read only those which are canonical of the Old and New Testament? But which are those? Are they all those which the Council of Trent listed in its catalog? By no means! But those which our churches embrace as canonical. If you stand by the judgment of this synod, Campianus, neither the book of Wisdom nor any of the others will find a place among the canonical scriptures. Now therefore we are not overly concerned about what Augustine would say if he were revived. Certainly against us he could say nothing on this matter; and if he had anything to say, he would have said it to the Fathers of Laodicea, whose decree concerning the canonical books he had seen, or at least could have seen.

Now, those subsequent arguments of yours are full of disdain, empty of reason—you call this a dreadful and execrable refuge. Come now, Champion, if you can, exclude us from this refuge. I see it is so fortified and secure on all sides that it can easily withstand and repel all your assaults. Even if your followers clamor with their mouths, if priests engage in trafficking, if they declaim in assembly, if they sharpen swords against Catholics, the rack, and the cross, yet they are vile, abject, squalid, and prostrate. Indeed, brother, thus far we have stood erect by God's favor, nor have we ever been routed by you, whose many armies we have long since, by divine grace, shattered, scattered, and overthrown. And indeed, that lofty edifice of your Pontifical Synagogue has long since begun to totter, and unless you Jesuits vigorously prop it up and sustain it, like Dagon before the Ark of the Lord, it will soon collapse to the ground. However, as long as we defend this cause, we certainly cannot be conquered by you. Therefore, with good courage and eager zeal we pursue this battle, nor do we doubt that the Lord will eventually restrain you and the other enemies of His name and glory, and make you the footstool of His feet.

As for what you write concerning the trafficking of priesthoods—if any such exist, they are remnants of your own crimes. For you know the custom of the Roman Curia, you know its filth, greed, simony; you know the perpetual

complaint of the whole world about your most lucrative little markets. But now is no time for Rome to investigate our morals or whether our domestic affairs are in order, so that you may without shame reproach others. If you have now at last begun to be more honest and holy, yet you will never erase by any memory the unjust stain of your ancient Church's disgrace. Indeed, those among us who engage in these impure transactions—if there are any—deserve to be ill spoken of even by you.

But I am less surprised that the trafficking of priesthoods is objected against us by you, when you even complain of our cruelty. Good God, are we cruel, and you gentle? What shall I say, or what response shall I prepare? Nothing can be more inhuman than cruelty, or more hostile to Christian virtue. For Christ's disciples ought to be merciful, gentle, meek—they ought to be able to resemble their Master. What then? Are we more cruel than you? I do not deny that whichever side is proven to have greater cruelty should be considered to have the worse cause. I call as witnesses all the peoples of the Christian world who have not entirely cast off all sense of humanity and equity. Let Italy speak, Germany, Spain, France, our England—why should I recount the horrendous slaughters, the dreadful burnings, the exquisite tortures? Your savagery is known and still remains in recent memory, nor will it ever be buried in oblivion. What similar thing have we done, or what cruelty of ours has been so great? Is it because we do not offer our throats to your swordsmen, do not receive blades into our bodies, do not lay down our necks, do not willingly depart from life to grant you the power to live as you please? This you desire, strive for, labor at; because we live and resist you, we are cruel. But I do not doubt that the injustice of this charge of yours is sufficiently clear to all fair-minded people. For these things which you name—the sword, the rack, the cross, the flame—are instruments of your cruelty; had they not existed, your Church would have perished long ago. For with these weapons it was first established, afterward increased, and is now defended; if these fail, certainly it cannot long endure.

But now you begin to press your adversaries a little more forcefully, and you ask them, for example, by what right they mutilate or tear apart the body of Scripture? I answer: We do no violence to this body; we cut off nothing that pertains to its nature and integrity; we tear away no part, no member. For we do not (to use your words) cut out genuine scriptures, but we sift out the spurious ones. And you wish to know by what judge we do this. You introduce Calvin

responding: "By the Holy Spirit." And you pretend that this response from him is prescribed so that the judgment of the Church may be evaded. If you ask how we understand that these writings, which we call scriptures, are heavenly and published by divine inspiration—that is, by what testimony we are persuaded that the so-called sacred scriptures are indeed sacred scriptures—I in turn ask you, with no less reason, how you know that the sun is the sun, or that God is God without doubt. For we know with no less certainty that these are the sacred Scriptures commended by the Lord to His Church, written by the Prophets and Apostles, and proceeding from divine authority, than we know that the moon is the moon, or indeed any of those things which we grasp with the most certain knowledge. Calvin also gave you this response, who writes that many things can be brought forward which easily prove, if there is a God in heaven, that the Law, the Prophets, and the Gospel have flowed from Him; and then he pursues with many words the strongest arguments which satisfy even human reason concerning the authority and faith of the scriptures. Therefore, there are in the books themselves sufficiently many clear and certain testimonies which confirm and demonstrate the trustworthiness of the scriptures, so that no room for doubt remains. But because human sense and reason often waver, and are drawn in various directions by uncertain thoughts, it is necessary for the secret and internal Spirit to intervene so that we may rest firmly in the scriptures. For although, compelled by external testimonies, we cannot out of shame deny that the sacred scriptures are the word of God, yet only then do we attain a certain and salutary conviction when the same Spirit by which those books were written and published persuades our minds concerning the trustworthiness of the scriptures. And this is that Spirit whom the Lord promised to His Church, and who dwells in the hearts of the faithful and serves as a seal. Whoever lacks this Spirit, however much he may hear the Church a thousand times, will always remain uncertain and doubtful within himself.

What do you find to criticize here, Champion? You say Calvin makes the Spirit the judge so that he may evade the judgment of the Church, by which spirits are examined. The judgment of the Church ought not to differ from the judgment of the Spirit: the same Spirit rules both the whole Church and individual believers. But your Church does not know this Spirit. Therefore, it judges poorly concerning this Spirit. However, I want to answer you once and for all: the authority of scripture is in no way placed in the judgment of the Church. Let the

Church judge whatever it wishes; yet by all its judgments it will never bring it about that either those books which are canonical are not canonical, or those which are not canonical are nevertheless held as canonical. Scripture has its own trustworthiness inherent and innate, not assumed from elsewhere; nor can the Church attribute greater authority to scripture than God, the author of scripture, does. But you ask: How then does it happen that the Calvinist Spirit accepts six Epistles which do not please the Lutheran Spirit? You always revolve back to the same point and repeat the same things without making progress. Lutherans do not reject those Epistles nor cut them out of the New Testament; indeed they accept them, use them in explaining controversies, interpret them in schools and churches, read them privately and publicly. Luther himself illuminated some of them with his commentaries; Illyricus did all of them. That there was once doubt in the Catholic Church concerning the authority of those Epistles—this they by no means conceal from readers, and they add the causes of that doubt; yet they leave the matter itself and its judgment open. How can you find here a conflict between the Calvinist and Lutheran spirit, Campion?

You go on further to slander this judgment of the Spirit, which is most certain and most divine; and here you bring in Anabaptists, Castellio, Brentius, Kemnitius, Luther, Beza. With these you hope you can weaken the authority of the Spirit.

The Anabaptist, you say, calls the story of Job a fable, mixed with tragic and comic elements. It is unknown how wickedly and blasphemously they have judged not only the history of Job but also all the other books of both Testaments. However, that Anabaptist spirit was a kind of madness, a reckless and unrestrained frenzy, which no spirit has opposed more than the Calvinist and Lutheran. Why then do you bring forth their insanity to evade the true judgment of the Holy Spirit?

You say that Castellio considered Solomon's Song nothing more than a ditty about a little girlfriend and an amorous conversation with the maidservants of the court—a lewd scoundrel. I do not take it upon myself to defend whatever anyone has written anywhere, much less to be greatly concerned about vindicating Castellio's faith, whom I know to have erred shamefully in many important matters. Yet in this place, I see a singular wrong done to Castellio by you. For in that brief argument which he prefixed to this book, he does not have

your terms: no "ditty," no "little girlfriend," no "maidservants of the court," no "amorous conversation," nothing of the sort. Summarizing the essence of that book briefly, truthfully, learnedly, and chastely, his first words are: "A Conversation of the Savior and the Church." Now you see both how highly Castellio esteemed this Song and how shameless your slander has been.

I cannot now be angry with you for accusing Luther of so many false things and Calvin—who was not ashamed to lie so openly about Castellio. What you add about the Apocalypse is like your other remarks: In it, you say, Luther, Brenz, and Chemnitz found something lacking. What is this "found something lacking"? Do they reject it? Do they condemn it? You cannot say that; thus you speak weakly and hesitantly: "found something lacking." Although, if you read Eusebius, you will perceive that in the canon it was not lacking anything, nor was it approved by all, but indeed was plainly rejected by some. But what are these things to us, whom you cannot deny embrace the Apocalypse and venerate its mysteries no less than you yourselves? And indeed, it would have been convenient for you if this book had either perished or lacked all credibility. For it depicts your Pope, your scarlet-clad harlot, in such colors that it does not allow the Antichrist to remain hidden.

Is there more about Luther? Luther, you say, compares the four Gospels with each other and, far preferring Paul's Epistles to the first three, thereafter declares only the Gospel of John to be beautiful, true, and foremost. Luther places John's Gospel above the other three because it treats Christ's deeds more briefly and His discourses more fully, and because the Gospel consists more in the divinity of doctrine than in the history of events. Yet he does not deny that the others are beautiful, true, and most excellent, nor does he judge that only this one should be called beautiful and true. Moreover, what you mention here I also find in the argument of the first Epistle of Peter. But I ask the pious reader to thoroughly understand this matter; thus he will easily perceive both Luther's integrity and Campion's slander.

First, Luther teaches what the Gospel is: and he writes that the Gospel signifies nothing other than the preaching and proclamation of the grace and mercy of God through Christ the Lord, obtained for us by His death. Whoever preaches or writes about this grace and mercy of God through Christ, Luther affirms, teaches the Gospel. Therefore, not only did the four Evangelists write and teach the

Gospel, but all the Apostles did so as well, especially Paul and Peter in their Epistles. And he says that those are the best Evangelists who have labored most to teach that we are justified by faith alone in Christ; for this is the sum of the Gospel. Hence he concludes that Paul's Epistles are more rightly called Gospel than what Matthew, Mark, and Luke wrote, because Paul described the grace of God in Christ more fully and abundantly than those three, whose history is largely occupied with narrating Christ's deeds and miracles.

This was the reason why he preferred John's Gospel and Paul's Epistles—under that name—to those three Gospels; in doing so he neither compares the four Evangelists among themselves, nor makes the Apostles partners in their quarrels, nor says anything perverse or out of place. For why should we not say that Paul described the power of Christ's cross more clearly and illustriously in his Epistles than any Evangelist did in history—yet without diminishing anything from the majesty of the Gospel history? Now I do not doubt that I have sufficiently defended Luther's innocence against your slanderous and insolent impudence.

But again you attack Luther, whom you claim did not hesitate to criticize the Gospel of Luke with a petulant style, because in it good works of virtues are too frequently commended to us. What immense impudence, audacity, and perfidy! I have carefully and attentively examined that passage which you noted in the margin, to understand what that petulance of Luther was. I find no word that is not holy, not honorable, not worthy of Luke, that is, of the heavenly Evangelist. Luther sets out to remove that scruple from people's minds, which that frequent mention of works in Luke could have introduced: lest anyone perhaps might think that Luke preaches so many things about works as to detract something from faith, or ascribe justification to works. This is what you say: to criticize Luke with a petulant style. If you bring forth anything more serious, I certainly will not deny that Luther was petulant. But what is this petulance of yours, Campion, which no reverence for God or men could prevent you from committing to writing and publishing to the public—things which you yourself could not possibly be ignorant are most false?

You also involve Beza with the same calumny, whom you say dared to corrupt and vitiate that secret passage: "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." But I see that this translation of yours, which you use, is

corrupt and vitiated. For you render "τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη" as "This is the cup, the New Testament," when it should rather be collected as: "This cup is the new testament." And you have rendered the present participle "ἐκχυνόμενον" with a future verb: "which shall be shed," instead of "which is shed." But you did not dare to depart a nail's breadth from the vulgar translation, lest you run into the Tridentine sanction. And here Theodore Beza is held in a monstrous and manifest crime. For Luke writes in this place "ἀλοικίζων." What then? A shameful deed, and in no way tolerable. Is it so? How then shall we defend Jerome, who wrote that Paul made solecisms in words and could not render hyperbaton or conclude a sentence? If Paul could be "συλοκτίζων" in words, why should we not think that Luke also could? If Jerome dared without crime to sometimes accuse Paul of solecism, why was it less permissible for Beza to notice a solecism in Luke? For you err, Champion, and think that in this way something is detracted from the authority or dignity of the Scriptures. For Jerome interprets it quite plainly.

Now therefore let us inspect the very passage of the Evangelist, so that we may judge what this matter is. The words are as follows: "Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον." If you change nothing in these words and exclude every solecism, then it is necessary that these last words, "τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον," refer to those first ones, "τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον." Therefore the sense here will be: this cup is shed for us. But not that cup, but Christ's blood was shed for us. Truly, you will say, the cup is taken for the wine. Therefore in these words you must acknowledge a figure and trope even unwillingly; yet you are accustomed to condemn every figure and to cry out with great clamor that it should be removed far from these words. But you in this place admit a double figure: first you interpret the cup for the wine, then the wine for the blood, which you certainly cannot do without a figure. Therefore cease henceforth to press this filth: for if you adhere to the very words, you must either confess that the cup was shed for us, or introduce a solecism.

If with Basil we read "τῷ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκχυνομένῳ," the sense is clear, so that those words, "which is shed for us," refer to Christ's blood. These are the things which Champion has collected from our men as admitted against the authority and majesty of the Scriptures; these he cries out testify to our diffidence and desperation; these he sets before you, most learned Academics. Nor indeed do I shun your judgment, whom I understand to be so erudite, prudent, and versed in

the best books and studies that I do not fear you may be moved by the calumnies and lies of this most inept Sophist. For what has he brought forth, or what finally has he devised that seems to proceed from recondite doctrine, multiple reading, or acute genius? Therefore despise the threats of this Philistine; hold steadfastly to the holy religion which you have learned from the Scriptures; and continue in that course of virtue and learning which you have entered upon, so that the Jesuits may in vain sing their song to you.

Thus far Campion has said what he could about the sacred books themselves; he also wished to say that we pervert them by translating, except that he left this labor to Gregory Martin, his colleague (as he says), and some others: who will perform this more learnedly and fully. Therefore, if it pleases, let us await that Martin, whom I indeed easily suppose, unless he is utterly unlearned, to be more learned than you. Nor indeed do I doubt that we can easily defend our translations, whether Latin or vernacular, against your Martin and the other colleagues. But those little Doctors whom you finally attack I do not recognize, nor do I understand what kind of crime that is. But when your Martin, who is now meditating something splendid, comes forth, perhaps we shall learn many new and excellent things.

And this seemed to you a sufficiently just reason—though by it you proved that glorious denunciation of disputation to our Academics. But you would have acted much more wisely for yourself, Campion, if you had never hatched those reasons or had buried them as soon as they were produced. For before, you had proclaimed a magnificent opinion of yourself by that noble production; now when they read those little reasonings, they understand there was no cause why you should assume so much for yourself; and they rightly laugh at you, despise you, and reject you. Therefore what Archidamus advised his son more inconsiderately concerning fighting with the Athenians, that advice the Academics give to you: "Either be equal to your power, or lower your pretensions." For never has anyone undertaken more for himself and performed less than you, Campion.

DURÆUS, Folio 4.²

² <https://books.google.com.pe/books?id=7eM7AAAAcAAJ&pg=PA1#v=onepage&q&f=false>

Although the deceptions of heretics are varied, it seems to me, Whitaker, that you particularly need to address that one with a response, especially at the outset. For when Edmund Campion has shown the extreme distrust of your people as clearly as daylight, you acknowledge none of it, to the point that you do not even admit they have ever fallen under the slightest suspicion of fear. Whether you have acted rightly or wrongly in this is not difficult to judge. For what greater distrust can there be than to inflict violence and force upon the divine books themselves?

WHITAKER.

I understand, Duræus, that the deceptions of heretics have always been varied; yet I profess that I am neither a heretic nor skilled in those arts which heretics employ. Therefore, I can justly complain of the great injury you have done me, since although I have openly responded to Campion and have shown no intention to deceive, I am nevertheless accused throughout your book of fraud, falsehood, and calumny. How piously and truthfully you have acted will become clear, Christ willing, in the rest of our discourse. For indeed, if you detest frauds and desire a straightforward explanation of arguments, and if you genuinely consider true reasons drawn from their principles and sources, free from all deceit and artifice, I hope that from this debate of ours you will gain this advantage: that you perceive the countless frauds of your own side and confess that you have hitherto been entangled in pernicious and wretched errors. For my part, I have always preferred to be defeated rather than to seem to win by fraud; so now I shall deal with you in good faith, and I will not evade any blow that the cause may inflict upon me. My sole aim is that Christ may conquer and the heretic fall. And in turn, I beg you to bring a mind free from all prejudice and sophistry to your reading, and to consider not what you have undertaken to defend, but what can and ought to be defended. In this way, you will return to favor with me and flee the deceptions of those who have too long deceived you to your detriment. Therefore, let us come to the matter and your book under good auspices. You say that the distrust and despair which Campion charged against us has been most clearly demonstrated, and you are angry with me for acknowledging no such thing. Abandon that fabricated complaint of your Campion about our distrust, Duræus. Those who are timid can reproach others for cowardice, but there is no reason why we should fear you so greatly, since it is certain that you can never stand firm in battle unless Scripture is forced into

line and Christ is driven defeated from the field. If we distrust our cause, we are mad, for we know it to be no less certain and true than that the sun shines and that Christ is the teacher of true religion and doctrine. For if we are deceived, then Christ, the Prophets, and the Apostles have misled us, whose institutions and doctrine we defend; and if ours are false, what then can be truer than those? Therefore, we are so far from despairing that, on the contrary, we never hesitate to profess our religion openly with the greatest boldness; and we have always been ready to give a defense whenever occasion demanded, that we might give an account of the hope that is in us. And in the future (I hope) we shall be all the more ardent and filled with true confidence, the more vehemently we are assailed by you. Therefore, Duræus, do not place too much confidence in yourself or your comrades, or promise anything about the distrust of your adversaries. Bring forth whatever force you can—what arms, what allies, what preparations: you will find that we lack neither courage nor strength, nor will you have had cause to triumph before victory. As for the violence which you say we have inflicted upon the divine books, I will respond later when we come to discuss the authority of the Apocryphal books. To separate these from the books of divine Scripture is so far from violence and injury that those who join them as equals—as you are accustomed to doing—may rightly seem to inflict violence upon the true Scriptures.

DURÆUS, Folio 4 & 5.

And yet you preach to us here a remarkable confidence in your own. They are Thraso-like. But I would like you to answer this for me: does a soldier seem to himself brave or rather timid, who dares to engage the enemy hand-to-hand on no other condition than that it be permitted for him to forbid the enemy whatever weapons he wishes, while taking up for himself whatever he pleases? This is your manner of fighting, that you do not allow yourselves to be struck by any weapons—neither of the Catholic Church, nor of Councils, nor of the Holy Fathers. Therefore, you leave to us (most brave soldiers) only the weapons of the Scriptures, and would that these were complete! Indeed, you imitate the ancient heretics, about whom Tertullian in *On Prescription Against Heretics* says: "That heresy does not receive certain Scriptures," etc. And what disputation have you ever undertaken with Catholics, of which you have not afterwards greatly repented? I will not dwell on examples. That one Campianus himself will be an example of all these, with whom a dispute undertaken has overturned your

sermons and suppers; and how unfavorably these battles have turned out for you thus far, learn even from the example of your own leader Sam, who, feeling himself defeated by Eckius, a Catholic priest, burst forth into these words: "Neither for God's sake was this matter begun, nor for God's sake will it end."

WHITAKER

While I proclaim the true confidence and constancy of our men, I do nothing that deserves the bitterness of this insult. But I pass over the reproaches, which I regret are so worn out for you, and I reply to what you ask: when a question concerning religion is undertaken, so that it may be understood which of two or more parts defends the truth, it is understood that this can in no way be known and judged except from the canonical Scriptures. Therefore, whoever wishes to prevail in this cause ought to use only those weapons, which alone are legitimate in this kind of warfare. For just as in war it is not lawful to seize any weapon whatever with which you may strike the enemy, so in this religious militia it is not permitted to hurl whatever comes to hand against an adversary; but either weapons must be brought forth from the armory of the Scriptures and the Holy Spirit, or no enemy will ever be overthrown. For the judgments of men are uncertain and cannot inflict a mortal wound; if you wish to kill a heretic, you must attack him armed with the Scriptures, or in vain will you throw up the Church, Councils, Fathers—which without the Scriptures are utterly worthless in this fight. The prophet says: "Every word of God is pure; he is a shield to those who take refuge in him. Do not add to his words." And whatever things are necessary for a man of God are to be sought from the Scriptures, whether he intends to confirm true doctrine, or refute false, or exercise any part of his duty, as the Apostle most clearly writes to Timothy. With this sword of the Spirit all adversaries of truth are cut down and slain. And since innumerable heresies have existed in the church in past times, none has ever been suppressed by other than the weapons of the Scriptures; and the Fathers themselves teach with the greatest consensus that both heresies are to be condemned and all controversies concerning religion are to be settled from the Scriptures alone.

Therefore Constantine exhorts the Nicene Fathers that since the Evangelical and Apostolic books and the oracles of the ancient prophets clearly teach us what we ought to think about divine matters, they should take from the God-inspired words—that is, from the sacred writings—the explanation of those things which

are called into question. And this was observed in that Council against Arius, and has prevailed in all pious Councils since then against all heretics of all times. For (as Hilary says) it has not been left to human eloquence concerning divine matters, except for the word of God; all other things are uncertain, closed off, hindered, and obscure. Therefore Augustine, when he prescribes the form of legitimate disputation, advises this above all: that the canonical books be at hand; for otherwise one cannot be brought to the terms of inquiry. And yet you mock our manner of fighting because we do not wish to be struck by any weapons of the Church, Councils, Fathers, and you call us most brave soldiers *Thrasonically* because we leave only the weapons of the Scriptures. What?

Can you find any better weapons than these? Or why do you rebuke us because we trust in them? Are these not sufficient for you and yours? Tell me now, I ask you, Durze, which cause do you consider superior: ours, which is content with the Scriptures alone, and armed with them can both defend our own and overthrow others', or yours, which cannot be safe if it relies on the Scriptures alone? Therefore, from the very beginning you are forced to admit that you go forth into battle unarmed and naked if only the weapons of the Scriptures are left to you.

Indeed, although we accept and approve the testimonies of the Church, the decrees of Councils, the writings of the Fathers—whatever agrees with the sacred Scriptures—nevertheless we understand that the authority of religion depends on God Himself. For this reason, we do not wish to submit our faith, which ought to be founded on the voice of God, to human opinions, and we reserve the Scriptures for ourselves, gladly leaving all other things to you which do not agree with the Scriptures. In this, what else are we doing than what the ancient Fathers both did themselves and taught us to do? For as to your opposing the Church, Councils, and Fathers against us, and relying on this armor you descend into battle, hoping that we, armed with Scripture alone, can be conquered by these forces: hear what Augustine answers you: "Therefore," he says, "whether concerning Christ or His Church, or any other matter pertaining to our faith and life, I do not say that we are in any way to be compared to him who said, 'Though we,' but absolutely what he added: 'If an angel from heaven should preach to you anything besides what you have received in the legal and evangelical Scriptures, let him be anathema.'" You see, therefore, that the weapons of the Scriptures are strong not only against men but also against

angels; and if the Church brings forth anything besides what has been handed down in the Scriptures themselves, it is by no means to be heard. Of what sort then will these weapons of yours be? Devoted not to sacred warfare but to anathema.

What then will you do next? Will you flee to Councils? If you listened to Augustine, you would not so greatly trust in these weapons. For Augustine could have pressed Maximinus the Arian with Councils, but he refused to fight in this manner. Thus he commands that Councils be entirely removed from disputation: "Neither should I bring forward the Council of Nicaea, nor you that of Ariminum, as if prejudging the matter. Let thing contend with thing, cause with cause, reason with reason by the authority of the Scriptures." This law of disputation, which Augustine considered most fair, why do you not accept it?

As for the Fathers, what protection can they offer you against the Scriptures? They freely confess their own ignorance and demand never to be heard except when they rightly interpret the Scriptures; they leave judgment concerning their writings free to the reader. Therefore, if we refer every legitimate disputation to the authority of the Scriptures, we do rightly; and shielded by these weapons we can be attacked but certainly never conquered. But more must be said later about these weapons of yours.

As for your wish that these weapons be left intact for you, I free you from that concern. Use the Scriptures as long as you wish, Durze, and attack us with the darts of Scripture: we will never complain of injury nor cry out that this kind of warfare is unfair—as you are accustomed to do—so that those whose weapons are better may not win. But when you either thrust apocryphal scriptures upon us or mix human inventions with divine oracles, we rightly reject such a fight and will never allow it to prevail against us.

Nor indeed, when we reject spurious scriptures, ought we to fear lest that saying of Tertullian—which you quote—touch us: "That heresy does not receive certain scriptures." For he said this about ancient heretics who rejected either the books of the Prophets or the entire Old Testament or certain parts of the New Testament. We receive the Scriptures—indeed whole and not diminished by a single syllable—as all understand who are endowed with fair judgment. But whoever considers your additions and subtractions, by which you pervert the

Scriptures to suit your own institution (as Tertullian says), will judge these words much more rightly to pertain to your sect.

I know of no disputations instituted with your men that we ever ought to regret; nor can you mention any out of so many held in various places within very few years that is honorable and salutary for you. Review the annals and consider the outcome of disputations. How often Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Bucer met with adversaries; the world testifies that the papal party always departed defeated and our number grew daily greater. The examples of disputations—which you say you do not wish to dwell upon—have been wisely passed over by you. Perhaps indeed you mean the Bern disputation, in which after Conrad Tregerus the Augustinian, patron of the papal cause, perceived that no weapons except those of Scripture were granted to him (which also seems most unfair to you), he suddenly fled and refused to enter discussion; whence soon followed the downfall of papism within the borders of Bern. Or perhaps the Poissy disputation, which the papal party abandoned; in which the Cardinal of Lorraine made an outstanding confession of timidity and diffidence: "Would that either he had been mute or we deaf!" Or perhaps the London disputation, in which the papal prelates could by no conditions be induced to dispute. These are those and other examples of this sort; we certainly will never regret them, and their recollection must be most troublesome for you. And although so often defeated you renew these broken and scattered forces and call us again into contest, what else are you doing but bringing harm upon yourselves?

Believe me never, Durze: by disputing, writing, teaching you will not win. There will always be those whose wisdom and spirit you will never resist. Your arts are different; had they not profited you more than these, you would have perished long ago.

As for what you relate about Campian and our sermons and suppers: in that you give too much credit to the vain rumors of your people. I wish you yourself had heard Campian disputing and had assisted him as a supporter; I believe you would not have judged him such a man as to make our sermons and suppers less frequent. Nor indeed are our churches now less filled with people than before—as you suspect—for if you had considered the emptiness of your sermons and suppers, you would never have remembered our infrequency. If some drift away, it is no wonder: for not all are of us; for if they had been of us, they would

certainly have remained with us. By their departure—who are carried about by any wind of doctrine—we have suffered no loss; and we do not envy you those accessions.

Finally, what you write about Eckius and Luther is unworthy of a response. Did Eckius conquer Luther? Who ever said that besides you? You favor your own too much, Durze, when you compare Eckius with Luther; who although he was bold and desirous of glory, nevertheless always harmed his pope more than Luther. For while defending human decrees against Scripture, he always provided a brilliant victory for Luther. Moreover, those words which you recall Luther uttered not concerning his own institution (whose most holy beginnings themselves testify) but concerning his adversaries' importunity—and especially that of Eckius—who were induced not by zeal for defending religion and truth but by hope of honors and rewards to resist Luther and make an end of protesting. Therefore what Luther said about his adversaries, you—somewhat dishonestly following your Cochlaeus—transfer to Luther himself; who was so far from that impiety that if at the beginning he could have obtained even the least from the pope he would soon have been quiet; but when the pope allowed nothing to be amended he was compelled to vindicate Christ's Gospel and doctrine from papal sacrileges. In this he aimed at nothing else except the glory of God and his duty.

DVRÆVS

Campianus complains that you have fallen into such infamy that you have most foully violated the majesty of the Holy Scriptures. While you deny this deed, what else do you do but heap sacrilege upon falsehood? Luther, says Campianus, calls the Epistle of James contentious, turgid, arid, straw-like, and the wicked apostate deems it unworthy of the Apostolic spirit. You strive officiously to soften these overly harsh, impious, and blasphemous judgments of your teacher. You skillfully divert the blame from Luther onto others. Indeed, you say, Eusebius writes concerning that epistle, "ὥς νοθεύεται," that is, "as it is considered spurious," wishing all to understand that the epistle ascribed to James is adulterine. What more fraudulent and malicious citation could be made by you? For Eusebius said nothing other than that this epistle was not considered James's by some; for books are called "νόθοι" which are thought to be by another author than the one to whom they are commonly ascribed. But that this doubt about

the author detracted nothing from its canonical authority is sufficiently indicated by the words that follow, in which he writes that it was publicly received by many churches and holds no other place than the Epistle of Jude, which you yourselves dare not say was rejected by him.

WHITAKERV

From these beginnings, I foresee what sort of person we shall henceforth find you to be. I would rather the matter were with a more modest adversary, so that, setting aside verbal harshness, we might engage in a Christian investigation and inquiry concerning religion. But you, immediately upon leaving prison, burst forth with insults and reproach us with infamy, sacrilege, falsehoods, impieties, blasphemies, fraud, and malice. These are the ornaments and allurements of your foul speech. For these injuries, I wish you a better conscience and mind.

I replied to Campianus, who accused Luther with most hateful words concerning the Epistle of James, that this judgment of Luther about that epistle was not new, and I adduced Eusebius as a witness, who expressly calls this epistle adulterine. If this word was tolerable in Eusebius, what did Luther do wrong that he should be accused of a great crime if he wrote perhaps less honorably about this epistle? You say Eusebius meant only that this epistle was not considered James's by some, in which you manifestly distort both the words and meaning of Eusebius. For first, he does not say that this epistle was not considered James's by some, as you affirm, but plainly declares his own judgment with very clear words: "ὡς νοθευομένην," that is, it must be understood that this epistle is indeed adulterine. Then, if it was not written by James, by whom then should we think it was written? Whoever he was, he calls himself James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ. Therefore, either James was the author of this epistle, or it is established in every way that the epistle is adulterine. For those whom the Holy Spirit willed to publish the sacred scriptures never customarily prefix foreign and supposititious names to their books. Therefore it amounts to the same whether you call it "ἄπόκρυφον" or deny it was written by James. So even if we accept your interpretation to the utmost, we must confess that this epistle was disapproved by Eusebius.

But that Eusebius meant something else can be sufficiently clear from his very words. For when he said it was adulterine, he immediately adds the reason: since not many ancients mention it. From this we sufficiently perceive that it is called

adulterine by Eusebius not because it was not written by James (but yet by another man of no less authority), but because Eusebius did not think it should be placed in the number of canonical scriptures, which he infers from this: because it was unknown to ancient authors. For if it had been genuine and θεόπνευστος (God-breathed), the ancient Fathers would have acknowledged it. This is Eusebius's reasoning about this epistle, which utterly overturns your interpretation.

And this is even more clear from what follows in this passage. For when he says this epistle is publicly received together with the rest in many churches, he sufficiently indicates that it was rejected by some as truly adulterine. If you do not yet understand Eusebius's meaning, read what he writes elsewhere and do not deny what is most evident.

Eusebius enumerates all the books of the New Testament: some he calls "ὁμολογουμένους," that is, certain and unquestioned, about which no one doubts; others "ἀντιλεγόμενους," that is, disputed and not received by all; in which number he leaves this Epistle of James—which he would not have done if he had judged it to have been written either by the Apostle James or by an apostolic man.

Then, so that you may more plainly understand the judgment of the ancient Church concerning this epistle, you must be reminded that it was also omitted by Origen when he enumerates the canonical books of the New Testament, as we read in Eusebius; from which it is manifest that Origen did not consider it canonical and genuine. These things are clear and cannot be obscured by your darkness.

I could also press you with testimonies from the Papists themselves, by whom the authority of this epistle is not yet established; so that henceforth you may learn to be more cautious in attacking Luther with their examples.

But let us now examine your argument, by which you conclude that this doubt detracted nothing from the canonical authority of this Epistle. For Eusebius writes that the Epistles of James and Jude were publicly received in many churches; from which you infer that these epistles were seen as canonical by Eusebius. Have your teachers taught you to argue thus? Eusebius says these epistles were received in many churches; therefore he confesses they are

canonical. On the contrary, it would be better: Eusebius says these epistles were not received by all; therefore he does not think they are canonical.

But so that all may plainly perceive there is no force in that argument, I will bring forward another passage from Eusebius. He writes that the book "The Shepherd," commonly ascribed to Hermas, was received in the churches; yet he numbers it among the νόθοι (spurious books). Therefore, his affirmation that these epistles were publicly circulated and read in churches does not prove their canonical authority.

But as for your saying that we ourselves dare not say the Epistle of Jude was rejected by Eusebius—do you dare or can you deny that Eusebius's judgment concerning both these epistles is the same? Or do you not know that this one too is placed by Eusebius among the ἀντιλεγόμενοι (disputed books)? Now reconsider this whole passage, Duræus; and unless you are fully resolved to defend your faulty interpretation and persist in error, you will assent to these things so true and so clear.

For thus the ancients, as you see, doubted not only about the author of this epistle but also about its authority.

DVRÆVS, Fol.6.

You then present Jerome as if he were another patron for your cause. "The Epistle of James," says Jerome, "is asserted by some to have been published by another under his name. But what does this matter? Just because he reports that some have asserted it was published by another under James's name, should he therefore be considered to doubt its authority?" What then will you say of Calvin, who in clear words denies that Paul is the author of the epistle to the Hebrews? But if you had presented the full passage of Jerome, everyone would easily have seen you to be a sycophant and an impostor. For it continues thus: "Although gradually, with the passage of time, it obtained authority." What could have been said more openly by Jerome to confirm the authority of this epistle?

WHITAKER.

From these words of Jerome we sufficiently understand that there was once doubt about the author of this epistle, which doubt necessarily touches the epistle's authority and credibility. For those who doubt whether James, whose

name is inscribed at the beginning of the epistle, published it, or whether some other person attached it to James and circulated it under his name, clearly judge that they do not know what to decide about the authority of this epistle. Then, if the epistle itself seemed to Jerome to be by James, why does he not disapprove of the suspicion of those who asserted it was published by another? For when he narrates that it is so asserted, and does not signify that what is asserted displeases him, who would not admit that he himself believed it to be as asserted? But Calvin, you say, denies in clear words that Paul was the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews. I admit it. But does he write that this epistle was published under Paul's name? Nothing, therefore, could be more dissimilar. For the Epistle of James bears the very name of James as its author. Therefore, he who denies that this epistle was written by James calls the epistle supposititious and deprives it of all credibility. But in that epistle to the Hebrews, nowhere is Paul's name found; there is therefore no reason why we should not hold that it was not published by Paul and yet is canonical.

But here you attack me rather insolently and hurl your reproaches. Why, then, and what was the cause of this offense? You say I presented a mutilated Jerome and omitted something. On the contrary, Dureus, I did not even omit what you accuse me of omitting. For thus I wrote in my book: "But, you will say, it was afterwards received; and Jerome also asserts this." Therefore I concealed nothing, and I am surprised that you were so harsh without cause. But what if Jerome writes that this epistle gradually obtained authority? Therefore will it be false that the authority of this epistle was once doubtful? If you had been as fair and as attentive as you ought to have been, you would have noticed that this epistle was not approved by all, even from the fact that Jerome says it gradually obtained authority with the passage of time. For that which gradually and with the passage of time acquires authority did not immediately have the highest authority from the beginning; but this Epistle gradually obtained authority; therefore it once lacked authority. And what kind of authority did it obtain? Thus Jerome spoke in Greek: ἀυθεντίας τινὸς ἐπιδέχεται, i.e., it obtained a certain authority. What could be written more weakly and remissly? Was this how one ought to speak about the canonical scriptures and divine books—that they gradually, with the passage of time, obtained a certain authority? It is therefore sufficiently manifest what Jerome judged about this Epistle. And as he says this Epistle obtained a certain authority, so also he writes about the book of Hermas,

that it was publicly read in some Eastern churches; nor, I think, will you therefore include Hermas' Shepherd among the canonical books. Therefore, what you say is most open for confirming the authority of this Epistle seems to me most uncertain and obscure; and I believe it now seems so to you as well. You ought therefore to bring forth other, clearer proofs hereafter, if you wish to teach us anything.

DVRÆUS, Fol. 7.

There was once doubt about what force it had, who would thereafter have placed it to be received by the Church? You say, however, that you do not inquire by what right it could be received by succession of time, since it was once rejected. Surely you are not ignorant about the Apocalypse of John, and about two of his epistles, and other books, how many once doubted concerning them, about which it is now forbidden to doubt? And to bind you more tightly with your own chains, since you noted a little earlier that there had been doubt about the epistle of James, if by no succession of times thereafter could it obtain the faith which it did not have at the beginning, it certainly should not yet be considered canonical. What therefore do you mean by what you soon add: "Indeed we receive it," etc.? Why do you twist here? Yet it is well that you agree so nicely with your great prophet Martin Luther. Let us hear John Calvin—good God—the judgment of which man is brought forth by you. "I because," etc. Therefore let all be silent; αὐτὸς ἔφα, of course. What more? Except that I may address you with the words of Gregory Nazianzen: "If your Calvin is Moses, let him also enter the cloud," etc. Let your Calvin be Moses for you.

WHITAKER.

Indeed, Duræus, it was never doubtful to me whether any book, about which some have doubted, could thereafter be received without any doubt; but whether it is permitted that any book which is agreed to have once been held as adulterated and suppositious should gradually become canonical with increasing approval. For if the Epistle of James is spurious, as Eusebius writes, and if not James but someone else published it under the name of James, as Jerome is authority that it is affirmed by some, and if from the beginning it did not have inherent and proper authority, certainly by no span of time could it become canonical which was once not canonical. For whatever is canonical was always canonical, unless perhaps we think that men can create books canonical

by their authority and judgment which are not canonical. If therefore the Epistle of James was ever deservedly rejected and did not have divine authority when it first came to light, it will never be able to be approved by any judgments of men. But however the trustworthiness of this epistle was once suspected by some, yet there was no legitimate cause of this suspicion, nor did the whole Church reject it, as we know from Eusebius; and indeed we receive and approve it, and we utterly dissent from the judgments of those who either do not now receive it or once refused it. Our judgment is similar concerning those other books which you mentioned. We receive all, we honor them, we acknowledge them as divine and canonical. What more can you demand, or why do you thrust upon us a dispute not ours? Accuse the ancients, whom it is agreed judged more harshly and unjustly about these books; if they deserved no reproof from you, why do you accuse Luther, why others, who say nothing which they did not say? Finally, what is most unjust, why are you troublesome to us, who neither follow nor approve the ancients or the more recent in this judgment? But here you bind me with certain chains. For I said there was once doubt about the epistle of James: if therefore it could not obtain faith by succession of time, not even yet should it be considered canonical. There was indeed doubt about this epistle, but not by the whole Church, and undeservedly. Although therefore it gradually obtained authority—that is, it was publicly received and acknowledged—yet it had divine authority from that very time when it was first written by James and came into the hands of men. Thus I have freed myself from your chains and snares. Nor ought you to blame us because we dissent from Luther. For although we perceive that Luther was moved not first by his own opinion to doubt about those books but followed in that the footsteps of the ancients, yet we openly profess that Luther's judgment in this matter displeases us. Approach Luther, if you please, and dispute with him why he admitted the more unjust opinion of certain ancients about this epistle. But why do you now attack Calvin? Is it because Calvin did not reject this epistle—was Calvin to be reprehended by you? Thus you assail both Luther doubting about this epistle and Calvin not doubting. Therefore whether we say this or that, we do not escape your curse. But I pass over your ironies, in which you take too much delight. Neither is Luther a prophet for us, nor Calvin Moses, nor do we depend on the mouth of any man; nor do we defer that "he himself said" to anyone except God alone. For you indeed the Roman pontiff is not only some prophet but greater than all

prophets and apostles, equal to Christ, as if some God on earth, as you yourself understand and acknowledge.

DVRÆUS, Fol. 8.

But again you run back to the defense of your Luther. You deny therefore that the epistle of James is called straw-like, swollen, unworthy of the apostolic spirit. Hear therefore...

Luther's words, as he says of the Epistle of James, are contentious, swollen, dry, straw-like, and unworthy of the Apostolic spirit. Indeed, you are very childish if you do not know that Luther's disciples still remain in the master's opinion. Vitus Theodorus says, "The Epistle of James is reprehensible in several places," etc. I will pass over the Magdeburgers and others; Pomeranus, in chapter 4 of Romans, denies that this epistle can be counted among the other books which teach justification by faith. But I forgive you, Whitaker, who have only read copies printed at Wittenberg or Strasbourg. For if you had seen those earlier editions, you would not so boldly deny such a certain matter. These rigid opinions of the teacher the soft Lutherans have corrected, imitating the ingenuity of ancient heretics, about whom Tertullian writes in "De Praescriptione." Moreover, they have shown no reverence even to their own leaders. I am also lying if they do not vary among themselves from their own rules, etc.

WHITAKER

6. Neither does my Luther need defense, nor did I intend, Dureus, to defend this opinion of Luther, nor do I greatly concern myself with the private defense of any man. However, when I saw Luther accused by Campianus, as I thought unjustly, it was permissible for me to note the false charge with a word. And so I denied that the Epistle of James was affected by those insults which Campianus mentions from Luther, because nothing of the sort could be found in Luther's books. You now bring forth the very words, which I have never seen, nor have I met anyone who said they had seen them. However the matter stands, it is not of great importance. For we are by no means bound to uphold every saying of Luther. Although I plainly profess that your credibility is suspect to me, and I suspect that you have given too much credit to the fabricated reports of others. First, indeed, I saw a certain very old preface of Luther, published in 1525 at

Wittenberg, in which he calls the Epistle of James straw-like compared to the epistles of Peter and Paul. But this is not to be compared with yours. Then, when other papists wish to show that the Epistle of James was called straw-like by Luther, they bring forth this very preface and these words; they make no mention of yours. Finally, when I see in a certain preface this epistle called straw-like above others, I do not think that in the same preface it is simply called swollen and dry and contentious and straw-like and unworthy of the Apostolic spirit. Therefore, while I see this new edition of yours, I prefer to withhold judgment rather than rashly affirm anything on either side. Nor was I so ignorant of things as not to know what some of Luther's disciples judged about this epistle. There was therefore no need for you to recite the judgments of Theodore Vitus, or the Magdeburgers, or Pomeranus, and fill your pages with idle testimonies. For what if they reject the Epistle of James? Is it therefore clear that this epistle is called by Luther dry, swollen, contentious, straw-like, unworthy of the Apostolic spirit?

But you nevertheless forgive me for your humanity's sake, who have seen none but Strasbourg or Wittenberg editions. Indeed I have seen a Latin Frankfurt edition, yet in all these I could not see these words of yours. But if I had read the Jena edition, I certainly would never have denied so certain a matter. I hardly believe you have read it yourself, Dureus, nor do I see any reason why I should desire the Jena edition when I have obtained the oldest Wittenberg one. Luther's prefaces were published at Wittenberg by Luther himself; in these I readily acquiesce because I acknowledge none more complete and genuine. For as to what you relate about soft and rigid Lutherans, tell me, I pray: were those Jena Lutherans more rigid than Luther himself when he lived at Wittenberg and published his German version of the Bible with prefaces at Wittenberg? It seems wonderful to me how it could happen that in the Jena edition some things are placed which are lacking in the Wittenberg one. Doubtless Luther was, if we believe you, a soft Lutheran. But why do I refute your conjectures or waste time discussing these things or do myself an injury? Even if it were most certain what you so greatly contend about, it would nevertheless do nothing at all for the matter. What you bring from Tertullian, I do not know where it tends. For our leader is not Luther but Christ; nor are we Lutherans but Christians; nor do we follow Luther's rule but Christ's doctrine and word. This ought to be your concern: to think about your own leaders and rules.

DURÆUS, Fol. 9.

And lest this seem strange to you concerning Lutherans, recall, if you please, how often Philip Melanchthon's "Loci Communes" have been inverted and walled up. And your own Calvin—how many things has he removed from earlier editions of his works? If you demand an example: how gravely and sharply did he inveigh against Henry, King of England, in chapter 1 of Hosea and in chapter 1 of Amos? If anyone denies these things were written by Calvin because they are now scarcely read in some copies, he is plainly ridiculous.

WHITAKER

Who ever thought it should be held as a fault against any learned man that he changed, corrected, increased, cut back, or polished his writings? For we cannot immediately attain what is highest and most perfect; nor is it shameful to retract what was poorly written. "No man is wise in all things," and the proverb is common in speech: "Second thoughts are wiser." Augustine excellently says, "It is great wisdom for a man to retract what he has spoken poorly." And Augustine himself used this wisdom especially, who corrected so many things in his books. Since this has always been held most honorable and sacred, neither Melanchthon, nor Calvin, nor any author did anything unusual or worthy of reproach when they either added something to their writings or took something away. But I easily forgive Luther if he perhaps at any time wrote something inconsiderately, especially since he himself demanded this from all his readers. For he writes thus: "Before all things I beseech the pious reader, and I beseech him for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ, that he read these things with judgment, indeed with much compassion, and know that I was once a monk." What could be asked more justly or more holily? But there was no reason for you to introduce Calvin here, unless to reopen the memory of some old offense. He wrote some things rather harsh against the most celebrated King Henry VIII. I confess it, nor do I defend it. For he had been persuaded by certain persons, when the title of supreme head of the Church under Christ was conferred upon the king, that it had been granted to him to establish whatever he wished concerning religion. If you ask by whom he was led into this error, you can learn from himself in the same place from which you have excerpted some things here. For it was Stephen Gardiner, as he himself writes clearly: "But where," he says, "that impostor, who afterwards was Chancellor," etc. Deceived by the

calumnies and fabricated speeches of this impostor, Calvin inveighed rather sharply against that title. But after he learned of his mistake and understood that such license had not been granted to the king under that name, he changed his opinion and manner of writing. In which both he here deserves pardon, and that man [Gardiner] was most worthy of the most just hatred.

DURAEUS, Folio 10

However it may be (you say), Luther had in this judgment the consent of the first and purest antiquity of the Church; and yet we, having dismissed Luther, judge no differently about this Epistle than you yourselves do. "Having been admitted to the spectacle, would you hold back your laughter?" For what is so ridiculous as to undertake the defense of a wretched man and then immediately desert him, having thrown away your shield? I cannot pass by this: if Luther had the purest Church agreeing with him, yet you judge differently; therefore you have fallen away from the purest antiquity of the Church. Here is that spirit of dizziness with which you new Evangelicals are afflicted.

WHITAKER

I do not delay your laughter; I can scarcely hold back tears when I see this desire of yours to trifle. I have never approved Luther's judgment nor have I attempted to defend it; I responded only concerning those disgraceful names with which Campian wrote that the Epistle of James was noted and condemned by Luther, as it was permissible for me to do, yet I by no means undertook Luther's defense for myself. What then was here so worthy of such gaping and laughter that you should stir up all the neighborhood against me? And whom you call a wretched man, I never doubt that he is blessed, and I pray God that He may make your misery known and clear to you and bring your feet back into the way of peace. But here is something which you could by no means pass over. For if (you say) Luther had the agreement of the purest and first Church, then we have fallen away from the purest antiquity of the Church because we disapprove of Luther's judgment. But this was a great matter and by no means to be passed over, in which there is nothing that answers to your acuteness. Luther had the agreement of the first and purest Church because many Churches in those first times rejected this epistle, as we learn from Eusebius; which Churches, however, are not on that account reproached as wicked, scandalous, blasphemous. Luther followed the judgment and example of these Churches; we rather approach

those which received the Epistle of James. And so we can both disagree with Luther and yet not fall away from the agreement of the purest Church. For I said "purest Churches," not those which judged most sincerely about this epistle, but those which flourished in the best and purest times. Therefore, it was not that spirit of our dizziness, but of your rashness.

DVRÆVS, Fol. 10.

It is pleasing, however, that you regain your courage. For Luther, when he contended that the justification of man is in no way to be attributed to works, and saw no path of escape open to him once this epistle was admitted, rejected its authority. But you say, "I pledge and promise that whatever you deduce from this epistle, we will most willingly accept." Then you add, "That dogma of ours is most true: that man is justified by faith alone. Paul teaches this most clearly, although he does not expressly mention faith alone." But I, on the contrary, will assert that your dogma is most false. Paul certainly never says that we are justified by faith alone, neither most clearly nor in express words; indeed, both most clearly and in express words, he denies that we are justified by faith alone. For "the hearers of the law are not just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified." And again, "If I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not charity, I am nothing." What can be said more openly, more expressly than these words?

WHITAKER.

What Luther determined concerning the Epistle of James is of no concern to me: I do not doubt that it is divine and sacred, so far am I from thinking that there is anything in it which conflicts with our doctrine of faith alone, or with any part of true religion. Therefore, I also promise you that whatever you bring forward from this epistle will always have with me the force and authority of the divine. Moreover, our doctrine concerning justification by faith alone rests upon the most certain foundations of Scripture, and is not weakened by any word of James that might make us less favorable to this epistle. Although that word "alone" is not found in the Pauline writings, nevertheless Paul explains our view concerning faith alone most clearly, so that we do not doubt it any less than if it had been proposed in so many words. For first, when he writes that we are justified by faith, if we wish to explain it genuinely, it is equivalent to saying that we are justified by faith alone. For faith looks to something external, that is, the

mercy of God promised in the Mediator. This mercy alone justifies us, and this mercy is apprehended by faith alone; therefore, the name of faith itself, placed by itself, obtains the force of faith alone. Secondly, Paul connects nothing with faith in this matter; therefore, he teaches that faith alone suffices. For if nothing is added in our justification, then it is established that it alone justifies us. Moreover, whatever might seem to contribute anything at all to justification is entirely removed from faith in justification. For what is it that you think should be joined with faith in this cause? Works, I suppose. Therefore, if works are separated, it remains and is necessary that we are justified by faith alone. Hear therefore Paul speaking in his own words: "We conclude that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law." Again: "To him who does not work but believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Again: "Therefore by the deeds of the law no flesh shall be justified in His sight." Again: "Just as David also pronounces the blessedness of the man to whom God imputes righteousness without works." And in another epistle more expressly: "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, except through faith in Jesus Christ." What could be said that would more confirm our view? For if not by the works of the law, and if we are justified only through faith, then it necessarily follows that we are justified by faith alone. To this adds that he writes we are justified freely and by the gift of God, which excludes all consideration of merits. For the Apostle says: "By grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, lest anyone should boast." And elsewhere: "Being justified freely by His grace." If these things seem insufficient to you, Duraeus, they certainly satisfy me abundantly, and I ask you to respond to this argument: If we are justified without the works of the law; if to him who does not work but believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness; if no man is justified by the works of the law; if righteousness is imputed without works; if freely, if by grace, if by the gift of God; finally, if we are justified only through faith—then we are justified by faith alone. The antecedent is true; therefore, the consequent also. Why then do you require this particle "alone," which you see abundantly compensated by so many equivalents? For he who says you think with your body and only with your mind affirms that you think with your mind alone.

Although we most truly defend from the sense of Scripture that we are justified by faith alone, nevertheless we do not mean that the faith by which we are

justified is alone, as we shall say hereafter. You, on the contrary, say our doctrine is most false, which indeed you do without any judgment, any argument, any Scripture. But you contend that Paul not only nowhere affirms that we are justified by faith alone, but even most plainly denies this very thing. You would never have written this if you had understood Paul, whom your masters interpret unfaithfully. You can perceive this from these two testimonies which you have now brought forward. For what the Apostle first says—"Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified"—overthrows the vain hope and confidence of the Jews, who because they heard the law daily persuaded themselves that they were blessed and just, when yet they violated the law in many ways. Therefore, the Apostle denies that it is enough for righteousness to hear and know the law unless you also satisfy the law. As the Prophet says: "If we had continued in them, we would have been saved." For the law pronounces none just except those who have fulfilled the whole law. These words therefore pertain to those who followed the righteousness of the law and thought themselves just by observing the law. If you pursue that righteousness, do what the law commands, and you will be just in this way. But you can do nothing less than fulfill the law; therefore, it is necessary to flee to another righteousness, which is imputed not to one working but to one believing—unless perhaps you think yourself more just than Abraham, David, or Paul, who were justified not by fulfilling the law but by believing. There is therefore a double righteousness: of the law and of the Gospel. The Apostle defines the righteousness of the law in these words—a righteousness in which no man ever could be just except Christ alone. The righteousness of the Gospel is such that whoever believes in Christ shall not perish but have eternal life. "The just shall live by his faith." This passage therefore has no force against the righteousness of faith; indeed, it makes it more stable. For since the righteousness of the law consists in most perfect obedience to the law, and no man can obey the law, hence it follows that there is no righteousness in the law, but another must be sought by us in the Gospel—which is remission of sins, reconciliation, and imputation of Christ's righteousness, freely given on account of Christ the Mediator.

Then what the Apostle says—that all faith without charity is nothing—he understands as faith of miracles; as is clear from his own words, and as Chrysostom and Oecumenius rightly interpret. For thus we read in Oecumenius:

"He does not now speak of common or catholic faith among believers, but of a gift of faith; for a certain kind of gift is called by a name similar to faith." You see that according to this interpreter's view, the Apostle spoke not about common Christian faith but about another gift of faith. Although we grant that this passage may be understood concerning true faith—what else then will you gather from it except that true faith can never be separated from charity?—which is most true. For a just man ought to be endowed with true charity; nor can faith ever justify us without charity. And so if these words seem very open and clear to you, they nevertheless show nothing that disagrees with our doctrine concerning justification by faith alone.

DVRÆVS, Fol.10.11.

Having been cast down from the position of the Scriptures, you take refuge in the Fathers, whom you do not even seem to have greeted at the threshold. Ambrose said that we are justified by faith alone, not to exclude from justification those works which follow faith, but rather those which used to be performed in the old law. For in that place he says, "Paul states with certainty that a Gentile is justified by believing, doing no works of the law." And Augustine holds the same opinion concerning Paul's words, in *On Faith and Works*, chapter 14: "When the Apostle says that he considers a man to be justified by faith without the works of the law, he does not do this so that, once faith is received and professed, the works of righteousness are despised, but so that each one may know that he is justified by faith, even if the works of the law have not preceded." And in *On Grace and Free Will*, chapter 7, Ambrose himself expressed his opinion in clear words, in his commentary on Romans chapter 13: "It is manifest," he says, "that each one will either be justified or condemned by his own works." Finally, one may rightly say that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law because it is given first, from which the others, which are properly called works, are obtained.

WHITAKER.

There is nothing I fear, Duraeus, lest you snatch from me the possession of the Scriptures, especially since you either use the Scriptures very rarely or handle them quite ignorantly and childishly. But undoubtedly the Fathers are very familiar to you, since you say that I have never approached the doors and threshold of the houses in which they dwell, as if you had been their doorkeeper.

You are fortunate, who could not only greet the Fathers from the threshold but also live and spend the night with them for so long. Although there was no reason for you to say that I am only a guest of the Fathers. For in that book in which you wished to show how devoted you were to the Fathers, you brought forth nothing that was new or unheard of to me. Therefore, do not boast too much of your extensive knowledge and reproach us for this ignorance. But now to the matter. You say that Ambrose does not exclude those works which follow faith, but rather those which used to be done in the old law. Therefore, this will be Ambrose's meaning: "We are justified by faith alone," that is, we are not justified by any works which are prescribed in the old law; thus faith alone removes from justification only ceremonial works, such as circumcision, new moons, and Sabbath observance. First, you cannot deny that Ambrose affirms we are justified by faith alone and writes that this is Paul's mind and doctrine; in this he plainly conflicts with you, who condemn this axiom, which nevertheless Ambrose asserts to be Pauline. But when Ambrose thought that Paul excluded only ceremonial works, he strayed very far from Paul's opinion, and Augustine and Jerome judged differently about Paul's mind. If you wish to defend this interpretation of Ambrose, you must necessarily assert that Jerome and Augustine were poor interpreters of Paul. I only wanted to declare with that testimony of Ambrose that this dogma and this axiom are Pauline and Apostolic: "We are justified by faith alone." And so that you may understand that Ambrose was not of the opinion that we are justified by our works, hear Ambrose himself writing thus in another place: "We are not justified by works, but by faith; because carnal weakness is an impediment to works; but the clarity of faith overshadows the error of deeds, which merits forgiveness of sins." This must be understood concerning the works of the reborn, since in those whose hearts faith has not purified, carnal weakness not only brings a great impediment to good works but does not even allow anything but impious and vicious things to proceed from them. But Augustine, whom you then bring forward, refutes the vain opinion of those who boasted of a dead faith and one empty of works, as we know from the last words of that chapter: "How far then are they mistaken," he says, "who promise themselves eternal life with a dead faith?" We confess that such faith is indeed useless. But here, Duraeus, it seems to me—if you have seen the passage itself—that you have inflicted some wound on your conscience. For when you quote Augustine's words, you omit something which greatly harms your defense. Thus in Augustine it follows:

For works follow justification; they do not precede being justified. In this, he takes away justification by works because he makes justification prior to works. Thus, good works do not produce justification, but justification produces good works. This clause pleased you little; therefore, you thought it should be cut out—cautiously indeed, but not very religiously. Moreover, what Augustine elsewhere proves—that faith is not sufficient if one lives wickedly, but faith ought to work through love—I willingly acknowledge. Nor was it necessary for Ambrose, who said that each one would be either justified or condemned by his works. For it is the same as what the Apostle says: God will render to each according to his works. For works are manifest to all and easily reveal the mind of each because they are testimonies either of one's faith or of unfaithfulness. Therefore, judgment will be rendered according to works, but it does not follow that anyone is justified before God by the merit of works, because eternal life is the gift of God, and those who are justified by works have something to boast about, although even Abraham did not attain this.

But that invention of yours, which you add at the end, saying that we are justified by faith without works because faith is given first, is rightly rejected by all. For how will faith be first when you yourselves make love the form of faith? If love is the form of faith, love ought to be prior to faith because the form is the cause of the thing that is formed. But Scripture attributes not only the beginning of our justification but the whole of justification to faith. "Whoever hears my word," says Christ, "and believes him who sent me has eternal life. This is the will of my Father, that whoever sees the Son and believes in him should have eternal life, and I will raise him up on the last day." If, therefore, our justification and salvation consist in eternal life, then faith brings us complete justification and salvation. "To all who received him," says the Apostle, "he gave the power to become children of God." Then he immediately adds and explains how Christ is received: "To those who believe in his name." Faith, therefore, receives Christ, in whom all parts of our righteousness are fulfilled, and makes us not, as sophists dream, fit for achieving righteousness by our works, but perfectly and truly righteous. But you propose for yourself a certain working and meritorious righteousness and wish to earn eternal life by your good deeds. I pray to God that you may at last understand that nothing is more vain than this hope and opinion of yours, and that you may seek true righteousness and salvation in the mercy of God who embraces us on account of Christ and forgives our sins.

DURAEUS, Fol. tr.

But Basil, whom you bring forward with the same ignorance, when he says that we are justified by faith alone in Christ, rejects those works which certain proud men thought sufficient for salvation by the powers of free will alone. For the whole aim of this sermon is to exhort the faithful to humility, lest anyone puffed up with pride place confidence in his own strength. But how much weight he believed good works of Christians—flowing from grace and faith—have for obtaining true righteousness before God, those things sufficiently show in Psalm 110: "Let no one say that this wisdom consists in knowledge alone," he adds, "good understanding," etc., "for faith is not enough unless a way of life fitting to faith is added." And in Psalm 117: "Do not think knowledge satisfies you," therefore he added, "who walk in his ways," that is, who fear and walk. For there are many who live corruptly with a fairly accurate faith and therefore are the most miserable of all. But the ways of the Lord are ways of life according to virtue, by which we ascend to heaven. This he says: "To ascend to heaven is nothing other than to be justified."

WHITAKERUS.

Indeed, I would be very ignorant, Duraeus, if I did not know that you have proven to be an unskilled interpreter of Basil in this passage. For Basil speaks so clearly and plainly that he easily refutes your cold and unlearned commentary. After he had stripped away from man all things that can be considered grand and glorious, he then teaches what it is in which the true matter of boasting consists, finally declaring it in the words of the Prophet: "Let him who boasts boast in this, that he understands and knows me, that I am Jehovah." That is, as Basil, following Paul, excellently interprets, all our wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption are placed in Christ alone. Then follows in Basil: "For this is the perfect and complete boasting in God, when one is not puffed up by his own righteousness, but knows himself to be empty of true righteousness, and is justified by faith in Christ alone." Thus you see that nothing of our own righteousness is to be attributed to us, since we lack true righteousness and must rest in the righteousness of Christ alone.

Now if we are "in need of true righteousness," as Basil writes—that is, we are lacking in true righteousness—we sufficiently understand that no righteousness is to be sought in our works, nor can we be justified except by faith in Christ

alone. Now let us see how skillfully you respond to Basil. You say that Basil in these words rejects only those works which are done by the powers of free will alone and do not arise from grace and faith. Do you think, Dürer, that you have fulfilled the duty of a good interpreter? For who does not know that works done before grace and faith do not bring righteousness, since they are sins and flow from a corrupt and vicious nature? But what kind of works Basil spoke of, we will understand much better from Basil himself than from your conjectures. For to make it plainly clear that Basil was not speaking only of those works which are done by the powers of free will and precede faith and grace, he brings forward the example of the Apostle Paul, whom you will not deny was endowed with both grace and faith. For thus it follows in the next words in Basil: "And Paul boasts in despising his own righteousness." That is, Paul boasts that he despises his own righteousness and seeks that righteousness which is from God through Christ in faith. For thus Paul not only rejects and renounces all his own righteousness—not only Pharisaic but any whatsoever—and leaves for himself only the righteousness of faith, and trusts in it. For although he had performed all good works that could be performed by anyone, so that he was conscious of nothing against himself, yet he denied that he was justified in that: "Far be it from me," he says, "to boast except in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." You see the Apostle, says Origen, not boasting in his own righteousness, nor in his chastity, nor in his wisdom, nor in his other virtues or skills. Then when Basil afterward mentions Peter also—whom I suppose you will concede was faithful and endowed with grace—you could easily have understood that not only those works of free will were rejected by Basil.

For although he surpassed all others in charity and love of Christ (as Basil says), yet he fell and denied the Lord. Thus you see Basil opposing the righteousness of faith alone to all the works of all people, and declaring that he is endowed with true righteousness who, distrusting his own works, places all hope of salvation in the righteousness of Christ alone. For these testimonies you bring from Basil's commentaries teach only this: that mere naked knowledge and that faith which consists only in understanding are not sufficient for salvation—which indeed we most openly always profess. Therefore we affirm that we must walk in the ways of the Lord and strive toward heaven through pious conduct, and we most willingly accept this entire discourse of Basil.

But your argument here must not be overlooked. For you argue thus: "By good works we strive toward heaven; therefore we are justified by good works." It is similar as if we were to conclude in this way: "By the Flaminian Way we travel to Rome; therefore the Flaminian Way is the cause of traveling to Rome." Good works are indeed like a way, and we ought to be engaged in them and strive toward eternal life; but we are justified before we enter upon this way. For until Christ receives us into grace and directs our feet into the way of peace, we wander far from that way which leads to heaven. Augustine says excellently: "Those very works which are said to be before faith, although they may seem praiseworthy to men, are empty." So they seem to me to be like great strength and very swift running off the road. Moreover, how much Basil attributes to the merits of our works he indicates with these words: "Eternal rest remains for those who have lawfully contended in this life, not on account of the merits of their deeds, but by the grace of the most generous God in which they hoped."

DVRÆUS, Fol. 12.

What you bring forward from Nazianzen sufficiently shows that you wish to impose upon incautious readers. For he teaches nothing other than that divine matters should be understood not rashly, but with sobriety, as Paul speaks. Therefore, he does not deny that man is justified by good works, but teaches that that sublime knowledge of divine things is not necessary for man's salvation, since faith alone suffices without it. But what is more absurd than to think from this that Nazianzen excluded works? Not to mention that he does not speak in your manner, saying that we apprehend Christ's righteousness by faith alone, but calls faith itself our righteousness.

WHITAKER.

You pass over no passage without some accusation of ours, all the fairness of which I readily leave to the reader to judge. Your Campianus reproves Luther because he taught that we are justified by faith alone; I show that the ancient Fathers also taught and wrote thus; wherefore I contend either that Luther brought forth nothing new, or that the ancient Fathers are to be accused of the same crime, whose voice and meaning were the same. Moreover, I brought forward Nazianzen speaking in this manner: Δικαιοσύνη μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ πιστεῦσαι μόνον, that is, "Righteousness indeed is to believe only," by which words righteousness is attributed to faith alone. If to believe only is righteousness, then

righteousness consists in faith alone, which we most truly teach and defend. What do you now answer to this so clear statement of Nazianzen? He does not deny (you say) that man is justified by good works. He affirms that we are justified by faith alone; therefore he denies that we are justified by good works. For he demands only that you believe, and places righteousness in believing. Therefore he quite clearly removes from righteousness all things besides faith. But (you say) he only taught that sublime knowledge of things is not necessary for man's salvation. If therefore the knowledge of divine things, which is an excellent and splendid matter, justifies no man, since faith lacking such knowledge suffices for righteousness, then he detracts righteousness from works, even by your own confession. For if he who has spent his whole life in this most beautiful work, so that he may abound in the knowledge of divine things, yet has attained no part of righteousness, certainly we must confess that righteousness is not acquired by our works. For what is denied to the most excellent work cannot by any means be granted to lesser ones. And Nazianzen did not speak about a certain kind of works, but pronounced a general statement, and said that only this is necessary for any man: to believe with the heart unto righteousness, and to confess with the mouth unto salvation, just as the Apostle taught. For true faith is followed by confession, as effect by cause. Thus the Apostle assigns both righteousness and salvation to faith, because faith produces confession, and after we have believed in Christ, and by this faith have received true righteousness, we proceed by confession as the way to salvation. Moreover, Nazianzen calls faith our righteousness, not because it itself makes us righteous by its own dignity and merit, but in the manner of the Scriptures, because it apprehends the righteousness of Christ. For thus he says: "Confess with your tongue, and believe that Christ rose from the dead, and you will be saved. For righteousness is even to believe only." But this was so trivial that it seemed to you yourself worthy to be omitted.

DVRÆUS, Fol. 12–13.

Let us return to the Epistle of James. When James (you say) denies that man is justified by faith only, and affirms that he is justified by works, he speaks of feigned and simulated faith. Who among the ancients ever explained this passage thus? Far be it that it should enter into a pious and Catholic man's mind that James spoke of feigned faith. For to what end would he say it, since it has no efficacy, which not only contributes nothing to salvation but is also very

harmful? Therefore it is necessary that he spoke of true and Christian faith. Which is clearer than light from the example of Abraham brought forward. Or do you think Abraham's faith was feigned? And yet James expressly pronounces that he was not justified by the faith alone which he had, though most true. What about the things which sufficiently show of what faith the Apostle speaks? "You believe" (he says) "that there is one God; you do well." Will you be so foolish as to think that he who believes God exists with feigned faith does well? Therefore nothing is accomplished by this new and distasteful interpretation. For if he had spoken of false faith, he certainly would never have said: "You see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only."

WHITAKER.

13. Now you approach Jacob again, and in your manner you demonstrate that he spoke not of a false and dead faith, but of true faith. But I will prove by the most certain arguments that Jacob spoke of a feigned faith, just as I had responded to Campianus. For thus the Apostle frames his discourse: "What profit is there, my brethren, if someone says he has faith, but does not have works?" From this principle it is not obscure what kind of faith Jacob signifies—one placed in a certain empty boasting of words, proven by no works. For that faith which does not have works is feigned; and Jacob speaks of this faith which lacks works, as is clear from the very words. Therefore, it is evident that this Apostle speaks of a feigned faith. This is made even more manifest from what follows. For he speaks of such faith which, to the naked and needy, offers nothing but words and wishes—"Go in peace, be warmed, and be filled"—yet provides nothing that they need. This is a feigned faith, which Jacob, because it lacks deeds, also calls dead. But if it is dead, therefore it is feigned. Then he concludes that only that faith is true which can be demonstrated by works; since that other is not such, it follows that it is false and feigned. But what he adds removes all doubt: Do you wish to be taught which faith Jacob denies to be effective for righteousness and salvation? You can know from these words: "You believe that God is one; you do well. And the demons believe and tremble." He speaks of that faith which falls even upon the demons themselves; but that faith is feigned and simulated and dead; therefore, this is that faith by which alone Jacob denies that we are justified. Now an easy response to your Confutation is shown to me. First, because you ask which of the ancients expounded this passage in such a way—since all the ancients explained this passage differently—I, relying on the words

themselves, would contend that it ought to be explained thus. But it would have been more fair, when you disapprove of that exposition, for you yourself to declare which of the ancients explained this passage otherwise. Nevertheless, I will satisfy your request. For I say that this passage was expounded thus by Augustine, whose words are these:

James is vehemently opposed to those who think that faith without works is sufficient for salvation, to the point that he even compares them to demons. You see, therefore, that according to Augustine's view, James is speaking of feigned faith and empty works; for no one doubts that feigned faith is demonic. And from this discussion of James, he ultimately concludes: "How greatly, then, is he deceived who promises himself eternal life by dead faith!" And in another place Augustine says: "James, in his Epistle, against those who were unwilling to do good works, presuming upon faith alone, commended the works of Abraham himself." I would be content with the judgment of Augustine alone, until you show us any of the ancients who thought this passage ought to be explained otherwise.

It remains now that we examine your little arguments, by which you attempt to overthrow this most true exposition of ours. "To what purpose," you say, "would he say this, since feigned faith not only contributes nothing to salvation but is even harmful to it?" This feigned faith, against which James disputes, is a bare knowledge of religion, by the external profession of which many promised themselves righteousness and salvation. James refutes this false persuasion of certain people, proving that by that faith which consists only in the knowledge of divine things, no one can be justified. You could have learned from Augustine that this is the Apostle's meaning, whose words are these: "Men not understanding what the Apostle says, 'We reckon that a man is justified by faith without the works of the law,' thought that he said faith is sufficient for a man, even if he lives wickedly and does not have good works." Then shortly after: "This is the faith by which the faithful of God are separated from unclean demons; for they, as the Apostle James says, believe and tremble, but do not do good works." And elsewhere: "Because this opinion had then arisen (that dead faith justifies), the apostolic epistles of Peter, John, and James are especially directed against it, so that they strongly assert that faith without works profits nothing."

You add that this is manifest from the example of Abraham, and you ask whether I think that Abraham's faith was feigned. By no means, Duræus? For Scripture proclaims that Abraham had true and living faith, which was made manifest by his works and obedience. The Apostle contends that this true faith of Abraham, which he declared by his deeds, was most unlike the empty opinion of these men. But as for what you say, that James declares Abraham was not justified by faith alone—although most true—I nowhere find this in James. Indeed, James says that he was justified by works; that is, declared righteous because he brought forth true fruits of true faith, by which we are justified, when he offered Isaac. Therefore, the matter itself proved that he was endowed not with dead faith but with true faith; such as those men boasted of but did not demonstrate. And this is what the angel said to Abraham: "Now I know that you fear God, since you have not withheld your only son from me." By this deed Abraham was justified because he testified that he truly believed in God; and in this way, as the Apostle says, Scripture was fulfilled, and all perceived it to be true that he believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness. In this, James did not violate the righteousness of faith alone by any word.

But as for what follows: "Are you so foolish that you think one who believes God exists with a feigned faith does well?" See, I ask you, to what this tends, and consider with yourself whom that speech touches. For these are not my words but the Apostle's, which you criticize. For thus James says: "You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe—and tremble." Therefore, because he affirms that these men believe well, he teaches that demons also believe the same thing; from which we understand that this faith by which they believe well that God is one is feigned, since James attributes it even to demons. If you call him who says this foolish, you are most openly blaspheming against the Holy Spirit and the Apostle, by whom we are taught that impious men and demons believe that God is one—and rightly so, because they are not deceived by the false opinion of many gods, and they believe what is most true and what all must necessarily believe.

Moreover, that James denies we are justified by faith alone must be understood concerning this empty, feigned, dead, imaginary, perishable, diabolical faith; the whole argument of the Apostle most clearly proves this.

James, you say, asserts that a man is justified by works, that is, that righteousness is approved, declared, demonstrated. Evidently, the Apostle was greatly concerned with how we might attain a reputation for righteousness among men, but he was not troubled about true justification, by which we are made righteous before God. Away with these trifles! And please, I beg you, see (if you can see anything) how beautifully your own claims cohere: that faith of yours is proven, demonstrated, declared by works—works which you yourselves affirm are nothing but defilements, filth, and true iniquity before God. What kind of demonstration is this, Whitaker? This same error, which you strive so earnestly to defend, Augustine attributes to the heretic Eunomius, in *On Heresies*, chapter 54. Moreover, what you cite from Augustine, *Eighty-Three Questions*, question 76, plainly refutes your fabrication and confirms the dogma of the Catholic Church. For what Catholic ever attributed righteousness to works preceding faith—contrary to Paul's protest—or denied it to works following faith, as James asserts? These are certainly your own delusions, you who teach that nothing should be attributed either to works preceding faith or to those following it. And so I write briefly on the doctrine of justification. For you understand that to treat this matter with the seriousness it deserves belongs to another occasion.

WHITAKER

Since you cannot overturn and refute our interpretation of this passage, you nevertheless attempt to evade it in some way, and then you exclaim, "Away with these trifles!" If these trifles displease you, there is no reason for you to be angry with us: for they are your own, not ours. For which of us said that this Apostle intended only to teach how one might gain a certain reputation for righteousness among men, but taught nothing about true righteousness? As if one who prescribes by what judgments and arguments you may prove yourself endowed with true righteousness is not at all concerned with true justification. For when James sets forth the fruits of righteousness and demonstrates true righteousness from its necessary and perpetual effects, does he not distinguish true righteousness from a false opinion of righteousness, and declare that he is concerned about true justification, by which we are righteous before God? If this seems to you not at all a matter of concern, could we make our righteousness attested by men so that all may understand us to be righteous, for which reason the Apostle says, "Show me your faith by your works, and I will show you my faith by my works"? Therefore, James considers no faith to be true unless it can

be recognized by deeds proper to true faith, and no one is justified before God (I always except infants) except those who testify that they are righteous by true works.

Moreover, we did not invent this interpretation ourselves but received it from those whose judgment you cannot reject, because they were not Lutherans and have always held the highest authority among your own. For thus Thomas (good God, to use your words, what a great man!) explained this passage of the Apostle: "Here he speaks of works following faith, which are said to justify, not according as justification is called the infusion of righteousness, but according as it is called the exercise, or demonstration, or consummation of righteousness." You will not say that this man was trifling, Durandus, nor should you judge your own master so unfairly. And learn what force the term "consummation" has from other words of the same: "It is consummated," that is, increased, and approved, and demonstrated. Genesis 22: "Now I know that you fear God." So also the ordinary gloss on that passage writes: "Abraham was justified without works by faith alone, but nevertheless the offering of his son was a testimony of the righteousness of faith." What more do you desire, or what could have been written more clearly by anyone?

But now you proceed, as is your custom, and fight with some monster or other. For we acknowledge no such monster as you imagine, and whatever it is, we affirm it to be yours. For I beseech you, Durandus, and appeal to your conscience (if perhaps you have not lost all conscience through prejudice), is this our dogma: that the works of the justified and reborn are nothing other than filth and defilements and true iniquity? Did you think anyone so foolish as to believe you when you write such things? We say that the works of the pious are gifts of God, pleasing to God, and that the most ample reward is both promised and paid for them; yet they are not perfect as the divine law demands, nor free from all vice on account of that contagion of sin which has corrupted our nature and cannot be utterly eradicated in this life. But God approves the works of the pious just as He receives the pious themselves. For although the pious struggle with many vices, nevertheless God loves them on account of Christ: so our works, although not entirely perfect, God accepts and rewards and testifies that they are pleasing to Him. But that the works of the saints are nothing other than filth, defilements, iniquity—this I declare to be most alien to our view.

Moreover, in saying that we are like Eunomius, you do a clear injury to all of us. Thus Augustine writes about Eunomius: "He is said to have been so hostile to good morals that he asserted that the commission and persistence of any sins whatsoever would harm no one if he were a partaker of that faith which was taught by him." Do we say this? Do we teach this? Let Christ vindicate His cause and our innocence! Eunomius separated an honorable life from true faith; we never separate true faith from holy morals. Eunomius granted impunity for every crime; we promise eternal life to none except those who live piously and holily. Therefore we condemn Eunomius, the teacher of a wicked life, and all disciples of a pernicious sect. Yet you impose the Eunomian view on us.

Augustine, in that passage where he reconciles the views of the two Apostles, attributes righteousness to faith and denies it to works; he does not refute this our commentary, as you say. Then he writes that James spoke about empty faith; for he says: "And another says that faith without works is empty." Therefore, when James says that Abraham was justified by works, he understands that he was endowed not with empty but with true faith and righteousness, and declared truly righteous by his deeds; this refutes your commentary openly.

But we disparage works only as much as we have learned from the Scriptures they must be entirely disparaged. For we do not fashion a new Christ for ourselves from our works so that we may hope to be made righteous by their merits and obtain heavenly life. These works, this righteousness, this heaven we gladly leave to you. But you will treat this cause elsewhere; for thus far you have brought forth nothing truly worthy of a learned man's esteem.

DVRÆVS, Fol. 14.15.

Campianus asserts that you have suddenly removed Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, Maccabees, and many other books from the Canon. In this matter, your speech exults strangely, because Jerome states that the Book of Wisdom, commonly ascribed to Solomon, and the book of Jesus son of Sirach, and Judith, and Tobit are not in the Canon. But beware, lest you sing triumph before victory. For who would not marvel that such a great Theologian has not yet learned that not all canonical scripture books were received by the entire Catholic Church at the same time? And in the past, there was doubt among many concerning some books of sacred scripture, about which even you yourselves now dare to say that there should be no doubt. Jerome asserts that these books were not in the Canon

according to Josephus. Certainly, in the Third Council of Carthage, Canon 47, they were accepted, whose canons the Synod of Constantinople approved in Canon 2, as did the Council of Florence in the letter of Eugenius to the Armenians, and the Council of Trent. Nor is it obscure that for many centuries before Luther, they were held and received in the Canon by absolutely all churches. You ridiculously throw Caietanus at us: although he spoke much more arrogantly than was fitting, which Catharinus and Canus judged before us.

WHITAKER.

That great crime was, which Campianus charged upon us, when he wrote that we had removed the sacred books, and indeed suddenly, from the Canon, as if we had surpassed all the audacity of any who have ever existed in the church, and that we had suddenly taken away from the Canon those books which had always been held as canonical. Therefore, I brought forward Jerome and Epiphanius, whose writings agree with our judgments concerning these books, so that all might perceive that no book was suddenly removed from the Canon by us. However, since you cannot deny that the opinion of these Fathers was plainly the same as ours, you have nevertheless contrived something to reply, which I wish all to consider of what sort it is.

"Not all," you say, "the books of canonical Scripture were received by the universal Church at the same time." This indeed, which you say, would have some weight if Jerome had left these books in doubt and had not openly pronounced his judgment concerning them. But since Jerome so often denies that all these are canonical and expressly calls them apocryphal, he undoubtedly declared the perpetual judgment of the Church in this matter. For unless the Church had judged these to be apocryphal, Jerome would not always have numbered them among the apocryphal. Moreover, he expressly writes that the Church indeed reads those books, but does not receive them among the canonical scriptures; which is to be understood of the Christian church, since the Jewish church never even reads these books at any time. Therefore, what the judgment of the church was concerning these books at the time when Jerome lived can be most clearly known from this testimony of Jerome.

Then, since you yourself confess that these books were not received in Jerome's time, teach therefore at what first time they were received by the universal church, so that we may understand when they began to be canonical.

"Certainly," you say, "in the Third Council of Carthage they were inscribed in the number of canonical books." But this council was not ecumenical; therefore I understand that these books were not approved by the whole Church. "Indeed," you say, "the ecumenical synod of Constantinople approved the canons of this council." Thus, according to your own confession, these books were not received by the universal church until almost seven hundred years after Christ. What then shall we determine concerning those most flourishing churches of earlier times, in which these books were not publicly received and approved? Now therefore, if we consider the time itself which intervened between the publication of these books and this Council of Constantinople, we shall find that more than a thousand years had passed from when Ecclesiasticus, Judith, Tobit, the book of Maccabees, Wisdom, Baruch, and the rest are said to have been written by their authors. Hence it follows that these books lay without canonical authority for more than a thousand years, which cannot be affirmed without wickedness concerning divine and sacred books. For who would say that the church of so many ages neither received nor acknowledged so many books commended to the church by the Holy Spirit?

Augustine, when he inquires how it can be understood which books are canonical, teaches that consideration of two things is necessary: first, that they have the testimony of that church in which the author lived; second, the continuous attestation of the subsequent church. But I observe that both are lacking for these books. For the Jewish church always rejected them, from which nevertheless, if they had been canonical, they ought wholly to have been received; nor did the subsequent church hold them as canonical, as we know from almost all the writings of the Fathers and from the history of the times.

Origen, in Eusebius, acknowledges no more canonical books of the Old Testament than those which the Hebrews receive. Cyril of Jerusalem most earnestly contends that only those same are to be accepted and read by all Christians, and says that the Apostles and bishops of the ancient church, who were much wiser than us, delivered only these to the church: "πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἀπόκρυφα μηδὲν ἔχε κοινόν" — "with the apocryphal," he says, "have nothing to do." Nothing could be said more clearly or vehemently. Athanasius in his Synopsis enumerates these same, then adds: "Besides these there are still other books of the same Old Instrument, not canonical, which are read only to catechumens." Nazianzen proposes the same number in verses, and at last writes

thus: "ἀρχαίας μὲν ἔθηκα δύο καὶ εἴκοσι βίβλους τοῖς τῶν Ἑβραίων χαμικασιν ἀντιθέτως" — "I have set forth twenty-two books of the Old Testament, equal to the letters of the Hebrews." Rufinus, an ancient author (or whoever it was who published the exposition of the Creed which we read in Cyprian's works), recounts exactly as many canonical books; concerning the rest he writes thus: "It must be known however that there are other books which are not called canonical but ecclesiastical by our ancestors, such as Wisdom," etc.

To these add Jerome and Epiphanius, whose testimony concerning canonical and apocryphal books is the same. These Fathers—so many, so distinguished, who lived in such varied times and places—ought to have no less weight with us in this cause than if we heard the very church of those times speaking. For who were more illustrious than these? Or if we wish to know the judgment of that church, whom should we consult rather than these? But these, as you see, acknowledge the same canonical books which we ourselves acknowledge; they reject as apocryphal those same which we reject.

What do you have to reply now, convicted by these testimonies? "Concerning some books," you say, "there was once doubt; about which you do not dare to doubt now." But concerning these books the Jewish church—which alone was once the true church of Christ—and these Fathers had no doubt at all. For that Jewish church always rejected these books; and these Fathers number no books among the canonical except those which the Jews held as canonical. For whatever is canonical in the Old Testament was delivered to the Jews, just as the Apostle writes expressly to the Romans: "To them were committed the oracles of God." But these books were not delivered to the Jews because they were not even written in Hebrew; therefore they are not the oracles of God. And indeed that is the Old Testament: "They have Moses and the prophets." "Beginning from Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all scriptures concerning himself." Therefore all ancient scriptures are contained in Moses and the prophets. "Persuading them," Luke says about Paul, "from the law of Moses and the prophets." "All things," says Christ, "which are written in the law of Moses and the prophets and psalms concerning me." And the Apostle writes that the church is built upon the foundation of prophets and apostles because it rests upon prophetic and apostolic doctrine. But since these books were neither written nor approved by prophets, certainly they are not prophetic. And the Apostle says that God spoke in times past to our fathers by prophets; since

therefore these were not prophets at all, it follows that God did not speak through them.

Here you object to me the Council of Carthage; I refer you to Laodicea, which was not much earlier than that one, in which are enumerated those same books of the Old Testament which our churches acknowledge as sacred and canonical—and no others at all—and it is clearly commanded that none besides be read or received into authority. Moreover, the Council of Carthage in its catalogue enumerates five books of Solomon when it is sufficiently agreed that there are only three Solomon's. For the book of Wisdom was written in Greek, as the ancients judged; and Ecclesiasticus was composed not by Solomon but by Jesus son of Sirach; and this council called these books canonical because a rule of morals can be sought from them—not because they contain a rule of faith—as Cajetan observed.

"But," you say, "the Council of Constantinople approved these canons of Carthage." What wonder? For it also sanctioned even the canons of Laodicea—in which those are denied to be canonical and are altogether forbidden even to be read—and it also approved even Apostolic Canons—in which three books of Maccabees are placed among canonical ones—although Carthage names only two and omits Wisdom, Judith, Tobit. And see indeed again and again, Durandus, lest you attribute too much to this council—by which our people hold Pope Honorius condemned as a heretic—since heresy can never fall upon a pope as you think.

But what Florence and Trent decreed is nothing for you to tell me—I who am moved by no authority of these councils.

But as you say, it is not obscure that for many centuries before Luther these books were received as canonical by all churches, as if after the decrees of the Councils of Carthage and Constantinople no Christian ever doubted them, just as they are accustomed to contend that after the judgment of the Church it is utterly wrong to judge otherwise—this indeed cannot be obscure to anyone, how rashly this is said by you. I, on the contrary, openly and truly affirm that these books were never at any time held as canonical and divine by the whole Church, which I will most clearly demonstrate with a few testimonies. After the Synod of Constantinople, John of Damascus lived and published his books on the Orthodox faith, in which he numbers no more than twenty-two books of the

Old Testament. He indeed praises the Wisdom of Solomon and the book of Jesus Sirach, but does not place them among the sacred writings. Concerning Tobit, Judith, and the histories of the Maccabees, he certainly does not mention a word. Hugh of St. Victor says that these books may indeed be read, but denies that they are written in the body of the text or in the canon of authority. Nicholas of Lyra states exactly the same about the apocryphal books, a man whom you know was learned, experienced in matters, and a son of the Roman Church. Cardinal Hugo must have great authority with you, unless Cardinals seem to you less Catholic or less wise than they ought. His verses are such as these: "There remain the Apocrypha: Jesus Sirach, Wisdom, Shepherd; and the books of Maccabees, Judith, and Tobit. Because they are doubtful, they are not numbered under the canon; but because they sing true things, the Church receives them." If you ask in what manner the Church receives these, let the Cardinal himself answer you: "The Church receives such," he says, "not for the proof of faith, but for the instruction of morals." But lest you think that only this Cardinal of the Roman Church held this opinion, you know that Cardinal Cajetan also is entirely on our side in this cause. From these writings of theirs, we clearly perceive that those books, which our Church declares to be apocryphal, have never up to now been held as canonical and sacred by the whole Church. I easily allow Cano and Catharinus to dispute with Cajetan; although there is no reason why I should not prefer one Cajetan to many Canos and Catharinuses. But it is well: Roman Cardinals testify that these books are not canonical; if they had been received as canonical by the whole Church, they certainly could not have been ignorant of it. But since not only they but also other most celebrated authors deny that these are canonical, how truly you have said that these were held as canonical by every single Church, all can now easily judge.

DURAEUS, Fol. 15-17.

That you say we equate apocryphal books and certain unwritten traditions with the sacred Scriptures of God—in this you are like yourself. And, as the old proverb goes, "An ape is always an ape." For to which heretics was it not formerly familiar to appeal to the written word of God alone? Following in the footsteps of the Fathers, we will rather obey Paul than you: "Stand fast," he says, "and hold the traditions which you have learned." So Tertullian, "On the Crown": "If no Scripture has determined this, certainly custom has confirmed it, which without

doubt flowed from tradition. Therefore we ask whether an unwritten tradition ought not to be received." And Basil, "On the Holy Spirit," chapter 27: "Some things we have from written doctrine, others again from apostolic tradition." And Augustine, "Against the Donatists," Book 5, chapter 26: "Let us return to the source, that is, to apostolic tradition." And Book 2, "On Baptism against the Donatists," speaking of not repeating baptism: "Which custom I believe came from apostolic tradition." And Book 10, "On Genesis to the Letter," chapter 23, on infant baptism: "Nor should it be believed at all unless it were apostolic tradition." Finally, to Januarius, Epistle 118: "Those things which we observe as not written but handed down, which indeed are observed throughout the whole world," etc. And to Casulanus: "In these matters, about which divine Scripture has determined nothing certain, the customs of the people of God or the institutions of our ancestors are to be held as law."

WHITAKER

If you deny that unwritten traditions are to be equated with sacred writings, Duraeus, you are neither like yourself nor like your own. For the Council of Trent receives and venerates traditions together with the books of the Old and New Testaments with equal piety and reverence. To what end then did your proverb about the ape look, unless that you judged those traditions of yours more suitable to apes than to Christians? But you say it was always familiar to all heretics to appeal to the written word of God alone. It was not. For how many heretics have appealed to certain secret writings and apocryphal books, do they sell light and silent traditions? Or do you not know how much the Manichaeans attributed to their founder Mani? Why should I mention others who despised the Scriptures and brought forward forged documents? And it has always been that familiar practice of you heretics, to refuse to rest in the Scriptures alone. "Take away from the heretics," says Tertullian, "what they have in common with the pagans, so that they may base their questions on the Scriptures alone, and they will not be able to stand." Therefore, to appeal to the Scriptures alone is not the mark of heretics, but of those who wish to overthrow and refute heretical questions.

Moreover, Paul, in whose footsteps I wish you would follow, by the name of "Tradition" signifies the doctrine delivered, which he first taught the Thessalonians by word, and afterwards by writing. This doctrine, explained in

words and writing, the Apostle commands the Thessalonians to hold, not to labor over uncertain little traditions. Tertullian, in his book *On Prescription*, sufficiently indicates that he is content with the Scriptures alone. For he says: "We have no need of curiosity after Christ Jesus, nor of inquiry after the Gospel. When we believe, we desire nothing beyond believing; for this we first believe, that there is nothing beyond which we ought to believe." Thus you see that when we first began to believe the Gospel, nothing else was desired to be believed. So indeed Tertullian wrote as a Catholic; but afterwards, having become a Montanist, he recounts many traditions from the teaching of that heresy. Although out of those so many traditions, about which he contends so greatly in his book *On the Crown of the Soldier*, your Church now retains none except one of signing with the cross. Indeed, you are a bad patron of the Roman Church, who introduce Tertullian the Montanist speaking for your traditions, and yet urge those traditions which the Roman Church long ago ceased to use.

But Erasmus thinks that Basil is corrupted in this place, which is the more believable because it is most clear that he himself elsewhere wrote entirely differently. For it reads: "It is a manifest falling away from the faith, and a crime of pride, either to keep silent about any of those things which are written, or to introduce any of those things which are not written." However the matter stands, your Church has long ago abrogated most of these traditions of Basil, which ought by no means to have been done if they were Apostolic.

Moreover, Augustine with what great gravity always defended the sufficiency of the Scriptures, so that he admitted nothing at all unless it could be approved by the authority of the Scriptures? For thus he replies to Petilian: "Let those things be removed from our midst which we recite against each other, not from the divine canonical books, but from elsewhere." But Apostolic Tradition in that place where he speaks of Cyprian, he calls doctrine delivered in Apostolic writings. And that baptism is not to be repeated is a pious and Apostolic Tradition, which is consistent with the Scriptures and can be confirmed from the Scriptures. Thus I confess that the baptism of infants is approved by Apostolic tradition, because there are most clear testimonies of Scripture by which we understand that Christian infants are to be baptized.

But those things which are observed everywhere undoubtedly have great weight; yet yours are not of this sort. For you can produce no Roman tradition which we

would disapprove if you prove that it has always been observed throughout the whole world. Finally, in middle matters, about which Scripture establishes nothing certain on either side, I grant that the custom of the people of God and the institutions of our elders are to be held in great regard. Yet we neither acknowledge you as the people of God nor venerate you as our elders.

This shall suffice for you as a response concerning Traditions in this place, in which there was no cause demanding that you say so many things about your traditions. Therefore we leave your Apes and Traditions to you, and we wish always to be content with the canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament alone, in which we do not doubt that the most perfect doctrine necessary for a Christian man in all parts of religion and salvation is most clearly taught.

DURÆUS, Fol. 18.

But we receive apocryphal books only as apocryphal. For unless those books, whose canonical authority we defend, are numbered among the canonical, by the same argument you ought to reject all the rest, since all are commended by the same Catholic Church authority. Why then do you boast so insolently? "If," you say, "you prove that any one book or any part of a book, which is known to have been written and fortified by divine authority, has been condemned by us, I do not oppose that we may seem to have lost our case completely." I accept the condition; I affirm that you have lost your case. For we prove that you reject not only parts of books but whole books—the Maccabees, Judith, Tobit, Esther, and others—by the same arguments by which Catholics once convicted heretics. For there is one voice of the Church, one Spirit, one authority.

WHITAKER

17. Those books which are established by the testimony of both the ancient and the modern church to be apocryphal, you hold as canonical, and propose them to the church for reading, not only for the instruction of morals, but even for the confirmation of faith and doctrine. Indeed, I have demonstrated by the opinions of so many celebrated authors and by such firm arguments from Scripture that this ought not to be done. Yet you object to me, I know not what voice of the church, which has commended these books. What church, pray tell, do you describe to us here? Were those many Fathers whom we have brought forward

as witnesses alien from the church, or ignorant of the voice of the church, or less able to report it to us? You say this voice of the church existed; they deny it. Shall I believe you and determine that they were in error? But those books which are truly canonical are confirmed by the testimony of that church in which they were written and of the churches that followed. For although some churches doubted for a time concerning certain books, nevertheless they were accepted by others as canonical, which cannot by any means be said of your apocryphal books, as it is clear that they have been rejected by every church. For those apocryphal books which pertain to the Old Testament were never received by the ancient churches of the Jews; and they were only permitted to be read in the churches of Christians for some usefulness of morals. Therefore I have most truly said that no book, no part of a book has been condemned by us which was established to have been written by divine authority. For you could never prove, even if you spent your whole life in this labor, that these books which we reject were written or supported by divine authority. Moreover, the ancient heretics who repudiated the canonical books were refuted by this argument: because they suddenly cast away in empty fury those books which the church both acknowledged from the beginning as written by divine inspiration and thereafter continually preserved as canonical. Thus Augustine refuted Faustus the Manichaeon. Now see whether this argument suits you: just as he argued that there should be no doubt about the Gospel of Matthew because from that time when Matthew himself lived on earth it was acknowledged and approved in the church, so you should show that the books of Wisdom, Judith, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, and Maccabees have always held authority in the church from the time they first came to light by a certain continuous succession. Unless you can prove this, you clamor in vain against us with the obscure voice of your church.

DURÆUS, Fol. 18.

And because you do not hesitate to appeal to one passage of Scripture, behold, I offer you not one but several. "Every spirit," says John, "that dissolves Jesus is not from God." These words the Nestorian heretics once expunged. (Socrates, Book 7, Chapter 32.) Where among you are these passages read? The greater passage which contains the story of the adulterous woman, which was removed from the codices by enemies of the faith deserving punishment for giving impunity for crime to their wives—Augustine testifies to this. Has not your Beza done the same in John chapter 8, where with remarkable impudence he says that

Eusebius, Chrysostom, and Theophylact cut out this history? There are also many other such instances, from which you may see how unfavorably such boasting of yours will turn out.

WHITAKER

18. Here you show yourself quite barren to us, so that all may perceive that a good cause was lacking to you.

No book of the Scriptures, no parts of books, no small portions have been rejected by us—so that you might teach how this is false and restrain my boasting, let us consider. You ask, moreover, where these things are read among us. "Every spirit that dissolves Jesus is not from God." Indeed, I confess I have never read it anywhere, nor do I judge it ought to be read. For these things are not read in the Greek copies, and if any error occurred here, we are by no means to be accused, who follow the most ancient authority of the books. Or do you dare to condemn all the Greek churches, which read differently and much better: "Every spirit that does not confess Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is not from God?" As if this were less effective for refuting Nestorius than what we read in the common edition: "Every spirit that dissolves Jesus." What will you decide about Cyprian, who followed our reading? What about Augustine, who presented both? But that is much more serious which you add concerning the story of the adulterous woman, which Augustine testifies was removed by certain ancients from their codices. What does that matter concern us, if some ancients removed this story? Shall we be guilty of this crime, who read this story in our books and churches? Here you tell us what Beza accomplished, as if it were any concern of ours what Beza judged about this story. And yet Beza did not remove this story from any book, as you can perceive from all the copies of Beza's translation. But this place seemed convenient enough for you to make some attack on Beza; thus you seize an opportunity, even if entirely unrelated, and say many things which hardly befit a modest young man. It is not necessary for me to respond on behalf of Beza, whose exceptional virtues are celebrated in all the churches of the saints and cannot be obscured by your slanders. Thus you have splendidly taught how unhappily my boasting has turned out for me.

DURAEUS, Fol. 19.

We freely ignore your hierarchies and multiple ranks of Angels; and we leave all this knowledge to you, to whom that Dionysius revealed these mysteries. I am not greatly surprised if, after you have taken it upon yourselves to abolish all order from the earth, with the same impudence you lift your faces to heaven and attempt to introduce a certain confused anarchy in heaven in place of the most holy hierarchy of Angels. But who is so foolish as not to prefer to trust Dionysius, the disciple of Paul, rather than Calvin or Beza or Luther?

WHITAKER.

I replied to Campianus concerning the Angels, which could have satisfied a modest man. For although we grant the patronage of Angels, as the Scriptures have handed down, yet we willingly ignore those Hierarchies of Angels, which that Dionysius, whoever he is, expounded and described with so many words, nor do we envy you that knowledge. Indeed, since that entire Dionysian description of the celestial regions and functions relies on no testimonies of Scripture, it may delight a curious mind, but it cannot establish the mind with firm faith and solid knowledge. When you ought to have overcome us with arguments, you judged us rather to be refuted by the petulance of words. You say you are not amazed if, after we have removed all order from the earth, we impudently lift our faces to heaven. And this indeed you say too vehemently. But what order have we removed? Set aside angry words, and accomplish what you set out to prove with arguments, not with curses. We maintain that order which Christ wished to be kept in His Church: other orders, which human ambition has introduced, however splendid and glorious, we indeed easily despise.

How then are we impudent towards heaven? Surely because for the Hierarchy of Angels we introduce confused anarchy in heaven. Do you say thus, Duraeus? Unless Dionysius had revealed those Hierarchies to us, it was to be feared that someone might think heaven is rashly moved, or Angels are held by no command, or all things flow away and are dissipated by anarchy? Suppose we grant there is a wonderful order of Angels, yet how shall we believe Dionysius, who was neither a Prophet nor an Apostle, nor an author known to ancient men, since no Father mentions him before Gregory? Irenaeus wrote much more modestly concerning the state of Angels than that Dionysius, for he says: "Let them tell us what is the nature of the invisible beings, let them recount the number of Angels, and the order of Archangels, let them show forth the

mysteries of Thrones, and teach the diversities of Dominions, Principalities, Powers, and Virtues. But they cannot say." But our Dionysius revealed all these things, if we wish to give him credit, which however Irenaeus thought could not be narrated. But he was (you say) a disciple of Paul: therefore we ought to believe him rather than Calvin, Beza, Luther. But we give very much faith to those who most clearly demonstrate what they teach by the authority of Scriptures. Therefore we do not heed Dionysius speaking without Scriptures, and we shall always prefer those who bring forth Scriptures to all Dionysiuses narrating their dreams. But how do you persuade that this was a disciple of Paul? For do not think that we can be fed on fables any longer. Why indeed did not Paul himself announce these mysteries to us, who caught up into the third heaven saw and heard much more than this Dionysius? If Paul the Master kept silent about those things, why did this disciple divulge them? But this one was never a disciple of Paul, as can easily be understood if we compare his books with Paul's: but more about this Pseudo-Dionysius will be said elsewhere.

DURAEUS, Fol. 19.

Paul (you say) condemns the worship of Angels. If only you had learned to interpret the Scriptures not according to your own judgment, but by the judgment of the Catholic Church, and from Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Theodoret, and other Fathers, you would have understood what kind of Angel worship Paul prohibits here. Namely, that which your father Simon Magus introduced into the world, who taught that sacrifices should be offered to Angels and that they are our mediators, because you thought the office of mediator not sufficiently fitting to the majesty of Christ. You add then: John an Angel once and again called back from this kind of worship. What? Do you think John was so rude and ignorant of divine worship that, unless the Angel had forbidden it, he would have committed the gravest crime of idolatry? The Apostle was indeed very far from all crime of idolatry, but by that act of his he then represented the person of those who thought Angels should be adored as Gods and worshipped with offered sacrifices; because he feared for himself (he says), in prophetic manner he taught that God alone is to be worshipped with this highest honor.

WHITAKER.

I have learned that Scriptures are not to be accommodated to the judgment of any one Church, but the interpretation of all churches is to be required from the Scriptures. For interpretations of Scripture are not to be measured from human thoughts, but are to be taken from the Scriptures themselves, which indeed abundantly interpret themselves if we ourselves show ourselves attentive and teachable. But no interpretation pleases you except that which your Church has taught you; hence it is less surprising that most of those interpretations which you bring forth are such that nothing more alien from the mind of the Holy Spirit can be imagined. Paul clearly prohibits the worship of Angels. Who can interpret this otherwise than to confess that all worship of Angels is forbidden by Paul? You call me back to the judgment of your Church. But your Church teaches that Angels are to be worshipped, whom Paul forbade me to worship. And why indeed do I need the judgment of your Church? As if nothing can be known unless your Church is first consulted. That is just as if the Lord had delivered His Scriptures to all, but had placed the sense of the Scriptures with the Roman pontiff. For I am not unaware within how narrow limits you circumscribe the judgment of the Catholic Church. Epiphanius indeed you...

You mention Chrysostom and Oecumenius; but when these men interpret the Scriptures differently than your pontiff wishes, then their judgment is denied to be Catholic. Thus, in the end, nothing is Catholic except what is known to please the pontiff. I say these are private interpretations, not Catholic ones; and there is no reason why anyone should be bound more to the judgment of the Roman pontiff than to that of Luther or any doctor of the Church. But how do your Fathers interpret Paul in this passage? Indeed, they condemn (if we believe you) the worship which consists in offering sacrifices. So this will be Paul's meaning: "One must not worship angels," that is, one must not offer sacrifices to angels as mediators. This is your Catholic sense: although angels are continually worshiped and adored by us, yet unless we sacrifice victims to them and make them new mediators, we sin in nothing. But Paul said not a word about sacrifices; he condemned all worship of angels.

Moreover, what kind of argument is this? The Fathers teach that sacrifices are not to be offered to angels as certain mediators; therefore, they grant that angels are to be invoked. Indeed, neither sacrifices nor prayers should be made to angels, because both are owed to God alone. Christ says: "When you pray, say: Our Father who art in heaven." Therefore, God alone, who is our heavenly

Father, is to be invoked by us in prayers. And the prophet David: "Offer to God a sacrifice of praise." And Hosea: "Take away all iniquity, and receive good, and we will render the calves of our lips." And the Apostle: "Through him let us offer a sacrifice of praise always to God, that is, the fruit of lips confessing his name." From these we understand that our sacrifices of prayers and thanksgivings are to be offered to God alone. Therefore, those who invoke and pray to angels, the Apostle here condemned no less than Simon Magus, who worshiped angels with sacrifices.

Moreover, that you say Chrysostom and Oecumenius interpret these words concerning Simon, I find nothing of the sort in them. Chrysostom interprets Paul piously, whose interpretation I willingly embrace. Chrysostom says: "There are some who say one ought not to approach God through Christ, but through angels—for that is too great for us to attain." So Oecumenius from Photius: "There were some who, under a pretense of humility, forbade them to approach by the gift of Christ, as if unworthy of such great things, and said one ought to use angels as advocates, who lead us to God." Thus you flee to angels and saints with a certain excuse of humility and unworthiness, so that they may commend you to God and render him propitious to you. Therefore, Paul teaches that all worship of angels is impious, and the ancient Church judged those who worshiped angels to be heretics.

But you interpret the second passage even more unworthily and ignorantly when you follow your Catholic interpretation—which I am so far from thinking is Catholic that I easily believe it has never occurred to anyone's mind except yours. John wished to adore an angel; the angel did not permit him. What do you say? Do you think John so rude that he would have committed the crime of idolatry? I do not think so, Durandus. Yet I see that John, overcome by the splendor and majesty of the angel, gave more honor and reverence to the angel than was proper; in this I acknowledge the weakness of human nature. Now let us hear your Catholic interpretation. You say: "John in this act assumed the person of those who thought angels were to be adored as gods and worshiped with offered sacrifices." Did John then also offer a sacrifice to this angel? That would have had to be done if he had assumed the person of those men who thought angels should be worshiped with sacrifices. But who could bear with equanimity the foolishness of this interpretation? As if it were not much better taught in words not to make sacrifices to angels than could be done by such a

pretense; or as if anyone would think John did something feignedly and hypocritically! He says: "I fell down to adore." You on the contrary deny that he fell down to adore. Augustine rightly says to Jerome in a similar case: "If we admit even the slightest lie in the Scriptures, we overthrow the authority of all Scripture." And when the angel commanded John not to do so and added the reason—"For I am your fellow servant, and of your brothers the prophets, and of those who keep the words of this book; worship God"—it sufficiently indicates that John did something which ought not to have been done, and most clearly teaches that angels are not to be adored by any pious persons because they are fellow servants of the pious, and all adoration is due to God alone.

For me, to this interpretation so certain and born from the very words, it will suffice to have added the testimony of your own Thomas. Thus he wrote on this passage: "I fell at his feet to adore him," namely with the adoration of *dulia*, to give thanks to him and show him reverence. Again in chapter 22: "I fell down to adore," namely with the adoration of *latria*. If neither *latria* nor *dulia* is to be given to angels, then angels are in no way to be worshiped. Thus I do not regret that I never learned to interpret the Scriptures in your manner.

DVRÆVS, Fol. 20.

The book of Tobit, which you call sacred scripture, is cited by those whose authority we consider most weighty and to be preferred over your levity. And to omit Augustine, Chrysostom, and Innocent, Cyprian confirmed a most serious matter by bringing forth testimony from the book of Tobit: that marriages with unbelievers are not to be contracted (Epistle 52, On Mortality, On the Good of Patience, On Works and Alms). Irenaeus numbers Tobit among the prophets who were treated with insult by the Gnostics (Book 1, Chapter 24). Hilary proved the intercession of angels from Tobit 12. Ambrose wrote a whole book on Tobit. Isidore says that the Church honors and proclaims this book among the divine scriptures (Isidore, Etymologies, Book 6, Chapter 1). He followed the judgment of Jerome, who stated that although this book is not held in the canon (he means the canon of the Jews), it is nevertheless used by ecclesiastical men (Preface to the Commentary on Jonah). When you reject Tobit, you certainly condemn your Anglican synagogues of impious superstition, for in their very divine worship they not infrequently read this book.

WHITAKERVS.

21. You try to persuade us with many testimonies that the book of Tobit ought to be placed among the canonical scriptures, yet these amount to only one argument, very weak and hardly worthy of any response. For you argue thus: The ancient Fathers cited the book of Tobit; therefore, it necessarily follows that the book of Tobit is canonical. But it cannot be inferred from the fact that the Fathers took some testimonies from this book that the book itself is canonical, unless it is first established that any book from which the Fathers produce some testimony must be numbered among the divine and canonical scriptures. Yet the Fathers cited the books of Esdras, which the Roman Church and that most recent Council of Trent left among the Apocrypha—Cyprian, Augustine, Ambrose in a serious matter, such as teaching that souls do not die along with bodies, and others. Now if your argument holds, I too will be permitted to conclude in favor of the authority of these books: Whatever books are cited by the Fathers are canonical; the third and fourth books of Esdras are cited by the Fathers; therefore they are canonical. Furthermore, Jerome testifies that many ancient writers used testimonies from the book of Hermes, which your Church has not yet included in the number of these books. But why should I try to refute this argument with arguments? Who does not know that your Thomas uses testimonies from Dionysius, the ancient Fathers, and philosophers everywhere? In this, indeed, who does not see how you fight with yourself when you contend that the book of Tobit is canonical by the judgments of Irenaeus, Cyprian, and Hilary, and yet you previously said that these books were not yet received into the canon in Jerome's time—and you responded to me when I brought forth Jerome. But here you affirm that they were held as canonical in the age of the more ancient Fathers. Thus it is sufficiently manifest that you have nothing certain and settled in which to rest, which can be made clearer even from this passage. For although above you could not deny that these books were plainly rejected by Jerome, now you wish us to be persuaded that Jerome was speaking only of the canon of the Jews—which anyone who has once examined Jerome will most easily perceive to be false. For thus he explains the judgment of the Church concerning all the Apocrypha when he writes about the books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus: "Therefore, just as the Church reads the books of Judith and Tobit and Maccabees but does not receive them among the canonical scriptures, so let it read these two volumes for the edification of the people, not for confirming the authority of ecclesiastical dogmas." Therefore, Jerome does not exclude these books from

He excluded not only the books of the Jews, as you say, but also those from the sincere Canon of the Catholic Christian Church. And elsewhere, Jerome says: "The Church does not acknowledge the Apocrypha; therefore, we must return to the Hebrews, from whom both the Lord speaks and the disciples take examples." Moreover, we have previously said enough about the Apocryphal books, from which we have confirmed our judgment concerning those books. It is not now necessary to speak of each one separately, although there is none that cannot be detected by some judgment of its own.

For what kind of thing is this that we read in the book of Tobit: that demons are driven away by the smoke of the heart and liver, and blindness is cured by applying gall? Who among the Prophets or Apostles ever taught that demons should be cast out in this manner? Paul described the whole armor of the Christian man, with which protected, we are not overcome by any powers of demons. But this marvelous weapon, with which Tobias repelled that demon, he never commended to us. There are many such things which scarcely reflect the divine majesty and spirit of the Scriptures.

To say nothing for now of that Raphael falsely claiming to be Azariah and the son of Hananiah—something good angels never do. But as for the English Churches, which you insultingly call synagogues, they do indeed read some of these books, but they do not acknowledge them as canonical. In your churches as well, the lives of the saints are read with solemn ritual, yet who now doubts that these are filled with endless falsehoods, fables, and more than old-womanish superstition?

DURAEUS, Fol. 21.

I am little concerned about the passage from Ecclesiasticus, nor would I believe in the freedom of the will, although he affirms it a hundred times here. That Stoic fate has so deeply influenced your soul's judgments that you deem nothing worthy of scriptural honor that seems to openly approve the freedom of the will. Yet allow us to appeal from your tribunal to other judges: Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, Innocent I, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and others of that kind—to say nothing of the Third Council of Carthage and the Council of Florence.

Truly, your censure adds a weighty reason: Scripture teaches that man's freedom was lost in sin; the Holy Fathers teach it; each person's own experience teaches it. Excellent: but I answer you in just as many words: "Neither does Scripture teach it, nor the Fathers, nor anyone's experience." But how ridiculous is this? Those words can be understood concerning the human race, such as it once was in Adam. Unless a blind love of fate hinders you, you would easily see that this author brought forward the condition of the first man as an argument to confirm free will in us. "If you will," he says, "keep the commandments, they will keep you; and he has set before you water and fire," etc.

WHITAKER.

I assign to the book of Ecclesiasticus only as much value as the ancient Church felt should be assigned to it, so that although I acknowledge many excellent precepts of conduct in it, I nevertheless understand sufficiently that no foundation of faith is to be sought from it. Therefore, when the freedom of human will is debated, what kind and how great it is, I maintain can be learned and judged not from any opinion of this book, but only from the authority of canonical Scripture. Yet I did not say, as you introduce me saying, that I do not believe in the freedom of the will, however many times it affirms it here, but rather, however many times it affirms here that "life and death are before men," you cut off my words to make the opinion seem harsher. For this author neither a hundred times nor once affirmed our will to be free. As for fate, which you interpose, it is so irrelevant that it is not even on the subject. I reject fate and that entire fatal assertion of the Stoics as contrary to divine providence and power, nor has that opinion ever been sown in my mind, much less taken deep roots, as you say. But why do you pour forth speech devoid of reason in vain? For is it a consequence that if we say a carnal man, not yet endowed with faith and the Holy Spirit, can will nothing from himself that is truly good and agreeable to the divine will, we seem to uphold and defend the Stoic fate? For if because unregenerate men cannot act well and necessarily act badly, therefore all things happen by fate: then because angels necessarily act well and demons necessarily act badly, we shall bind the free providence of God by fate. Men can freely perform those common and civil actions; they lack only that freedom of will which pertains to the duties of faith, because before the Son freed them, they are slaves to sin. Therefore, your fate has nothing to do here, unless perhaps you think we become good by fate; and you must first persuade us of the Stoic fate

before this argument of yours: "Men before faith cannot will, or desire, or accomplish anything pleasing to God; therefore all things are by fate," is shown to be well and properly concluded. But here you appeal from my tribunal to judges who nevertheless pronounce no judgment in your favor. I shall drag you from the tribunal back to the schools and demand that you prove this argument to me: "Cyprian, Clement, and other ancient Fathers used testimonies from this book; therefore this book is canonical." For the Fathers also use testimonies from other books which you yourselves never say are canonical, as I have taught above, from which it is clear that this citation of books has no force of argument. Moreover, I added a sufficiently weighty reason for my judgment, why I should not believe in the freedom of human will from the authority of this book: because Scripture teaches that man's freedom was lost through sin, the Fathers testify to it, and each person's own experience confirms it. You deny all these things in so many words without reason. I shall satisfy you concerning my reasoning. The Apostle says: "The natural man does not perceive the things that are of the Spirit of God, nor can he understand them." From these I construct an argument thus: If a man endowed only with natural powers and faculties cannot perceive and know the things that are of the Spirit of God—that is, in which eternal life and salvation consist—then much less can he will them or accomplish them, since will follows understanding. But the antecedent is true if we believe the Apostle; therefore the consequent is also true. Thus the Apostle writes elsewhere: "It is God who works in us both to will and to do according to His good pleasure." But if no one can will or accomplish anything unless God has embraced them with His gratuitous good pleasure and His mercy, and works in them so that they can will, then it is clear that the rest, in whom He works no such thing and whom no mercy follows, can will or do nothing good. God Himself has openly judged concerning man's will—whose judgment you ought to be content with: "Every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart is only evil continually." If whatever he thinks, he always thinks evilly, what freedom of good will does he have before he is renewed by faith and the Holy Spirit? When you have skillfully resolved these arguments for me—which I know you will never do—I shall propose others to you; meanwhile it will suffice that you have refuted these.

I shall not bring forth many Fathers: Augustine says: "For by using free will badly, man both lost himself and lost free will itself." Ambrose most clearly: "Although

it is in man's power not to will good, yet unless he is given it, he does not have the power to will good: and nature contracted this through fault; nature receives it through grace." Bernard piously: "Therefore it is by the grace of God that we are created, sanctified, and saved." What shall I say about experience? Though you tell me your experience a thousand times, I have nevertheless learned from Scripture that human nature is such that I listen to no voice of experience which attributes so much freedom and power to an unregenerate will. Moreover, I say these words of this author can be understood concerning that first state of man's integrity and concerning the whole human race as it was in Adam before sin. That seems ridiculous to you, which I am not at all concerned about. Therefore let us analyze the passage itself. Thus concerning the first man: "He Himself from the beginning made man and left him in the hand of his own counsel; He added commandments and precepts." These are what he explains shortly: "If you will keep the commandments, they shall keep you." For if Adam had obeyed God's commandments, he would have remained safe forever. "And He set before you water and fire; stretch forth your hand to whichever you will. Before man are life and death, good and evil; whichever pleases him shall be given to him." These are undoubtedly to be understood concerning Adam, to whom those commandments and precepts were given. For to Adam He offered water and fire, life and death, and gave him a choice so that he might choose whichever he wished. Laugh as much as you will—although it would be more fitting for a theologian and a Jesuit to argue than to laugh. But even if we grant that this son of Sirach spoke about free will, we shall affirm nothing worthy of your laughter. For he also erred elsewhere when he said that true Samuel prophesied after he had fallen asleep, raised his voice from the earth, and showed the king his death. For the souls of saints are not subject to the evocations and exorcisms of sorcerers because immediately upon leaving their bodies they are transferred to a certain and perpetual peace and placed in Abraham's bosom, from which they cannot be drawn out by any witchcraft.

DVRÆV S, Fol.21-22.

I care less about the book of Maccabees which you add, which Epiphanius, Jerome, Athanasius, and Cyprian rejected; this should be counted among your other falsehoods. For these books have never been repudiated by any Church. And to omit Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Innocent, Augustine says that the books of Maccabees are held as canonical not by the Jews, but by

the Church (De Civitate Dei, Book 18, Chapter 6). However, they were not received into the canon by the Jews because it was their custom that no book of scripture should be ascribed to the canon unless some prophet had approved it. But Christians ought to depend on the judgment of the Catholic Church.

You say that the Jews were not commanded, nor was it their custom, to offer sacrifices and prayers for the dead. But who does not know that this religious custom of praying for the dead was once, and even now is, most celebrated among the Jews? Unless perhaps you are unaware that even today the book Machzor exists among the Jews, etc.

Finally, you conclude: "There is such confusion of words in the Greek exemplar that you can scarcely draw out the complete and true meaning." It is well that it is scarcely possible; let it be so. But as for you promising Campianus a better opinion of his own erudition if he conveniently renders that passage for you, what else do you do but expose your own ignorance to the Academics? Behold for you what the Holy Spirit wrote through that author: "ποιησάμενός τε καὶ τακσευάζματα κατὰ ἀνδρολογίαν," etc. What here is not clear?

WHITAKER.

Before I address those points in which I differ from you here, I will briefly demonstrate that the authority of these books is not canonical and sacrosanct. Moreover, many arguments can be drawn from the books themselves, so that none need be sought from elsewhere. The Holy Spirit never condescends to abridge the books of a profane author and compose epitomes from them. Yet the second book of Maccabees is entirely woven from the five volumes of Jason of Cyrene, as we understand from the author's own confession.

Next, there are many *autopiai*—so certain and manifest—in the second and first books, that they cannot be concealed by any plausible defense. In the first book, Judas is said to have been killed by the army of Bacchides in the 152nd year of the Seleucid reign; but in the second book, he writes letters in the 188th year—thirty-six years after he died. Concerning the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, the first book does not agree with the second. For in the first, Antiochus, seized by illness, appoints Philip over the kingdom and establishes him as guardian for his son Antiochus, and dies in his bed. But in the second, he is stoned to death in the temple of Nanea. And yet in that same book, another death of the same

Antiochus is also narrated, from a most loathsome disease. He must have been a monster, whom so many deaths could scarcely take life from. But the Holy Spirit never fights against itself.

Finally, whoever wrote these books acknowledges his own inadequacy and asks for pardon, from which it can sufficiently be judged that this book was composed by a human spirit, not a divine one. For the Holy Spirit never uses such an excuse, nor does it fail to achieve what it intended, nor does it write meagerly and thinly.

Now I come to your points. And that I said these books were rejected by Jerome, Epiphanius, Athanasius, and Cyprian is manifest from the very words of these Fathers, which we have previously cited. Yet you affirm that they were repudiated by no Church. What? Not even by the ancient Jewish Church? That, I think, you will by no means say. But why did that Church, which was the true Church of God, repudiate these books if they were canonical? It would have committed a monstrous crime if it had rejected the sacred scriptures of God and truly canonical books.

If you mean the Christian Church, I have refuted that with most illustrious testimonies as well. And so that you may clearly perceive that your cause is poorly defended by you, I will refute you with the authority of the Roman pontiff himself. That Gregory the Great denies that the books of Maccabees are canonical. For he writes thus clearly and distinctly: "Therefore we do not act improperly if we bring forth testimony from books that are indeed not canonical, but yet are brought forward for the edification of the Church." Then he narrates the death of Eleazar from the second book of Maccabees. You can desire no more august and ample testimony. The Roman pontiff himself declared openly in his own words that the books of Maccabees are not canonical.

Why do you now throw Tertullian, Cyprian, and others at me, who merely cited certain testimonies from these books? But Gregory also cited them, and yet he plainly confesses that they are not canonical. "But Augustine," you say, "calls them canonical." "But Gregory," I say, "who lived two hundred years after Augustine, denies that they are canonical." Which you prefer to which I leave for you to deliberate.

And what Augustine meant is not difficult to judge. For he calls them canonical not because he thought them equal to the sacred and truly canonical books, but because they are read in the churches of Christians for piety of life and morals, and are not utterly rejected as in the Jewish Church. For thus he writes: "The reckoning of their times is found not in the holy scriptures, which are called canonical, but in others, among which are also the books of Maccabees; which not the Jews, but the Church holds as canonical, on account of the sufferings—vehement and wonderful—of certain martyrs." Thus first he denies that they are holy and canonical scriptures; then he writes that they are held as canonical—that is, of such a kind as are read in the Church.

This will be even clearer from other words of Augustine: "The scripture of Maccabees," he says, "is received by the Church not without profit if it is read or heard soberly, especially on account of those Maccabees." Would Augustine have spoken thus if he believed this book to be truly canonical? "It is received not without profit if read soberly, on account of this or that."

Moreover, when you teach why the Jews did not receive these books at all, you yourself undermine all their authority. For if—as you confess—the Jews had no prophet for many years before these books were written, then you confirm by your own judgment that these books are not canonical. For those who produced canonical books had both illustrious authority and doctrine attested and approved by divine testimony. But these books were neither written by prophets nor approved by prophets; therefore they can have no certain and divine authority.

Indeed, Christians ought to depend on the judgment of the Catholic Church. First, the Catholic Church can never make canonical books from non-canonical ones; second, the Catholic Church never at any time judged these books to be canonical—and this we have proven with nearly countless testimonies. Therefore, you in vain claim the judgment of the Church for this cause. I truly labor little over the book Machzor, nor do I say that Jews now pray for the dead. For I know they have memorial books, which they read in their synagogues, and I am not unaware that they now customarily use certain prayers for the dead. Thus, it was not necessary for you to confirm with such great effort something about which I had no doubt. For these are my words: "Nor was it commanded to the Jews, nor established as a custom, that they should offer sacrifices and

prayers for the dead." You see that I spoke thus concerning the ancient Jews, to whom it was neither commanded nor established as a custom to offer prayers and sacrifices for the dead. Since all kinds of sacrifices, even of the smallest matters, are so diligently recorded in the law of the Lord, yet this sacrifice for the dead is nowhere read as instituted or commended. From which it may seem incredible either that Judas, being such a pious man, would have ordained a sacrifice of this kind, or that the priests would have wished to approve it. As for the disordered composition of words—whether I have written correctly or not—I readily allow the learned reader to judge. But I am not at all surprised that the sentence structure seems clear and straightforward to you, who have made such great progress in Greek studies as our academics can scarcely hope for. However, to attribute to you as much knowledge of the Greek language as you yourself claim—this I will do, I hope, without my own loss or inconvenience.

DURAVUS, Fol. 23.

You say that I pass over the dream of Judas concerning Onias as if it were a mere dream. So much has preconceived hatred led you astray that you neither see many things revealed in divine scriptures through dreams, nor call this dream worthy of faith despite that scripture which so many and such great Fathers held as canonical relating it, nor consider the minds of the Jews uplifted divinely by the narration of this dream. Therefore, to you deriders of divine things, this dream may seem vain; but to the Jews of old, certainly faithful, to whom the invocation of saints was so familiar that they called upon Christ as Elijah when He said, "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani," and to the holy Church and Fathers, who always approved their intercession, it appeared most full of faith and religion.

WHITAKER.

I hear the accusation, but I see no argument. For is it necessary that one who denies that the saints should be invoked does so out of hatred for the saints? Although I worship one God and acknowledge no saints, I willingly leave to you this multitude of saints to be venerated and invoked, since so many saints have long left you with no God at all. Now, to prove that dream of Judas, let us briefly examine it. First, that you deny I see many things in the divine scriptures revealed through dreams—I am not so blind, Duraeus, as to fail to see that. But here I perceive no force of solid reasoning. What if many things were revealed to

the prophets through dreams? Does it therefore follow that I must accept as divine testimony every dream recorded in the Apocryphal books? For you will never prove this book to be canonical, which so many Fathers, both ancient and recent, such invincible arguments, and the constant tradition declare and persuade to have always been and now to be Apocryphal. What if the narration of this dream somewhat strengthened the spirits of the Jews? In war, there are many things that can move and excite the soldiers' spirits so that they come eagerly to battle. But this is a weak argument: the Jews, hearing the dream of Judas, conceived hope of a good victory; therefore, this dream confirms by divine testimony that the saints should be invoked so that they may make vows for us. For here they invoke neither Onias nor Jeremiah, but turn themselves to the one God.

But that which you add is undoubtedly most elegant: the Jews thought Christ called upon Elijah when he said, "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani?" Therefore, the invocation of the saints was formerly familiar to the Jews. If this invocation of the dead was so familiar to the Jews, I wonder that no mention of it exists either in the Old or New Testament. For here the Jews say Elijah is called upon by Christ, not because it was their custom to invoke either Elijah or any other dead person, but because they wished to mock and insult Christ more insolently; so that when he cried out to his God, they said, with cruel derision, that Elijah was now being invoked by him, as if, forsaken by God, he had fled to Elijah. By these arguments, the papal invocation of dead men is defended; if they perhaps seem insufficiently firm to anyone, it is necessary to bear it with patience. For this cause does not yield better ones. But I will respond to your Fathers next, when you bring them forward.

DURÆUS, Fol. 24-25.

You say that Jerome testifies that Baruch is neither read nor held among the Hebrews. What then? Have you not yet learned, I believe, that the prophecy of Baruch was considered by the ancient writers as a certain part of Jeremiah, as Augustine could have taught you in Book 18, Chapter 33 of *The City of God*? I omit other Fathers who attribute no less authority to this book than to the writings of Jeremiah. As to why we do not number the two later books of Ezra in the Canon, I answer in one word: because the Catholic Church never received these books. I am glad you number Esther among the canonical books; I wonder

that you immediately add: "as much as is written in Hebrew is of divine authority." As if canonical scripture and the rule of divine authority ought to be held in the Hebrew language alone. It is of the same impiety that you do not deem those chapters of Daniel worthy of sacred honor. You either shamefully ignore or maliciously conceal what Origen once replied to Julius Africanus doubting the credibility of this history. But you refer us to Jerome. Read—you say—what Jerome has in the preface to Daniel. I, to return like for like, bid you read what the same Jerome replied to Rufinus when he brought the same calumny against him in Book 2 of the *Apology*. Nor indeed did Jerome alone approve these chapters, but Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostom, and other Church Fathers. What of the fact that not even Josephus passed over these as unworthy of credit in Book 10, Chapter 12?

WHITAKER.

Indeed, concerning the book of Baruch, the words of Jerome are clear: "The book of Baruch his scribe, which among the Hebrews is neither read nor held, we have omitted." It suffices for you to have responded to Jerome, "What then after that?" For do you not perceive how great a crime of either negligence or audacity it would have been, if Jerome had omitted the book of Baruch, if it were any part of Jeremiah? But Jerome omitted this book; therefore, without any controversy, he thought it was no part of Jeremiah. Although in Latin codices the book of Baruch is joined with the prophecy of Jeremiah, yet we cannot be led by any reasons to think that this book is either a part of Jeremiah or in any way equal to it. For if either Jeremiah or Baruch himself had written this book, each would certainly have done so in Hebrew, not in Greek or Latin. But Jerome testifies that the book of Baruch is neither read nor held at all among the Hebrews; therefore, neither Baruch nor Jeremiah nor indeed any prophet wrote it. But if Baruch, whose book it is said to be, did not write this prophecy, by whom then should we think it was composed and published? But here you present your old argument again: Augustine, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Basil, and other Fathers sometimes use testimonies from this book; therefore, the whole book itself is canonical. I have often responded to you that the canonical authority of books is not proven by the citation of these passages. For then it follows not only that those two books of Ezra ought to be held as canonical, but also that others should be admitted into this number, which yet even you yourselves will not concede to be canonical. But do you not know that the Apostle Jude in his Epistle cited a

testimony from an apocryphal book? Thus your Aquinas writes: "But the book from which he took this testimony is apocryphal." You a little later: "It is permitted to take testimonies of truth from apocryphal books." Now therefore what remains, except that by your argument and judgment we establish this book as canonical, which yet all antiquity has deservedly rejected until now? For I do not think you will attribute less to the Apostle than to the Fathers, so that if the Apostle could cite an apocryphal book, you may also admit that the Fathers could. And your Church ought not to have rejected these two apocryphal books of Ezra, if books cited by the Fathers are all canonical; for the Fathers also cited these, as we said above. But your defense is never consistent. For when you concede that these books, which our Church rightly numbers among the apocrypha, were not held as canonical before the time of Jerome, yet you adduce Cyprian, Eusebius, and Clement of Alexandria, from whose citation you persuade that these books are canonical.

You congratulate us concerning the book of Esther, and yet you wonder what I mean when I say that only what is written in Hebrew is of divine authority; then you ask whether the Hebrew language ought to be held as the rule for canonical scripture and divine authority. I in turn ask whether you think any book can be numbered among the New Testament scriptures which is known to have been written in Latin? Nor yet do you make the Greek language for that reason the rule of canonical scripture. But those additions which are attached to the book of Esther are neither written in Hebrew, like the rest, nor do they agree sufficiently with them, which without doubt are canonical. To bring one example for many: we read in the true history that Haman was an Agagite; but the Agagites were by descent Amalekites; yet those apocryphal additions call him a Macedonian. But I would like you to teach me how one who is an Agagite can be a Macedonian. But those three spurious chapters of Daniel—if it is impious not to honor them with the dignity of sacred scripture, certainly Jerome was impious, who not only rejected all those things but also held them as fables and slew them with his own spit. For thus Jerome says: "Which among the Hebrews has neither the history of Susanna, nor the hymn of the three youths, nor the fables of Bel and the Dragon; which we, because they are scattered throughout the whole world, have placed under our spit and slain." Moreover, what Julius Africanus doubted, I read in Eusebius; what Origen answered him, I do not find. Nor indeed does it matter at all what excellent meanings Origen

observed in the book of Susanna. Here now when I bring forth Jerome, you object Jerome to me as like for like. But is this to respond to Jerome—to thrust upon me another opinion from Jerome? But I can easily reconcile Jerome with Jerome. For when he was accused by Rufinus because he had called those writings fables, in order to avoid the odium of this word, he replied that he had not so thought himself but had explained what the Hebrews were accustomed to say. For concerning those books Jerome certainly never changed his opinion; but because he saw that they were read in some churches by a certain custom, he did not wish to seem to condemn them as fables and utterly reject them, especially since his enemy Rufinus had objected for this reason, by whom he understood he was being dragged into hatred by every means. Although it cannot be denied that Jerome answered cunningly—as Erasmus cleverly noted—since from the very Preface it clearly appears that he so thought. Concerning Jerome I have now retorted many things to you; nor do you expect me to respond again to that worn-out and indeed bad argument of yours, which I have refuted so many times. For even if you demonstrate a hundred times that these passages are cited by the Fathers, yet you will have accomplished nothing less than vindicating their authority. Why you mention Josephus, I do not know—unless to inflict some wound upon yourself. For since he professes that he will narrate only those things which are prescribed in the Hebrew volumes, he sufficiently indicates what he judged about the other books.

DVRÆVS, Fol. 26.

Indeed, it troubles you greatly that Campian follows the opinion of Augustine. You respond, however, that the canonical books are called by Augustine those which are not full of lies and fables. O excellent interpreter of Augustine! This alone was lacking to your sharpness: that you prove your subtle interpretation with no testimony from him. But what you bring forward from Cajetan—that these canonical books were called by certain councils and Augustine such because a rule of morals, not doctrine, could be derived from them—is truly too weak. For I have said above how much weight that opinion on the canon of Scripture holds among Catholics. You have read (I believe) what Melchior Canus long ago replied to him in Book 2, Chapter 11. Again, you run into Augustine. What Augustine so greatly contends (you say)—that the book of Wisdom ought by no means to be thrust out of the canon—let Augustine see to that himself. Jerome specifically thrust out this book. These I call all Academics. A little

before, you wrote that Jerome does not at all disagree with Augustine in fact and judgment; now you say that Augustine placed the book of Wisdom in the canon, but Jerome specifically thrust it out. How these things agree, I do not sufficiently see. You, who like another Gorgias seem to know nothing as an Academic, if you can, explain it.

WHITAKER.

I have explained Augustine's opinion so easily and conveniently that you might think it was not very troublesome to me. Nor indeed, if Augustine had said something that contradicted us in this matter, should I have been troubled by it, since I have so many other arguments at hand, by which the judgment of Augustine alone could not be an obstacle. I do not deny that those books which are considered Apocryphal in our churches are called canonical by Augustine. What then? Did Augustine depart from so many churches and Fathers who deny that those books are canonical? Or if Augustine thought these books canonical, shall we prefer his opinion to the judgments of so many ancient, equal, and more recent authorities? One should not outweigh so many Fathers of all ages. But there is no reason why we should suspect Augustine to differ from the others. For he calls those books canonical which can be read in Christian churches, so that from them documents of virtue and examples of piety may be taken, as we have shown above. For thus Augustine opposes canonical to apocryphal: but he calls apocryphal not as Jerome does—those which can be read in churches for the edification of the people, not for the confirmation of ecclesiastical doctrines—but those which are filled with many falsehoods, as is clear from Augustine himself. For you wish to be taught which book Augustine calls apocryphal. Hear Augustine himself speaking: "In the apocryphal books, even if some truth is found, nevertheless because of many falsehoods there is no canonical authority." And in another place: "The Manichaeans read apocryphal scriptures," which he understands concerning certain fictitious writings.

Now that you call me an excellent interpreter of Augustine, I do not fear that I cannot defend this interpretation and prove it to all learned men; and I have now confirmed it with Augustine's testimony, so that you may understand that this acuteness is not lacking in me. And that this was Augustine's mind can be learned from the very passage in which he enumerates the canonical books. For when he holds this rule in canonical scriptures, that we prefer those which are

accepted by all Catholic churches to those which some do not accept, it is sufficiently manifest even by his judgment that there are some books about which it was permitted not only to doubt but even to reject them as less canonical. For if Augustine had thought all were of such faith and authority as the Prophetic and Apostolic writings are, he would never have left it free to the reader to follow the prejudice of this or that church, but would have established that all were to be received without any controversy or doubt.

But you, as I see, are somewhat troubled because Cardinal Cajetan so openly opposes you, a Cardinal of the Roman Church, whom because you can in no way interpret according to your sense, you are forced to reject, hardly sufficiently for the dignity of a Roman Cardinal. Cajetan writes, and truly writes, that these books are called canonical by Augustine and certain councils, not because they are equal to the other canonical books, or because a norm of doctrine can be taken from them, but because they contain indeed an excellent rule of morals; and he warns all students of theology that when they sometimes read them called canonical by the ancients, they understand this concerning the canon of morals, not of doctrine, and that they refer all books of the Old Testament to Jerome's limit. This is a very clear judgment of a Roman Cardinal, and indeed a most celebrated one, for our churches against the pontifical party; how moved and offended these are cannot be said. You call this jejune, yet nothing that comes from a Cardinal ought to seem jejune to you, unless perhaps Cardinals are now more jejune than they once were. But you ought to be well-fed and plainly satisfied, for whom Cardinals are jejune. What Canus replies to him is none of my concern: he indeed acknowledges him as learned and calls him pious, but says he was deceived by Erasmus's cleverness and novelties. It is a wonder that such a Cardinal could be misled by Erasmus. But Canus refuted this Cardinal's judgment with no arguments; and if it was permitted for Canus to dissent from Cajetan, it is also permitted for me to disapprove of Canus's judgment.

Finally, you stir up the whole Academy against me: I believe because you distrust your own strength. But what was the cause of this clamor? I say that Augustine and Jerome agree; yet I affirm that Augustine placed the book of Wisdom in the canon, which Jerome expressly excluded. You do not sufficiently see how these things cohere. If you do not see it, is it fair for all the Academics to be angry with me? I see you are too excited; as soon as something creaks, you immediately sound the trumpet and fill the whole city with tumult as if Hannibal were at the

gates. Again I say that Augustine and Jerome do not fight. For what Augustine contended concerning the book of Wisdom, he did not do with the intention of persuading that this book was genuinely canonical, but to defend it from the calumnies of certain persons who attributed no authority to it and held it in no esteem: indeed so much so that as soon as they read something from that book, they immediately rejected it. Therefore Augustine took it so ill that this book was despised by them and reproved their rashness. Thus I think this tumult is settled with an easy task, and I wish you to be more moderate hereafter.

DVRÆVS, Fol.27.

But (you say) when Augustine cited testimony from that book, some of the brothers who were present objected that it had not been taken from a canonical book. Yet you, in your usual manner, remained silent about what Augustine replied. How dare you oppose the objection of a few brothers to the consensus of all the bishops, the faithful, the laity, the penitents, and the catechumens—which Augustine brought forward to confirm the authority of this book? And lest I enumerate the ancient writers who mentioned this book as sacred, your own Melito listed it among the canonical books. Nor did Jerome himself remove this book from the canon; he only asserted that it was not in the Hebrew canon. But how foolish is this remark of yours? "Not even if the Church had gathered all its votes," you say, "could it have provided strength to the book unless it had first possessed its own proper strength divinely given." As if any Catholic ever said that the Church's vote is applied to anything other than divine books, and not rather that it is the Church that declares which books are divine and which are not—so that the Church does not make books divine but declares that such books were made so by God.

WHITAKER.

That some Catholic brothers, upon hearing the book of Wisdom cited by Augustine, immediately rejected it and, by common opinion and voice, spurned the whole testimony which Augustine adduced from this book, must necessarily weigh heavily against the authority of this book, however much Durandus may protest. For if they were pious, learned, and skilled in the Scriptures—as it is established they were—they would certainly never have repudiated the testimony of a canonical book, especially since they showed themselves so fair and equitable that if Augustine wished to confirm something by the testimony of

this book, and demonstrated that it had pleased preceding Catholic commentators, they would by no means have opposed it. From this, one can judge how utterly contemptuously and disdainfully they regarded that book.

Now let us consider what Augustine replied to these men, since you complain that I passed over this. Does Augustine inveigh against their rashness, impudence, and sacrilege for rejecting a canonical book? Not at all. Nor does he greatly fault them for this. Rather, he says: "As if the matter we wish to teach from this source were not clear even without the attestation of this book." And he concludes: "They must prefer this book of Wisdom to all commentators." This I willingly grant both to Augustine and to you, so that I may acknowledge the authority of this book as superior to that of all commentators.

But when he opposes to them the consensus of bishops, the faithful, laity, penitents, and catechumens, he does so to persuade them that the opinion of this book should not be so easily rejected, because it deserved (as he says) "to be read in the Church of Christ from the rank of readers, and to be heard with the veneration due to divine authority." Therefore, since some churches read this book and accept and acknowledge its doctrine as useful, he contends that it ought not to have been despised by those brothers, especially since the meaning of this testimony is confirmed by the support of the canonical books. For Augustine himself testifies in another place that the book of Wisdom was not received by all churches.

You do well and wisely not to enumerate the ancient writers; for at last (as I hope) you have perceived the weakness of this argument which you have often used. I would not wish you to think you owe anything to a better one. For if he taught that the book of Wisdom is canonical, he confirmed that your other books are not canonical. Or will you lose so many books by this rule in order to gain this one? Although it is credible, as it seems to most learned men, that by the name "Wisdom" the very book of Proverbs is signified, in which the true wisdom of Solomon is contained.

Moreover, I truly wonder with what mind—I will not say with what face—you assert that this book was not extruded from the Canon by Jerome. For read Jerome's preface to the books of Solomon, in which he calls this book *δήγγραφον* [disputed], and relates that it is not received among the canonical Scriptures, and permits it to be read in the Church for the edification of the people, not for

confirming doctrines. And when he writes that among the Hebrews it is nowhere found, that it reeks of Greek eloquence, and that some ancients thought it was written by Philo the Jew, does he not utterly extrude it from the Canon? And in another place Jerome says: "That we may know whatever is outside these is to be placed among the Apocrypha. Therefore Wisdom," etc. Thus in this whole cause you always have Jerome as an adversary, who spoke not only about the Hebrews—as you answer too inconsiderately—but about the genuine Canon of Christians. For Jerome says: "The Church indeed reads these books, but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures." This must be understood concerning Christian churches, because they were never even read in Jewish synagogues.

Now indeed, if you attribute no other authority to the Church except that of approving, declaring, and judging Scripture—as you seem to do—in this I easily agree with you, and I ask that you remain steadfast in this opinion. For the Church can separate true Scriptures from spurious writings. But your church assumes another power for itself: not only does it acknowledge and declare certain books to be divine, but it also makes divine those which are not divine. For books that are apocryphal, not canonical, sprinkled with fables—such as those we contend about were judged by antiquity—it decrees to be canonical and divine; which certainly never were, are, or will be divine if either reason, Scripture, or the authority of the ancients can prevail.

And we have said before what should suffice anyone and what can never be refuted; and to those many Fathers (if multitude delights you) you can also add Hilary. If you are not content with these, I know not what can satisfy you.

And here you seem to me to speak much more moderately about the authority of the Church than others of your party are accustomed to do, since you leave to your Church only this right of approving and declaring. For Pighius (whom you will not deny was a Catholic) expressly writes: "The Church has imparted canonical authority to certain Scriptures, and those chiefly of the Evangelists, which they had among us neither from themselves nor from their writers." Then he says:

A great part of the Scriptures received their universal authority from the Church. And your Stapleton, whom I believe you are not unfamiliar with, concludes his fifth controversy thus: "It is within the power of the Church of this time to

include in the number of sacred and certainly canonical books some other book not yet received into the Canon, yet written in the time of the Apostles and never hitherto condemned by the judgment of the Church (for example, the book of Hermas and the Apostolic Constitutions published by Clement)." Therefore, if it pleased the Roman Church now, why should we not have more canonical books, more Scriptures, indeed even more Testaments? Who would not censure the unworthiness of this statement? Who would not condemn such great license of the pontiffs? Although the Constitutions of Clement, which we read were once condemned in a general council, if your Church can by its authority make them canonical, it can also receive into the Canon books previously rejected and condemned—which, however, Stapleton denies. But perhaps these men were either foolish or not very Catholic; indeed, nothing seems to me to be able to be said more foolishly or less Catholicly.

DURAEUS, Fol. 28.

At last you return to the Council of Laodicea: although it has been answered a thousand times that not all books of that age were received into the Canon. And if only the Synod of Laodicea moves you, why does not the third Council of Carthage also move you? Why not the Council of Florence? Why finally does not the latest Council of Trent move you? Yet I would not wish anyone to understand this in such a way as to think that councils were contrary to councils, but what was not yet certain in earlier councils was established in later ones by the revealing Holy Spirit. Which neither St. Augustine denies (lib. 1 de peccatorum meritis, cap. 27, and de doctrina Christiana, lib. 2, cap. 8).

WHITAKER.

The Council of Laodicea removes from the Canon of Scripture all those books which our churches hold as Apocryphal. If therefore you decide that our churches are to be condemned by this name, it is necessary that you condemn the Synod of Laodicea by the same judgment. "But," you say, "it has already been answered a thousand times: not all books of that age were received into the Canon." Therefore, these books for three hundred years after Christ were not canonical even by your own confession. Why should we labor about the subsequent Church when we have the first and purest one agreeing with us? For what reason did the Church in those first and best times of more than three hundred years not receive these books into the Canon? What cause could

anyone possibly imagine, except that it sufficiently understood they were not canonical? This I would now wish all to consider: that our churches agree with the first and most ancient churches concerning the authority of these books; which is so well established that it cannot be denied even by our adversaries themselves. Therefore, we can henceforth proceed more securely in this cause, and when the judgment of a more recent Church is objected, we can appeal to the Apostolic Church and the most ancient Church which followed it for three hundred years. And indeed, that the Church itself judged differently about these books up to our age is not established by any certain and true indications; and I have shown by many testimonies brought forth before the time of the Council of Trent that the Church always held these books among the Apocrypha.

You set the Council of Laodicea against the Councils of Carthage, Florence, and Trent. Concerning the two latter, there is no reason for you to expect my response, since I do not acknowledge them as legitimate councils. Regarding the Council of Carthage, however, I have already responded above: these books are counted among the canonical scriptures, which may be read publicly in churches for the instruction of morals and piety, but not for establishing the authority of doctrine and faith. Although I would not wish you to place too much confidence in the decrees of this council. For you know how much it detracted from the dignity of the Roman pontiff when it forbade him to be called the universal bishop. Thus Gratian reported the words of the council: "Moreover, let not even the Roman pontiff be called universal."

It is not the place here to debate whether councils contradict each other. Yet if the Council of Carthage decreed that these books were truly canonical and equal to the other canonical books, it certainly contradicts the Council of Laodicea. For it is plainly denied in the Council of Laodicea that they are canonical. Thus we read in the council: "It is not permitted to read books that are outside the canon, except only the canonical books of the New and Old Testament. Those which ought to be read and received in authority are these: Genesis, Exodus," etc. Then it enumerates the remaining books of the Old Testament which our churches approve. It omits all the apocryphal books, which our churches reject. Therefore, if the Council of Carthage declares these books to be canonical, it openly conflicts with Laodicea, which expressly denies that they are canonical.

Concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, which Augustine mentions, I admit that it was once doubted by some, but it cannot be shown by any testimonies that it was ever rejected by the whole Church. Moreover, in the book *On Christian Doctrine*, he speaks of those books which were of uncertain and doubtful authority and advises that those which are accepted by all churches should be preferred to those which not all accept. This does little indeed for your apocryphal books. For what if some are preferred to others? Will you thereby prove that all are canonical?

DURÆUS, Fol. 28–29.

You show yourself truly harsh and cruel when you declaim so copiously about the morals of the Roman curia. Nor should you expect me here to reply in turn with anything about the morals of your own side. Moreover, that you so praise your own clemency while attributing unheard-of cruelty to Catholics—this you do in your usual most impudent manner. The mind shudders to think of such monstrous punishments inflicted on the most innocent people, which you everywhere treat as sport—and yet you seem mild and merciful to yourselves, such as Campianus himself recently experienced you to be: most cruelly tortured, finally killed and savagely torn apart. Indeed, as a witness of your clemency in England, you have issued this splendid law: "If anyone shall persuade another to that religion which is now publicly held in England," etc.

WHITAKER

I acknowledge that I am neither eloquent nor learned, nor indeed would I have said anything about Roman customs, had not Campion's speech about our trafficking in priesthoods, about the sword, the rack, and the criminal cross compelled me. In this defense of mine, if any word is false or immoderate, I do not shrink from the reproach of any honorable and free-born man. But that eloquence which you describe, I willingly leave to you, Duraeus; for in it, unless you had put in a great deal of work, you would never have made such progress. For what page of your book is not illuminated by those ornaments of your diction, so that nothing was more troublesome to me than to separate your arguments and disputation from perpetual slanders and abuses? What Jerome once replied to Rufinus, see if it does not suit you no less: "What have you achieved in thirty years in the East, who consider the impudence of illiterate scribblers, cleverness, and reviling everyone as a sign of a good conscience?" I,

however, will remove all this debate about morals, clemency, and cruelty from our controversy, and I will entrust the judgment and assessment of this matter to the world. If Campion, condemned by the public laws of the realm for treason, could not escape death, who would attribute this to our cruelty rather than to the magnitude of his own crime? For concerning religion, no inquiries were made against his life, and whatever he suffered, he suffered not on account of religion but on account of a civil crime. Everyone can perceive this to be true from the fact that others condemned for the same crime as Campion, yet who admitted that the Roman pontiff could not depose a prince from his kingdom nor release subjects from their oath of obedience, escaped punishment. Thus, no one is punished unless they attribute to the pontiff the authority to depose a prince—a crime which all may judge worthy of punishment; we indeed confess it to be capital. But as for you accusing our recent law enacted against the pontificals and transcribing it into your book, in that you were not very eloquent and rather unwise, as if our nobles had committed a great crime by promulgating a law without consulting you. For is it thus to be judged that all laws are cruel which are enacted against the Roman pontiff and do not permit him the utmost license to attempt anything in our kingdom? You are indeed very foolish, Duraeus, if you now expect that our laws should be such as your pontiff most greatly desires; or if good Christians are burned among you, that it should not be lawful for us to hang our traitors.

DURAEUS, Fol. 2 & 30.

Campion asked by what right the body of Scripture is mutilated. You boldly deny the deed. "We do not," you say, "cut out true Scriptures, but we sift out spurious ones." But Campion asks by what right you do this, to whom you respond in these words: "If you ask by what testimony we are persuaded that the sacred writings which are called sacred writings are such: I will ask how you know the sun to be the sun, or do not doubt that God is God." And again: "Although I want this answered to you once and for all: the authority of Scripture is not at all placed in the judgment of the Church. Scripture has its own proper and inherent credibility, not assumed from elsewhere," etc. What need would there be for this new Enthusiasm if there were a certain authority of the Church among you for discerning the canonical books of Scripture? But what is more absurd than to deny to the whole Church what among you tailors, weavers, shoemakers, and other sorts of men—even you being their judge—each claims for themselves by

their own right? Who ever before your Luther and Calvin talked such nonsense that when asked why he considers Matthew's Gospel canonical rather than Thomas's, he answered nothing else than that it is no less certain to him by some Enthusiasm than that the sun is the sun or God is God? But those who have read the monuments of the ancients cannot be ignorant how often the authority of the canonical books has been called into controversy, and the truth declared not by the testimony of hidden Enthusiasm but by the public authority and judgment of the Church. Thus Athanasius in his Synopsis: "The canons of the holy and Catholic Church have sanctioned four books of the Gospels." Thus Eusebius, Book 3, Chapter 19. Thus Augustine against Faustus, Book 13, Chapters 4 and 5; and against the Foundation, Chapter 9; and against Faustus, Book 23, Chapter 9. Tertullian, Book 4 against Marcion. And not undeservedly indeed: for if each person's own testimony suffices for discerning Scriptures, what end will there be to controversies? Or how would divine providence have provided for human salvation unless, as with other controversies, so also with this one—which has not rarely arisen concerning the canonical Scriptures—a certain authority was granted to the Church for settling it? Enthusiasm has only this advantage: that it snatches men into a kind of immense sea and finally plunges them headlong into the whirlpool of Atheism.

WHITAKER.

Campianus has complained without cause that something was cut off by us from the sacred body of the Scriptures: and you will never prove that this charge was true in the smallest particle of Scripture.

Indeed, you add many things to this body, and you mock us when we distinguish and separate what is alien from the true members. Although we are not only prohibited from taking anything away from this body, but also from adding even the smallest thing to it by the gravest denunciation. When Campianus asked by what right we do this, I gave many responses, which you, since you could in no way refute them, almost entirely pass over, and inveigh against one or another little sentence torn from the rest of the discourse. Moreover, the state of this controversy is this: when we affirm these books to be canonical, but deny those others, by what judgment and authority do we do this? For it seems unworthy to the pontiffs that we determine anything about the Scriptures differently than the Roman Church has prescribed for us, to which they contend this whole

judgment must be entrusted. Thus, when this church says that these books are canonical, which are held by us as apocryphal, they argue that no testimony remains for us to rely upon. We, on the contrary, defend that although we take no account at all of this church, yet most certain proofs are available to us, by which we can distinguish and recognize apocryphal books from canonical scriptures. For if you ask me how I know these scriptures to be sacred and divine and written by the authority of the Holy Spirit, you certainly ask something about which you cannot rightly doubt more than that God exists, that Christ exists, that the Holy Spirit exists, finally that the sun shines at midday. For if there is a God, as we have ascertained to be the case—however much the Roman church may never have persuaded us of this—then we cannot be ignorant that this is the word of God described and attested in these writings. But will you deny that God is God unless it seems so to the Roman Church? Or would I have doubted it unless I had learned it thoroughly from the Roman Church? Just as therefore I know God exists without the testimony of the Roman Church, so I understand these to be the scriptures of the same God even if it remains silent. For if I did not know this at all without your Church, tell me, I ask, why what your Church could know, I could in no way attain? For I frame the argument thus: The marks by which the Roman Church recognized and approved the scriptures are common to all Christians, nor did the Roman Church know the scriptures to be scriptures by other arguments than those which can persuade this very thing to all Christians. Therefore, if we do not know these to be scriptures, how did the Roman Church understand them to be scriptures, unless they can bring forth certain hidden indications known to none but themselves? Therefore, when they ask how we know these to be scriptures, let them first answer us and explain how they recognized the scriptures and judged the true from the false: thus they will easily perceive that all this knowledge is common to us with them.

Therefore, they dispute falsely about the knowledge of the sacred books, which they themselves know to be sacred from no other source than those testimonies by which we also have been persuaded of the authority of these books as sacred. For first, because they require the approval of the Church, we confess that it is necessary, and we admit none except those alone concerning which there are certain and perpetual testimonies of the true Church. For in the beginning these books were written by those who were designated by divine authority for that

task, whom the Church knew to be either prophets, or apostles, or evangelists; then they were handed down to the Church, received by it, and commended to all by the testimony of that Church in which they were first written, which indeed confirmed the faith and authority of those books to all churches. And this testimony of the first church and those following afterward held, and in this way preserved the canon of sacred books; and we willingly follow it, and you have nothing else to follow. You see therefore how much we attribute to the testimony of the Church, since we judge there is sufficient force in it for confirming the canon of scripture, and for refuting all those who wish either to increase or diminish the number of these books. Yet that we may rest in this persuasion and assent fully to these books and hear God speaking in them, we need the Holy Spirit, who may cast out all doubt from us. For just as we understand that God exists by certain arguments by which even philosophers have been overcome, yet unless the Holy Spirit intervenes, we often doubt and do not fully satisfy our consciences, and we hesitate and fluctuate and turn over many things in our mind: so although there are infinite arguments by which the authority of scripture is confirmed and those who wish to break it are refuted, yet this persuasion will never be salutary or firm or perpetual for us until it is established by the testimony of the Holy Spirit. Therefore we add this testimony, not because there are no others by which profane men may be refuted, but because by it all others are sanctified for us for faith and salvation.

Therefore there was no need for you to object so many things here to Luther and Calvin about certain new enthusiasms, in which who does not see from what spirit it proceeded that you compare the testimony of the Holy Spirit to the insane enthusiasms of certain persons? I pray God to forgive you this blasphemy. But if you do not know that the power of the Holy Spirit is necessary for us to perceive the scriptures, you can understand it from these scriptures. Christ says: "The Holy Spirit will teach you all things and bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you." And John: "You have an anointing from the Holy One and know all things; the anointing teaches you concerning all things." And Paul: "The natural man does not perceive the things of the Spirit of God; but the spiritual man judges all things; for the Spirit searches all things, even the deep things of God." And Isaiah the prophet: "My Spirit which is in you and my words which I have put in your mouth shall not depart from your mouth nor from the mouth of your offspring forever." From these it is clear that the same Spirit who spoke in

the prophets and apostles also seals this word of God in our minds and persuades us that all those things which we hear have come from God. For without the Spirit some knowledge can exist, but certainly no faith can exist. But before we believe, we are never certain about the authority of scripture. Therefore those who lack the testimony of the Spirit can indeed read scripture and abound in arguments by which they defend these and reject other writings; yet they cannot embrace these scriptures from the heart as truly divine and recognize the Holy Spirit speaking in them before that Spirit has brought their minds and wills into this full assurance. Therefore when you ask what need there was for that enthusiasm if a certain authority of the Church stood firm for us, I reply that your invention about enthusiasms has never been more strongly repressed than by our people, and that you are more than unfair who make us similar to enthusiasts because we say that the Holy Spirit is the indicator and witness of the divine word beyond all exception. But we willingly acknowledge the authority of the Church and receive those books which the first church judged ought to be received, in which the apostles themselves lived and sealed the canon of scripture. Now indeed to attach a perpetual power of adding new books to that ancient canon of scripture delivered by the apostles themselves to the church in early times—see, I ask you, is it not to desire new enthusiasms?

What you add about human dregs was no reason why you should so disgracefully call Christ's people. For not all can be theologians or bishops or Jesuits; and Christ paid no less a price for cobblers and tailors than for monks or monarchs. But you must take care lest muleteers and herdsmen whom you so greatly despise enter into the kingdom of heaven while Jesuits are excluded. And although those men do not seem sufficiently armed to you to be able to judge about scripture, yet in them dwells the Spirit of God. Unless they have Christ's spirit, they are not his; indeed Jesus Christ is in them unless they are reprobate. If therefore they have God's spirit and Christ's spirit and Christ himself dwelling in them, certainly they can recognize God's word and judge about scripture. But as for why Matthew's Gospel is received and Thomas's rejected—these things can easily be demonstrated to you without enthusiasms. For that Matthew's Gospel was written by Matthew himself is testified by that very church in which Matthew lived, and this testimony has always held valid up to our times; but that Thomas's Gospel was published by some other person is perceived from this: that it was written differently than befitted apostolic truth and spirit. You think

there is no other cause except because thus decreed by the church: that this should be received, that rejected. Therefore between your opinion and mine this difference exists: that I affirm scriptures to be so true in themselves and full of faith that the church could not do otherwise than receive them and approve them with its testimony; you on the contrary contend that scriptures do not have this authority from themselves but borrow it only from the church. Now that some books were rejected—of which we read there were many—the cause was not alone because thus it seemed good to the church, but because they conflicted with the analogy of faith and did not agree with prophetic and apostolic doctrine. I prefer you learn this from Augustine's words rather than mine: "But other men," he says, "who attempted or dared to write something about the acts of the Lord or of the apostles did not exist in such a way in their times that the church would have faith in them and receive their writings into canonical authority of holy books. Not only because they were not such men as ought to be believed when narrating but also because they inserted certain false things into their writings which Catholic and apostolic rule of faith and sound doctrine condemns." And again: "Luke wrote so that his book alone was held worthy of faith in the church concerning narrated acts of apostles; all others who dared to write about acts and deeds of apostles not with due faith were rejected." For at that time Mark and Luke wrote when they could be approved not only by Christ's church but even by apostles still living in flesh. And in another place: "Manichaeans read apocryphal scriptures written by some fabricators of fables under apostles' names: which would deserve to be received into authority by holy church in their own times if holy and learned men who were then in this life and could examine such things recognized them as speaking truth." Thus those books are disapproved not on account of bare judgment of church but on account of discrepancy of doctrine.

Moreover, with what argument Fathers used against ancient heretics—Athanasius, Eusebius, Augustine, Tertullian—with that same argument we also will use in similar cause. For just as they refuted adversaries fabricating new scriptures by testimony of church, so also we will defend canon of scripture by testimony of church. For testimony of Spirit avails not for refuting others but for persuading ourselves. Thus you see it is not left to each one's judgment to receive or reject whatever book he wishes—as you feign—but those books are received by us which ancient church received; those rejected which it

admonished ought to be rejected. And when it is sufficiently established that complete canon of scripture was written while apostles were still living and delivered to church—who does not see this controversy is removed and settled so that there was no cause for you to complain about divine providence? Finally, because you make spirit cause of distrust and atheism—I do not doubt all easily see how horrible this is. Do you dare affirm that those who trust testimony of Holy Spirit are plunged into gulf of distrust and atheism? Or must testimony of Holy Spirit be rejected so your church's testimony may be believed? Is this remedy for distrust and atheism? But however much church decrees something and pronounces a hundred times—yet it will never be received with certain firm faith before Holy Spirit persuades human consciences by secret instinct that it is true. For what if all men affirm something which is proved to me by no judgments except their testimonies? Can I repel all assaults of distrust by this testimony? By no means indeed; nor will any salutary persuasion ever stick fixed in my mind before I am supported by greater and more divine authority than human authority—that is, testimony of Holy Spirit. But when authority of Holy Spirit accedes to voice and testimony of church—then at last all distrust is overthrown and true tranquility of mind follows. And Augustine himself teaches this most clearly: "Let us follow those," he says, "who invite us first to believe what we cannot yet see so that strengthened by faith itself we may merit to understand what we believe—not now men but God himself strengthening and illuminating our mind within."

DVRÆV'S, Fol. 22

"How does it happen," he says, "that the spirit of the Calvinists receives six epistles which do not please the Lutheran spirit?" I reply: Lutherans do not reject those epistles, nor do they cut them out from the New Testament. You may think otherwise; yet that they do not please them (as Capianus said) the Magdeburgenses themselves confirm, Cent. 1, lib. 2, cap. 4. I commend, however, that you so subtly and acutely prove these epistles are by no means displeasing to the Lutheran spirit. "Some of them," you say, "Luther illustrated with his commentaries; Illyricus all." By the same argument you might have said: Some of Aesop's fables Luther illustrated with his commentaries, Illyricus all; therefore Aesop's fables are to be placed in the Canon by the Lutheran spirit.

WHITAKER:

You are very pleased with yourself when you can jest about the Lutheran and Calvinist spirit. Although there is no reason why you should despise or ridicule this spirit, which has blown so adversarially and fiercely against your pontiff for so long that unless a new spirit of the Jesuits had emerged, no spirit would have remained to him long ago. And this spirit, which the Lord sent forth from His own mouth, will more and more each day consume that Antichrist whom you worship, however much all your spirits may resist. But as to the matter itself: if certain outstanding and learned men thought differently about those six epistles than their dignity demanded, was it fair that we should pay for that fault? Why then do you bring this quarrel against us, who judge those six epistles no less splendidly and honorably than you yourselves? Or if they, following the example of some ancient Churches, decided a little too harshly about them, is this such a great battle and dissension of spirits? Not all things are revealed to all at once; nor is the measure of the spirit the same for everyone; and if anyone thinks otherwise, the Lord will also declare that to him in His own time.

You praise, however, that I have so acutely proved these epistles are not displeasing to the Lutheran spirit—in which matter you yourself were too acute, who could devise such a marvelous argument about Aesop's fables. "For I would have said," you say, "by this argument that Aesop's fables are to be placed in the Canon." And why might I not also have said that Aesop's fables could be placed in the Canon, if it seemed good to your Church? For if Scripture, deserted by the authority of the Church, is no more valid than Aesop's fable, as one of your not obscure writers affirmed, why should we not think it possible that Aesop's fables be placed in the Canon, provided only the authority of your Church is added? But this was your argument, not mine. For my words are thus: "Indeed they receive them; in explaining controversies they employ them; in schools they interpret them; in churches they read them publicly and privately." Thus everyone sees how untimely your argument about Aesop's fables was. I would advise you to omit the Scriptures, which you always interpret so badly, and henceforth rather write new commentaries on Aesop's fables.

DVRÆVS, Fol. 33

Let us grant to you that the Lutheran spirit agrees very well with the Calvinist. Yet you have not accomplished the matter unless you also show that it agrees with the spirit of your order and of the other Evangelical spirits. Let us take one

example: the Anabaptist spirit, whose history seems to you a fable mixed with tragic and comic laws. For Campianus used this example. To which what do you reply? "The Anabaptist spirit," you say, "was a certain madness and a headlong, unbridled fury, which no spirit resisted more than the Calvinist and Lutheran." But the Anabaptists in turn accuse the Calvinist spirit by the same token. If therefore faith is to be sought from Scripture, but Scripture is not to be judged except by the spirit, what, I ask, is to be done in such a conflict of spirits and such a varied warfare?

WHITAKER

You have no reason to call the Anabaptists Evangelicals or ours, unless they are Evangelicals and ours whom the Gospel condemns, and ours have always most strongly condemned. This is so true and attested that unless these people had been received and treated better by you than by the Evangelicals, they would either have long since ceased to exist or certainly few would remain. For these insane Anabaptists were refuted by the evangelical ministers Luther, Zwingli, Bullinger, and Calvin in their writings, and then either expelled from their territories by princes or recalled to sound mind by the pious severity of laws. But if Evangelicals and ours are to be considered because they arose after the Gospel was spread, then the Evangelical Jesuits will also be such, who emerged into the light after the promulgation of the Gospel restored by Luther.

Moreover, that they compare the history of Job to an Anabaptist tragicomedy reveals their madness and blasphemy: and our people diligently refute these frenzies of insane men, while your side allows them to remain quiet in papal kingdoms. But if they in turn accuse the Calvinist spirit of madness and frenzy, I certainly shall not fear to make you yourself the judge of this very controversy, who can never pronounce our cause to be like theirs unless oppressed by the same frenzies. For they reject all the Scriptures and depend entirely on sudden enthusiasms: the Calvinists (as you call them), on the contrary, propose no doctrine except that of the Scriptures, and condemn all those spirits, enthusiasms, and whatever bold and reckless impulses of the mind toward all wicked things. Now you judge what difference there is between the Calvinist spirit and those enthusiasms of the Anabaptists.

But what (you ask) will happen in such a conflict of spirits, if Scripture is evaluated only by the spirit? Indeed, Duræus, we have many things besides the

spirit by which we evaluate the Scriptures. For it has the highest authority indeed from the Holy Spirit, by whose inspiration and teaching it was written; then from the writers themselves, whom the Lord adorned with divine testimonies, so that the books they published would be held as canonical; next from the clearly divine and heavenly nature of the things delivered in the Scriptures; finally, from the early Church, which testifies that these books were published by the Apostles themselves or Evangelists. By these arguments we will refute both the Anabaptists and all other heretics and demonstrate that these books are canonical, however much all the spirits of adversaries oppose. And yet these arguments, though strong for judging and proving the truth, cannot arouse a certain and faithful assent in ourselves until they are confirmed by the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit.

DURÆUS, Fol. 34.

You say that Castellio is wronged, and you do not notice that in defending Castellio you accuse your own Beza, who charged him with the same crime in the preface to Joshua; nor can anyone who reads Castellio's translation ever think that his opinion on this book of Scripture was otherwise. For thus with certain amatory expressions, etc. In the Apocalypse of John, Campianus said that Luther, Brentius, and Kemnitius lacked something. What is this something? you ask. Rather, you should see. And you strive to free these censors from all suspicion of crime by the authority of Eusebius, book 3, chapter 24. And since no just reason for defense occurs to you, you say: What are these things to us? If Luther is a heretic to you, these things certainly pertain nothing to you; but if you acknowledge Lutherans as brothers and Luther as a father, how is it not especially your concern? That you slanderously claim the Roman pontiff is criticized in this book: you do indeed what befits a man of his sect. But because you could not bring forth even one word that touches the Roman pontiff even lightly, you are ridiculous if you expect any response from me."

WHITAKERUS.

If Castellio has written anything too insolent or unworthy of the authority of the Scriptures, he certainly will not have me as his defender; and it will be free for you through me to refute his opinions in entire books. For you are mistaken if you think I am concerned about what you think of Castellio, as if I would wish to exchange many words with you about this man. Yet in that preface I said I find

nothing of the sort that was objected to him by Campiano. You now tell me of another preface, not Castellio's, but Beza's, which either I have not seen, or you have not used in good faith. But let us set aside Castellio, about whom it is not necessary for us to dispute.

In the Apocalypse, however, what those men you name might have found lacking, I certainly do not understand, nor do I much care. And you bring forth nothing from which I might perceive that there was anything lacking by them. To me, indeed, that most just defense seems to be that these things do not pertain to us, since even if it were established that Luther and others had found something lacking in this passage, we nevertheless find nothing at all lacking, nor do we think anything more divine could have been written.

Here now you insist that we either make Luther a heretic or hold him as our father. Neither, my dear Duraeus. We acknowledge no heresy of Luther's, unless it was a heresy to attack your heresies, which indeed Luther did, as you know, to the great harm of your Church and the calamity of all monks. And although Ignatius may be a father to you, we are nevertheless neither Lutherans nor do we call anyone on earth father, because we have one Father in heaven.

But if Luther could find nothing lacking in the Apocalypse without soon becoming a heretic, then those ancient Churches were heretical which we read doubted about this book—unless that which in them was by no means heretical, when transferred to Luther, suddenly began to be heretical. Thus heresies will be not of things but of persons, and what at one time is Catholic will, with changed times, become heretical.

But whether the Apocalypse has censured your pontiff and that entire pontifical hierarchy, do not expect me to discuss in this place. As long as the Apocalypse endures, the pontiff will never vindicate his seat from the worst suspicion, since he lives and reigns in that city which the Holy Spirit in this book foretold so clearly would be the metropolis of Antichrist, that even the pontifical party themselves have now ceased to doubt about it. Therefore, until some new Antichrist is born—which will never happen—in the meantime we must necessarily and reasonably suspect the pontiff to be Antichrist.

For if it is probable that Antichrist will sit at Rome, as those now confess, it is indeed much more probable that the pontiff is this very Antichrist, who has

already sat at Rome for many centuries and, as far as I know, thinks nothing of moving. Whether this matter can pertain at all to your pontiff, you yourself shall see.

DURAEUS, Fol. 33

"Luther," you say, "said that the best of all evangelists are those who labored especially to teach that we are justified by faith alone in Christ."

If this is so, Luther is certainly the best of all evangelists. But I would like you to answer me: what Scripture teaches that those are to be esteemed by the name of evangelists whose aim was to show that we are justified by faith alone in Christ? For the angel did not say he was evangelizing because he taught justification by faith alone in Christ; but he said: "I evangelize to you great joy," etc. And the evangelists had another aim set before them: namely, to prove that Jesus, the son of Mary, is the true Messiah. These things, as John says, "are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." (John 20:31) And Matthew begins his Gospel in this manner: "The book of the generation," etc., to demonstrate that he was doing this: that he who was born was Christ and the Messiah. And Mark: "The beginning of the Gospel," etc., as if to say he had this one thing in mind: to describe that Jesus born of the Virgin Mary is the true Messiah. Finally Luke says he proposed to show that what the prophets had foretold about the coming Messiah was fulfilled in Jesus, the son of Mary.

Neither Paul nor Peter nor the other apostles wrote their epistles for this primary purpose, but to exhort men already Christian to the perfection of Christian life. How ridiculously then did Luther say that Paul's epistles are more rightly called the Gospel, when Paul himself was accustomed to call his epistles nothing but epistles? However much you may strive to defend Luther's innocence, you will never bring it about that he was not a proud and indeed very unskilled censor.

WHITAKER.

Luther asserted that the opinion of some concerning the four Gospels must be abolished, since there is truly only one Gospel, expounded by all the Evangelists and Apostles. For as Chrysostom says, "Though a thousand men write Gospels, if they write the same things, the many are one." Since this is so, Luther said that the name "Gospel" applies no less to Paul's epistles, or even more, than to the first three Gospels, because Paul in his epistles declared the sum of the Gospel

more fully than those three Evangelists, whose history is almost entirely consumed in narrating Christ's deeds and miracles. For since the Gospel is nothing other than the announcement and declaration of the grace and mercy of God, which Christ by his death has merited for us, it cannot be denied that the doctrine which most fully expounds this benefit and joyful message is most evangelical, and that for this reason the Gospel is taught most copiously and clearly in Paul's epistles, and that Paul is the best Evangelist. Indeed (you say), if this is so, Luther is the best of all Evangelists. Wittily said: as if all have explained this doctrine more illustriously than Paul in his epistles to the Romans and Galatians—which you would easily notice if you even lightly tasted those epistles.

Moreover, concerning what you ask—which Scripture teaches that those who show we are justified by faith alone in Christ are to be reckoned under the name of Evangelists—I could cite many Scriptures for you, if the cause demanded it. How beautiful are the feet of those who evangelize peace, who evangelize good things, says the Apostle from the prophet? But peace arises from the remission of sins and reconciliation with God, which we obtain by faith alone. For justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. Then, since the Gospel is the announcement of reconciliation between God and men, and we are reconciled to God when God does not impute our sins to us and imputes faith to believers as righteousness, and since the ministry of this reconciliation has been committed to all the Apostles, who does not see that all the Apostles announcing this reconciliation through faith were Evangelists? Theophylact writes that it is called Gospel because it announces good things to us: but of what kind? "Remission of sins, justification, access into heaven, adoption by God." But how do we obtain these good things? Easily, he says. For we have not labored in acquiring these good things, nor have we received them by our good works, but by the grace and mercy of God we have been made partakers of such great goods. If this is the Gospel, then there are not only four Evangelists, and those are to be reckoned under the name of Evangelists who teach that we are justified by faith alone, because by faith alone we receive remission of sins and adoption. For to those who believe in his name, he gave this dignity, that they should become sons of God.

But (you say) the angel did not say that he evangelized that we are justified by faith alone in Christ. You confess therefore that the angel was an Evangelist: but

he was not one of the four Evangelists; therefore this name is not to be adjudicated to them alone. And what did he evangelize? That we are to be justified by our works? Or that now one is born who by his death effects that we can merit our salvation? Far be it that any such thing ever entered this Evangelist's mind. What therefore was the sum of this Gospel? Namely, that a Savior is born for us, Christ the Lord, who frees us lost in sins, remitting our sins to us and imputing his obedience and death for righteousness alone, finally offering himself to us not as a half, but as a whole and sole Savior.

Here you tell us what the Evangelists proposed to themselves in composing the Gospels, and you open the fountains of Theology. The proposed scope of the Evangelists (you say) was to prove that Jesus, son of Mary, is the true Messiah. And what else (I ask) was proposed to Paul, to Peter, to the remaining Apostles, than to confirm that this same son of Mary is the true Messiah—that is, the only prophet, king, priest, savior of the whole Church? Indeed the epistles are full of exhortations, but do you conclude from that that the Apostles had something else in mind than to convert all men to receiving this Messiah and to persuade them that all salvation and happiness is to be sought in him alone? Whatever moreover the Evangelists write about Christ's birth, life, doctrine, miracles, death, resurrection, and ascension into heaven, they refer it all to this end: to teach that he is the one who, by crushing the serpent's head, brought salvation to all believers. And this the remaining Apostles most diligently performed in their epistles. Thus Paul says that he was separated for the Gospel of God; that he begot the Corinthians through the Gospel; that God will judge the secrets of men according to his Gospel; and that his Gospel is veiled to those who perish if it is veiled. What else did Paul do than teach the Gospel when he pronounced anathema on those who evangelized something else? Was not Timothy an Evangelist, whom Paul ordered to do the work of an Evangelist? Why then do you restrict the name "Gospel" only to those writings which were published by the four Evangelists?

Therefore Luther said nothing ridiculous when he affirmed that Paul's epistles can most rightly be called Gospel; and they show themselves more than ridiculous who do not acknowledge the Gospel in Paul's epistles. What if Paul called his epistles only epistles? They were sent to certain churches or men: therefore they do not deserve the name "Gospel"? Should you thus argue ridiculously, you who call Luther ridiculous? Or must you now be taught why

these four books are called Gospels? Cease therefore accusing Luther, whom you will never convict in this cause either of ignorance or of pride.

But it is well: when it was objected to Luther that with preposterous zeal he set the Gospels against each other; that he called John's one Gospel beautiful, true, preeminent; that he willingly wished to enlist the Apostles as companions in his quarrels: now at last no crime in Luther except either pride or ignorance is reprehended here. But I wish you modesty, Durze; certainly I do not envy your knowledge.

DVRÆVS, Fol.36.

But truly, will you defend Campion's innocence even now, regarding what he said—that Luther, with a petulant pen, attacked the Gospel of Luke? Absolutely. Do you then consider Luther so circumspect that he spoke more wisely and prudently than the Holy Spirit Himself? And indeed, concerning the Lutherans—whom you, as a Calvinist, have so unfortunately defended—I am not surprised. You will show sharper zeal in vindicating Beza. He said that Campion dared to translate that mystery ("This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you") as corrupted. First, you find fault with us for rendering the words, "Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη," as "This cup is the new testament," as if it were a very great difference in what sense the word "is" is understood. We indeed acknowledge metonymy in the cup, yet from it the truth of the blood is most clearly demonstrated. For we do not rightly say "the cup is poured out" except because what is poured out is contained in the cup. Therefore, it was not wine but blood in the cup. But it is amusing what you bring up about the solecism. Yet Campion charged Beza with no crime whatever in this matter; nor did Beza take it upon himself, but rather he reproved Beza for saying that those words, "τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον," had crept from the margin into the text, and therefore seemed to him to require expunging.

WHITAKERVS.

It grieves you that anyone has been found to answer a word on Luther's behalf. Although if it is permitted for you to trouble Luther so often with unjust charges, why should it be forbidden for me to defend his innocence? Concerning the Gospel of Luke, Luther never uttered any word except honorable and pious ones. What if he anticipated the suspicion of some who might have thought that

Luke's frequent mention of works could be seen as somewhat adverse to justification by faith? Is this attacking

Is it wiser or more learned to wish to speak than the Holy Spirit has spoken, or to rebuke the eloquence of the Gospel's light with a petulant pen? Who does not see that this occasion for criticism has been seized without cause? For when you persuade us that Paul, writing so often about justification by faith, nevertheless does nothing against your meritorious righteousness, do you then insolently rebuke Paul, or teach the Holy Spirit to speak better and more correctly? Thus, how undeservedly Campianus accused Luther can be discerned even from this your rather unfortunate repetition of that same accusation.

"In defending Beza," you say, "you will show yourself more sharp." Since you are so languid and feeble, it is not necessary for me to be sharper. And first, that you say it makes no difference in what place a word is understood to be positioned—who would grant you that? Does it make no difference whether we say, "This cup is the new testament," or in this manner, "This is the cup of the new testament?" It is plain that the copula, which contains the statement, is placed in an alien position. Yet you acknowledge a metonymy in "cup," which indeed you would never do unless forced by necessity. For so it is that in the words of the Supper all metonymies are hateful to you, such that you would admit anything rather than a metonymy. Now indeed you confess there is one metonymy in "cup." I will accept what you give, and what you do not give I will wrest away. "This cup," that is, you say, "this blood"—proceed, and weigh from what follows how fine this metonymy is. Your metonymy has this meaning: "This blood is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." Thus you think Christ spoke, so that He called His blood the new testament in His blood. Then from Mark the Evangelist it is established that He drank before all the Apostles, than that Christ said, "This cup is the new testament." If therefore there was any change of wine into blood, it follows that it was made not in the cup, but in the stomachs of the Apostles. For what is this double blood, of which one is in the other? Or what are these new inventions of tropes? That this metonymy is rightly to be rejected by all is sufficiently clear.

Therefore, since "cup" is taken not for blood, but for wine, we must here establish another metonymy, since wine is not properly the new testament. The sense of these words therefore is easy and straightforward, and consistent with

the Scriptures: "This cup," that is, "this wine is the new testament," that is, the symbol and sacrament of the new covenant, "in my blood which is shed for you," that is, which is sanctified by my blood shed for you. You wish the cup—or because this is absurd, the blood in the cup—to be shed for us, as if Christ drew His own blood and offered it to His Apostles to drink, which even to think horrifies the mind. Wherefore, since it can in no way be otherwise than that those words "τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον" refer to what is nearest, it is necessary that we either place here some solecism, or confess that those words have crept from the margin into the text, or with Basil read "περ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον." This reading of Basil, cited in my previous book, you pass over without response, which I do not wonder at at all, because you had nothing probable to answer.

You acquit Beza concerning solecism, about which so many of the pontifical party have accused him. What therefore did Campianus object against Beza? Namely, that he sensed one or another word had crept from the margin into the context. But a great crime indeed: as if this never happened in the Scriptures. Moreover, that these seemed to him to be expunged, Beza left written in no place, that I know. Thus when true crimes do not occur to you, you are compelled to object false and fabricated ones.

DURÆUS, Fol. 37.

Campianus, you most impudently boast that you have responded enough and more than enough, and among the Academics you elevate his reputation by every means you can. Far be it from Campianus to place his hope of victory either in an abundance of recondite learning, or in variety of multiple readings, or in sharpness of wit, or in any other arenas of that sort; indeed he understood himself to be sufficiently fortified by the goodness of his cause alone. It is your part, Whitaker, since you cannot by truth, to wish to persuade by false opinions of this kind concerning the arms of learning.

WHITAKER.

There was no reason why I should seem to anyone to boast about my response, nor do I see how replying to Campion could have been a matter for boasting. Therefore, you are greatly mistaken, Duraeus, if you think I was driven to write by any desire for glory—a task in which I foresaw much labor, trouble, and danger, but no glory at all. And if I could have avoided this necessity of replying,

I would have had nothing to do with Campion or with you altogether. As for the impudence you so often reproach me with, in this matter our academic colleagues find your judgment lacking in moderation; comparing my defense with Campion's accusation, they understand that at this time, in this cause, against such an adversary, scarcely anything milder could have been written. But I would certainly be impudent if I wished to contend with you for this palm of victory, seeing that from you not only Campion himself but also the other Jesuits I have read appear defeated. However, by what weapons Campion chiefly relied upon to wage war against us, I leave for others to judge; to me, he seemed to trust and use nothing less than the truth.