

SAINT JEROME

APOLOGY AGAINST THE BOOKS OF
RUFINUS

Apologia adversus Libros Rufini

SABBATISMUS

Saint Jerome (347–420)
Apologia adversus Libros Rufini · Apology Against the Books of Rufinus

Latin text: public domain.
Translation, alignment and edition © 2026 Inversiones San Juan Diego (Sabbatismus). Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license (CC BY-SA 4.0).

Facing-page bilingual edition: Latin on the left-hand pages, English on the right.
Sabbatismus is the imprint of the Inversiones San Juan Diego foundation, San Pedro Sula, Honduras.
Set in EB Garamond and Cinzel.
sabbatismus.com

CONTENTS

 APOLOGY OF ST. EUSEBIUS HIERONYMUS, PRESBYTER OF STRIDON,
 AGAINST THE BOOKS OF RUFINUS, SENT TO PAMMACHIUS AND
 MARCELLA. (C) 5

BOOK FIRST..... 9

Book three 123

S. EUSEBII HIERONYMI STRIDONENSIS
PRESBYTERI APOLOGIA ADVERSUS LIBROS
RUFINI, MISSA AD PAMMACHIUM ET
MARCELLAM. (C)

IN LIBROS CONTRA RUFINUM ADMONITIO,

Dissensionis Hieronymum inter ac Rufinum longe notior historia est, quam nostra explicatione ut indigeat. Causa mali tanti Latina versio librorum Origenis περὶ Ἀρχῶν fuit, quam presbyter Aquileiensis, sublesta utique fide, elaboraverat Romae circa annum 398. Nam ut Origeniani dogmatis venena, subdolae interpretationis fuco oblita, Latinis auribus tutius propinaret, praefationem operi praefixit, in qua Hieronymum figuratis laudibus praedicabat, veluti Adamantii opinionum fautorem, suaeque sententiae socium: ipsum vero librum ab ascriptis erroribus expurgatum opera sua jactabat. Sed cum multa essent adhuc quae christianas aures moverent, et minus catholice dicta existimarentur, Pammachius et Oceanus Hieronymo auctores fuerunt, ut germanam ipse ejus libri interpretationem vulgaret, nequaquam dissimulatis erroribus, quo se manifesto proderent; purgaretque adeo suspicionem favoris in Origenem ab aemulo injectam, ne si criminantem convincere differret, consentire illi videretur. S. Doctor datis primum Rufino litteris, amice conquestus est: deinde anno 400 Origenis ipsum librum ita ad finem vertit, ut haereses statim innotescerent: deditque una epistolam, in nostra recensione 84, Pammachio, et Oceano, in qua calumniam omnem a se longe amovet, quove animo legerit aliquando, aut laudarit Origenem absque pietatis periculo exponit. Hinc porro ingens in Ecclesia incendium exortum est; nam Rufinus Apologiam pro sua fide ad Anastasium papam scribere compulsus, non tam pro se nisus est satisfacere, quam in sui defensionem novas Hieronymo calumnias struere. Tum recrudescente in dies magis inimicitiae vulnere, tres Invectivarum libros anno insequenti sive 401 in S. Doctorem procudit: quibus ille nondum lectis, sed tantum ex ore amicorum ex parte auditis, respondet tribus hisce Apologeticis libris: quos ad annum 402 refero ex duobus ipsiusmet Hieronymi testimoniis. Alterum circa finem primi libri, ubi post biennium se scribere profitetur, ex quo edito brevi libello, praeconiis Rufini responderat: brevis enim libellus iste ipsa est ad Pammachium laudata epistola 84, quae ad annum spectat 400.

APOLOGY OF ST. EUSEBIUS HIERONYMUS,
PRESBYTER OF STRIDON, AGAINST THE BOOKS
OF RUFINUS, SENT TO PAMMACHIUS AND
MARCELLA. (C)

ADMONITION CONCERNING THE BOOKS AGAINST RUFINUS

The history of the dissension between Jerome and Rufinus is far too well known to require our explanation. The cause of so great an evil was the Latin translation of Origen's books *Περὶ Ἀρχῶν* (*On First Principles*), which the presbyter of Aquileia, a man of certainly shaky faith, had produced in Rome around the year 398. For in order to more safely administer the poisons of Origen's dogma, disguised by the artifice of a cunning interpretation, to Latin ears, he prefixed a preface to the work, in which he praised Jerome with veiled compliments, as if he were a supporter of the opinions of Adamantius and an associate in his own views; and he boasted that the book itself had been purged by his efforts of the errors attributed to it. But since there were still many things that would trouble Christian ears and were considered to be expressed in a less than Catholic manner, Pammachius and Oceanus urged Jerome to publish a faithful translation of that book himself, without concealing the errors in any way, so that they would reveal themselves plainly; and thus to clear away the suspicion of favoritism towards Origen cast upon him by his rival, lest, if he delayed in refuting the accuser, he might seem to agree with him. The Holy Doctor first sent a letter to Rufinus, complaining in a friendly manner; then, in the year 400, he translated Origen's book itself to the end in such a way that the heresies would immediately become known. He also sent a letter, number 84 in our collection, to Pammachius and Oceanus, in which he completely rejects all calumny against himself and explains with what spirit he had at one time read or praised Origen without danger to piety. From this, a great fire was then kindled in the Church; for Rufinus, compelled to write an Apology for his faith to Pope Anastasius, did not so much strive to justify himself as to construct new calumnies against Jerome in his own defense. Then, as the wound of enmity grew worse day by day, in the following year, 401, he produced three books of Invectives against the Holy Doctor; to which the latter, not yet having read them but only having heard parts of them from the mouths of friends, responds with these three Apologetic books, which I date to the year 402 based on two testimonies from Jerome himself. One is near the end of the first book, where he states that he is writing two years after he had responded to Rufinus's praises by publishing a short work; for that short work is the aforementioned Letter 84 to Pammachius, which pertains to the year 400.

Alterum post medium II libri, ubi se ante annos ferme decem scripsisse de Illustribus viris dicit: compertum nempe est omnibus, anno 392 prodiisse librum illum, hosque adeo inita ratione anno 402 ascribendos esse. Eorum porro summa est huiusmodi: In primo interpretationem suam multis argumentis excusat, sibi que diluit objecta crimina: altero Apologiam Rufini ad papam Anastasium missam exagitat: tertio denique ejusdem Rufini litteris sibi cum Invectivarum codice missis respondet.

2. Nunc quid a nobis in illis recudendis praestitum sit, explicemus. Primo Rufini Invectivas, quas e regione Hieronymianae Apologiae in adversa columna continenter P. Martianaus apposuerat, loco movimus, et Hieronymianis ipsis subnectimus. Neque enim ex ordine sententiae sententiis respondent, aut ubi in una columna aemulus calumniam intentat, in altera criminis dilutio est; sed e contrario alter prout libet suo stomacho inservit et velitatur: alter non lectis contra se libris, sed vulgo intellectis criminationibus occurrit. Quare praeposteram Martianaei curam nemo non improbavit, natam ad creandum lectori laborem, ipsumque S. Doctoris contextum singulis paginis intercipiendum. Secundo cum sit utile studiosis et commodum, authentica monumenta, quae scriptis auctoris quem exornas, occasionem dederunt, vel quae ab ipso auctore impugnantur, scriptis iisdem annectere, nos huc adscivimus primo Rufini libellum illum, sive Apologiam, aut confessionem fidei, quam ad papam Anastasium misit, et quam Hieronymus toto secundo libro confutat; deinde ipsam quoque Anastasii super nomine Rufini epistolam, quam illi toties tum alibi, tum maxime hisce in libris ingerit S. Doctor. Hactenus in eum tomum qui aliena ac supposititia complectitur, rejectae sunt; sed in antiquis codicibus, quemadmodum de veteri Corbeiensi P. Coustantius tradit, satis prudenter ipsis apponuntur Hieronymi libris, ejusque dispositionis doctissimo viro ipse auctor Hieronymus videbatur. Denique lucubrationes omnes pleramque partem cum antiquis editionibus, unam aut alteram cum vetustissimo Palatino - Vaticano 234 contulimus, saepe etiam emendamus.

The other is after the middle of the second book, where he says that he wrote **De Viris Illustribus** (**On Illustrious Men**) almost ten years earlier; indeed, it is well known to all that that book was published in the year 392, and thus, by this calculation, these books must be ascribed to the year 402. Furthermore, their summary is as follows: In the first, he defends his translation with many arguments and refutes the charges brought against him; in the second, he attacks Rufinus's Apology sent to Pope Anastasius; finally, in the third, he responds to a letter from Rufinus himself, sent to him with the manuscript of the *Invectives*.

2. Now let us explain what we have accomplished in reprinting them. First, we have moved Rufinus's *Invectives*, which Father Martianay had continuously placed in the opposite column alongside Jerome's Apology, and have appended them to Jerome's own works. For the sentences do not respond to sentences in order, nor where the rival levels a calumny in one column is there a refutation of the charge in the other; but on the contrary, the one indulges his own spleen as he pleases and skirmishes, while the other, not having read the books against him but responding to accusations commonly understood, meets the charges. Therefore, everyone has disapproved of Martianay's preposterous arrangement, which was designed to create labor for the reader and to interrupt the very context of the Holy Doctor on every single page. Secondly, since it is useful and convenient for scholars to append to the same writings the authentic documents that gave occasion to the works of the author you are editing, or which are attacked by the author himself, we have included here, first, that little book of Rufinus, or Apology, or confession of faith, which he sent to Pope Anastasius and which Jerome refutes in the entire second book; then also the letter of Anastasius himself concerning the name of Rufinus, which the Holy Doctor so often brings up against him, both elsewhere and especially in these books. Hitherto, they have been relegated to that volume which contains foreign and supposititious works; but in ancient codices, as Father Coustant reports concerning the old Corbie manuscript, they are quite prudently appended to Jerome's own books, and Jerome himself seemed to the most learned man to be the author of this arrangement. Finally, we have collated all these works for the most part with ancient editions, and one or two with the very old Palatinus-Vaticanus 234, and have also often emended them.

LIBER PRIMUS.

457 1. Et vestris et multorum litteris didici, objici mihi in schola Tyranni, lingua canum meorum ex inimicis ab ipso (Ps. LXVII, 24), cur Peri Archon libros in Latinum verterim. O impudentiam singularem! accusant medicum quod venena prodiderit; ut scilicet pharmacopolam suum, non innocentiae merito, sed criminis communione tueantur, quasi culpam numerus peccantium minuat, et in personis, non in rebus sit accusatio. Scribuntur contra me libri, ingeruntur omnibus audiendi; et tamen non eduntur, ut et simplicium corda percutiant, et mihi facultatem pro me auferant respondendi. Novum malitiae genus, accusare, quod prodi timeas: scribere, quod occultes. Si sunt vera quae scribit, cur publicum timuit? si falsa, cur scripsit? Olim pueri legimus: Intemperantis esse arbitror scribere quidquam, quod occultari velis (Cicero lib. I Academ. Quaest.). Rogo quis est iste dolor? Quid aestuant? quid insaniunt? Quod praeconem repuli figuratum? quod nolui me subdolo ore laudari? quod sub amici 458 nomine, inimici insidias deprehendi? Frater et collega in praefatiuncula vocor, et satis aperte exponuntur crimina mea, quid scripserim, quibus in coelum Origenem laudibus levaverim. Bono animo fecisse se dicit. Et quomodo nunc eadem inimicus objicit, quae tunc amicus laudaverat? Voluerat me in interpretatione quasi praeivum sequi; et auctoritatem operi suo ex nostris opusculis mutuari. Suffecerat semel dixisse, quod scripseram. Quid necesse fuit eadem rursus iterare, et frequenter ingerere: et quasi nemo sibi laudanti crederet, ipsa dicta replicare? Non est tam sollicita de audientium fide, simplex et pura laudatio. Quid metuit, ne illi sine testimoniis dictorum meorum in meis laudibus non credatur? Videtis nos intelligere prudentiam ejus et praedicationis diasyrtae strophis in scholis saepe luisse? Simpliciter obtendere non potest, in quo artifex deprehenditur malitia. Semel, aut ut multum, bis errasse sit casus; cur prudenter errat et crebro, 459 et sic per totum textit errorem, ut mihi non liceat negare quod laudat? Prudentis fuerat et amici, post reconciliatam simultatem, etiam leves suspiciones fugere: ne quod fortuito fecisset, consulto facere putaretur.

BOOK FIRST.

457 1. From your letters and those of many others I have learned that it is objected against me in the school of Tyrannus, by the tongue of my dogs from among the enemies (Ps. LXVII, 24), why I translated the books *Peri Archon* into Latin. Oh, singular impudence! They accuse the physician because he has exposed the poisons; so that, to be sure, they may protect their pharmacopolist, not by the merit of innocence, but by the communion of crime, as if the number of sinners lessens the fault, and the accusation lies in the persons, not in the deeds. Books are written against me, thrust upon everyone to be heard; and yet they are not published, so that they may both strike the hearts of the simple and take away from me the opportunity of defending myself. A new kind of malice, to accuse someone of what you fear to publish: to write what you hide. If what he writes is true, why did he fear the public? If false, why did he write it? Long ago as boys we read: "I consider it to be the mark of an intemperate man to write anything that you wish to be hidden" (Cicero, *Acad. Quaest.*, bk 1). I ask, what is this grief? Why do they rage? Why are they insane? Because I rejected a figurative herald? Because I did not wish to be praised with a deceitful mouth? Because under the name of a friend, I discovered the snares of an enemy? I am called brother and colleague in a little preface, and my crimes are exposed quite openly: what I have written, and with what praises I have raised Origen to the sky. He says he did it with a good intention. And how does an enemy now object to the same things that a friend had then praised? He had wished to follow me in interpretation as if I were a guide; and to borrow authority for his own work from our little writings. It had sufficed to have said once what I had written. What was the necessity of repeating the same things again, and of thrusting them in frequently: and, as if no one would believe him while praising, to replicate the very words said? A simple and pure praise is not so solicitous about the faith of the listeners. What does he fear, lest he not be believed in my praises without the testimonies of my words? Do you see that we understand his prudence and that we have often played with the tricks of his mocking preaching in the schools? He cannot pretend simplicity, in whom malice is detected as a craftsman. To have erred once, or at most twice, might be an accident; why does he err prudently and frequently, 459 and so weave the error through the whole, that it is not permitted for me to deny what he praises? It would have been the part of a prudent man and a friend, after a reconciled quarrel, to avoid even light suspicions: lest what he had done by chance, should be thought to be done by design.

Unde et Tullius in Commentariis causarum pro Gabinio: «Ego, inquit, cum omnes amicitias tuendas semper putavi summa religione et fide, tum eas maxime quae essent ex inimiciis revocatae in gratiam: propterea quod integris amicitiiis officium praetermissum, imprudentiae, vel (ut gravius interpretemur) negligentiae excusatione defenditur; post reditum in gratiam, si quid est commissum, id non neglectum, sed violatum putatur: nec imprudentiae, sed perfidiae assignari solet.» Flaccus Horatius quoque in Epistola quam scribit ad Florum: Male, ait, sarta Gratia nequidquam coit, et rescinditur.

2. Hilarius, Origenis interpres, et Ambrosius et Victorinus. Tres libri Rufini.--- Quid mihi nunc prodest, quod simpliciter errasse se jurat? Ecce objiciuntur mihi laudes ejus, et crimini datur simplicissimi amici, non simplex, nec pura laudatio. Si auctoritatem suo operi praestruerat, volens quos sequeretur ostendere, habuit in promptu Hilarium Confessorem, qui quadraginta ferme millia versuum Origenis in Job et Psalmos transtulit. Habuit Ambrosium, cujus pene omnes libri hujus sermone pleni sunt: et Martyrem Victorinum, qui simplicitatem suam in eo probat, dum nulli molitur insidias. De his omnibus tacet, et quasi columnis Ecclesiae praetermissis, me solum pulicem et nihili hominem per angulos consecatur. Nisi forte eadem simplicitate, qua amicum nescius accusavit, illos ignorasse se juret. Et quis ei credet viro eruditissimo, et qui tantam habeat scientiam Scriptorum veterum, maxime Graecorum, ut dum peregrina sectatur, pene sua amiserit: quod recentissimae memoriae viros et Latinos nesciat? Ex quo apparet non tam me ab eo laudatum, quam illos non accusatos: ut sive laus illa est (ut stultis persuadere conatur) sive accusatio, ut ego ex vulneris mei dolore sentio, nec in laude haberem aequalium gloriam, nec in vituperatione solatium.

3. Teneo epistolas vestras, quibus accusatum me scribitis esse: et hortamini 460 ut respondeam criminanti; ne si tacuerim, videar crimen agnoscere. Ad quas respondi, fateor: et quamvis laesus, sic amicitiae iura servavi, ut me sine accusantis accusatione defenderem: et quod unus Romae amicus objecerat, a multis in toto orbe inimicis dicerem jactitatum, ut non viderer homini, sed criminibus respondere.

Whence also Tully in the Commentaries of causes for Gabinius says: "I, while I have always thought that all friendships should be kept with the greatest religion and faith, then especially those which have been recalled into favor from enmities: because in intact friendships a duty passed over is defended by the excuse of imprudence or (to interpret more gravely) of negligence; after a return into favor, if anything is committed, it is thought not neglected, but violated: nor is it usually assigned to imprudence, but to perfidy." Horace Flaccus also in the Epistle which he writes to Florus says: "A Grace badly patched together joins in vain, and is torn asunder."

2. Hilarius, the interpreter of Origen, and Ambrose and Victorinus. Three books of Rufinus. --- What does it profit me now, that he swears he erred simply? Behold, his praises are objected to me, and the not simple, nor pure praise of a most simple friend is given as a crime. If he was building authority for his own work, wishing to show whom he followed, he had at hand Hilary the Confessor, who translated nearly forty thousand lines of Origen on Job and the Psalms. He had Ambrose, almost all of whose books are full of the discourses of this man: and the Martyr Victorinus, who proves his simplicity in this, that he prepares snares for no one. Concerning all these he is silent, and as if having passed over the columns of the Church, he follows me alone, a flea and a man of nothing, through the corners. Unless perchance he swears that he was ignorant of them with the same simplicity with which he unknowingly accused a friend. And who will believe him, a most learned man, and one who has such great knowledge of the ancient Writers, especially the Greeks, that while he pursues foreign things, he has almost lost his own: that he does not know men of very recent memory and Latins? From which it appears that I was not so much praised by him, as they were not accused: so that whether that is praise (as he tries to persuade fools) or an accusation, as I feel from the pain of my wound, I should neither have the glory of my equals in praise, nor solace in blame.

3. I have your letters, in which you write that I have been accused: and you exhort 460 me to respond to the accuser; lest if I should be silent, I should seem to acknowledge the crime. To which I responded, I confess: and although injured, I so preserved the laws of friendship, that I defended myself without an accusation of the accuser: and what one friend in Rome had objected, I said was being bandied about by many enemies in the whole world, so that I might not seem to respond to a man, but to crimes.

Aliud est, si pro jure amicitiae accusatus tacere debui, et dum lutatam habeo faciem, atque (ut ita dicam) haeretico fetore conspersam, ne simplici quidem aqua diluere, ne ille mihi fecisse putaretur injuriam. Haec vox nec hominis est, nec ad hominem, aperte amicum petere, et crimina ejus sub persona laudatoris exponere: et illi ne hoc quidem liberum derelinqui, ut se catholicum probet, et laudationem haeretici, quae illi objicitur, non de assensu haereseos, sed de ingenii exstitisse admiratione respondeat. Placuerat ei, sive ut ipse vult videri, compulsus erat in Latinam linguam vertere, quod nolebat. Quid necesse fuit me latentem, et tantis maris atque terrarum divisum spatiis inserere quaestioni? opponere invidiae plurimorum, ut plus mihi laudando noceret, quam sibi prodesset exemplo? Nunc quoque quia renui laudatorem, et verso stylo docui me non esse, quod meus necessarius praedicavit, dicitur furere, et tres contra me libros venustate Attica texuisse: eadem accusans, quae ante laudaverat, et objiciens mihi in translatione Origenis nefaria dogmata, de quo in Praefatiuncula laudationis suae dixerat: «Sequar regulam praecessorum, et ejus praecipue viri, cujus superius fecimus mentionem: qui cum ultra septuaginta libellos Origenis, quos Homiliticos appellavit, aliquantos etiam de tomis in Apostolom scriptis, transtulisset in Latinum: in quibus cum aliquanta offendicula inveniantur in Graeco, ita eliminavit omnia interpretando atque purgavit, ut nihil in illis quod a fide nostra discrepet, Latinus lector inveniat. Hunc ergo etiam nos, licet non eloquentiae viribus, disciplinae tamen regulis in quantum possumus, sequimur.»

4. Fides Romana Catholicorum est.---Certe haec illius verba sunt, negare non potest. Ipsa styli elegantia et sermo compositus, quodque his majus est, 461 simplicitas Christiana, auctoris sui characterem probant. Aliud est, si ista Eusebius depravavit, et accusator Origenis, meique studiosus, in uno eodemque opere et illum et me vel errasse, vel bene sensisse testatus est. Non potest me nunc inimicus haeticum dicere, quem a fide sua dudum non discrepare praefatus est. Simulque et hoc ab eo quaero, quid sibi velit sermo moderatus et dubius? Nihil, inquit, in illis quod a fide nostra discrepet, Latinus lector inveniet. Fidem suam quam vocat? Eamne qua Romana pollet Ecclesia? an illam, quae in Origenis voluminibus continetur? Si Romanam responderit, ergo Catholici sumus, qui nihil de Origenis errore transtulimus. Sin autem Origenis blasphemia, fides illius est: dum mihi inconstantiae crimen impingit, se haeticum probat. Sive bene credit laudator meus, confessione sua me assumit in socium; sive male, ostendit me ideo ante laudatum, quia participem sui putabat erroris.

It is one thing, if for the law of friendship I, being accused, ought to have been silent, and while I have a mud-spattered face, and (so to speak) sprinkled with heretical stench, not to wash it even with simple water, lest he should be thought to have done me an injury. This voice is neither of a man, nor toward a man, to openly attack a friend, and expose his crimes under the person of a praiser: and that not even this freedom is left to him, that he might prove himself a catholic, and respond that the praise of a heretic, which is objected to him, existed not from the assent of heresy, but from the admiration of genius. It had pleased him, or as he himself wishes to be seen, he was compelled to turn into the Latin language what he did not wish. What necessity was there to insert me, who was hidden and divided by such great spaces of sea and land, into the question? To expose me to the envy of many, so that by praising he might harm me more than he might benefit himself by example? Now also because I have refused the praiser, and with a turned stylus have shown that I am not what my intimate preached, he is said to rage, and to have woven three books against me with Attic elegance: accusing the same things which he had before praised, and objecting to me in the translation of Origen nefarious dogmas, concerning whom he had said in the little Preface of his praise: "I will follow the rule of predecessors, and especially of that man whom we mentioned above: who when he had translated into Latin more than seventy little books of Origen, which he called Homiletic, and some also from the tomes written on the Apostle: in which when some stumbling blocks are found in the Greek, he so polished and purged everything in interpreting, that the Latin reader may find nothing in them which disagrees with our faith. This man therefore we also follow, although not with the powers of eloquence, yet as much as we can with the rules of discipline."

4. The Roman faith is that of Catholics. --- Certainly these are his words, he cannot deny them. The elegance of the style itself and the composed speech, and what is greater than these, 461 Christian simplicity, prove the character of their author. It is another thing, if Eusebius depraved those things, and the accuser of Origen, and a studious friend of mine, testified in one and the same work that both he and I either erred, or thought well. He cannot now as an enemy call me a heretic, whom he before prefaced as not disagreeing with his own faith for a long time. And at the same time I also ask this of him, what does a moderate and doubtful speech mean for himself? Nothing, he says, will the Latin reader find in them which disagrees with our faith. What does he call his faith? Is it that in which the Roman Church is powerful? Or that which is contained in the volumes of Origen? If he responds Roman, then we are Catholics, who have translated nothing of the error of Origen. But if the blasphemy of Origen is his faith: while he impinges the crime of inconstancy upon me, he proves himself a heretic. Whether my praiser believes well, by his confession he takes me as a companion; or whether ill, he shows that I was therefore praised before, because he thought me a participant in his error.

Sed adversus illos libros, qui per angulos garriunt, et furtiva accusatione me mordent, cum editi fuerint, et de tenebris ad lucem processerint, atque ad nos vel studio fratrum, vel temeritate aemulorum potuerint pervenire, respondere conabor. Neque enim magnopere formidandi sunt, quos metuit auctor suus prodere, et tantum confederatis legendos esse decrevit. Tunc aut agnoscam crimina, aut diluam, aut in accusatorem quae sunt objecta retorquebo: et ostendam quod hucusque silentium modestiae fuerit, non male conscientiae.

5. Auctor sese excusat.---Interim apud tacitum lectoris iudicium purgatum me esse volui, et gravissimum inter amicos crimen refellere, ne prior laesisse videat, qui et vulneratus nequaquam contra persecutorem tela direxi; sed meo tantum vulneri admovi manum. Quem obsecro, ut absque praeiudicio personarum, culpam in eum referat, qui lacesivit. Nec laesisse contentus, quasi adversus elinguem semperque taciturnum, tres elucubravimus libros, et ἀντιθέσεις Marcionis de meis opusculis fabricatus est. Gestit animus, et illius repente doctrinam, et meam inspiratam vecordiam 462 cognoscere. Fortasse brevi tempore didicit, quod nos docere debeat; et quod illum scire nullus putabat, subitum eloquentiae flumen ostendet. Sic pater ille Deum faciat: sic magnus Iesus (Ex Virgil. lib. X Aeneid.). Incipiat conferre manum. Quamvis libnaverit accusationis suae hastas, et totis adversum nos viribus intorserit, credimus in Dominum Salvatorem, quod scuto circumdabit nos veritas ejus; et cum Psalmista cantare poterimus: Sagittae parvulorum factae sunt plagae eorum (Psal. LXIII, 8). Et, Si constiterint adversum me castra, non timebit cor meum. Si steterit adversum me praelium, in hoc ego sperabo (Psal. XXVI, 3, 4). Sed haec alias. Nunc ad id quod coepimus, revertamur.

6. Cur Latine verterit Origenis Periarchon? Didymus propugnator Origenis. --- Objiciunt mihi sectatores ejus, cerealiaque arma Expediunt fessi rerum (Aeneid. lib. I), quare περὶ Ἀρχῶν libros Origenis noxios, et Ecclesiasticae fidei repugnantes, in Latinum sermonem verterim. Ad quos brevis et succincta responsio est: Tuae me, frater Pammachi, et tuorum litterae compulerunt, dicentes illos ab alio fraudulenter esse translatos, et interpolata nonnulla, et vel addita vel mutata. Ac ne parvam Epistolis haberem fidem, misistis exemplaria ejusdem translationis, cum praefatiuncula laudatrice mea. Quae cum legissem, contulissemque cum Graeco, illico animadverti quae Origenes de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto impie dixerat: et quae Romanae aures ferre non poterant, in meliorem partem ab interprete commutata.

But against those books which chatter through the corners, and bite me with a furtive accusation, when they shall have been published, and shall have proceeded from the shadows into the light, and shall have been able to reach us either by the study of the brothers or by the rashness of rivals, I will try to respond. For they are not greatly to be dreaded, whom their author fears to publish, and has decreed to be read only by confederates. Then I will either acknowledge the crimes, or wash them away, or retort those things which were objected upon the accuser: and I will show that the silence until now has been of modesty, not of a bad conscience.

5. The author excuses himself. --- In the meantime, I wished to be purged in the silent judgment of the reader, and to refute the gravest crime among friends, lest he who was wounded should seem to have injured first, who by no means directed weapons against the persecutor; but only moved my hand to my own wound. Whom I beseech, that without prejudice of persons, he should refer the fault to him who provoked it. Nor content with having injured, as if against one tongueless and always to be silent, he elucubrated three books, and fabricated 462 the Antitheses of Marcion from my little works. My mind exults to know suddenly both his doctrine and my unhopd-for folly. Perhaps in a short time he learned what he ought to teach us; and what no one thought he knew, a sudden flood of eloquence will show. "So may that father of the gods do: so great Jesus" (From Virgil, *Aeneid* bk 10). Let him begin to join hand. Although he has balanced the spears of his accusation, and has hurled them with all his strength against us, we believe in the Lord Savior, that his truth will surround us with a shield; and we will be able to sing with the Psalmist: "The arrows of the little ones have been made their wounds" (Psalm 63:8). And, "If camps should stand against me, my heart shall not fear. If battle should stand against me, in this I will hope" (Psalm 26:3, 4). But these things elsewhere. Now let us return to that which we began.

6. Why did he translate Origen's *Periarchon*? Didymus, the defender of Origen. ---His followers object to me, and "weary of things, they prepare the arms of Ceres" (*Aeneid*, Book I), as to why I translated the books of Origen's *Peri Archon* (*On First Principles*), which are harmful and repugnant to the Ecclesiastical faith, into the Latin language. To them, there is a brief and succinct response: Your letter, brother Pamachius, and those of your friends compelled me, saying that those books had been fraudulently translated by another, and that some things had been interpolated, and either added or changed. And lest I should have little faith in the letters, you sent copies of the same translation, with a little preface praising me. When I had read these and compared them with the Greek, I immediately noticed what Origen had impiously said concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit; and those things which Roman ears could not bear had been changed for the better by the translator.

Caetera autem dogmata, de Angelorum ruina, de animarum lapsu, de resurrectionis praestigiis, de mundo, vel intermundiis Epicuri, de restitutione omnium in aequalem statum, et multo his deteriora: quae longum esset retexere, vel ita vertisse, ut in Graeco invenerat, vel de Commentariolis Didymi, qui Origenis apertissimus propugnator est, exaggerata et firmiora posuisse: ut qui in Trinitate catholicum legerat, in aliis haereticum non caveret.

7. Alius forsitan, qui non esset amicus ejus, diceret: aut totum muta, quod malum est: aut totum prode, quod optimum putas. Si propter simplices noxia quaeque detruncas, et ea quae ab haereticis addita simulas, in peregrinum non vis transferre sermonem, cedo quidquid est noxium. Sin autem veritatis fidem in translatione conservas, cur alia mutas, et alia dimittis intacta? Quamquam aperta confessio est in eodem Prologo, emendasse te prava, et optima reliquisse. Ex quo non interpretis libertate, sed scriptoris auctoritate teneberis, si quid in his quae vertisti, haereticum comprobetur; et manifesti criminis argueris, idcirco te veneni calicem circumlinere melle voluisse, ut simulata dulcedo, virus pessimum tegeret. Haec et multo his duriora inimicus diceret: et te, non ut interpretem mali operis, sed ut astipulatorem in jus Ecclesiae traheret. Ego autem memet tantum defendisse contentus, in libris *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* simpliciter quod in Graeco habebatur expressi: non ut crederet lector his quae interpretabar; sed ne crederet illis, quae tu ante transtuleras. Duplex in opere meo utilitas fuit, dum et haereticus auctor proditur, et non verus interpres arguitur. Ac ne quis me putaret his consentire quae verteram, interpretationis necessitatem praefatione munivi, et docui, quibus lector non deberet credere. Prior translatio laudem Auctoris continet: secunda vituperationem. Illa lectorem provocat ad credendum; ista ad non credendum movet. Ibi et ego invitus laudator assumor; hic intantum non laudo quem transfero, ut cogar accusare laudantem. Eadem res non eadem mente perfecta est; immo unum iter diversos exitus habuit.

But the other dogmas, concerning the ruin of the Angels, the fall of souls, the deceits of the resurrection, the world, or the interworlds of Epicurus, the restoration of all things into an equal state, and many things much worse than these: which it would be long to retrace, he had either so translated as he had found in the Greek, or he had placed them exaggerated and firmer from the commentaries of Didymus, who is the most open defender of Origen: so that he who had read a Catholic view on the Trinity would not be on guard against the heretical view in other matters.

7. Another perhaps, who was not his friend, would say: either change the whole, which is bad: or bring forth the whole, which you think is best. If on account of the simple you cut off all harmful things, and those which you pretend were added by heretics you do not wish to translate into a foreign language, I yield whatever is harmful. But if you preserve the fidelity of truth in the translation, why do you change some things and leave others untouched? Although it is an open confession in the same Prologue, that you have corrected the perverse things and left the best. From which you will be held not by the liberty of a translator, but by the authority of a writer, if anything heretical is proved in these things which you have translated; and you will be convicted of a manifest crime, that you therefore wished to smear the cup of poison with honey, so that the feigned sweetness might cover the worst venom. These and many things much harder than these an enemy would say: and he would drag you into the law of the Church, not as a translator of a bad work, but as a supporter. But I, content only to have defended myself, simply expressed in the books of *Peri Archon* what was held in the Greek: not so that the reader might believe in these things which I was interpreting; but lest he should believe in those things which you had translated before. There was a double utility in my work, while both the heretical author is exposed, and the untruthful translator is convicted. And lest anyone should think that I consent to these things which I had translated, I fortified the necessity of the interpretation with a preface, and I taught what the reader ought not to believe. The first translation contains the praise of the Author; the second contains his vituperation. That one provokes the reader to believe; this one moves him not to believe. There I also am assumed as an unwilling praiser; here I so far do not praise the one whom I translate, that I am forced to accuse the one who praises. The same thing was perfected not with the same mind; rather, one journey had different outcomes.

Abstulit quae erant, dicens ab haereticis depravata; et addidit quae non erant, asserens ab eodem in locis aliis disputata: quod nisi ipsa loca monstraverit, unde transtulisse se dicit, probare non poterit. Mihi studio fuit nihil mutare de vero. Ad hoc enim interpretabar, ut mala interpretata convincerem. Putatis me interpretem? Proditor fui: prodidi haeticum, ut Ecclesiam ab haeresi vindicarem. Cur Origenem in quibusdam ante laudaverim, praelatus huic operi ostendit liber. Nunc sola interpretationis meae causa redditur, quae cum pietatis habeat voluntatem, non debeo impietatis argui, prodens impium, quod quasi pium Ecclesiis tradebatur (Epistola ad Pammachium et Oceanum).

8. Eusebius signifer Arianae factionis. ---Septuaginta libros ejus, ut meus necessarius criminatur, in Latinum verteram, et multa de tomis. Numquam de opere meo fuit quaestio, numquam Roma commota est. Quid necesse erat Latinis auribus tradere, quod detestatur et Graecia, quod orbis accusat? Ego per tot annos tam multa convertens, nunquam scandalo fui. Tu ad primum et solum opus, ignotus prius, temeritate factus es nobilis. Docet ipsa Praefatio, et Pamphili martyris librum pro defensione Origenis a te esse translatum. Et hoc agis totis viribus, ut cujus fidem martyr probat, Ecclesia non refutet. Sex libros (ut ante jam dixi) Eusebius Caesariensis episcopus, Arianae quondam signifer factionis, pro Origene scripsit, latissimum et elaboratum opus; et multis testimoniis approbavit, Origenem juxta se catholicum, id est, juxta nos Arianum esse. Horum tu primum librum vertis sub nomine martyris. Et miramur, si me homunculum parvi pretii, Origenis laudatorem velis, cum martyri calumniam feceris? Paucisque testimoniis de Filio Dei et Spiritu sancto commutatis, quae sciebas displicitura Romanis, caetera usque ad finem integra dimisisti; hoc idem faciens in Apologia, quasi Pamphili, quod et in Origenis περὶ Ἀρχῶν translatione fecisti. Si iste Pamphili liber est, de sex libris quis erit primus Eusebii? In ipso volumine, quod tu Pamphili simulas, sequentium librorum facta mentio est. In secundo quoque et reliquis dicit Eusebius, quod in primo libro ante jam dixerat, et quod eadem repetere non debeat. Si totum opus Pamphili est, cur reliquos libros non transfers? Si alterius, cur nomen immutas? Taces; ipsae res loquuntur: videlicet ut crederent martyri, qui Arianorum principem detestaturi erant.

He took away what was there, saying they were depraved by heretics; and he added what was not there, asserting they were discussed by the same in other places: which unless he shows those very places, from where he says he translated, he will not be able to prove it. It was my zeal to change nothing of the truth. For I was interpreting for this purpose, that I might convict the badly interpreted things. Do you think me a translator? I was a betrayer: I betrayed the heretic, so that I might vindicate the Church from heresy. Why I previously praised Origen in some things, the book placed before this work shows. Now only the reason for my interpretation is rendered, which since it has the will of piety, I ought not to be accused of impiety, betraying the impious one, which was being handed over to the Churches as if pious (Letter to Pammachius and Oceanus).

8. Eusebius, the standard-bearer of the Arian faction. ---Seventy of his books, as my close associate accuses, I had translated into Latin, and many from the tomes. Never was there a question about my work, never was Rome moved. What was necessary to hand over to Latin ears what even Greece detests, what the world accuses? I, translating so many things through so many years, was never a scandal. You, at the first and only work, previously unknown, have become noble by temerity. The Preface itself teaches, and the book of Pamphilus the martyr for the defense of Origen was translated by you. And you do this with all your strength, so that the one whose faith the martyr approves, the Church may not refute. Six books (as I have already said before) Eusebius bishop of Caesarea, once the standard-bearer of the Arian faction, wrote for Origen, a very wide and elaborate work; and he proved with many testimonies that Origen was a Catholic according to him, that is, according to us, an Arian. Of these, you translate the first book under the name of the martyr. And do we wonder, if you wish me, a little man of small price, to be a praiser of Origen, when you have done a calumny to the martyr? And a few testimonies concerning the Son of God and the Holy Spirit having been changed, which you knew would displease the Romans, you left the rest intact until the end; doing this same thing in the Apology, as if of Pamphilus, which you also did in the translation of Origen's *Peri Archon*. If that book is of Pamphilus, which of the six books will be the first of Eusebius? In the volume itself, which you feign as Pamphilus's, mention of the following books is made. In the second also and the others Eusebius says what he had already said before in the first book, and that he ought not to repeat the same things. If the whole work is of Pamphilus, why do you not translate the remaining books? If it is of another, why do you change the name? You are silent; the things themselves speak: namely, that they might believe the martyr, who were going to detest the prince of the Arians.

9. Pamphilus martyr nihil omnino scripsit. ---Quid tibi animi fuisse dicam, amice simplicissime? tene potuisse haeretici hominis libro, martyris nomen imponere, et ignaros sub auctoritate testis Christi, Origenis facere defensores? Pro eruditione qua polles et inclytus συγγραφεὺς in Occidente laudaris, ita ut κορυφαῖον te omnes tuae partis nominent, non reor te ignorasse Eusebii σύνταγμα, et Pamphilum martyrem nihil omnino operis condidisse. Ipse enim Eusebius amator et praeco et contubernalis Pamphili tres libros scripsit elegantissimos, vitam Pamphili continentes: in quibus cum caetera miris laudibus praedicaret, humilitatemque ejus ferret in coelum, etiam hoc in tertio libro addidit: «Quis studiosorum amicus non fuit Pamphili? Si quos videbat ad victum necessariis indigere, praebebat large quae poterat. Scripturas quoque sanctas non ad legendum tantum, sed et ad habendum, tribuebat promptissime. Nec solum viris, sed et feminis, quas vidisset lectioni deditas. Unde et multos codices praeparabat, ut cum necessitas poposcisset, volentibus largiretur. Et ipse quidem proprii operis nihil omnino scripsit, exceptis epistolis, quas ad amicos forte mittebat; intantum se humilitate dejecerat. Veterum autem tractatus Scriptorum legebat studiosissime, et in eorum meditatione jugiter versabatur.»

10. Thophilus et Anastasius Origenem haeticum dicebant. ---Defensor Origenis, et laudator Pamphili, dicit Pamphilum nihil omnino scripsisse, nec proprii quidquam condidisse sermonis. Et hoc dicit jam Pamphilo martyrio coronato, ne habeas suffugium post editos ab Eusebio libros, hoc Pamphilum scripsisse. Quid facies? Eo libro quem sub nomine martyris edidisti, vulneratae sunt conscientiae plurimorum. Non valet apud eos super Origenis damnatione episcoporum auctoritas, quem putant a Martyre praedicatum. Quid facient epistolae Theophili episcopi? quid papae Anastasii in toto orbe haeticum persequentes, cum liber tuus sub nomine Pamphili editus pugnet contra Epistolas eorum, et Episcopali nomini testimonium Martyris opponatur? Quod fecisti in libris περὶ Ἀρχῶν, hoc facito et in isto volumine ψευδεπιγράφῳ. Audi consilium amici, non te poeniteat artis tuae: vel dicito, tuum non esse, vel ab Eusebio presbytero depravatum. Unde probari tibi poterit, quod a te translatus est? Non manus tua tenetur: non tantae es eloquentiae, ut nullus te possit imitari.

9. Pamphilus the martyr wrote nothing at all. ---What should I say was in your mind, most simple friend? That you were able to impose the name of a martyr on the book of a heretical man, and to make the ignorant defenders of Origen under the authority of a witness of Christ? For the erudition in which you excel and are praised as a renowned writer (*syngrapheus*) in the West, so that all of your party name you the head (*koryphaion*), I do not think you were ignorant of Eusebius's collection (*syntagma*), and that Pamphilus the martyr composed no work at all. For Eusebius himself, the lover and herald and companion of Pamphilus, wrote three most elegant books containing the life of Pamphilus: in which, while he proclaimed other things with wonderful praises, and bore his humility to heaven, he also added this in the third book: "Who of the studious was not a friend of Pamphilus? If he saw any who were in need of the necessities for food, he provided largely what he could. The holy Scriptures also, not only for reading but also for possessing, he bestowed most promptly. And not only to men, but also to women whom he had seen devoted to reading. Whence also he prepared many codices, so that when necessity demanded, he might bestow them on those who wished. And he himself indeed wrote nothing at all of his own work, except letters which he perhaps sent to friends; so far had he cast himself down in humility. But he read most studiously the treatises of the ancient Writers, and was continually engaged in meditation upon them."

10. Theophilus and Anastasius called Origen a heretic. ---The defender of Origen, and the praiser of Pamphilus, says that Pamphilus wrote nothing at all, nor composed anything of his own speech. And he says this now that Pamphilus has been crowned with martyrdom, lest you should have a refuge after the books published by Eusebius, that Pamphilus had written this. What will you do? By that book which you published under the name of the martyr, the consciences of many have been wounded. The authority of the bishops concerning the damnation of Origen does not prevail with them, whom they think was praised by the Martyr. What will the letters of bishop Theophilus do? What those of Pope Anastasius, pursuing the heretic in the whole world, when your book published under the name of Pamphilus fights against their Letters, and the testimony of the Martyr is opposed to the Episcopal name? What you did in the books of *Peri Archon*, do also in this falsely titled (*pseudepigrapho*) volume. Hear the counsel of a friend, let it not repent you of your art: either say it is not yours, or that it was depraved by the presbyter Eusebius. Whence will it be able to be proved to you, that it was translated by you? Your hand is not held: you are not of such eloquence that no one can imitate you.

Aut certe si res ad probationem venerit, et impudentiam frontis oppresserint testimonia plurimorum, palinodiam Stesichori more cantato. Melius est te poenitere facti tui, quam et martyrem in calumnia, et deceptos in errore persistere. Nec erubescas de commutatione sententiae: non es tantae auctoritatis et famae, ut errasse te pudeat. Imitare me, quem plurimum amas, sine quo nec vivere, nec mori potes: et mecum clama, quae ego laudatus a te in defensione mei locutus sum.

11. Quid Eusebius objiciebat Methodio martyri. Eusebii opuscula ab Hieronymo translata. ---Eusebius Caesariensis episcopus, cujus supra memini, in sexto *ἀπολογία*s Origenis, hoc idem objicit Methodio episcopo et martyri, quod tu in meis laudibus criminaris, et dicit: Quomodo ausus est Methodius nunc contra Origenem scribere, qui haec et haec de Origenis locutus est dogmatibus? Non est hujus loci pro martyre loqui: neque enim omnia in locis omnibus disserenda sunt. Nunc tetigisse sufficiat hoc ab Ariano homine objici clarissimo et eloquentissimo martyri, quod tu in me et amicus laudas, et offensus accusas. Habes occasionem et de praesenti loco, si velis, mihi calumniam struere, cur nunc et Eusebio detraham, quem in alio loco ante laudavi? Alterum quidem nomen Eusebii; sed eadem quae super Origenis vobabulo est calumnia. Laudavi Eusebium in Ecclesiastica Historia: in digestionem Temporum: in descriptionem sanctae Terrae; et haec ipsa opuscula in Latinum vertens, meae linguae hominibus dedi. Num ex eo Arianus sum, quia Eusebius qui hos libros condidit, Arianus est? Si ausus fueris me haereticum dicere, memento Praefatiunculae *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, in qua fidei tuae me esse testaris: simulque obsecro, ut amicum quondam tuum expostulantem patienter audias. Contra alios digladiaris, aut facis calumniam, aut pateris. Quos accusas, et a quibus accusaris, ordinis tui sunt: recte an perperam, vos videritis. Mihi etiam vera accusatio contra fratrem displicet: nec reprehendo alios, sed dico quid ipse non facerem. Tantis spatiis terrarum separatus quid peccavi in te? quid commerui? An quia Origenisten me non esse respondi? Numquid defensio mea, accusatio tua est? Et tu si non es Origenistes, vel non fuisti, credo juranti; si fuisti, suscipio poenitentem. Quid doles, si id sum, quod esse te dicis? An quia *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* Origenis libros post te transferre ausus sum, et interpretatio mea suggillatio putatur operis tui? Quid poteram facere? Missa mihi est laudatio tua, id est, accusatio mea. Tam fortiter me prolixique laudaveras, ut si tuis laudibus acquievissem, omnes haereticum me putarent.

Or certainly if the matter comes to proof, and the testimonies of many overwhelm the impudence of your face, sing the recantation (palinodiam) in the manner of Stesichorus. It is better for you to repent of your deed, than for both the martyr to persist in calumny and the deceived to persist in error. Nor should you blush at the change of opinion: you are not of such authority and fame that it would shame you to have erred. Imitate me, whom you love most, without whom you can neither live nor die: and cry out with me, what I, praised by you, spoke in defense of myself.

11. What Eusebius objected to Methodius the martyr. Eusebius's short works translated by Jerome. ---Eusebius bishop of Caesarea, whom I mentioned above, in the sixth book of his Apology for Origen, objects this very same thing to Methodius, bishop and martyr, which you charge against me in your praises, and says: "How did Methodius dare now to write against Origen, who spoke these and those things concerning the dogmas of Origen?" It is not the place here to speak for the martyr: for not all things are to be discussed in all places. Now let it suffice to have touched upon this, that what is objected by an Arian man to a most illustrious and eloquent martyr, is what you both praise in me as a friend and accuse when offended. You have an opportunity also from the present place, if you wish, to build a calumny against me, as to why I now detract from Eusebius, whom I praised before in another place? The name of Eusebius is indeed another; but it is the same calumny which is over the name of Origen. I praised Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History, in the ordering of Times (Chronicle), in the description of the Holy Land (Onomasticon); and translating these very short works into Latin, I gave them to the men of my language. Am I therefore an Arian because Eusebius, who composed these books, is an Arian? If you dare to call me a heretic, remember the little Preface to Peri Archon, in which you testify that I am of your faith: and at the same time I beseech you, that you patiently hear your former friend expostulating. You fight with others, or you make a calumny, or you suffer one. Those whom you accuse, and by whom you are accused, are of your order: whether rightly or wrongly, you will see to it. To me even a true accusation against a brother is displeasing: nor do I reprehend others, but I say what I myself would not do. Separated by such spaces of land, what have I sinned against you? What have I deserved? Or is it because I responded that I am not an Origenist? Is my defense your accusation? And you, if you are not an Origenist, or were not, I believe you as you swear; if you were, I receive you as a penitent. Why do you grieve, if I am what you say you are? Or is it because I dared to translate Origen's books of Peri Archon after you, and my interpretation is thought a slight (suggillatio) to your work? What could I do? Your praise was sent to me, that is, my accusation. You had praised me so strongly and prolixly, that if I had acquiesced in your praises, all would think me a heretic.

Vide quid Romanae ad me Epistolae clausula teneat: «Purga suspiciones hominum, et convince criminantem; ne si dissimulaveris, consentire videaris» (Epistola Pammachii et Oceani). Tali constrictus articulo, interpretaturus eosdem libros, ausculta quid scripserim: «Hoc mihi praestiterunt amici mei (non dixi amicus meus, ne te viderer arguere) ut si tacuero, reus; si respondero, inimicus iudicer. Dura utraque conditio, sed e duobus eligam quod levius est. Simultas redintegrari potest: blasphemia veniam non meretur (Epist. ad Pamm. et Ocean). Animadvertis invito mihi et repugnanti hoc onus impositum; et futuram ex huiusmodi opere similtatem, necessitatis excusatione curatam? Si interpretatus esses libros *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* absque meo nomine, recte querereris in reprehensionem tuam a me postea esse translatos. Nunc autem injuste doles, in eo opere a me tibi esse responsum, in quo a te laudando accusatus sum. Quam enim tu laudem vocas, omnes accusationem intelligunt. Constet apud te, quod accusaveris; et non indignaberis, quod responderim. Esto, tu bono animo scripseris, et homo innocens et amicus fidissimus, de cuius numquam egressum est ore mendacium, me nescius vulneraris: quid ad me, qui percussus sum? Num idcirco curari non debeo, quia tu me bono animo vulnerasti? Confossus jaceo, stridet vulnus in pectore: candida prius sanguine membra turpantur, et tu mihi dicis: Noli manum adhibere vulnere, ne ego te videar vulnerasse? Quamquam et ipsa translatio magis Origenem quam te arguit. Tu enim emendasti quae addita ab haeticis arbitratus es. Ego prodidi, quod ab illo scriptum Graecia universa conclamat. Quis rectius arbitratus sit, nec meum, nec tuum iudicium est. Utriusque scripta censoriam lectoris virgulam sentiant. Tota illa Epistola, qua pro me satisfacio, contra haeticos et accusatores meos dirigitur: quid ad te, qui et orthodoxum et laudatorem meum te esse dicis, si asperior sum in haeticos, et illorum in publicum strophas profero? Laetare invectione mea; ne si dolueris, haeticus esse videaris. Quando sine nomine contra vitia scribitur; qui irascitur, accusator sui est. Prudentis hominis fuerat, etiam si dolebat, dissimulare conscientiam; et cordis nubilum, frontis serenitate discutere.

12. Epistolae Theophili et Epiphanii, et Imperatorum scripta adversus Origenem. ---Alioqui, si quidquid contra Origenem et sectatores ejus dicitur, in te dictum putas; ergo et epistolae papae Theophili et Epiphanii, et aliorum episcoporum, quas nuper ipsis jubentibus transtulit, te petunt, te lacerant. Imperatorum quoque scripta, quae de Alexandria et Aegypto Origenistas pelli jubent, me suggerente, dictata sunt. Ut Romanae urbis Pontifex miro eos odio detestetur, meum consilium fuit.

See what the conclusion of the Roman Letter to me holds: "Clear the suspicions of men, and convict the one who charges; lest if you dissemble, you should seem to consent" (Letter of Pammachius and Oceanus). Constrained by such an article, when I was about to translate the same books, listen to what I wrote: "My friends have afforded me this (I did not say my friend, lest I should seem to charge you) that if I remain silent, I am judged guilty; if I respond, an enemy. Both conditions are hard, but from the two I will choose what is lighter. A grudge can be reintegrated: blasphemy does not merit pardon (Letter to Pammachius and Oceanus). Do you notice that this burden was imposed on me unwilling and resisting; and that the future grudge from such a work was cured by the excuse of necessity? If you had translated the books of Peri Archon without my name, you would rightly complain that they were afterwards translated by me for your reprehension. But now you grieve unjustly, that you were answered by me in that work in which I was accused by your praising me. For what you call praise, all understand as an accusation. Let it be established with you, that you accused; and you will not be indignant that I responded. Grant that you wrote with a good mind, and as an innocent man and most faithful friend, from whose mouth a lie never issued, you wounded me unknowingly: what is that to me, who have been struck? Should I not therefore be cured because you wounded me with a good mind? I lie pierced, the wound hisses in my breast: the previously white limbs are defiled with blood, and you say to me: "Do not apply your hand to the wound, lest I should seem to have wounded you?" Although the translation itself charges Origen rather than you. For you corrected what you thought was added by heretics. I brought forth what all Greece proclaims was written by him. Who may have thought more rightly is neither my judgment nor yours. Let the writings of both feel the censor's rod of the reader. All that Letter, in which I satisfy for myself, is directed against the heretics and my accusers: what is it to you, who say you are both orthodox and my praiser, if I am harsher toward the heretics, and bring forth their tricks (strophas) into public? Rejoice in my invective; lest if you grieve, you should seem to be a heretic. When it is written against vices without a name, he who is angry is the accuser of himself. It would have been the part of a prudent man, even if he grieved, to dissemble his conscience; and to dispel the cloud of the heart with the serenity of the brow.

12. The letters of Theophilus and Epiphanius, and the writings of the Emperors against Origen. ---Otherwise, if you think whatever is said against Origen and his followers is said against you; then also the letters of Pope Theophilus and Epiphanius, and of other bishops, which I recently translated at their command, seek you, they tear you. The writings of the Emperors also, which command the Origenists to be driven from Alexandria and Egypt, were dictated at my suggestion. That the Pontiff of the city of Rome detests them with a wonderful hatred, was my counsel.

Ut totus orbis post translationem tuam in Origenis odia exarserit, quem antea simplici lectitabat, meus operatus est stylus. Si tantum possum, miror cur me non metuas. Ego ille moderatus in epistola publica (Epist. 81 ad Rufin.), qui diligenter cavi, ne quid in te dictum putares, scripsi ad te statim brevem Epistolam, expostulans super laudibus tuis. Quam, quia Romae non eras, amici mei tibi mittere noluerunt, eo quod te dicerent cum sodalibus tuis indigna nomine Christiano de mea conversatione jactitare. Cujus exemplum huic volumini subdidi, ut scias quantum dolorem, quanta moderatione necessitudinis temperavi.

13. Judaeus Hieronymi praeceptor. Gregorius Nazianzenus magister Hieronymi. Huillus Judaeus. Psalmi sine titulo. ---Audio praeterea te quaedam de epistola mea philosophice carpere, et hominem rugosae frontis adductique supercilii, Plautino in me sale ludere, eo quod Barrabam Judaeum dixerim praeceptorem meum. Nec mirum si pro BAR-ANINA, ubi est aliqua vocabulorum similitudo, scripseris Barrabam, cum tantam habeas licentiam nominum immutandorum; ut de Eusebio Pamphilum, de haeretico martyrem feceris. Cavendus homo, et mihi maxime declinandus, ne me repente, dum nescio, de Hieronymo Sardanapalum nomines. Audi ergo, sapientiae columen, et norma Catonianae severitatis. Ego non illum magistrum dixi; sed meum in Scripturas sanctas studium volui comprobare, ut ostenderem me sic legisse Origenem, quomodo et illum audieram. Neque enim Hebraeas litteras a te discere debui. An injuria tibi facta est, quod pro te Apollinarium, Didymumque sectatus sum? Numquid in illa epistola Gregorium virum eloquentissimum non potui nominare? Quis apud Latinos par sui est? quo ego magistro gloriator et exulto. Sed eos tantum posui, qui in reprehensione erant, ut similiter me Originem, non ob fidei veritatem, sed ob eruditionis meritum legisse testarer. Ipse Origenes, et Clemens et Eusebius, atque alii complures, quando de Scripturis aliqua disputant, et volunt approbare quod dicunt, sic solent scribere: Referebat mihi Hebraeus; et, audivi ab Hebraeo: et, Hebraeorum ista sententia est. Certe etiam Origenes Patriarchen Huillum, qui temporibus ejus fuit, nominat: et tricesimum tomum in Isaiam, in cujus fine edisserit: Vae tibi, civitas Ariel, quam expugnavit David, illius expositione concludit; et cum aliter prius sensisse se dicat, doctum ab illo, id quod est verius, confitetur. Octogesimum quoque nonum Psalmum, qui scribitur: Oratio Moysi hominis Dei, et reliquos undecim, qui non habent titulos, secundum Huilli expositionem, ejusdem Moysi putat, nec dedignatur Hebraeam Scripturam interpretans per singula loca, quid Hebraeis videatur, inserere.

That the whole world after your translation has been inflamed with hatred for Origen, whom before it read simply, my style has worked. If I can do so much, I wonder why you do not fear me. I, that moderate one in the public letter (Letter 81 to Rufinus), who diligently took care lest you should think anything was said against you, wrote to you immediately a brief Letter, expostulating concerning your praises. Which, because you were not in Rome, my friends did not wish to send to you, because they said that you with your companions were boasting about my conversation things unworthy of the Christian name. An example of which I have added to this volume, so that you may know how great a grief I tempered with how great a moderation of necessity.

13. Jerome's Jewish teacher. Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome's master. Huillus the Jew. Psalms without titles. --I hear, moreover, that you philosophically carp at certain things in my letter, and that as a man of wrinkled brow and drawn-up eyebrow, you play with Plautine wit against me, because I called a certain Bar-Anina, a Jew, my teacher. Nor is it a wonder if for Bar-Anina, where there is some similarity of words, you wrote Barrabas, since you have such license for changing names; so that from Eusebius you made Pamphilus, and from a heretic a martyr. A man to be guarded against, and most especially to be declined by me, lest suddenly, while I do not know it, you should name me Sardanapalus instead of Jerome. Hear then, o column of wisdom and norm of Catonian severity. I did not call him my master; but I wished to prove my zeal in the holy Scriptures, so that I might show that I had so read Origen as I had also heard him. For I ought not to have learned Hebrew letters from you. Or was an injury done to you because for your sake I followed Apollinaris and Didymus? Could I not in that letter name Gregory, a most eloquent man? Who among the Latins is his equal? In whom as a master I glory and exult. But I placed those only who were under reprehension, so that I might similarly testify that I had read Origen, not for the truth of the faith, but for the merit of his erudition. Origen himself, and Clement and Eusebius, and many others, when they dispute something from the Scriptures and wish to approve what they say, are accustomed to write thus: "A Hebrew related to me"; and, "I heard from a Hebrew"; and, "This is the opinion of the Hebrews." Certainly Origen also names the Patriarch Huillus, who was in his times: and the thirtieth tome on Isaiah, at the end of which he discusses: "Woe to you, city of Ariel, which David besieged," he concludes with his exposition; and although he says he had previously felt otherwise, he confesses that he was taught by him that which is truer. The eighty-ninth Psalm also, which is written: "A prayer of Moses the man of God," and the remaining eleven which do not have titles, he thinks are of the same Moses according to the exposition of Huillus, nor does he disdain, when interpreting the Hebrew Scripture through individual places, to insert what seems right to the Hebrews.

14. Origenes damnatus. ---Lectis nuper papae Theophili epistolis, in quibus Origenis exponit errores, dicitur obturasse aures suas, et auctorem tanti mali clara cum [Al. coram] omnibus voce damnasce, et dixisse: usque ad illud tempus se ignorasse, quod tam nefaria scripserit. Non recuso, nec dico quod alius diceret forsitan, non potuisse eum ignorare, quod interpretatus est, cujus Apologiam scriptam ab haeretico sub nomine martyris edidit: cujus defensionem etiam proprio volumine professus est: adversum quod in sequentibus, si dictandi spatium fuerit, disputabo. Hoc loquor, cui contradicere non potest. Si illi licet non intellexisse quod transtulit, quare mihi non liceat ignorasse libros *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, quos ante non legi; et eas tantum Homilias legisse, quas transtuli, in quibus nihil esse mali, ipsius testimonium est? Sin autem contra sententiam suam nunc me in eis arguit, in quibus ante laudaverat, undique strictus tenebitur. Aut enim idcirco me haereticum hominem laudavit, quia ejusdem mecum dogmatis erat: aut nunc frustra inimicus accusat, quem prius ut orthodoxum praedicavit. Sed forsitan tunc errores meos quasi amicus tacuit; et nunc iratus profert quod prius celaverat.

15. Comment. in epist. ad Ephes. tuetur. ---Quamquam non mereatur fidem inconstantia, et professae inimicitiae suspicionem habeant mendacii: tamen audacter conferam gradum, volens scire quid haereticum scripserim, ut aut cum illo agam poenitentiam, et Origenis mala ignorasse me jurem, ac nunc primum a papa Theophilo didicisse impietates ejus: aut certe doceam me quidem bene sensisse, sed illum more suo non intelligere. Neque enim fieri potest ut in eisdem ad Ephesios libris, quos ut audio, criminatur, et bene et male dixerim; et de eodem fonte dulce amarumque processerit: ut qui toto opere damnaverim eos, qui credunt animas ex Angelis conditas, subito mei oblitus id defenderem quod ante damnavi. Stultitiam mihi objicere non potest, quem disertissimum et eloquentissimum in suis opusculis praedicavit. Alioqui stulta verbositas, rabulae potius et garruli hominis, quam eloquentis putanda est. Quid in libris proprie accuset, ignoro. Fama enim ad me criminum ejus, non scripta venerunt: et stultum est juxta Apostolum, pugnis aerem verberare. Tamen in incertum respondebo, donec ad certa perveniam: *ἀντίζηλον* meum docebo senex, quod puer didici, multa esse genera dictionum; et pro qualitate materiae, non solum sententias, sed et Scripturarum verba variari.

14. Origen condemned. ---Having recently read the letters of Pope Theophilus, in which he exposes the errors of Origen, he is said to have stopped his ears, and to have condemned the author of such great evil with a clear voice before all, and to have said: that until that time he had been ignorant that he had written such nefarious things. I do not refuse, nor do I say what another perhaps would say, that he could not have been ignorant of what he translated, whose Apology written by a heretic he published under the name of a martyr: whose defense he also professed in his own volume: against which I will dispute in the following parts, if there shall be space for dictating. I speak of this, which he cannot contradict. If it is permitted to him not to have understood what he translated, why should it not be permitted to me to have been ignorant of the books of Peri Archon, which I did not read before; and to have read only those Homilies which I translated, in which his own testimony is that there is nothing evil? But if, contrary to his own opinion, he now charges me in those things in which he had previously praised me, he will be held constrained on all sides. For either he praised me as a heretical man because he was of the same dogma with me: or now as an enemy he accuses in vain the one whom he previously proclaimed as orthodox. But perhaps then as a friend he was silent about my errors; and now being angry he brings forth what he had previously concealed.

15. Defense of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians. ---Although inconstancy does not merit faith, and professed enmities have the suspicion of a lie: nevertheless I will boldly take a step, wishing to know what heretical thing I have written, so that I may either do penance with him and swear that I was ignorant of the evils of Origen, and have now first learned his impieties from Pope Theophilus: or certainly I may show that I indeed felt rightly, but that he in his own manner does not understand. For it cannot be that in the same books on the Ephesians, which as I hear he charges, I have spoken both well and ill; and that from the same fountain sweet and bitter have proceeded: so that I who in the whole work condemned those who believe that souls were created from Angels, suddenly forgetting myself should defend what I previously condemned. He cannot object stupidity to me, whom he proclaimed most learned and eloquent in his short works. Otherwise a stupid verbosity is to be thought rather of a brawler and a talkative man than of an eloquent one. What he properly accuses in the books, I do not know. For the fame of his charges has come to me, not the writings: and it is stupid according to the Apostle, to beat the air with fists. Nevertheless I will respond to the uncertain, until I arrive at the certain: I will teach my rival (antizelon), old as I am, what I learned as a boy, that there are many kinds of dictions; and according to the quality of the matter, not only the opinions, but also the words of the Scriptures are varied.

16. Commentarii quid operis habeant. Donatus praeceptor Hieronymi. ---Chrysippus et Antipater inter spineta versantur. Demosthenes et Aeschynes contra se invicem fulminant. Lysias et Isocrates dulciter fluunt. Mira in singulis diversitas, sed omnes in suo perfecti sunt. Lege ad Herennium Tullii libros, lege Rhetoricos ejus: aut, quia illa sibi dicit inchoata et rudia excidisse de manibus, revolve tria volumina de Oratore, in quibus introducit eloquentissimos illius temporis oratores, Crassum et Antonium disputantes; et quartum Oratorem, quem jam senex scribit ad Brutum: tunc intelliges aliter componi Historiam, aliter Orationes, aliter Dialogos, aliter Epistolas, aliter Commentarios. Ego enim in Commentariis ad Ephesios sic Origenem et Didymum et Apollinarium secutus sum (qui certe contraria inter se habent dogmata) ut fidei meae non amitterem veritatem. Commentarii quid operis habent? Alterius dicta edisserunt, quae obscure scripta sunt, plano sermone manifestant: multorum sententias replicant; et dicunt: Hunc locum quidam sic edisserunt: alii sic interpretantur: illi sensum suum et intelligentiam his testimoniis, et hac nituntur ratione firmare: ut prudens Lector, cum diversas explanationes legerit, et multorum vel probanda, vel improbanda didicerit, judicet quid verius sit: et quasi bonus trapezita, adulterinae monetae pecuniam reprobet. Num diversae interpretationis, et contrariorum inter se sensuum tenebitur reus, qui in uno opere quod edisserit, expositiones posuerit plurimorum? Puto quod puer legeris Aspri in Virgilium et Sallustium Commentarios, Vulcatii in Orationes Ciceronis, Victorini in Dialogos ejus et in Terentii Comoedias, praeceptoris mei Donati aequae in Virgilium, et aliorum in alios: Plautum videlicet, Lucretium, Flaccum, Persium atque Lucanum. Argue interpretes eorum, quare non unam explanationem secuti sint: et in eadem re quid vel sibi, vel aliis videatur, enumerent.

17. Vitia sermonis Rufini. ---Praetermitto Graecos, quorum tu jactas scientiam, et dum peregrina sectaris, pene tui sermonis oblitus es: ne veteri proverbio, Sus Minervam docere videar, et in silvam ligna portare. Illud miror, quod Aristarcus nostri temporis puerilia ista nescieris. Quamquam tu occupatus in sensibus, et ad struendam mihi calumniam cernulus, Grammaticorum et oratorum praecepta contempseris, parvipendes *ὀπέρβαρα* post anfractus reddere, asperitatem evitare consonantium, hiulcam fugere dictionem. Ridiculum est debilitati et fracti totius corporis vulnera pauca monstrare.

16. What kind of work Commentaries have. Donatus, Jerome's teacher. --- Chrysippus and Antipater are engaged among the thorns. Demosthenes and Aeschines thunder against each other in turn. Lysias and Isocrates flow sweetly. There is a wonderful diversity in each, but all are perfect in their own way. Read the books of Tully (Cicero) To Herennius, read his Rhetorics: or, because he says those fell from his hands as unfinished and rude, revolve the three volumes On the Orator, in which he introduces the most eloquent orators of that time, Crassus and Antonius, disputing; and the fourth, The Orator, which he writes to Brutus when already an old man: then you will understand that History is composed in one way, Orations in another, Dialogues in another, Letters in another, Commentaries in another. For I in the Commentaries on the Ephesians so followed Origen and Didymus and Apollinaris (who certainly have contrary dogmas among themselves) that I did not lose the truth of my faith. What work do Commentaries have? They explain the sayings of another; those things which are obscurely written they manifest in plain speech: they repeat the opinions of many, and they say: "Some explain this place thus; others interpret it thus; those strive to firm their sense and understanding with these testimonies and this reason": so that the prudent Reader, when he has read the diverse explanations and has learned what is to be approved or disapproved of many, may judge what is truer: and like a good money-changer (*trapezita*), may reject the money of adulterated coinage. Shall he be held guilty of diverse interpretation and of senses contrary among themselves, who in one work which he explains has placed the expositions of many? I think that as a boy you read the Commentaries of Asper on Virgil and Sallust, of Vulcatius on the Orations of Cicero, of Victorinus on his Dialogues and on the Comedies of Terence, of my teacher Donatus likewise on Virgil, and of others on others: namely, on Plautus, Lucretius, Horace (*Flaccum*), Persius, and Lucan. Reprove their interpreters, as to why they have not followed one explanation: and in the same matter they enumerate what seems right either to themselves or to others.

17. Vices of Rufinus's speech. ---I pass over the Greeks, of whose knowledge you boast, and while you follow foreign things, you have almost forgotten your own speech: lest by the old proverb I should seem to teach Minerva as a Sow (*Sus Minervam*), and to carry wood into the forest. This I wonder at, that you, a contemporary Aristarchus, did not know those childish things. Although you, occupied in senses and prone (*cernulus*) to build a calumny for me, have contemned the precepts of Grammarians and orators; you think it a small matter to render *hyperbata* (*hyperbata*) after windings, to avoid the harshness of consonants, to flee a gaping (*hiulcam*) diction. It is ridiculous to show a few wounds to one whose whole body is weakened and broken.

Non eligo quod reprehendam, eligat ipse quod vitio careat. Ne illud quidem Socraticum nosse debuerat: Scio quid nescio: Navem agere ignarus navis timet; abrotanum aegro Non audet, nisi qui didicit, dare. Quod medicorum est, Promittunt medici: tractant fabrilia fabri. Scribimus indocti, doctique poemata passim (Horat., epist. I ad August.). Nisi forte se litteras non didicisse jurabit; quos nos illi et absque iuramento perfacile credimus: vel ad Apostolum confugiet profitentem: Et si imperitus sermone, non tamen scientia (I Cor. XI, 6). Ille Hebraeis litteris eruditus, et ad pedes doctus Gamalielis, quem non erubescit, jam Apostolicae dignitatis, magistrum dicere, Graecam facundiam contemnebat, vel certe, quod erat humilitatis, dissimulabat: ut praedicatio ejus, non in persuasione verborum, sed in signorum virtute consisteret: spernens alienas opes, qui in suis dives erat: quamquam ad imperitum, et per singulas instar tui sententias corruentem, numquam pro tribunali Festus diceret: Insanis, Paule: insanis: multae te litterae ad insaniam convertunt (Act. XXVI, 24). Tu qui in Latinis mussitas, et testudineo gradu moveris potius, quam incedis: vel Graece debes scribere, ut apud homines Graeci sermonis ignaros, aliena scire videaris: vel si Latina tentaveris, ante audire Grammaticum, ferulae manum subtrahere, et inter parvulos ἄθῆνο γέρον artem loquendi discere. Quamvis Craesos quis spiret et Darios, litterae marsupium non sequuntur. Sudoris comites sunt et laboris: sociae jejuniorum, non saturitatis: continentiae, non luxuriae. Demosthenes plus olei quam vini expendisse dicitur, et omnes opifices nocturnis semper vigiliis praevenisse. Quod ille in una littera fecit exprimenda, ut a cane rho disceret, tu in me criminaris, quare homo ab homine Hebraeas litteras didicerim. Inde est quod quidam inerudite sapientes remanent, dum nolunt discere quod ignorant. Nec Horatium audiunt commonentem: Cur nescire pudens prave, quam discere malo? Loquitur et Sapientia, quam sub nomine Salomonis legimus: In malevolam animam numquam intrabit sapientia, nec habitabit in corpore subdito peccatis. Spiritus enim sanctus eruditionis fugiet dolum, et recedet a cogitationibus stultis (Sap. I, 4, 5).

I do not choose what to reprehend; let him choose himself what is free of vice. At least he ought to have known that Socratic saying: "I know what I do not know." "The one ignorant of a ship fears to drive a ship; he does not dare to give southernwood to the sick, except the one who has learned. What belongs to physicians, physicians promise: smiths handle the tools of smiths. We write poems everywhere, unlearned and learned alike" (Horace, Epistles I, to Augustus). Unless perhaps he will swear that he did not learn letters; which we believe him very easily even without an oath: or he will flee to the Apostle professing: "Even if I am unskillful in speech, yet not in knowledge" (2 Cor. 11:6). He, erudite in Hebrew letters and taught at the feet of Gamaliel, whom he does not blush to call his master even now in Apostolic dignity, contemned Greek eloquence, or certainly, what was of humility, dissembled it: so that his preaching might consist not in the persuasion of words, but in the power of signs: spurning foreign riches, who was rich in his own: although to an unlearned man, and falling at every individual sentence like you, Festus would never say from the tribunal: "You are mad, Paul: you are mad: much learning turns you to madness" (Acts 26:24). You who mutter in Latin, and move rather than walk at a turtle's pace: either you ought to write in Greek, so that among men ignorant of the Greek speech you may seem to know foreign things: or if you attempt Latin ones, first listen to a Grammarian, withdraw your hand from the rod, and learn the art of speaking among little children like an old man learning (*atheno geron*). However much anyone may breathe Cræsus and Darius, letters do not follow the purse. They are the companions of sweat and labor: associates of fasts, not of satiety: of continence, not of luxury. Demosthenes is said to have spent more oil than wine, and to have anticipated all craftsmen by nocturnal vigils. What he did in expressing one letter, so that he might learn the rho from a dog, you charge against me, as to why I, a man, learned Hebrew letters from a man. Thence it is that some remain unlearnedly wise, while they do not wish to learn what they are ignorant of. Nor do they hear Horace warning: "Why do I wrongly prefer to be bashful about not knowing than to learn?" Wisdom also speaks, which we read under the name of Solomon: "Into a malevolent soul wisdom will never enter, nor will it dwell in a body subject to sins. For the holy spirit of erudition will flee deceit, and will withdraw from foolish thoughts" (Wisdom 1:4, 5).

Aliud est, si vulgi lectione contenti, doctorum aures despiciunt; et contemnunt illud elogium, quo procax imperitia denotatur: Non tu in triviis, indocte, solebas, Stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen? Quasi non cirratorum turba Milesiarum in scholis figmenta decantet: et testamentum Suis, Bessorum cachinno membra concutiat, atque inter scurrarum epulas, nugae istiusmodi frequententur. Quotidie in plateis fictus hariolus stultorum nates verberat, et obtorto scorpione dentes mordentium quatit: et miramur si imperitorum libri lectorem inveniant?

18. Indignantur quare Origenistas scripserim inter se orgiis mendaciorum foederari. Nominavi librum, in quo hoc scriptum legerim; id est, sextum Stromateon Origenis, in quo Platonis sententiae, nostrum dogma componens, ita loquitur: Plato in tertio de Republica libro: «Veritas quoque sectanda magnopere est. Si enim, ut paulo ante rectissime dicebamus, Deo indecens et inutile mendacium est, hominibus quandoque utile (ut utantur eo quasi condimento atque medicamine); nulli dubium est, quin huiusmodi licentia medicis danda sit, et ab imprudentibus removenda. Vera, inquit, asseris: ergo principes urbium, si quibus et aliis hoc conceditur, oportet aliquando mentiri, vel contra hostes, vel pro patria et civibus. Ab aliis vero qui uti mendacio nesciunt, auferendum est omne mendacium.» Origenes: «Et nos igitur illius praecepti memores: Loquimini veritatem unusquisque cum proximo suo (Ephes. IV, 25), non debemus dicere, quis est proximus meus? sed considerare quomodo philosophus caute dixerit: Deo indecens et inutile esse mendacium, hominibus interdum utile; et quod ne pro dispensatione quidem putandus sit Deus aliquando mentiri. Sin autem commodum audientis exegerit, verbis loquitur ambiguus et per aenigmata quae vult, profert: ut et veritatis apud eum dignitas conservetur: et quod noxium esse poterat, si nudum proferretur in vulgus, quodam tectum velamine proferatur. Homo autem, cui incumbit necessitas mentiendi, diligenter attendat, ut sic utatur interdum mendacio, quomodo condimento atque medicamine; ut servet mensuram ejus, ne excedat terminos, quibus usa est Judith contra Holofernem, et vicit eum prudenti simulatione verborum. Imitetur Esther, quae Artaxerxis sententiam, diu tacita gentis veritate correxit.

It is another thing if, content with the reading of the vulgar, they despise the ears of the learned; and condemn that eulogy by which insolent ignorance is denoted: "Were you not accustomed in the cross-roads, unlearned one, to destroy a wretched song with a hissing straw?" (Virgil, Eclogues 3). As if a crowd of long-haired Milesian fables (Milesiarum) would not chant fictions in the schools: and the Testament of the Pig would shake limbs with the laughter of the Bessi, and among the feasts of buffoons trifles of this kind would be frequent. Daily in the squares a feigned soothsayer beats the buttocks of fools, and with a twisted scorpion shakes the teeth of those who bite: and do we wonder if the books of the unlearned find a reader?

18. They are indignant as to why I wrote that the Origenists are allied among themselves by orgies of lies. I named the book in which I read this written; that is, the sixth book of the Stromateis of Origen, in which, composing our dogma from the opinions of Plato, he speaks thus: Plato in the third book of the Republic: "Truth also is to be pursued greatly. For if, as we were saying most rightly a little while ago, a lie is unbecoming and useless to God, but sometimes useful to men (that they may use it as a seasoning and a medicine); there is no doubt but that license of this kind is to be given to physicians, and removed from the imprudent. You assert true things, he says: therefore the rulers of cities, if it is granted to them and to some others, ought sometimes to lie, either against enemies, or for the sake of the fatherland and the citizens. But from others who do not know how to use a lie, all lying must be taken away." Origen: "And we therefore, mindful of that precept: Speak the truth every man with his neighbor (Ephes. 4:25), ought not to say, who is my neighbor? but to consider how cautiously the philosopher said: that a lie is unbecoming and useless to God, but sometimes useful to men; and that God is not to be thought to lie sometimes even for the sake of a dispensation (dispensatione). But if the advantage of the hearer requires it, he speaks in ambiguous words and brings forth what he wishes through enigmas: so that the dignity of truth may be preserved in his presence: and that which could be harmful, if it were brought forth nakedly to the common people, may be brought forth covered by some veil. But the man on whom the necessity of lying falls, let him diligently attend, that he may so use a lie sometimes, as a seasoning and a medicine; that he may keep the measure of it, so as not to exceed the limits, which Judith used against Holofernes, and conquered him by a prudent simulation of words. Let him imitate Esther, who corrected the sentence of Artaxerxes, having long kept silent the truth of her nation.

Et in primis Patriarcham Jacob, quem legimus benedictiones patris artifice impetrasse mendacio. Ex quo perspicuum est, quod nisi ita mentiti fuerimus, ut magnum nobis ex hoc aliquod quaeratur bonum, iudicandi simus, quasi inimici ejus, qui ait: Ego sum veritas (Joan. XIV).» Haec Origenes scripsit, negare non possumus: scripsit in libris, quos ad perfectos et ad discipulos loquebatur: docetque magistris mentiendum; discipulos autem non debere mentiri. Qui ergo bene mentitur, et absque ulla verecundia quidquid in buccam venerit confingit in fratres, magistrum se optimum probat.

19. Psalmi II interpretationem defendit. Deosculatio pro veneratione apud Hebraeos. ---Illud quoque carpere dicitur, quod secundum Psalmum interpretans, pro eo quod legimus in Latino, apprehendite disciplinam; et in Hebraico volumine scriptum est NESCU BAR, dixerim in Commentariolis meis, adorate filium. Et rursum omne Psalterium in Romanum vertens sonum, quasi immemor expositionis antiquae posuerim, adorate pure: quod utique sibi esse contrarium omnibus patet. Et revera ignoscendum est ei, si ignoret linguae Hebraicae veritatem, qui interdum et in Latinis haesitat. NESCU, ut verbum de verbo interpreter, *καταφιλήσατε*, id est, deosculamini dicitur: quod ego nolens transferre putide, sensum magis secutus sum, ut dicerem, adorate. Quia enim qui adorant solent deosculari manum, et capita submittere (quod se beatus Job elementis et idolis fecisse negat, dicens (Cap. XXXI, 26, 27): Si vidi solem cum fulgeret, et lunam incedentem clare: et laetatum est in abscondito cor meum, et osculatus sum manum meam ore meo, quae iniquitas maxima est, et negatio contra Deum altissimum), et Hebraei juxta linguae suae proprietatem, deosculacionem pro veneratione ponunt, id transtuli, quod ipsi intelligunt, quorum verbum est. BAR autem apud illos diversa significat. Dicitur enim et filius, ut est illud: Barjona, filius columbae, et Bartholomaeus, filius Tholomaei, et Barthimaeus, et Barhiesu, et Barabas. Triticum quoque, et spicarum fasciculus, et electus, ac purus. Quid igitur peccavi, si verbum ambiguum diversa interpretatione converti? et qui in Commentariolis, ubi libertas est disserendi, dixeram, adorate filium; in ipso corpore, ne violentus viderer interpres, et Judaicae calumniae locum darem, dixerim, adorate pure, sive electe: quod Aquila quoque et Symmachus transtulerunt. Quid ergo Ecclesiasticae fidei nocet, si doceatur lector, quot modis apud Hebraeos unus versiculus explanetur?

And especially the Patriarch Jacob, whom we read to have obtained the blessings of his father by a skillful lie. From which it is clear, that unless we have lied in such a way that some great good is sought for us from this, we are to be judged as enemies of him who says: I am the truth (John 14)." Origen wrote these things, we cannot deny it: he wrote them in the books which he spoke to the perfect and to his disciples: and he teaches that teachers should lie; but that disciples ought not to lie. He, therefore, who lies well, and without any shame feigns whatever comes into his mouth against his brothers, proves himself an excellent master.

19. He defends the interpretation of the second Psalm. Kissing for veneration among the Hebrews. ---He is also said to carp at this, that in interpreting the second Psalm, instead of what we read in the Latin, embrace discipline (apprehendite disciplinam); and in the Hebrew volume it is written NESCU BAR, I said in my Commentarioli, worship the son (adorate filium). And again, turning the whole Psalter into the Roman sound, as if unmindful of the ancient exposition, I put worship purely (adorate pure): which certainly is obvious to all as being contrary to itself. And in truth he is to be forgiven if he is ignorant of the truth of the Hebrew language, he who sometimes even hesitates in Latin ones. NESCU, that I may interpret word for word, is called kataphilesate (καταφιλήσατε), that is, deosculamini (kiss); which I, unwilling to translate it distastefully (putide), followed the sense rather, so that I said, adore (worship). For because those who worship are accustomed to kiss the hand and bow their heads (which the blessed Job denies he did to the elements and idols, saying (Job 31:26-27): If I saw the sun when it shone, and the moon walking clearly: and my heart rejoiced in secret, and I kissed my hand with my mouth, which is a very great iniquity, and a denial against the most high God), and the Hebrews, according to the property of their language, put "kissing" for "veneration," I translated that which they themselves understand, whose word it is. But BAR among them signifies diverse things. For it is called both filius (son), as is that: Barjona, son of a dove, and Bartholomaeus, son of Tholomaeus, and Barthimaeus, and Barhiesu, and Barrabas. Also triticum (wheat), and a bundle of ears, and electus (chosen), and purus (pure). What then did I sin, if I converted an ambiguous word by a diverse interpretation? And I who in the Commentarioli, where there is freedom of discussion, had said, worship the son (adorate filium); in the body itself, lest I should seem a violent interpreter and give place to Jewish calumny, said, worship purely (adorate pure), or choicely (electe): which Aquila also and Symmachus translated. What then does it harm the Ecclesiastical faith, if the reader is taught in how many ways one little verse is explained among the Hebrews?

20. Origenis errores. ---Origeni tuo licet tractare de μετεμψύχῳσει, innumerabiles mundos introducere, et rationabiles creaturas aliis atque aliis vestire corporibus, Christumque dicere saepe passum, et saepius passurum, ut quod semel profuit, semper prosit assumptum: tibi quoque ipse tantam assumis auctoritatem, ut de haeretico martyrem, de Origenis libris haeticorum adulteria mentiaris: mihi non licebit disputare de verbis, et in Commentariorum opere Latinos docere, quod ab Hebraeis didici? Nisi enim et prolixum esset, et redoleret gloriolam, jam nunc tibi ostenderem, quid utilitatis habeat magistrorum limina terere, et artem ab artificibus discere: et videres quanta silva sit apud Hebraeos ambiguum nominum atque verborum. Quae res diversae interpretationi materiam praebuit: dum unusquisque inter dubia, quod sibi consequentius [Al. convenientius] videtur, hoc transfert. Quid ad peregrina te mitto? Revolve Aristotelem, et Alexandrum Aristotelis volumina disserentem; et quanta ambiguum sit copia, eorum lectione cognosces: ut tandem desinas amicum tuum in eo reprehendere, quod ne per somnium quidem aliquando didicisti.

21. Commentar. ad Ephesios. Sed quia Paulinianus frater meus, de Commentariis ad Ephesios quaedam ab eo reprehensa narravit, et pauca ex his memoriae tradidit, mihique ipsa demonstravit loca, non debeo subterfugere: quaesoque lectorem, ut si paululo in proponendis et diluendis criminibus longior fuero, necessitati det veniam. Non enim alterum accuso; sed me nitor defendere, et objectam haereseos calumniam refutare. In Epistolam Pauli ad Ephesios, tria Origenes scripsit volumina. Didymus quoque et Apollinarius propria opuscula condidere. Quos ego vel transferens, vel imitans, quid in Prologo ejusdem operis scripserim, subjiciam: «Illud quoque in Praefatione commoneo, ut sciatis Originem tria volumina in hanc Epistolam conscripsisse, quem et nos ex parte secuti sumus: Apollinarium etiam, et Didymum quosdam Commentariolos edidisse. Ex quibus licet pauca, decerpimus; et nonnulla quae nobis videbantur, adjecimus, sive subtraximus: ut studiosus statim in principio lector agnoscat, hoc opus vel alienum esse, vel nostrum (Prologus Comment. in Epist. ad Ephes.).» Quidquid ergo in explanatione hujus Epistolae vitii potuerit demonstrari, si ego illud in Graecis voluminibus, unde in Latinum vertisse me dixi, ostendere non potuero, crimen agnoscam, et meum erit, quod alienum non fuerit. Tamen ne rursus videar cavillari, et hac excusationis strophæ, gradum non audere conferre, ponam ipsa testimonia, quae vocantur in crimen.

20. Origen's errors. --Your Origen is allowed to treat of metempsychosis (metempsychosi), to introduce innumerable worlds, and to clothe rational creatures with one body after another, and to say that Christ has often suffered and will often suffer, so that what once profited, being assumed, may always profit: you also assume so much authority for yourself, that you lie about a martyr from a heretic, and about the adulteries of heretics from the books of Origen: shall it not be permitted to me to dispute about words, and in a work of Commentaries to teach the Latins what I learned from the Hebrews? For unless it were both prolix and smelled of a bit of glory (gloriolam), I would even now show you what utility it has to wear down the thresholds of masters, and to learn an art from craftsmen: and you would see how great a forest there is among the Hebrews of ambiguous names and words. Which thing provided material for diverse interpretation: while each one among doubtful things, that which seems to him more consistent [Al. more convenient], this he translates. Why do I send you to foreign things? Turn over Aristotle, and Alexander discussing the volumes of Aristotle; and how great a supply of ambiguities there is, you will know by their reading: so that at last you may cease to reprehend your friend in that which you have never learned even in a dream.

21. Commentary on the Ephesians. But because my brother Paulinianus related some things reprehended by him from the Commentaries on the Ephesians, and committed a few of these to memory, and showed the places themselves to me, I ought not to avoid them: and I ask the reader, that if I shall be a little longer in proposing and dissolving the crimes, he will give pardon to the necessity. For I do not accuse another; but I strive to defend myself, and to refute the calumny of heresy cast upon me. On the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians, Origen wrote three volumes. Didymus also and Apollinarius composed their own little works. Whom I either translating or imitating, what I wrote in the Prologue of the same work, I will subjoin: «I also advise in the Preface, that you may know that Origen composed three volumes on this Epistle, whom we also have followed in part: that Apollinarius also, and Didymus, published certain little commentaries. From which we have plucked a few things, and added or subtracted some things which seemed to us [proper]: so that the studious reader may immediately recognize at the beginning, that this work is either another's, or ours (Prologue to the Comm. on the Epist. to the Ephesians).» Whatever vice, therefore, could be demonstrated in the explanation of this Epistle, if I shall not be able to show it in the Greek volumes, from whence I said I turned it into Latin, I will acknowledge the crime, and it shall be mine, which was not another's. Yet lest I should seem again to cavil, and by this artifice of excuse, not to dare to join battle, I will put the testimonies themselves, which are called into crime.

22. Commentatoris officium. Tempus scriptionis Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Ephes. ---In primo statim volumine testimonium Pauli, in quo loquitur: Sicut elegit nos in ipso ante constitutionem mundi: ut essemus sancti et immaculati coram ipso (Ephes. 1, 4), sic interpretati sumus, ut electionem non juxta Origenem, eorum diceremus, qui prius fuerant; sed ad Dei praescientiam referremus. Denique diximus: «Quod autem electos nos, ut essemus sancti et immaculati coram ipso, hoc est, Deo, ante fabricam mundi, testatus est, ad praescientiam Dei pertinet, cui omnia futura jam facta sunt, et antequam fiant universa sunt nota. Sicut et Paulus ipse praedestinatur in utero matris suae; et Jeremias in vulva sanctificatur, eligitur, roboratur, et in typo Christi Propheta Gentibus mittitur.» Certe in expositione ista nullum crimen est: et Origene dicente contraria, nos Ecclesiasticum sensum secuti sumus. Et quia Commentatoris est officium, multorum sententias ponere, et hoc me facturum in Praefatione promiseram, etiam Origenis, absque invidia nominis ejus, explanationem posui, dicens: «Alius vero, qui Deum justum conatur ostendere, quod non ex praepudio scientiae suae, sed ex merito electorum unumquemque eligat, dicit ante visibiles creaturas, coelum, terram, maria, et omnia quae in eis sunt, fuisse alias invisibiles creaturas, in quibus et animas, quae ob quasdam causas soli Deo notas dejectae sint deorsum, in vallem istam lacrymarum, in locum afflictionis et peregrinationis nostrae, in quo sanctus constitutus orabat, ut ad sedem pristinam reverteretur, dicens: Heu mihi, quia incolatus meus prolongatus est: habitavi cum habitantibus Cedar, multum peregrinata est anima mea (Ps. CXIX, 5). Et Apostolus: Miser ego homo, quis me liberabit de corpore mortis hujus (Rom. VII, 24)? Et, Melius est reverti, et esse cum Christo (Phil. I, 23). Et alibi: Antequam humiliarer, ego peccavi (Ps. CXVIII, 67),» et caetera his similia, quae longum est scribere. Animadvertite quid dixerim: Alius vero, qui Deum justum conatur ostendere: conatur ostendere, inquam, non ostendit. Si autem in eo scandalum pateris, quare latissimam Origenis disputationem brevi sermone comprehenderim, et lectori sensum ejus aperuerim; atque ex eo tibi occultus illius videor esse sectator, quia nihil ab eo dictum praetermiserim, vide ne hoc idcirco fecerim, ut vestram calumniam declinarem, ne me diceretis quae ab eo fortiter sunt dicta, tacuisse, et illum in Graeco robustius disputare. Posui ergo omnia, licet brevius, quae in Graeco reperi, ut nihil haberent discipuli ejus novi, quod Latinorum auribus ingererent. Facilius enim nota, quam repentina contemnimus.

22. The duty of a Commentator. The time of writing the Commentaries on the Epistle to the Ephesians. ---In the first volume immediately the testimony of Paul, in which he speaks: As he chose us in him before the constitution of the world: that we should be holy and immaculate before him (Ephes. 1:4), we have interpreted in such a way, that we did not say the election was according to Origen, of those who had been before; but we referred it to the foreknowledge of God. Finally we said: "But as to his testifying that we were chosen, that we should be holy and immaculate before him, that is, God, before the fabric of the world, it pertains to the foreknowledge of God, to whom all future things are already done, and before they are made all things are known. Just as Paul himself also is predestined in the womb of his mother; and Jeremiah is sanctified in the vulva, chosen, strengthened, and sent as a Prophet to the Gentiles in a type of Christ." Certainly in that exposition there is no crime: and Origen saying contrary things, we have followed the Ecclesiastical sense. And because it is the duty of a Commentator to put the opinions of many, and I had promised in the Preface that I would do this, I also put the explanation of Origen, without envy of his name, saying: «But another, who tries to show God to be just, because he chooses each one not from the prejudice of his knowledge, but from the merit of the chosen, says that before the visible creatures, heaven, earth, seas, and all things that are in them, there were other invisible creatures, in which also were souls, which for certain causes known to God alone were cast down below, into this valley of tears, into the place of our affliction and pilgrimage, in which a saint being constituted was praying, that he might return to his former seat, saying: Woe is me, because my sojourning is prolonged: I have dwelt with the inhabitants of Cedar, much has my soul been a sojourner (Ps. 120:5). And the Apostle: Wretched man that I am, who will deliver me from the body of this death? (Rom. 7:24). And, It is better to return and be with Christ (Phil. 1:23). And elsewhere: Before I was humbled, I sinned (Ps. 119:67)," and other things similar to these, which it is long to write. Observe what I said: "But another, who tries to show God to be just": he tries to show, I say, he does not show. But if you suffer scandal in this, because I have comprehended the very broad disputation of Origen in a short speech, and opened his sense to the reader; and from that I seem to you to be a hidden follower of his, because I have passed over nothing said by him, see whether I did not do this for this reason, that I might decline your calumny, lest you should say that I have been silent about those things which are strongly said by him, and that he disputes more robustly in the Greek. I put, therefore, all things, although more briefly, which I found in the Greek, so that his disciples should have nothing new, which they might thrust into the ears of the Latins. For we more easily condemn known things than sudden ones.

Exposita autem interpretatione ejus, quid in fine capituli dixerimus, ausculta: «Non enim ait Apostolus, elegit nos ante constitutionem mundi, cum essemus sancti et immaculati: sed elegit nos ut essemus sancti et immaculati: hoc est, qui sancti et immaculati ante non fuimus, ut postea essemus. Quod et de peccatoribus ad meliora conversis dici potest; et stabit illa sententia: Non justificabitur in conspectu tuo omnis vivens (Ps. XLII, 2); id est, in tota vita sua, in omni quo in mundo isto versatus est tempore. Quod quidem ita intellectum, et adversum eum facit, qui antequam mundus fieret, animas dicit esse electas propter sanctitatem, et nullum vitium peccatorum.» Non enim (ut ante jam diximus) eliguntur Paulus, et qui ei similes sunt, quia erant sancti et immaculati: sed eliguntur et praedestinantur, ut in consequenti vita per opera atque virtutes, sancti et immaculati fiant. Et audet quisquam post hujusmodi sententiam, nos Origenis haereseos accusare? Decem et octo ferme anni sunt, ex quo istos dictavi libros, eo tempore quo Origenis nomen florebat in mundo; quo περὶ Ἀρχῶν, illius opus, Latinae aures ignorabant: et tamen professus sum fidem meam; et quid mihi displiceret, ostendi. Ex quo etiam si in caeteris aliquid haereticum monstrare potuisset inimicus, non tam dogmatum perversorum, quae hic et in aliis libris saepe damnavi, quam improvidi tenerer erroris.

23. Ecclesiae fides. ---Secundum locum quem mihi ab eo reprehensum frater ostendit, quia valde frivolus est, et apertam sui praefert calumniam, ponam breviter. In eo testimonio ubi Paulus loquitur: Sedere eum faciens ad dexteram suam in coelestibus, super omnem principatum et potestatem et virtutem et dominationem, et omne nomen quod nominatur, non solum in hoc saeculo, sed etiam in futuro (Ephes. I, 20, 21); post multiplicem expositionem, cum ad ministrorum Dei officia pervenissem, et de principatibus ac potestatibus et virtutibus ac dominationibus dicerem, etiam hoc addidi: «Necesse est, ut subjectos habeant, et timentes se, et servientes sibi, et eos qui a sua fortitudine roborentur. Quae distributiones officiorum, non solum in praesentiarum, sed etiam in futuro saeculo erunt: ut per singulos profectus et honores, ascensiones et descensiones, vel crescat aliquis, vel decrescat, et sub alia atque alia potestate, virtute, principatu, et dominatione fiat.» Et post exemplum terreni regis, totamque Palatii descriptionem, per quam diversa ministeriorum Dei officia demonstrabam, addidi: «Et putamus Deum, Dominum dominorum, regemque regnantium, simplici tantum ministerio esse contentum?» Quomodo Archangelus non dicitur, nisi qui prior est Angelorum: sic Principatus et Potestates et Dominationes non appellantur, nisi subjectos aliquos habeant et inferioris gradus.

But his interpretation having been set forth, what we said at the end of the chapter, listen: "For the Apostle does not say, he chose us before the constitution of the world, when we were holy and immaculate: but he chose us that we should be holy and immaculate: that is, we who were not holy and immaculate before, so that we might be afterwards. Which can also be said of sinners converted to better things; and that sentence will stand: Every living being shall not be justified in your sight (Ps. 143:2); that is, in his whole life, in all the time in which he has been conversant in this world. Which indeed, being so understood, also makes against him who says that souls were chosen before the world was made, on account of holiness, and no vice of sins." For (as we have said already before) Paul and those who are similar to him are not chosen because they were holy and immaculate: but they are chosen and predestined, so that in the consequent life through works and virtues, they may become holy and immaculate. And does anyone dare after a sentence of this kind, to accuse us of the heresy of Origen? It is almost eighteen years since I dictated those books, at that time when the name of Origen was flourishing in the world; when *On First Principles* (*Peri Archon*), his work, Latin ears were ignorant of: and yet I professed my faith; and showed what displeased me. From which even if my enemy could show something heretical in the rest, I should be held not so much for perverse dogmas, which I have often damned here and in other books, as for an improvident error.

23. The faith of the Church. ---The second place which my brother showed me as reprehended by him, because it is very frivolous and puts forth an open calumny of itself, I will put briefly. In that testimony where Paul speaks: Making him sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, above all principality and power and virtue and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in the future (Ephes. 1:20-21); after a manifold exposition, when I had come to the duties of the ministers of God, and was speaking of principalities and powers and virtues and dominions, I also added this: «It is necessary that they have subjects, and those fearing them, and serving them, and those who are strengthened by their fortitude. Which distributions of duties will be not only in the present, but also in the future world: so that through individual progresses and honors, ascensions and descensions, either someone may grow, or someone may decrease, and be made under one or another power, virtue, principality, and dominion.» And after the example of an earthly king, and the whole description of the Palace, through which I was demonstrating the diverse duties of the ministries of God, I added: "And do we think that God, the Lord of lords, and King of those who reign, is content with only a simple ministry?" As an Archangel is not called so, except the one who is first of the Angels: so Principalities and Powers and Dominions are not so named, unless they have some subjects and those of an inferior grade.

Sin autem putat idcirco me Origenem sequi, quia profectus et honores, ascensiones et descensiones, incrementa et immunitiones, in expositione mea posui; sciat multum interesse de Angelis et Seraphim et Cherubim dicere, daemones et homines fieri, quod affirmat Origenes; et ipsos inter se Angelos diversa officiorum genera esse sortitos, quod Ecclesiae non repugnat. Quomodo et inter homines ordo dignitatum ex laboris varietate diversus est, cum episcopus et presbyter, et omnis Ecclesiasticus gradus habeat ordinem suum; et tamen omnes homines sunt: sic et inter Angelos merita esse diversa, et tamen in Angelica omnes persistere dignitate: nec de Angelis homines fieri, nec rursum homines in Angelos reformari.

24. Verecunde non posuit nomina Expositorum. ---Tertius est reprehensionis locus quod dicente Apostolo: Ut ostenderet in saeculis supervenientibus abundantes divitias gratiae suae in bonitate super nos in Christo Jesu, nos triplicem expositionem posuimus. In prima quid nobis videretur: in secunda quid Origenes opponeret: in tertia quid Apollinarius simpliciter explanaret. Quorum si nomina non posui, ignosce verecundiae meae: non debui eos carpere, quos imitabar ex parte, et quorum in Latinam linguam sententias transferebam. «Sed, dixi, qui diligens lector est, statim requireret, et dicet. Et rursus in fine, Alius vero hoc quod ait, ut ostenderet in saeculis supervenientibus abundantes divitias gratiae suae, ad illam intelligentiam transfert.» Ecce, inquires, sub diligentis lectoris persona, Origenis sententias explicasti. Fateor errorem, non debui diligentem dicere, sed blasphemum: quod si fecissem, et aliquo scissem vaticinio te istiusmodi naenias sectaturum, etiam calumniae verba vitassem. Grande crimen si Origenem diligentem dixi esse lectorem, cujus septuaginta libros interpretatus sum, quem in coelum laudibus tuli; pro quo compulsus sum ante biennium brevi libello tuis contra me praeconiis respondere (Epistola ad Pammach. ante biennium scripta). Ecclesiarum magistrum a me dictum esse Origenem, in tuis laudibus objicis: et putas quod pertimescere debeam, si diligentem lectorem me illum dixisse inimicus accuses. Solemus et negotiatores parcissimos, et frugi servos, et molestos paedagogos, et argutissimos fures, diligentes vocare. Et in Evangelio villicus iniquitatis prudenter quaedam fecisse dicitur (Luc. XVI): et, Prudentiores sunt filii hujus saeculi filiis lucis in generatione sua (Ibid. XVI, 8). Et, Serpens sapientior erat omnibus bestiis, quas fecit Dominus super terram (Gen. III, 1).

But if he thinks that I follow Origen for this reason, because I put progresses and honors, ascensions and descensions, increments and immunities, in my exposition; let him know that it makes much difference to say that Angels and Seraphim and Cherubim become demons and men, which Origen affirms; and that the Angels themselves among themselves have been allotted diverse kinds of duties, which is not repugnant to the Church. Just as among men the order of dignities is diverse from the variety of labor, since bishop and presbyter, and every Ecclesiastical grade has its own order; and yet all are men: so also among Angels the merits are diverse, and yet all persist in Angelic dignity: neither that men become Angels from Angels [sic], nor again that men are reformed into Angels.

24. He modestly did not put the names of the Expositors. --The third place of reprehension is that, the Apostle saying: That he might show in the ages to come the abundant riches of his grace in goodness upon us in Christ Jesus, we have put a triple exposition. In the first, what seemed [correct] to us: in the second, what Origen might oppose: in the third, what Apollinarius might simply explain. Whose names if I have not put, pardon my modesty: I ought not to carp at those whom I was imitating in part, and whose opinions I was turning into the Latin language. «But,» I said, «he who is a diligent reader, will immediately inquire and say. And again at the end: But another turns that which he says, that he might show in the ages to come the abundant riches of his grace, to that understanding.» Behold, you will say, under the persona of a diligent reader, you have explained the opinions of Origen. I confess the error, I ought not to have said diligent, but blasphemous: which if I had done, and had known by some prophecy that you would follow trifles of this kind, I would also have avoided the words of calumny. A great crime if I said Origen was a diligent reader, seventy of whose books I have interpreted, whom I have raised to heaven with praises; for whom I was compelled two years ago to respond in a short booklet to your encomiums against me (Epistle to Pammachius written two years ago). That Origen was called a master of the Churches by me, you object in your praises: and you think that I ought to be greatly afraid, if my enemy accuses me of having called him a diligent reader. We are accustomed to call even very sparing merchants, and frugal slaves, and troublesome pedagogues, and most sharp-witted thieves, "diligent." And in the Gospel the steward of iniquity is said to have done certain things "prudently" (Luke 16): and, The children of this world are more prudent than the children of light in their generation (Luke 16:8). And, The serpent was wiser than all the beasts which the Lord made upon the earth (Gen. 3:1).

25. Corpus mortis quod sit. ---Quartus reprehensionis locus, exordium secundi libri possidet, in quo hoc Pauli testimonium exposuimus: Hujus rei gratia ego Paulus vinctus Jesu Christi pro vobis gentibus (Ephes. III, 2); et quia per se locus ipse manifestus est, eam tantum partem ponam explanationis, quae patet calumniae: «Vinctum Christi Jesu Paulum esse pro Gentibus, potest et de martyrio intelligi, quod Romae in vincula coniectus, hanc Epistolam miserit, eo tempore quo ad Philemonem, et ad Colossenses, et Philippenses, in alio loco scriptas esse monstravimus. Vel certe, quia in plurimis locis lectum est vinculum animae corpus hoc dici, quo quasi clauso teneatur in carcere, dicimus propterea Paulum corporis nexibus coerceri, nec reverti, et esse cum Christo, ut perfecta in Gentes per eum praedicatio compleatur: licet quidam alium sensum in hoc loco introducant, quod Paulus praedestinatus et sanctificatus ex utero matris suae ad praedicationem Gentium antequam nasceretur, postea vincula carnis acceperit.» Et in hoc triplicem, ut supra, expositionem posui. In prima, quid mihi videretur; in secunda, quid Origenes assereret; in tertia, quid Apollinarius contra illius vadens dogmata sentiret. Lege Graecos Commentarios; et nisi ita repereris, crimen fatebor. Quod est in isto loco peccatum meum? Illud nimirum, pro quo supra respondi: quare non eos a quibus dicta sunt, nominarim? Superfluum erat per singula Apostoli testimonia, eorum nomina ponere, quorum me Opuscula translaturum in Praefatione signaveram. Et tamen vinctam dici animam corpore, donec ad Christum redeat, et in resurrectionis gloria, corruptivum et mortale corpus, incorruptione et immortalitate commutet, non absurdae intelligentiae est. Unde et Apostolus: Miser ego, inquit, homo: quis me liberabit de corpore mortis hujus? Corpus mortis appellans, quod vitiis et morbis et perturbationibus ac morti subjaceat: donec cum Christo resurgat in gloria, et fragile prius lutum, excoquatur fervore Spiritus sancti in testam solidissimam: demutans gloriam, non naturam.

26. Quintus locus validissimus est, in quo exponentes illud Apostoli testimonium, Ex quo totum corpus compactum et conglutinatum per omnem juncturam subministrationis, secundum operationem in mensuram uniuscujusque membri, augmentum corporis facit in aedificationem sui in charitate (Lib. II, cap. 4), latissimam Origenis expositionem, et eosdem sensus per diversa verba volventem, brevi sermone constrinximus, nihil exemplis et assertionibus illius auferentes.

25. What the body of death is. ---The fourth place of reprehension possesses the beginning of the second book, in which we have explained this testimony of Paul: For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles (Ephes. 3:1); and because the place itself is manifest through itself, I will put only that part of the explanation which lies open to calumny: «That Paul is a prisoner of Christ Jesus for the Gentiles can be understood both of martyrdom, because being cast into chains at Rome, he sent this Epistle, at that time when we have shown that those to Philemon, and to the Colossians, and Philippians, were written in another place. Or certainly, because in very many places it is read that this body is called a 'chain' of the soul, by which it is held as if closed in a prison, we say that for this reason Paul is coerced by the bonds of the body, nor does he return and be with Christ, so that the perfect preaching to the Gentiles through him may be completed: although some introduce another sense in this place, that Paul, predestined and sanctified from the womb of his mother to the preaching of the Gentiles before he was born, afterwards received the chains of the flesh.» And in this I put a triple exposition, as above. In the first, what seemed [correct] to me; in the second, what Origen asserted; in the third, what Apollinarius, going against his dogmas, thought. Read the Greek Commentaries; and unless you shall find it so, I will confess the crime. What is my sin in that place? That, to be sure, for which I responded above: why did I not name those by whom they were said? It was superfluous to put their names through the individual testimonies of the Apostle, whose little works I had signaled in the Preface that I would translate. And yet that the soul is said to be bound by the body until it returns to Christ, and in the glory of the resurrection, the corruptible and mortal body should change into incorruption and immortality, is not of an absurd understanding. Whence also the Apostle: Wretched man that I am, he says, who will deliver me from the body of this death? calling it the body of death, because it lies subject to vices and diseases and perturbations and death: until it rises with Christ in glory, and the fragile clay of before be baked by the heat of the Holy Spirit into a most solid shell: changing glory, not nature.

26. The fifth place is very strong, in which, explaining that testimony of the Apostle: From whom the whole body being compacted and conglutinated through every joint of subministration, according to the operation in the measure of each member, makes the increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in charity (Lib. II, cap. 4), we have constrained the very broad exposition of Origen, and his revolving the same senses through diverse words, into a short speech, taking away nothing from his examples and assertions.

Cumque pervenissemus ad finem, haec subjecimus: «Igitur et in restitutione omnium, quando corpus totius Ecclesiae nunc dispersum atque laceratum, verus medicus Christus Jesus sanaturus advenerit, unusquisque secundum mensuram fidei et agnitionis Filii Dei (quem ideo agnoscere dicitur, quia prius noverat, et postea nosse desivit) suum recipiet locum, et incipiet id esse quod fuerat: ita tamen, ut non juxta haeresim aliam omnes in una aetate sint positi, id est, omnes in Angelos reformentur; sed unumquodque membrum juxta mensuram et officium suum perfectum sit. Verbi gratia, ut Angelus refuga id esse incipiat, quod creatus est: ut homo qui de paradiso fuerat ejectus, ad culturam iterum paradisi restituatur,» et reliqua.

27. Duae haereses. ---Miror te hominem prudentissimum non intellexisse artem expositionis meae. «Quando enim dico, ita tamen ut non juxta aliam haeresim omnes in una aetate sint positi, id est, omnes in Angelos reformentur, ostendo et ea de quibus disputo esse haeretica, et ab alia haeresi discrepare.» Quae sunt ergo duae haereses? Una, quae dicit omnes rationabiles creaturas in Angelos reformari. Altera quae asserit unumquodque in restitutione mundi id fore quod conditum est. Verbi gratia: quia ex Angelis daemones sunt, rursum daemones Angelos fieri: et animas hominum, ita ut sunt conditae, non in Angelos; sed in id quod a Deo sunt conditae, reformari, ut et justi et peccatores aequales fiant. Denique ut scias me non meam explicasse sententiam, sed inter se haereses comparasse, quarum utramque in Graeco legeram, disputationem meam hoc fine complevi: «Idcirco, ut supra diximus, haec apud nos obscuriora sunt, quia μεταφορικῶς dicuntur in Graeco; et omnis metaphora, si de alia in aliam linguam transferatur ad verbum, quibusdam quasi sentibus, orationis sensus et germina suffocantur.» Nisi haec eadem in Graeco repereris, quidquid dictum est, meum putato.

28. Sextum, quod et extremum, mihi objicere dicitur (si tamen nihil in medio frater oblitus est) cur illum locum Apostoli interpretans ubi ait (Ephes. V, 28, 29): Qui uxorem suam diligit, seipsum diligit. Nemo enim unquam suam carnem odit; sed nutrit et fovet eam, sicut et Christus Ecclesiam, post simplicem expositionem, Origenis posuerim quaestionem, ex cujus persona tacito nomine dixerim: «Opponi nobis potest, quod non sit vera sententia dicentis Apostoli: Nemo unquam carnem suam odit, cum morbo regio laborantes, phthisi, et cancro et distillationibus, mortem vitae praeferant, et sua oderint corpora; et statim quid ipse sententiam adjunxi: Magis itaque ad tropicam intelligentiam sermo referatur.» Quando dico, tropicam, doceo verum non esse, quod dicitur, sed allegoriae nubilo figuratum.

And when we had come to the end, we subjoined these things: "Therefore also in the restoration of all things, when the true physician Christ Jesus shall arrive to heal the body of the whole Church, now dispersed and torn, each one according to the measure of faith and the acknowledgment of the Son of God (whom he is said to acknowledge for this reason, because he had known him before, and afterwards ceased to know him) will receive his own place, and begin to be that which he had been: so, however, that not according to another heresy all are placed in one age, that is, all are reformed into Angels; but each individual member be perfect according to its measure and duty. For example, that the fugitive Angel begin to be that which he was created: that the man who had been ejected from paradise, be restored again to the cultivation of paradise," and the rest.

27. Two heresies. ---I wonder that you, a most prudent man, have not understood the art of my exposition. «For when I say, 'so however that not according to another heresy all are placed in one age, that is, all are reformed into Angels,' I show both that those things about which I dispute are heretical, and that they differ from another heresy.» What then are the two heresies? One, which says all rational creatures are reformed into Angels. The other which asserts each one in the restoration of the world will be that which it was created. For example: because from Angels they are demons, again the demons become Angels: and the souls of men, just as they were created, not into Angels, but into that which they were created by God, are reformed, so that both the just and sinners become equal. Finally, that you may know that I have not explained my own opinion, but have compared heresies among themselves, both of which I had read in the Greek, I completed my disputation with this end: "Therefore, as we said above, these things are more obscure among us, because they are said metaphorically (*metaphorikos*) in the Greek; and every metaphor, if it be transferred word for word from one language into another, the senses and buds of the speech are choked by certain thorns as it were." Unless you shall find these same things in the Greek, whatever was said, think it mine.

28. The sixth, and last, he is said to object to me (if however my brother has forgotten nothing in between) why, in interpreting that place of the Apostle where he says (Ephes. 5:28-29): He who loves his wife, loves himself. For no one ever hated his own flesh; but nourishes and cherishes it, as also Christ the Church, after a simple exposition, I put the question of Origen, from whose persona, with his name silenced, I said: «It can be opposed to us, that the sentence of the Apostle saying no one ever hated his own flesh is not true, since those laboring with the royal disease [*jaundice*], with *phthisis*, and with cancer and distillations, prefer death to life, and hate their own bodies»; and immediately I added what I myself thought: «Therefore let the speech be referred rather to a tropical understanding.» When I say "tropical," I teach that what is said is not true [literally], but figured with the cloud of allegory.

Ponamus tamen ipsa verba quae in Origenis libro tertio continentur: «Dicamus quod illam carnem, quae visura sit salutare Dei, anima diligat, et nutriat, et foveat eam, disciplinis erudiens, et coelesti saginans pane, et Christi sanguine irrigans: ut refecta et nitida, possit libero cursu virum sequi, et nullo debilitatis pondere praegravari. Pulchre etiam in similitudinem Christi nutrientis et foveantis Ecclesiam, et dicentis ad Jerusalem: Quoties volui congregare filios tuos, ut gallina congregat pullos suos sub alas suas, et noluisti (Matth. XXIII, 37), animae quoque foveant corpora sua, ut corruptivum hoc induat incorruptionem, et alarum levitate suspensum, in aerem facilius sublevetur (I Cor. XV). Foveamus igitur et viri uxores nostras, et animae nostrae corpora: ut et uxores in viros, et corpora redigantur in animas, et nequaquam sit sexuum ulla diversitas: sed quomodo apud Angelos, non est vir et mulier; ita et nos, qui similes Angelis futuri sumus, jam nunc incipiamus esse quod nobis in coelestibus repromissum est.»

29. Supra simplicem expositionem quae nobis in testimonio isto esse videbatur, expressimus, dicentes: «Quantum ad simplicem intelligentiam pertinet, sancta inter virum et uxorem charitate praecepta, nunc jubemur, ut nutriamus et foveamus conjuges: ut scilicet eis victum et vestitum, et ea quae sunt necessaria praebeamus.» Haec nostra sententia est. Igitur omne quod sequitur deinceps, et opponi nobis potest, ostendimus non ex nostra, sed ex contradicentium intelligi debere persona. Quae quum si brevis et absoluta responsio, et juxta id quod supra diximus, etiam allegoriae umbris, de eo quod est, ad id quod non erat, depravata: tamen accedam propius, et sciscitabor quid tibi in hac disputatione displiceat. Nempe quia dixerim, animas ut viros fovere quasi uxores corpora sua, ut corruptivum hoc induat incorruptionem, et alarum levitate suspensum, in aerem facilius sublevetur. Quando dico corruptivum hoc induat incorruptionem, non muto naturam corporum, sed augeo gloriam. Nec non quod sequitur, alarum levitate suspensum in aerem facilius sublevetur: qui alas assumit, id est, immortalitatem, ut levius ad coelum volet, non perdit esse quod fuerat. Sed dices, movent me quae sequuntur: «Foveamus igitur et viri uxores, et animae nostrae corpora, ut et uxores in viros, et corpora redigantur in animas, et nequaquam sit sexuum ulla diversitas; sed quomodo apud Angelos non est vir, neque mulier: ita et nos, qui similes Angelis futuri sumus, jam nunc incipiamus esse in terris, quod nobis in coelestibus repromissum est.»

Let us put however the words themselves which are contained in the third book of Origen: "Let us say that the soul loves that flesh which is to see the salvation of God, and nourishes and cherishes it, eruditing it with disciplines, and fattening it with heavenly bread, and watering it with the blood of Christ: so that refreshed and shining, it may be able to follow the husband with a free course, and be weighed down by no weight of debility. Beautifully also in the similitude of Christ nourishing and cherishing the Church, and saying to Jerusalem: How often would I have gathered your children together, as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, and you would not (Matt. 23:37), souls also cherish their own bodies, so that this corruptible may put on incorruption, and being suspended by the levity of wings, may be more easily raised into the air (1 Cor. 15). Let us cherish therefore both as men our wives, and our souls our bodies: so that both wives may be reduced into men, and bodies into souls, and there be no diversity of sexes at all: but as among the Angels, there is not male and female; so also we, who are to be like the Angels, may even now begin to be what has been promised to us in the heavenly places."

29. Above the simple exposition which seemed to us to be in this testimony, we expressed, saying: "As much as pertains to the simple understanding, holy charity having been commanded between husband and wife [by this precept], we are now commanded that we should nourish and cherish our spouses: that is, to be sure, that we should provide them with food and clothing, and those things which are necessary." This is our opinion. Therefore everything that follows thereafter, and can be opposed to us, we showed ought to be understood not from our persona, but from that of the contradictors. Which since it was a brief and absolute response, and according to what we said above, also depraved by the shadows of allegory, from that which is, to that which was not: yet I will approach closer, and inquire what displeases you in this disputation. Namely because I said, that souls like men cherish their bodies as it were wives, so that this corruptible may put on incorruption, and being suspended by the levity of wings, may be more easily raised into the air. When I say *this corruptible put on incorruption*, I do not change the nature of bodies, but I increase the glory. Nor yet what follows, *being suspended by the levity of wings may be more easily raised into the air*: he who assumes wings, that is, immortality, so that he may fly more lightly to heaven, does not lose being what he had been. But you will say, the things that follow move me: "Let us cherish therefore both as men our wives, and our souls our bodies, so that both wives may be reduced into men, and bodies into souls, and there be no diversity of sexes at all; but as among the Angels there is not male, nor female: so also we, who are to be like the Angels, may even now begin to be on earth, what has been promised to us in the heavenly places."

Recte moverent, nisi post priora dixissem, jam nunc incipiamus esse, quod nobis in coelestibus repromissum est. Quando dico, hic esse incipiamus in terris, naturam non tollo sexuum; sed libidinem, et coitum viri et uxoris aufero, dicente Apostolo: Tempus breve est: reliquum est, ut et qui habent uxores, sic sint quasi non habeant (I Cor. VII, 29). Et Dominus interrogatus in Evangelio, cujus de septem fratribus in resurrectione esse deberet uxor, ait: Erratis, nescientes Scripturas, neque virtutem Dei: in resurrectione enim neque nubent, neque nubentur; sed erunt sicut Angeli Dei in coelo (Matth. XXII, 29, 30). Et revera ubi inter virum et mulierem castitas est, nec vir incipit esse, nec femina: sed adhuc in corpore positi, mutantur in Angelos: in quibus non est vir neque mulier. Quod et in alio loco ab eodem Apostolo dicitur: Quicumque in Christo baptizati estis, Christum induistis. Non est Judaeus, neque Graecus, non est servus neque liber, non est masculus neque femina. Omnes enim unum vos estis in Christo Jesu (Galat. III, 27, 28).

30. Accusationes Rufini falsae. Rufinus Graecas litteras didicerat sine magistro. Gregorium Nazianzenum transtulerat. ---Sed quoniam de confragosis et asperis locis enavigavit oratio, et haereseos crimen impactum tota frontis libertate repulimus [Mss. respuimus], ad alias ejus accusationis partes, quibus nos mordere nititur, transeamus. E quibus prima est, me hominem maledicum, omnium detractorem, in praecessores meos genuinum semper infigere. Det unum, cujus in opusculis meis nomen taxaverim, vel quem juxta artem illius figurata laude perstrinxerim. Sin autem contra invidos loquor, et Luscium Lavinium, vel Asinium Pollionem de genere Corneliorum, styli mei mucro convulnerat, si histiculae et lividae mentis hominem a me submoveo, et ad unum stipitem cuncta jacula dirigo, quid vulnera sua partitur in multos? quid ex impatientia respondendi, ostendit se esse qui petitur? Objicit mihi perjurium, et mixtum sacrilegio, quod in libro (Epist. 22, ad Eustochium) quo ad instituendam Christi virginem loquor, ante tribunal judicis dormiens pollicitus sim, numquam me litteris saecularibus daturum operam, et nihilominus damnatae eruditionis interdum meminerim. Nimirum iste est Sallustianus Calpurnius, qui nobis per Magnum Oratorem, non magnam moverat quaestionem, cui libello brevi satisfacimus. Nunc quod instat, pro sacrilegio atque perjurio somnii respondendum est.

They would move [you] rightly, unless after the prior things I had said, *may even now begin to be what has been promised to us in the heavenly places*. When I say, *let us begin to be here on earth*, I do not take away the nature of the sexes; but I take away libido, and the coitus of husband and wife, the Apostle saying: *The time is short: it remains, that even those who have wives, be as if they had them not* (1 Cor. 7:29). And the Lord being interrogated in the Gospel, whose wife she ought to be of the seven brothers in the resurrection, said: *You err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God: for in the resurrection they shall neither marry, nor be given in marriage; but they shall be as the Angels of God in heaven* (Matt. 22:29-30). And in truth where there is chastity between man and woman, he does not begin to be a man, nor she a woman: but being still placed in the body, they are changed into Angels: in whom there is not male nor female. Which is also said in another place by the same Apostle: *As many of you as have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew, nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. For you are all one in Christ Jesus* (Gal. 3:27-28).

30. False accusations of Rufinus. Rufinus had learned Greek letters without a master. He had translated Gregory Nazianzen. ---But since the speech has sailed out from the broken and rough places, and we have repelled the crime of heresy impacted [upon us] with all freedom of brow, let us pass to other parts of his accusation, by which he strives to bite us. Of which the first is, that I, a maledictory man, a detractor of all, always fix my canine tooth (*genuinum*) in my predecessors. Let him give one [name], whose name I have taxed in my little works, or whom I have touched upon with figured praise according to his art. But if I speak against the envious, and the sword-point of my style wounds Luscus Lavinius, or Asinius Pollio of the genus of the Cornelii, if I remove from myself a man of a histrionic and livid mind, and direct all my javelins to one stump, why does he partition his wounds among many? why from impatience of responding, does he show that he himself is the one who is sought? He objects to me perjury, mixed with sacrilege, because in the book (Epistle 22, to Eustochium) in which I speak for the institution of a virgin of Christ, sleeping before the tribunal of the judge I promised that I would never give effort to secular letters, and nevertheless I sometimes remember the damned erudition. To be sure this is that Sallustian Calpurnius, who had moved no great question to us through the Great Orator, to which little book we have satisfied briefly. Now what is instant, we must respond for the sacrilege and perjury of the dream.

Dixi me saeculares litteras deinceps non lecturum: de futuro sponsio est, non praeteritae memoriae abolitio. Et quomodo, inquires, tenes, quod tanto tempore non relegis? Rursum si aliquid de veteribus libris respondero, et dixerò, adeo in teneris consuescere multum est (Virgil. Georg. II): dum renuo, crimen incurro, et pro me testimonium proferens, hoc ipso arguor, quo defendor.

Scilicet nunc longo sermone texendum est, quod probant conscientiae singulorum. Quis nostrum non meminit infantiae suae? Ego certe, ut tibi homini severissimum risum moveam, et imiteris aliquando Crassum, quem semel in vita dicit risisse Lucilius, memini me puerum cursitasse per cellulas servulorum, diem feriatum duxisse lusibus, et ad Orbilius saevientem de aviae sinu tractum esse captivum. Et quo magis stupeas, nunc cano et recalvo capite, saepe mihi videor in somnis comatulus, et sumpta toga, ante rhetorem controversiolam declamare. Cumque experrectus fuero, gratulor me dicendi periculo liberatum. Crede mihi, multa ad purum recordatur infantia. Si litteras didicisses, oleret testa ingenioli tui, quo semel fuisset imbuta. Lanarum conchyliis nullae aquae diluunt. Etiam asini et bruta animalia, quamvis in longo itinere, noverunt secundo diverticula. Miraris si ego litteras Latinas non sum oblitus, quum tu Graecas sine magistro didiceris? Septem modos conclusionum dialectica me elementa docuerunt; quid significet ἀξίωμα, quod nos pronuntiatum possumus dicere: quomodo absque verbo et nomine nulla sententia fit, soritarum gradus, pseudomeni argutias, sophismatum fraudes. Jurare possum me postquam egressus de schola sum, haec numquam omnino legisse. Bibendum igitur mihi erit de Lethaeo gurgite juxta fabulas poetarum, ne arguar scire quod didici. En tu qui in me parvam criminis scientiam, et videris tibi litteratulus atque Rabbi, responde, cur scribere aliqua ausus sis, et virum disertissimum Gregorium pari eloquii splendore transferre. Unde tibi tanta verborum copia, sententiarum lumen, translationum varietas, homini, qui oratoriam vix primis labris in adolescentia degustasti? Aut ego fallor, aut tu Ciceronem occulte lectitas. Et ideo tam disertus es, mihi que lectionis ejus crimen intendis, ut solus inter ecclesiasticos tractatores eloquentiae flumine glories.

I said that I would not read secular letters thereafter: the promise is of the future, not the abolition of past memory. And how, you will say, do you hold what you do not reread for so much time? Again if I shall respond something from the old books, and shall say, to be accustomed so much in tender [years] is much (Virgil, *Georgics* II): while I refuse, I incur the crime, and bringing forth testimony for myself, I am argued by this very thing by which I am defended.

To be sure now it must be woven in a long speech, what the consciences of individuals prove. Which of us does not remember his infancy? I certainly, that I may move a laugh for you a most severe man, and that you may sometimes imitate Crassus, whom Lucilius says laughed once in his life, remember myself as a boy running about through the cells of the little slaves, spending the holiday in games, and being dragged as a captive from the lap of my grandmother to the raging Orbilius. And that you may wonder more, now with a grey and balding head, I often seem to myself in dreams to be long-haired (*comatulus*), and having taken up the toga, to declaim a little controversy before the rhetorician. And when I shall have woken up, I congratulate myself that I am liberated from the danger of speaking. Believe me, infancy records many things to the pure. If you had learned letters, the jar of your little genius would smell of that with which it had once been imbued. No waters dilute the shellfish-dyes of wools. Even asses and brute animals, although in a long journey, know the diversions for a second time. Do you wonder if I have not forgotten Latin letters, when you have learned Greek ones without a master? The elements of dialectics taught me the seven modes of conclusions; what *axioma* (*ἀξίωμα*) signifies, which we can call a "pronouncement": how without a verb and a noun no sentence is made, the grades of sorites, the subtleties of the *pseudomenos*, the frauds of sophisms. I can swear that after I departed from school, I have never read these at all. I will have to drink therefore from the Lethean gulf according to the fables of the poets, lest I be argued to know what I learned. Lo you who criminate small science in me, and seem to yourself a little man of letters and a Rabbi, respond, why you dared to write some things, and to translate that most eloquent man Gregory with an equal splendor of eloquence. Whence to you such great abundance of words, the light of sentences, the variety of translations, to a man who have scarcely tasted oratory with the first lips in adolescence? Either I am deceived, or you read Cicero in secret. And therefore you are so eloquent, and intend the crime of his reading against me, so that you alone among ecclesiastical tractators may glory in the stream of eloquence.

Licet magis philosophos sequi videaris, spinas Cleantis, et contorta Chrysippi, non ex arte quam nescis, sed de ingenii magnitudine. And quoniam Stoici logicam sibi vindicant, et tu hujus scientiae deliramenta contemnis, in hac parte Epicureus es: nec quaeris quomodo, sed quid loquaris. Quid enim ad te pertinet, si alius non intelligat quid velis dicere, quia non ad omnes, sed ad tuos loqueris? Denique et ego scripta tua relegens, quamquam interdum non intelligam quid loquaris, et Heraclitum me legere putem: tamen non doleo, nec me poenitet tarditatis: id enim in legendo patior, quod tu pateris in scribendo.

31. Somnium defendit. Sanctorum Locorum celebritas et de toto orbe conventus.---Cur Hieronymo detraxerit Rufinus. ---Haec dicerem, si quippiam vigilans promississem. Nunc autem, novum impudentiae genus, objicit mihi somnium meum. Utinam celebritas loci, et sanctorum de toto orbe conventus, sineret me divinas Scripturas legere! Intantum spatium non habeo externa meditandi. Sed tamen qui somnium criminatur, audiat Prophetarum voces, somniis non esse credendum, quia nec adulterium somnii ducit me ad tartarum, nec corona martyrii in coelum levat. Quoties vidi me esse mortuum, et in sepulcro positum! Quoties volare super terras, et montes ac maria natatu aeris transfretare? Cogat ergo me non vivere, vel pennas habere per latera, quia vagis imaginibus mens saepe delusa est. Quanti in somnis divites, apertis oculis repente mendici sunt? Sitientes flumina bibunt; et experrecti, siccis faucibus aestuant. Tu a me somnii exigis sponsionem: ego te verius strictiusque conveniam. Fecisti omnia quae in baptismo promisisti? Quidquid monachi vocabulum flagitat, nostrum uterque complevit? Cave, quaeso, ne per trabem tuam, festucam meam videas. Invitus loquor, et retractantem linguam dolor in verba compellit. Non tibi sufficiunt quae de vigilante confingis, nisi et somnia crimineris. Tantam habes curiositatem meorum actuum, ut quid dormiens fecerim, dixerimve, discutias. Praetermitto, quae contra me loquens, propositum tuum deturpasti: quae in depomationem omnium Christianorum, et verbis et opere feceris. Hoc unum denuntio, et repetens iterum iterumque monebo.

Although you seem to follow the philosophers more, the thorns of Cleanthes, and the contorted things of Chrysippus, not from the art which you do not know, but from the magnitude of genius. And since the Stoics vindicate logic for themselves, and you condemn the ravings of this science, in this part you are an Epicurean: nor do you seek how, but what you may speak. For what does it pertain to you, if another does not understand what you wish to say, because you speak not to all, but to your own? Finally I also rereading your writings, although sometimes I do not understand what you speak, and think that I am reading Heraclitus: yet I do not grieve, nor does it repent me of my tardiness: for I suffer that in reading, which you suffer in writing.

31. He defends the dream. The celebrity of the Holy Places and the assembly from the whole world.---Why Rufinus detracted from Jerome. --I would say these things, if I had promised anything while awake. But now, a new kind of impudence, he objects to me my dream. Would that the celebrity of the place, and the assembly of saints from the whole world, permitted me to read the divine Scriptures! To such an extent I do not have space for meditating on external things. But nevertheless let him who criminales the dream, hear the voices of the Prophets, that dreams are not to be believed, because neither the adultery of a dream leads me to tartarus, nor the crown of martyrdom raises me to heaven. How often have I seen myself to be dead, and placed in a sepulcher! How often to fly over lands, and to cross over mountains and seas by the swimming of the air? Let him therefore force me not to live, or to have wings through my sides, because the mind has often been deluded by wandering images. How many in dreams are rich, and their eyes being opened are suddenly beggars? Thirsting they drink rivers; and having woken up, they burn with dry throats. You exact from me the promise of a dream: I will convene you more truly and more strictly. Have you done all things which you promised in baptism? Whatever the name of monk flags for, has each of us completed? Beware, I ask, lest through your beam, you see my mote. Unwillingly I speak, and pain compels the retracting tongue into words. Those things which you feign about me awake are not enough for you, unless you also criminate dreams. You have such great curiosity of my acts, that you discuss what I did or said while sleeping. I pass over those things, by which speaking against me, you have defiled your purpose: what things you have done both in word and deed for the depompation of all Christians. This one thing I denounce, and repeating again and again I will warn.

Cornutam bestiam petis: et nisi caverem illud Apostoli, Maledici regnum Dei non possidebunt (I Cor. VI, 19); et, Mordentes invicem consumpti estis ab invicem (Galat. V, 15), jam nunc sentires de parvula subdolaque concordia, magnam in mundo ortam esse discordiam. Quid tibi prodest, apud notos pariter et ignotos in nos maledicta congerere? An quia Origenistae non sumus, et in coelo nos peccasse nescimus, in terris arguimur peccatores? Et ideo in concordiam redivimus, ut mihi loqui contra haereticos non liceret, ne, si illos descripsero, tu te appetitum putes? Quamdiu non renuebam laudationem tuam, sequebaris me ut magistrum, fratrem et collegam vocabas, et catholicum in omnibus fatebaris. Postquam non agnovi laudes tuas, et me indignum tanti viri praeconio iudicavi, illico vertis stylum, et omnia laudata prius vituperas, de eodem ore et dulce proferens et amarum. Sentisne quid taceam, quod aestuanti pectori verba non commodem? et cum Psalmista loquar: Pone, Domine, custodiam ori meo, et ostium munitum labiis meis. Non declines cor meum in verba malitiae (Ps. CXL, 3). Et alibi: Cum consisteret adversum me peccator, obmutui, et humiliatus sum, et silui a bonis (Ps. XXXVIII, 1, 2). Et rursus: Factus sum quasi homo non audiens, nec habens in ore suo increpationes (Ps. XXXVII, 12)? Sed pro me ultor tibi Dominus respondebit, qui dicit per Prophetam, Mihi vindicta, et ego retribuam, dicit Dominus (Rom. XII, 19). Et in alio loco: Sedens adversus fratrem tuum loquebaris, et adversus filium matris tuae ponebas scandalum. Haec fecisti et tacui: existimasti, inique, quod ero tui similis; arguam te, et statuam contra faciem tuam (Psal. XL, 20 seqq.); ut in te videas condemnata, quae falso in aliis criminaris.

32. Chrysogonus sectator Rufini. ---Audio praeterea objici mihi a Chrysogono sectatore ejus, cur in baptismo dixerim universa peccata dimitti, et mortuo bimarito, novum virum in Christo resurgere: atque istiusmodi Sacerdotes in Ecclesiis esse non-nullos. Cui brevi sermone respondebo: habent libellum (Epist. ad Oceanum), quem in crimen vocant: ille respondeat, hunc sua disputatione subvertat, et scripta scriptis arguat. Quid austeritate frontis, et contractis rugatisque naribus, concava verba trutinatur, et sanctitatem apud vulgus ignobile simulato rigore mentitur? Audiat nos iterum proclamantes, Veterem Adam in lavacro totum mori, et novum cum Christo in baptismo suscitari: perire choicum, et nasci supercoelestem. Haec dicimus, non quod ipsi, propitio Christo, hac quaestione teneamur, sed interrogati a fratribus, quid nobis videretur, respondimus, nulli praejudicantes sequi quod velit, nec alterius decretum nostra sententia subvertentes.

You are attacking a horned beast: and unless I took care for that [word] of the Apostle, Revilers shall not possess the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:10 [Vulgate 6:19]); and, Biting one another you are consumed by one another (Gal. 5:15), you would even now feel that from a small and crafty concord, a great discord has arisen in the world. What does it profit you, to heap maledictions upon us among known and unknown alike? Is it because we are not Origenists, and we do not know ourselves to have sinned in heaven, that we are argued as sinners on earth? And therefore did we return into concord, so that it should not be permitted to me to speak against heretics, lest, if I shall describe them, you think yourself sought? As long as I did not refuse your praise, you followed me as a master, you called me brother and colleague, and you confessed me catholic in all things. After I did not acknowledge your praises, and judged myself unworthy of the proclamation of such a great man, immediately you turn the style, and vituperate all things praised before, from the same mouth bringing forth both sweet and bitter. Do you feel what I keep silent, because I do not lend words to a seething breast? and speak with the Psalmist: Set, O Lord, a guard to my mouth, and a fortified door to my lips. Do not decline my heart into words of malice (Ps. 141:3). And elsewhere: When the sinner stood against me, I was dumb, and was humbled, and kept silence from good things (Ps. 39:1-2). And again: I was made as a man not hearing, and not having in his mouth reprehensions (Ps. 38:14 [Vulgate 37:12])? But for me the avenging Lord will respond to you, who says through the Prophet, To me vengeance, and I will repay, says the Lord (Rom. 12:19). And in another place: Sitting against your brother you spoke, and against the son of your mother you placed a scandal. These things you did and I kept silence: you thought, wickedly, that I will be like you; I will argue you, and set [it] before your face (Ps. 50:20 seqq. [Vulgate 49]); so that in yourself you may see condemned, what you falsely criminate in others.

32. Chrysogonus, a follower of Rufinus. ---I hear besides that it is objected to me by Chrysogonus a follower of his, why I said in baptism all sins are dismissed, and the twice-married man being dead, a new man rises again in Christ: and that there are some Priests of this kind in the Churches. To whom I will respond in a short speech: they have the booklet (Epistle to Oceanus), which they call into crime: let him respond, let him subvert this by his disputation, and argue writings by writings. Why with austerity of brow, and with contracted and wrinkled nostrils, are concave words weighed, and sanctity feigned with simulated rigor among the ignoble common people? Let him hear us again proclaiming, that the old Adam dies totally in the laver, and the new is raised with Christ in baptism: that the earthy (choicum) perishes, and the super-heavenly is born. These things we say, not that we ourselves, Christ being propitious, are held by this question, but being interrogated by brothers what seemed [correct] to us, we responded, prejudging no one to follow what he wishes, nor subverting the decree of another by our opinion.

Neque enim ambimus sacerdotium, qui latemus in cellulis; nec humilitate damnata, episcopatum auro redimere festinamus; nec electum pontificem a Deo, rebeli cupimus mente jugulare: nec favendo haereticis, haereticos nos docemus. Pecunias nec habemus, nec habere volumus: Habentes victum et vestitum, his contenti sumus (I Tim. VI, 3): illud de ascensore montis Dominici jugiter decantantes: Qui pecuniam suam non dedit ad usuram, et munera super innocentem non accepit. Qui facit haec, non movebitur in aeternum (Psal. XIV, 5, 6). Ergo qui non facit, jam corrui in aeternum.

Hucusque de criminibus, immo pro criminibus meis, quae in me quondam subdolos laudator ingressit, et discipuli ejus constantius arguunt, non ut debui, sed ut potui, moderato dolore [Al. labore] respondi. Propositum quippe mihi est, non tam alios accusare, quam me defendere. Veniam ad Apologiam ejus, qua sancto Anastasio, Romanae urbis episcopo, satisfacere nititur, et in defensionem sui mihi rursum calumniam struit; tantumque me diligit, ut raptus turbine, et in profunda demersus, meum potissimum invadat pedem, ut mecum aut liberetur, aut pereat.

Dicit se primum respondere rumoribus, quibus illius Romae carpatur fides, hominis probatissimi, tam in fide, quam in charitate Dei. Et nisi post triginta annos parentibus redditus, nollet eos deserere, quos tam tarde viderat, ne inhumanus putaretur, aut durus, et tam longi itineris labore fragilior, ad iterandos labores esset infirmus, ipsum venire voluisse. Quod quia non fecerit, contra latratores suos misisse baculum litterarum, quem ille teneret in dextera, et saevientes contra se abigeret canes. Si probatus est cunctis, et maxime ipsi cui scribit episcopo, in fide et charitate Dei: quomodo Romae mordetur, et carpitur, et appetitae aestimationis ejus fama crebrescit? Deinde cujus est humilitatis, probatum se dicere in fide, et charitate Dei, cum Apostoli petant: Domine, adauge nobis fidem (Luc. XVII, 5); et audiant, Si habueritis fidem ut granum sinapis (Ibid., 6). Et ad ipsum dicatur Petrum: Modicae fidei, quare dubitasti (Matth. XIV, 31)? Quid loquar de charitate, quae et fide et spe major est: et quam Paulus optat potius quam praesumit: sine qua et martyrio sanguis effusus, corpusque flammis traditum, coronam non habet praemiorum? Harum utramque iste sic sibi vindicat, ut tamen contra se habeat latratores: qui nisi inclyti pontificis baculo repellantur, 492 latrare non cessant.

For neither do we ambit for the priesthood, we who lie hidden in little cells; nor, with humility damned, do we hasten to redeem a bishopric with gold; nor do we desire with a rebellious mind to jugulate a pontiff elected by God: nor by favoring heretics, do we teach ourselves to be heretics. Monies we neither have, nor wish to have: Having food and clothing, with these we are content (1 Tim. 6:8): continually chanting that [word] about the ascender of the mountain of the Lord: He who has not given his money to usury, nor accepted gifts over the innocent. He who does these things, shall not be moved forever (Ps. 15:5-6 [Vulgate 14]). Therefore he who does not do them, has already fallen forever.

Thus far, concerning the charges—or rather, on behalf of my "crimes"—which a certain deceitful praiser once heaped upon me, and which his disciples now press more constantly, I have responded not as I ought to have, but as I was able, with moderate grief [or: labor]. For my purpose is not so much to accuse others as to defend myself. I shall now turn to his Apology, in which he strives to satisfy the holy Anastasius, bishop of the city of Rome, and in his own defense constructs a new calumny against me; and he "loves" me so much that, caught in a whirlwind and plunged into the depths, he seizes my foot above all, so that with me he might either be saved or perish.

He says that he is first responding to the rumors by which his faith is attacked there in Rome—the faith of a man most proven, he says, both in faith and in the love of God. And that he would have wished to come himself, were it not that, having been restored to his kinsmen after thirty years, he was unwilling to desert those whom he had seen after so long a time, lest he be thought inhuman or harsh; and that, being more fragile from the labor of so long a journey, he was too weak to undertake new labors. And because he has not done this, he has sent the "staff" of a letter against his barkers, which the bishop might hold in his right hand and drive away the dogs raging against him. If he is proven to all, and especially to the very bishop to whom he writes, in the faith and love of God, how is it that in Rome he is bitten and attacked, and the rumor of his damaged reputation spreads? Furthermore, what sort of humility is it to say that he is proven in the faith and love of God, when the Apostles ask, "Lord, increase our faith" (Luke 17:5), and hear, "If you had faith like a grain of mustard seed" (Luke 17:6)? And it is said to Peter himself: "O you of little faith, why did you doubt?" (Matthew 14:31). What shall I say of charity, which is greater than both faith and hope, and which Paul desires rather than presumes to have; without which even blood shed in martyrdom and the body given to the flames has no crown of rewards? This man claims both of these for himself in such a way that he nevertheless has "barkers" against him, who, unless they are driven back by the staff of the renowned pontiff, do not cease to bark.

Illud vero ridiculum, quod post triginta annos ad parentes se reversum esse jactat, homo qui nec patrem habet, nec matrem; et quos vivos juvenis dereliquit, mortuos senex desiderat: nisi forte parentes militari vulgarique sermone, cognatos, et affines nominat, quos quia non vult deserere, ne inhumanus putetur, aut durus, idcirco patria derelicta, Aquileiae habitat. Periclitatur Romae illa probatissima fides ejus, et hic supinus et lassulus, post triginta annos, per mollissimum Flaminiae iter, essedo venire non potest; sicque praetendit longi itineris lassitudinem, quasi triginta annis semper cucurrerit, aut biennio Aquileiae sedens, praeteriti itineris labore confectus sit.

«Carpamus reliqua, et ipsa epistolae ejus verba ponamus: Quamvis igitur fides nostra, persecutionis haereticorum tempore, cum in sancta Alexandrina Ecclesia degeremus, in carceribus et exiliis, quae pro fide inferebantur, probata sit.» Miror quod non adjecerit: Vinctus Jesu Christi, et liberatus sum de ore leonis, et Alexandriae ad bestias pugnavi, et cursum consummavi, fidem servavi, superest mihi corona justitiae. Quae exsilia, quos iste carceres nominat? Pudet me apertissimi mendacii; quasi carceres, et exsilia absque judicum sententiis irrogentur. Volo tamen ipsos scire carceres, et quarum provinciarum se dicat exsilia sustinuisse. Et utique habet copiam de multis carceribus et infinitis exiliis unum aliquod nominandi. Prodat nobis confessionis suae acta, quae hucusque nescivimus; ut inter alios Alexandriae Martyres hujus quoque gesta recitemus, et contra latratores suos possit dicere: De caetero nemo mihi molestus sit, ego enim stigmata Domini nostri Jesu Christi in corpore meo porto (Galat. VI, 17).

«Tamen et si quis nunc est, qui vel tentare fidem nostram cupit vel audire, vel discere, sciat quod de Trinitate 493 ita credimus,» et reliqua. Supra contra canes tuos baculum episcopo porrigis, quo pro te munitus incedat. Nunc quasi ambigens dicis: Si quis est qui tentare fidem nostram cupit; denuo dubitas, cum multorum latratus ad te usque pervenerint. Non discussio parumper elocutiones tuas, quas et tu contemnis et despicias; tantum sensibus respondebo. Aliud a te quaeritur, et pro alio satisfacis.

But that is ridiculous—that he boasts of having returned to his parents after thirty years, a man who has neither father nor mother; and those whom he, as a young man, left while they were alive, he now, as an old man, longs for when they are dead. Unless perhaps by "parents" (*parentes*), in common and military parlance, he means kinsmen and relations, whom, because he does not wish to desert them lest he be thought inhuman or harsh, he has for that reason left his homeland and now lives in Aquileia. His "most proven" faith is in peril in Rome, and here he is, idle and weary, unable after thirty years to come by chariot along the very smooth Flaminian Way; and so he feigns weariness from a long journey, as if he had been running continuously for thirty years, or as if, after sitting in Aquileia for two years, he is exhausted by the labor of a past journey.

Let us take up the rest, and set down the very words of his letter: "Although, therefore, our faith was proven in the time of the persecution by the heretics, when we were living in the holy Church of Alexandria, in the prisons and exiles that were inflicted for the faith." I am surprised that he did not add: "A prisoner of Jesus Christ," and "I was delivered from the lion's mouth," and "I fought with beasts at Alexandria," and "I have finished my course, I have kept the faith, there remains for me a crown of justice." What exiles, what prisons does this man name? I am ashamed of this most open lie; as if prisons and exiles are inflicted without the sentences of judges. Nevertheless, I want to know of these prisons, and in which provinces he says he has endured exile. And surely, out of so many prisons and infinite exiles, he has the opportunity to name at least one. Let him produce for us the acts of his confession, which until now we have not known, so that among the other Martyrs of Alexandria we may also recite his deeds, and so that he can say against his "barkers": "Henceforth let no one cause me trouble, for I bear on my body the marks of our Lord Jesus Christ" (Galatians 6:17).

"Nevertheless, if there is anyone now who desires either to test our faith, or to hear, or to learn, let him know that concerning the Trinity we believe thus," and so on. Above, you offer a staff to the bishop against your dogs, that he may proceed protected by it on your behalf. Now, as if hesitating, you say: If there is anyone who desires to test our faith; you doubt again, although the barks of many have reached you. For the moment, I do not scrutinize your expressions, which you yourself scorn and despise; I will respond only to the meanings. One thing is asked of you, and you give satisfaction for another.

Contra Arii dogmata, jam Alexandriae in carceribus, et exiliis dimicaveras, non voce, sed sanguine. Nunc super Origenis haeresi tibi calumnia commovetur. Nolo cures, quae sana sunt, vulnera medicare. Trinitatem dicis unius esse Deitatis. Hoc toto credente jam mundo, puto quod et daemones confiteantur Filium Dei natum de Maria Virgine, et carnem naturae humanae, atque animam suscepisse. Si arctius quid rogavero, contentiosum vocabis. Si dicis Filium Dei humanae naturae carnem atque animam suscepisse, oro te, ut absque stomacho respondeas: anima ista, quam suscepit Jesus, eratne antequam nasceretur ex Maria? An in origine virginali, quae de Spiritu sancto nascebatur, cum corpore simul creata est, vel jam in utero corpore figurato, statim facta et missa est de coelo? E tribus unum quid sentias, scire desidero. Si fuit [Al. non fuit] antequam nasceretur ex Maria, necdum ergo erat anima Jesu, et agebat aliquid, ac propter merita virtutum postea facta est anima ejus. Si cepit ex traduce, humanarum igitur animarum, quas aeternas fatemur, et brutorum animantium, quae cum corpore dissolvuntur, una conditio est. Sin autem figurato corpore statim creatur et mittitur, fatere simpliciter, et nos scrupulo libera.

Nihil horum loqueris: sed occupatus in aliis, simplicitate nostra abuteris, et praestigiis pompaque verborum haerere nos non sinis quaestioni. Quid, inquires, nonne quaestio erat de resurrectione carnis, et poenis diaboli? Fateor [Al. Fatere]. Ergo breviter pureque responde. Non quaero quod scribis, eandem carnem resurgere, in qua vivimus, nullo membro amputato, nec aliqua parte corporis desecta, haec enim tua verba sunt: sed quaero, quod Origenes negat, 494 utrum in eodem sexu, quo mortua sunt corpora, suscitentur: et Maria Maria, Joannes resurgat Joannes: an commixto sexu atque turbato, nec vir, nec femina sit; sed utrumque, vel neutrum? Et an ipsa corpora incorrupta, et immortalia, et ut argute praemones, juxta Apostolum spiritusalia permaneant in aeternum: et non solum corpora, sed caro et sanguis infusus, venis et ossibus irrigatus, quae Thomas tetigit: an certe paulatim resolvantur in nihilum, et ad quatuor unde compacta sunt elementa, retrahantur? Haec aut dicere debueras, aut negare, et non ea loqui, quae subdole Origenes fatetur; ut quasi fatuis et pueris illudens, «nullo membro amputato, nec aliqua corporis parte desecta.» Scilicet hoc timuimus, ne sine naso et auribus surgeremus, et amputatis sectisque genitalibus, eunuchorum in coelesti Jerusalem civitas conderetur.

Against the dogmas of Arius, you had already fought in the prisons and exiles of Alexandria, not with your voice, but with your blood. Now a calumny is stirred up against you concerning the heresy of Origen. I do not want you to try to heal wounds that are sound. You say the Trinity is of one Godhead. With the whole world already believing this, I think that even the demons confess that the Son of God was born of the Virgin Mary, and took on the flesh and soul of human nature. If I should ask something more pointedly, you will call me contentious. If you say that the Son of God took on the flesh and soul of human nature, I beg you to answer without anger: that soul, which Jesus took on, did it exist before he was born of Mary? Or, at the virginal origin, which was born of the Holy Spirit, was it created at the same time as the body, or, with the body already formed in the womb, was it then made and sent from heaven? I desire to know which of these three you believe. If it existed before he was born of Mary, then it was not yet the soul of Jesus, and it was doing something, and on account of the merits of its virtues it later became his soul. If it began by transmission (*ex traduce*), then the condition of human souls, which we confess to be eternal, and of the souls of brute animals, which are dissolved with the body, is one and the same. But if, however, it is created and sent at once when the body is formed, confess it plainly, and free us from this uncertainty.

You say none of these things: but, being occupied with other matters, you abuse our simplicity, and with tricks and pomp of words you do not allow us to stick to the question. What, you will say, was not the question about the resurrection of the flesh, and the punishments of the devil? I confess. Therefore, answer briefly and purely. I am not asking what you write, that the same flesh in which we live will rise again, with no member amputated, nor any part of the body cut off, for these are your words: but I ask what Origen denies, whether they will be raised in the same sex in which the bodies died: and Mary will rise as Mary, John as John: or whether, with sex mixed and confused, there will be neither man nor woman, but both, or neither? And whether the bodies themselves, incorruptible and immortal, and as you cleverly point out, spiritual according to the Apostle, will remain for eternity: and not only the bodies, but the flesh and blood infused, flowing through veins and bones, which Thomas touched: or whether, on the contrary, they will gradually be resolved into nothing, and be drawn back to the four elements from which they were composed? You should have either affirmed or denied these things, and not said those things which Origen cunningly admits, so that, as if mocking fools and children, you say, "with no member amputated, nor any part of the body cut off." Of course, this is what we feared: that we would rise without a nose and ears, and that with the genitals amputated and cut off, a city of eunuchs would be founded in the heavenly Jerusalem.

Porro de diabolo sic sententiam temperat: «Dicimus quoque et iudicium futurum, in quo iudicio unusquisque recipiet propria corporis, prout gessit, sive bona, sive mala. Quod si homines recepturi sunt pro operibus suis, quanto magis et diabolus, qui omnibus existit causa peccati! De quo illud sentimus quod scriptum est in Evangelio (Matth. XXV): quia et ipse diabolus, et omnes angeli ejus, cum his qui opera ejus faciunt, id est, qui criminantur fratres, cum ipso pariter aeterni ignis haereditate potentur. Si quis ergo negat diabolum aeternis ignibus mancipari, partem cum ipso aeterni ignis accipiat, ut sentiat quod negavit. Repetamus singula. «Dicimus, inquit, futurum iudicium; in quo iudicio,» et caetera. Super verborum vitiis tacere decreveram; sed quia discipuli ejus mirantur eloquentiam praeceptoris, pauca perstringam. Dixerat iudicium futurum; sed homo cautus timuit solum dicere, in quo, et posuit, in quo iudicio; ne si non secundo repetisset iudicium, nos, obliti superiorum, pro iudicio asinum putaremus. Illud quoque quod postea infert, «qui criminantur fratres, cum ipso pariter aeterni ignis haereditate potentur,» ejusdem est venustatis. Quis enim umquam audit potiri ignibus, et frui suppliciis? Sed homo Graecus videtur mihi seipsum interpretari voluisse, et pro eo quod apud eos dicitur *κληρονομήσουσιν* et apud nos uno verbo dici potest, haereditabunt, compositius et ornatius dixisse, haereditate potentur. Istiusmodi nugis et acyrologiis omnis ejus scatet oratio. Sed revertamur ad sensum.

7. Ridet Rufini verba. Ignis aeternus juxta Origenem.

Grandi diabolus lancea percutitur, qui omnibus existit causa peccati, si pro operibus suis, quasi homo, redditurus est rationem, et cum angelis suis aeterni ignis haereditate potietur. Hoc enim deerat, ut hominibus tormento subditis, ille potiretur ignibus aeternis, quos tanto tempore desideraverat. Et videris mihi calumniam in hoc loco facere diabolo, et criminatorem omnium falsis criminibus accusare. Dicis enim, «qui omnibus existit causa peccati;» et dum in illum refert crimina, homines culpa liberas, tollisque arbitrii libertatem, Salvatore dicente, quod de corde nostro exeunt cogitationes malae, homicidia, adulteria, fornicationes, furta, falsa testimonia, blasphemiae (Matth. XV, 19). Et rursum de Juda in Evangelio legimus: Post buccellam intravit in eum Satanas (Joan. XIII, 27): qui ante buccellam sponte peccaverat, et nec humilitate, nec clementia Salvatoris flexus est ad poenitentiam. Unde Apostolus: Quos tradidi, inquit, Satanae, ut discant non blasphemare (I Tim. I, 20).

Furthermore, concerning the devil, he tempers his opinion thus: "We also say that there will be a future judgment, in which judgment each one will receive the proper things of the body, according to what he has done, whether good or evil. But if men are to receive for their works, how much more so the devil, who is the cause of sin for all! Concerning him, we believe what is written in the Gospel (Matthew 25): that the devil himself, and all his angels, along with those who do his works, that is, who accuse the brethren, will equally with him possess the inheritance of eternal fire. If anyone, therefore, denies that the devil is to be given over to eternal fires, may he receive a share with him of the eternal fire, so that he may feel what he has denied." Let us review these points one by one. "We say," he says, "that there will be a future judgment; in which judgment," and so on. I had decided to remain silent about the faults in his wording; but since his disciples admire their teacher's eloquence, I will touch upon a few things. He had said there would be a future judgment; but this cautious man was afraid to say merely, "in which," and so he put, "in which judgment"; lest, if he had not repeated "judgment" a second time, we, having forgotten what came before, might think he meant a donkey instead of a judgment. That which he adds later, "who accuse the brethren, will equally with him possess the inheritance of eternal fire," is of the same elegance. For who has ever heard of "possessing fires" and "enjoying punishments"? But this Greek seems to me to have wanted to interpret himself, and for what among them is said as *κληρονομήσουσιν* (*klēronomēsousin*) and can be said among us with a single word, **haereditabunt** (they will inherit), he has said, more elaborately and ornately, **haereditate potientur** (they will possess by inheritance). His entire discourse is teeming with trifles and improprieties of speech (**acyrologiae**) of this kind. But let us return to the meaning.

7. He laughs at the words of Rufinus. Eternal fire according to Origen.

The devil, who is the cause of sin for all, is struck with a great lance if, like a man, he is to render an account for his works and, with his angels, will come into the inheritance of eternal fire. For this was what was lacking: that while men were subjected to torment, he should possess the eternal fires which he had desired for so long. And you seem to me in this passage to be slandering the devil, and to be accusing the accuser of all with false charges. For you say, "who is the cause of sin for all;" and while you refer the crimes to him, you free men from blame and take away the freedom of the will (**arbitrii libertatem**), when the Savior says that **from our heart come evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies** (Matt. 15:19). And again, we read of Judas in the Gospel: **After the morsel, Satan entered into him** (John 13:27): who had sinned of his own accord before the morsel, and was not moved to repentance either by the humility or by the clemency of the Savior. Hence the Apostle says: **Whom I have delivered to Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme** (1 Tim. 1:20).

Et in alio loco: Tradidi huiusmodi Satanae in interitum carnis, ut spiritus salvus fiat (I Cor. V, 5). Tradidit eos Satanae, quasi tortori ad puniendum, qui antequam traderentur, voluntate propria blasphemaverant. Et David, Ab occultis, inquit, meis munda me, Domine, et ab alienis parce servo tuo (Ps. XVIII, 13): breviter et suae voluntatis errorem, et vitiorum incentiva significans. In Ecclesiaste quoque legimus: Si spiritus potestatem habentis ascenderit super cor tuum, locum tuum ne dimiseris (Eccles. X, 4). Ex quo liquido apparet, si dederimus ascendenti locum, nos peccasse qui dederimus, et ascendentem muros hostem non praecipitem deturbaverimus.

Quod autem imprecaris fratribus, 496 hoc est, criminatioribus tuis, aeternos ignes cum diabolo, non tam fratres mihi videris premere, quam diabolum sublevare, cum iisdem quibus homines Christiani ignibus puniendus sit. Ignis autem aeternos, quos intelligere solet Origenes, puto quod te non fugiat, conscientiam videlicet peccatorum, et poenitudinem interna cordis urentem. De qua et Isaias loquitur: Vermis eorum non morietur, et ignis eorum non exstinguetur (Isai. LXVI, 24). Et ad Babylonem scriptum est: Habes carbones ignis, sedebis super eos: hi erunt tibi in adiutorio (Psal. XXVII, 14). Et in Psalmo poenitens audit: Quid detur tibi, aut quid apponatur tibi ad linguam dolosam? Sagittae potentis acutae, cum carbonibus desolatoriis (Psal. CXIX, 4); ut linguam dolosam, sagittae praeceptorum Dei (de quibus in alio loco Propheta dicit (Psal. XXXI, 4), Versatus sum in miseria, dum configitur mihi spina) vulnerent atque confodiant, et peccatorum in ea solitudinem faciant. Illud quoque testimonium in quo Dominus loquitur: Ignem veni mittere super terram, et quam volo ut ardeat (Luc. XII, 49), sic interpretatur: «Omnes cupio agere poenitentiam, et excoquere Spiritu sancto vitia atque peccata. Ipse enim sum de quo scribitur: Deus ignis consumens est (Deut. IV, 24). Non ergo grande est hoc de diabolo dicere, quod et hominibus praeparatum est.» Magis debueras (ut suspicionem salutis diabolicae declinares) dicere: Perditio factus es: et non eris in aeternum (Ezech. XXVIII, sec. LXX); et ex persona Domini loquentis ad Job de diabolo: Ecce spes ejus frustrabitur eum, et videntibus cunctis praecipitabitur (Job. XL, 28). Non quasi crudelis suscitabo eum. Quis enim resistere potest vultui meo? Quis ante dedit mihi ut reddam ei? Omnia quae sub coelo sunt, mea sunt. Non parcam ei, et verbis potentibus, et ad deprecandum compositis (Job. XLI, 1 et seqq). Verum haec possunt quasi simplicis hominis excusari: et cum eruditos non subterfugiant, apud indoctos praeferre innocentiae similitudinem.

And in another place: *I have delivered such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved* (1 Cor. 5:5). He delivered them to Satan, as to a torturer for punishment, who before they were delivered had blasphemed of their own will. And David says, *Cleanse me, O Lord, from my secret faults, and from those of others spare your servant* (Ps. 18:13): briefly signifying both the error of his own will and the incentives of vices. In Ecclesiastes we also read: *If the spirit of him that hath power, ascend upon thy heart, leave not thy place* (Eccles. 10:4). From this it is clearly apparent that if we have given place to the one ascending, we who have given it have sinned, and have not cast down headlong the enemy ascending the walls.

But as for your imprecation upon the brethren, that is, your accusers, of eternal fires with the devil, you seem to me not so much to oppress the brethren as to relieve the devil, since he is to be punished with the same fires as Christian men. Moreover, as for the eternal fires, which Origen is accustomed to understand, I think it does not escape you that they are the conscience of sinners, and the repentance burning the inner parts of the heart. Of which Isaiah also speaks: *Their worm shall not die, and their fire shall not be quenched* (Isa. 66:24). And to Babylon it is written: *You have coals of fire, you shall sit upon them: these shall be a help to you* (Isa. 47:14). And in the Psalm the penitent hears: *What shall be given to thee, or what shall be added to thee, for a deceitful tongue? Sharp arrows of the mighty, with desolating coals* (Ps. 119:3-4); so that the arrows of God's precepts (of which the Prophet says in another place (Ps. 31:4), *I was turned in my anguish, whilst the thorn is fastened*) may wound and pierce the deceitful tongue, and make in it a solitude of sins. That testimony also in which the Lord speaks, *I am come to cast fire on the earth; and what will I, but that it be kindled?* (Luke 12:49), is thus interpreted: "I desire all to do penance, and to purge away their vices and sins by the Holy Spirit. For I am he of whom it is written: *God is a consuming fire* (Deut. 4:24). Therefore, it is not a great thing to say this of the devil, which is also prepared for men." You ought rather (to avoid the suspicion of the devil's salvation) to have said: *Thou art become a perdition, and thou shalt not be for ever* (Ezek. 28, according to the LXX); and from the person of the Lord speaking to Job about the devil: *Behold his hope shall fail him, and in the sight of all he shall be cast down* (Job 40:28). *I will not stir him up as one that is cruel. For who can resist my countenance? Who hath given me before that I should repay him? All things that are under heaven are mine. I will not spare him, nor his powerful words, nor his words framed for entreaty* (Job 41:1 ff.). But these things can be excused as if from a simple man: and while they do not escape the learned, they may present a semblance of innocence to the unlearned.

8. Quod sequitur de animarum statu, excusari omnino non potest. Dicit enim: «Audio et de anima quaestiones 497 esse commotas: de qua re utrum recipi debeat querimonia an abjici, vos probate. Si autem et de me quid sentiam quaeritur, fateor me de hac quaestione apud quamplurimos tractatorum diversa legisse. Legi quosdam dicentes, quod pariter cum corpore per humani seminis traducem etiam animae diffundantur: et haec quibus poterant assertionibus confirmabant. Quod puto inter Latinos Tertullianum sensisse, vel Lactantium, fortassis et nonnullos alios. Alii asserunt, quod, formati in utero corporibus, Deus quotidie faciat animas et infundat. Alii quod factas jam olim, id est, tunc cum omnia creavit Deus ex nihilo, nunc eas iudicio suo nasci dispenset in corpore. Hoc sentit et Origenes, et nonnulli alii Graecorum. Ego vero cum haec singula legerim (Deo teste dico) quia usque ad praesens certi et definiti aliquid de hac quaestione non teneo; sed Deo relinquo scire quid sit in vero, et si cui ipse revelare dignabitur. Ego tamen haec singula et legisse me non nego, et adhuc ignorare confiteor: praeter hoc quod manifeste tradit Ecclesia, Deum esse et animarum et corporum conditorem.»

9. Antequam de sensibus disputem, Theophrasti verba mirabor: «Audio, inquit, de anima quaestiones commotas esse: de qua re utrum recipi debeat querimonia, aut abjici, vos probate.» Si quaestiones de animae statu in Urbe commotae sunt, quae est ista querimonia vel querela, quae utrum recipi debeat, episcoporum iudicio relinquitur? nisi forte quaestionem et querimoniam idipsum significare putat: quia in Capri Commentariis huiusmodi figuram reperit. Deinde ponit, «Legi quosdam dicentes, quod pariter cum corpore per humani seminis traducem etiam animae diffundantur, et haec quibus poterant assertionibus confirmabant.» Rogo quae est ista licentia figurarum? quae modorum et temporum perturbatio? «Legi dicentes, quibus poterant assertionibus confirmabant.» Et in consequentibus: «Alii asserunt, quod, formati 498 in utero corporibus, Deus quotidie faciat novas animas, et infundat. Alii, factas jam olim, id est, tunc cum omnia Deus creavit ex nihilo, nunc eas iudicio suo nasci dispenset in corpore.» Et hic ordo pulcherrimus. Alii, inquit, asserunt hoc vel illud: alii factas jam olim, id est, tunc cum omnia Deus creavit ex nihilo, nunc eas iudicio suo nasci dispenset in corpore. Tam putide et confuse loquitur, ut plus ego in reprehendendo laborem, quam ille in scribendo. Ad extremum posuit: «Ego vero cum haec singula legerim,» et adhuc pendente sententia, quasi novum aliquid protulisset, adjecit: «Ego tamen haec singula et legisse me non nego, et adhuc ignorare confiteor.»

8. What follows concerning the state of souls cannot be excused at all. For he says: "I hear that questions have also been raised about the soul: concerning which matter, you must judge whether the complaint should be received or rejected. But if it is asked what I myself think, I confess that I have read diverse opinions on this question among a great many authors. I have read some who say that souls are propagated along with the body through the transmission of human seed (*tradux*), and they confirmed this with what assertions they could. This, I think, is the opinion held among the Latins by Tertullian, or Lactantius, and perhaps some others. Others assert that, once bodies are formed in the womb, God daily makes souls and infuses them. Others, that they were made long ago, that is, at the time when God created all things from nothing, and that He now, by His judgment, dispenses them to be born in a body. This is the opinion of Origen, and some other of the Greeks. As for me, though I have read each of these views (I say this with God as my witness), I hold nothing certain and definite on this question up to the present; but I leave it to God to know what is true, and to whomever He may deign to reveal it. Nevertheless, I do not deny having read each of these things, and I confess that I am still ignorant, except for this which the Church manifestly teaches: that God is the creator of both souls and bodies."

9. Before I dispute the meanings, I will marvel at the words of our Theophrastus: "I hear," he says, "that questions have been raised about the soul: concerning which matter, you must judge whether the complaint should be received or rejected." If questions about the state of the soul have been raised in the City, what is this complaint or grievance, which is left to the judgment of bishops whether it should be received? unless perhaps he thinks that "question" and "complaint" mean the same thing, because he found such a figure of speech in the Commentaries of Caprus. Then he sets down, "I have read some who say that souls are propagated along with the body through the transmission of human seed, and they confirmed this with what assertions they could." What, I ask, is this license of figures? What a confusion of moods and tenses! "I have read [some] saying... which they confirmed with what assertions they could." And in the following: "Others assert that, once bodies are formed in the womb, God daily makes new souls and infuses them. Others, that they were made long ago, that is, at the time when God created all things from nothing, and that He now, by His judgment, dispenses them to be born in a body." And this is a most beautiful arrangement. "Others," he says, "assert this or that; others, that they were made long ago, that is, at the time when God created all things from nothing, and that He now, by His judgment, dispenses them to be born in a body." He speaks so offensively and confusedly that I labor more in criticizing him than he did in writing. At the end he put: "As for me, though I have read each of these things," and with the sentence still hanging, as if he had produced something new, he added: "Nevertheless, I do not deny having read each of these things, and I confess that I am still ignorant."

10. Trinitatis mysterium ignoratum Antiquis.---O infelices animas, quae tantis vitiorum lanceis vulnerantur! non eas puto juxta Origenis errorem tantum laborasse, cum de coelo in terras ruerent, et crassis corporibus vestirentur, ut nunc et verbis et sentiis hinc inde collisas; ut praetermittam *κακέμφοτον*, quo de humani seminis traduce diffundi animae dicuntur. Scio inter Christianos verborum vitia non solere reprehendi; sed ex paucis ostendere volui, cujus temeritatis sit docere quod nescias, scribere quod ignores: ut similem prudentiam et in sensibus requiramus. Mittit epistolam, id est, robustissimum baculum, quo Romanae urbis armetur episcopus: et in ipsa quaestione, pro qua canes latrant, dicit se nescire quod quaeritur. Si ignorat, pro quo sibi calumnia commovetur, quid necesse est Apologiam mittere, quae non habet defensionem sui, sed ignorantiae confessionem? Hoc est suspiciones hominum non sopire, sed serere. Tres super animarum statu ponit sententias, et in fine concludens: «Singula, inquit, me legisse non nego, et adhuc ignorare cofiteor.» Arcesilam, aut Carneadem putes, qui omnia incerta pronuntiant, licet et illos superet cautione. Illi enim omnium philosophorum invidiam non ferentes, quod veritatem e vita tollerent, verisimilia reppererunt, 499 ut ignorantiam rerum probabili assertionem temperarent: iste se dicit incertum, et e tribus omnino nescire quid verum sit. Si hoc erat responsurus, quae eum ratio impulit, ut tantum Pontificem inscitiae suae testem faceret. Nimirum haec illa est lassitudo, quod triginta annorum itinere confectus, Romam venire non potuit. Quanta et alia nescimus, et tamen imperitiae nostrae testes non quaerimus! De Patre, Filio, et Spiritu sancto; de nativitate Domini Salvatoris, super qua Isaias clamat: Generationem ejus quis enarrabit (Isai. LIII, 8)? audacter loquitur, et mysterium omnibus retro saeculis ignoratum scientiae suae vindicat: et hoc solum ignorat, quod ignoratum cunctis scandalum facit. Scit quomodo Deum Virgo generavit; et nescit quomodo ipse sit natus. Animarum et corporum conditorem fatetur Dominum, sive animae ante corpora fuerint, sive cum corporum nascentur exordiis, sive jam formati in utero figuratisque corporibus immittantur. In omnibus novimus auctorem Dominum.

10. The Mystery of the Trinity was Unknown to the Ancients.---O unhappy souls, who are wounded by so many lances of vice! I do not think that, according to the error of Origen, they labored so much when they fell from heaven to earth and were clothed in gross bodies, as they are now battered on all sides by both words and opinions; to say nothing of the ill-sounding expression (*kakemphaton*) by which souls are said to be propagated by the transmission (*traduce*) of human seed. I know that among Christians faults of language are not usually censured; but by these few examples I have wished to show what temerity it is to teach what you do not know, to write what you are ignorant of: so that we might demand similar prudence in matters of substance as well. He sends a letter, that is, a most sturdy staff, with which the bishop of the city of Rome is to be armed: and on the very question for which the dogs are barking, he says he does not know what is being asked. If he is ignorant of the matter for which calumny is stirred up against him, what need is there to send an Apology which contains not a defense of himself, but a confession of ignorance? This is not to quell men's suspicions, but to sow them. He sets forth three opinions on the state of souls, and concluding at the end, he says: "I do not deny that I have read each of them, and I confess that I am still ignorant." You would think him an Arcesilas or a Carneades, who pronounce everything uncertain, although he surpasses even them in caution. For they, unable to bear the odium from all the other philosophers for removing truth from life, devised the notion of the probable (*verisimilia*), so as to temper their ignorance of things with a plausible assertion: but this man says he is uncertain, and that of the three options he is altogether ignorant of which is true. If this was what he was going to answer, what reason impelled him to make so great a Pontiff a witness to his own ignorance? Doubtless this is that weariness, on account of which, exhausted by a thirty-year journey, he could not come to Rome. How many other things we do not know, and yet we do not seek witnesses to our lack of skill! About the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; about the birth of the Lord Savior, concerning which Isaiah exclaims: "Who shall declare his generation?" (Isa. 53:8), he speaks boldly, and claims for his own knowledge a mystery unknown to all preceding ages: and this alone he is ignorant of, which, being unknown, causes scandal to all. He knows how the Virgin gave birth to God; and he does not know how he himself was born. He confesses the Lord to be the creator of souls and bodies, whether souls existed before bodies, or are born with the beginnings of bodies, or are infused into bodies already formed and shaped in the womb. In all these cases, we know the Lord is the author.

Nec de hoc nunc quaestio est, utrum Deus, an alius eas fecerit: sed e tribus quas posuit, quae sit illarum sententia vera, nescire se dicit. Vide ne statim tibi obijciatur, idcirco te trium ignorantiam confiteri, ne unum damnare cogaris: et Tertulliano et Lactantio ideo parcere, ne Origenem cum illis jugules. Quantum memoria suggerit, nisi tamen fallor, nescio me legisse Lactantium *συπείρομένην* animam dicere. Caeterum qui legisse te scribis, dic in quo libro legeris, ne ut me dormientem, sic illum mortuum calumniatus esse videaris. Sed et in hoc cunctabundus incedis et cautus. Dicis enim: «Puto inter Latinos Tertullianum sensisse, vel Lactantium, fortassis et alios nonnullos.» Non solum de animarum statu dubitas, sed et de auctorum sententiis putas: et tamen aliquid interest. De animabus autem aperte nescis, et inscitiam confiteris: de auctoribus sic nosse te dicis, ut putes potius quam praesumas. In solo Origene non ambigis. Dicis quippe, «Hoc sentit Origenes.» Interrogabo te: bene 500 sentit, an male? Nescio, inquis. Quid me igitur missis tabellariis et creberrimis nuntiis docere conaris, ut sciam, quod nescias? Et ne forte non credam imperitiae tuae, et arbitrer te callide reticere quod nosti, juras Deo teste, quod usque ad praesens certi et definiti aliquid de hac quaestione non teneas; et Deo relinquo scire quid sit in vero, et si cui ipse revelare dignabitur. Per tanta saecula tibi nullus videtur dignus fuisse, cui de hac quaestione Dominus revelarit? Non patriarcha, non propheta, non apostolus, non martyr? Ne tibi quidem, quando in carceribus et exiliis morabar, hujusmodi sacramenta patuerunt? Dominus in Evangelio, Pater, inquit, revelavi nomen tuum hominibus (Joan. XVII, 6). Qui Patrem revelavit, de animarum statu tacuit: et miraris si contra te fratrum scandala concitentur, cum id nescire te jures, quod Christi Ecclesiae se nosse fateantur?

11. Exposita fide sua, immo inscitiae confessione, transit ad aliud; et excusare se nititur, cur libros *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* in Latinum verterit. Et haec scribit ad verbum: «Sane quia audio etiam inde esse disputatum quod quaedam Origenis rogatus a fratribus de Graeco in Latinum transtuli, puto quod omnes intelligant, haec pro solo livore culpari. Si enim aliquid est quod displiceat in auctore, quare id ad interpretem detorquetur? Sicut in Graecis habetur, rogatus sum ut Latinis ostenderem. Graecis sensibus verba dedi Latina tantummodo.

Nor is the question now whether God or another made them: but of the three opinions he has set forth, he says he does not know which is the true one. See that it not be immediately objected to you, that you confess ignorance of the three for this reason: that you might not be forced to condemn one of them, and that you spare Tertullian and Lactantius so as not to execute Origen along with them. As far as memory serves, unless I am mistaken, I do not recall having read that Lactantius says the soul is "sown together with" (*syspeiromenen*). But as for you who write that you have read it, say in what book you read it, lest you seem to have slandered him in death, just as you have me in my sleep. But even in this you proceed hesitantly and cautiously. For you say: "I think that among the Latins Tertullian held this view, or Lactantius, and perhaps some others." Not only do you doubt about the state of souls, but you also "think" about the opinions of authors: and yet there is some difference. For about souls you are openly ignorant, and you confess your ignorance: about the authors you say you know in such a way that you "think" rather than "presume." In Origen alone you have no doubts. Indeed, you say, "This is what Origen thinks." I will ask you: does he think rightly or wrongly? "I do not know," you say. Why then do you try to teach me, by sending couriers and most frequent messengers, so that I might know what you do not know? And lest by chance I should not believe your lack of skill, and think that you are cunningly silent about what you know, you swear with God as your witness that up to the present you hold nothing certain and definite on this question; and that you leave it to God to know what is true, and to whomever he himself will deign to reveal it. Through so many ages, does no one seem to you to have been worthy for the Lord to have revealed this matter to them? Not a patriarch, not a prophet, not an apostle, not a martyr? Were not sacraments of this kind laid open even to you, when you were lingering in prisons and exiles? The Lord says in the Gospel, "Father, I have revealed your name to men" (John 17:6). He who revealed the Father was silent about the state of souls: and you wonder if scandals are stirred up against you by the brethren, when you swear that you are ignorant of that which the Churches of Christ profess to know?

11. Having set forth his faith, or rather, his confession of ignorance, he passes to another matter; and he strives to excuse himself for having translated the books *On First Principles* (*περὶ Ἀρχῶν*) into Latin. And he writes this verbatim: "Indeed, because I hear that there has also been a dispute about the fact that, at the request of the brethren, I translated certain works of Origen from Greek into Latin, I think that everyone understands that these things are blamed out of sheer malice (*livore*). For if there is something that is displeasing in the author, why is it twisted back upon the translator? As it is found in the Greek texts, I was asked to show it to the Latins. I have only given Latin words to the Greek meanings."

Sive ergo in illis sensibus laus inest aliqua, non est mea: sive culpa, similiter non est mea.» «Audio, inquit, etiam inde esse disputatum.» Quam prudenter accusationem suam, disputationem vocat! «Quod quaedam Origenis rogatus a fratribus de Graeco in Latinum transtuli.» Quae sunt illa quaedam? Nomen non habent? Taces? Libelli accusatorum loquuntur. «Puto, ait, quod omnes intelligant haec pro solo livore culpari.» Pro quo livore? Num invident eloquentiae tuae? Aut fecisti quod nullus hominum umquam facere potuit? Ecce et ego Origenis 501 multa transtuli: et praeter te nemo nec invidet, nec calumniatur. «Si enim, inquit, aliquid est quod displiceat in Auctore, quare id ad interpretem detorquetur? sicut in Graecis habetur, rogatus sum ut Latinis ostenderem. Graecis sensibus verba dedi Latina tantummodo. Sive ergo in illis sensibus laus inest aliqua, non est mea: sive culpa, similiter non est mea.» Et miraris, si de te homines male sentiant, quum de apertis blasphemiiis dicas: «Si est aliquid, quod displiceat in auctore.» Omnibus quae in illis libris dicta sunt, displicent: et tu solus dubitas, et quereris, cur ad interpretem detorqueatur, quod in translationis tuae Praefatione laudasti. Rogatus eras, ut quomodo habebatur in Graeco, in Latinum verteres. Utinam fecisses quod rogatum te esse simulas! nulli nunc invidiae subjaceres. Si tu translationis servasses fidem, mihi necessitas non fuisset interpretationem falsam vera interpretatione subvertere. Novit conscientia tua, quae addideris, quae subtraxeris, quae in utramque partem, ut tibi visum fuerit, immutaris: et post haec audes dicere, quod et bona et mala non tibi, sed auctori debeant imputari. Et oppressus invidia adhuc verba moderaris; et quasi super aristas pendenti incedens gradu, loqueris. «Sive in illis sensibus laus est, sive culpa.» Defendere non audes, et tamen damnare non vis. Elige e duobus quod vis, optio tibi datur: si bona est interpretatio tua, lauda: si mala, condemna. Verum excusat se, et subnectit aliam stropham. Dicit enim: «Quinimmo etiam aliud adjeci, sicut in Praefatiuncula mea designavi; ut in quantum possem, aliquanta deciderem: illa tamen quae mihi ad suspicionem veniebant, quod non ab ipso Origene ita dicta, sed ab aliis viderentur esse inserta, propter hoc quod de eisdem rebus in aliis auctoris ejusdem locis catholice dictum legeram.» Mira eloquentia, et Attico flore variata: Quinimo etiam; et Quae mihi ad suspicionem veniebant. Admiror 502 ausum illum esse haec Romam verborum portenta transmittere. Compeditam putes linguam ejus, et inextricabilibus nodis ligatam, vix in humanum sonum erumpere. Sed ad causam redeam.

Therefore, if there is any praise in those meanings, it is not mine; or if there is blame, likewise it is not mine." "I hear," he says, "that there has also been a dispute about it." How prudently he calls his own accusation a "dispute"! "That I translated *certain works* of Origen from Greek into Latin at the request of the brethren." What are these "certain works"? Do they not have a name? Are you silent? The pamphlets of the accusers speak. "I think," he says, "that everyone understands that these things are blamed out of sheer malice." For what malice? Do they envy your eloquence? Or have you done what no man has ever been able to do? Look, I too have translated many works of Origen; and besides you, no one envies or slanders me. "For if," he says, "there is something that is displeasing in the Author, why is it twisted back upon the translator? As it is found in the Greek texts, I was asked to show it to the Latins. I have only given Latin words to the Greek meanings. Therefore, if there is any praise in those meanings, it is not mine; or if there is blame, likewise it is not mine." And you are surprised if men think ill of you, when you say of open blasphemies: "If there is *something* that is displeasing in the author." All things that are said in those books are displeasing; and you alone doubt, and complain why that which you praised in the Preface of your translation is twisted back upon the translator. You were asked to translate it into Latin just as it was in the Greek. If only you had done what you pretend you were asked to do! You would now be subject to no envy. If you had preserved the fidelity of the translation, it would not have been necessary for me to subvert a false interpretation with a true one. Your own conscience knows what you have added, what you have subtracted, what you have changed in either direction as it seemed good to you; and after this you dare to say that both the good and the bad things should be imputed not to you, but to the author. And overwhelmed by envy, you still moderate your words; and you speak as if walking with a suspended step over the ears of corn. "Whether there is praise in those meanings, or blame." You do not dare to defend, and yet you do not wish to condemn. Choose which of the two you wish, the choice is given to you: if your interpretation is good, praise it; if it is bad, condemn it. But he excuses himself and adds another trick. For he says: "Indeed, I also added something else, as I indicated in my short Preface; that, as far as I could, I would cut out some things: those things, however, which came under my suspicion, that they were not so said by Origen himself, but seemed to have been inserted by others, on account of this, that I had read that it was said catholically about the same matters in other places of the same author." Wonderful eloquence, and varied with Attic flower: "Indeed, also;" and "Which came under my suspicion." I am amazed that he dared to transmit these monstrosities of words to Rome. You would think his tongue fettered and bound with inextricable knots, scarcely breaking forth into human sound. But let me return to the matter at hand.

11. Origenis blasphemia.--- Quis tibi dedit hanc licentiam, ut multa de interpretatione decideres? Rogatus eras ut Graeca in Latinum verteres, non ut emendares: ut alterius dicta proferres, non ut tua conderes. Non fecisse te quod rogatus es, recidendo plurima, confiteris. Atque utinam praecidisses mala, et non in assertionem malorum, tua multa posuisses! E quibus unum proferam, ut ex hoc cognoscantur et caetera. In primo libro *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, ubi Origenes lingua sacrilega blasphemavit, quod Filius Patrem non videat, tu etiam causas reddis, quasi ex persona ejus, qui scripsit, et Didymi interpretaris *σχόλιον*, in quo ille casso labore conatur alienum errorem defendere, quod Origenes quidem bene dixerit: sed nos simplices homines, et cicures Enniani, nec illius sapientiam, nec tuam, qui interpretatus es, intelligere possumus. Praefatio tua, quam nominas, et in qua me miris ornas laudibus, te reum pessimae translationis facit. Dicis enim quod de Graeco multa decideris, licet taceas quod addideris. Quae decidisti, mala erant, an bona? Utique mala. Quae reservasti bona, an mala? utique bona. Neque enim mala transferre poteras. Ergo mala amputasti, et reliquisti bona? nulli dubium est. Probantur autem quae translata sunt, pene omnia mala. Quidquid igitur malum in translatione monstravero, tibi imputabitur, qui illud pro bono transtulisti. Aliud est, si iniquus censor ejusdem criminis reus, alios de senatu pellis, alios in curia retines. Sed dicis, «Omnia mutare non poteram; sed ea tantum, quae addita ab haereticis arbitrabar, mihi amputanda credidi.» Pulchre. Si amputasti quae addita ab haereticis existimabas, ergo quae reliquisti, ejus sunt quem interpretatus es [Al. interpretabaris]; 503 responde, utrum bona, an mala sint? Mala transferre non poteras. Semel enim, quae ab haereticis addita fuerant, amputasti. Nisi forte haereticorum mala amputare debueris, et Origenis errores in Latinum integros vertere. Dic ergo, quare Origenis mala in Latinum verteris: ut auctorem mali proderes, an ut laudares? Si prodis, in praefatione cur laudas? Si laudas, haereticus approbaris. Restat, ut quasi bona protuleris. Si haec omnia probantur mala, igitur unius et Auctor et Interpres rei criminis erunt, et implebitur illa sententia: Videbas furem, et currebas cum eo: et cum adulteris portionem tuam ponebas (Psal. XLIX, 18). Non est necesse rem planam, argumentatione dubiam facere. Quod sequitur, respondeat, unde illi sit orta suspicio, haec ab haereticis addita? «Quia, inquit, de eisdem rebus in aliis locis ejusdem auctoris catholice dictum legeram.»

11. The blasphemy of Origen.--- Who gave you this permission, that you should cut out so much from the translation? You were asked to turn Greek into Latin, not to emend it: to present the words of another, not to compose your own. You confess that you did not do what you were asked, by excising a great deal. And would that you had cut away the bad things, and not laid down many of your own in defense of the bad! I will present one of these, that from it the rest may also be recognized. In the first book of *On First Principles* (περὶ Ἀρχῶν), where Origen blasphemed with a sacrilegious tongue, that the Son does not see the Father, you even render reasons, as if in the person of him who wrote, and you translate the commentary (scholium) of Didymus, in which he strives with vain labor to defend another's error, arguing that Origen had indeed spoken well: but that we simple men, and Ennian cicures (tame folks), can understand neither his wisdom nor yours, who interpreted him. Your preface, which you name, and in which you adorn me with wondrous praises, makes you the culprit of a very bad translation. For you say that you cut out many things from the Greek, although you are silent about what you added. The things you cut out, were they bad, or good? Utterly bad. The things you kept, good, or bad? Utterly good. For neither could you have translated the bad ones. Therefore you amputated the bad, and left the good? There is doubt to no one. But what has been translated is proven to be almost all bad. Whatever bad thing, therefore, I shall show in the translation, will be imputed to you, who translated it as good. It is one thing if an unjust censor, guilty of the same crime, expels others from the senate, and retains others in the curia. But you say, "I could not change everything; but I believed that only those things which I judged to have been added by heretics ought to be amputated by me." Beautifully said. If you amputated what you thought had been added by heretics, therefore what you left belongs to him whom you interpreted; answer, are they good, or bad? You could not translate bad things. For once and for all, you amputated what had been added by heretics. Unless perhaps you ought to have amputated the bad things of the heretics, and turned the errors of Origen into Latin whole. Say therefore, why did you turn the bad things of Origen into Latin: that you might betray the author of the evil, or that you might praise him? If you betray him, why do you praise him in the preface? If you praise him, you are approved as a heretic. It remains, that you brought them forth as though they were good. If all these things are proven bad, therefore Author and Interpreter of one thing will be guilty of the crime, and that sentence will be fulfilled: When you saw a thief, you ran with him: and with adulterers you have placed your portion (Ps. 49:18). It is not necessary to make a plain matter doubtful by argumentation. To what follows, let him answer, whence has the suspicion arisen for him that these things were added by heretics? "Because," he says, "I had read similar matters, spoken of catholically in other places by the same author."

12. Origenis haeretica.---Videamus, quod primum est, ut ordine venerit ad secundum. Probo ego inter multa Origenis mala, haec maxime haeretica: Dei Filium creaturam; Spiritum sanctum ministrum; mundos innumerabiles, aeternis sibi saeculis succedentes. Angelos versos in animas hominum: animam Salvatoris fuisse antequam nasceretur ex Maria: et hanc esse, quae cum in forma Dei esset, non est rapinam arbitrata aequalem se esse Deo (Philip. II); sed se exinanivit, formam servi accipiens: resurrectionem nostrorum corporum sic futuram, ut eadem membra non habeant; quia cessantibus membrorum officiis, superflua membra reddantur: ipsaque corpora tenuia et spiritalia paulatim evanescere, et in auram tenuem, atque in nihilum dissipari: in restitutione omnium, quando indulgentia principalis venerit, Cherubim et Seraphim, Thronos, Principatus, Dominationes, Virtutes, Potestates, Archangelos, Angelos, Diabolum, daemones, animas omnium hominum, tam christianorum, quam Iudaeorum, et Gentilium, unius conditionis, et mensurae fore. Cumque ad formam, et libram aequitatis pervenerint, et rationabiles creaturas 504 omni corporum faece deposita, novus de mundi exilio populi revertentis monstraverit exercitus, tunc rursus ex alio principio fieri mundum alium, et alia corpora, quibus labentes de coelo animae vestiantur, ut verendum nobis sit, ne qui nunc viri sumus, postea nascamur in feminas; et quae hodie virgo, tunc [Al. postea] forte prostibulum sit. Haec in Origenis libris ego haeretica doceo: tu ostende, in quo ejus opere his contraria legeris.

13. Sex millia librorum Origenis.---Nolo dicas, Quae de eisdem rebus in aliis locis ejusdem auctoris catholice dicta legeram; ne me mittas ad sex millia librorum ejus, quos legisse beatum papam Epiphanium criminari; sed ipsa loca nomina: nec hoc mihi sufficiet, nisi eadem dicta ad verbum protuleris. Non est fatuus Origenes, et ego novi: contraria sibi loqui non potest. Igitur ex hac supputatione illa summa [Al. sententia] nascitur, non haereticorum esse, quae amputasti, sed Origenis, cujus ideo mala interpretatus es, quia putasti bona; et tibi tam bona, quam mala illius imputanda, cujus scripta in Prologo comprobasti.

14. Hilarius et Ambrosius Origenis interpretes. Anastasii epistola ad Joannem Hierosolymitanum.---Sequitur in eadem Apologia: «Origenis ego neque defensor sum, nec assertor, nec primus interpret. Alii ante me hoc idem opus fecerunt [Al. fecerant]: feci et ego postremus rogatus a fratribus. Si jubetur, ne fiat, jussio observari solet in posterum. Si culpantur, qui ante jussionem fecerunt, culpa a primis incipiat.»

12. The heresies of Origen.---Let us see what is first, so that he may come in order to the second. I prove among the many bad things of Origen, these especially heretical: that the Son of God is a creature; the Holy Spirit a minister; innumerable worlds, succeeding one another in eternal ages. That angels were turned into the souls of men: that the soul of the Savior existed before He was born from Mary: and that it is this soul, which when it was in the form of God, did not consider it a robbery to be equal to God (Phil. 2); but emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant. That the resurrection of our bodies will be such that they will not have the same members; because with the duties of the members ceasing, the members would be rendered superfluous: and that the very bodies, thin and spiritual, will gradually vanish, and dissipate into a thin breeze, and into nothing. That in the restitution of all things, when the principal indulgence shall come, Cherubim and Seraphim, Thrones, Principalities, Dominations, Virtues, Powers, Archangels, Angels, the Devil, demons, and the souls of all men, both of Christians, as well as of Jews, and Gentiles, will be of one condition and measure. And when they will have arrived at the form and balance of equity, and the rational creatures, having laid aside all the dregs of bodies, a new army of the returning people from the exile of the world shall have shown itself, then again from another beginning another world will be made, and other bodies, with which souls falling from heaven may be clothed, so that it is to be feared by us, lest we who are now men, hereafter be born as women; and lest she who is today a virgin, then perhaps be a prostitute. These things in the books of Origen I teach to be heretical: you show me in which of his works you have read contrary things to these.

13. Six thousand books of Origen.---I do not want you to say, Because I had read similar matters spoken of catholically in other places by the same author; lest you send me to his six thousand books, which you accuse the blessed pope Epiphanius of having read; but name the places themselves: nor will this suffice me, unless you produce the same sayings word for word. Origen is not a fool, and I know it: he cannot speak things contrary to himself. Therefore from this reckoning that conclusion is born: that the things which you amputated are not of the heretics, but of Origen, whose bad things you therefore interpreted, because you thought them good; and that to you are to be imputed both the good and the bad things of him, whose writings you have approved in the Prologue.

14. Hilary and Ambrose, interpreters of Origen. The epistle of Anastasius to John of Jerusalem.---There follows in the same Apology: "I am neither the defender of Origen, nor his assertor, nor his first interpreter. Others before me have done this same work: I, the last, did it also, having been asked by the brethren. If it is ordered that it should not be done, the order is usually observed for the future. If they are blamed who did it before the order, let the blame begin with the first ones."

Tandem evomuit, quod volebat, et omnis animi tumor in nostrae accusationis erupit invidiam. Ubi interpretatur libros *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, me sequi se dicit: ubi accusatur cur hoc fecerit, meum ponit exemplum; et securus, et periclitans sine me vivere non potest. Audiat igitur quod nescire se simulat. Nemo tibi objicit, quare Origenem interpretatus es, alioqui Hilarius et Ambrosius hoc crimine tenebuntur; sed quia interpretatus haeretica, Praefationis tuae laude firmasti. Ego ipse, quem in crimen vocas, sic [Al. ideo] septuaginta Homilias ejus transtuli, et nonnulla de Tomis, ut et mala in bonorum interpretatione 505 subtraherem, et aperte in libris *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* ad coarguendam translationem tuam, quid lector vitaret, ostenderem. Vis Origenem in Latinum vertere? Habes multas homilias ejus et tomos, in quibus moralis tractatur locus, et Scripturarum panduntur obscura. Haec interpretare: haec rogantibus tribue. Quid primus labor tuus incipit ab infamia? Cur translaturus haeretica, in defensionem eorum praemittis quasi martyris librum, et id Romanis auribus ingeris, quod translatum totus orbis expavit? Aut certe si ideo interpretaris, ut eum haeticum arguas, nihil de Graeco mutes, et hoc ipsum praefatione testare, quod prudentissime Papa Anastasius in epistola, quam contra te scribit ad episcopum Joannem, suo sermone complexus est, me liberans, qui id feci, et te arguens, qui facere noluisti. Ac ne forsitan hoc quoque neges, subjeci exemplum ejus: ut si non vis audire fratrem monentem, audias episcopum condemnantem [Al. calumniantem].

15. Rufinus Origenis defensor probatur. Eusebius Arianorum princeps. Rufini praefatio in Apologiam Pamphili pro Origene.---Dicis te non esse defensorem, neque assertorem Origenis: jam nunc tibi proferam librum tuum de quo in famosa illa praefatiuncula praeclari operis tui his verbis loqueris: «Cujus diversitatis causam plenius tibi in Apologetico, quem Pamphilus in libris suis scripsit, edidimus brevissimo libello superaddito, in quo evidentibus, ut arbitror, probamentis, corruptos esse in quamplurimis ab haeticis et malevolis libros ejus ostendimus, et praecipue istos, quos nunc exigis ut interpreter, id est, *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*.» Non tibi suffecerat Eusebii, vel certe ut tu vis, Pamphili pro Origene defensio, nisi quod ab illis minus dictum putabas, tu quasi sapientior et doctior adderes? Longum est, si velim totum librum tuum huic operi inserere, et propositis capitulis ad singula respondere, quid in his vitiorum sermo habeat, quid mendaciorum assertio, quid inconsequens textus ipse verborum. Unde laciniosae disputationis fastidia fugiens, et in arctum verba compingens, tantum sensibus respondebo. Statim de portu egrediens, navem impegit.

At last he vomited what he wanted, and all the swelling of his mind broke out into the envy of our accusation. Where he interprets the books *On First Principles* (περὶ Ἀρχῶν), he says he follows me: where he is accused of why he did this, he sets forth my example; and secure and in danger, he cannot live without me. Let him hear therefore what he pretends not to know. No one objects to you, as to why you interpreted Origen, otherwise Hilary and Ambrose will be held by this crime; but because, having interpreted heretical things, you confirmed them by the praise of your Preface. I myself, whom you call into accusation, translated seventy Homilies of his thusly, and some parts from the *Tomes*, so that I might withdraw the evil things in the interpretation of the good things, and openly show in the books *On First Principles* (περὶ Ἀρχῶν), in order to refute your translation, what the reader should avoid. Do you wish to turn Origen into Latin? You have many homilies of his and tomes, in which moral topics are treated, and the obscurities of the Scriptures are revealed. Interpret these: bestow these on those asking. Why does your first labor begin from infamy? Why, when about to translate heretical things, do you send ahead in their defense the book of, as it were, a martyr, and force upon Roman ears that which, when translated, the whole world dreaded? Or certainly if you interpret it for this reason, so that you may argue him a heretic, change nothing from the Greek, and testify this very thing in the preface, which Pope Anastasius most prudently embraced in his own speech in the epistle which he writes against you to Bishop John, freeing me, who did this, and arguing against you, who refused to do it. And lest perhaps you also deny this, I have subjoined a copy of it: so that if you do not wish to hear a brother warning you, you may hear a bishop condemning you.

15. Rufinus is proven a defender of Origen. Eusebius the prince of the Arians. The preface of Rufinus to the *Apology of Pamphilus for Origen*.---You say that you are neither a defender nor an assertor of Origen: already now I will bring forth to you your book, of which you speak in that famous little preface of your distinguished work, with these words: "The cause of which diversity we have published more fully for you in the *Apologetic*, which Pamphilus wrote in his books, a very short little book having been superadded, in which we showed by evident proofs, as I think, that his books have been corrupted in very many places by heretics and malevolent men, and especially those, which you now demand that I interpret, that is, *On First Principles* (περὶ Ἀρχῶν)." Was not the defense of Eusebius, or certainly as you wish, of Pamphilus for Origen, sufficient for you, unless you, as if wiser and more learned, added what you thought was less spoken by them? It is long, if I should wish to insert your whole book into this work, and by setting forth chapters, to answer to individual things: what of vices the speech has in these, what assertion of lies, what inconsistent text of words itself. Whence, fleeing the disgusts of a fragmented disputation, and compacting words into a narrow space, I will answer only to the senses. Immediately departing from the port, he crashed the ship.

Referens enim de Apologia Pamphili martyris (quam nos Eusebii, Arianorum principis, probavimus) de qua dixerat, Prout potuimus, 506 vel res poposcit, Latino sermone digessimus, intulit: «Illud est, quod, desideriorum vir, Macari, te admonitum volo, ut scias hanc quidem fidei regulam, quam de libris ejus supra exposuimus, esse talem, quae et amplectenda et tenenda sit. In omnibus enim his catholicum inesse sensum evidenter probatur.» Quamvis de Eusebii libro multa subtraxerit, et in bonam partem de Filio, et Spiritu sancto nisus sit commutare; tamen multa in illo scandala reperiuntur, et apertissimae blasphemiae, quae iste sua negare non poterit, catholica esse pronuntians. Dicit Eusebius, immo (ut tu vis) Pamphilus, in isto volumine, Filium Patris ministrum: Spiritum sanctum non de eadem Patris Filiique substantia: animas hominum lapsas esse de coelo: et in hoc quod sumus de Angelis commutati, in restitutione omnium aequales et Angelos, et daemones, et homines fore; et multa alia tam impia, et nefaria, quae etiam replicare sit criminis. Quid faciet assertor Origenis, et interpret Pamphili? Si in his, quae emendavit, tanta blasphemia est; in illis, quae ab haereticis falsata confingit, quanta sacrilegia continentur? Cujus opinionis causam hanc suspicatur, quod vir neque stultus, neque insanus dicere sibi repugnantia non potuerit. Et ne forsitan putaremus diversis eum varia scripsisse temporibus, et pro aetatibus edidisse contraria, addidit: «Quid facimus, quod interdum in eisdem locis, atque, ut ita dixerim, in consequenti pene capite sententia contrarii sensus invenitur inserta? Numquid in eodem opere ejusdem libri, et interdum, ut diximus, statim in consequenti capitulo, oblitus sui esse potuit? Verbi gratia, ut qui superius dixerat, nusquam inveniri in omni Scriptura, ubi Spiritus sanctus factus, vel creatus esse diceretur, continuo subjiceret, inter caeteras creaturas factum esse Spiritum sanctum? Aut iterum, qui Patrem et Filium unius substantiae, quod Graece *ὁμοούσιον* dicitur, designavit: in consequentibus statim capitulis alterius esse substantiae, et creatum poterat dicere eum, quem paulo ante de ipsa natura Dei Patris pronuntiaverat natum?»

16. Eusebius et Didymus in Origenis scita concedunt,---Haec ipsius verba sunt, negare 507 non potest. Nolo dicas: Verbi causa, ut qui superius dixerat; sed ipsum librum nomina, ubi prius bene dixerit, et postea male: ubi Spiritum sanctum, et Filium de Dei Patris scribens esse substantia, statim in consequentibus asseruerit creaturas. Nescisne me Origenis habere omnia? legisse quamplurima?

For recounting concerning the Apology of Pamphilus the martyr (which we have proven to be of Eusebius, prince of the Arians), of which he had said, As much as we could, or the matter demanded, we digested it in the Latin speech, he brought in: "That is, what I wish you to be admonished of, Macarius, man of desires, so that you may know that indeed this rule of faith, which we have expounded above concerning his books, is such that it is both to be embraced and to be held. For in all these things it is evidently proven that a Catholic sense is present." Although he subtracted much from the book of Eusebius, and strove to change it into a good part concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit; nevertheless many scandals are found in it, and most open blasphemies, which he will not be able to deny are his own, pronouncing them to be Catholic. Eusebius says, or rather (as you wish) Pamphilus, in that volume, that the Son is the minister of the Father: that the Holy Spirit is not of the same substance of the Father and the Son: that the souls of men have fallen from heaven: and that in this what we are, changed from Angels, in the restitution of all things, both Angels, and demons, and men, will be equals; and many other things so impious, and nefarious, that even to replicate them would be of a crime. What will the assertor of Origen, and the interpreter of Pamphilus do? If in these things which he emended, there is such great blasphemy; in those things which he feigns were falsified by heretics, what great sacrileges are contained? He suspects this to be the cause of his opinion, that a man neither an idiot nor insane could not have spoken things repugnant to himself. And lest perhaps we might think that he wrote various things at diverse times, and put forth contrary things according to his ages, he added: "What do we do, that sometimes in the same places, and, so to speak, in almost the consequent chapter, a sentence of contrary sense is found inserted? Could he have forgotten himself in the same work of the same book, and sometimes, as we said, immediately in the consequent chapter? For example, that he who had said above, that it is nowhere found in all Scripture where the Holy Spirit is said to have been made, or created, should immediately subjoin, that the Holy Spirit was made among the other creatures? Or again, he who designated the Father and the Son of one substance, which in Greek is called *homooousion* (ὁμοούσιον): could he, immediately in the consequent chapters, be able to say Him to be of another substance, and created, whom a little before he had pronounced born from the very nature of God the Father?"

16. Eusebius and Didymus concede to the decrees of Origen.---These are his own words, he cannot deny them. I do not want you to say: For example, as he who had said above; but name the book itself, where he first spoke well, and afterwards badly: where writing that the Holy Spirit and the Son are of the substance of God the Father, he immediately in the following parts asserted them to be creatures. Do you not know that I have all the works of Origen? That I have read very many?

Ad populum phaleras, ego te intus, et in cute novi. (Persius, Sat. 3.)

Vir doctissimus Eusebius (doctissimum dixi, non catholicum, ne more solito, mihi et in hoc calumniam struas) per sex volumina nihil aliud agit, nisi ut Origenem suae ostendat fidei, id est, Arianæ perfidiae. Et multa ponit exempla, et hoc constanter probat. Tibi ergo in quo somnio Alexandrini carceris revelatum est, ut quae ille vera profitetur, falsata confingas? Sed forsitan hic, ut Arianus, ab haereticis addita, in occasionem sui traxit erroris, ne solus male sensisse contra Ecclesiam putaretur. Quid respondebis pro Didymo, qui certe in Trinitate catholicus est? Cujus etiam nos de Spiritu sancto librum in Latinam linguam vertimus (Vid. supra). Certe hic in his, quae ab haereticis in Origenis operibus addita sunt, consentire non potuit; et in ipsis περὶ Ἀρχῶν, quos tu interpretatus es libris, breves dictavit Commentariolos, quibus non negaret ab Origene scripta, quae scripta sunt: sed nos simplices homines non posse intelligere, quae dicuntur: et quo sensu in bonam partem accipi debeant, persuadere conatur. Hoc dumtaxat de Filio, et Spiritu sancto. Caeterum in aliis dogmatibus et Eusebius, et Didymus apertissime in Origenis scita concedunt, et quod omnes Ecclesiae reprobant, catholice et pie dictum esse defendunt.

17. Rufinus de adulteratione librorum Origenis.---Videamus tamen, quibus argumentis probare nitatur Origenis ab haereticis scripta vitiata. «Clemens, inquit, Apostolorum discipulus, qui Romanae Ecclesiae post Apostolos episcopus et martyr fuit, libros edidit, qui appellantur ἀναγνωρισμός, id est, recognitio, in quibus quum ex persona Petri Apostoli doctrina, quasi vere apostolica in quamplurimis exponatur: in aliquibus ita Eunomii dogma inseritur, ut nihil aliud quam ipse Eunomius disputare credatur, Filium Dei creatum 508 de nullis exstantibus asseverans.» Et post alia, quae prolixum est, scribere: «Quid, quaeso, ait, de his sentiendum est, quod Apostolicus vir haeretica scripserit? An id potius credendum, quod perversi homines ad assertionem dogmatum suorum sub virorum sanctorum nomine, tamquam facilius credenda, interseruerint ea, quae illi nec sensisse, nec scripsisse credendi sunt?» Clementem quoque Alexandrinae Ecclesiae presbyterum, virum catholicum, scribit in libris suis interdum Dei Filium dicere creatum: et Dionysium Alexandrinae urbis episcopum, virum eruditissimum, contra Sabellium quatuor voluminibus disputantem, in Arianum dogma delabi.

Trappings for the people, I know you inside and out [lit. inside and in the skin]. (Persius, Sat. 3:30)

The most learned man Eusebius (I said most learned, not Catholic, lest in your usual manner, you build up a calumny against me also in this) through six volumes does nothing else, except that he may show Origen to be of his own faith, that is, of Arian perfidy. And he sets down many examples, and constantly proves this. To you therefore in what dream of an Alexandrian prison was it revealed, that the things which he professes to be true, you feign to be falsified? But perhaps he, as an Arian, drew what was added by heretics into the occasion of his own error, lest he alone should be thought to have sensed badly against the Church. What will you answer for Didymus, who is certainly Catholic in the Trinity? Whose book concerning the Holy Spirit we also turned into the Latin tongue (See above). Certainly he could not consent in these things, which have been added by heretics in the works of Origen; and in the very books *On First Principles* (περὶ Ἀρχῶν), which you have interpreted, he dictated brief little Commentaries, in which he would not deny the things written by Origen, which have been written: but that we simple men cannot understand the things which are said: and he attempts to persuade with what sense they ought to be received in a good part. This only concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit. But in other dogmas both Eusebius and Didymus most openly concede to the decrees of Origen, and that which all the Churches reprove, they defend to have been said catholically and piously.

17. Rufinus on the adulteration of the books of Origen.--Let us see, however, by what arguments he strives to prove that the writings of Origen have been vitiated by heretics. "Clement," he says, "a disciple of the Apostles, who was bishop and martyr of the Roman Church after the Apostles, published books which are called *anagnorismos* (ἀναγνωρισμὸς), that is, recognition, in which when the doctrine from the person of Peter the Apostle, as if truly apostolic, is expounded in very many places: in some places the dogma of Eunomius is so inserted, that he is believed to dispute nothing else than Eunomius himself, asserting that the Son of God was created from no existing things." And after other things, which it is lengthy to write: "What, I ask," he says, "must be felt concerning these things, that an Apostolic man should have written heretical things? Or rather ought this to be believed, that perverse men for the assertion of their own dogmas under the name of holy men, as if more easily to be believed, intermingled those things, which they are to be believed neither to have felt, nor to have written?" He also writes that Clement, a presbyter of the Alexandrian Church, a Catholic man, sometimes says in his books that the Son of God was created: and that Dionysius, bishop of the Alexandrian city, a most erudite man, disputing against Sabellius in four volumes, glides into the Arian dogma.

Et sub his exemplis illud agit, ut non ecclesiasticos, et catholicos viros male sensisse, sed ab haereticis eorum scripta corrupta esse testetur, et concludat ad extremum, dicens: «De Origene quoque, in quo similiter, ut in his quos supra diximus, quaedam diversitas invenitur, istud non sufficiat sentire, quod de praejudicatis jam catholicis sentitur, vel intelligitur viris, ne similis causae, similis sufficiat excusatio.» Si conceditur, ut quidquid in libris noxium reperitur, ab aliis corruptum sit [Al. id si ita est nihil, etc.], nihil eorum erit, quorum fertur nominibus; sed his deputabitur, a quibus dicitur esse vitiatum. Quamquam et illorum non erit, quorum incerta sunt nomina: atque ita fiet, ut dum omnium omnia sunt, nihil alicujus sit. Hac defensionis perturbatione nec Marcion, nec Manichaeus, nec Arius, nec Eunomius accusari poterunt: quia quidquid nos ab his impie dictum objecerimus, discipuli respondebunt, non a magistris suis ita editum [Al. dictum], sed ab inimicis esse violatum. Hoc genere et iste ipse tuus liber, tuus non erit, sed forsitan meus. Et meus liber, quo tibi accusatus respondeo, si in illo aliquid reprehenderis, non erit meus, sed tuus, a quo reprehenditur. Et dum omnia ad haereticos refers, quid Ecclesiasticis tribues, quibus proprium nihil relinquis? Et quomodo, inquires, in libris eorum vitiosa nonnulla sunt? Si me causas vitiorum nescire respondero, non statim illos haereticos judicabo. Fieri enim potest, ut vel simpliciter erraverint, 509 vel alio sensu scripserint, vel a librariis imperitis eorum paulatim scripta corrupta sint. Vel certe antequam in Alexandria quasi daemonium meridianum Arius nasceretur, innocenter quaedam, et minus caute locuti sunt, et quae non possint perversorum hominum calumniam declinare. Objiciuntur Origeni crimina, et tu non illum defendis, sed alios accusas; nec crimen renuis, sed criminolorum turbam requiris. Si tibi diceretur, quos habet Origenes in haeresi socios, recte ista proferes. Nunc a te quaeritur, haec quae in Origenis libris scripta reperiuntur, bona sint an mala? Taces, et pro his alia loqueris. Clemens hoc ait: Dionysius in isto errore deprehenditur: Athanasius [Al. Anastasius] episcopus sic Dionysii defendit errorem: Apostolorum scripta similiter depravata sunt; quomodo et nunc ab aliis tibi haereseos crimen impingitur, et tu pro te taces, et pro me confiteris. Ego neminem accuso, pro me tantum respondisse contentus. Non sum quod arguis: si tu es quod accusaris, ipse videris. Nec absolutio mea me, nec reatus te, aut innocentem, aut obnoxium crimini probabunt.

And under these examples he does this, that he may testify that ecclesiastic and Catholic men did not sense badly, but that their writings were corrupted by heretics, and may conclude at the end, saying: "Concerning Origen also, in whom similarly, as in these whom we spoke of above, a certain diversity is found, would it not suffice to feel that which is already felt or understood concerning prejudged Catholic men, lest for a similar cause, a similar excuse may suffice." If it is conceded, that whatever harmful thing is found in books, has been corrupted by others, nothing will belong to those under whose names they are borne; but it will be imputed to those by whom it is said to have been vitiated. Although it will not belong even to those whose names are uncertain: and so it will come to pass, that while all things belong to all, nothing belongs to anyone. By this perturbation of defense neither Marcion, nor Manichaeus, nor Arius, nor Eunomius will be able to be accused: because whatever impiously spoken by them we shall object to, the disciples will answer, that it was not so published by their masters, but was violated by enemies. By this kind even that very book of yours, will not be yours, but perhaps mine. And my book, by which I, accused, answer you, if you apprehend anything in it, will not be mine, but yours, by whom it is apprehended. And while you refer everything to heretics, what will you bestow upon the Ecclesiastics, for whom you leave nothing of their own? And how, you will say, are there some faulty things in their books? If I answer that I do not know the causes of the faults, I will not immediately judge them heretics. For it can happen, that either they erred simply, or wrote with another sense, or their writings were gradually corrupted by unskilled copyists. Or certainly before Arius was born in Alexandria like a mid-day demon, they spoke some things innocently, and less cautiously, and which could not decline the calumny of perverse men. Crimes are objected to Origen, and you do not defend him, but accuse others; neither do you refuse the crime, but you seek a crowd of criminals. If it were said to you, whom does Origen have as companions in heresy, you would rightly bring forth these things. Now it is asked of you, whether these things which are found written in the books of Origen, are good or bad? You are silent, and speak other things instead of these. Clement says this: Dionysius is caught in that error: Bishop Athanasius [or Anastasius] thus defends the error of Dionysius: the writings of the Apostles are similarly depraved; just as even now the crime of heresy is impinging upon you by others, and you are silent for yourself, and confess for me. I accuse no one, content to have answered only for myself. I am not what you argue: if you are what you are accused of, you yourself must see to it. Neither will my absolution prove me, nor your guilt prove you, either innocent or liable to the crime.

18. Epistola Origenis ad amicos Alexandriae. Origenianae epistolae prior pars.--- Praemissa falsatione ab haereticis, apostolorum, et utriusque Clementis, atque Dionysii, venit ad Origenem, et his verbis loquitur: «Ipsius hoc conquerentis et deplorantis scriptis ac vocibus prabavimus. Quid enim ipse cum adhuc in carne vivens, sentiens, vidensque perpeccus sit de librorum suorum, vel sermonum corruptionibus, vel adulterinis editionibus, ex ipsius epistola quam scribit ad quosdam charos suos Alexandriam, evidenter docetur.» Statimque exemplum subjungit epistolae; et qui falsitatem scriptorum Origenis haereticis imputat, ipse incipit a falsitate: non ita interpretans ut habetur in Graeco, nec id Latinis insinuans, quod ipse in suis litteris profitetur. Cumque illa epistola tota Demetrium Alexandrinae urbis pontificem laceret, et in totius orbis episcopos et clericos invehatur, et frustra ab Ecclesiis excommunicatum esse se dicat, nec velle in maledictis referre vicem, ne scilicet maledicus videatur esse homo, qui in tantum cautus sit ad maledicendum, ut ne diabolo quidem audeat maledicere; unde et Candido Valentiniani dogmatis sectatori, calumniandi se occasionem 510 dederit, quod diabolum salvandae dixerit esse naturae: hic dissimulato argumento epistolae, fingit pro Origene, quod ille non loquitur. Unde epistolae ipsius partem paululum ex superioribus transtuli, et his junxi, quae ab ipso commatice doloseque translata sunt, ut quo consilio superiora tacuerit, ipse lector agnoscat. Contra sacerdotes ergo Ecclesiae generaliter disputans, a quibus indignus communione ejus fuerat judicatus, haec intulit: «Quid necesse est de prophetarum sermonibus dicere, quibus saepissime pastoribus, et majoribus natu, et sacerdotibus, ac principibus populi comminantur et arguunt eos? Quae absque nobis de sanctis Scripturis elicere potestis, et liquido pervidere, quod forsitan hoc tempus sit, de quo dicitur: Nolite credere amicis, nec speretis in principibus (Mich. VII, 5). Et nunc impleatur vaticinium: Duces populi mei me nescierunt, filii stulti sunt, et non sunt sapientes. Sapientes sunt, ut faciant mala, bene autem facere nesciunt (Jerem. IV, 21, 22); quorum magis misereri quam eos odisse debemus, et orare pro illis, quam eis maledicere. Ad benedicendum enim, et non ad maledicendum creati sumus. Unde et Michael cum adversus diabolum disputaret de Moysi corpore, ne tanto quidem malo ausus est iudicium inferre blasphemiae, sed dixit: Increpet tibi Dominus (Jud. 9).

18. The epistle of Origen to friends from Alexandria. The prior part of the Origenian epistle.---Having sent ahead the falsification by heretics of the Apostles, and of both Clement and Dionysius, he comes to Origen, and speaks with these words: "We have proven this by the writings and voices of the man himself complaining and deploring. For what he himself, while still living in the flesh, sensing, and seeing, endured concerning the corruptions or adulterous editions of his own books, or sermons, is evidently taught from his own epistle which he writes to certain dear friends of his in Alexandria." And immediately he subjoins a copy of the epistle; and he who imputes the falsity of the writings of Origen to heretics, himself begins from a falsity: not interpreting it as it is held in the Greek, nor insinuating that to the Latins, which he professes in his own letters. And since that whole epistle lacerates Demetrius the pontiff of the Alexandrian city, and inveighs against the bishops and clerics of the whole world, and says he has been excommunicated by the Churches in vain, and that he does not wish to return the turn in curses, lest forsooth he should seem to be an abusive man, who is so cautious to curse, that he does not even dare to curse the devil; whence he gave an occasion of calumniating him to Candidus, the sectary of the Valentinian dogma, because he had said the devil was of a nature to be saved: here, having dissimulated the argument of the epistle, he feigns for Origen what he does not speak. Whence I have translated a little part of his epistle from the prior parts, and joined them to these which have been translated by him concisely and deceitfully, so that the reader himself may recognize with what counsel he was silent about the prior parts. Disputing therefore generally against the priests of the Church, by whom he had been judged unworthy of his communion, he brought in these things: "What is it necessary to say concerning the sermons of the prophets, in which they very often threaten and argue the pastors, and the elders, and the priests, and the princes of the people? Which things you can elicit from the holy Scriptures without us, and clearly perceive, that perhaps this is the time concerning which it is said: Do not believe friends, nor hope in princes (Mich. 7:5). And now let the prophecy be fulfilled: The leaders of my people have not known me, they are foolish children, and they are not wise. They are wise to do evil, but to do good they know not (Jer. 4:22); of whom we ought to have mercy rather than to hate them, and to pray for them, rather than to curse them. For we have been created to bless, and not to curse. Whence Michael also, when disputing against the devil concerning the body of Moses, did not dare to bring a judgment of blasphemy even upon so great an evil, but said: The Lord rebuke thee (Jude 9).

Cui quid simile etiam in Zacharia legimus: Increpet tibi Dominus, diabole: et increpet Dominus in te, qui elegit Jerusalem (Zach. III, 2). Itaque et nos cupimus increpari a Domino eos qui nolunt cum humilitate a proximis increpari. Dicente autem Michael: Increpet tibi Dominus, diabole; et Zacharia similiter: utrum increpet, an non increpet Deus diabolum, ipse viderit. Et si increpat, quomodo increpet, ipse agnoscat.» Et post multa quae prolixum est scribere, addit: «Nos hoc sentimus quod ejicientur de regno coelorum, non solum qui grandia peccaverunt, verbi gratia, fornicatores et adulteri, et masculorum concubitores, et fures, sed et qui minora deliquerunt, ex eo quod scriptum est: Neque ebriosi, neque maledici regnum Dei possidebunt (I Cor. VI, 16); et tam in bonitate quam in severitate Dei esse mensuram. Unde cuncta nitimur agere consilio: in vini quoque potu, et in moderatione sermonis, ut nulli audeamus maledicere. Ergo cum propter Dei timorem caveamus in quempiam maledicta conferre, recordantes illius dicti, Non fuit ausus iudicium inferre blasphemiae, quod dicitur de Michael contra diabolum; et in alio loco: Dominationes quidem reproban, glorias autem blasphemant: quidam eorum qui libenter contentiones reperiunt, ascribunt nobis et nostrae doctrinae blasphemiam, super qua ipsi viderint, quomodo illud audiant: Neque ebriosi, neque maledici regnum Dei possidebunt: licet patrem malitiae et perditionis eorum, qui de regno Dei ejicientur, dicant posse salvari, quod ne mente quidem quis captus dicere potest.» Caetera quidem ex eadem epistola transtulit pro hoc, quod in fine verborum Origenis interpretati sumus. «Ergo cum propter timorem Dei caveamus in quempiam maledicta conferre,» et reliqua: iste fraudulenter amputatis superioribus, ex quibus inferiora dependent, sic coepit transferre epistolam, quasi hoc sensu superius esset exordium, et ait: «Quidam eorum qui libenter habent criminari proximos suos, ascribunt nobis et doctrinae nostrae crimen blasphemiae, quod a nobis nusquam audierunt: de quo ipsi viderint, nolentes observare mandatum illud quod dicit: Quia maledici regnum Dei non possidebunt; dicentes asserere me patrem malitiae et perditionis eorum qui de regno Dei ejiciuntur, id est diabolum, esse salvandum: quod ne aliquis quidem mente motus et manifeste insaniens dicere potest.»

Similar to which we read also in Zechariah: The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan: and the Lord who hath chosen Jerusalem rebuke thee (Zech. 3:2). Therefore we also desire those to be rebuked by the Lord who refuse to be rebuked with humility by their neighbors. But with Michael saying: The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan; and Zechariah similarly: whether God rebukes, or does not rebuke the devil, let him see. And if He rebukes, how He rebukes, let him acknowledge." And after many things which it is lengthy to write, he adds: "We feel this, that they will be cast out of the kingdom of heaven, not only those who have committed great sins, for example, fornicators and adulterers, and abusers of themselves with mankind, and thieves, but also those who have offended in lesser things, from that which is written: Neither drunkards, nor revilers shall possess the kingdom of God (1 Cor. 6:10); and that there is a measure as much in the goodness as in the severity of God. Whence we strive to do all things with counsel: in the drinking of wine also, and in the moderation of speech, so that we may dare to curse no one. Therefore when on account of the fear of God we beware of conferring curses upon anyone, remembering that saying, He did not dare to bring a judgment of blasphemy, which is said concerning Michael against the devil; and in another place: Indeed they despise dominions, and blaspheme majesties: some of those who gladly discover contentions, ascribe blasphemy to us and to our doctrine, concerning which let them see how they hear that: Neither drunkards, nor revilers shall possess the kingdom of God: although they say that I say that the father of their malice and perdition, of those who will be cast out of the kingdom of God, can be saved, which not even a man bereft in mind could say." Indeed he translated the rest of the things from the same epistle for this, which we have interpreted at the end of the words of Origen. "Therefore when on account of the fear of God we beware of conferring curses upon anyone," and the rest: he, with the prior parts fraudulently amputated, from which the lower parts depend, thus began to transfer the epistle, as if the exordium were higher in this sense, and says: "Some of those who gladly have to incriminate their neighbors, ascribe to us and to our doctrine the crime of blasphemy, which they never heard from us: concerning which let them see to it, refusing to observe that command which says: Because revilers shall not possess the kingdom of God; saying that I assert that the father of their malice and perdition who are cast out of the kingdom of God, that is the devil, is to be saved: which not even anyone moved in mind and manifestly insane can say."

19. Dialogus Candidi Origenis. Liber Novatiani de Trinitate.---Conferte Origenis verba, quae supra ad verbum transtuli, his quae ab isto non versa sunt, sed eversa, et quantam inter se non solum verborum, sed et sensuum habeant dissonantiam, perspicietis. 512 Obsecro ne molesta sit vobis prolixior interpretatio. Idcirco enim omnia vertimus, ut quo consilio superiora tacuerit, probaremus. Habetur dialogus apud Graecos Origenis, et Candidi Valentinianae haereseos defensoris, in quo duos Audabatas digladiantes inter se spectasse me fateor. Dicit Candidus Filium de Patris esse substantia, errans in eo quod *προβολήν*, id est, prolationem asserit. E regione. Origenes juxta Arium et Eunomium repugnat, eum vel prolatum esse, vel natum, ne Deus Pater dividatur in partes; sed dicit sublimem et excellentissimam creaturam voluntate exstitisse Patris, sicut et caeteras creaturas. Rursus ad secundam veniunt quaestionem. Asserit Candidus diabolum pessimae esse naturae, et quae salvari nunquam possit. Contra hoc recte Origenes respondit, non eum periturae esse substantiae, sed voluntate propria corruiisse, et posse salvari. Hoc Candidus vertit in calumniam, quasi Origenes dixerit, diaboli naturam esse salvandam: quod ille falso objecerat, hic refutat. Et intelligimus in hoc tantum dialogo ab Origene argui haereticam falsitatem, et non in caeteris libris, de quibus nunquam quaestio fuit. Alioqui si omnia quae haeretica sunt, non erunt Origenis, sed haeticorum: omnes autem propemodum illius tomi his erroribus pleni sunt; nihil Origenis erit, sed eorum, quorum ignoramus vocabula. Non ei sufficit Graecos et antiquos calumniari, de quibus pro vetustate temporum et longinquitate regionum habet licentiam quidquid voluerit mentiendi; venit ad Latinos, et primum ponit Hilarium confessorem, quod post Ariminensem synodum liber 513 illius falsatus ab haeticis sit. Et ob hanc causam cum in concilio episcoporum ei quaestio moveretur, proferri librum de domo sua jusserit: qui, nesciente se, in scriniis suis haeticus tenebatur. Cumque prolatus fuisset, et ab omnibus haeticus judicatus, auctor libri excommunicatus, de concilii conventionem discesserit. Et tantae auctoritatis se putat, ut cum hoc familiaribus suis narrat somnium, nemo ei contra confessorem ista simulanti audeat contradicere. Responde, quaeso; synodus, a qua excommunicatus est, in qua urbe fuit? Dic episcoporum vocabula: profer sententias subscriptionum, vel diversitatem, vel consonantiam. Doce qui eo anno consules fuerint, quis imperator hanc synodum jusserit congregari: Galliaene tantum episcopi fuerint, an et Italiae, et Hispaniae: certe quam ob causam synodus congregata sit.

19. The Dialog of Candidus to Origen. The book of Novatian concerning the Trinity.---Compare the words of Origen, which I have translated word for word above, with these which have not been turned by him, but overturned, and you will perceive how great a dissonance they have among themselves not only of words, but also of senses. I beseech you that a more prolix interpretation may not be troublesome to you. For we have turned all things for this reason, so that we might prove with what counsel he was silent about the prior parts. A dialog of Origen is held among the Greeks, and of Candidus, a defender of the Valentinian heresy, in which I confess I watched two blind gladiators (Andabatas) crossing swords among themselves. Candidus says that the Son is of the substance of the Father, erring in this, that he asserts a probolen (προβολήν), that is, a prolation. From the other side, Origen, according to Arius and Eunomius, repugns against Him being either prolated, or born, lest God the Father be divided into parts; but he says that a sublime and most excellent creature existed by the will of the Father, just as the other creatures. Again they come to the second question. Candidus asserts that the devil is of the worst nature, and which can never be saved. Against this Origen answered rightly, not that he is of a perishing substance, but that he fell by his own will, and can be saved. This Candidus turns into a calumny, as if Origen had said that the nature of the devil is to be saved: what he had falsely objected, this one refutes. And we understand that only in this dialog is heretical falsity argued by Origen, and not in the rest of his books, concerning which there was never a question. Otherwise if all things which are heretical will not belong to Origen, but to heretics: and almost all his tomes are full of these errors; nothing will belong to Origen, but to those whose names we are ignorant of. It is not sufficient for him to calumniate the Greeks and the ancients, concerning whom, on account of the antiquity of times and the distance of regions, he has the license of lying whatever he wishes; he comes to the Latins, and first sets down Hilary the confessor, that after the synod of Ariminum his book was falsified by heretics. And on account of this cause, when a question was moved to him in a council of bishops, he ordered the book to be brought forth from his house: which, without him knowing, was held as heretical in his own bookcases. And when it had been brought forth, and judged heretical by all, the author of the book, having been excommunicated, departed from the convention of the council. And he thinks himself to be of such great authority, that when he narrates this dream to his familiar friends, no one dares to contradict him feigning these things against a confessor. Answer, I ask; the synod, by which he was excommunicated, in what city was it? Say the names of the bishops: profer the sentences of the subscriptions, whether their diversity, or consonance. Teach who were consuls in that year, what emperor ordered this synod to be congregated: whether there were only bishops of Gaul, or also of Italy, and of Spain: certainly on account of what cause the synod was congregated.

Nihil horum nominas, sed virum eloquentissimum, et contra Arianos Latini sermonis tubam, ut Origenem defendas, excommunicatum a synodo criminaris. Sed confessoris calumnia utcumque toleranda est. Transit ad inclytum martyrem Cyprianum, et dicit Tertulliani librum, cui titulus est, de Trinitate, sub nomine ejus Constantinopoli a Macedonianae partis haereticis lectitari. In quo crimine mentitur duo. Nam nec Tertulliani liber est, nec Cypriani dicitur; sed Novatiani, cujus et inscribitur titulo: et auctoris eloquium, styli proprietates demonstrat.

20. Fabella de Hieronymo.---Et superfluum puto apertas ineptias confutare, cum mihi mea ingeratur fabella, a synodo videlicet, et sub nomine cujusdam amici Damasi Romanae urbis episcopi ego petar, cui ille ecclesiasticas epistolas dictandas tradidit, et Apollinariorum versutiae describantur, quod Athanasii librum ubi Dominicus homo scriptus est, ad 514 legendum acceptum, ita corruerint, ut in litura id quod raserint, rursus scriberent, ut scilicet non ab illis falsatum, sed a me additum putaretur. Quaeso te, amice charissime, ut in Ecclesiasticis tractatibus, ubi de veritate dogmatum quaeritur, et de salute animarum nostrarum, majorum flagitur auctoritas, hujuscemodi deliramenta dimittas, et prandiorum coenarumque fabulas pro argumento non teneas veritatis. Fieri enim potest, ut etiam si a me verum audisti, alius qui hujus rei ignarus est, dicat a te esse compositum: et quasi mimum Philistionis, vel Lentuli, ac Marulli stropham eleganti sermone confictam.

21. De S. Epiphanio querela.---Quo non perveniat semel effrenata temeritas? Post excommunicationem Hilarii, post Cypriani *ψευδεπίγραφον* haereseos librum, post Athanasii, me dormitante, lituram, simul et inscriptionem, erupit aliquando contra Papam Epiphanium, et dolorem pectoris sui, quod eum in epistola quam ad Joannem episcopum scripserat, haereticum arguit, in Apologia pro Origine digerit, et his se sermonibus consolatur: «Quin potius aperienda est hoc in loco veritas latens. Non enim possibile est, tam iniquo iudicio uti quemquam hominum, ut de causa aequali non aequaliter sentiat. Sed quod auctores obtrectatorum ejus hi sunt, qui vel in Ecclesia disputare latius solent, vel etiam libros scribere, qui totum de Origene vel loquuntur, vel scribunt. Ne ergo plures ipsorum furta cognoscant, quae utique si ingrati in magistrum non essent, nequaquam criminosa viderentur, simpliciores quosque ab ejus lectione deterrent.

You name none of these things, but you accuse a most eloquent man, and the trumpet of the Latin speech against the Arians, of having been excommunicated by a synod, so that you might defend Origen. But the calumny of a confessor is somehow to be tolerated. He passes over to the illustrious martyr Cyprian, and says that a book of Tertullian, whose title is *On the Trinity*, is frequently read under his name in Constantinople by heretics of the Macedonian party. In which crime he lies twice. For it is neither a book of Tertullian, nor is it said to be of Cyprian; but of Novatian, with whose title it is also inscribed: and the eloquence of the author, and the propriety of the style demonstrate it.

20. A fable concerning Jerome.---And I think it superfluous to confute manifest ineptitudes, when my own fable is forced upon me, namely from a synod, and under the name of a certain friend of Damasus, bishop of the Roman city, I am attacked, to whom he handed over the ecclesiastical epistles to be dictated, and the craftiness of the Apollinarians are described, that having received a book of Athanasius to be read, where *Dominicus homo* (the Lord's man) was written, they so corrupted it, that in an erasure they wrote again that which they had scraped, so that forsooth it might be thought not to have been falsified by them, but added by me. I ask you, dearest friend, that in Ecclesiastical tractates, where the truth of dogmas is sought, and concerning the salvation of our souls, the authority of the elders is demanded, you would dismiss deliriums of this kind, and not hold the fables of lunches and dinners for an argument of the truth. For it can happen, that even if you heard the truth from me, another who is ignorant of this matter, might say that it was composed by you: and forged in elegant speech, like a mime of Philistion, or of Lentulus, and the strophe of Marullus.

21. Complaint concerning St. Epiphanius.---To what does a temerity once unbridled not arrive? After the excommunication of Hilary, after the pseudepigraphal (*ψευδεπίγραφον*) heretical book of Cyprian, after the erasure of Athanasius, while I was sleeping, and at the same time the inscription, he erupted at last against Pope Epiphanius, and digests the sorrow of his own breast, because he argued him a heretic in the epistle which he had written to bishop John, in the *Apology for Origen*, and consoles himself with these words: "But rather the latent truth must be opened in this place. For it is not possible that any of men should use so unjust a judgment, as not to sense equally concerning an equal cause. But because the authors of his detractors are these, who either are accustomed to dispute more broadly in the Church, or even to write books, who either speak or write everything concerning Origen. Therefore lest more should know their thefts, which indeed if they were not ungrateful against their master, would by no means seem criminal, they deter every simple person from his reading.

Denique quidam ex ipsis, qui se velut evangelizandi necessitatem per omnes gentes et per omnes linguas habere putat, de Origene male loquendi, sex millia librorum ejus se legisse, quam plurima 515 fratrum multitudine audiente, confessus est. Qui si utique (ut ipse dicere solet) pro cognoscendis ejus malis legebat, sufficere poterant decem libri ad cognoscendum, aut viginti certe, aut ut plurimum triginta. Sex millia autem librorum legere, non jam est errores ac mala velle cognoscere, sed totam pene vitam disciplinis ejus ac studiis dedere. Quomodo ergo iste merito audiendus est, quum eos culpat, qui instructionis suae causa perpauca ejus (salva fidei regula atque integra pietate) legerunt?»

22. Epiphanius quinque linguas noverat. Qui sunt isti, qui in Ecclesia disputare latius solent? qui libros scribere? qui totum de Origene loquuntur et scribunt? qui dum sua nolunt furta cognosci, et ingrati sunt in magistrum, idcirco simplices ab illius lectione deterrent? Nominatim debes dicere, et ipsos homines denotare. Ergo beati episcopi Anastasius, et Theophilus, et Venerius (Mediolani), et Chromatius (Aquilēiae), et omnis tam Orientis quam Occidentis Catholicorum synodus, qui pari sententia, quia pari et spiritu, illum haereticum denuntiant populis, fures librorum illius judicandi sunt: et quando in Ecclesiis praedicant, non Scripturarum mysteria, sed Origenis furta commemorant? Non tibi sufficit passim contra omnes detrectatio, nisi specialiter contra beatum et insignem Ecclesiae Sacerdotem styli tui lanceam dirigas? Quis est ille, qui velut necessitatem evangelizandi per omnes gentes, et per omnes linguas habere se putat, de Origene male loquendi? qui sex millia librorum ejus se legisse, quam plurima fratrum multitudine audiente, confessus est? In qua multitudine et caterva fratrum tu quoque medius eras, quando ille in sua Epistola queritur, pro Origenis haeresi nefaria a te dogmata esse prolata? Crimini ei dandum est quare Graecam, Syram, et Hebraeam et Aegyptiacam linguam, ex parte et Latinam noverit? Ergo et Apostoli et Apostolici viri, qui linguis loquebantur, in crimine sunt; et me trilinguem, bilinguis ipse ridebis? De sex millibus autem librorum, quos 516 ab eo lectos esse confingis, quis credet aut te verum dicere, aut illum potuisse mentiri? Si enim Origenes sex millia scripsisset librorum, potuerat fieri ut vir eruditissimus [Al. eruditus], et ab infantia sacris Litteris institutus, pro curiositate et scientia legisset aliena. Quod vero ille non scripsit, quomodo iste legere potuit?

Finally a certain one of them, who thinks he has the necessity of evangelizing through all nations and through all tongues, of speaking ill of Origen, confessed that he had read six thousand of his books, with a very great multitude of brethren hearing. Who if indeed (as he himself is accustomed to say) he was reading for knowing his evils, ten books could suffice for knowing, or certainly twenty, or at most thirty. But to read six thousand books, is not already to wish to know his errors and evils, but to dedicate almost a whole life to his disciplines and studies. How therefore is he deservedly to be heard, when he blames those, who for the sake of their instruction have read his very few things (the rule of faith and entire piety being safe)?"

22. Epiphanius knew five languages. Who are these, who are accustomed to dispute more broadly in the Church? Who write books? Who speak and write everything concerning Origen? Who, while they do not wish their thefts to be known, and are ungrateful against their master, therefore deter the simple from his reading? You ought to say by name, and denote the men themselves. Therefore are the blessed bishops Anastasius, and Theophilus, and Venerius (of Milan), and Chromatius (of Aquileia), and the whole synod of Catholics, as much of the East as of the West, who by an equal sentence, because with an equal spirit, denounce him as a heretic to the peoples, to be judged thieves of his books: and when they preach in the Churches, do they not commemorate the mysteries of the Scriptures, but the thefts of Origen? Does the detraction against all everywhere not suffice for you, unless you specially direct the lance of your style against a blessed and illustrious Priest of the Church? Who is he, who thinks he has the necessity, as it were, of evangelizing through all nations, and through all tongues, of speaking ill of Origen? Who confessed that he had read six thousand of his books, with a very great multitude of brethren hearing? In which multitude and crowd of brethren you also were in the middle, when he complains in his Epistle, that for the nefarious heresy of Origen, dogmas were brought forth by you? Must it be given to him as a crime why he knew the Greek, Syriac, and Hebrew and Egyptian languages, and partly the Latin? Therefore both the Apostles and Apostolic men, who spoke in tongues, are in crime; and will you, a bilingual, mock me, a trilingual? But concerning the six thousand books, which you feign to have been read by him, who will believe either that you say the truth, or that he could have lied? For if Origen had written six thousand books, it could have happened that a most erudite man, and instituted from infancy in the sacred Letters, for curiosity and alien knowledge might have read them. But that which he did not write, how could he have read?

Numera indices librorum ejus qui in tertio volumine Eusebii, in quo scripsit vitam Pamphili, continentur: et non dico sex millia, sed tertiam partem non reperies. Habemus Epistolam supradicti Pontificis, in qua huic calumniae tuae, dum adhuc esses in Oriente, respondet, et apertissimum mendacium libera veritatis fronte confutat.

23. Habebat in animo scribere contra Pamphili Apologiam. Liber de Viris illustribus ad Dextrum. Transtulit homilias Origenis in adolescentia.---Post haec et tanta audes in Apologia tua dicere, te non esse defensorem Origenis, neque assertorem illius, pro cujus defensione Pamphilus et Eusebius tibi parum dixisse sunt visi. Adversum quae volumina (si Dominus vitae hujus dederit spatium) alias respondere conabor. Nunc tantum tuis assertionibus obviasse sufficiat, et hoc breviter prudentem instruxisse lectorem, me istum librum qui sub nomine Pamphili ferebatur, vidisse primum scriptum in codice tuo; et quia non erat mihi curae quid pro haeretico diceretur, sic semper habuisse, quasi diversum esset opus Pamphili et Eusebii: postea vero quaestione mota, scriptis eorum respondere voluisse, et ob hanc causam legisse, quid pro Origene unusquisque sentiret, perspicueque deprehendisse, quod primus liber sex voluminum Eusebii ipse esset, qui unus sub nomine Pamphili a te editus est, tam Graece quam Latine, immutatis dumtaxat sensibus de Filio et Spiritu sancto, qui apertam blasphemiam praeferabant. Unde etiam ante annos ferme decem cum Dexter amicus meus, qui praefecturam administravit praetorii, me rogasset, ut auctorum nostrae religionis ei indicem texerem, inter caeteros tractatores posui et hunc librum a Pamphilio editum, ita putans esse, ut a te et tuis discipulis fuerat divulgatum. Sed cum ipse dicat Eusebius Pamphilum 517 nihil scripsisse, exceptis brevibus Epistolis ad amicos: et primus liber sex voluminum illius, eadem et eisdem verbis contineat, quae sub nomine Pamphili a te ficta sunt, perspicuum est te idcirco librum hunc disseminare voluisse, ut sub persona martyris haeresim introduces. Cumque de hoc ipso libro quem Pamphili simulat, multa perverteris, et aliter in Graeco, aliter in Latino sit, fraudem tuam errori meo imputare non debes. Credidi enim ejus esse librum, quem titulus praefererat, sicut *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, et multa alia Origenis opera, plurimorumque Graeciae tractatorum, quae aut ante non legi, aut nunc compellor legere, quaestione haereseos suscitata, ut sciam quae vitare debeam, quae probare. Unde et in adolescentia homilias tantum ejus quas loquebatur ad populum, in quibus non tanta scandala tenebantur, simpliciter rogantibus transtuli, nullis praejudicans ex his quae probantur, illa suscipere quae manifeste haeretica sunt.

Count the titles of his books which are contained in the third volume of Eusebius, in which he wrote the life of Pamphilus: and I do not say six thousand, but you will not find a third part. We have the Epistle of the abovesaid Pontiff, in which he answers this calumny of yours, while you were still in the East, and confutes the most open lie with the free front of truth.

23. He had it in mind to write against the Apology of Pamphilus. The book *On Illustrious Men* to Dexter. He translated the homilies of Origen in his youth.---After these things, and such great things, you dare to say in your Apology that you are not a defender of Origen, nor his assertor, for whose defense Pamphilus and Eusebius seemed to you to have said too little. Against which volumes (if the Lord will have given space to this life) I will attempt to answer at another time. Now let it suffice only to have met your assertions, and to have briefly instructed the prudent reader of this, that I first saw that book which was borne out under the name of Pamphilus, written in your codex; and because I did not care what was said for a heretic, I thus always held it, as if the work of Pamphilus and Eusebius were diverse: but afterwards, when a question was moved, I wished to answer their writings, and for this cause I read what each one felt for Origen, and clearly apprehended, that the first book of the six volumes of Eusebius was itself, that one which was published by you under the name of Pamphilus, as well in Greek as in Latin, only the senses concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit having been changed, which proffered open blasphemy. Whence also almost ten years ago when my friend Dexter, who administered the prefecture of the praetorium, had asked me to weave for him an index of the authors of our religion, among other tractators I placed also this book published by Pamphilus, thinking it to be so, as it had been divulged by you and your disciples. But since Eusebius himself says that Pamphilus wrote nothing, except brief Epistles to friends: and the first book of his six volumes contains the same things and in the same words, which were feigned by you under the name of Pamphilus, it is clear that you wished to disseminate this book for this reason, so that under the person of a martyr you might introduce heresy. And since you perverted many things from this very book which you simulate to be of Pamphilus, and it is otherwise in Greek, otherwise in Latin, you ought not to impute your fraud to my error. For I believed the book to be of him, whom the title proffered, just as *On First Principles* (περὶ Ἀρχῶν), and many other works of Origen, and of very many tractators of Greece, which I either did not read before, or am now compelled to read, the question of heresy having been stirred up, so that I may know what I ought to avoid, what to approve. Whence also in my youth I interpreted only those homilies of his which he spoke to the people, in which not such great scandals were held, simply for those asking, prejudging no one from these things which are approved, to undertake those things which are manifestly heretical.

Certe (ut compendium longi sermonis faciam) sicut ego ostendo, me ab his accepisse librum qui de tuo codice transcripserunt: sic tu doce a quo exemplar acceperis, ut qui auctorem libri dare alium non potuerit, ipse falsitatis reus teneatur. Bonus homo de bono cordis thesauro profert illa quae bona sunt (Matth. XLII, 35): atque ex pomorum dulcedine, generosi seminis arbor agnoscitur.

24. Epistola supposita Hieronymo.---Scribit frater Eusebius se apud Afros episcopos, qui propter Ecclesiasticas causas ad Comitatum venerant, Epistolam quasi meo scriptam nomine reperisse, in qua agerem poenitentiam, et me ab Hebraeis in adolescentia inductum esse testaret, ut Hebraea volumina in Latinum verterem, in quibus nulla sit veritas. Quod audiens obstupui. Et quia in ore duorum vel trium stat omne verbum (Deut. XVII, 6; Matth. XVIII, 16; II Cor. XIII, 1), unique testi, nec Catoni creditum est, idipsum multorum me ex Urbe fratrum scripta docuerunt, sciscitantium, an ita se haberet, et a quo ipsa epistola disseminata esset in vulgus lacrymabiliter indicantium. Qui hoc ausus est facere, quid aliud non audeat? Bene, quod malitia non habet tantas vires, quantos conatus. Perierat innocentia, si semper nequitiae juncta esset potentia, et totum quidquid cupit calumnia, 518 praevaleret. Stylum meum, qualiscumque est, et formam eloquii vir disertissimus exprimere non potuit: sed inter ipsas praestigias, et alterius personam, qua se fraudulenter induerat, quis esset ostendit. Ergo ille qui epistolam sub nomine meo poenitentiae finxerat, quod male Hebraea volumina transtulissem, objicere dicitur, me in Septuaginta condemnationem Scripturas sanctas interpretatum, ut sive falsa sunt, sive vera quae transtuli, in crimine maneam; dum aut in novo opere fateor me errasse, aut recens editio veteris condemnatio sit [Al fit]. Miror quomodo in eadem epistola homicidam, et adulterum, et sacrilegum, et parricidam me esse non dixerit, et quidquid potest tacita mentis cogitatio intra se turpitudinis volvere. Gratias ei debeo agere, quod cum tanta silva sit criminum, unum mihi erroris vel falsitatis crimen objecerit. Egone contra Septuaginta interpretes aliquid sum locutus, quos ante annos plurimos diligentissime emendatos, meae linguae studiosis dedi, quos quotidie in conventu fratrum edissero, quorum Psalmos jugi meditatione decanto? Tam stultus eram, ut quod in pueritia didici, senex oblivisci vellem?

Certainly (so that I may make a compendium of a long speech) just as I show that I received the book from those who transcribed it from your codex: so you teach from whom you received the exemplar, so that he who could not give another author of the book, may himself be held guilty of falsity. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth those things which are good (Matt. 12:35): and from the sweetness of the fruits, a tree of noble seed is recognized.

24. An epistle substituted for Jerome.---Brother Eusebius writes that he found among the African bishops, who had come to the Court on account of Ecclesiastical causes, an Epistle written as if in my name, in which I did penance, and testified that I had been induced by the Hebrews in my youth to turn Hebrew volumes into Latin, in which there is no truth. Hearing which I was astounded. And because in the mouth of two or three every word standeth (Deut. 17:6; Matt. 18:16; 2 Cor. 13:1), and a single witness, not even Cato was believed, the writings of many brethren from the City taught me the same thing, inquiring whether it was so, and tearfully indicating by whom the epistle itself had been disseminated among the common people. He who dared to do this, what else would he not dare? It is well, that malice does not have as much strength, as it has attempts. Innocence would have perished, if power were always joined to wickedness, and all that calumny desires, prevailed. A most eloquent man could not express my style, such as it is, and the form of my speech: but amid the very prestiges, and the person of another, with which he had fraudulently clothed himself, he showed who he was. Therefore he who had feigned an epistle of penance under my name, because I had translated Hebrew volumes badly, is said to object, that I interpreted the holy Scriptures unto the condemnation of the Seventy, so that whether what I translated is false, or true, I remain in crime; while I either confess that I have erred in a new work, or a recent edition is a condemnation of the old. I marvel how in the same epistle he did not say that I am a murderer, and an adulterer, and sacrilegious, and a parricide, and whatever of baseness the silent thought of the mind can roll within itself. I ought to give thanks to him, that when there is such a great forest of crimes, he objected to me one crime of error or falsity. Have I spoken anything against the Septuagint interpreters, whom having been most diligently emended many years ago, I gave to the studious of my tongue, whose Psalms I sing in daily meditation, which every day I expound in the convention of the brethren? Was I so foolish, that what I learned in childhood, I would wish to forget as an old man?

Universi tractatus mei horum testimoniis texti sunt. Commentarii in duodecim Prophetas, et meam et Septuaginta editionem edisserunt. O labores hominum, semper incerti! o mortalium studia contrarios interdum fines habentia! Unde me putabam bene mereri de Latinis meis, et nostrorum ad discendum animos concitare, quod etiam Graeci versum de Latino post tantos interpretes non fastidiunt; inde in culpam vocor, et nauseanti stomacho cibos ingero. Et quid in homine tutum sit, si innocentia criminosa est? Dormiente patrefamilias inimicus homo zizania superseminavit (Matth. XIII, 25). Exterminavit vineam aper de silva, et singularis ferus depastus est eam (Psal LXXIX, 14). Ego taceo, et litterae non meae loquuntur contra me. Ignoro crimen, et crimen in toto orbe confiteor. Heu mihi, mater mea, ut quid me genuisti, virum qui iudicer et discernar omni terrae (Jerem. XV, 10, sec. LXX)?

25. Ex Prologo in Genesin.---Omnes Praefatiunculae veteris Instrumenti, quarum ex parte exempla subjeci, huic rei testes sunt. Et superfluum est, quod in illis dictum est, 519 aliter quam ibi dictum est, scribere. Incipiam igitur a Genesi, cujus Prologus talis est: «Desiderii mei desideratas accepi epistolas, qui quodam praesagio futurorum, cum Daniele sortitus est nomen, obsecrantis ut translatum in linguam Latinam de Hebraeo sermone Pentateuchum nostrorum auribus traderem. Periculosum opus certe, et obtrectatorum latratibus patens; qui me asserunt in Septuaginta interpretum suggillationem, nova pro veteribus cudere: ita ingenium, quasi vinum probantes, cum ego saepissime testatus sim, me pro virili portione in tabernaculo Dei offerre quae possim; nec opes alterius, aliorum paupertate foedari. Quod ut auderem, Origenis me studium provocavit, qui editioni antiquae translationem Theodotionis miscuit, asterisco +, et obelisco ÷, id est, stella et veru, opus omne distinguens: dum aut illucere facit, quae minus ante fuerant, aut superflua quaeque jugulat et confodit, maximeque quae Evangelistarum et Apostolorum auctoritas promulgavit. In quibus multa de veteri Testamento legimus, quae in nostris codicibus non habentur, ut est illud: Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum (Ose. XI, 1); Et: Quoniam Nazareus vocabitur (Matth. II, 23); et: Videbunt in quem compunxerunt (Zach. XII, 10); et: Flumina de ventre ejus fluent aquae vivae (Joan. VII, 38); et: Quae nec oculus vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit, quae praeparavit Deus diligentibus se (I Cor. II, 9); et multa alia, quae proprium σύνταγμα desiderant. Interrogemus ergo eos, ubi haec scripta sint; et cum dicere non potuerint, de libris Hebraeis proferamus.

All my tractates are woven with their testimonies. The Commentaries on the twelve Prophets expound both my compilation and the edition of the Seventy. O the labors of men, always uncertain! o the studies of mortals having sometimes contrary ends! Whence I thought I deserved well of my Latins, and to excite the minds of our people to learning, because even the Greeks do not disdain a version from the Latin after such great interpreters; thence I am called into fault, and I ingest foods to a nauseating stomach. And what is safe in a man, if innocence is criminal? While the master of the house slept, the enemy man over-sowed tares (Matt. 13:25). The boar out of the wood hath destroyed the vineyard, and the singular wild beast hath devoured it (Ps. 79:14). I am silent, and letters not mine speak against me. I am ignorant of the crime, and I confess the crime in the whole world. Woe is me, my mother, why hast thou borne me, a man of strife, a man of contention to all the earth? (Jer. 15:10, according to LXX).

25. From the Prologue to Genesis.---All the little Prefaces of the ancient Instrument, of which I have subjoined copies in part, are witnesses to this thing. And it is superfluous to write that which is said in them, otherwise than it is said there. I will begin therefore from Genesis, whose Prologue is such: "I received the desired epistles of my Desiderius, who by a certain presage of future things, was allotted his name with Daniel, beseeching that having been translated into the Latin tongue from the Hebrew speech I would hand over the Pentateuch to our ears. A perilous work certainly, and exposed to the barkings of detractors; who assert that I strike new things for the old unto the contumely of the Septuagint interpreters: thus proving my genius, as if wine, since I have very often testified, that I offer in the tabernacle of God what I can for my virile portion; nor are the riches of another defiled by the poverty of others. That I might dare which, the study of Origen provoked me, who mingled the translation of Theodotion to the ancient edition, distinguishing the whole work with an asterisk *, and an obelus ÷, that is, a star and a spit: while he either makes those things shine, which had been less before, or cuts the throat of and stabs through whatever things are superfluous, and most of all those things which the authority of the Evangelists and Apostles promulgated. In which we read many things concerning the Old Testament, which are not held in our codices, as is that: Out of Egypt have I called my son (Hos. 11:1); And: For he shall be called a Nazarene (Matt. 2:23); and: They shall look upon him whom they have pierced (Zech. 12:10); and: Rivers of living water shall flow from his belly (John 7:38); and: Things which eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have it entered into the heart of man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him (1 Cor. 2:9); and many other things, which require a proper syntax (σύνταγμα). Let us ask them therefore, where these things are written; and when they cannot say, let us bring them forth from the Hebrew books.

Primum testimonium est in Osee. Secundum in Isaia. Tertium in Zacharia. Quartum in Proverbiis. Quintum aequè in Isaia. Quod multi ignorantes, apocryphorum deliramenta sectantur, et Iberas naenias libris authenticis praeferunt. Causas erroris non est meum exponere. 520 Iudaei prudenti factum dicunt esse consilio, ne Ptolemaeus unius Dei cultor, apud Hebraeos etiam duplicem divinitatem deprehenderet: quod maxime idcirco faciebant, quia in Platonis dogma cadere videbatur. Denique ubicumque sacratum aliquid Scriptura testatur de Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto, aut aliter interpretati sunt, aut omnino tacuerunt, ut et regi satisfacerent, et arcanum fidei non divulgarent. Et nescio quis primus auctor septuaginta cellulas Alexandriae mendacio suo extruxerit, quibus divisi eadem scriptitarint, cum Aristaeas, ejusdem Ptolemaei ὑπερασπιστής, et multo post tempore Josephus, nihil tale retulerint; sed in una basilica congregatos contulisse scribant, non prophetasse. Aliud est enim vatem, aliud interpretem esse. Ibi spiritus ventura praedicat, hic eruditio et verborum copia ea quae intelligit transfert. Nisi forte putandus est Tullius Oeconomicum Xenophontis, et Platonis Protagoram, et Demosthenis pro Ctesiphonte orationem afflatus rhetorico spiritu transtulisse; ut aliter de eisdem libris per Septuaginta interpretes, aliter per Apostolos Spiritus sanctus testimonia texuerit; ut quod illi tacuerint, hi scriptum esse mentiti sint. Quid igitur? damnamus veteres? Minime. Sed post priorum studia, in domo Domini quod possumus, laboramus. Illi interpretati sunt ante adventum Christi; et quod nesciebant, dubiis protulere sententiis. Nos post passionem et resurrectionem ejus, non tam prophetiam, quam historiam scribimus. Aliter enim audita, aliter visa narrantur. Quod melius intelligimus, melius et proferimus. Audi igitur aemule, et obtrectator ausculta: Non damno, non reprehendo Septuaginta; sed confidenter cunctis illis Apostolos praefero. Per istorum os mihi Christus sonat, 521 quos ante Prophetas inter spiritualia charismata positos lego: in quibus ultimum pene gradum interpretes tenent. Quid livore torqueris? quid imperitorum animos contra me concitas? Sicubi tibi in translatione errare videor, interroga Hebraeos, diversarum urbium magistros consule: quod illi habent de Christo, tui codices non habent. Aliud est, si contra se postea ab Apostolis usurpata testimonia probaverunt, et emendatiora sunt exemplaria Latina, quam Graeca: Graeca, quam Hebraea.»

The first testimony is in Hosea. The second in Isaiah. The third in Zechariah. The fourth in Proverbs. The fifth equally in Isaiah. Which many being ignorant of, follow the deliriums of the apocrypha, and prefer Iberian dirges to the authentic books. It is not mine to expound the causes of the error. The Jews say it was done by prudent counsel, lest Ptolemy, a worshipper of one God, should apprehend a double divinity also among the Hebrews: which they did most of all for this reason, because it seemed to fall into the dogma of Plato. Finally wherever the Scripture testifies anything sacred concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, they either interpreted otherwise, or were altogether silent, so that they might both satisfy the king, and not divulge the secret of the faith. And I do not know what first author constructed seventy cells at Alexandria by his lie, in which divided they wrote the same things, since Aristeas, the shield-bearer (ὑπερασπιστής) of the same Ptolemy, and Josephus a long time after, related no such thing; but write that they bore them together, congregated in one basilica, not prophesied. For it is one thing to be a seer, another to be an interpreter. There the spirit predicts things to come, here erudition and abundance of words translates those things which it understands. Unless perchance Tully is to be thought to have translated the Oeconomicus of Xenophon, and the Protagoras of Plato, and the oration of Demosthenes for Ctesiphon inspired by a rhetorical spirit; so that the Holy Spirit wove testimonies concerning the same books otherwise through the Seventy interpreters, otherwise through the Apostles; so that what they were silent about, these lied to have been written. What therefore? do we condemn the ancients? By no means. But after the studies of the priors, we labor what we can in the house of the Lord. They interpreted before the advent of Christ; and what they did not know, they brought forth in dubious sentences. We write after his passion and resurrection, not so much a prophecy, as a history. For things heard are narrated otherwise, otherwise things seen. What we understand better, we also bring forth better. Hear therefore O emulator, and listen O detractor: I do not condemn, I do not reprehend the Seventy; but confidently I prefer the Apostles to all of them. Through the mouth of these Christ sounds to me, whom I read placed among spiritual charisms before the Prophets: in which the interpreters hold almost the last step. Why are you tortured with envy? why do you stir up the minds of the unskilled against me? For wherever I seem to you to err in translation, ask the Hebrews, consult the masters of diverse cities: what they have concerning Christ, your codices do not have. It is another thing, if they afterwards approved the testimonies usurped by the Apostles against themselves, and the Latin exemplars are more emended, than the Greek: the Greek, than the Hebrew."

26. Ex Prologo in libros Regum.---In libris quoque Samuel et Malachim, quos nos Regnorum quatuor nominamus, post catalogum divinae Scripturae haec intuli: «Quae quum ita se habeant, obsecro te, lector, ne laborem meum reprehensionem existimes antiquorum. In tabernaculo Dei offert unusquisque quod potest. Alii aurum et argentum et lapides pretiosos, alii byssum et purpuram et coccum offerunt et hyacinthum. Nobiscum bene agitur, si obtulerimus pelles et caprarum pilos. Et tamen Apostolus contemptibilia nostra magis necessaria iudicat (I Cor. XII, 21). Unde et tota illa tabernaculi pulchritudo et per singulas species Ecclesiae praesentis futuraeque distinctio, pellibus tegitur et ciliciis; ardoremque solis et injuriam imbrium, ea quae viliora sunt prohibent.» Vide quanto contra Septuaginta interpretes tumeam supercilio, ut illos aurum et pretiosos lapides et purpuram, me pelles et pilos caprarum in tabernaculo Dei obtulisse profitear?

27. Ex Prolog. in Paralipomena. Interpretum LXX versio corrupta.---Ponam et aliud testimonium, ne nunc me rerum necessitate compulsus dicas mutasse sententiam. In libro Temporum, id est, Paralipomenon, qui Hebraice dicitur DABRE JAMIM, hac ad sanctum papam Chromatium Praefatiuncula usus sum: «Si Septuaginta interpretum pura, et ut ab eis in Graecum versa est, editio permaneret, superflue me, mi Chromati, episcoporum sanctissime atque doctissime, impelleres, ut tibi Hebraea volumina Latino sermone transferrem. Quod enim semel aures hominum occupaverat, et nascentis Ecclesiae roboraverat fidem, 522 justum erat etiam nostro silentio comprobari. Nunc vero quum pro varietate regionum diversa ferantur exemplaria, et germana illa antiquaque translatio corrupta sit, atque violata, nostri arbitrii putas, aut ex pluribus iudicare quid verum sit, aut novum opus in veteri opere cudere, illudentibusque Judaeis, cornicum, ut dicitur, oculos configere. Alexandria et Aegyptus in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque ad Antiochiam Luciani martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palaestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origene elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt; totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat. Et certe Origenes non solum exempla composuit quatuor editionum, e regione singula verba describens, ut unus dissentiens statim, caeteris inter se consentientibus, arguatur; sed quod majoris audaciae est, in editione Septuaginta, Theodotionis editionem miscuit, asteriscis videlicet designans quae minus fuerant, et virgulis quae ex superfluo videbantur apposita.

26. From the Prologue to the books of Kings.---Also in the books of Samuel and Malachim, which we name the four of Kingdoms, after the catalog of divine Scripture I brought in these things: "Since these things have themselves thus, I beseech thee, reader, that thou wouldst not esteem my labor a reprehension of the ancients. In the tabernacle of God each one offers what he can. Some offer gold and silver and precious stones, others fine linen and purple and scarlet and hyacinth. With us it is done well, if we shall have offered skins and the hairs of goats. And yet the Apostle judges our more contemptible things more necessary (1 Cor. 12:21). Whence also all that beauty of the tabernacle and the distinction of the present and future Church through individual species, is covered with skins and haircloths; and those things which are of less value prohibit the ardor of the sun and the injury of the showers." See with what great superciliousness I swell against the Septuagint interpreters, that I profess them to have offered gold and precious stones and purple, me skins and the hairs of goats in the tabernacle of God?

27. From the Prologue to Paralipomenon. The version of the LXX interpreters corrupted.---I will set down also another testimony, lest you say that now compelled by the necessity of things I have changed my sentence. In the book of Times, that is, Paralipomenon (Chronicles), which in Hebrew is called Dabre Jamim, I used this little Preface to the holy pope Chromatius: "If the pure edition of the Septuagint interpreters, and as it had been turned by them into Greek, remained, you would superfluously impel me, my Chromatius, most holy and most learned of bishops, that I should transfer the Hebrew volumes for you in the Latin speech. For what had once occupied the ears of men, and had corroborated the faith of the nascent Church, it was just should be approved even by our silence. But now since for the diversity of regions diverse exemplars are borne, and that germane and ancient translation has been corrupted, and violated, you think it to be of our judgment, either to judge from many what is true, or to strike a new work in the old work, and to the mocking Jews, to configure the eyes of the crows, as it is said. Alexandria and Egypt praise Hesychius as the author in their Septuagint. Constantinople as far as Antioch approves the exemplars of Lucian the martyr. The middle provinces between these read the Palestinian codices, which elaborated by Origen Eusebius and Pamphilus vulgarized; and the whole world fights among itself with this threefold variety. And certainly Origen not only composed the exemplars of four editions, writing down single words opposite, so that one dissenting immediately, the others consenting among themselves, it might be argued; but what is of greater audacity, he mingled the edition of Theodotion in the edition of the Septuagint, designating with asterisks namely those things which had been less, and with virgules those things which from the superfluous seemed to be adjoined.

Si igitur aliis licuit non tenere, quod semel susceperant, et post septuaginta cellulas, quae vulgo sine auctore jactantur, singulas cellulas aperuere: hocque in Ecclesiis legitur, quod Septuaginta nescierunt; cur me non suscipiant Latini mei, qui inviolata editione veteri, ita novam condidi, ut laborem meum Hebraeis, et (quod his majus est) Apostolis auctoribus probem? Scripsi nuper librum de Optimo genere interpretandi, ostendens illa de Evangelio: Ex Aegypto vocavi filium meum (Ose. XI, 1); et: Quoniam Nazaraeus vocabitur (Matth. II, 15, 23); et: Videbunt in quem compunxerunt (Zach. XII, 10); et illud Apostoli: quae oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascenderunt, quae praeparavit Dominus diligentibus se (Cor. I, 19); caeteraque his similia, in Hebraeorum libris inveniri. Certe Apostolus et Evangelistae, Septuaginta interpretes noverant. Et unde eis hoc dicere, quod in Septuaginta non habetur? Et Christus Dominus noster, utriusque Testamenti conditor, in Evangelio secundum Joannem: Qui credit, 523 inquit, in me sicut dicit Scriptura, flumina de ventre ejus fluent aquae vivae (Joan. VII, 38). Utique scriptum est, quod Salvator scriptum esse testatur. Ubi scriptum est? Septuaginta non habent, apocrypha nescit Ecclesia. Ad Hebraeos igitur revertendum: unde et Dominus loquitur, et discipuli exempla praesumunt. Haec pace veterum loquor, et obtrectatoribus meis tantum respondeo, qui canino dente me rodunt, in publico detrahentes, legentes in angulis, iidem et accusatores et defensores, cum in aliis probent, quod in me reprobant, quasi virtus et vitium non in rebus sit, sed cum auctore mutetur. Caeterum memini editionem Septuaginta translatorum olim de Graeco emendatam tribuisse me nostris, nec inimicum debere existimari eorum, quos in conventu fratrum semper edissero. Et quod nunc DABRE JAMIM id est, Verba Dierum, interpretatus sum, idcirco feci ut inextricabiles moras, et silvam nominum, quae scriptorum confusa sunt vitio, sensuumque barbariem [Al. labyrinthos] apertius, et per versuum cola digererem, mihimetipsi et meis juxta Hismeniam canens, si aures surdae sunt caeterorum.»

28. Ex Prolog. in Ezram.--In Ezrae quoque volumine, similia praefatus sum et post multa haec addidi: «Quod illaturus sum, aequissimum est. Edidi aliquid, quod non habetur in Graeco, vel aliter habetur, quam a me versum est. Quid interpretem laniant? Interrogent Hebraeos, et ipsis auctoribus translationi meae, vel arrogent vel derogent fidem.

If therefore it was permitted to others not to hold, what they had once undertaken, and after the seventy cells, which are commonly boasted about without an author, they opened individual cells: and this is read in the Churches, which the Seventy did not know; why should my Latins not undertake me, who the ancient edition being inviolate, have so founded a new one, that I approve my labor by the Hebrews, and (what is greater than these) by the Apostles as authors? I wrote lately a book *On the Best Kind of Interpreting*, showing those things concerning the Gospel: Out of Egypt have I called my son (Hos. 11:1); and: For he shall be called a Nazarene (Matt. 2:15, 23); and: They shall look upon him whom they have pierced (Zech. 12:10); and that of the Apostle: what eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have it entered into the heart of man, what things the Lord hath prepared for them that love him (1 Cor. 2:9); and other things similar to these, to be found in the Hebrew books. Certainly the Apostle and the Evangelists, knew the Septuagint interpreters. And whence to them to say this, which is not held in the Septuagint? And Christ our Lord, the founder of both Testaments, in the Gospel according to John says: He that believeth in me, as the Scripture saith, rivers of living water shall flow from his belly (John 7:38). At any rate it is written, what the Savior testifies to be written. Where is it written? The Septuagint do not have it, the Church does not know the apocrypha. It must therefore be reverted to the Hebrews: whence both the Lord speaks, and the disciples presume exemplars. These things I speak by the peace of the ancients, and I only answer my detractors, who gnaw me with a canine tooth, detracting in public, reading in corners, the same both accusers and defenders, since they approve in others, what they reprove in me, as if virtue and vice were not in things, but were mutated with the author. For the rest I remember that I gave the edition of the Septuagint translators formerly emended from the Greek to our people, nor ought I to be esteemed an enemy of them, whom in the convention of the brethren I always expound. And because now I have interpreted *Dabre Jamim*, that is, the Words of the Days, I have done it for this reason that the inextricable delays, and the forest of names, which have been confused by the fault of the writers, and the barbarism of the senses (or: the labyrinths) I might more openly, and digest through colons of verses, singing to myself and to my own near Ismenias, if the ears of the rest are deaf."

28. From the Prologue to Ezra.---In the volume of Ezra also, I prefaced similar things and after many things I added these: "What I am about to infer, is most equitable. I have published something, which is not held in the Greek, or is held otherwise, than it has been turned by me. Why do they lacerate the interpreter? Let them ask the Hebrews, and from the authors themselves let them either arrogate or derogate faith to my translation.

Porro aliud est, si clausis, quod dicitur, oculis, mihi volunt maledicere, et non imitantur Graecorum studium et benevolentiam, qui post Septuaginta translators jam Christi Evangelio coruscante, Judaeos, et Ebionitas Legis veteris interpretes, Aquilam videlicet, Symmachum et Theodotionem, curiose legunt, et per Origenis laborem ἐν ἑξαπλοῖς Ecclesiis dedicarunt: quanto magis Latini mei grati esse deberent, quod exultantem Graeciam cernerent aliquid a se mutuari! Primum enim magnorum sumptuum est, 524 et infinitae difficultatis, exemplaria habere omnia. Denique et qui habuerint, et Hebraei sermonis ignari sunt, magis errabunt, ignorantes quis e multis verius dixerit. Quod etiam sapientissimo cuidam, nuper apud Graecos accidit, ut interdum Scripturae sensum relinquens, uniuscujuslibet [Al. uniuscujusque] interpretis sequeretur errorem. Nos autem qui Hebraeae linguae saltem parvam habemus scientiam, et Latinus nobis utcumque sermo non deest, et de aliis magis possumus judicare, et ea quae ipsi intelligimus, in nostra lingua exprimere.»

29. Ex Prolog. in Job.---Transibo ad librum Job, quem post Septuaginta interpretum editionem, quam Origenes obelis, asteriscisque distinxit, ante annos plurimos Latino sermoni datum, cum rursum juxta ipsum Hebraicum verterem, sic locutus sum: «Cogor per singulos Scripturae divinae libros, adversariorum respondere maledictis, qui interpretationem meam, reprehensionem Septuaginta interpretum criminantur: quasi non et apud Graecos Aquila, Symmachus et Theodotion vel verbum e verbo, vel sensum e sensu, vel ex utroque commixtum et medie temperatum genus translationis expresserint, et omnia veteris Instrumenti volumina Origenes obelis asteriscisque distinxerit: quos vel additos, vel de Theodotione sumptos, translationi antiquae inseruit, probans defuisse quod additum est. Discant igitur obtrectatores mei recipere in toto, quod in partibus susceperunt, aut interpretationem meam cum asteriscis suis radere. Neque enim fieri potest, ut quos plura intermisisse perspexerint, non eosdem etiam in quibusdam errasse fateantur: praecipue in Job, cui si ea quae sub asteriscis addita sunt subtraxeris, pars maxima detruncabitur. Et hoc dumtaxat apud Graecos. Caeterum apud Latinos, ante eam translationem, quam sub asteriscis et obelis nuper edidimus, septingenti ferme aut octingenti versus desunt, ut decurtatus et laceratus, corrosusque liber foeditatem sui publice legentibus praebeat.» Et post multa quae studio brevitatis praetereo, haec in fine 525 subjunxi:

Moreover it is another thing, if with closed eyes, as it is said, they wish to curse me, and do not imitate the study and benevolence of the Greeks, who after the Seventy translators, the Gospel of Christ already flashing, curiously read the Jewish and Ebionite interpreters of the old Law, namely Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, and dedicated them through the labor of Origen in the Hexapla (ἐν ἑξαπλοῖς) in the Churches: how much more ought my Latins to be grateful, that they should perceive exulting Greece to borrow something from themselves! For first it is of great expenses, and of infinite difficulty, to have all the exemplars. Finally even those who have had them, and are ignorant of the Hebrew speech, will err the more, ignorant who of the many has spoken more truly. Which also happened lately to a certain most wise man among the Greeks, that sometimes relinquishing the sense of the Scripture, he followed the error of any one (or: each one) of the interpreters. But we who have at least a small knowledge of the Hebrew tongue, and the Latin speech is not wanting to us somehow, can both judge more of others, and those things which we ourselves understand, express in our tongue."

29. From the Prologue to Job.---I will pass over to the book of Job, which after the edition of the Septuagint interpreters, which Origen distinguished with obeli, and asterisks, having been given to the Latin speech very many years ago, when again I was turning it according to the Hebrew itself, I spoke thus: "I am compelled through individual books of the divine Scripture, to answer the maledictions of adversaries, who criminate my interpretation as a reprehension of the Septuagint interpreters: as if also among the Greeks Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion did not express either word from word, or sense from sense, or a kind of translation commingled from both and moderately tempered, and Origen distinguished all the volumes of the ancient Instrument with obeli and asterisks: which ones being either added, or assumed from Theodotion, he inserted into the ancient translation, proving that what was added was wanting. Let my detractors learn therefore to receive in the whole, what they have undertaken in parts, or to scrape my interpretation with its asterisks. For neither can it happen, that those whom they have perceived to have omitted more things, they should not confess the same ones also to have erred in some things: especially in Job, from which if you subtract those things which have been added under asterisks, the greatest part will be truncated. And this at least among the Greeks. But among the Latins, before that translation, which we lately published under asterisks and obeli, almost seven hundred or eight hundred verses are wanting, so that the book decurtated and lacerated, and corroded may offer its foulness to those reading it publicly." And after many things which for the study of brevity I pass over, I subjoined these things in the end:

«Audiant quapropter canes mei, idcirco me in hoc volumine laborasse, non ut interpretationem antiquam reprehenderem, sed ut ea quae in illa, aut obscura sunt, aut omissa, aut certe vitio scriptorum depravata, manifestiora nostra interpretatione fierent, qui et Hebraeum sermonem ex parte didicimus, et in Latino pene ab ipsius incunabulis inter grammaticos et rhetores et philosophos detriti sumus. Quod si apud Graecos post Septuaginta editionem, jam Christi Evangelio coruscante, Judaeus Aquila, et Symmachus ac Theodotion judaizantes haeretici sunt recepti, qui multa mysteria Salvatoris, subdola interpretatione celarunt, et tamen in Hexaplis habentur apud Ecclesias, et explanantur ab ecclesiasticis viris: quanto magis ego Christianus, de parentibus Christianis natus, et vexillum crucis in mea fronte portans, cujus studium fuit omissa repetere, depravata corrigere, et sacramenta Ecclesiae, puro et fideli aperire sermone, vel a fastidiosis, vel a malignis lectoribus non debeo reprobari!»

30. Ex Prologo in Psalterium.---Psalterium quoque quod certe emendatissimum juxta Septuaginta interpretes nostro labore dudum Roma suscepit, rursum juxta Hebraicum vertens, Praefatione munivi, et sic in parte prologi sum locutus: «Quia igitur nuper cum Hebraeo disputans, quaedam pro Domino Salvatore de psalmis testimonia protulisti; volensque ille te illudere, per sermones pene singulos asserebat, non ita haberi in Hebraeo, ut tu de Septuaginta interpretibus opponebas, studiosissime postulasti, ut post Aquilam, Symmachum, et Theodotionem, novam editionem Latino sermone transferrem. Aiebas enim te magis interpretum varietate turbari, et pro amore quo laberis, vel translatione, vel iudicio meo esse contentum. Unde impulsus a te, cui et quae non possum, negare non debeo, rursum me obtrectatorum latratibus tradidi, maluique te vires potius meas, quam voluntatem in amicitia quaerere. Certe confidenter dicam, et multos hujus operis testes citabo, me nihil, dumtaxat scientem, 526 de Hebraica veritate mutasse. Sicubi ergo editio mea a veteribus discrepat, interroga quemlibet Hebraeorum, et liquido pervidebis, me ab aemulis frustra lacerari, qui malunt contemnere videri praeclara, quam discere. Perversissimi homines: nam cum novas semper expetant voluptates, et gulae eorum vicina maria non sufficiant, cur in solo studio Scripturarum veteri sapore contenti sunt? Nec hoc dico quod praecessores meos mordeam, aut quidquam de his arbitrer detrahendum, quorum translationem diligentissime emendatam olim meae linguae hominibus dedi: sed quod aliud sit in ecclesiis Christi credentium Psalmos legere, aliud Judaeis singula verba calumniantibus respondere.»

"Let my dogs hear wherefore, therefore I labored in this volume, not that I might reprehend the ancient interpretation, but that those things which in that, are either obscure, or omitted, or certainly depraved by the fault of the writers, might become more manifest by our interpretation, who both have learned the Hebrew speech in part, and in the Latin have been worn away almost from our very cradles among grammarians and rhetoricians and philosophers. But if among the Greeks after the Septuagint edition, the Gospel of Christ already flashing, the Jew Aquila, and Symmachus and Theodotion judaizing heretics have been received, who concealed many mysteries of the Savior by a deceitful interpretation, and yet they are held in the Hexapla among the Churches, and are expounded by ecclesiastic men: how much more I a Christian, born of Christian parents, and carrying the standard of the cross on my forehead, whose study it has been to recover things omitted, to correct things depraved, and to open the sacraments of the Church, with a pure and faithful speech, ought not to be reprobated either by fastidious, or by malignant readers!"

30. From the Prologue to the Psalter.---The Psalter also, which our labor formerly undertook at Rome, certainly most emended according to the Septuagint interpreters, turning it again according to the Hebrew, I fortified with a Preface, and thus I spoke in a part of the prologue: "Because therefore lately disputing with a Hebrew, you brought forth certain testimonies from the psalms for the Lord the Savior; and he wishing to mock you, asserted through almost every word, that it was not held so in the Hebrew, as you opposed from the Septuagint interpreters, you most studiously postulated, that after Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, I should transfer a new edition in the Latin speech. For you said that you were more disturbed by the variety of interpreters, and for the love with which you are carried away, to be content either with my translation, or with my judgment. Wherefore impelled by you, to whom I ought not to deny even those things which I cannot do, again I handed myself over to the barkings of detractors, and I preferred that you should seek rather my strength, than my will in friendship. Certainly I will confidently say, and I will cite many witnesses of this work, that I have changed nothing, at least knowingly, from the Hebrew truth. If therefore anywhere my edition disgraces from the ancients, ask any one of the Hebrews, and you will clearly perceive, that I am lacerated in vain by emulators, who prefer to seem to condemn illustrious things, than to learn. Most perverse men: for since they always demand new pleasures, and the neighboring seas do not suffice for their gluttony, why in the sole study of the Scriptures are they content with the ancient savor? Nor do I say this that I may bite my predecessors, or think that anything is to be detracted from them, whose translation most diligently emended I gave to the men of my tongue formerly: but because it is one thing to read the Psalms in the churches of the believers of Christ, another to answer the Jews calumniating individual words."

31. Ex Prologo in libb. Salomonis.---Salomonis etiam libros, quos olim juxta Septuaginta additis obelis et asteriscis in Latinum verteram, ex Hebraico transferens, et dedicans sanctis episcopis Chromatio et Heliodoro, haec in Praefatiunculae meae fine subjeci: «Si cui Septuaginta interpretum magis editio placet, habet eam a nobis olim emendatam. Neque enim sic nova cudimus, ut vetera destruamus.»

32. Ex Prolog. in Isaiam.---Veniam et ad Isaiam, et partem Prologi ejus super Septuaginta interpretatione subjungam. Quem cum magis evangelistam quam prophetam dicerem, eo quod universa Christi Ecclesiae mysteria sic ad liquidum persecutus esset, ut non de futuro vaticinari, sed de praeteritis historiam texere crederetur, etiam hoc addidi: «Unde conjicio noluisse tunc temporis Septuaginta interpretes, fidei suae sacramenta perspicue Ethnicis prodere: ne sanctum canibus, et margaritas porcis darent. Quae cum hanc editionem legeritis, ab illis animadvertetis abscondita. Nec ignoro quanti laboris sit, Prophetas intelligere, nec facile quempiam posse judicare de interpretatione, nisi intellexerit ante quae legerit. Nos quoque patere morsibus plurimorum, qui stimulante invidia, quod consequi non valent, despiciunt. Sciens ergo et prudens in flammam mitto manum. Et nihilominus a fastidiosis lectoribus hoc precor: ut quomodo Graeci post 527 Septuaginta translatores, Aquilam et Symmachum et Theodotionem legunt vel ob studium doctrinae suae, vel ut Septuaginta magis ex collatione eorum intelligant: sic et isti saltem unum post priores habere dignentur interpretem. Legant prius, et postea despiciant; ne videantur non ex judicio, sed ex odii praesumptione, ignorata damnare.»

33. De Daniele.---De Daniele autem breviter respondebo, me non negasse eum prophetam, quem statim in fronte Prologi prophetam esse confessus sum, sed quid Hebraei dicerent, et quibus argumentis suam niterentur probare sententiam, voluisse monstrare, et docuisse lectorem, ecclesias Christi hunc prophetam juxta Theodotionem legere, et non juxta Septuaginta translatores. Quorum si in isto libro editionem dixi multum a veritate distare, et recto ecclesiarum Christi judicio reprobata, non est meae culpa qui dixi, sed eorum qui legunt.

31. From the Prologue to the books of Solomon.---The books of Solomon also, which formerly according to the Septuagint I had turned into Latin with added obeli and asterisks, transferring them from the Hebrew, and dedicating them to the holy bishops Chromatius and Heliodorus, I subjoined these things at the end of my little Preface: "If the edition of the Septuagint interpreters pleases anyone more, he has it from us formerly emended. For neither do we strike new things thus, so that we may destroy the old."

32. From the Prologue to Isaiah.---I will come also to Isaiah, and I will subjoin a part of his Prologue upon the interpretation of the Septuagint. Whom when I called more an evangelist than a prophet, in that he had followed up all the mysteries of the Church of Christ so clearly to the liquid, that he was believed not to vaticinate concerning the future, but to weave a history concerning things past, I added this also: "Whence I conjecture that the Septuagint interpreters at that time were unwilling, to bring forth the sacraments of their faith perspicuously to the Ethnics: lest they should give what is holy to dogs, and pearls to swine. Which when you shall have read this edition, you will animadvert to have been hidden by them. Nor am I ignorant of how much labor it is, to understand the Prophets, nor that anyone can easily judge of an interpretation, unless he shall have understood before what he reads. We also lie open to the bites of very many, who stimulated by envy, despise what they cannot follow. Knowing therefore and prudent I put my hand into the flame. And nevertheless I pray this from fastidious readers: that just as the Greeks after the Seventy translators, read Aquila and Symmachus and Theodotion either for the study of their doctrine, or that they may understand the Septuagint more from their collation: so also let these deign to have at least one interpreter after the priors. Let them read first, and afterwards despise; lest they should seem to condemn unknown things not from judgment, but from the presumption of hatred."

33. Concerning Daniel.---Concerning Daniel however I will answer briefly, that I did not deny him to be a prophet, whom I confessed to be a prophet immediately in the front of the Prologue, but I wished to show what the Hebrews said, and by what arguments they leaned to prove their sentence, and to teach the reader, that the churches of Christ read this prophet according to Theodotion, and not according to the Septuagint translators. Whose edition if I said in that book to be distant by much from the truth, and to have been reprov'd by the right judgment of the churches of Christ, the fault is not mine who said it, but theirs who read.

In promptu sunt quatuor editiones, Aquilae, Symmachi, Septuaginta, et Theodotionis: ecclesiae juxta Theodotionem legunt Danielelem. Ego quid peccavi, si ecclesiarum iudicium secutus sum? Quod autem refero, quid adversum Susannae historiam, et hymnum trium puerorum, et Belis, Draconisque fabulas, quae in volumine Hebraico non habentur, Hebraei soleant dicere, qui me criminatur, stultum se sycophantam probat. Non enim quid ipse sentirem, sed quid illi contra nos dicere soleant, explicavi. Quorum opinioni, si non respondi in Prologo, brevitati studens, ne non praefationem, sed librum viderer scribere, puto quod statim subjecerim; dixi enim, «De quo non est hujus temporis disserere.» Alioquin et ex eo, quod asserui Porphyrium contra hunc prophetam multa dixisse, vocavique hujus rei testes Methodium, Eusebium, et Apollinarium, qui multis versuum millibus illius vesaniae responderunt, me accusare poterit, quare non in praefatiuncula contra libros Porphyrii scripserim. Qui istiusmodi naenia consecratur, et Scripturae Hebraicae veritatem non vult recipere, audiat libere proclamantem: 528 Nemo enim cogitur legere, quod non vult. Ego petentibus scripsi, non fastidiosis; gratis, non invidis; studiosis, non oscitantibus. Et tamen miror quomodo Theodotionem haereticum et judaizantem legit, et qualiscumque peccatoris christiani translationem fastidit.

34. Quaeso te, amice dulcissime, qui tam curiosus es, ut etiam somnia mea noveris, omniaque quae per tot annos absque metu futurae scripsi calumniae, in accusationem vocas; ut respondeas, quomodo eorum praefationes librorum nescias, quos accusas: quae quodam vaticinio, futurae calumniae responderunt; implentes proverbium: «Prius antidotum, quam venenum.» Quid nocet ecclesiis nostra translatio? Magnis, ut scio, sumptibus redemisti Aquilae, et Symmachi, et Theodotionis, quintaecum et sextae editionis Judaicos translatores. Origenes tuus, et (ne forte queraris figurata te laude percussus) Origenes noster (nostrum voco ob eruditionem ingenii, non ob dogmatum veritatem) in omnibus libris suis post Septuaginta interpretes, Judaeorum translationes explanat et edisserit. Eusebius quoque et Didymus idem faciunt. Praetermitto Apollinarium, qui bono quidem studio, sed non secundum scientiam, de omnium translationibus in unum vestimentum pannos assuere conatus est, et consequentiam Scripturae, non ex regula veritatis, sed ex suo iudicio texere: apostolici viri Scripturis utuntur Hebraicis: ipsos apostolos et evangelistas hoc fecisse perspicuum est. Dominus atque Salvator ubicumque veteris Scripturae meminit, de Hebraicis voluminibus ponit exempla, ut est illud: Qui credit in me, sicut Scriptura dicit: Flumina de ventre ejus fluent aquae vivae.

In readiness are the four editions, of Aquila, Symmachus, the Septuagint, and Theodotion: the churches read Daniel according to Theodotion. What have I sinned, if I have followed the judgment of the churches? But that I refer, what the Hebrews are accustomed to say against the history of Susanna, and the hymn of the three boys, and the fables of Bel, and the Dragon, which are not held in the Hebrew volume, he who criminales me, proves himself a foolish sycophant. For I explicated not what I myself felt, but what they are accustomed to say against us. To whose opinion, if I did not answer in the Prologue, studying brevity, lest I should seem to write not a preface, but a book, I think that I subjoined it immediately; for I said, "Concerning which it is not of this time to discourse." Otherwise even from this, that I asserted Porphyry to have said many things against this prophet, and called Methodius, Eusebius, and Apollinarius witnesses of this thing, who answered his madness in many thousands of verses, he could accuse me, why I did not write against the books of Porphyry in a little preface. He who pursues a dirge of this sort, and does not wish to receive the truth of the Hebrew Scripture, let him hear me proclaiming freely: For no one is compelled to read, what he does not wish. I wrote to those asking, not to the fastidious; to the grateful, not to the envious; to the studious, not to the yawning. And nevertheless I marvel how he reads Theodotion a heretic and judaizer, and is fastidious of the translation of a Christian sinner of whatever sort.

34. I beseech thee, most sweet friend, who art so curious that thou knowest even my dreams, and all things which through so many years I wrote without fear of future calumny, thou callest into accusation; that thou wouldst answer, how thou art ignorant of the prefaces of those books, which thou accusest: which by a certain vaticination, answered the future calumny; fulfilling the proverb: "The antidote before the poison." What does our translation harm the churches? With great expenses, as I know, you have redeemed the Jewish translators of Aquila, and Symmachus, and Theodotion, and of the fifth and sixth edition. Your Origen, and (lest perchance you complain that you are struck with figured praise) our Origen (I call him ours on account of the erudition of his genius, not on account of the truth of his dogmas) in all his books after the Septuagint interpreters, expounds and discourses upon the translations of the Jews. Eusebius also and Didymus do the same. I pass over Apollinarius, who with good study indeed, but not according to science, attempted to sew together rags from the translations of all into one garment, and to weave the consequence of Scripture, not from the rule of truth, but from his own judgment: apostolic men use the Hebrew Scriptures: it is perspicuous that the apostles themselves and the evangelists did this. The Lord and Savior wherever he remembers the ancient Scripture, sets examples from the Hebrew volumes, as is that: He that believeth in me, as the Scripture saith: Rivers of living water shall flow from his belly.

Et in ipsa cruce, ELI, ELI, LEMA AZABATHANI, quod interpretatur: Deus meus, Deus meus, quare me dereliquisti (Joan. VII, 38)? non ut a Septuaginta positum est: Deus, Deus meus, respice in me, quare me dereliquisti (Ps. XXI, 1)? et multa his similia. Nec hoc dicimus quod Septuaginta interpretes suggillemus, sed quod apostolorum et Christi major sit auctoritas, 529 et ubicumque Septuaginta ab Hebraeo non discordant, ibi apostolos de interpretatione eorum exempla sumpsisse; ubi vero discrepant, id posuisse in Graeco, quod apud Hebraeos didicerant. Sicut ergo ego ostendo multa in novo Testamento posita de veteribus libris, quae in Septuaginta non habentur, et haec scripta in Hebraico doceo, sic accusator ostendat, aliquid scriptum esse in novo Testamento de Septuaginta interpretibus, quod in Hebraico non habeatur, et finita contentio est.

35. Operis Conclusio.---Ex quibus omnibus approbatur, et Septuaginta interpretum editionem quae legentium vetustate firmata est, utilem 530 esse Ecclesiis, dum ante gentes audiunt Christum venturum esse quam veniat; et caeteros interpretes non reprobandos, quia non sua, sed divina volumina transtulerunt, et familiarem meum id a Christiano et amico debere suscipere, quod magno sumptu sibi a Judaeis describere festinavit. Excessi Epistolae modum, et qui contra nefariam haeresim jam stylum fixeram, pro me respondere compulsus sum, exspectans tria amici volumina, et ad congeriem criminum ejus tota mente suspensus: nisi quod levius est, professum inimicum cavere, quam hostem latentem sub amici nomine sustinere.

And on the cross itself, ELI, ELI, LEMA AZABATHANI, which is interpreted: My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me (John 7:38)? not as it is set down by the Septuagint: O God, my God, look upon me, why hast thou forsaken me (Ps. 21:1)? and many things similar to these. Nor do we say this that we may disgrace the Septuagint interpreters, but because the authority of the apostles and of Christ is greater, and wherever the Septuagint do not discord from the Hebrew, there the apostles took examples from their interpretation; but where they discrepate, they set that in the Greek, which they had learned among the Hebrews. Just as therefore I show many things set in the New Testament from the ancient books, which are not held in the Septuagint, and I teach these things to be written in the Hebrew, so let the accuser show, that anything is written in the New Testament from the Septuagint interpreters, which is not held in the Hebrew, and the contention is finished.

35. Conclusion of the Work.---From all of which things it is approved, both that the edition of the Septuagint interpreters which is firm by the antiquity of those reading it, is useful to the Churches, while the gentiles hear before that Christ is about to come than that he came; and that the other interpreters are not to be reprobated, because they translated not their own, but the divine volumes, and that my familiar ought to undertake that from a Christian and a friend, which with great expense he hastened to write out for himself from the Jews. I have exceeded the measure of an Epistle, and I who had already fixed my stylus against the nefarious heresy, have been compelled to answer for myself, expecting the three volumes of the friend, and suspended with my whole mind to the congeries of his crimes: except that it is lighter, to beware of a professed enemy, than to sustain an enemy latent under the name of a friend.

LIBER TERTIUS

, *VEL ULTIMA RESPONSIO S. HIERONYMI ADVERSUS SCRIPTA RUFINI.*

531 1. Acceptis ab ipso Rufino libris *Invectivar.* respondet. Lectis litteris prudentiae tuae, quibus in me inveheris, et laudatum, quondam tuum, quem verum collegam loquebaris et fratrem, nunc libris ad respondendum provocas, terresque criminibus, intellexi illud Salomonis in te esse completum: In ore stulti baculus contumeliae (Prov. XIV, 3). Et, non recipit fatuus verba prudentiae: nisi ea dixeris, quae versantur in corde ejus (Prov. XVIII, 2). Et Isaias: Fatuus, inquit, fatua loquetur, et cor ejus vana intelliget: ut compleat iniquitates, et loquatur contra Deum mendacium (Isai. XXXII, 6). Quid enim necesse fuit accusationis volumina mittere, et maledicta proferre in medium; si tu in ultima parte epistolae, denuntiata morte me deterres, ne audeam respondere criminibus, immo laudibus tuis? Eadem quippe et praedicas et accusas, et de uno fonte dulce amarumque procedit. Unde obsecro te, ut verecundiam et pudorem, quem a me exigis, prior exhibeas; et qui mendacii alterum criminaris, desinas ipse mentiri. Ego nulli scandalum facio, nec accusator interim tui sum. Non etenim considero, quid tu merearis, sed quid me deceat; et Salvatoris eloquium pertimesco dicentis: Qui scandalizaverit unum de pusillis istis, qui in me credunt, expedit ei, ut suspendatur mola asinaria in collo ejus, et demergatur in profundum maris (Marc. IX, 41). Et, Vae mundo ab scandalis. Necesse est enim ut veniant scandala; sed vae homini per quem scandalum venit (Matth. XVIII, 7). Poteram et ego in te falsa congerere, et dicere me, vel audisse, vel vidisse, quae nullus notat, ut apud ignorantes impudentia veritas, et furor constantia putaretur. Sed absit ut imitator tui sim; et quod in te reprehendo, ipse faciam. Ille loquatur spurcitas, qui potest spurca committere: Malus homo de malo cordis thesauro profert ea quae mala sunt. Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur (Matth. XII, 35, et Luc. VI, 45). Habeto interim lucrum, quod amicus quondam tuus nunc 532 accusatus, turpia tibi non vult objicere.

BOOK THREE

, OR THE LAST ANSWER OF ST. JEROME AGAINST THE WRITINGS OF RUFINUS.

1. Having received from Rufinus himself his books of Invectives (Apology), he answers. Having read the letters of your prudence, by which you inveigh against me, and you who once spoke of your praised one as a true colleague and brother, now provoke to answer by books, and terrify with crimes, I understood that of Solomon to be fulfilled in you: In the mouth of a fool is the rod of contumely (Prov. 14:3). And, A fool receiveth not the words of prudence: unless thou say those things which are in his heart (Prov. 18:2). And Isaiah: The fool, he says, will speak foolish things, and his heart will understand vain things: that he may accomplish iniquities, and speak a lie against God (Isa. 32:6). For what necessity was there to send volumes of accusation, and to bring forth maledictions into the midst; if you in the last part of the epistle, deter me by a denounced death, lest I should dare to answer the crimes, nay rather your praises? For you both predicate and accuse the same things, and from one fountain proceeds sweet and bitter. Whence I beseech you, that you first exhibit the modesty and shame, which you exact from me; and you who criminate another of a lie, cease yourself to lie. I make a scandal to no one, nor am I meanwhile your accuser. For I do not consider, what you deserve, but what becomes me; and I fear greatly the speech of the Savior saying: He that shall scandalize one of these little ones that believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be drowned in the depth of the sea (Mark 9:42). And, Woe to the world because of scandals. For it must needs be that scandals come; but woe to that man by whom the scandal cometh (Matt. 18:7). I could also myself heap up false things against you, and say that I either heard, or saw, things which no one notes, so that among the ignorant my impudence might be thought truth, and my fury constancy. But far be it that I should be an imitator of you; and that what I reprehend in you, I myself should do. Let him speak filth, who can commit filthy things: A bad man out of the evil treasure of his heart bringeth forth those things which are evil. Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh (Matt. 12:35, and Luke 6:45). Have it for gain meanwhile, that your former friend now accused, does not wish to object base things to you.

Et hoc dico, non quod accusationis tuae gladios pertimescam; sed quod magis accusari velim, quam accusare, et pati injuriam, quam facere, sciens praeceptum ab Apostolo: Non vosmetipsos ulciscentes, charissimi, sed date locum irae; scriptum est enim (Deut. XXXII, 35): Mihi vindicta, et ego retribuam, dicit Dominus. Sed si esurierit inimicus tuus, ciba illum: si sitierit, potum da illi. Hoc enim faciens, carbones ignis congeres super caput ejus (Rom. XII, 19-21.) Qui enim seipsum vindicat, ultionem Domini non meretur.

2. Apostoli salvis amicitiiis dissenserunt.---Et tamen antequam respondeam epistolae tuae, expostulare tecum libet, vetutissime monachorum, bone presbyter, imitator Christi, fratrem tuum potes occidere, quem si tantum oderis, homicida es? Hoc a Salvatore didicisti, ut verberanti maxillam, praeberes et alteram? Sic ipse respondit percussori suo: Si male locutus sum, testimonium perhibe de malo: si bene, quid me caedis (Joan. XVIII, 13)? Mortem minaris, quam et serpentes inferre possunt. Mors omnium est, homicidium pessimorum. Quid enim? nisi tu me occideris, ego immortalis ero? Quin potius habeo gratiam, quod facis de necessitate virtutem. Nonne et Apostoli salvis inter se amicitiiis dissenserunt; cum Paulus et Barnabas propter Joannem, cognomento Marcum, stomachati sunt, et separavit eos navigatio, quos Christi Evangelium copulabat? Nonne idem Paulus in faciem Cephae restitit, quod non recto pede incederet in Evangelio? Et tamen praecessorem suum et columnam Ecclesiae vocat, et exponit cum eo praedicationem, ne in vacuum curreret, aut cucurrisset. Nonne in religione etiam liberi a parentibus, et conjuges a maritis salva pietate dissentiunt? Vos si ita habetis. ut habemus, cur nos odistis? Si aliter creditis, 533 quid vultis occidere? An qui a vobis dissenserit, occidendus est? Testem invoco Jesum conscientiae meae, qui et has litteras, et tuam epistolam judicaturus est, me ad commonitionem sancti papae Chromatii voluisse reticere, et finem facere simultatum, et vincere in bono malum; sed quia minaris interitum, nisi tacuero, respondere compellor, ne videar tacendo crimen agnoscere, et lenitatem meam, malae conscientiae signum interpreteris.

3. Epistolae Rufini verba.---Hoc est verum dilemma tuum; non ex dialectica arte quam nescis, sed ex carnificum officina et meditatione prolatum. Si tacuero, criminus ero: si respondero, maledicus. Tu me ergo et prohibes, et cogis ad respondendum. In quo utrumque moderabor, ut et objecta diluam, et ab injuria temperem. Quis enim eum non timeat, qui est paratus occidere? Sequarque vestigia propositionis tuae, servans caetera illis eruditissimis libris, quos antequam legeram, confutavi.

And this I say, not that I fear greatly the swords of your accusation; but because I would rather be accused, than accuse, and suffer an injury, than do one, knowing the precept from the Apostle: Revenge not yourselves, my dearly beloved, but give place unto wrath; for it is written (Deut. 32:35): Revenge is mine, and I will repay, saith the Lord. But if thy enemy be hungry, give him to eat: if he thirst, give him to drink. For doing this, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head (Rom. 12:19-21). For he who avenges himself, does not deserve the ultion of the Lord.

2. The Apostles dissented with friendships intact.---And yet before I answer your epistle, it pleases me to expostulate with you, most ancient of monks, good presbyter, imitator of Christ, can you kill your brother, whom if you only hate, you are a murderer? Did you learn this from the Savior, that to him striking the cheek, you should offer also the other? Thus he himself answered his striker: If I have spoken evil, give testimony of the evil: if well, why strikest thou me (John 18:23)? You threaten death, which even serpents can bring. Death is of all, murder is of the worst. For what? unless you kill me, shall I be immortal? Nay rather I have grace, that you make of necessity a virtue. Did not the Apostles also dissent with friendships intact among themselves; when Paul and Barnabas were angry on account of John, surnamed Mark, and navigation separated them, whom the Gospel of Christ coupled? Did not the same Paul resist Cephas to the face, because he did not walk with a straight foot in the Gospel? And yet he calls him his predecessor and a pillar of the Church, and expounds the preaching with him, lest he should run in vain, or should have run in vain. Do not even children from parents, and wives from husbands dissent in religion with piety intact? If you hold thus, as we hold, why have you hated us? If you believe otherwise, why do you wish to kill? Or is he who shall have dissented from you, to be killed? I invoke Jesus as witness of my conscience, who is going to judge both these letters, and your epistle, that at the commonition of the holy pope Chromatius I wished to remain silent, and to make an end of simultaneous enmities, and to overcome evil in good; but because you threaten destruction, unless I shall be silent, I am compelled to answer, lest I seem by being silent to acknowledge a crime, and you should interpret my leniency as a sign of a bad conscience.

3. Words of the epistle of Rufinus.---This is your true dilemma; not brought forth from the dialectic art which you do not know, but from the office and meditation of executioners. If I shall be silent, I shall be criminal: if I shall answer, maledictory. You therefore both prohibit me, and compel me to answering. In which I will moderate both, so that I may both dilute what is objected, and temper myself from injury. For who would not fear him, who is prepared to kill? And I will follow the footsteps of your proposition, reserving the rest for those most erudite books, which before I had read, I confuted.

Dicis «te accusationem meam ad eos tantum misisse, qui meis verbis laesi fuerant, et non ad plures: quia non ad ostentationem, sed ad aedificationem Christianis loquendum est.» Et unde, oro te, librorum tuorum ad me fama pervenit? Quis eos Romae? quis in Italia? quis per Dalmatiae insulas disseminavit? Si in scriniis tuis et amicorum tuorum latebant, ad me quomodo mea crimina pervenerunt? Et audes dicere te non ad ostentationem, sed ad aedificationem quasi Christianum loqui, qui de sene senex tanta confingis, quanta non diceret de latrone homicida, de scorto meretrix, scurra de mimo? Qui parturis mihi montes criminum, et gladios quos defigas [Al. designas] in jugulum meum, tanto ante tempore excuis? Idcircone Cereales et anabasi tui per diversas provincias cucurrerunt, ut laudes meas legerent? Ut panegyricum tuum per angulos et plateas, ac muliercularum textrinas recitarent? Haec est tua illa sancta verecundia, haec aedificatio Christiana; sic modestus es, sic pudens, ut catervatim de occidente venientes, mihi tua maledicta narraverint: ita memoriter et consentanee, ut ego cogerer 534 non scriptis tuis, quae necdum legeram, sed scriptorum respondere opinionibus, et volantia toto orbe jacula falsitatis, clypeo veritatis excipere.

4. Epiphaniae epistolam furatus est monachus Rufini minister.---Sequitur in epistola tua: «Noli multo auro redimere notarium meum: sicut amici tui de meis *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* schedulis, nondum emendatis, nondum ad purum digestis, fecerunt: ut facilius falsare possent, quod aut nullus haberet, aut admodum pauci. Gratis a me missum suscipe codicem, quem censu magno cuperes comparatum.» Non te pudet prooemii? Ego auro redimerem notarium tuum? Et quis talis ac tantus est, ut audeat cum Croeso et Dario pugnare divitiis? Ut subitum Demaratum, et Crassum non pertimescat? Usque adeone obdurasti frontem ut mendacium ponas spem tuam: et existimes te protegi posse mendacio, et quidquid finxeris tibi credendum putes? Quis Bethlehem de cubiculo fratris Eusebii furatus est epistolam laudatricem tuam? Cujus artificio, et a cujus ministris in sanctae Fabiolae hospitio, et viri Christiani et prudentis Oceani, inventus est codex, quem illi numquam viderant? An idcirco te existimas innocentem, si quidquid tuum est, in alios conferas? Quicumque te offenderit, quamvis simplex, quamvis innoxius sit, illico criminosus fiet? habes enim, per quod Danaes est victa pudicitia, quod Giezi magistri praetulit sanctitati, propter quod Judas tradidit Dominum suum.

You say "that you sent my accusation only to those, who had been hurt by my words, and not to many: because one must speak not to ostentation, but to edification to Christians." And whence, I pray you, did the fame of your books reach to me? Who disseminated them at Rome? who in Italy? who through the islands of Dalmatia? If they lay hid in your chests and those of your friends, how did my crimes reach to me? And do you dare to say that you speak not to ostentation, but to edification as a Christian, who being an old man feign so great things about an old man, as a murderer would not say about a robber, a harlot about a whore, a buffoon about an actor? Who bring forth to me mountains of crimes, and sharpen so much before the time the swords which you would fix [or: designate] in my throat? Therefore did your Cereales and letter-carriers run through diverse provinces, so that they might read my praises? So that they might recite your panegyric through corners and streets, and the weaving-shops of little women? This is that holy modesty of yours, this is Christian edification; thus modest you are, thus bashful, that coming in crowds from the west, they narrated your maledictions to me: so from memory and consentingly, that I was compelled not to your writings, which I had not yet read, but to answer the opinions of the writers, and to intercept the flying darts of falsity in the whole world, with the shield of truth.

4. A monk, a minister of Rufinus, stole the epistle of Epiphanius.---It follows in your epistle: "Do not redeem my notary with much gold: as your friends did concerning my schedulae of On First Principles, not yet emended, not yet digested to the pure: that they might more easily falsify, what either no one had, or very few. Take the codex sent gratis by me, which you would desire bought with a great census." Are you not ashamed of the proem? Would I redeem your notary with gold? And who is such and so great, that he would dare to fight with Croesus and Darius in riches? That he would not fear a sudden Demaratus, and Crassus? Have you so far obdured your forehead that you put your hope in a lie: and you esteem yourself to be able to be protected by a lie, and you think that whatever you shall have feigned is to be believed to you? Who at Bethlehem stole your laudatory epistle from the cubicle of brother Eusebius? By whose artifice, and by whose ministers in the hospice of the holy Fabiola, and of the Christian and prudent man Oceanus, was the codex found, which they had never seen? Or do you therefore esteem yourself innocent, if whatever is yours, you confer upon others? Whoever shall have offended you, however simple, however innoxious he may be, shall he instantly become criminal? for you have, by what the chastity of Danae was overcome, what Gehazi preferred to the sanctity of his master, on account of what Judas betrayed his Lord.

5. Non probat accusationem Christiani in Christianum. Defendit Eusebium Cremonensem. Errores libri Periarchon.---«Videamus tamen quid meus necessarius de schedulis tuis, necdum emendatis, et nondum ad purum digestis, falsaverit: et ob id facilius ei falsatae fuerint, quod aut nullus eas haberet, aut admodum pauci.» Et ante scripsi, et nunc eadem, Deo audiente, protestor, me non approbasse accusationem ejus, nec cujusquam Christiani in Christianum. Quid enim necesse est, in multorum scandala ruinamque proferri, quae secreto aut corripere valeas, aut emendare? Sed quia unusquisque vivit stomacho suo: et amicus non statim dominus est alterius voluntatis: sicut accusationem etiam veram reprehendo, sic falsitatem schedulerum in sancto viro non suscipio. Quid enim 535 homo Latinus de interpretatione Graeca potuit immutare? Aut quid subtraheret, vel adderet in libris περὶ Ἀρχῶν ubi sic contexta sunt omnia, et alterum pendet ex altero, ut quidquid tollere volueris, vel addere, quasi pannus in vestimento statim appareat? Quod ergo me mones, ipse facito: paululum saltem humani, si non Christiani pudoris assume, ne despecta et calcata conscientia tua, verbis te purgatum putes, qui rebus urgeris. Si Eusebius auro redemit inemendatas schedulas, quas falsaret, tu profer tuas, quae falsatae non sint: et si probaveris nihil in eis haereticum, tunc ille crimine tenebitur falsitatis. Quamvis mutes, quamvis corrigas, catholicas non probabis. Si enim error esset in verbis, aut in paucis sensibus, possent detruncari mala, et bona pro his reponi. Ubi autem tota disputatio aequalis est: ut universae rationales creaturae, quae propria voluntate corruerant, in unum postea revertantur statum: ut rursum ex eodem principio aliae sint ruinae; quid habes emendare, nisi cuncta mutaveris? Quod si facere volueris, jam non libros alienos interpretaberis, sed condes tuos. Hoc autem cujusmodi argumentum sit, non intelligo. Quia, inquit, inemendatae, et nondum ad purum digestae erant schedulae, idcirco facilius ab Eusebio falsatae sunt. Aut ego tardior sum; aut mihi satis fatuum et obtusum videtur. Si nondum emendatae, nec ad purum digestae erant schedulae, error earum non Eusebio imputabitur, sed morae et tarditati tuae, qui emendare cessasti. Et in eo solo erit ille culpabilis, quia scripta tua cito disseminavit in vulgus, quae tu paulatim emendare decreveras. Sin autem, ut tu vis, eas falsavit Eusebius: quid causaris, atque praetendis inemendatas, et necdum ad purum digestas in publicum prorupisse? Et emendatae enim, et non emendatae similem recipiunt falsitatem. Nul-
lus, inquis, eos habebat libros, aut admodum pauci. In uno sermone quanta diversitas!

5. He does not approve the accusation of a Christian against a Christian. He defends Eusebius of Cremona. The errors of the book *Periarchon* (*On First Principles*).---"Let us see however what my friend falsified concerning your *schedulae*, not yet emended, and not yet digested to the pure: and that they were therefore more easily falsified for him, because either no one had them, or very few." Both before I wrote, and now I protest the same things, God hearing, that I did not approve his accusation, nor of any Christian against a Christian. For what necessity is there, to bring forth into the scandal and ruin of many, what you might be able either to correct in secret, or to emend? But because every one lives by his own stomach: and a friend is not immediately the master of another's will: just as I reprehend an accusation even when true, so I do not undertake the falsity of the *schedulae* in a holy man. For what could a Latin man change about a Greek interpretation? Or what would he subtract, or add in the books *On First Principles* where all things are so contexted, and one hangs from another, that whatever you should wish to take away, or add, would immediately appear as a patch on a garment? What therefore you warn me, do yourself: assume at least a little bit of human, if not Christian modesty, lest with your conscience despised and trodden under foot, you should think yourself purged by words, who are urged by things. If Eusebius redeemed unemended *schedulae* with gold, which he might falsify, do you bring forth yours, which are not falsified: and if you shall have proved nothing heretical in them, then he will be held by the crime of falsity. Although you change, although you correct, you will not prove them catholic. For if the error were in words, or in a few senses, the bad things could be truncated, and good things put back in their place. But where the whole disputation is equal: that all rational creatures, which had fallen by their own will, are to be reverted afterwards into one state: that again from the same beginning there are to be other ruins; what do you have to emend, unless you shall have changed all things? Which if you shall have wished to do, already you will not interpret alien books, but you will found your own. But of what sort this argument is, I do not understand. Because, he says, the *schedulae* were unemended, and not yet digested to the pure, therefore they were more easily falsified by Eusebius. Either I am too slow; or it seems to me foolish and obtuse enough. If the *schedulae* were not yet emended, nor digested to the pure, the error of them will not be imputed to Eusebius, but to your delay and slowness, who ceased to emend. And in this alone will he be culpable, because he quickly disseminated your writings to the vulgus, which you had decreed to emend paulatim. But if, as you wish, Eusebius falsified them: why do you cause, and pretend that they burst forth into the public unemended, and not yet digested to the pure? For both emended, and unemended receive a similar falsity. No one, you say, had those books, or very few. In one speech how much diversity!

Si nullus eos habebat, quomodo apud paucos erant? Si pauci habebant, cur nullum habuisse mentiris? cum autem dicas 536 apud paucos fuisse; et te ipso confitente subversum sit, quod nullus habuerit, ubi est illud, quod quereris, auro redemptum notarium tuum? Dic nomen notarii, quantum auri datum sit, ubi, per quem, aut cui datum. Utique proditorem tuum abjecisti a te [Al. ante]; et tanti facinoris reum a tuo consortio separasti. Vide ne magis illud verum sit, a paucis illis amicis tuis, et Eusebio et caeteris data exemplaria; quae ita inter se congruunt, atque consentiunt, ut ne puncto quidem alterum ab altero differat. Deinde cujus prudentiae est, dare exemplar aliis, quod nondum emendaveras? Scriptae ad purum non erant schedulae; et emendandos errores tuos jam alii possidebant. Sentisne non haerere inter se mendacium? Et quid tibi in articulo temporis profuit, ut episcoporum sententias subterfugeres, patere discussum, et tuis te verbis redargui? Ex quo apparet juxta inclyti oratoris (Ciceronis) elogium, te voluntatem habere mentiendi, artem fingendi non habere.

6. Comparare et emere quid differant?---Sequar ordinem epistolae, et ipsa, ut locutus es, verba subnectam. «Eloquentiam, ut dicis, tuam, et in Praefatione mea laudasse me fateor; et etiam nunc laudarem, nisi tu eam contra Tullii tui sententiam, multa jactantia faceres odiosam.» Ubi jactavi eloquentiam meam, qui etiam a te laudatam non libenter accepi? An hoc dicis, quia non vis subdola praedicatione palpari? Aperte accusaberis, ut qui laudantem respuis, sentias criminantem. Imperitiam autem tuam, non tam stultus eram, ut reprehenderem; quam nemo potest fortius accusare, quam tu ipse dum scribis. Sed volui ostendere condiscipulis tuis, qui tecum non didicerunt litteras, quid per triginta annos in Oriente profeceris: qui, συγγραφεὺς ἀγράμματος (scriptor illitteratus), procacitatem, disertitudinem, et maledicere omnibus, bonae conscientiae signum arbitraris. Nec tibi, ut dicis, ferulas adhibeo, neque athenogoronta (Senem discipulum) meum scutica, et plagis litteras docere contendo; sed quia fulmen [Al. flumen] eloquentiae tuae, atque doctrinae omnes tractatores ferre non possumus, et ingenii acumine perstringis oculos nostros, intantum ut omnes 537 tuos invidos putes, certatim opprimere te cupimus: ne si semel in scribendo obtinueris principatum, et in eloquentiae arce steteris, cunctis nobis qui aliquid scire volumus, mutire non liceat. Ego philosophus, rhetor, grammaticus, dialecticus, Hebraeus, Graecus, Latinus, trilinguis.

If no one had them, how were they among a few? If a few had them, why do you lie that no one had them? but when you say that they were among a few; and by your own confessing it is subverted, that no one had them, where is that, which you complain, that your notary was redeemed with gold? Name the name of the notary, how much gold was given, where, by whom, or to whom it was given. At any rate you cast away your betrayer from you [or: before]; and you separated the criminal of so great a facinorous deed from your consortium. See lest it be more true, that exemplars were given from those few friends of yours, both to Eusebius and to others; which so congruate among themselves, and consent, that not even by a point does one differ from another. Then of what prudence is it, to give an exemplar to others, which you had not yet emended? The *schedulae* were not written to the pure; and others already possessed your errors to be emended. Do you not feel that the lie does not stick together? And what did it profit you in the articulation of time, that you should subterfuge the sentences of the bishops, lying open to be discussed, and to be redargued by your own words? From which it appears according to the elogy of the illustrious orator (Cicero), that you have the will of lying, you do not have the art of feigning.

6. To compare (*comparare*/prepare/purchase) and to buy (*emere*), how do they differ?---I will follow the order of the epistle, and I will subjoin the very words, as you spoke. "I confess that I praised your eloquence, as you say, also in my Preface; and even now I would praise it, unless you, against the sentence of your Tully, made it odious by much boasting." Where did I boast of my eloquence, who did not freely accept it even praised by you? Or do you say this, because you do not wish to be stroked by dolous preaching? You will be openly accused, so that you who spew out the praiser, may feel the criminator. But I was not so foolish, as to reprehend your *imperitia* (lack of skill); which no one can more strongly accuse, than you yourself while you write. But I wished to show your fellow-disciples, who did not learn letters with you, what you have profited through thirty years in the East: who, a *signigraphus agrammatos* (an illiterate writer), arbitrate procacity, disertitude, and malediction to all, as a sign of a good conscience. Nor do I, as you say, adhibit rods to you, nor do I contend to teach my *athenogeronta* (old disciple) letters with a scourge, and plagues; but because all we tractators cannot bear the thunderbolt [or: river] of your eloquence, and doctrine, and by the acumen of your genius you perstringe our eyes, insomuch that you think everyone your envious ones, we desire to oppress you *certatim*: lest if once you shall have obtained the principate in writing, and stood in the citadel of eloquence, it should not be licit to all of us who wish to know something, to mutter. I am a philosopher, a rhetor, a grammarian, a dialectician, a Hebrew, a Greek, a Latin, trilingual.

Hoc modo et tu bilinguis eris, qui tantam habes Graeci Latinique sermonis scientiam, ut et Graeci te Latinum, et Latini te Graecum putent: et papa Epiphanius πεντάγλωττος [Mss. πεντάγλωστος] quia quinque linguis contra te et Amasium tuum (Origenem) loquitur. Simulque admiror, qua temeritate contra tantarum artium virum audeas dicere: «Tu qui tot disciplinarum oculis vigilas, quomodo venia donandus es, si erraveris, et non perpetuo pudoris silentio contegendus?» Quod cum legissem, et me putarem alicubi in sermone lapsum (qui enim (Jacob III, 2) in verbo non peccat, iste perfectus est), et suspicarer eum aliquid meorum prolaturum esse vitiorum, subito intulit: «Ante biduum mihi, quam proficisceretur harum bajulus, in manus venerunt, quae in me declamasti.» Ubi est ergo, quod minaris, et dicis, «Quomodo donandus es venia, si erraveris, et non perpetuo pudoris silentio contegendus?» Nisi forte prae angustia temporis potuisti ea in ordinem digerere: aut aliquem de cruditis conducturus eras, qui in opusculis meis gemmarum eloquentiae tuae ornamenta perquireret. Supra scripsisti: «Gratis a me missum codicem suscipe, quem sensu magno cuperes comparatum, et nunc humilitatis praestigiis loqueris. Imitari te volui [Al. volui]; sed refestinante eo, qui ad te remeabat, malui paucis ad te, quam ad alios pro tuis maledictis latius scribere. Et interim audac ter frueris imperitia tua. Semel enim confessus es, dicens: «Superflua tibi reprehensio fuit in paucis, quae professa nobis habetur in omnibus.» Nec reprehendam, quod comparatum codicem, pro empto posueris: cum comparatio aequalium sit; emptio pretii annumeratio: et refestinante eo, qui ad te remeabat, sordidissimae elocutionis περισσολογία. Tantum sensibus respondebo; et te nequaquam soloecistam, ac barbarum, sed 538 mendacem, subdolum, impudentem esse convincam.

7. In Praefatione libri περὶ Ἀρχῶν.---Si ad me tantum epistolam scribis, ut me commoneas, et emendatum velis, ne caeteris scandalum facias, et aliis furentibus, jugulentur alii: cur libros contra me scribis ad alios, et legendos per satellites tuos toto orbe dispergis? Ubi est syllogismus tuus, quo me irretire conaris, et loqueris? «Quem in hoc, magister optime, emendare cupiebas? si illos, ad quos scribis, nihil deliquerant; si me quem arguis, non ad me scripseras.» Et ego tuis respondebo tibi sermonibus: Quem emendare cupiebas, magister indocte? eosne, qui non peccaverant?

By this mode you also will be bilingual, who have so great a science of the Greek and Latin speech, that both the Greeks think you a Latin, and the Latins think you a Greek: and pope Epiphanius a pentaglottos (speaker of five languages) because he speaks in five languages against you and your Amasius (Origen). And at the same time I marvel, with what temerity against a man of so great arts you dare to say: "You who watch with the eyes of so many disciplines, how are you to be given pardon, if you shall have erred, and not to be covered by a perpetual silence of shame?" Which when I had read, and I thought myself fallen somewhere in a speech (for he who offends not in word, the same is a perfect man, James 3:2), and I suspected him about to bring forth something of my vices, suddenly he brought in: "Before a biduum to me, than the carrier of these letters set out, there came into my hands, what you declaimed against me." Where is therefore, what you threaten, and say, "How are you to be given pardon, if you shall have erred, and not to be covered by a perpetual silence of shame?" Unless perchance for shortness of time you could not digest them into order: or you were about to hire someone of the erudite, who might search out in my little works ornaments of the gems of your eloquence. Above you wrote: "Receive the codex sent gratis by me, which you would desire comparatum (bought/prepared) with a great census, and now you speak with the prestiges of humility. I wished to imitate you; but he re-hastening, who was returning to you, I preferred to write briefly to you, than more widely to others for your maledictions. And meanwhile boldly you enjoy your imperitia. For once you confessed, saying: "The reprehension in a few things was superfluous to you, which in all things is held professed by us." Nor will I reprehend, that you put comparatum (prepared/bought) codex, for emptio (bought): since comparatio is of equals; emptio is the annumeration of a price: and refestinantem eo, qui ad te remeabat (he re-hastening, who was returning to you), by a perissologia (redundancy) of most sordid elocution. I will only answer to the senses; and I will convince you to be by no means a solecist, and a barbarian, but a liar, dolous, impudent.

7. In the Preface of the book On First Principles.--If you write an epistle to me only, so that you may commonish me, and wish me emended, lest you should make a scandal to the rest, and while others are raging, others should be jugulated: why do you write books against me to others, and disperse them to be read by your satellites in the whole world? Where is your syllogism, by which you endeavor to irretire me, and you speak? "Whom did you cupere to emend in this, best master? if those, to whom you write, they had delicted nothing; if me whom you argue, you had not written to me." And I will answer you with your own speeches: Whom did you cupere to emend, undoct master? those, who had not sinned?

an me, ad quem non scripseras? Brutos putas esse lectores, et omnes non intelligere prudentiam tuam, immo malitiam, qua et serpens prudentior fuit cunctis bestiis in paradiso: ut a me secretam admonitionem flagites, quem publica accusatione persequeris; et non te pudet accusationem tuam Apologiam vocare? Quererisque cur opponam clypeum pugioni tuo, et tibi quasi religiosulus et sanctulus personam humilitatis imponis et dicis: «Si erraveram, quare scribis aliis, et non meipsum redarguis?» Hoc ipsum in te retorquebo: Quidquid enim me non fecisse causaris, quare non ipse fecisti? Velut si quis pugnis aliquem calcibusque collidens, si resistere voluerit, dicat ei: Nonne tibi praeceptum est: Qui te percusserit in maxillam, praebe illi et alteram (Matth. V, 39)? Quid enim, bone vir, tibi praeceptum est, ut me verberes; oculum mihi effodias; et si paululum me commovero, Evangelii mihi praecepta cantabis. Vis scire totas [Al. tortas] argutiarum tuarum strophas, et vulpecularum insidias, quae habitant in parietinis, de quibus Ezechiel loquitur: Quasi vulpes in deserto Prophetarum tui, Israel (Ezech. XIII, 4)? Ausculta quid feceris. Ita me in tua Praefatione laudasti, ut objicerentur mihi laudes tuae, et nisi me alienum a tanto laudatore dixissem, haereticus judicaretur. Postquam repuli crimina, id est laudes tuas, et absque invidia tui nominis, respondi criminibus, non criminatori: atque ut me catholicum a te infamatus probarem, invectus sum in haereticos; irasceris, furis, 539 et luculentissimos libros contra me cudis: quos quum legendos et cantandos omnibus tradidisses, certatim ad me de Italia, et urbe Roma, atque Dalmatia Scripta venerunt, quibus me laudator pristinus ornasses praeconiis.

8. Purgavit haereseos suspicionem.---Fateor, illico ad objecta respondi; et me non esse haereticum, totis viribus probare conatus sum. Misique hos ipsos Apologiae meae libros, ad eos quos tu vulneraveras; ut venena tua, nostra sequeretur antidotus. Ob hanc culpam mittis mihi et priores libros, et recentem epistolam, plenam injuriarum et criminum. Quid me vis facere, bone amice? Taceam? Videbor crimen agnoscere. Loquar? Terres me gladiis tuis, et accusationem non jam Ecclesiasticam, sed tribunalium comminaris. Quid feci? quid commerui? in quo te laesi? Quia me negavi haereticum?

or me, to whom you had not written? Do you think the readers are brutes, and that all do not understand your prudence, nay rather malice, by which even the serpent was more prudent than all the beasts in paradise: that you flagitate a secret admonition from me, whom you persecute with a public accusation; and are you not ashamed to call your accusation an Apology? And do you complain why I oppose a shield to your dagger, and you impose upon yourself the person of humility as if a little religious and holy man and say: "If I had erred, why do you write to others, and not redargue myself?" This very thing I will retort upon you: For whatever you cause that I did not do, why did you not do it yourself? Just as if someone colliding another with fists and heels, if he shall have wished to resist, should say to him: Is it not commanded to you: He who shall have struck thee on the cheek, offer to him also the other (Matt. 5:39)? For what, good man, is commanded to you, that you should verberate me; dig out my eye; and if I shall have commoved myself a little bit, you will sing to me the precepts of the Gospel. Do you wish to know all the tortuous strophes of your argutenesses, and the insidies of the little foxes, which dwell in the ruined walls, of which Ezekiel speaks: Like foxes in the desert are thy prophets, O Israel (Ezek. 13:4)? Listen what you have done. You so praised me in your Preface, that your praises were objected to me, and unless I had said myself alien from so great a praiser, I should be judged a heretic. After I repulsed the crimes, that is your praises, and without envy of your name, I answered the crimes, not the criminator: and that I might prove myself a catholic defamed by you, I inveighed against heretics; you are angry, you rage, and you strike most luculent books against me: which when you had handed over to all to be read and sung, certatim writings came to me from Italy, and the city of Rome, and Dalmatia, by which you, pristine praiser, would have adorned me with preconies.

8. He purged the suspicion of heresy.---I confess, instantly I answered to the objected things; and I conated to prove with all my vires that I am not a heretic. And I sent these very books of my Apology, to those whom you had wounded; so that our antidote might follow your poisons. On account of this culpa you send me both your prior books, and a recent epistle, full of injuries and crimes. What do you wish me to do, good friend? Shall I be silent? I shall seem to acknowledge the crime. Shall I speak? You terrify me with your swords, and you comminate an accusation not now Ecclesiastical, but of the tribunals. What have I done? what have I commerited? in what have I hurt you? Because I denied myself a heretic?

quia me tuis laudibus duxi indignum? quia haereticorum fraudulentias et perjurias aperto sermone descripsi? Quid ad te, qui et catholicum et veracem te esse jactas, qui libentius me accusas quam te defendis? Num mea defensio, accusatio tua est? Aut aliter orthodoxus esse non poteris, nisi me haeticum comprobaveris? Quid tibi prodest societas mea? Aut quae est ista prudentia? Accusatus ab aliis, accusas alium. Ab alio appeteris; et illi tergum obvertens, quiescentem contra te provocas.

9. Senes Rufinus et Hieronymus. Origenis laudavit eruditionem in adolescentia.--- Testor mediatorem Jesum, invitum me et repugnantem ad haec verba descendere [Al. respondere]; et nisi tu provocares, semper taciturnum fuisse. Denique noli accusare, et ego cessabo defendere. Quae enim est audientium aedificatio, duos senes inter se propter haeticos digladiari: praesertim cum ambo Catholicos se videri velint? Omittamus haeticorum patrociniū, et nulla erit inter nos contentio. Eodem fervore quo Origenem ante laudavimus, nunc damnatum toto orbe damnemus. Jungamus dexteras, animos copulemus: et duos (Theophilum et Anastasium) Orientis atque Occidentis τροπαιοφόρους, alacri sequamur incessu. Erravimus juvenes, emendemur senes. Si frater es, me gaude correctum. Si amicus sum, de conversione tua debeo gratulari. 540 Quamdiu inter nos jurgium fuerit, videbimur rectam fidem necessitate ducere, non voluntate. Inimicitiae nostrae, invicem nobis tollunt testimonium verae poenitentiae. Si unum credimus, si idem et volumus et nolumus (ex quo firmas nasci amicitias, etiam Catilina testatur), si haeticos pariter odimus, et veterem aequae damnamus errorem, quid contra nos tendimus, cum eadem oppugnemus, eadem defendamus? Ignosce mihi, quod Origenis eruditionem et studium Scripturarum, antequam ejus haeresim plenius nossem, in juvenili aetate laudavi; et ego tibi dabo veniam, quod Apologiam librorum ejus cano scripseris capite.

10. Ante biduum, quam ad nos Epistolam scriberes, libellos meos in manus tuas venisse testaris, et idcirco non habuisse spatium ex otio respondendi: alioqui si meditatus in nos paratusque dixisses, fulmina jacere, non crimina videreris. Et quis tibi credet homini veracissimo, ut negotiator orientalium mercium, qui et hinc deportata vendere necesse habebat, et ibi emere, quae huc rursus adveheret, biduum tantum Aquileiae fuerit, ut raptim et ex tempore contra nos dictare epistolam cogereris? Libri enim tui quos limasti per triennium, disertiores sunt?

because I led myself unworthy of your praises? because I described the fraudulencies and perjuries of heretics with open speech? What is it to you, who jactate yourself to be both a catholic and veracious, who more willingly accuse me than defend yourself? Is my defense, your accusation? Or otherwise will you not be able to be orthodox, unless you shall have comproved me a heretic? What does my society profit you? Or what prudence is that? Accused by others, you accuse another. You are appetited by another; and turning your back to him, you provoke against yourself one component.

9. The old men Rufinus and Jerome. He praised the erudition of Origen in his youth.---I testate the mediator Jesus, that I descend to answer to these words unwilling and repugnant; and unless you provoked, I would have always been silent. Finally do not accuse, and I will cease to defend. For what is the edification of the hearers, that two old men should digladiate between themselves on account of heretics: especially since both wish to seem Catholics? Let us omit the patronage of heretics, and there will be no contention between us. With the same fervor with which we before praised Origen, now condemned by the whole world let us condemn him. Let us join right hands, let us couple our minds: and let us follow with alacrious incessant step the two tropaiophoroi (trophy-bearers) (Theophilus and Anastasius) of the East and of the West. We erred as young men, let us be emended as old men. If you are a brother, rejoice me corrected. If I am a friend, I ought to gratulate concerning your conversion. As long as there shall be a jurgium between us, we shall seem to direct the right faith by necessity, not by will. Our enmities take away from each other the testimony of true penitence. If we believe one thing, if we both will and will not the same thing (from which Catiline also testifies that firm friendships are born), if we equally hate heretics, and equally condemn an ancient error, why do we tend against ourselves, when we oppugn the same things, defend the same things? Ignosce to me, because before I knew his heresy more fully, I praised the erudition of Origen and his study of the Scriptures in juvenile age; and I will give you pardon, because you wrote an Apology of his books with a hoary head.

10. Before a biduum, than you wrote the Epistle to us, you testate that my little books came into your hands, and therefore you did not have a space of answering from otium: otherwise if you had spoken meditated and prepared against us, you would seem to throw thunderbolts, not crimes. And who will believe you a most veracious man, that a negotiator of oriental wares, who had necessity both to sell the things deported from hence, and to buy there, what he might advect hither again, was only a biduum at Aquileia, so that you were compelled to dictate an epistle against us rapidly and extempore? For your books which you filed for a triennium, are they more disert?

Nisi forte non fuit impraesentiarum, qui tuas emendaret naenias: et idcirco omne iter dictionis tuae, absque Palladis arte, salebris et voraginibus vitiorum inciditur. Tam apertum temporis mendacium est, ut non dicam respondere, sed legere biduo mea scripta non potueris. Ex quo apparet te illam epistolam, aut pluribus diebus scripsisse, ut styli ipsius elegantia probat: aut si tumultuaria dictio [Al. dictatio] est, nimirum te esse negligentem, qui cum extemporalis talis sis, meditatus deterior fueris.

11. Commentariorum mos et regula.---Illud autem quod tergiversaris, et dicis, te ea transtulisse de Graeco, quae ego prius Latino sermone transtulerim, non satis intelligo quid velis dicere: nisi forte adhuc Commentarios ad Ephesios criminari, et quasi nihil tibi super hoc responsum sit, obduras frontis impudentiam; nec auribus obturatis, voces recipis incantantis. Nos in Commentariis, et illis et aliis, et 541 nostram et aliorum sententiam explicavimus, aperte confitentes quae sunt haeretica, quae catholica. Hic est enim Commentariorum mos, et explanantium regula, ut opiniones in expositione varias persequantur, et quod vel sibi, vel aliis videatur, edisserant. Et hoc non solum sanctarum interpretes Scripturarum, sed saecularium quoque litterarum, explanatores faciunt, tam Latinae linguae, quam Graecae. Tu in libris *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, idipsum obtendere non potes. Arguet enim te Praefatiuncula tua, in qua polliceris, detruncatis malis, et quae ab haereticis addita fuerant, optima remansisse: ut quidquid ibi vel bonum, vel malum dixeris, jam non ei imputetur, quem transfers, sed tibi qui interpretatus es; nisi forte haereticorum errores emendare debueras, et Origenis mala proferre in medium. Sed de hoc, quia nos remittis ad codicem, ante tibi respondimus, quam tua scripta legeremus.

12. Ridiculosa res et ridicula. Fides Romana praestigias non recepit.---De Pamphili libro, non ridiculosa, ut tu scribis, sed ridicula mihi forte res accidit, ut postquam Eusebii asseruerim esse, non Pamphili, ad extremum dixerim, etiam me annos plurimos hoc putasse, quod Pamphili fuerit, et a te exemplar hujus voluminis mutuatum. Vide quantum timeam cachinnos tuos, ut etiam nunc eadem ingeram. De tuo codice quasi Pamphili exemplar accepimus. Credidi Christiano, et credidi monacho: non putavi tantum sceleris a te posse confingi.

Unless perchance in presential circumstances there was no one who might emend your dirges: and therefore every journey of your diction, without the art of Pallas, falls into the unevennesses and voragines of vices. It is so open a lie of time, that I will not say to answer, but you could not have read my writings in a biduum. From which it appears that you either wrote that epistle in many days, as the elegance of the very stylus proves: or if it is a tumultuary dictation, nimirum you are negligent, who since you are such extempore, meditated you would be worse.

11. The custom and rule of commentaries.---But that which you tergiversate, and say, that you translated from Greek those things, which I before translated in Latin speech, I do not understand enough what you wish to say: unless perchance you still criminate the Commentaries to the Ephesians, and as if nothing had been answered to you upon this, you obdurate the impudence of your forehead; nor do you receive the voices of the incantator with stopped up ears. We in our Commentaries, both in those and in others, have explicated both our sentence and that of others, openly confessing what are heretical, what are catholic. For this is the custom of Commentaries, and the rule of those explaining, that they pursue various opinions in exposition, and edissertate what seems either to themselves, or to others. And this not only the interpreters of the holy Scriptures, but also the explainers of secular letters do, as well of the Latin tongue, as of the Greek. You in the books *On First Principles*, cannot obtend the very same thing. For your little Preface will argue you, in which you promise, the bad things being truncated, and what had been added by heretics, the best remained: so that whatever you shall say there either good, or bad, now is not imputed to him, whom you translate, but to you who interpreted it; unless perchance you ought to have emended the errors of the heretics, and brought forth the bad things of Origen into the midst. But concerning this, because you remit us to the codex, we answered you before, than we read your writings.

12. A ridiculous and laughable thing. The Roman faith did not receive prestiges.---Concerning the book of Pamphilus, not a ridiculose, as you write, but a ridiculous thing perchance happened to me, that after I asserted it to be of Eusebius, not of Pamphilus, at the extreme I said, that even I for very many years thought this, that it was of Pamphilus, and that a copy of this volume was mutuated from you. See how much I fear your cachinnations, that even now I ingerate the same things. We received the exemplar of Pamphilus from your codex as if it were his. I believed a Christian, and I believed a monk: I did not think so much of crime could be feigned by you.

Postea vero per interpretationem tuam, quaestione contra Origenem toto orbe com-mota, in quaerendis exemplaribus diligentior fui, et in Caesariensi Bibliotheca Eusebii sex volumina reperi Ἀπολογίας ὑπὲρ Ὀριγένους. Quae cum legissem, primum eum librum deprehendi, quem tu solus sub nomine martyris edidisti, de Filio et Spiritu Sancto, in bonam partem plerisque blasphemis commutatis. Et hoc vel Didymum, vel te, vel alium fecisse nescio quem, quod tu apertissime in libris περὶ Ἀρχῶν, fecisse convinceris: maxime cum idem Eusebius (ut jam duobus (superioribus) libris docui) scribat Pamphilum, nihil proprii operis edidisse. Dic ergo et tu, a quo exemplar acce-peris, nec mihi ad subterfugendum 542 crimen, mortuos aliquos nomines: ut cum auctorem ostendere non potueris, illum [Al. alium] proferas, qui non possit respon-dere. Sin autem rivulus ille in tuis scriniis fontem habet, quid sequatur, etiam me tacente, non dubitas. Verum fac ab alio quolibet amatore Origenis, libri hujus titulum, et auctoris vocabulum commutatum, cur hoc in Latinam linguam vertis? Videlicet ut testimonio Martyris, omnes Origenis scriptis crederent: praemissa munitione tanti auctoris et testis. Nec tibi sufficit doctissimi viri Apologia, nisi scribas et proprium volumen pro defensione ejus: quibus per multos disseminatis, tuto jam libros περὶ Ἀρχῶν vertis e Graeco, et hos ipsos Praefatione commendas, dicens nonnulla in his ab haereticis depravata, quae tu de aliorum librorum Origenis lectione correxeris. Me quoque laudas, ne tibi amicorum meorum quispiam contradicat. Origenis κήρυκα (praeconem) praedicas, eloquentiam meam fers in coelum, ut fidem in coenum depri-mas: fratrem et collegam vocas, et imitatore te mei operis confiteris. Cumque a me translatas Origenis septuaginta homilias, et nonnullos tomos in Apostolum jactes, in quibus sic cuncta limaverim, «ut nihil in illis, quod a fide catholica discrepet, Latinus lector inveniat; nunc eosdem libros, haereticos criminariis: et verso stylo, quem prae-dicaveras, quia consortem putabas, accusas, quoniam [Al. additur modo] perfidiae tuae cernis inimicum. Quis e duobus calumniator est martyris? Ego qui illum dico haereticum non fuisse, nec scripsisse librum, qui ab omnibus reprehenditur: an tu, qui volumen hominis Ariani, titulo commutato, sub nomine Martyris edidisti?

But afterwards through your interpretation, with a question moved against Origen in the whole world, I was more diligent in seeking exemplars, and in the library of Caesarea of Eusebius I found six volumes of the Apology for Origen. Which when I had read, first I deplored that book, which you alone published under the name of the martyr, concerning the Son and the Holy Spirit, with most of the blasphemies commutated into a good part. And whether Didymus did this, or you, or some other I know not whom, because you are convinced to have most openly done it in the books *On First Principles*: especially since the same Eusebius (as I have already taught in the two previous books) writes that Pamphilus published nothing of his own proper work. Say therefore and you, from whom you received the exemplar, nor to subterfuge the crime, name to me some dead men: so that when you shall not have been able to show the author, you may bring forth him [or: another], who cannot answer. But if that little river has its fountain in your scrinia, what follows, even I being silent, you do not doubt. But suppose the title of this book, and the vocable of the author was commutated by some other lover of Origen whatsoever, why do you turn this into the Latin tongue? Videlicet that by the testimony of the Martyr, all might believe the writings of Origen: with the munition of so great an author and witness sent before. Nor is the Apology of a most learned man sufficient to you, unless you write also a proper volume for his defense: which being seminanted through many, safely now you turn the books *On First Principles* from Greek, and these very ones you commend with a Preface, saying some things in these were depraved by heretics, which you corrected from the reading of other books of Origen. You also praise me, lest anyone of my friends should contradict you. You preach me a keryx (herald) of Origen, you bear my eloquence to heaven, that you may depress my faith into the mire: you call me a brother and colleague, and confess yourself an imitator of my work. And when you jactate seventy homilies of Origen translated by me, and some tomes on the Apostle, in which I so filed all things, "that a Latin reader may find nothing in them, which discrepates from the catholic faith;" now you criminate those same books as heretical: and with the stylus turned, him whom you had preached, because you thought him a consort, you accuse, since [or: now] you discern him an enemy of your perfidy. Which of the two is the calumniator of the martyr? I who say that he was not a heretic, nor wrote a book, which is reprehended by all: or you, who published the volume of an Arian man, with the title commutated, under the name of the Martyr?

Non tibi sufficit scandalum Graeciae, nisi illud et Latinorum auribus ingeras, et inclytum Martyrem tua quantum in te est translatione deformes. Tu quidem alia mente fecisti, non ut me accusares, sed ut Origenis per nos scripta defenderes. Attamen scito Romanam fidem, Apostolica voce laudatam, istiusmodi praestigias non recipere: etiam si Angelus aliter annuntiet, quam semel praedicatum est, Pauli auctoritate munitam non posse mutari. Ergo, frater, sive a te falsatus est 543 liber, ut multi putant: sive ab altero, ut forsitan persuadere conaberis, et temere credidisti, haeretici hominis σύνταγμα (opus) esse martyris, muta titulum, et Romanam simplicitatem tanto periculo libera. Non tibi expedit, ut per te clarissimus martyr haereticus judicetur; ut qui effudit pro Christo sanguinem, contrarius fidei Christi approbetur. Dic potius, Inveni librum, putavi illum martyris: ne timeas poenitentiam. Jam te non urgebo, non quaeram a quo acceperis: vel mortuorum aliquem nominato, vel in platea ab ignoto homine te emisse dicito. Non enim damnationem tuam quaerimus, sed conversionem. Melius est, ut tu erraveris, quam ut Martyr haereticus fuerit. Interim de praesenti compede, utcumque erue pedem. In futuro iudicio tu videris, quid ad martyris contra te respondeas querimonias.

13. De commentariis calumnia. Apollinarius et Didymus diversi.---Proponis etiam tibi, quod nemo objicit, et diluis quod nullus accusat. Ais enim quod in meis litteris legeris: «Dic quis tibi permisit, ut interpretans quaedam auferres, quaedam mutares, quaedam adderes?» Statimque tibi ipsi respondes, et contra me loqueris: «En tibi dico: Quaeso quis permiserit, ut in Commentariis tuis, quaedam de Origene, quaedam de Apollinario, quaedam de te ipso scriberes, et non de Origene totum, aut ex te, aut ex alio?» Interim in te dum aliud agis, crimen fortissimum prodidisti, et oblitus es veteris proverbii: Mendaces memores esse debere. Dicis enim me in Commentariis meis, quaedam de Origene, quaedam de Apollinario, quaedam ex me ipso posuisse. Si ergo Apollinarii sunt et Origenis, quae sub aliorum nomine posui: quomodo in libris tuis mihi crimen impingis, quod quando scribo: «Alius hoc dicit; Quidam sic suspicatur;» alius ille, et quidam, ego sim. Inter Apollinarium et Didymum explanationis, styli, et dogmatum magna diversitas est. Cum in uno capitulo diversas pono sententias, num contrarios sensus sequi credendus sum? Sed haec alias.

The scandal of Greece is not sufficient to you, unless you also ingerate it to the ears of the Latins, and deform the renowned Martyr by your translation as much as is in you. You indeed did it with another mind, not that you might accuse me, but that you might defend the writings of Origen through us. But nevertheless know that the Roman faith, praised by the Apostolic voice, does not receive prestiges of this sort: even if an Angel announce otherwise, than was once preached, fortified by the authority of Paul it cannot be changed. Therefore, brother, whether the book was falsified by you, as many think: or by another, as you shall perchance conate to persuade, and you temerarily believed, the syntagma (work) of a heretical man to be of the martyr, change the title, and liberate the Roman simplicity from so great a danger. It is not expedient for you, that through you a most illustrious martyr be judged a heretic; that he who shed his blood for Christ, be approved contrary to the faith of Christ. Say rather, I found the book, I thought it was of the martyr: lest you fear penitence. Now I will not urge you, I will not ask from whom you received it: either nominate some one of the dead, or say that you bought it from an unknown man in the street. For we do not seek your damnation, but your conversion. It is better, that you erred, than that the Martyr was a heretic. Meanwhile from the present shackle, however so, pluck out your foot. In the future judgment you will see, what you may answer to the querimonies of the martyr against you.

13. Calumny concerning the commentaries. Apollinarius and Didymus are diverse.---You also propose to yourself, what no one objects, and you dilute what no one accuses. For you say that you read in my letters: "Say who permitted you, that interpreting you should take away certain things, change certain things, add certain things?" And immediately you answer to yourself, and you speak against me: "Behold I say to you: I pray who permitted, that in your Commentaries, you should write certain things from Origen, certain things from Apollinarius, certain things from yourself, and not all from Origen, or from yourself, or from another?" Meanwhile while you do another thing against yourself, you have betrayed a most strong crime, and have forgotten the old proverb: Liars ought to be mindful. For you say that I in my Commentaries, put certain things from Origen, certain things from Apollinarius, certain things from myself. If therefore they are of Apollinarius and of Origen, which I put under the name of others: how in your books do you impinge a crime upon me, that when I write: "Another says this; A certain one thus suspects;" that other, and that certain one, should be I. Between Apollinarius and Didymus there is a great diversity of explanation, of stylus, and of dogmas. When in one chapter I put diverse sentences, am I to be believed to follow contrary senses? But these things at another time.

14. Quid damnet in translatione libri *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*. Origenis interpretes.---Nunc quaero a te: quis tibi objecerit, quare de Origene vel abstuleris quaedam, vel addideris, vel mutaveris, et te quasi in equuleo appensum interrogaverit: bona sunt, an mala 544 quae transtulisti? Frustra simulas innocentiam, ut interrogatione stulta, veram percontationem extenues. Ego non accusavi quare Origenem pro voluntate transtuleris: hoc enim et ipse feci, et ante me Victorinus, Hilarius, Ambrosiusque fecerunt; sed quare translationem haereticam Praefationis tuae testimonio roborasti? Cogis me eadem rursus iterare, et per meas lineas incedere. Dicis enim in eodem Prologo te ea quae ab haereticis addita fuerant, amputasse, et pro his reposuisse bona. Si haereticorum mala abstulisti, ergo quae dimisisti vel addidisti, aut Origenis erunt, aut tua, quae utique quasi bona posuisti. Sed multa in his mala negare non poteris. Quid, inquires, ad me? Imputa Origeni: ego enim ea tantum quae ab haereticis addita fuerant, commutavi. Expone causas, quare haereticorum mala tuleris, et Origenis integra dereliqueris? Nonne perspicuum est, quod mala Origenis ex parte sub haereticorum nuncupatione damnaveris, et ex parte susceperis, quia non mala, sed bona, et tuae esse fidei iudicabas? Haec sunt de quibus quaesivi, utrum bona essent, an mala, quae in Praefatione laudasti, quae amputatis pessimis, quasi optima remansisse confessus es, et te in verae argumentationis appendi equuleo, ut si bona dixeris, haereticus comproberis [Al. comprehendaris]; si mala, statim audias: Cur ergo quae mala sunt, in Praefatione laudasti? Et non illud adjunxi, quod tu callide simulas: Cur quae mala erant, ad Latinorum notitiam transtulisti? Mala enim ostendere interdum non docentis est, sed vetantis [Al. vitantis]: ut caveat lector, non ut sequatur errores; ut nota contemnat, quae nonnunquam ignota miraculo sunt. Et audes post haec dicere, quod ego auctor talium scriptorum sim: tu autem ut interpres, in quibus emendare aliquid potueris, plus egeris quam interpres; in quibus non potueris, solum interpres fueris. Recte ista diceres, si libri tui *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* Praefatiunculam non haberent.

14. What he may condemn in the translation of the book *On First Principles*. The interpreters of Origen.---Now I ask from you: who objected to you, why you either abstuleris certain things from Origen, or added, or changed, and interrogated you as if appended on an equuleus: are they good, or bad which you translated? In vain do you simulate innocence, that by a foolish interrogation, you may extenuate a true percontation. I did not accuse why you translated Origen for your will: for this both I myself did, and Victorinus, Hilary, and Ambrose did before me; but why did you corroborate a heretical translation by the testimony of your Preface? You compel me to iterate the same things again, and to walk through my own lines. For you say in the same Prologue that you amputated those things which had been added by heretics, and put good things back for them. If you took away the bad things of heretics, therefore what you left or added, will be either Origen's, or yours, which at any rate you put as good things. But you will not be able to deny many bad things in these. What, you will say, is it to me? Impute it to Origen: for I commutated only those things which had been added by heretics. Expound the causes, why you should have borne the bad things of heretics, and left the integral things of Origen? Is it not perspicuous, that you condemned the bad things of Origen in part under the nuncupation of heretics, and in part suscipiated them, because you judged them not bad, but good, and to be of your faith? These are the things concerning which I inquired, whether they were good, or bad, which you praised in the Preface, which you confessed that, the worst things being amputated, as if the best things remained, and that you might be appended on the equuleus of true argumentation, so that if you should say they are good, you might be comproved [or: comprehended] a heretic; if bad, immediately you might hear: Why therefore did you praise those things which are bad, in the Preface? And I did not adjoin that, which you callidly simulate: Why did you translate what were bad, to the notice of the Latins? For to show bad things is sometimes not of one teaching, but of one forbidding [or: avoiding]: so that the reader may beware, not that he may follow errors; so that he may condemn known things, which sometimes are a miracle because unknown. And do you dare to say after these things, that I am the author of such writings: but you as an interpreter, in those things which you could emend anything, you did more than an interpreter; in those which you could not, you were only an interpreter. Rightly would you say those things, if your books *On First Principles* did not have a little Preface.

Quod et Hilarius in transferendis ejus Homiliis fecit, ut et bona et mala non interpreti, sed suo imputarentur auctori. Si non dixisses, amputasse te pessima, et optima reliquisse, utcumque de luto evaderes. Hoc est quod destruit strophas ingenioli tui, et te hinc 545 inde constrictum evadere non sinit. Nec intantum abutare simplicitate lectoris: et sic omnes qui tuam scripturam lecturi sunt, brutos putes, ut cum vulnera putrescere sinas, sano corpori te imponere emplastra non rideant.

15. De resurrectione. De carnis resurrectione quid sentias, jam in Apologia tua didicimus, «Nullo membro amputato, nec aliqua parte corporis desecta.» Haec est tuae simplicitatis pura et aperta confessio, quam ab omnibus Italiae episcopis asseris esse susceptam. Crederem dicenti, nisi me dubitare de te iste liber, non Pamphili, faceret. Et tamen miror quomodo probaverit Italia, quod Roma contempsit? Episcopi susceperint, quod sedes Apostolica condemnavit.

16. Duae epistolae Theophili Latine redditae ab Hieronymo. Scribis quoque, me litteris indicasse, quod papa Theophilus expositionem fidei nuper ediderit, quae ad vos necdum pervenit: et polliceris quod quidquid ille scripserit, tu sequaris. Ego me hoc scripsisse non novi, nec istiusmodi umquam litteras direxisse. Sed tu idcirco ad incerta consentis, et his quae qualia futura sint nescis, ut certa declines, et ad eorum non tenearis assensum. Duas, synodicam et paschalem, ejus epistolas contra Origenem illiusque discipulos, et alias adversum Apollinarium et eundem Origenem, per hoc ferme biennium interpretatus sum; et in aedificationem Ecclesiae, legendas nostrae linguae hominibus dedi. Aliud operum ejus nescio me transtulisse. Et tamen tu qui papae Theophili dicis te in omnibus sententiam sequi, cave ne hoc magistri et discipuli tui audiant, et offendas quamplurimos, qui me latronem, te martyrem vocant, ne irascatur is tibi, qui contra papam Epiphanium ad te epistolas dirigens, hortabatur ut permaneres in fidei veritate, et non mutares ullo terrore sententiam. Quae epistola holographa tenetur ab his, ad quos perlata est. Et post haec more tuo loqueris, «Ut de quo supra dixeras, ego tibi etiam furenti satisfaciam: nunc dicis, Quid tibi videtur: habesne ultra aliquid, quo nervos tuae loquacitatis intendas?» Et indignaris si putide te loqui 546 arguam, cum Comoediarum turpitudines et scortorum amatorumque ludicra ecclesiasticus scriptor assumas?

Which also Hilary did in translating his Homilies, so that both the good and the bad might not be imputed to the interpreter, but to its author. If you had not said, that you amputated the worst things, and left the best, however so you might evade from the mud. This is what destroys the strophes of your little genius, and does not permit you constricted from here and there to evade. Nor do you so much abuse the simplicity of the reader: and thus think all who are about to read your scripture brutes, that when you permit wounds to putrefy, they do not laugh that you impose plasters on a healthy body.

15. Concerning the resurrection. What you feel concerning the resurrection of the flesh, we have already learned in your Apology, "No member being amputated, nor any part of the body cut off." This is the pure and open confession of your simplicity, which you assert has been received by all the bishops of Italy. I would believe the one saying this, if that book, not of Pamphilus, did not make me doubt concerning you. And yet I marvel how Italy proved, what Rome contemned? The bishops received, what the Apostolic see condemned.

16. Two epistles of Theophilus rendered in Latin by Jerome. You write also, that I indicated by letters, that pope Theophilus lately published an exposition of faith, which has not yet reached you: and you promise that whatever he shall have written, you will follow. I do not know that I wrote this, nor that I ever directed letters of this sort. But you therefore consent to uncertain things, and to these which you know not what sort they will be, so that you may decline certain things, and that you may not be held to their assent. Two of his epistles, a synodical and a paschal, against Origen and his disciples, and another against Apollinarius and the same Origen, I have interpreted for almost these two years; and I gave them to the men of our tongue to be read, into the edification of the Church. Another of his works I do not know that I have translated. And yet you who say that you follow the sentence of pope Theophilus in all things, beware lest your masters and fellow-disciples hear this, and you offend very many, who call me a robber, you a martyr, lest he be angry with you, who directing epistles to you against pope Epiphanius, exhorted you that you should remain in the truth of faith, and not change your sentence by any terror. Which holographic epistle is held by those, to whom it was brought. And after these things you speak by your custom, "So that of what you had said above, I also may satisfy you raging: now you say, What does it seem to you: do you have anything further, by which you may intend the nerves of your loquacity?" And are you indignant if I argue you to speak putridly, when as an ecclesiastical writer you assume the turpitudes of Comedies and the ludicra of harlots and lovers?

17. De Paulo episcopo. Porro quod interrogas, quando papae Theophili sententiam sequi coeperim, eique fidei communione sociatus sim, et ipse tibi respondes, «Tunc credo, quando Paulum quem ille damnaverat, summo nisu et omnibus studiis defendebas: quando eum per imperiale scriptum recipere sacerdotium, quod episcopali iudicio amiserat, instigabas.» Non prius pro me respondebo, quam de aliorum injuriis loquar. Cujus est humanitatis, cujusve clementiae, insultare aliorum miseriis, et vulnera cunctis aliena monstrare? Siccine te docuit ille Samarites, seminecem ad stabulum reportare? oleum plagis infundere? mercedem stabulario polliceri? Sic revectam ovem, repertam drachmam, prodigum filium legis esse susceptum? Esto, ego te laeseram, et quibusdam, ut dicis, stimulis ad maledictorum insaniam provocaram: quid meruit homo latens, ut nudares cicatricem ejus, et obductam cutem, insperato dolore rescinderes? Nonne etiam si ille dignus esset contumeliis, tu facere non deberes? Aut ego fallor, aut illud est verum quod plurimi jactitant, te Origenistarum hostes in illo persequi, et sub occasione unius in utrumque saevire. Si papae Theophili sententiis delectaris, et nefas putas Pontificum decreta convelli, quid de caeteris dicis, quos ipse damnavit? Quid de papa Anastasio, de quo nulli, ut ais, verum videtur, ut tantae urbis sacerdos, vel innocenti tibi injuriam facere potuerit, vel absenti? Nec hoc dico, quod de episcoporum sententiis judicem, aut eorum cupiam statuta rescindi; sed quod unusquisque suo periculo faciat, quod sibi videtur, et ipse noverit, quomodo de suo iudicio judicandum sit. Nobis in monasterio hospitalitas cordi est; omnesque ad nos venientes, laeta humanitatis fronte suscipimus. Veremur enim ne Maria cum Joseph locum non inveniatur in diversorio, ne nobis Jesus dicat exclusus: Hospes eram, et non suscepistis me (Matth. XXV, 43). Solos 547 haereticos non recipimus, quos vos solos recipitis. Propositum quippe nobis est pedes lavare venientium, non merita discutere. Recordare, frater, confessionis ejus, et pectoris quod flagella secuerunt. Memento carceris, tenebrarum, exsilii, metallorum, et non indignaberis hospitio transeuntem esse susceptum. An ideo tibi rebelles videmur, quia calicem aquae frigidae in nomine Christi sitientibus porrigimus?

17. Concerning bishop Paul. Moreover, as to what you interrogate, when I began to follow the sentence of pope Theophilus, and was consociated with him in the communion of faith, and you answer yourself, "Then I believe, when you defended Paul whom he had condemned, with the highest *nisus* and all studies: when you instigated by an imperial rescript to receive the priesthood, which he had lost by episcopal judgment." I will not answer for myself before I speak concerning the injuries of others. Of what humanity is it, or of what clemency, to insult the miseries of others, and to show alien wounds to all? Did that Samaritan so teach you, to carry back the half-dead man to the stable? to pour oil into his plagues? to promise a reward to the stable-keeper? Do you read that the re-carried sheep, the found drachma, the prodigal son were so received? So be it, I had hurt you, and by certain stimuli, as you say, I provoked you to the madness of maledictions: what did a latent man merit, that you should bare his scar, and rescind the obducted skin, with un hoped-for pain? Even if he were worthy of contumelies, ought not you to do it? Either I am deceived, or that is true which very many jactate, that you persecute the enemies of the Origenists in him, and under the occasion of one you rage against both. If you are delighted by the sentences of pope Theophilus, and think it a *nefas* that the decrees of the Pontiffs be convulsed, what do you say concerning the rest, whom he himself condemned? What concerning pope Anastasius, concerning whom to no one, as you say, does it seem true, that the priest of so great a city, could do injury either to you innocent, or absent? Nor do I say this, that I may judge concerning the sentences of bishops, or desire their statutes to be rescinded; but that everyone may do at his own peril, what seems to himself, and he himself knows, how he ought to be judged concerning his own judgment. Hospitality in the monastery is to our heart; and we receive all coming to us, with a joyful forehead of humanity. For we fear lest Mary with Joseph should not find a place in the inn, lest Jesus excluded should say to us: I was a guest, and you did not receive me (Matt. 25:43). We do not receive only heretics, whom you alone receive. For it is our *propositum* to wash the feet of those coming, not to discuss their merits. Record, brother, his confession, and the breast which the scourges cut. Remember the prison, the darkness, the exile, the mines, and you will not be indignant that one passing through was received with hospitality. Or do we therefore seem rebels to you, because we offer a cup of cold water in the name of Christ to those thirsting?

18. Haereticorum factio fugata. Theophilus laudatur.---Vis scire unde illum et nos plus amare, et tu odisse plus debeas? Haereticorum factio nuper fugata de Aegypto et Alexandria, se Hierosolimam contulit, et huic voluit copulari, ut quorum unus esset dolor, una fieret et accusatio. Quos ille repulit, sprexit, abiecit, dicens se non esse inimicum fidei, nec contra Ecclesiam bella suscipere: quod prius tentavit, doloris fuisse, non perfidiae: nec alterius appetisse innocentiam, sed suam probare voluisse. Impium putas, post sententias sacerdotum imperiale rescriptum? quod quale sit, noverit ille qui meruit. Quid tibi videtur de his, qui damnati, palatia obsident, et facto cuneo, fidem Christi in uno homine persequuntur? Meae autem communionis, et Papae Theophili, nullum alium testem vocabo, nisi ipsum quem a me laesum simulas, cujus epistolas ad me semper datas, etiam eo tempore non ignoras, quo mihi eas reddi prohibebas, et quotidie missis tabellariis, inimicum ejus amicum nostrum et familiarissimum jactitabas, et ea quae nunc impudenter scribis, mentiebaris, ut illius contra nos odia concitares, et injuriae dolor, fidei fieret oppressio. Sed vir prudens et Apostolicae sapientiae, tempore ac rebus probavit et nostrum in se animum, et vestras contra nos insidias. Si discipuli mei, ut scribis, tibi Romae insidias concitarunt, et inemendatas schedulas, te dormiente, furati sunt: quis papam Theophilum adversus perduelles in Aegypto suscitavit? Quis regum scita? quis orbis in hac parte consensum? Et gloriaris te ab adolescentia 548 Theophili fuisse auditorem et discipulum: cum et ille antequam episcopus fieret, pro humilitate sibi insita numquam docuerit, et tu postquam hic episcopus factus est, Alexandriae non fueris. Et audes dicere in suggillationem mei, Magistros meos, nec accuso, nec muto. Quod si verum est, suspectam mihi facis conversationem tuam. Nec enim damno, ut criminaris, institutores meos, sed metuo illud Isaiae: Vae qui dicunt malum bonum, et bonum malum: qui ponunt tenebras lucem, et lucem tenebras: qui dicunt amarum dulce, et dulce amarum (Isai. IX, 20). Tu autem dum inter mulsum magistrorum et venena pariter bibis, a magistro Apostolo recessisti, qui docet etiam Angelum et se, si in fide erraverint, non sequendos.

18. The faction of heretics put to flight. Theophilus is praised.---Do you wish to know whence both we ought to love him more, and you hate him more? The faction of heretics lately put to flight from Egypt and Alexandria, betook itself to Jerusalem, and wished to be coupled to him, so that of those whose grief was one, the accusation might also become one. Whom he repulsed, despised, cast away, saying that he was not an enemy of the faith, nor did he undertake wars against the Church: that what he before attempted, was of grief, not of perfidy: nor did he appetitize the innocence of another, but wished to prove his own. Do you think an imperial rescript impious, after the sentences of the priests? what sort of thing it is, he will have known who merited it. What does it seem to you concerning these, who being condemned, besiege the palaces, and with a wedge made, persecute the faith of Christ in one man? But of my communion, and of Pope Theophilus, I will call no other witness, except him himself whom you simulate was hurt by me, whose epistles always given to me, you are not ignorant of even at that time, when you prohibited them to be rendered to me, and daily tabellaries being sent, you jactitated his enemy to be our friend and most familiar, and those things which now you impudently write, you lied, that you might concitate his hatreds against us, and the pain of injury, might become the oppression of faith. But a prudent man and of Apostolic wisdom, by time and things proved both our mind towards him, and your insidies against us. If my disciples, as you write, concitated insidies against you at Rome, and stole the unemended schedulae, while you were sleeping: who suscitated pope Theophilus against the perduellions in Egypt? Who the scita (decrees) of the kings? who the consent of the world in this part? And you glory that from adolescence you were a hearer and disciple of Theophilus: although both he before he became a bishop, for the humility innated to him never taught, and you after he was made bishop here, were not at Alexandria. And you dare to say in suggillation of me, I neither accuse, nor change my Masters. But if it is true, you make your conversation suspect to me. For neither do I condemn, as you criminate, my institutors, but I fear that of Isaiah: Woe to them that call evil good, and good evil: who put darkness for light, and light for darkness: who call bitter sweet, and sweet bitter (Isa. 5:20). But you while you drink equally among the mulled wine of the masters and poisons, have receded from the master Apostle, who teaches that even an Angel and himself, if they shall have erred in faith, are not to be followed.

19. De Vigilantio calumnia.---In Vigilantii nomine quid somnies, nescio. Ubi enim eum scripsi haeretica apud Alexandriam communionem maculatum? Da librum, profer epistolam, nusquam omnino reperies, et eadem licentia, immo impudentia mentiendo, qua putas omnes tuis sermonibus credituros, addis: «Quando testimonium de Scripturis in cum tam injuriose posuisti, ut ego id repetere meo ore non audeam.» Non audes repetere, qui tacendo amplius criminaris. Et quia non habes quod objicias, simulas verecundiam, ut lector te putet mihi parcere, qui mentiens nec tuae animae pepercisti. Quod est illud testimonium de Scripturis, quod de tuo illo pudenterissimo ore non exeat? Aut quid in sanctis Libris potest turpe memorari? Si erubescis loqui, scribe saltem, ut nos procacitatis proprius sermo convincat. Ut caetera sileam, ex hoc uno capitulo comprobabo, ferream te frontem possidere fallaciae. Vide quantum timeam criminationem tuam. Si protuleris quod minaris, mea erunt universa quae tua sunt. Ego in Vigilantio tibi respondi. Eadem enim accusabat, quae tu postea et amicus laudas, et inimicus accusas. Scio a quo illius contra me rabies concitata sit, novi cuniculos tuos. Simplicitatem 549 quam omnes praedicant, non ignoro. Per illius stultitiam tua in me malitia debacchata est; quam ego si epistola mea repuli, ne solus habere videaris baculum litterarum, non debes turpitudinem simulare verborum, quam nusquam omnino legisti; sed intelligere et confiteri, per illius vecordiam, tuis calumniis fuisse responsum.

20. Epist. Papae Anastasii ad Joannem Hieros. de Rufino. ---In epistola sancti papae Anastasii lubricus exstitisti; et turbatus, in quo figas gradum non reperis. Modo enim dicis a me esse compositam, nunc ab eo ad te debuisse transmitti, cui missa est. Rursum injustitiam scribentis arguis; etiam si scripta sit ab illo, sive non scripta, ad te nihil pertinere testaris, qui praecessoris ejus habeas testimonium, et rogantem Romam, ut eam illustrares praesentia tua, oppiduli tui amore contempseris. Si a me fictam epistolam suspicaris, cur eam in Romanae Ecclesiae chartario non requiri? ut quum deprehenderis ab episcopo non datam, manifestissime criminis reum teneas: et nequaquam araneorum mihi opponas cassiculos, sed fortissimo me et solidissimo constringas reti. Si autem Romani episcopi est, stulte facis ab eo exemplar epistolae petere, cui missa non est, et non ab illo qui miserit, de oriente exspectare testimonium; cujus auctorem et testem habeas in vicino. Vade potius Romam, et praesens apud eum expostula, cur tibi et absenti et innocenti fecerit contumeliam.

19. Calumny concerning Vigilantius.---In the name of Vigilantius what you dream, I know not. For where did I write him maculated by heretical communion at Alexandria? Give the book, bring forth the epistle, nowhere at all will you find it, and with the same license, nay rather impudence of lying, by which you think all will believe your speeches, you add: "When you put a testimony concerning the Scriptures against him so injuriously, that I do not dare to repeat it with my mouth." You do not dare to repeat, who by being silent criminate more amply. And because you do not have what to object, you simulate bashfulness, that the reader may think you spare me, who lying have not even spared your own soul. What is that testimony concerning the Scriptures, which may not go out from that your most bashful mouth? Or what foul thing can be memorized in the holy Books? If you blush to speak, write at least, that the proper speech of procacity may convince us. That I may be silent on the rest, from this one chapter I will comprove, that you possess an iron forehead of fallacy. See how much I fear your crimination. If you shall have brought forth what you comminate, all things which are yours will be mine. I answered you in Vigilantius. For he accused the same things, which you afterwards both as a friend praise, and as an enemy accuse. I know by whom his rabies against me was concitated, I know your cuniculi (underground passages). The simplicity which all preach, I am not ignorant of. Through his folly your malice bacchanalized against me; which if I repulsed by my epistle, lest you should seem alone to have the staff of letters, you ought not to simulate the turpitude of words, which nowhere at all you have read; but to understand and confess, through his recordy (madness), there had been an answer to your calumnies.

20. The Epistle of Pope Anastasius to John of Jerusalem concerning Rufinus. ---In the epistle of holy pope Anastasius you have stood out lubricous; and being turbated, you do not find in what you may fix your step. For now you say it was composed by me, now that it ought to have been transmitted from him to you, to whom it was sent. Again you argue the injustice of the writer; even if it was written by him, or not written, you testify that it pertains nothing to you, who have the testimony of his predecessor, and asking Rome, that you might illustrate it with your presence, you contemned it for the love of your little town. If you suspect the epistle was feigned by me, why is it not sought in the chartulary of the Roman Church? so that when you shall have apprehended that it was not given by the bishop, you might hold me most manifestly guilty of crime: and by no means oppose to me the little nets of spiders, but constrict me with a most strong and most solid net. But if it is of the Roman bishop, you do foolishly to seek the exemplar of the epistle from him, to whom it was not sent, and not to expect testimony from the east from him who sent it; whose author and witness you have in the vicinity. Go rather to Rome, and present expostulate with him, why he did contumely to you both absent and innocent.

Primum, ut non reciperet expositionem fidei tuae, quam omnis, ut scribis, Italia comprobavit, et baculo tuarum uti noluerit litterarum contra canes tuos. Deinde, ut epistolas contra te ad Orientem mitteret et cauterium tibi haereseos, dum nescis inureret, diceretque libros Origenis *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* a te translato, et simplici Romanae Ecclesiae traditos, ut fidei veritatem quam ab Apostolo didicerant, per te perderent, et quo tibi maiorem faceret invidiam, ausus sit criminari hos ipsos, Praefationis tuae testimonio roboratos. Non est leve quod 550 tibi impingit tantae urbis pontifex, vel ab alio objectum temere suscepit. Vociferare et clamita per compita, per plateas: Non est meus liber; et si meus est, schedulas inemendatas Eusebius furto abstulit. Aliter ego edidi, immo nec edidi. Nulli eas dedi, aut certe paucis; et tam sceleratus inimicus, tam negligentes amici fuerunt, ut omnium codices ab eo pariter falsarentur. Haec, frater charissime, facere debueras, et non illi tergum obvertens, in me transmarinas maledictorum tuorum sagittas dirigere. Quid enim vulneribus tuis prodest, si ego fuero vulneratus? An solatium percussus est, amicum secum videre morientem?

21. Siricii jam in Domino dormientis profers epistolam, et viventis Anastasii dicta contemnis. Quid enim tibi, ut ais, officere potest, quod te ignorante, aut scripsit, aut forte non scripsit? Et si scripsit, sufficit tibi totius orbis testimonium, quod nulli verum videtur, ut tantae urbis sacerdos, vel innocenti injuriam facere potuerit, vel absenti. Innocentem te vocas, ad cuius interpretationem Roma contremuit. Absentem, qui accusatus respondere non audes. Et tantum Romanae urbis iudicium fugis, ut magis obsidionem barbaricam, quam pacatae urbis velis sententiam sustinere. Esto, praeteriti anni ego epistolam finxerim. Recentia ad orientem scripta quis misit? In quibus papa Anastasius tantis te ornat floribus, ut cum ea legeris, magis te velle defendere incipias, quam nos accusare. Simulque considera illam inimitabilem prudentiam tuam, et sales Atticos, et sancti eloquii venustatem. Ab aliis appeteris, aliorum criminatione confoderis, et contra me furibundus jactaris, et loqueris, «Numquid et ego non possum enarrare, tu quomodo de Urbe discesseris? Quid de te in praesenti iudicatum sit? quid postea scriptum, quid iuraveris? ubi navim conscenderis?

First, that he did not receive the exposition of your faith, which all Italy, as you write, approved, and was unwilling to use the staff of your letters against your dogs. Then, that he sent epistles against you to the East and inured the cautery of heresy to you, while you know not, and said that the books of Origen On First Principles were translated by you, and delivered to the simple Roman Church, so that they might lose through you the truth of faith which they had learned from the Apostle, and by which he might make greater envy for you, he dared to criminate those very ones, corroborated by the testimony of your Preface. It is not light what the pontiff of so great a city impinges upon you, or temerariely suscipiated what was objected by another. Vociferate and clamor through the crossroads, through the streets: It is not my book; and if it is mine, Eusebius by theft took away the unemended schedulae. Otherwise I published, nay rather I did not publish. I gave them to none, or certainly to a few; and so wicked was the enemy, so negligent were the friends, that the codices of all were equally falsified by him. These things, dearest brother, you ought to have done, and not turning your back to him, to direct the transmarine arrows of your maledictions against me. For what does it profit your wounds, if I shall have been wounded? Or is it a solace of the stricken, to see a friend dying with him?

21. You bring forth the epistle of Siricius already sleeping in the Lord, and condemn the dicta of Anastasius living. For what can it officiate against you, as you say, what he either wrote you being ignorant, or perchance did not write? And if he wrote, the testimony of the whole world suffices for you, because to no one does it seem true, that the priest of so great a city, could do injury either to the innocent, or to the absent. You call yourself innocent, at whose interpretation Rome trembled. Absent, who accused dare not answer. And you so much flee the judgment of the Roman city, that you would rather sustain a barbaric siege, than the sentence of a pacated city. So be it, last year I feigned the epistle. Who sent the recent writings to the east? In which pope Anastasius adorns you with such flowers, that when you read them, you may begin to wish more to defend yourself, than to accuse us. And closely consider that your inimitable prudence, and Attic salts, and the venusty of your holy eloquence. You are appetized by others, you are stabbed by the crimination of others, and you are jactated furious against me, and you speak, "Can I not also enarrate, how you departed from the City? What was judged concerning you in the present? what afterwards written, what you swore? where you ascended the ship?

quam sancte perjurium vitaveris? Poteram pandere, sed plura servare statui, quam referre.» Haec 551 sunt tuorum ornamenta verborum. Et post ista si quid in te asperum dixerō, statim mihi proscriptionem et gladios comminaris. Et interim homo eloquentissimus arte ludis rhetorica, et simulas te praeterire quae dicis, ut qui objecta probare non poteris, quasi praetermissa facias criminosa. Haec est tua tota simplicitas, sic amico parcis, et reservas te ad tribunalia iudicum, ut acervum criminum mihi, dum parcis, objeceris.

22. Ordo profectionis Hieronymi de Urbe.---Vis nosse profectionis meae de Urbe ordinem? Narrabo breviter. Mense Augusto, flantibus etesiis, cum sancto Vincentio presbytero, et adolescente fratre, et aliis monachis, qui nunc Hierosolymae commorantur, navim in Romano portu securus ascendi, maxima me Sanctorum frequentia prosequente. Veni Rhegium, in Scyllaeo litore paululum steti, ubi veteres didici fabulas, et praecipitem pellacis [Al. fallacis] Ulyssis cursum, et sirenarum cantica, et insatiabilem Charybdis voraginem. Cumque mihi accolae illius loci multa narrarent, darentque consilium, ut non ad Protei columnas, sed ad Jonae portum navigarem: illum enim fugientium et turbatorum, hunc securi hominis esse cursum, malui per Maleas et Cycladas Cyprum pergere. Ubi susceptus a venerabili episcopo Epiphanio, cujus tu testimonio gloriaris, veni Antiochiam, ubi frui sum communione pontificis confessorisque Paulini, et deductus ab eo media hyeme et frigore gravissimo, intravi Hierosolymam. Vidi multa miracula; et quae prius ad me fama pertulerat, oculorum iudicio comprobavi. Inde contendi Aegyptum, lustravi monasteria Nitriae, et inter Sanctorum choros aspides latere perspexi. Protinus concito gradu Bethleem meam reversus sum, ubi odoravi praesepe et incunabula Salvatoris. Vidi quoque famosissimum lacum, nec me inertem tradidi otio; sed multa didici, quae ante nesciebam. Quid autem de me Romae iudicatum sit, et quid postea scriptum, nolo taceas, praesertim cum habeas testimonium [Al. testimonio] Scripturarum, et ego non verbis tuis quae simulare potes, et impunito jactare mendacio, sed scriptis 552 ecclesiasticis arguendus sim. Vide quantum te timeam: Si vel parvam schedulam contra me Romani episcopi, aut alterius Ecclesiae protuleris, omnia quae in te scripta sunt, mea crimina confitebor. Numquid et ego non possem profectionem tuam discutere? Cujus aetatis fueris, unde, quo tempore navigaris? ubi vixeris? quibus interfueris? Sed absit, ut quod in te reprehendo, faciam: et in ecclesiastica disputatione, anilium jurgiorum deliramenta compingam. Hoc solum prudentiae tuae dixisse sufficiat, ut caveas in alterum dicere, quidquid in te statim retorqueri potest.

how holily you avoided perjury? I could expand, but I statuted to keep more, than to refer." These are the ornaments of your words. And after these things if I shall have said anything harsh against you, immediately you comminate me with proscription and swords. And meanwhile a most eloquent man you play by rhetorical art, and simulate that you pass over what you say, as one who could not prove the things objected, you make them criminous as if pretermitted. This is all your simplicity, so you spare a friend, and reserve yourself to the tribunals of judges, so that you object a heap of crimes to me, while you spare.

22. The order of the setting out of Jerome from the City.---Do you wish to know the order of my setting out from the City? I will narrate briefly. In the month of August, the etesian winds blowing, with the holy presbyter Vincent, and a young brother, and other monks, who now tarry at Jerusalem, I secure ascended a ship in the Roman port, the greatest frequency of Saints prosecuting me. I came to Rhegium, I stood a little while on the Scyllaeen shore, where I learned the old fables, and the headlong course of the pellacious [or: fallacious] Ulysses, and the songs of the sirens, and the insatiable whirlpool of Charybdis. And when the inhabitants of that place told me many things, and gave counsel, that I should not sail to the columns of Proteus, but to the port of Jonah: for that was the course of those fleeing and turbate, this of a secure man, I preferred to proceed through Maleas and the Cyclades to Cyprus. Where being received by the venerable bishop Epiphanius, whose testimony you glory in, I came to Antioch, where I enjoyed the communion of the pontiff and confessor Paulinus, and being led by him in the middle of winter and the heaviest cold, I entered Jerusalem. I saw many miracles; and what fame had before brought to me, I comproved by the judgment of my eyes. Thence I contemned [or: hastened to] Egypt, I lustrated the monasteries of Nitria, and perceived asps to lie hid among the choirs of Saints. Forthwith with a concitated step I returned to my Bethlehem, where I adored the manger and the incunabula of the Savior. I saw also the most famous lake, nor did I deliver myself to inert leisure; but I learned many things, which before I knew not. But what was judged concerning me at Rome, and what afterwards written, I will not that you be silent, especially since you have the testimony of the Scriptures, and I am to be argued not by your words which you can simulate, and unpunished jactate with a lie, but by ecclesiastical writings. See how much I fear you: If you shall have brought forth even a small schedula against me of the Roman bishop, or of another Church, all the things which are written against you, I will confess as my crimes. Could not I also discuss your setting out? Of what age were you, whence, in what time did you navigate? where did you live? whom were you among? But be it far away, that what I reprehend in you, I should do: and in an ecclesiastical disputation, I should compact the deliraments of anile brawls. Let it suffice to have said this only to your prudence, that you beware to speak against another, whatever can immediately be retorted against you.

23. Maledicta Rufini in Epiphanium. Epiphanii epist. ad Joannem.---In sancti Epiphanii nomine mira tua tergiversatio, ut post osculum, post orationem, neges eum contra te potuisse scribere: quomodo si contendas non potuisse eum mori, qui paulo ante vixerat, aut certior sit tui reprehensio, quam post pacem excommunicatio. Ex nobis, inquit, exierunt: sed non fuerunt ex nobis, mansissent utique nobiscum (I Joan. II, 19). Haereticum post unam et alteram commonitionem vitandum Apostolus praecipit, qui utique antequam vitetur atque damnetur, Ecclesiastici gregis portio fuit (Tit. III, 10). Simulque risum tenere non possum, quod a quodam prudente commonitus, in laudes Epiphanii personas: «Hic est ille delirus senex, hic est anthropomorphites; hic qui sex millia Origenis libros, te praesente, cantavit; qui omnium gentium linguis praedicationem sibi contra Origenem injunctam putat; qui ideo eum legi prohibet, ne aliis ejus furta cognoscant.» Lege scripta tua, et epistolam ejus, immo epistolas, e quibus unum proferam tuae fidei testimonium, ut non immerito nunc a te laudatus esse videatur. «Te autem, frater, liberet Deus, et sanctum populum Christi, qui tibi creditus est, et omnes fratres qui tecum sunt, et maxime Rufinum presbyterum, ab haeresi Origenis, et aliis haeresibus, et perditione earum. Si enim propter unum verbum, aut duo, quae contraria fidei sunt, multae haereses objectae sunt ab Ecclesia, quanto magis hic inter haereticos habebitur, qui tantas perversitates, 553 et tam mala dogmata contra fidem adinvenit, Dei Ecclesiae hostis exstitit!» Haec est viri sancti de te testificatio: sic ab eo ornatus, sic laudatus incedis. Ita est epistola, quam de cubiculo fratris Eusebii nummis aureis produxisti, ut calumniareri interpretem, et me apertissimi teneres criminis reum, quare pro honorabili charissimum transtulisses. Sed quid ad te, qui prudenti consilio cuncta moderaris, et sic medius incedis, ut si inveneris qui tibi credant; nec Anastasius contra te, nec Epiphanius scripserint; nisi ipsae epistolae reclamaverint, et fregerint tuae frontis audaciam, statim judicium utriusque contemnas, et non ad te pertineat, sive scripserint, sive non scripserint, quia de innocente et absente scribere non potuerint [Al. potuerant]. Nec in sanctum virum haec mala conferenda sunt, «ut ostendatur ore quidem et osculo pacem dedisse, mala autem et dolum in suo corde servasse.»

23. The maledictions of Rufinus against Epiphanius. The epistle of Epiphanius to John.---In the name of holy Epiphanius your tergiversation is wonderful, that after the kiss, after the prayer, you deny that he could have written against you: just as if you should contend that he could not have died, who a little before had lived, or as if your reprehension were more certain, than excommunication after peace. They went out from us, he says, but they were not of us, they would surely have remained with us (1 John 2:19). The Apostle commands a heretic to be avoided after one and a second commonition, who surely before he is avoided and condemned, was a portion of the Ecclesiastical flock (Tit. 3:10). And at the same time I cannot hold laughter, that being commonished by a certain prudent man, you personate into the praises of Epiphanius: "This is that delirious old man, this is the anthropomorphite; this is he who sang six thousand books of Origen, you being present; who thinks the preaching in the tongues of all nations is enjoined upon him against Origen; who therefore prohibits him to be read, lest others should know his thefts." Read your writings, and his epistle, nay rather epistles, from which I will bring forth one testimony of your faith, so that he may not seem unmeritedly now to be praised by you. "But may God liberate you, brother, and the holy people of Christ, who is credited to you, and all the brothers who are with you, and especially Rufinus the presbyter, from the heresy of Origen, and other heresies, and their perdition. For if on account of one word, or two, which are contrary to faith, many heresies have been objected by the Church, how much more shall this one be held among heretics, who adinvented so great perversities, and so bad dogmas against faith, and stood forth an enemy of the Church of God!" This is the testification of the holy man concerning you: so adorned by him, so praised do you walk. Such is the epistle, which you produced from the cubicle of brother Eusebius for golden coins, so that you might calumniate the interpreter, and hold me guilty of a most open crime, why for honorable I had translated most dear. But what is it to you, who moderate all things by prudent counsel, and so walk in the middle, that if you shall find those who will believe you; neither Anastasius nor Epiphanius would have written against you; unless the epistles themselves cried out, and broke the audacity of your forehead, immediately you condemn the judgment of both, and it pertains nothing to you, whether they wrote, or did not write, because they could not have written concerning an innocent and an absent one. Nor are these evil things to be conferred upon the holy man, "that it may be shown that with mouth indeed and kiss he gave peace, but evil and guile he preserved in his heart."

Sic enim argumentaris, et haec sunt verba defensionis tuae. Ipsi esse adversum te epistolam, et orbis agnoscit, et authenticam in manus tuas venisse convincimus: et miror quo pudore, immo qua impudentia neges, quod verum esse non ambigis? Ergo pollutus erit Epiphanius, qui tibi pacem dedit, et in suo corde dolum servavit. Cur non illud verius sit, quod te primum monuerit? quod voluerit emendare, et ad rectum iter reducere, ut Judae osculum non refutaret, ut proditorem fidei frangeret patientia; et postquam se intellexit casso sudare labore, nec pardum mutare varietates, nec Aethiopem pellem suam, quod mente conceperat, litteris indicasse?

24. Calumnia de ficta pace. Amici Hieronymi missi in Occidentem.---Tale quid et contra papam Anastasium disputas, ut quia Siricii Episcopi habes epistolam, iste contra te scribere non potuerit. Vereor ne tibi factam injuriam suspiceris. Nescio quomodo acutus et prudens ad has ineptias devolaris, ut dum stultos lectores putas, te stultum esse demonstres. Post egregiam argumentationem, ponis in clausula: «Absit hoc a viris sanctis. De vestra schola solent ista 554 procedere. Vos nobis pacem proficiscentibus dedistis, et a tergo jacula venenis armata jecistis.» Et in hac eadem prudentia, immo declamatione disertus esse voluisti. Pacem dedimus, non haeresim suscepimus. Junximus dexteras: abeuntes persecuti sumus, ut vos essetis catholici, non ut nos essemus haeretici. Volo tamen scire, quae sint ista jacula venenata, quae post tergum vestrum nos jecisse conquereris. Vincentius, Paulinianus, Eusebius, Rufinus, presbyteri: quorum Vincentius multo tempore ante vos Romam venit: Paulinianus et Eusebius post annum vestrae navigationis profecti sunt: Rufinus in causa Claudii post biennium missus: omnes, vel pro re familiari, vel pro periculo capitis alieni. Numquid nosse potuimus, quod ingrediente te Romam, vir nobilis somniaret navim plenam mercium, inflatis intrare velis? Quod omnes adversus fatum quaestiones, non fatua solveret interpretatio? Quod librum Eusebii pro Pamphili verteres? quod tuum quasi operculum venenatae patellae imponeres? quod famosissimum opus *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* eloquii tui majestate transferres? Novum calumniae genus ante accusatores misimus, quam tu accusanda committeres. Non fuit, non fuit, inquam, nostri consilii, sed Dei providentiae, ut missi ad aliud, contra nascentem haeresim dimicarent; et in morem Joseph, famem futuram, fidei ardore sublevarent.

For so you argumentate, and these are the words of your defense. Both the orb acknowledges that the epistle is his against you, and we convince that it came authentic into your hands: and I marvel with what pudor, nay rather with what impudence you deny, what you do not doubt to be true? Therefore Epiphanius will be polluted, who gave you peace, and preserved guile in his heart. Why may it not be more true, that he first monished you? that he wished to emend you, and reduce you to the right way, that he might not refute the kiss of Judas, that he might break the betrayer of faith by patience; and after he understood himself to sweat with vain labor, and that the pard does not change its varieties, nor the Ethiopian his skin, he indicated by letters what he had conceived in his mind?

24. Calumny concerning feigned peace. The friends of Jerome sent into the West.---Such a thing you also dispute against pope Anastasius, that because you have an epistle of Bishop Siricius, that one could not have written against you. I fear lest you suspect an injury done to you. I know not how, acute and prudent, you are devolved to these ineptitudes, that while you think the readers fools, you demonstrate yourself to be a fool. After an egregious argumentation, you put in the close: "Be it far from holy men. Such things are wont to proceed from your school. You gave peace to us departing, and from the back you threw darts armed with poisons." And in this same prudence, nay rather declamation, you wished to be eloquent. We gave peace, we did not suscipiate heresy. We joined right hands: we prosecuted you departing, that you might be catholics, not that we might be heretics. Yet I wish to know, what those poisoned darts are, which you complain we threw behind your back. Vincentius, Paulinianus, Eusebius, Rufinus, presbyters: of whom Vincentius came to Rome much time before you: Paulinianus and Eusebius set out after a year of your navigation: Rufinus sent in the cause of Claudius after two years: all, either for a familiar affair, or for the peril of another's head. Could we have known, that you entering Rome, a noble man would dream a ship full of merchandises, to enter with inflated sails? That an interpretation that was not fatuous, would solve all questions against fate? That you would translate the book of Eusebius as of Pamphilus? that you would impose your own as if a cover to a poisoned dish? that you would translate the most famous work *On First Principles* with the majesty of your eloquence? We sent a new kind of calumny before the accusers, before you committed things to be accused. It was not, it was not, I say, of our counsel, but of the providence of God, that those sent for another thing, should dimicate against a nascent heresy; and in the manner of Joseph, should sublevate by the ardor of faith, the future famine.

25. De falsa epist. ad Afros. Ex Graecis Latina Rufinus emendaverat.---Quo non erumpat semel effrenata audacia? Alienum crimen sibi objecit, ut nos finxisse videamur. Quod absque nomine dictum est, in se dictum refert, et purgans externa peccata, tantum de sua securus est innocentia. Jurat enim se epistolam non scripsisse ad Afros sub nomine meo, in qua confitear inductum me a Judaeis, mendacia transtulisse; et mittit libros eadem omnia continentes, quae nescisse se jurat. Et miror quomodo prudentia ejus cum alterius nequitia convenerit, ut quod alius in Africa mentitus est, hic concorditer verum diceret, stylique ejus elegantiam, nescio quis imperitus posset imitari. Tibi soli licet haereticorum 555 venena transferre; et de calice Babylonis, cunctis gentibus propinare. Tu Latinas Scripturas de Graeco emendabis; et aliud Ecclesiis trades legendum, quam quod semel ab Apostolis susceperunt; mihi non licebit post Septuaginta editionem, quam diligentissime emendatam, ante annos plurimos meae linguae hominibus dedi, ad confutandos Judaeos, etiam ipsa exemplaria vertere, quae ipsi verissima confitentur, ut si quando adversum eos Christianis disputatio est, non habeant subterfugiendi diverticula, sed suomet potissimum mucrone feriantur? Plenius super hoc et in multis aliis locis, et in fine secundi libri, ubi accusationi tuae respondi, scripsisse me memini; et popularitatem tuam, qua mihi invidiam apud simplices et imperitos niteris concitare, perspicua ratione compescui, illucque lectorem transmittendum puto.

26. Martyr et Apostolus vocatus Rufinus a suis. ---Hoc intactum praeteriri non patiar, ne doleas falsatorem schedularum tuarum, confessoris apud me gloriam possidere, cum tu ejusdem criminis reus, post Alexandrinum exilium et tenebrosos carceres, a cunctis Origenis sectatoribus martyr et apostolus nomineris. Super excusatione imperitiae tuae, jam tibi respondi. Sed quia eadem repetis, et quasi superioris tuae defensionis oblitus, rursum admones, ut sciamus te per triginta annos Graecis voluminibus devoratis, Latina nescire: paulisper attende, me non pauca in te verba reprehendere, alioquin omnis tibi Scriptura delenda est; sed voluisse ostendere discipulis tuis, quos magno studio nihil scire docuisti, ut intelligerent, cujus verecundiae sit, docere quod nescias, scribere quod ignores, et eamdem magistri sapientiam etiam in sensibus quaerent.

25. Concerning the false epistle to the Africans. Rufinus had emended the Latin from the Greek.---Where does an audacity once unbridled not break forth? He objected an alien crime to himself, that we may seem to have feigned it. What was said without a name, he brings back as said against himself, and purging external sins, is only secure concerning his own innocence. For he swears that he did not write the epistle to the Africans under my name, in which I should confess myself induced by the Jews, to have translated lies; and he sends books containing all those same things, which he swears he did not know. And I marvel how his prudence convened with the wickedness of another, that what another lied in Africa, this one concordantly should speak as true, and unskillful I know not who, could imitate the elegance of his stylus. To you alone it is licit to translate the poisons of heretics; and from the cup of Babylon, to propinate to all nations. You will emend the Latin Scriptures from the Greek; and you will deliver another thing to the Churches to be read, than what they once received from the Apostles; to me it will not be licit after the edition of the Septuagint, which most diligently emended, I gave to the men of my tongue many years ago, for confuting the Jews, even to turn those very exemplars, which they themselves confess to be the truest, so that if ever there is a disputation with them by the Christians, they may not have diverticles of subterfuge, but may be struck most especially by their own sword? I remember that I wrote more fully upon this both in many other places, and in the end of the second book, where I answered your accusation; and your popularity, by which you strive to concitate envy against me among the simple and unskillful, I compesced by perspicuous reason, and I think the reader should be transmitted thither.

26. Called martyr and Apostle by his own. ---This untouched I will not suffer to be passed over, lest you grieve that the falsifier of your schedulae possesses the glory of a confessor with me, since you, guilty of the same crime, after the Alexandrian exile and dark prisons, are nominated by all the sectators of Origen a martyr and an apostle. Concerning the excusation of your unskillfulness, I have already answered you. But because you repeat the same things, and as if oblivious of your former defense, again admonish, that we may know that you, thirty years having devoured Greek volumes, do not know Latin: attend for a little while, that I do not reprehend a few words in you, otherwise all Scripture must be deleted by you; but that I wished to show to your disciples, whom you taught with great study to know nothing, that they might understand, of what bashfulness it is, to teach what you know not, to write what you ignore, and that they might seek the same wisdom of the master also in the senses.

Quodque addis, «peccata putere, non verba, mendacium, calumniam, detractionem, falsum testimonium, et universa convicia, et Os quod mentitur occidit animam (Sap. I, 11),» monesque «ne ille fetor nares meas penetret,» crederem dicenti, nisi facta contraria deprehenderem, quasi si fullo et coriarius moneant pigmentarium, ut naribus obturatis, tabernas suas praetereat. Faciam ergo, quod praecipis, claudam nares meas, ne veritatis et benedictionum tuarum suavissimo odore crucientur.

27. In uno homine diversa laudamus et accusamus. ---In laude et detractione mea, quia varius exstitisti, miro acumine argumentatus es, sic tibi licere de me, 556 et bene et male dicere, quomodo et mihi licuerit Origenem et Didymum reprehendere, quos ante laudaverim. Audi ergo, vir sapientissime, et Romanae dialecticae caput, non esse vitii hominem unum laudare in aliis, et in aliis accusare; sed eandem rem probare et improbare. Ponam exemplum; ut quod non intelligis, prudens mecum lector intelligat. In Tertulliano laudamus ingenium, sed damnamus haeresim. In Origene miramur scientiam Scripturarum, et tamen dogmatum non recipimus falsitatem. In Didymo vero et memoriam praedicamus, et super Trinitate fidei puritatem; sed in caeteris quae Origeni male credidit, nos ab eo retrahimus. Magistrorum enim non vitia imitanda sunt, sed virtutes. Grammaticum quidam Afrum habuit Romae virum eruditissimum; et in eo se aemulum praeceptoris putabat, si stridorem linguae ejus et vitia tantum oris exprimeret. In Praefatiuncula *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* fratrem me nominas, et collegam dicis eloquentissimum, fidei meae praedicas veritatem. His tribus detrahare non poteris; caetera carpe ut libet, ne videaris tuo de me testimonio repugnare. Cum fratrem et collegam dicis, amicitia tua dignum fateris. Cum eloquentem praedicas, imperitiae ultra non arguis. Cum catholicum in omnibus profiteris, haereseos non poteris mihi crimen impingere. Extra haec tria si quid in me reprehenderis, non tibi videberis esse contrarius. Ex qua supputatione illa summa nascitur, et te errare ea in me reprehendentem, quae prius laudaveras; et me non esse in vitio, si in eisdem hominibus et laudanda praedicem, et vituperanda reprehendam.

And what you add, "sins putrefy, not words, a lie, calumny, detraction, false testimony, and all reproaches, and The mouth that lies slays the soul (Wis. 1:11)," and admonish "lest that stench should penetrate my nostrils," I would believe the one saying this, if I did not deprehend contrary deeds, as if a fuller and a currier should admonish a pigment-seller, that with stopped nostrils, he should pass by their taverns. I will do therefore, what you command, I will close my nostrils, lest they should be cruciated by the most sweet odor of your truth and benedictions.

27. In one man we praise and accuse diverse things. ---In praise and detraction of me, because you have stood out various, you have argumentated with wonderful acumen, that it is so licit for you to speak well and ill concerning me, just as it was also licit for me to reprehend Origen and Didymus, whom I had before praised. Hear therefore, most wise man, and head of Roman dialectic, that it is not of vice to praise one man in some things, and accuse him in others; but to prove and reprove the same thing. I will put an example; so that what you do not understand, a prudent reader may understand with me. In Tertullian we praise the genius, but we condemn the heresy. In Origen we marvel at his knowledge of the Scriptures, and yet we do not receive the falsity of his dogmas. In Didymus truly we preach both his memory, and his purity of faith concerning the Trinity; but in the rest which he evilly believed with Origen, we draw ourselves back from him. For not the vices of the masters are to be imitated, but their virtues. A certain very erudite man had an African grammarian at Rome; and in that he thought himself a rival of the preceptor, if he expressed only the stridor of his tongue and the vices of his mouth. In the little Preface On First Principles you name me a brother, and call me a most eloquent colleague, you preach the truth of my faith. From these three things you will not be able to detract; carp at the rest as it libet you, lest you seem to repugn your own testimony concerning me. When you call me a brother and colleague, you confess me worthy of your friendship. When you preach me eloquent, you argue me no further of unskillfulness. When you profess me a catholic in all things, you will not be able to impinge upon me the crime of heresy. Outside these three things if you reprehend anything in me, you will not seem to be contrary to yourself. From which supputation that sum is born, both that you err reprehending those things in me, which you had before praised; and that I am not in vice, if in the same men I both preach things to be praised, and reprehend things to be vituperated.

28. De animarum quaestione. Liber Didymi ad Rufinum, et Explanatio Osee ad Hieronymum.---Transis ad animarum statum, et prolixius fumos meos increpas; atque ut tibi liceat ignorare, quod consulto te scire dissimulas, quaeris a me primum de coelestibus, quomodo Angeli, quomodo Archangeli sint? quae eis, vel qualis habitatio? quaeve inter ipsos differentia, aut si nulla omnino? quae solis sit ratio; unde augmenta lunae, unde defectus; quis vel qualis sit siderum cursus? Miror quomodo oblitus sis illos versiculos ponere: Unde tremor terris, qua vi maria alta tumescant, Obicibus ruptis, rursusque in seipsa residunt:

Defectus Solis varios, Lunaeque labores;

557 Unde hominum genus, et pecudum: unde imber et ignes,

Arcturum, pluviasque hyadas, geminosque Triones.

Quid tantum Oceano properent se tingere soles

Hiberni, vel quae tardis mora noctibus obstet. (Virgil., Georg. II, 473; Aeneid. I, 746.) Deinde coelestia deserens, et ad terrena descendens, in minoribus philosopharis. Interrogas enim me: «Dic nobis quae fontium ratio? quae ventorum? Quid grando? quid pluviae? quid mare salsum? quid flumina dulcia? quid nubes, aut imbres, fulgura, aut tonitrua, aut fulmina?» Ut postquam me haec nescire respondero, tuto tibi liceat de animabus ignorare; et unius rei scientiam, tantarum rerum ignorance compenses. Tu qui per singulas paginas, fumos meos ventilas, non intelligis videre nos caligines tuas et turbines? Nam ut tibi sciolum esse videaris, et apud Calpurnianos discipulos doctrinae gloriam teneas, totam mihi Physicam opponis ut frustra Socrates ad ethicam transiens dixerit: Quae supra nos, nihil ad nos. Ergo nisi tibi rationem reddidero: quare formica parvum animal, et punctum, ut ita dicam, corporis, sex pedes habeat, cum elephantis tanta moles quatuor pedibus incedat: cur serpentes et colubri ventre labantur et pectore: cur vermiculus quem vulgus millepedam vocat, tanto pedum agmine scateat, de animarum statu scire non potero? Quaeris a me quid ipse de animabus sentiam, ut cum professus [Al. processus] fuero, statim invadas. Et si dixerò illud Ecclesiasticum, Quotidie Deus operatur animas, et in corpore eas mittit nascentium, illico magistri tendiculas proferas: et ubi est iustitia Dei, ut de adulterio incestuque nascentibus animas largiatur? Ergo cooperator est malorum hominum, et adulteris seminantibus corpora, ipse fabricatur animas? quasi vitium sementis in tritico sit quod furto dicitur esse sublatum, et non in eo qui frumenta furatus est; idcircoque terra non debeat gremio suo semina confovere, quia sator immunda ea projecit manu.

28. Concerning the question of souls. The book of Didymus to Rufinus, and the Explanation of Hosea to Jerome.---You pass over to the state of souls, and more prolixly you increpate my smokes; and that it may be licit for you to ignore, what by counsel you dissimulate to know, you ask me first concerning heavenly things, how Angels, how Archangels are? what or what kind of habitation is for them? or what difference among themselves, or if none at all? what is the reason of the sun; whence the augments of the moon, whence the defects; what or what kind is the course of the stars? I marvel how you forgot to put those little verses: Whence the tremor on the earths, by what force the deep seas swell,
 The barriers being broken, and again sink back into themselves:
 The various defects of the Sun, and the labors of the Moon;
 Whence the race of men, and of cattle: whence rain and fires,
 Arcturus, and the rainy Hyades, and the twin Triones.
 Why the winter suns hasten so much to tinge themselves in the Ocean,
 Or what delay obstructs the slow nights. (Virgil., Georg. 2:473; Aeneid. 1:746.) Then deserting heavenly things, and descending to earthly things, you philosophize in smaller things. For you interrogate me: "Tell us what is the reason of the fountains? what of the winds? What is hail? what rains? what the salt sea? what sweet rivers? what the clouds, or showers, lightnings, or thunders, or thunderbolts?" So that after I shall have answered that I know not these things, it may be tuto licit for you to ignore concerning souls; and you may compensate the knowledge of one thing, by the ignorance of so great things. You who through singular pages, ventilate my smokes, do you not understand that we see your caligines and whirlwinds? For that you may seem to yourself to be a little knower, and among Calpurnian disciples hold the glory of doctrine, you oppose all Physics to me so that in vain Socrates passing to ethics should have said: The things above us, are nothing to us. Therefore unless I shall have rendered a reason to you: why the ant, a small animal, and a point, so to speak, of body, has six feet, when the elephant of so great a bulk walks with four feet: why serpents and colubers slide on their belly and breast: why the little worm which the vulgar calls the millepede, scates with so great a line of feet, I will not be able to know concerning the state of souls? You ask of me what I myself think concerning souls, so that when I shall have professed, you may immediately invade. And if I shall say that Ecclesiastic thing, Daily God operates souls, and sends them into the body of those being born, forthwith you may bring forth the tendicles of the master: and where is the justice of God, that he should bestow souls to those being born of adultery and incest? Therefore is he a cooperator of evil men, and adulterers sowing bodies, does he fabricate souls? as if the vice of the sowing in the wheat is that it is said to be taken away by theft, and not in him who stole the corn; and therefore the earth ought not to cherish the seeds in her bosom, because the sower threw them with an unclean hand.

Hinc est et illa tua arcana interrogatio, 558 quare moriantur infantes; cum propter peccata, corpora acceperint. Exstat liber Didymi ad te, quo sciscitanti tibi respondit, non eos multa peccasse, et ideo corporum carceres tantum eis tetigisse sufficere. Magister meus et tuus eo tempore, quo tu ab eo ista quaerebas, tres explanationum in Osee prophetam libros ad me, me rogante, dictavit. Ex quo apparet, quid me, quid te docuerit.

29. Naturales quaestiones.---Urges ut respondeam de natura rerum. Si esset locus, possem tibi vel Lucretii opiniones juxta Epicurum, vel Aristotelis juxta Peripateticos, vel Platonis atque Zenonis secundum Academicos et Stoicos dicere. Et ut ad Ecclesiam transeam, ubi norma est veritatis, multa et Genesis et Prophetarum libri ac Ecclesiastes nobis de hujusce modi quaestionibus suggerunt. Aut si haec ignoramus, quomodo de animarum statu, debueras in Apologia tua omnium rerum ignorantiam confiteri, et a calumniatoribus quaerere, cur a te unum impudenter expeterent, cum ipsi tanta nescirent? O triremem locupletissimam, quae Orientalibus et Aegyptiis mercibus Romanae urbis ditare venerat paupertatem! Tu Maximus ille es, Unus, qui nobis scribendo restituis rem. Ergo nisi de oriente venisses, eruditissimus vir haereret adhuc inter mathematicos, et omnes [Al. homines] christiani quid contra fatum dicerent [Al. dissererent], ignorarent. Merito a me quaeris de astrologia, et coeli ac siderum cursu, qui tantarum mercium plenam navem detulisti. Fateor paupertatem, non sum ita ut tu in oriente ditatus. Te multo tempore Pharus docuit, quod Roma nescivit [Al. nesciret]; instruxit Aegyptus, quod Italia hucusque non habuit.

30. Sententiae variae de anima.---Scribis apud Ecclesiasticos tractatores, tres de animabus esse sententias. Unam, quam sequitur Origenes. Alteram, quam Tertullianus et Lactantius (licet de Lactantio apertissime mentiaris); tertiam, quam nos simplices et fatui homines, qui non intelligimus, quod si ita sit, injustus a nobis arguatur Deus. Et post haec juras te nescire quid sit verum. Dic, oro te: putasne, extra haec 559 tria esse aliquid in quo veritas sit? et in tribus istis mendacium? An de tribus unum esse quod verum sit? Si est aliquid, cur disputantium libertatem angusto fine concludis; et cum mendacia protuleris, de veritate taces? Sin autem e tribus unum verum est, et reliqua duo falsa sunt: cur simili ignorantia ignoras falsa cum veris? An idcirco verum dissimulas, ut tibi tutum sit, cum volueris, falsa defendere? Hi sunt fumi, hae caligines, quibus ex oculis hominum conaris lumen auferre.

Hence is also that your arcane interrogation, why infants die; when on account of sins, they have received bodies. The book of Didymus to you is extant, in which he answers you inquiring, that they did not sin much, and therefore it sufficed for them only to have touched the prisons of bodies. My master and yours, in that time, in which you asked those things of him, dictated three books of explanations on the prophet Hosea to me, at my asking. From which it appears, what he taught me, what you.

29. Natural questions.---You urge that I answer concerning the nature of things. If there were a place, I could tell you either the opinions of Lucretius according to Epicurus, or of Aristotle according to the Peripatetics, or of Plato and Zeno according to the Academics and Stoics. And that I may pass to the Church, where the norm of truth is, many books both of Genesis and of the Prophets and Ecclesiastes suggest to us concerning questions of this kind. Or if we are ignorant of these things, how concerning the state of souls, you ought to have confessed ignorance of all things in your Apology, and asked your calumniators, why they impudently sought one thing from you, when they themselves knew not so great things? O most rich trireme, which had come to enrich the poverty of the Roman city with Oriental and Egyptian merchandises! You are that great Maximus,

One man, who by writing restores the state to us. Therefore unless you had come from the east, the most erudite man would still stick among the mathematicians, and all Christian men would be ignorant of what they should say against fate. Meritedly do you ask me concerning astrology, and the course of the heaven and the stars, who brought down a ship full of so great merchandises. I confess poverty, I am not enriched in the east as you are. For much time the Pharos taught you, what Rome knew not; Egypt instructed you, what Italy hitherto had not.

30. Various sentences concerning the soul.---You write that among Ecclesiastical tractators, there are three sentences concerning souls. One, which Origen follows. Another, which Tertullian and Lactantius (although concerning Lactantius you most openly lie); the third, which we simple and fatuous men, who do not understand, that if it be so, God is argued to be unjust by us. And after these things you swear that you know not what is true. Tell me, I pray you: do you think, that outside these three there is something in which truth is? and in these three a lie? Or of the three is there one which is true? If there is something, why do you conclude the liberty of the disputants in a narrow limit; and when you have brought forth lies, are silent concerning the truth? But if one of the three is true, and the remaining two are false: why by a like ignorance do you ignore the false with the true? Or do you therefore dissimulate the true, that it may be safe for you, when you will, to defend the false? These are the smokes, these the caligines, by which you try to take away the light from the eyes of men.

Aristippus nostri temporis, qui plenam cunctarum mercium navem Romano invehis portui, et sella publice posita, Hermagoram nobis, et Gorgiam exhibes Leontinum; dum navigare festinas, unius quaestiunculae mercimonium in oriente oblitus es. Et iterum clamitas, et Aquileiae atque Alexandriae te didicisse jactas, quod sit Deus et animarum et corporum creator. De hoc scilicet quaestio ventilatur, utrum Deus, an diabolus animas fecerit; et non utrum animae ante corpora fuerint, quod vult Origenes, et egerint aliquid, propter quod sint crassis corporibus alligatae: an in morem glirium torpentes consopitaeque dormierint. Haec taces, quae omnes flagitant: et ad illa respondes, quae nullus inquit.

31. Fumos quoque meos frequenter irrides, eo quod similem me scire quod nesciam, et enumeratione doctorum, rude vulgus illudam [Al. inducam]. Tu videlicet flammeus, immo fulmineus, qui in loquendo fulminas, et flammam ore conceptas tenere non potes, atque ut ille Bar-Chochabas, auctor seditionis Judaicae, stipulam in ore succensam anhelitu ventilabat, ut flammam evomere putaretur: ita et tu nobis, alter Salmoneus, omnia per quae incedis illustras, et nos fumosos arguis, de quibus forte dicatur, Qui tangis montes, et fumigant: nec intelligis quid fumus in Propheta significet 560 locustarum; et quod pulchritudo oculorum tuorum, amaritudinem fumi nostri ferre non potest.

32. De sacramento in somnio. ---De crimine autem perjurii, quia me remittis ad codicem tuum, et ex magna parte in aliis libris, tibi, Calpurnioque respondi, nunc breviter dixisse sufficiat, te exigere a dormiente quod numquam vigilans praestitisti. Magni criminis reus sum, si puellis et virginibus Christi, dixi saeculares libros non legendos, et me in somnis commonitum promisisse ne legerem. Tua navis Romanae urbi revelatione promissa, aliud pollicetur, et aliud efficit. Mathematicorum venerat solvere quaestiones, et solvit fidem Christianorum. Quae per Ionium et Aegeum, Adriaticum atque Tyrrhenum [Al. additur mare] plenis cucurrerat velis, in Romano portu naufragium fecit. Nonne te pudet istiusmodi deliramenta conquirere, et mihi similia objiciendi imponere necessitatem? Esto, alius de te somnium viderat gloriosum; verecundiae tuae fuerat et prudentiae dissimulare quod audieras, et non, quasi magno testimonio, alterius somnio gloriari. Vide quid inter tuum et meum intersit somnium. Ego me humiliter reprehensum refero, tu jactanter laudatum te esse congeminas. Nec dicere potes, Nihil mea refert quid alius viderit, cum in luculentissimis libris tuis, hac te ad interpretandum dicas ratione commotum, ne vir illustris de te somnium perderet. Hic est omnis conatus tuus; si me perjurium docueris, tu haereticus non eris.

O Aristippus of our time, who bring in a ship full of all merchandises to the Roman port, and a chair being publicly placed, exhibit Hermagoras to us, and Gorgias of Leontini; while you hasten to sail, you forgot the merchandise of one little question in the east. And again you clamor, and jactate that you learned at Aquileia and Alexandria, that God is the creator both of souls and of bodies. Concerning this, forsooth, the question is ventilated, whether God, or the devil made souls; and not whether souls were before bodies, which Origen wishes, and did something, on account of which they are bound to crass bodies: or in the manner of dormice they slept torpid and consopitate. You are silent concerning these things, which all flagitate: and you answer to those things, which no one inquires.

31. You also frequently irride my smokes, because I simulate that I know what I know not, and by an enumeration of teachers, I illude the rude vulgar. You forsooth flaming, nay rather fulmineous, who in speaking fulminate, and cannot hold the flames conceived in your mouth, and as that Bar-Cochba, the author of the Judaic sedition, ventilated with his panting breath a burning straw in his mouth, so that he was thought to vomit flames: so also you, another Salmoneus, illustrate to us all things through which you walk, and argue us smoky, of whom perchance it may be said, Who touches the mountains, and they smoke: nor do you understand what smoke signifies in the Prophet of locusts; and that the beauty of your eyes, cannot bear the bitterness of our smoke.

32. Concerning the sacrament in a dream. ---But concerning the crime of perjury, because you remit me to your codex, and in great part in other books I have answered you and Calpurnius, let it suffice now briefly to have said, that you exact from a sleeping man what you never performed waking. I am guilty of a great crime, if I told girls and virgins of Christ, that secular books are not to be read, and being commonished in sleep I promised not to read them. Your ship promised to the Roman city by revelation, promises one thing, and effects another. It had come to solve the questions of the mathematicians, and it solved the faith of Christians. She which had run through the Ionian and Aegean, the Adriatic and Tyrrhenian seas with full sails, made shipwreck in the Roman port. Are you not ashamed to conquire deliraments of this kind, and to impose on me the necessity of objecting similar things? Be it so, another had seen a glorious dream concerning you; it had been of your bashfulness and prudence to dissimulate what you had heard, and not to glory in the dream of another, as if by a great testimony. See what is between your dream and mine. I humbly relate that I was reprehended, you boastingly congeminate that you were praised. Nor can you say, It matters nothing to me what another saw, when in your most luculent books, you say you were commoved to interpreting by this reason, lest an illustrious man should lose his dream concerning you. This is your whole conatus; if you shall have taught me perjury, you will not be a heretic.

33. De infidelitate calumnia. ---Venio ad gravissimum crimen, in quo post reconciliatas amicitias, me infidelitatis accusas. Fateor, inter cuncta maledicta, quae vel objicis, vel minaris, nihil a me ita repellendum est, quam fraus, dolus, infidelitas. Peccare enim hominis est: insidias tendere, diaboli. Ergo ideo in Anastasi immolato agno dexteram junximus, ut 561 tuas Romae schedulas furaremur? Ut immissi canes inemendatas chartulas, te dormiente, corroderent? Et hoc credibile est, ante nos accusatores parasse, quam tu crimen admitteres? Scilicet noveramus quid in animo volveres? quid alius de te somniatus esset? Ut impleretur in te graecum proverbium, et [Al. ut] sus doceret Minervam. Si Eusebium ego ad latrandum miseram, quis Aterbii [Mss. Atarvii et Atarbii] contra te et caeterorum rabiem concitavit? Nonne ille est, qui et me haereticum ex tuis amicitiiis judicabat? Cui cum satis fecissem damnatione dogmatum Origenis, tu clausus domi, nunquam eum videre ausus es, ne aut damnares quod nolebas, aut aperte resistens, haereseos invidiam sustineres. An idcirco testis contra te esse non poterit, quia accusator tui est? Antequam sanctus Epiphanius venisset Hierosolimam, et ore quidem et osculo tibi pacem daret, mala autem et dolos in suo corde servaret; antequam nos ei suggillationem tui epistolas dictaremus, ut haereticum scriberet, quem oculis orthodoxum comprobavit, Aterbii [Al. Atervius] contra te latrabat Hierosolymis; et nisi cito abiisset, sensisset baculum non litterarum, sed dexterae tuae, quo tu canes abigere consuevisti.

34. De schedulis non emendatis. ---«Cur, inquit, falsatas meas schedulas suscepisti? Quare post interpretationem meam, ausus es in libris *περὶ Ἀρχῶν* stylum figere? num si erraveram ut homo, debuisti me privatis litteris convenire, et sic mihi blandiri, quomodo et ego tibi nunc in epistolis meis blandior?» Haec tota mea culpa est, quare subdolis laudibus accusatus, purgare me volui, et hoc sine invidia nominis tui: ut quod tu solus accusaveras, ad multos referrem, non tibi haeresim objiciens, sed a me repellens. Numquid scivi quod irascereris, si contra haereticos scriberem? Dixeras te de Origenis libris haeretica sustulisse: fautorem te haeticorum jam non esse credebam, et ideo non in te, sed in haereticos invectus sum; in quo si vehementior fui, ignosce mihi. Putavi, quod et tibi placerem. Furto et insidiis ministrorum meorum dicis schedulas tuas in publicum prolatas fuisse, quae latebant in cubiculo tuo, vel apud eum solum erant, qui rem sibi geri injunxerat. Et quomodo supra confiteris, quod aut nullus eas habuerit, aut admodum pauci? Si in cubiculo tuo latebant, qua ratione apud eum erant, qui sibi rem geri injunxerat?

33. Calumny concerning infidelity. ---I come to the most heavy crime, in which after reconciled friendships, you accuse me of infidelity. I confess, among all the maledictions, which you either object, or comminate, nothing is so to be repelled by me, as fraud, guile, and infidelity. For to sin is of a man: to lay snares, of the devil. Therefore did we join right hands on the immolated lamb in the Anastasis, that we might steal your schedulae at Rome? That the immitted dogs might gnaw the unemended chartules, while you slept? And is this credible, that we prepared accusers before you admitted the crime? Forsooth we knew what you revolved in mind? what another had dreamed concerning you? That the Greek proverb might be fulfilled in you, and the sow might teach Minerva. If I had sent Eusebius to bark, who concitated the rabies of Aterbius against you and the rest? Is not he the one, who judged me also a heretic from your friendships? To whom when I had done enough by the damnation of the dogmas of Origen, you shut up at home, never dared to see him, lest either you should condemn what you were unwilling to, or openly resisting, should sustain the envy of heresy. Or will he therefore not be able to be a witness against you, because he is your accuser? Before holy Epiphanius had come to Jerusalem, and with mouth indeed and kiss gave you peace, but preserved evil and guiles in his heart; before we dictated to him epistles of your suggillation, that he might write him a heretic, whom by kisses he comproved orthodox, Aterbius barked against you at Jerusalem; and unless he had quickly departed, he would have felt the staff not of letters, but of your right hand, with which you are accustomed to drive away dogs.

34. Concerning the unemended papers (*schedulae*). ---"Why," he says, "did you receive my falsified papers? Why, after my interpretation, did you dare to fix your style in the books *Peri Archon* (*Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*)? if I had erred as a man, ought you not to have convened me by private letters, and thus blandished me, as I now blandish you in my epistles?" This is my whole fault, that being accused by guileful praises, I wished to purge myself, and this without envy of your name: so that what you alone had accused, I might refer to many, not objecting heresy to you, but repelling it from myself. Did I know that you would be irate, if I wrote against heretics? You had said that you had taken away heretical things from the books of Origen: I believed that you were no longer a favorer of heretics, and therefore I inveighed not against you, but against the heretics; in which if I was too vehement, forgive me. I thought that I should also please you. You say that by the theft and snares of my ministers your papers were brought forth into public, which were lurking in your chamber, or were only with him who had enjoined the matter to be done for himself. And how do you confess above, that either no one had them, or very few? If they were lurking in your chamber, by what reason were they with him who had enjoined the matter to be done?

Sin autem unus cui scriptae fuerant occultandas suscepit, ergo non latebant tantum in cubiculo tuo, nec habuerunt eas pauci, quos habuisse testatus es. Furto sublatis arguis: et rursum emptas grandi pecunia et infinitis mercibus criminaris. In una re, et in parva epistola quanta varietas et dissonantia mentiendi! Tibi licet accusare, mihi defendere non licebit? Quando criminaris, amicum non cogitas. Quando respondeo, tunc tibi jus amicitiae in mentem venit. Dic, oro te, celandas schedulas scripseras, an prodendas? si ut celares, cur scripsisti? si ut proderes, cur celabas?

35. Cavit suspicionem hypocriseos. ---Sed in eo reprehendendus sum: quare accusatores tuos amicos meos non coercuerim. Vis tibi proferam litteras eorum, in quibus me hypocriseos arguunt, quod te sciens haereticum, tacuerim; quod dum pacem incautus praebeo, intestina Ecclesiae bella suscepit? Tu discipulos vocas, qui me tuum condiscipulum suspicantur. Et quia parcius fui in refellendis laudibus tuis, putant me tuum esse symmysten. Hoc mihi praestitit prologus tuus, ut plus me amicus laederes quam inimicus. Semel sibi persuaserant (recte an perperam ipsi viderint) te esse haereticum. Si defendere voluero, hoc solum proficiam, ut me tecum pariter accusent. Denique mihi obijciunt laudationem tuam, et te non putant insidiosae scripsisse, sed vere: et quod tu in me semper ante laudabas, vehementer insimulant. Quid me vis facere? ut discipulos accusatores pro te habeam; ut contorta in amicum jacula, meo suscipiam pectore?

36. De libris autem περὶ Ἀρχῶν debes mihi et gratias agere. Tu enim, ut dicis, noxia quaeque detruncans, meliora posuisti. Ego ita ut habebantur in Graeco, expressi. Ex quo et tua apparet fides; et ejus quem interpretatus es, haeresis. Scribebatur mihi de Urbe a viris (Pammachio et Oceano) in Christo praecipuis: Responde criminanti; ne si tacueris, consensisse videaris. Consona omnes voce poscebant, ut Origenis versutias proderem, ut [Al. et] venena haereticorum Romanis auribus cavenda monstrarem. Quid hoc ad injuriam tuam pertinet?

But if the one to whom they had been written received them to be concealed, therefore they were not lurking only in your chamber, nor did few have them, whom you testified to have had them. You argue that they were taken away by theft: and again you criminate that they were bought with a great sum of money and infinite wares. In one thing, and in a small epistle, what variety and dissonance of lying! It is lawful for you to accuse; shall it not be lawful for me to defend? When you criminate, you do not think of a friend. When I respond, then the right of friendship comes into your mind. Tell me, I pray you, had you written the papers to be concealed, or to be betrayed? If that you might conceal them, why did you write? if that you might betray them, why did you conceal them?

35. He avoided the suspicion of hypocrisy. ---But in this I am to be reprehended: why I did not coerce your accusers, my friends. Do you wish me to proffer their letters, in which they argue me of hypocrisy (*hypocriseos*), because knowing you to be a heretic, I kept silence; because while I incautiously grant peace, the Church has undertaken intestine wars? You call them disciples, who suspect me of being your fellow-disciple. And because I was more sparing in refuting your praises, they think me to be your fellow-initiate (*symmysten*). Your prologue has afforded this to me, that as a friend you should hurt me more than an enemy. Once they had persuaded themselves (whether rightly or wrongly, let them see to it) that you were a heretic. If I shall wish to defend you, I shall only profit this, that they may accuse me together with you. Finally they object to me your laudation, and do not think that you wrote insidiously, but truly: and what you always praised in me before, they vehemently insinuate. What do you wish me to do? that I should have the disciples as accusers for you; that I should receive in my breast the darts contorted against a friend?

36. Concerning the books *Peri Archon* (*Περὶ Ἀρχῶν*), however, you ought even to give me thanks. For you, as you say, detruncating whatever was noxious, placed better things. I expressed them as they were held in the Greek. From which both your faith appears, and the heresy of him whom you have interpreted. It was written to me from the City by men (Pammachius and Oceanus) chief in Christ: Respond to the criminating one; lest if you keep silence, you seem to have consented. All with consonant voice demanded, that I should betray the versutiae of Origen, that I should show the poisons of the heretics to be avoided by Roman ears. What does this pertain to your injury?

Num solus interpretatus es istos libros, et alios hujus operis non habes participes? Numquid et tu de Septuaginta interpretibus es, ut post editionem tuam aliis transferre non liceat? Ecce et ego multos, ut dicis, libellos de Graeco in Latinum transtuli: habes potestatem et tu rursus eos vertendi, ut volueris; et bona enim et mala suo imputantur auctori. Quod et in te fieret, nisi dixisses te amputasse haeretica et optima transtulisse. Hic est enim nodus tuus, qui solvi non potest. At [Al. Aut] si errasti ut homo, priorem damna sententiam.

37. Latinos libros vertebat in Graecum Rufinus. ---Sed quid facies de Apologetico tuo, quem pro Origenis scripsisti operibus? Quid de volumine Eusebii? in quo quum multa mutaveris, et, sub nomine martyris, haeretici hominis scripta transtuleris: tamen plura posuisti, quae Ecclesiasticae fidei non conveniunt. Tu etiam Latinos libros in Graecum vertis, nobis dare nostris externa prohibebis? Si in alio opere respondissem, in quo me non laeseras, videri poteram in injuriam tuam transferre quod verteras: ut te vel imperitum, vel subdolum demonstrarem. Nunc vero novum querimoniae genus: doles tibi in eo esse responsum, in quo a te accusatus sum. Dicebatur ad interpretationem tuam Roma subversa, postulabant omnes a me hujus rei remedium. Non quo ego alicujus momenti essem; sed qui petebant, me esse aliquid arbitrabantur. Tu amicus eras, qui illa transtuleras; quid me vis facere? Obedire Deo magis oportet, an hominibus (Act. V, 29)? Domini custodire substantiam, an furtum celare conservi? Aliter te non placabo, nisi et ego tecum accusanda commiserō? Si nullam fecisses mei nominis mentionem: si me non ornasses egregiis laudibus, poteram aliquod habere suffugium, et diversa obtendere, ne rursus interpretata transferrem. Tu me, amice, compulisti, ut aliquot dies in hoc opere perderem, ut proferrem in medium quod Charybdis debuit devorare: et tamen laesus, amicitiae in te jura servavi, et quantum in me fuit, sic me defendi, ut te non accusarem. Tu nimium suspiciosus et querulus, qui dicta in haeticos ad tuam refers contumeliam. Quod si aliter amicus tuus esse non possum, nisi et haeticorum amicus fuero; levius tuas inimicitias, quam illorum amicitias sustinebo.

Did you alone interpret those books, and have no participants in other works of this kind? Are you also of the Seventy Interpreters (*Septuaginta*), so that after your edition it is not lawful for others to transfer? Behold, I also have translated many little books, as you say, from Greek into Latin: you also have the power of turning them again as you shall wish; for both good and evil things are imputed to their author. Which would also be done in you, unless you had said that you had amputated the heretical parts and translated the best. For this is your knot, which cannot be solved. But if you have erred as a man, damn your prior sentence.

37. Rufinus was turning Latin books into Greek. ---But what will you do concerning your Apology (*Apologetico*), which you wrote for the works of Origen? What concerning the volume of Eusebius? in which since you changed many things, and, under the name of a martyr, translated the writings of a heretical man: yet you placed many more things which do not agree with the Ecclesiastical faith. You also turn Latin books into Greek; will you prohibit us from giving external things to our own? If I had responded in another work, in which you had not hurt me, I could seem to transfer what you had turned to your injury: that I might demonstrate you either unskilful or guileful. Now truly there is a new kind of complaint: you grieve that you were responded to in that in which I was accused by you. It was said that at your interpretation Rome was subverted; all demanded from me a remedy for this thing. Not that I was of any moment; but they who sought, thought me to be something. You were the friend who had translated those things; what do you wish me to do? Ought we to obey God rather than men (Acts v, 29)? To keep the substance of the Lord, or to conceal the theft of a fellow-servant? Shall I not otherwise placate you, unless I also commit with you things to be accused? If you had made no mention of my name: if you had not adorned me with egregious praises, I could have had some refuge, and have pretended diverse things, lest I should again transfer what had been interpreted. You, friend, compelled me, that I should lose some days in this work, that I should bring forth into the medium what Charybdis ought to have devoured: and yet being hurt, I preserved the rights of friendship toward you, and as much as was in me, so I defended myself, that I might not accuse you. You are too suspicious and querulous, who refer things said against heretics to your own contumely. But if I cannot otherwise be your friend, unless I shall also be a friend of heretics; I will sustain your enmities more lightly than their friendships.

38. De epistola ad Rufinum. ---Novum quoque me putas finxisse mendacium, ut epistolam ad te meo nomine componerem, quasi olim scriptam, quo bonus esse videar et modestus; quam tu numquam omnino susceperis. Haec res perfacile probari potest. Multi Romae ejus exemplaria habent, ante hoc circiter triennium, qui tibi eam mittere noluerunt, scientes quae de meo nomine jactitares, et quam indigna proposito Christiano ac nefanda confingeres. Ego scripsi nesciens, quasi ad amicum. Illi non reddiderunt ei, quem inimicum noverant: parcentes et meo errori, et tuae conscientiae. Et simul argumentaris, quod si talem tibi epistolam scripseram, non debueram contra te in alio libello multa mala scribere. Hic est totus error tuus, et haec justa querimonia: quod quae nos in haereticos dicimus, tu in te dicta confingis: et nisi illis pepercimus, te putas esse violatum. An ideo panem tibi non damus, quia haereticorum cerebro lapidem illidimus? Et ut nostram epistolam non probes, papae quoque Anastasii simili dicis fraude subnixam, de qua tibi ante respondi: quam si suspicaris ipsius non esse, habes ubi apud eum nos arguas falsitatis. Sin autem ejus est, ut hujus quoque anni contra te epistolae probant, frustra et falso falsam arguere niteris, cum ex illius vera epistola, nostram veram esse doceamus.

39. Pythagorae discipuli. Pythagorica praecepta et symbola. Quid apud Graecos invenit primus Pythagoras. ---In excusando mendacio tuo [Al. mendacium tuum], quam elegans esse voluisti: et ne sex millia Origenis libros proferas, Pythagorae a me exigis monumenta. Ubi est illa fiducia, qua inflatis buccis creberrime personabas, te quae in aliis libris Origenis legeras, emendasse in libris *περὶ Ἀρχῶν*, et non aliena, sed sua reddidisse suis? De tanta librorum silva unum fruticem ac surculum proferre non potes. Hi sunt veri fumi, hae nebulae, quas dum in me criminaris, in te extinctas dissipatasque per me cognoscis, nec fractam cervicem dejicis, 565 sed majori impudentia, quam imperitia, dicis me denegare, quae in promptu sunt, ut cum montes aureos pollicitus fueris, ne scorteum quidem nummum de thesauris tuis proferas. Justa contra me odia recognosco, et vera in nos debaccharis insania. Nisi enim ego quod non est, audacter exigerem, tu videbaris habere quod non habes. Pythagorae a me libros flagitas. Quis enim tibi dixit illius exstare volumina?

38. Concerning the epistle to Rufinus. --You also think that I have feigned a new lie, that I might compose an epistle to you in my name, as if written long ago, by which I might seem to be good and modest; which you never at all received. This thing can be proved very easily. Many at Rome have copies of it, from about three years ago, who were unwilling to send it to you, knowing what things you boasted concerning my name, and what things unworthy of the Christian purpose and nefarious you feigned. I wrote not knowing, as if to a friend. They did not render it to him, whom they knew to be an enemy: sparing both my error, and your conscience. And at the same time you argument, that if I had written such an epistle to you, I ought not to have written many evil things against you in another little book. This is your whole error, and this is a just complaint: that what things we say against heretics, you feign to be said against yourself: and unless we shall have spared them, you think yourself to be violated. Or do we therefore not give you bread, because we dash a stone against the brain of heretics? And that you may not prove our epistle, you say that it is supported by a similar fraud of Pope Anastasius (*papae Anastasii*), concerning which I responded to you before: which if you suspect not to be his own, you have where you may argue us of falsity before him. But if it is his, as the epistles of this year also against you prove, in vain and falsely you strive to argue a false thing, when from his true epistle we teach that ours is true.

39. Disciples of Pythagoras. Pythagorean precepts and symbols. What Pythagoras first found among the Greeks. --In excusing your lie, how elegant you wished to be: and lest you bring forth six thousand books of Origen, you exact monuments of Pythagoras from me. Where is that confidence, with which with inflated cheeks you most frequently sounded forth, that what you had read in other books of Origen, you had emended in the books *On First Principles*, and had rendered not alien things, but his own to his own? From so great a forest of books you cannot bring forth one shrub and sprig. These are the true smokes, these the mists, which while you criminate against me, you know through me to be extinguished and dissipated against you, nor do you cast down your broken neck, but with greater impudence, than imperitence, you say that I deny things which are in prompt, so that when you have promised golden mountains, you bring forth not even a leathern coin from your treasures. I recognize just hatreds against me, and true insanity bacchizes against us. For unless I boldly exacted what is not, you seemed to have what you have not. You flagitate books of Pythagoras from me. For who told you that volumes of his are extant?

Nonne in epistola mea, quam criminaris, haec verba sunt? «Sed fac me errasse in adolescentia, et philosophorum, id est, Gentilium studiis eruditum, in principio fidei ignorasse dogmata Christiana, et hoc putasse in Apostolis, quod in Pythagora et Platone et Empedocle legeram.» De dogmatibus eorum, non de libris locutus sum, quae potui in Cicerone, Bruto, ac Seneca discere. Lege pro Vatinio oratiunculam, et alias ubi sodalitiolorum mentio fit. Revolve dialogos Tullii. Respice omnem oram Italiae, quae quondam magna Graecia dicebatur: et Pythagoricorum dogmatum incisa publicis litteris aera cognosces. Cujus enim sunt illa χρυσᾶ παραγγέλματα? nonne Pythagorae? in quibus omnia ejus breviter dogmata continentur, et in quae latissimo opere philosophus commentatus est Jamblichus, imitatus ex parte Moderatum virum eloquentissimum, et Archippum ac Lysidem Pythagorae auditores. Quorum Archippus ac Lysides in Graecia, id est, Thebis scholas habuere, qui memoriter tenentes praecepta doctoris, ingenio pro libris utebantur, a quibus illud est: Φυγαδευτέον πάση μηχανῇ, καὶ περικοπτέον πυρὶ καὶ σιδηρῷ καὶ μηχαναῖς παντοίαις, ἀπὸ μὲν σώματος νόσον, ἀπὸ δὲ ψυχῆς ἀμαθίαν, κοιλίας δὲ πολυτέλειαν, πόλεως δὲ στάσιν, οἴκου δὲ διχοφροσύνην, ὁμοῦ δὲ πάντων ἀμετρίαν. Quod in Latinum ita possumus vertere: Fuganda sunt omnibus modis et abscindenda, languor a corpore, imperitia ab animo, luxuria a ventre, a civitate seditio, a domo discordia, et in commune a cunctis rebus intemperantia. 566 Pythagorica et illa praecepta sunt: Amicorum omnia esse communia. Et Amicum seipsum esse alterum: duorumque temporum maxime habendam curam, mane et vesperi, id est, eorum quae acturi sumus, et eorum quae gesserimus. Post Deum veritatem colendam, quae sola homines Deo proximos faciat. Illaque aenigmata, quae diligentissime Aristoteles in suis libris prosequitur: Stateram ne transilias, id est, ne praetergrediare justitiam. Ignem gladio ne fodias. Iratum videlicet et tumidum animum verbis maledicis ne lacessas. Coronam minime carpendam, id est, leges urbium conservandas. Cor non comedendum, id est, moerorem de animo projiciendum. Cum profectus fueris, inquit, ne redeas; id est, post mortem vitam istam ne desideres. Per viam publicam ne ambules; id est, ne multorum sequaris errores [Al. errorem]. Hirundinem in domum non suscipiendam; id est, garrulos et verbosos homines sub eodem tecto non habendos. Oneratis superponendum onus: deponentibus non communicandum; id est, ad virtutem incedentibus, augmentanda [Al. augenda] praecepta: tradentes se otio, relinquendos. Et quia Pythagorica dogmata legisse me dixeram: audi quid apud Graecos Pythagoras primus invenerit.

Are not these words in my epistle, which you criminate? "But suppose me to have erred in adolescence, and being erudite in the studies of philosophers, that is, of Gentiles, in the beginning of faith to have ignored Christian dogmas, and to have thought this in the Apostles, which I had read in Pythagoras and Plato and Empedocles." I spoke concerning their dogmas, not concerning their books, which I could learn in Cicero, Brutus, and Seneca. Read the little oration for Vatinius, and others where mention of sodalities is made. Revolve the dialogues of Tully. Look back at the whole coast of Italy, which formerly was called Magna Graecia: and you will know the brasses incised with public letters of Pythagorean dogmas. For whose are those golden precepts? are they not of Pythagoras? in which all his dogmas are briefly contained, and on which in a most broad work the philosopher Iamblichus commented, imitating in part Moderatus a most eloquent man, and Archippus and Lysis auditors of Pythagoras. Of whom Archippus and Lysis had schools in Greece, that is, at Thebes, who holding in memory the precepts of their teacher, used their genius instead of books, by whom is that: Languor from the body is to be fled from by all machines, and to be cut around by fire and sword and by machines of all kinds; but imperitence from the soul, luxury from the belly, sedition from the city, discord from the house, and intemperance in common from all things. Which we can thus turn into Latin: Languor from the body is to be fled from by all modes and to be cut off; imperitence from the mind, luxury from the belly, sedition from the city, discord from the house, and intemperance in common from all things. Also those are Pythagorean precepts: That all things of friends are common. And that a friend is himself another: and that the greatest care should be had of two times, morning and evening, that is, of those things which we are about to do, and of those things which we have done. After God truth is to be worshiped, which alone makes men nearest to God. And those enigmas, which Aristotle most diligently prosecutes in his books: You shall not leap over the balance, that is, you shall not transgress justice. You shall not dig the fire with a sword. Evidently you shall not provoke an angry and tumid mind with maledictory words. A crown is by no means to be plucked, that is, the laws of cities to be preserved. The heart is not to be eaten, that is, sorrow is to be cast from the mind. When you have set out, he says, do not return; that is, after death do not desire that life. Do not walk through the public way; that is, do not follow the errors of the many. A swallow is not to be received into the house; that is, garrulous and verbose men are not to be had under the same roof. A burden is to be superimposed on those burdened: not to be communicated to those putting it down; that is, to those proceeding to virtue, precepts are to be augmented: leaving those giving themselves to ease. And because I had said that I had read Pythagorean dogmas: hear what Pythagoras first found among the Greeks.

Immortales esse animas, et de aliis corporibus transire in alia. Quod quidem et Virgilius in sexto Aeneidos volumine sequens loquitur: Has omnes, ubi mille rotam volvere per annos,

Lethaeum ad fluvium Deus evocat agmine magno;

Scilicet immemores supera ut convexa revisant,

Rursus et incipiant in corpora velle reverti.

40. Pythagorae alia dogmata. Origenes in libros suos Platonem transtulit. --- Se primum fuisse Euphorbum, secundo Callidem, tertio Hermotimum, quarto Pyrrhum, ad extremum Pythagoram: et post certos temporum circulos, ea quae fuerant, rursus fieri: nihilque in mundo videri novum. Philosophiam meditationem esse mortis: 567 quotidie de corporis carcere nitentem animae educere libertatem: μαθήσεις ἀναμνήσεις; id est, discentias reminiscencias esse; et multa alia, quae Plato in libris suis, et maxime in Phaedone, Timaeoque prosequitur. Nam post Academiam et innumerabiles discipulos, sentiens multum suae deesse doctrinae, venit ad magnam Graeciam, ibique ab Archyta Tarentino et Timaeo Locrensi, Pythagorae doctrina eruditus, elegantiam et leporem Socratis, cum hujus miscuit disciplinis, quae omnia nomine commutato, Origenes in libros suos περὶ Ἀρχῶν transtulisse convincitur. In quo igitur erravi, si adolescens dixi, me ea putasse in Apostolis, quae in Pythagora et Platone et Empedocle legeram? Non ut tu calumniaris et fingis, in Pythagorae et Platonis et Empedoclis libris, sed quae in illis fuisse legeram, et aliorum me scripta eos habuisse docuerunt. Et hoc genus elocutionis frequentissimum est: ut si dicam, quae in Socrate legi dogmata, putavi vera. Non quod Socrates libros ullos scripserit; sed quae legi apud Platonem et alios Socraticos illum habuisse. Et rursus, imitati volui gesta, quae in Alexandro et Scipione legeram. Non quod ipsa sua gesta descripserint; sed quod apud alios legerim, quae illos gessisse mirabar. Igitur etiam si docere non possem, ipsius Pythagorae exstare monumenta, nec a filio ejus ac filia, aliisque discipulis probata convincerem, me non teneres mendacii, quia non libros, sed dogmata legisse me dixi: et te frustra errare, me tuum protegere mendacium voluisse, ut nisi ego unum librum Pythagorae protulero, tu sex millia Origenis libros perdideris.

That souls are immortal, and pass from other bodies into others. Which indeed Virgil also speaks of following in the sixth volume of the Aeneid: These all, when they have rolled the wheel for a thousand years,
 The God calls forth in a great band to the Lethean river;
 Forsooth that unmindful they may revisit the airy convex,
 And again begin to wish to return into bodies.

40. Other dogmas of Pythagoras. Origen transferred Plato into his books. ---That he was first Euphorbus, second Callides, third Hermotimus, fourth Pyrrhus, at the last Pythagoras: and after certain circles of times, those things which had been, happened again: and that nothing in the world is seen to be new. That philosophy is the meditation of death: daily striving to lead out the liberty of the soul from the prison of the body: **matheses anamneseis** (**μαθήσεις ἀναμνήσεις**); that is, that learnings are recollections (**discentias reminiscantias**); and many other things, which Plato in his books, and especially in the **Phaedo** and **Timaeus**, prosecutes. For after the Academy and innumerable disciples, sensing that much was lacking to his doctrine, he came to Great Greece, and there by Archytas of Tarentum and Timaeus of Locri, being erudite in the doctrine of Pythagoras, he mixed the elegance and grace of Socrates with the disciplines of the latter, all of which things, the name being changed, Origen is convinced to have transferred into his books **Peri Archon** (**Περὶ Ἀρχῶν**). In what therefore did I err, if as a youth I said, that I had thought those things in the Apostles, which I had read in Pythagoras and Plato and Empedocles? Not as you calumniate and feign, in the books of Pythagoras and Plato and Empedocles, but those which I had read were in them, and the writings of others taught me that they had them. And this kind of elocution is most frequent: as if I should say, the dogmas which I read in Socrates, I thought to be true. Not that Socrates wrote any books; but those which I read in Plato and other Socratici, that he had. And again, I wished to imitate the deeds, which I had read in Alexander and Scipio. Not that they described their own deeds; but that I read among others, what I wondered that they had done. Therefore even if I could not teach, that the monuments of Pythagoras himself exist, nor should convince them proved by his son and daughter, and other disciples, you would not hold me of a lie, because I said that I had read not books, but dogmas: and that you err in vain, wishing to protect your lie with mine, so that unless I shall have brought forth one book of Pythagoras, you will have lost six thousand books of Origen.

41. Minabatur Hieronymo interitum Rufinus. ---Veniam ad epilogos, id est, maledicta tua, in quibus me ad poenitentiam cohortaris; et nisi conversus fuero, id est, nisi te accusante siluero, mihi minaris interitum. Et hoc scandalum redundaturum in caput meum denuntias, qui te hominem lenissimum et Mosaicae mansuetudinis, responsione mea ad scriptionis insaniam provocaverim. Scire enim te jactas crimina, 568 quae tibi soli amicissimo sim confessus, et haec in medium prolaturum; meisque me coloribus esse pingendum, et debere meminisse, quod jacuerim ad pedes tuos, ne gladio oris tui amputares caput meum. Et post multa, in quibus furibundus exsultas, revocas te, et dicis optare pacem cum denuntiatione dumtaxat, ut deinceps taceam, id est, ut non scribam contra haereticos, nec audeam respondere accusationi tuae. Si hoc fecero, frater ero et collega, et vir eloquentissimus et amicus ac sodalis, et quod his majus est, omnia quae de Origene transtuli, catholica judicabis. Sin autem mutiero, et me commovero, illico impurus ero et haereticus, et tua indignus necessitudine. Haec sunt praeconia mea, sic me hortaris ad pacem, et ne gemitum quidem ac lacrymas dolori liberas esse concedis.

42. Calumniandi licentiam reprehendit. Fulvia et Herodias. ---Possem et ego tuis te coloribus pingere, et insanire contra insanientem; et dicere quidquid vel scio, vel nescio: et eadem licentia, immo furore et amentia, vel falsa, vel vera congerere, ut et me loqui, et te puderet audire: et objicere tibi, quae aut accusantem damnarent, aut accusatum; ut ex frontis duritia, fidem lectori facerem; ut quod impudenter scriberem, vere scribere judicaret. Sed procul sit a moribus Christianis, ut dum aliorum petunt sanguinem, suum offerant; et sine gladio, voluntate homicidae sint. Tuae hoc bonitati, tuaeque mansuetudini et simplicitati convenit, qui de uno pectoris sterquilinio, et odorem rosarum, et fetorem profers cadaverum: et contra sententiam Prophetalem (Isai. V), amarum dicis esse, quod quasi dulce laudaveras. Nec necesse est, ut in ecclesiasticis tractatibus rem tribunalium ventilemus; nihilque super hoc amplius audies, nisi illud e trivio: «Cum dixeris quod vis, audies quod non vis.» Aut si tibi vile videtur vulgare proverbium, et homo sapientissimus magis philosophorum ac poetarum sentiis delectari, lege illud Homericum:

Ὅποῖον κ' εἴπησθα ἔπος, τοῖον κ' ἐπακούσῃς.

41. Rufinus was threatening Hieronymus with destruction. ---I shall come to the epilogues, that is, your maledictions, in which you exhort me to penitence; and unless I shall have been converted, that is, unless I shall have kept silence while you accuse, you threaten me with destruction (*interitum*). And you denounce that this scandal will redund into my own head, who provoked you, a most lenient man and of Mosaic mildness, by my response to the insanity of your writing. For you boast that you know crimes, which I confessed to you alone as a most dear friend, and that you will bring these forth into the medium; and that I am to be painted with my own colors, and ought to remember, that I lay at your feet, lest by the sword of your mouth you should amputate my head. And after many things, in which you exult furiously, you revoke yourself, and say that you opt for peace provided only with a denunciation, that henceforth I keep silence, that is, that I do not write against heretics, nor dare to respond to your accusation. If I shall have done this, I shall be a brother and colleague, and a most eloquent man and friend and sodalis, and what is greater than these, you will judge all things which I translated from Origen as catholic. But if I shall mutter, and move myself, immediately I shall be impure and a heretic, and unworthy of your necessity. These are my praises, thus you exhort me to peace, and you do not concede even a groan and tears to be free for grief.

42. He reprehends the license of calumniating. Fulvia and Herodias. ---I also could paint you with your colors, and be insane against one insane; and say whatever I either know, or do not know: and with the same license, rather with furor and amentia, conger either false things, or true things, so that it might shame me to speak, and you to hear: and obsecrate things to you, which might condemn either the accuser, or the accused; so that from the hardness of the forehead, I might make faith to the reader; so that what I impudently wrote, I might be judged to write truly. But let it be procul from Christian mores, that while they seek the blood of others, they should offer their own; and without a sword, be in the will of a homicide. This is convenient to your goodness, and your mansuetude and simplicity, who from one sterquilinum of the breast, bring forth both the odor of roses, and the feter of cadavers: and contrary to the Prophetical sentence (Isa. 5), you say that to be bitter, which you had praised as sweet. Nor is it necessary, that in ecclesiastical tractates we should ventilate the thing of tribunals; and you will hear nothing more concerning this, unless that from the trivium: "When you shall have said what you wish, you will hear what you do not wish." Or if the vulgar proverb seems vile to you, and a most sapient man is more delectated by the sentences of philosophers and poets, read that Homeric one: Of what sort the word you say, of such sort you may hear.

569 Hoc solum requiro ab eximia sanctitate et censura tua (cujus tanta est puritas, ut ad sudaria et semicinctia tua daemones rugiant), cujus exemplum in scribendo sequaris? Quis umquam catholicorum in disputatione sectarum, turpitudinem ei, adversum quem disputat, objecit? Sic te docuerunt magistri tui? Talibus institutus es disciplinis, ut cui respondere non potueris, caput auferas; et linguam quae tacere non potest, seces? Nec magnopere glories, si facias quod scorpiones possunt facere et cantharides. Fecerunt haec et Fulvia in Ciceronem, et Herodias in Joannem: quia veritatem non poterant audire, et linguam veriloquam discriminale acu confoderunt. Canes latrant pro dominis suis, et tu non vis me latrare pro Christo? Scripserunt multi contra Marcionem, Valentinum, Arium, et Eunomium. A quo eis objecta est turpitudine? Nonne toti in convincenda haeresi incubuerunt? Ista machinae haereticorum, id est, magistrorum tuorum sunt, ut convicti de perfidia, ad maledicta se conferant. Sic Eustathius Antiochenus episcopus, filios dum nescit, invenit. Sic Athanasius Alexandrinae urbis pontifex, tertiam Arsenii amputavit manum. Duas enim qui mortuus prius fingebatur, vivens postea habere monstratus est. Talia et condiscipuli tui et magistri nunc de ejusdem Ecclesiae sacerdote confingunt: et auro, id est, tuis tuorumque viribus oppugnant fidei veritatem. Quid loquar de haereticis, qui licet foris sint, tamen se nominant Christianos? Adversum impiissimos, Celsum atque Porphyrium, quanti scripsere nostrorum? Quis omissa causa, in superflua criminum objectione versatus est? Quae non chartae Ecclesiasticae, sed libelli debent iudicum continere. Aut quid refert, si causa cadas, et crimine superes? Non necesse est, ut cum periculo tui capitis accuses. Uno percussore conducto, satis potes facere desiderio tuo. Et scandalum timere te simulas, qui dudum fratrem, nunc accusatum, semper inimicum, es paratus occidere. Et tamen 570 miror, quomodo homo prudens, furore praeventus, velis mihi beneficium tribuere, ut educas de carcere animam meam, et non patiaris tecum in tenebris hujus saeculi commorari.

43. Haereticis non poterat parcere. --Vis ergo me tacere? Ne accuses. Depone gladium, et ego scutum abjiciam. In uno tibi consentire non potero, ut parcam haereticis, ut me catholicum non probem. Si ista est causa discordiae, mori possum, tacere non possum. Debueram quidem de omni Scriptura tuae insaniae respondere, et divinis vocibus in modum David citharizantis (I Reg. VI) lenire furorem pectoris tui; sed contentus ero unius libri paucis testimoniis, et opponam sapientiam stultitiae; ut si humana contemnis, saltem divina non negligas.

This alone I require from your egregious sanctity and censure (whose purity is so great, that demons roar at your sudaries and semicincts), whose example do you follow in writing? Who of the Catholics in the disputation of sects, ever objigated turpitude to him, against whom he disputes? Thus did your masters teach you? By such disciplines were you instituted, that to him to whom you could not answer, you might take away the head; and cut the tongue which cannot be silent? Nor should you magnopere glory, if you do what scorpions and cantharides can do. Fulvia also did these things against Cicero, and Herodias against John: because they could not hear the truth, and they transfixed the veriloquent tongue with a discriminal needle. Dogs bark for their masters, and you do not wish me to bark for Christ? Many wrote against Marcion, Valentinus, Arius, and Eunomius. By whom was turpitude objigated to them? Did they not all incubate in convincing the heresy? Those machines are of heretics, that is, of your masters, that being convicted of perfidy, they may confer themselves to maledictions. Thus Eustathius bishop of the Antiochene city, while he knows not sons, finds them. Thus Athanasius pontiff of the Alexandrine city, amputated the third hand of Arsenius. For the two which he who was dead was first feigned to have, he was afterwards demonstrated to have living. Such things both your condisciples and masters now confide concerning the priest of the same Church: and with gold, that is, with your vires and those of yours, they oppugn the truth of faith. What shall I speak concerning heretics, who although they are without, nevertheless limit themselves Christians? Against the most impious ones, Celsus and Porphyry, how many of ours wrote? Who having omitted the cause, versated himself in the superfluous objigation of crimes? Which not Ecclesiastical charts, but libels of judges ought to contain. Or what matters it, if you fall in the cause, and superate in crime? It is not necessary, that you should accuse with the peril of your head. With one percussor conducted, you can satisfy your desire. And you simulate that you fear a scandal, who lately were prepared to kill a brother, now an accused, always an enemy. And nevertheless I wonder, how a prudent man, prevented by furor, you wish to tribute a beneficium to me, that you may educe my soul from prison, and may not suffer to commorate with you in the tenebries of this world.

43. He could not spare heretics. ---Do you wish therefore that I be silent? That you may not accuse. Put down the sword, and I will cast away the shield. In one thing I will not be able to consent to you, that I should spare heretics, that I should not prove myself a Catholic. If that is the cause of discord, I can die, I cannot be silent. I ought indeed concerning all the Scripture to answer to your insanity, and with divine voices in the manner of a citharizing David (1 Kings [1 Sam] 16) lenify the furor of your breast; but I will be content with a few testimonies of one book, and I will oppose wisdom to stultitude; so that if you condemn human things, at least you may not neglect divine ones.

Audi igitur, quid de te, et de omnibus invidis, ac maledicis et contumeliosis loquatur sapiens Salomon: Insipientes dum injuriis cupidi sunt, impii facti oderunt sensum. Ne fabriceris in amicum tuum mala. Et ne inimiceris adversum hominem sine causa. Impii exaltant contumeliam. Circumcide a te os pravum, et iniqua labia longe repelle abs te: oculos contumeliosi, linguam iniqui, manus effundentes sanguinem justis, cor fabricans cogitationes malas, et pedes festinantes ad malefaciendum. Qui nititur mendacio, pascit ventos, et sequitur aves volantes. Dereliquit [Al. derelinquit] enim vias vineae suae, et axes culturae suae fecit errare. Perambulat aridum ac desertum, et colligit manibus suis sterilitatem. Os procacis appropriat contritioni; et qui profert maledicta, stultissimus est. Anima benedicta omnis simplex vir: Animosus inhonestus est. Per delicta labiorum incidit in laqueum peccator. Itinera stultorum recta in conspectu suo. Stultus eadem die ostendit iram suam. Abominatio est Domino, labia mendacia. Qui custodit os suum, servat animam suam. Et qui temerarius est labiis, terrebit seipsum. Malus cum contumelia agit mala, et insipiens expandit malitiam suam. Quaeres apud malos sapientiam, et non invenies. Suis itineribus saturabitur temerarius. Sapiens timendo declinat malum. Stultus confidens miscetur ei. Longanimus vir multus in prudentia est: pusillanimus valde imprudens est. Qui calumniatur pauperem, lacessit factorem ejus. Lingua sapientium bona novit, et os stultorum pronunciat malum. Vir animosus parat rixas: et immundus est apud Deum omnis qui exultat cor suum. Manus manui inferens injuste, non erit impunitus. Qui diligit vitam, parcat ori suo. Ante contritionem praecedat contumelia, et ante ruinam mala cogitatio. Qui obfirmat oculos suos, cogitat perversa, et provocat labiis suis omnia mala. Labia stulti ducunt eum in mala, et os audax mortem invocat. Malignus vir multa detrimenta patietur. Melior est pauper justus, quam mendax dives. Gloria est viro, qui avertit se a maledictis: qui autem stultus est, talibus se obligat. Noli amare detrahare, ne eradiceris. Suavis est homini panis mendacii; postea implebitur os ejus calculo. Qui operatur thesauros lingua mendacii [Al. mendacis], vana sectatur, et veniet in laqueos mortis.

Hear therefore, what the sapient Solomon speaks concerning you, and concerning all the invidious, and maledictive and contumelious: Fools while they are cupidinous of injuries, having been made impious hate sense. Do not fabricate evils against your friend. And do not become an enemy against a man without cause. The impious exalt contumely. Circumcise a depraved mouth from yourself, and repel iniquitous lips far from yourself: the eyes of the contumelious, the tongue of the iniquitous, hands effunding the blood of the just, a heart fabricating evil cogitations, and feet hastening to do evil. He who relies on a lie, feeds the winds, and follows flying birds. For he has derelicted the ways of his own vineyard, and has made the axes of his own culture err. He perambulates the arid and desert, and colligates sterility with his hands. The mouth of the procacious appropinquates to contrition; and he who proffers maledictions, is most foolish. A blessed soul is every simple man: the animose is inhonest. By the delicts of the lips the sinner falls into a snare. The journeys of fools are right in their own sight. The fool on the same day ostends his ire. Lying lips are an abomination to the Lord. He who custodites his mouth, servates his soul. And he who is temerarious with his lips, will terrify himself. The evil man acts evils with contumely, and the insipient expatiates his malice. You will require wisdom among the evil, and you will not find it. The temerarious will be saturated with his own journeys. The sapient declines evil by fearing. The fool confiding is mixed with it. A longanimous man is much in prudence: the pusillanimous is very imprudent. He who calumniates the poor, laccessates his maker. The tongue of the sapient knows good things, and the mouth of fools pronounces evil. An animose man parates rixations: and every one who exalts his heart is immund before God. A hand bringing in against a hand unjustly, will not go unpunished. He who diligites life, spares his mouth. Contumely precedes contrition, and an evil cogitation precedes ruin. He who obfirmes his eyes, cogitates perverse things, and provokes all evils with his lips. The lips of a fool lead him into evils, and an audacious mouth invokes death. A malign man will suffer many detriments. A just poor man is better, than a mendacious rich man. It is glory to a man, who averts himself from maledictions: but he who is a fool, obligates himself to such. Be unwilling to love to detract, lest you be eradicated. The bread of a lie is suave to a man; afterwards his mouth will be filled with gravel. He who opertates the treasures of a mendacious tongue, sectates vain things, and will come into the snares of death.

In aure stulti noli quidquam dicere, ne forte irrideant sapientes sermones tuos. Clava et gladius et sagitta perniciosi sunt; sic et vir, qui contra amicum suum falsum dicit testimonium. Sicut aves avolant, et passeret; ita maledictum vanum non superveniet illi. Noli respondere imprudenti ad imprudentiam ejus, ne similis ei fias: sed responde stulto ad stultitiam ejus, ne sibi sapiens esse videatur. Qui insidiatur amicis suis, cum visus fuerit, dicit: Ludens feci. Craticula carbonibus, et ligna igni, et vir maledicus ad tumultum rixae. Si te rogaverit inimicus tuus, parcens voce magna, ne consentias ei: septem enim nequitiae sunt in anima ejus. Gravis est lapis, et vix portabilis arena; sed ira 572 stulti gravior utroque, crudelis est indignatio, et acuta ira et zelus impatiens est. Impius calumniatur pauperes: et qui confidit in cordis audacia [Al. avaritia], stultissimus est. Totam iram suam profert insipiens: sapiens dispensat in partes. Filius malus gladios dentes habet, et cultros molas, ut consumat infirmos de terra, et pauperes ex hominibus (Prov. X, XVIII, et al., sec. LXX). His ergo doctus exemplis, nolui mordere mordentem, nec vicem talionis implodere: maluique insaniam excantare furibundi, et unius libri antidotum venenato pectori infundere [Al. inserere]. Sed vereor ne nihil proficiens, illud Davidicum cantare compellar, et his me sermonibus consolari: Alienati sunt peccatores a vulva, erraverunt ab utero. Locuti sunt falsa, furor illis secundum similitudinem serpentis: sicut aspidis surdae, et obturantibus aures suas, quae non audiat vocem incantantium, et venefici incantantis sapienter. Deus conteret dentes eorum in ore ipsorum; molas leonum confringet Dominus [Al. Deus]. Ad nihilum devenient, tamquam aqua decurrens. Intendit arcum suum, donec infirmantur. Sicut cera, quae fluit, auferentur: supercecidit ignis, et non viderunt solem (Psal. LVII, 4 seqq). Et iterum: Laetabitur justus, cum viderit vindictam impiorum: manus suas lavabit in sanguine peccatoris. Et dicet homo: si utique est fructus justo, utique est Deus iudicans eos in terra (Ibid., 11).

44. In extrema Epistola scribis manu tua: «Opto te pacem diligere.» Ad quod breviter respondebo: Si pacem desideras, arma depone. Blandienti possum acquiescere, non timeo comminantem. Sit inter nos una fides, et illico pax sequetur.

Into the ear of a fool be unwilling to say anything, lest perhaps they irrede your sapient sermons. A club and a sword and a pernicious arrow they are; so is the man, who says false testimony against his friend. As birds fly away, and sparrows; so a vain malediction will not supervene to him. Be unwilling to answer the imprudent according to his imprudence, lest you become like him: but answer the fool according to his stultitude, lest he seem to himself to be sapient. He who insidiates against his friends, when he shall have been seen, says: Playing I did it. A gridiron to coals, and wood to fire, and a maledictive man to the tumult of a rixation. If your enemy shall have rogated you, sparing with a great voice, do not consent to him: for seven nequities are in his soul. A stone is heavy, and sand scarcely potable; but the ire of a fool is heavier than both, indignation is cruel, and ire is acute and zeal impatient. The impious calumniates the poor: and he who confides in the audacity of a heart, is most foolish. The insipient proffers all his ire: the sapient dispensates it into parts. An evil son has swords for teeth, and iron blades for molars, that he may consummate the infirm from the earth, and the poor from among men (Prov. 10, 18, and elsewhere, according to the Septuagint). Taught therefore by these examples, I was unwilling to bite the biter, nor implode the turn of retaliation: and I maled to excantate the insanity of the furibund, and to infund the antidote of one book upon a venenated breast. But I verecund that profiting nothing, I may be compelled to sing that Davidian thing, and coordinate myself with these sermons: Sinners are alienated from the vulva, they have erred from the womb. They have spoken false things, furor is in them according to the similitude of a serpent: as of a deaf asp, and obturating her ears, which may not hear the voice of the incantating, and of the venefice incantating sapiently. God will contert their teeth in their mouth; the Lord will confringe the molars of lions. They will come to nothing, as water decurrent. He intends his bow, until they be infirmed. As wax, which flows, they will be taken away: the fire has superceded over them, and they have not seen the sun (Psalm 58:3 seqq). And again: The just will letate, when he shall have seen the vindication of the impious: he will lave his hands in the blood of the sinner. And a man will say: if utique there is a fruit to the just, utique there is a God judging them on earth (Ibid., 11).

44. In the extreme Epistle you write with your hand: "I optate that you love peace." To which I will briefly answer: If you desire peace, put down arms. I can acquiesce to one blandishing, I do not fear one comminating. Let there be one faith between us, and forthwith peace will follow.