

Gregory Martin: A Discovery of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy  
Scriptures, 1582

English Recusant Literature, 1558-1640, Selected and Edited by D. M. Rogers, Vol. 127

Reproduced from a copy in the library of Ampleforth Abbey, by permission of the Abbot and  
Community. References: Allison and Rogers 525; STC 17503.

A Discovery of the Manifold Corruptions of the Holy Scriptures by the Heretics of our days, especially the English Sectaries, and of their foul dealing herein, by partial and false translations to the advantage of their heresies, in their English Bibles used and authorized since the time of Schism.

By Gregory Martin, one of the readers of Divinity in the English College of Rheims.

*2 Cor. 2: Non sumus sicut plurimi, adulterantes verbum Dei, sed ex sinceritate, sed sicut ex Deo, coram Deo, in Christo loquimur.* (We are not as very many, adulterating the word of God, but of sincerity, and as of God, before God, in Christ we speak.)

Printed at Rheims, by John Fogy, 1582.

## FOREWORD

by the Transcriber

This work has been transcribed by the Eclipseofthechurch.com staff into more easily read English. This foreword explains our method for transcription.

The Shakespearean English in which this book was written is actually very clear and understandable for the most part. The most obvious difference was the use of the long s, f, initially and medially, which despite its visual similarity to f, was not abandoned until the early 1800s. Also, j, v, and w were not considered separate letters at the time. For j, I and i were used everywhere. The letters u and v were considered one, with capital V for both and lowercase v used initially and u medially and finally regardless of which sound they were meant to be used for; resulting in the spellings “value”, “vpon”, “haue”, and “thus”. In the case of w, Fr. Martin’s printer apparently was short on the type for this letter, or ligature as it was considered at the time, and usually substituted “vv” (at the beginning of sentences, “Vv”).

In the 16th century, quotation marks were rarely if ever used, with italics taking their place instead. Small capitals played the role of italics within italics whenever that need arose, and this format was kept in the chapter headings for stylistic purposes. We use italics to represent all Latin words, as well as when an English word is emphasized in a quote from Scripture. Footnotes appeared in the margin next to the line with the reference and did not have reference numbers, and sometimes Greek or other words and phrases were provided in the margins as well where we would use parentheses. As footnotes were not numbered in the text, and hardly ever indicated (on rare occasions with asterisks), sometimes this caused confusion in the material which appears in the margins (chiefly footnotes and translations into Latin, Greek, or Hebrew), especially if there was overlap. Unfortunately, due to blurring in the Hebrew script and inconsistencies in the Greek (along with a couple of places where an unrecognizable ligature was used), some mistakes have likely crept into the Greek and Hebrew transcriptions.

There are some minor language differences which were corrected. For example, the English in the book used “then” where we use “than” in comparative statements. More confusingly, “too” was spelled “to”, and “latter” (as opposed to “former”), “later”. Also, the plural and/or possessive endings *-(e)s*, *-s*, and *-(e)s’* all appear as simply *-(e)s* in the book. Our term “on purpose” appeared as “of purpose”, which has also been updated, as well as an alteration of their “only faith” to “faith alone”, which is far more prevalent and familiar to present-day Catholics. Sentence style also diverges somewhat from the modern. Also, the third-person singular verbal ending in the present tense *-s* (as in “he has”, “he reads”, “he puts”, and so forth) was still spelled *-(e)th* at the time, and this has also been altered to the modern form, unless it appears in a Scriptural quote. They use “himself”, “themselves”, and similar *-self* words like emphasized pronouns, in the way we would say “he himself” or “they themselves”. Many common words were spelled rather differently, the most notable being many cases of silent final e which have been subsequently dropped, final *-ie* where we have *-y*, single final *l* where we have double (as in “all”), and so forth. At the same time, there were some rather comforting and amusing instances where we are reminded strongly that this is indeed the same language, such as where the writer plaintively asks, “Is not this good stuff?” (p. 27) or uses the unusually long-lived slang term “play fast and loose” (p. 64), or even the more technical grammatical terms such as “dative case”. Indeed, the modern reader can still very much feel, often palpably, the writer’s frustration, exasperation, and sometimes amusement at the Protestants and their tricks burning up from the page at times.

This material should prove to be a very valuable resource for Catholics, especially American Catholics who live in a country where evangelical Protestantism is the unofficial standard of Christianity.

## The PREFACE

Containing five sundry abuses or corruptions of Holy Scriptures, common to all Heretics, and agreeing especially to these of our time: with many other necessary advertisements to the reader.

As it has been always the fashion of Heretics to pretend Scriptures, for show of their cause: so has it been also the custom and property to abuse the said Scriptures many ways, in favour of their errors.

1. One way is, to deny whole books thereof or parts of books, when they are evidently against them. So did (for example) Ebion all St. Paul's Epistles, Manicheus the Acts of the Apostles, Alogiani St. John's Gospel, Marcion many pieces of St. Luke's Gospel, and so did both these and other heretics in other books, denying and allowing what they list, as is evident by St. Ireneus, St. Epiphanius, St. Augustine, and all antiquity.

2. Another way is, to call into question at the least and make some doubt of the authority of certain books of Holy Scriptures, thereby to diminish their credit. So did Manicheus affirm of the whole New Testament, that it was not written by the Apostles: and peculiarly of St. Matthew's Gospel, that it was some other man's under his name: and therefore not of such credit, but that it might in some part be refused. So did Marcion and the Arians deny the Epistle to the Hebrews to be St. Paul's, Epiphanius li. 2. haer. 69 Euseb. li. 4. hist. c. 27. & Alogiani the Apocalypse to be St. John's the Evangelist, Epiphanius & August. In haer. Alogianorum.

3. Another way is, to expound the Scriptures after their own private conceit and fantasy, not according to the approved sense of the holy ancient Fathers and Catholic Church. So did Theodorus Mopsuestites (Act. Synod. 5.) affirm of all the books of the Prophets, and of the Psalms, that they spoke not evidently of Christ, but that the ancient Fathers did voluntarily draw those sayings unto Christ which were spoken of other matters. So did all heretics, that would seem to ground their heresies upon Scriptures, and to avouch them by Scriptures expounded according to their own sense and imagination.

4. Another way is, to alter the very original text of the Holy Scripture, by adding, taking away, or changing it here and there for their purpose. So did the Arians in sundry places, and the Nestorians in the first Epistle of St. John, and especially Marcion, who was therefore called "Mus Ponticus", the mouse of Pontus<sup>1</sup>, because he had gnawed (as it were) certain places with his corruptions, whereof some are said to remain in the Greek text until this day<sup>2</sup>.

5. Another way is, to make false translations of the Scriptures for the maintenance of error and heresie. So did the Arians (as St. Jerome notes in 26. Esa.) read and translate Proverb 8. *Dominus creavit me in initio viarum suarum*. That is, "The Lord created me in the beginning of his ways"<sup>3</sup>, so to make Christ the wisdom of God, a mere creature. St. Augustine also li. 5. cont. Iulian. c. 2. notes it as the interpretation of some Pelagian Gen. 3. *Fecerunt sibi vesti menta*, for, *perizómata* (קִנְיָי) or *campestria*, that is, "They made themselves garments". Whereas the word of the Scripture is, breeches or aprons proper and peculiar to cover the secret parts [i.e., undergarments] (הַגֵּרְתָּי). Again, the selfsame heretics did read falsely Ro. 5. *Regnavit mors ab Adam usque ad Moysen etiam in eos qui peccaverunt in similitudinem praevaricationis Adae*, that is, "Death reigned from Adam to Moses even on them that sinned after the similitude of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. cont. Marcio. li. 1. in princ.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. li. 5.

<sup>3</sup> κτῆσαστο, possedit.

prevarication of Adam” (□πι τους μ□ □μαρτήσαντας), to maintain their heresy against Original Sin, that none were infected therewith, or subject to death and damnation, but by sinning actually as Adam did. Thus did the old Heretics.

6. What these of our days? Is it credible that being so well warned by the condemnation and detestation of them, they also would be as mad and as impious as those? Heretics, gentle Reader, be always like Heretics, and howsoever they differ in opinions or names, yet in this point they agree, to abuse the Scriptures for their purpose by all means possible. I will but touch four points of the five before mentioned, because my purpose is to stay upon the last only, and to decipher their corrupt translations. But if I would stand upon the other also, were it not easy to show the manner of their proceeding against the Scriptures to have been thus: to deny some whole books and parts of books, to call other some into question, to expound the rest at their pleasure, to pick quarrels to the very original and Canonical text, to fester and infect the whole body of the Bible with cankered translations?

7. Did not Luther deny St. James’ Epistle and so condemn it that he called it an “epistle of straw”, and not worthy of an Apostolical spirit? Must I prove this to Mr. Whitakers, who would never have denied it so vehemently<sup>4</sup> in the superlative degree for shame, if he had not thought it more shame to grant it? I need not go far for the matter: Ask Mr. Fulke<sup>5</sup>, and he will flatly confess it was so. Ask Calvin *in arg. ep., Iacobi.*, ask Flaccus Illyricus, *in argum. ep. Iacobi.*, and you shall perceive it as very true. I will not send you to the Catholic Germans and others, both of his own time and after, that wrote against him in the question of justification: among whom not one omits this, being a thing so famous and infamous to the confusion of that Arch-heretic.

8. To let this pass, Toby, Ecclesiasticus, and the Machabees are they not most certainly rejected? And yet they were allowed and received for Canonical<sup>6</sup>, by the same authority that St. James’ Epistle was. This Epistle the Calvinists are content to admit, because so it pleased Calvin<sup>7</sup>: those books they reject, because so also it pleased him. And why did it so please Calvin? Under pretence forsooth that they were once doubted of, and not taken for Canonical. But is that the true cause indeed? How do they then receive St. James’ Epistle as Canonical<sup>8</sup>, having been before doubted of also, yea, as they say, rejected?

9. Mark, gentle Reader, for thy soul’s sake, and thou shalt find, that heresy and only heresy is the cause of their denying these books: so far, that against the orders and Hierarchies and particular patronages of Angels, one of them writes thus in the name of the rest, “We pass not for that Raphael of Toby, neither do we acknowledge those seven Angels which he speaks of. All this is far from Canonical Scriptures, that the same Raphael records, and favours I wot not what superstition.” Against free will thus: “I little care for the place of Ecclesiasticus, neither will I believe free will, though he affirm a hundred times, that before men is life and death.” And against prayer for the dead, and intercession of Saints, this: “As for the book of the Machabees, I do care less for it than for the other. Judas’ dream concerning Onias I let pass as a dream.” This is their reverence of the Scriptures which have universally been revered for Canonical in the Church of God above 1100 years, *Conc. Carth. 3.* and particularly of many Fathers long before. *August. de doct. Christ. lib. 2 ca. 8.*

10. As for parts of books do they not reject certain pieces of Daniel and of Esther, because they are not in the Hebrew, which reason St. Augustine rejects: or because they were once

---

<sup>4</sup> Cont. rat. Edm. Camp. pag. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Retent. pag. 32. dist. of the Rock p. 307. Luther, in novo Test. Germa. in Pref. Jacob.

<sup>6</sup> Conc. Carth. 3 can. 47.

<sup>7</sup> Argum. in ep. Jac.

<sup>8</sup> Whitak. p. 10.

doubted of by certain of the Fathers? By which reason some part of St. Mark and St. Luke's Gospel might now also be called in controversy, especially if it be true which Mr. Whitakers by a figurative speech more than insinuates, "That he cannot see by what right that which once was not in credit, should by time win authority." Forgetting himself by and by, and in the very next lines admitting St. James' Epistle (though before doubted of) for Canonical Scriptures. Unless they receive it but of their courtesy, and so may refuse it when it shall please them, which must needs be gathered of his words, as also many other notorious absurdities, contradictions, and dumb blanks. Which only to note, were to confute Mr. Whitakers by himself, being the Answerer for both Universities.

11. For the second point, which is not the gross denial of books, but yet calling of them into question, moving scruples about them, and diminishing their authority and credit, I will go no further than to St. Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews, which I will not ask why they doubt of, or rather think it not to be St. Paul's, for they will tell me, because it was once in doubt (not considering that it was in like manner doubted whether it were Canonical, and yet they will not now deny but it is Canonical) but I must ask them and request them to make a reasonable answer, why in their English Bible of the year 1579 and 1580 they presume to leave St. Paul's name out of the very title of the said Epistle, which name is in the Greek (□ πρ□ς □βραίου□ □πιστολ□ Γαύλον), and in Beza's Latin translation, both which they profess to follow. See the title of the new Test an. 1580. Does not the title tell them that it is St. Paul's? Why seek they further: or why do they change the title, striking out St. Paul's name, if they meant to deal simply and sincerely? And what a heretical peevishness is this, because Beza tells them of one obscure Greek copy that has not Paul's name, and only one: that they will rather follow it, than all other copies both Greek and Latin? I report me to all indifferent men of common sense, whether they do it not to diminish the credit of the Epistle.

12. I know very well that the authority of Canonical Scripture stands not upon the certainty of the author, but yet to be Paul's or not Paul's, Apostolical or not Apostolical, makes great difference of credit and estimation. For, what made St. James' Epistle doubted of sometime, or the second of St. Peter, and the rest, but that they were not thought to be the epistles of those Apostles? This Luther saw very well, when he denied St. James' Epistle to be James the Apostle's writing. If titles of books be of no importance, then leave out Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, leave out Paul in his other epistles also, and you shall much pleasure the Manichees and other old Heretics: and if the titles make no difference, urge no more the title of the Apocalypse, "St. John the Divine's", as though it were not St. John the Evangelist's, and you shall much displeasure some Heretics nowadays. Briefly, most certain it is, and they know it best by their own usual doings, that it is a principal way to the discredit of any book, to deny it to be that author's, under whose name it has been received.

13. But I come to the third point of voluntary expositions of the Scripture, that is, when every man expounds according to his error and Heresy. This needs no proof, for we see it with our eyes. Look upon the Calvinists and Puritans at home, the Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists abroad: read their books written vehemently, one sect against another: are not their expositions of one and the same Scripture as diverse and contrary, as their opinions differ one from another? Let the example at home be, their controversy about the distinction of Ecclesiastical degrees, Archbishop, Bishop, and minister: the example abroad, their divers imaginations and fantasies upon these most sacred words, *Hoc est corpus meum*.

14. And if you will yet have a further demonstration, this one may suffice for all. They reject Councils, and Fathers, and the Catholic Church's interpretation, unless it be agreeable to God's Word, and whether it be agreeable or no, that Luther shall judge for the Lutherans, Calvin for the Calvinists, Cartwright for the Puritans, and another for the Brethren of Love:

Briefly they themselves will be judges both of Councils and Fathers whether they expound the Scriptures well or not, and every youth among them upon confidence of his spirit and knowledge will saucily control not only one but all the Fathers consenting together, if it be against that which they imagine to be the truth.

15. Whereupon it rises that one of them defends this as very well said of Luther, “that he esteemed not the worth of a rush a thousand Augustines, Cyprians, Churches, against himself.” And another very finely and figuratively, as he thought, against the holy Doctor and Martyr St. Cyprian affirming “that the Church of Rome cannot err in faith,” says thus: “Pardon me Cyprian, I would gladly believe thee, but that believing thee, I should not believe the Gospel.” This is that which St. Augustine says of the like men, *dulcissime vanos esse, non peritos sed perituros, nec tam disertos in errore, quam desertos a veritate*. And I think verily that not only we, but the wiser men among themselves smile at such eloquence, or pity it, saying this or the like most truly, *Prodierunt oratores novi, stulti adolescenti*.

16. The fourth point is, of picking quarrels to the very original text: for alter and change it I hope they shall not be able in this watchful world of most vigilant Catholics. But what they would do, if all Bibles were only in their hands and at their commandment, guess by this: that Beza against the evidence of all copies both Greek and Latin (in his Annot. upon the new Test, set forth in the year 1556), thinks  $\pi\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$  is more than should be in the text Mat. 10: and  $\tau\omicron\kappa\chi\eta\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\nu$  Luc. 22. and  $\pi\rho\sigma\kappa\upsilon\nu\omicron\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  Act. 7: the first, against Peter’s supremacy: the second, against the real presence of Christ’s blood in the Blessed Sacrament: the third, against the making of whatsoever images, whether they be adored or no. Thus you see how the mouse of Geneva (as I told you before of Marcion the mouse of Pontus) nibbles and gnaws about it, though he cannot bite it off altogether.

17. He does the like in sundry places which you may see in his Annotations Act. 7:16. Where he is saucy against all copies Greek and Latin to pronounce corruption, corruption, avouching and endeavouring to prove that it must be so, and that with these words, “To what purpose should the Holy Ghost, or Luke, add this?” Act. 8:26. But because those places concern no controversy, I say no more but that he bites at the text, and would change it according to his imagination, if he might: which is too proud an enterprise for Beza, and small reverence of the Holy Scriptures, so to call the very text into controversy, that whatsoever pleases not him, crept out of the margin into the text, which is his common and almost his only conjecture.

18. He bites sore at the word  $\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\lambda\omicron$  Luc. 1:78 and will not translate that, but the Hebrew word of the Old Testament ( $\pi\eta\aleph$ ). But at  $\delta\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha\varsigma$  (Act. 2:24) much more, and at  $\beta\delta\omicron\mu\acute{\eta}\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ \pi\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon$  (Act. 7:14) exceedingly: but yet after he has said all that he could against it, he concludes, that “he durst not, and that he had a conscience, upon conjecture to change anything.” And therefore all this is gnawing only, but in the 3 of Luke he makes no conscience at all, to leave out these words verse 36, *Qui fuit Cainan*, ( $\tau\omicron\kappa\alpha\nu\nu$ ) not only in his own translation, but in the Vulgar Latin which is joined therewith, saying in his Annotations, *Non dubitavimus expungere*, that is, “We doubted not to put it out”: and why? “by the authority of Moses Gen. 11.” Whereby he signifies, that it is not in the Hebrew Gen. 11 where this posterity of Shem is reckoned: and so to maintain the Hebrew verity (as they call it) in the old Testament he cares not what become of the Greek in the New Testament: which yet at other times, against the Vulgar Latin text, they call the Greek verity, and the pure fountain, and that text whereby all translations must be tried.

19. But if he have no other way to reconcile both Testaments, but by striking out in the Greek of the New, all that agrees not with the Hebrew of the Old Testament, then let him alter and change so many words of Our Saviour Himself, of the Evangelists, and of the Apostles, as

are cited out of the Old Testament, and are not in Hebrew. Which places they know are very many, and when need is, they shall be gathered to their hands. Let him strike out (Mat. 13:14-5 and Act. 28:26-7) the words of Our Saviour and St. Paul, cited out of Esay (Esa. 6:9-10, Gal. 3,13), because they are far otherwise in the Hebrew. Strike out of the Epistle to the Galatians these words, “upon a tree” (πικρεμάμενας πικξύλον): because in the Hebrew it is only thus (יִלְקָח). “Cursed is he that is hanged.” Deut. 21 in fine. Yea, strike out of David’s Psalms that which concerns our redemption upon the Cross much nearer, “they have pierced my hands and my feet”, Ps. 21. because in the Hebrew there is no such thing. Let them control the Apostle, Eph. 4, for saying *dedit*, “he gave gifts”: because it is both in the Hebrew (תָּתַן) and Greek (λάβεις), (Psal. 67) *Accepisti*, “thou tookest gifts”, and (Hebr. 10) for *corpus aptasti*, let them put, *ures perforasti*, because it is so in the Hebrew Psal. 40 (לִּי תִּפְּרְוּ אָזְנוֹתַי). To be short, if all must be reformed according to the Hebrew, why does he not in St. Steven’s sermon cut off the number of five souls from seventy five, because it is not in the Hebrew?

20. Must such difficulties and diversities be resolved by chopping and changing, hacking and hewing the sacred text of Holy Scripture? See into what perplexities willful heresie and arrogance has driven them. To discredit the Vulgar Latin translation of the Bible, and the Fathers’ expositions according to the same (for that is the original cause of this) and besides, that they may have always this evasion, “It is not so in the Hebrew, it is otherwise in the Greek,” and so seem jolly fellows and great clerks upon the ignorant people, what do they? They admit only the Hebrew in the Old Testament and the Greek in the New to be the true and authentic text of the Scripture. Whereupon this follows, that they reject, and must needs reject the Greek of the Old Testament (called the Septuagint) as false, because it differs from the Hebrew. Which being rejected thereupon it follows again, that wheresoever those places so disagreeing from the Hebrew are cited by Christ or the Evangelists and Apostles, there also they must be rejected, because they disagree from the Hebrew, and so yet again it follows, that the Greek text of the New Testament is not true, because it is not according to the Hebrew verity: and consequently the words of Our Saviour, and writings of His Apostles must be reformed (to say the least) because they speak according to the Septuagint, and not according to the Hebrew.

21. All which must needs follow, if this be a good consequence, “I find it not in Moses, nor in the Hebrew, therefore I struck it out,” as Beza does and says concerning the foresaid words, *Qui fuit Cainan*, This consequence therefore let us see how they will justify: and withal let them tell us, whether they will discredit the New Testament, because of the Septuagint, or credit the Septuagint, because of the New Testament, or how they can credit one, and discredit the other, where both agree and consent together: or, whether they will discredit both, for credit of the Hebrew: or rather, whether there be not some other way to reconcile both Hebrew and Greek, better than Beza’s impudent presumption. Which if they will not maintain, let them flatly confess that he did wickedly, and not (as they do) defend every word and deed of their Masters, be it never so heinous, or salve it at the least.

22. Alas, how far are these men from the modesty of the ancient Fathers, and from the humble spirit of obedient Catholics, who seek all other means to resolve difficulties, rather than to do violence to the sacred Scripture, and when they find no way, they leave it to God. St. Augustine concerning the difference of the Hebrew and the Greek, says often to this effect, that it pleased the Holy Ghost to utter by the one, that which he would not utter by the other. And St. Ambrose thus, “We have found many things not idly added of the 70 Greek interpreters.” St. Jerome, though an earnest patron of the Hebrew (not without cause, being at that time perhaps the Hebrew verity indeed) yet gives many reasons for the differences of the Septuagint, and concerning the foresaid places of St. Luke, he does give a reason thereof, both for the 70,



and for the Evangelist that followed them, neither doubting of the truth thereof, not controlling them “by the authority of Moses” (as Beza speaks) that is, by the Hebrew. Others say concerning Cainan, that Moses might leave him out in the Genealogy of Shem, by the instinct of the same Spirit, that St. Matthew left out three kings in the genealogy of Our Saviour. Where if a man would control the Evangelist by the Hebrew of the Old Testament that is read in the books of the kings, he should be as wise and as honest a man as Beza. Lastly, Venerable Bede thinks it sufficient in this very difficulty of Cainan, to marvel at it reverently, rather than to search it dangerously. And thus far of picking quarrels to the original text, and their good will to alter and change it as they list, if they might be suffered.

23. Which also may be proven by all their false translations (being the principal point I mean to speak of) most evidently. For as now they translate falsely to their purpose, because they cannot alter the text: so would they, if it were possible, have the text agreeable to their translation. For example, he that translates, “ordinances”, when it is in the original Greek text, “justifications”, and “traditions”, he would rather that it were, “ordinances”, also in the Greek: but because he cannot bring that about, he does at the least what he can, to make the ignorant believe it is so, by so translating it.

24. And this of all other is the most fine and subtle treachery against the Scriptures, to deceive the ignorant readers withal, (which St. Paul calls “the secret things of dishonesty, and adulterating of the word of God,” as it were mingle water with wine like false vintners) when they give them for God’s word, and under the name of God’s word, their own words, and not God’s, forged and framed, altered and changed, according to differences of times, and variety of new opinions, and diversity of humors and spirits, diversely and differently, one Heretic not only correcting his fellow every day, but one eagerly refuting and refelling another. Bucer, and the Osiandrians and Sacramentaries against Luther for false translations: Luther against Munster, Beza against Castaleo, Castaleo against Beza, Calvin against Servetus, Illyricus both against Calvin and Beza: The Puritans control the grosser Calvinists of our Country, yea the later translations of the selfsame Heretics control the former exceedingly, not only of oversights, but of willful falsifications, as it is notorious in the later editions of Luther and Beza, and in our English Bibles set forth in divers years, from Tyndale their first translator until this day: yea (which is more) the English translators of Beza’s New Testament, control him and his translation which they protest to follow, being afraid sometimes and ashamed to express in English his false translations in the Latin.

25. But in this Catalogue of dissentious falsifiers and disagreeing translators, I will not greatly rip up old faults neither abroad, nor at home. I leave Luther’s false translations into the German tongue, to the credit of Staphylus, *Apolog. part. 2.* and Emserus, *praef. Annot. in no. Test. Luth.* and other German writers of his own time, that saw them and read them, and reckoned the number of them in the New Testament only, about 1400 heretical corruptions: I leave Calvin’s and Beza’s French corruptions, to so many worthy men as have noted them in their French books against the said heretics: Tyndale’s and his companions’ corruptions in their first English bible, to our learned countrymen of that age, and namely to the right Rev. Father and Confessor Bishop Tonal, who in a sermon openly protested that he had found in the New Testament only, no less than two thousand. If we know it now, or will not believe it, strangers in their Latin writings testify it to the world.

26. But I omit these as known to our country, or to this age, and will deal principally with the English translations of our time, which are in every man’s hands within our country the corruptions whereof, as they are partly touched here and there in the Annotations upon the late new English Testament Catholicly translated and printed at Rheims, so by occasion thereof, I will by God’s help, to the better commodity of the reader, and evidence of the thing, lay them

closer together, and more largely display them, not counting the number, because it were hard, but esteeming the weight and importance of so many as I thought good to note, especially in the New Testament. Where I have to advertise the Reader of certain special things, which he must observe.

27. First, that in this book he may not look for the proof or explication and deciding of controversies, which is done in the Annotations upon the New Testament, but only the refuting or controlling of their false translations concerning the said controversies, which is the peculiar argument of this treatise.

28. Secondly, that we refute sometime one of their translations, sometimes another, and every one as their falsehood gives occasion. Neither is it a good defense for the falsehood of one, that it is truly translated in another: the reader being deceived by one, because commonly he reads but one. Yea one of them is a condemnation of the other.

29. Thirdly, that we speak indifferently against Protestants, Calvinists, Bezites, and Puritans, without any curious distinction of them, being all among themselves brethren and pew fellows, and sometimes the one sort of them, sometimes the other more or less corrupting the Holy Scriptures.

30. Fourthly, that we give but a taste of their corruptions, not seeing so far, nor marking all so narrowly and skillfully, as themselves know their own subtleties and meanings, who will smile at the places which we have not espied.

31. Fifthly, that the very use and affectation of certain terms, and avoiding other some, though it be no demonstration against them, but that they may seem to defend it for true translation, yet was it necessary to be noted, because it is and has been always a token of heretical meaning.

32. Sixthly, that in explicating these things, we have endeavored to avoid (as much as was possible) the tediousness of Greek and Hebrew words, which are only for the learned in these tongues, and which made some little doubt whether this matter (which of necessity must be examined by them) were to be written in English or no, but being persuaded by those (who themselves have no skill in the said tongues) that every reader might reap commodity thereby, to the understanding and detesting of such false and Heretical translations, it was thought good to make it vulgar and common to all our dear countrymen, as the New Testament itself is common, whereof this Discovery is as it were an handmaid, attending thereupon for the larger explication and proof of corruptions there briefly touched, and for supply of other some not there mentioned.

33. Seventhly, that all the English corruptions here noted and refuted, are either in all or some of their English bibles printed in these years, 1562, 1577, 1579. And if the corruption be in one Bible, not in another, commonly the said Bible or bibles are noted in the margin: if not, yet sure it is that it is in one of them, and so the reader shall find it, if he find it not always in his own Bible. And in this case the reader must be very wise and circumspect, that he think not by and by we charge them falsely, because they can show him some later edition that has it not so as we say, for it is their common and known fashion, not only in their translations of the Bible, but in their other books and writings, to alter and change, add and put out, in their later editions, according as either themselves are ashamed of the former, or their scholars that print them again, dissent and disagree from their Masters. So has Luther's, Calvin's, and Beza's writings and translations been changed both by themselves and their scholars in many places, so that Catholic men when they confute that which they find evident faults in this or that edition, fear nothing more than that the reader has some other edition, where they are corrected for very shame, and so may conceive that there is no such thing, but that they are accused wrongfully. For example: Call to mind the late pretended conference in the tower,

where that matter was denied and faced out for Luther's credit, by some one book or edition of his, which themselves, and all the world knows was most truly laid to his charge.

34. Eighthly, in citing Beza, I mean always (unless I note otherwise) his Latin translation of the New Testament with his annotations adjoined thereunto, printed in the year 1556.

35. Lastly and principally is to be noted that we will not charge them with falsifying that which indeed is the true and authentic Scripture, I mean the Vulgar Latin Bible, which so many years has been of so great authority in the Church of God, and with all the ancient fathers of the Latin Church, as is declared in the preface of the New Testament: though it is much to be noted, that as Luther, only in favor of his heresies did willfully forsake it, so the rest followed and do follow him at this day, for no other cause in the world but that it is against them. And therefore they inveigh against it, and against the holy Council of Trent for confirming the authority thereof, both in their special treatises thereof, and in all their writings, where they can take any occasion.

36. And concerning their willful and heretical avoiding thereof in their new translations, what greater argument can there be than this, that Luther, who before always had read with the Catholic Church and with all antiquity, these words of St. Paul, "Have not we power to lead about *a woman a sister*, as also the rest of the Apostles?" and in St. Peter, these words, "Labour that *by good works* you may make sure your vocation and election": suddenly, after he had contrary to his profession taken "a wife" (as he called her) and preached that all other votaries might do the same, and that faith only justified, "good works" were not necessary to salvation: suddenly (I say) after he fell to these heresies, he began to read and translate the former Scriptures accordingly, thus: "Have not we power to lead about a *sister a wife*, as the rest of the Apostles?" and, "Labour that you may make sure your vocation and election": leaving out the other words, "by good works". And so do both the Calvinists abroad, and our English Protestants at home read and translate at this day, because they hold the selfsame heretics.

37. So do they in infinite places alter the old text, which pleased them well before they were Heretics, and they do it with brazen faces, and plain protestation, having no shame nor remorse at all in fleeing from that which all antiquity with one consent allowed and embraced until their unhappy days. Which though it be an evident condemnation of their novelties in the fight of any reasonable man that has any grace, yet as I began to admonish thee (gentle Reader) we will not charge them for altering the ancient approved Latin translation, because they pretend to follow the Hebrew and Greek, and our purpose is not here, to prove that they should not follow the Hebrew and Greek that now is, before the ancient approved Latin text, which is done briefly already in the preface to the New Testament.

38. Neither will we burden them, for not following the Vulgar Latin text, when the same agrees with most ancient Greek copies: which notwithstanding is great partiality in them, and must needs be of an heretical wilful humour, that among the Greek copies themselves, they reject that which most agrees with the Vulgar Latin text, in places of controversies: Yet will we not I say, neither in this case, lay falsehood and corruption to their charge, because they pretend to translate the common Greek text of the New Testament, that is, one certain copy, but here at the least let them show their fidelity, and that they be true and exact translators, for here only shall they be examined and called to account.

39. And if they follow sincerely their Greek and Hebrew text, which they profess to follow, and which they esteem the only authentic text, so far we accuse them not of heretical corruption. But if it shall be evidently proven, that they shrink from the same also, and translate another thing, and that wilfully, and of full intention to countenance their false religion and wicked opinions, making the Scriptures to speak as they list: then we trust, the indifferent reader for his own soul's sake, will easily see and conclude, that they have no fear of

God, no reverence of the Scriptures, no conscience to deceive their readers: He will perceive that the Scriptures make against them, which they so pervert and corrupt for their purpose: that neither the Hebrew nor Greek text is for them, which they dare not translate truly and sincerely: that their cause is naught, which needs such foul shifts: that they must needs know all this, and therefore do wilfully against their conscience, and consequently are obstinate Heretics.

40. And the more to understand their misery and wretchedness, before we enter to examine their translations, mark and gather of all that which I have said in this preface, their manifold flights and jumps, from one shift to another, and how Catholic writers have pursued and chased them, and followed them, and driven them even to this extreme refuge and seely covert of false translation, where also they must of necessity yield, or devise some new evasion, which we cannot yet imagine.

41. First we are wont to make this offer (as we think) most reasonable and indifferent: that forasmuch as the Scriptures are diversely expounded of us and of them, they neither be tied to our interpretation, nor we to theirs, but to put it to the arbitrement and judgement of the ancient Fathers, of general Councils, of universal custom of times and places in the Catholic Church. No, say they, we will be our own judges and interpreters, or follow Luther, if we be Lutherans: Calvin, if we be Calvinists: and so forth.

42. This being of itself a shameless shift, unless it be better coloured, the next is to say, that the Scriptures are easy and plain and sufficient of themselves to determine every matter, and therefore they will be tried by the Scriptures only. We are content, because they will needs have it so, and we allege unto them the books of Toby, Ecclesiasticus, Machabees. No, say they: we admit none of these for Scripture. Why so? Are they not approved Canonical by the same authority of the Church, of ancient Councils and Fathers, that the other books are? No matter, say they, Luther admits them not, Calvin does not allow them.

43. Well, let us go forward in their own dance. You allow at the least the Jews' Canonical books of the Old Testament, that is, all that are extant in the Hebrew Bible: and all of the New Testament without exception. Yea, that we do. In these books then, will you be tried by the vulgar ancient Latin Bible, only used in all the Western Church above a thousand years? No. Will you be tried by the Greek Bible of the Septuagint interpreters, so renowned and authorised, in our Saviour's own speeches, in the Evangelists' and Apostles' writings, in the whole Greek Church evermore? No. How then will you be tried? They answer, Only by the Hebrew Bible that now is, and as now it is pointed with vowels. Will you so? And do you think that only, the true authentic Hebrew which the Holy Ghost did first put into the pens of those sacred writers? We do think it (say they) and esteem it the only authentic and true Scripture of the Old Testament.

44. We ask them again, what say you then to that place of the psalm, where in the Hebrew it is thus, כַּאֲרִי, "As a lion my hands and my feet": for that which in truth should be thus, "They dug" or "pierced my hands and my feet": being an evident prophecy of Christ's nailing to the Cross. There indeed (say they) we follow not the Hebrew, but the Greek text. Sometime then you follow the Greek and not the Hebrew only. And what if the same Greek text make for the Catholics, as in these places for example, "I have inclined my heart to keep they justifications for reward": and, "Redeem thy sins with alms": might we not obtain here the like favour at your hands for the Greek text, especially when the Hebrew does not disagree? No, say they, nor in no other place where the Greek is never so plain, if the Hebrew word at the least may be any otherwise interpreted, and drawn to another signification.

45. We reply again and say unto them, why, is not the credit of those Septuagint interpreters, who themselves were Jews, and best learned in their own tongue, and (as St. Augustine often, and other ancient Fathers say) were inspired with the Holy Ghost, in

translating the Hebrew bible into Greek: is not their credit (I say) in determining and defining the signification of the Hebrew word, far greater than yours? No. Is not the authority of all the ancient Fathers both Greek and Latin, that followed them, equivalent in this case to your judgement? No, say they, but because we find some ambiguity in the Hebrew, we will take the advantage, and we will determine and limit it to our purpose.

46. Again we condescend to their wilfulness, and say: what if the Hebrew be not ambiguous, but so plain and certain to signify one thing, that it cannot be plainer? As, נַפְשׁ בְּשָׂאוֹל, “Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell,” which proves for us, that Christ in soul descended into Hell. Is not the one Hebrew word as proper for soul, as *anima* in Latin, the other as proper and usual for Hell, as *Infernus* in Latin? Here then at the least will you yield? No, say they, not here neither, for Beza tells us that the Hebrew word, which commonly and usually signifies, “soul”, yet for a purpose, if a man will strain it, may signify, not only “body”, but also, “carcass” and so he translates it. But Beza (say we) being admonished by his friends, corrected it in his later edition. Yea, say they, he was content to change his translation, but not his opinion concerning the Hebrew word, as himself protests.

47. Well then, does it like you to read thus according to Beza’s translation, “Thou shalt not leave my carcass in the grave?” No, we are content to alter the word carcass (which is not a seemly word for our Saviour’s body) and yet we are loath to say soul, but if we might, we would say rather, “life,” “person,” as appears in the margin of our Bibles, but as for the Hebrew word that signifies Hell, though the Greek and Latin Bible throughout, the Greek and Latin Fathers in all their writings, as occasion serves, do so read it and understand it, yet will we never so translate it: but for “Hell,” we will say “grave,” in all such places of Scripture as might infer *Limbus partum*, if we should translate “Hell”. These are their shifts, and turnings, and windings, in the Old Testament.

48. In the New Testament, we ask them, will you be tried by the ancient Latin translation, which is the text of the Fathers and the whole Church? No, but we appeal to the Greek. What Greek, say we, for there by sundry copies, and the best of them (as Beza confesses) agree with the said ancient Latin. For example, in St. Peter’s words, “Labour that by good works you may make sure your vocation and election”. Does this Greek copy please you? No, say they: we appeal to that Greek copy, which has not those words, “by good works”, for otherwise we should grant the merit and efficacy of good works toward salvation. And generally to tell you at once, by what Greek we will be tried, we like best the vulgar Greek text of the New Testament, which is most common and in every man’s hands.

49. Well, say we, if you will needs have it so, take your pleasure in choosing your text, and if you will stand to it, grant us that Peter was chief among the Apostles, because your own Greek text says, “The first, Peter”. No, says Beza: we will grant you no such thing, for these words were added to the Greek text by one that favoured Peter’s primacy. Is it so? Then you will not stand to this Greek text either. Not in this place, says Beza.

50. Let us see another place. You must grant us (say we) by this Greek text, that Christ’s very blood which was shed for us, is really in the chalice, because St. Luke says so in the Greek text. No, says Beza, those Greek words came out of the margin into the text, and therefore I translate not according to them, but according to that which I think the truer Greek text, although I find it in no copies in the world, and this his doing is maintained and justified by our English Protestants in their writings of late.

51. Well yet, say we, there are places in the same Greek text, as plain for us as these now cited, where you cannot say, it came out of the margin, or, it was added falsely to the text. As, “Stand and hold fast to the traditions &c.” by this text we require that you grant us traditions delivered by word of mouth, as well as the written word, that is, the Scriptures. No, say they,

we know the Greek word signifies tradition as plain as possibly, but here and in the like places, we rather translate it, “ordinances,” “instructions,” and what else soever. Nay Sirs, say we, you cannot so answer the matter, for in other places, you translate it duly and truly, “tradition”: and why more in one place than in another? They are ashamed to tell why, but they must tell, and shame both themselves and the Devil, if ever they think it good to answer this treatise, as also why they changed “congregation,” which was always in their first translation, into “Church,” in their later translations, and did not change likewise “ordinances” into “traditions,” “Elders” into “Priests”.

52. The cause is, that the name of Church was at the first odious unto them, because of the Catholic Church which stood against them: but afterward this name grew into more favour with them, because of their English Church, so at length called and termed. But their hatred of Priests and traditions continues still, as it first began, and therefore their translation also remains as before, suppressing the names both of the one and of the other. But of all these their dealings they shall be told in their several chapters and places.

53. To conclude as I began, concerning their shifts, and jumps, and windings, and turnings every way, from one thing to another, till they are driven to the extreme refuge of palpable corruptions and false translations: consider with me in this one case only of traditions, as may be likewise considered in all other controversies, that the ancient Fathers, Councils, antiquity, universality, and custom of the whole Church allow traditions: the canonical Scriptures have them, the Latin text has them, the Greek text has them: only their translations have them not. Likewise in the Old Testament, the approved Latin text has such and such speeches that make for us, the renowned Greek text has it, the Hebrew text has it: only their translations have it not.

These are the translations which we call heretical and wilful, and which shall be examined and discussed in this book.

## CONTENTS

The Arguments of Every Chapter, with the page where every Chapter begins.

Chapter 1: That the Protestants translate the Holy Scripture falsely on purpose, in favour of their heresies, throughout all controversies.	13
2: Against Apostolical <i>Traditions</i> .	19
3: Against sacred <i>Images</i> .	21
4: The Ecclesiastical use of words turned into their original and profane significations.	27
5: Against the <i>Church</i> .	29
6: Against <i>Priest</i> and <i>Priesthood</i> . Where much also is said of their profaning of Ecclesiastical words.	31
7: Against <i>Purgatory</i> , <i>Limbus partum</i> , and Christ's <i>descending into Hell</i> .	38
8: Concerning <i>Justification</i> , and God's justice in rewarding good works.	46
9: Against <i>Merits</i> , <i>meritorious works</i> , and the <i>reward</i> for the same.	48
10: Against <i>Free Will</i> .	54
11: For <i>Imputative justice</i> against true inherent justice.	58
12: For <i>Special faith</i> , vain security, and <i>faith alone (only faith)</i> .	60
13: Against <i>Penance</i> and <i>Satisfaction</i> .	62
14: Against the Holy <i>Sacraments</i> , namely <i>Baptism</i> and <i>Confession</i> .	67
15: Against the Sacrament of <i>Holy Orders</i> , and for the <i>Marriage</i> of <i>Priests</i> and <i>Votaries</i> .	69
16: Against the Sacrament of <i>Matrimony</i> .	75
17: Against the <i>Blessed Sacrament</i> , and <i>Sacrifice</i> , and <i>altars</i> .	77
18: Against the honour of <i>Saints</i> , namely of our <i>Blessed Lady</i> .	83
19: Against the distinction of <i>Dulia</i> and <i>Latria</i> .	86
20: Adding to the text.	88
21: Other heretical <i>treacheries</i> and <i>corruptions</i> worthy of observation.	90
22: Other faults <i>Judaical</i> , <i>profane</i> , <i>mere vanities</i> , <i>follies</i> , and <i>novelties</i> .	92

## CHAPTER I.

*That the Protestants translate the Holy Scriptures falsely on purpose, in favour of their heresies.*

Though this shall evidently appear throughout this whole book in every place that shall be objected unto them: yet because it is an observation of greatest importance in this case, and which stings them sore, and touches their credit exceedingly, insomuch that one of them setting a good face upon the matter<sup>1</sup>, says confidently, that all the Papists of the world are not able to show one place of Scripture mistranslated wilfully and on purpose: therefore I will give the reader, certain brief observations and evident marks to know wilful corruptions, as it were an abridgement and sum of this treatise.

2. The first mark and most general is: If they translate elsewhere not amiss, and in places of controversy between them and us, most falsely: it is an evident argument that they do it not of negligence, or ignorance, but of partiality to the matter in controversy. This is to be seen through the whole Bible, where the faults of their translations are altogether, or especially, in those Scriptures that concern the causes in question between us. For other small faults, or rather oversights, we will no further note unto them, than to the end, that they may the more easily pardon us the like, if they find them.

3. If, as in their opinions and heresies, they forsake the ancient Fathers: so also in their translations, they go from that text and ancient reading of Holy Scriptures, which all the Fathers used and expounded: is it not plain that their translation follows the vein and humour of their heresy? And again if they that so abhor from the ancient expositions of the Fathers, yet if it seem to serve for them, stick not to make the exposition of any one Doctor, the very text of Holy Scripture: what is this but heretical wilfulness? See this chap. 1 parag. #43, ch. 10 #1-2, ch. 18 #10-11, and ch. 19 #1.

4. Again, if they that profess to translate the Hebrew and Greek, and that because it makes more for them (as they say) and therefore in all conferences and disputations appeal unto it as to the fountain and touchstone, if they (I say) in translating places of controversy, flee from the Hebrew and the Greek, it is a most certain argument of wilful corruption. This is done many ways, and is to be observed also throughout the whole Bible, and in all this book.

5. If the Greek be, ἰδωλολατρεία, and ἰδωλολάτρης: and they translate not, “Idolatry”, and “idolater”: but, “worshipping of images,” and “worshipper of images,” and that so absurdly, that they make the Apostle say, “Covetousness is worshipping of images”: this none would do but fools or madmen, unless it were on purpose against sacred images. See ch. 3 #1-2.

6. If the Apostle say, A pagan “idolater”, and a Christian “idolater”, by one and the same Greek word (ἰδωλολάτρης), in one and the same meaning: and they translate, A pagan “idolater”, and a Christian “worshipper of images”, by two distinct words and diverse meanings: it must needs be done wilfully to the foresaid purpose. See ch. 3 #8-9.

7. If they translate one and the same Greek word (παράδοσις), “Tradition”, whensoever the Scripture speaks of evil traditions: and never translate it so, whensoever it speaks of good and Apostolical traditions: their intention is evident against the authority of Traditions. See ch. 2 #1-3.

8. Yea if they translate, “Tradition”, taken in ill part, where it is not in the Greek (τί δογματίζεσθε): and translate it not so, where it is in the Greek, taken in good part: it is more evidence of the foresaid wicked intention. See ch. 2 #5-6.

9. If they make this a good rule, to translate according to the usual signification, and not the original derivation of words, as Beza and Mr. Whitakers do: and if they translate contrary to

---

<sup>1</sup> Confutation of Jo. Howlet fol. 35. pag. 2



this rule, what is it but willful corruption? So they do in translating, *idolum*, an image, *Presbyter*, and elder: and the like. See ch. 4 and ch. 6 #6-8 &c. #13 &c.

10. If *Presbyter*, by Ecclesiastical use, be appropriated to signify a Priest, no less then, *Episcopus*, to signify a Bishop, or *Diaconus*, a Deacon: and if they translate these two latter accordingly, and the first never in all the New Testament: what can it be but willful corruption in favour of his heresy<sup>2</sup>, That there are no Priests of the New Testament? See ch. 6 #11.

11. If for God's "altar", they translate "Temple": and for Baal's idololatrical "table", they translate "altar": judge whether it be not on purpose against our altars, and in favour of their communion table. See ch. 17 #15-16.

12. If at the beginning of their heresy, when sacred images were broken in pieces, altars dug down, the Catholic Church's authority defaced, the king made supreme head, then their translation was made accordingly, and if afterward when these errors were well established in the realm, and had taken root in the people's hearts, all was altered and changed in their later translations, and now they could not find that in the Greek, which was in the former translation: what was it at the first but wilful corruption to serve the time that then was? See ch. 3. 5, ch. 17 #15, ch. 15 #22.

13. If at the first revolt, when none were noted for Heretics and Schismatics, but themselves, they did not once put the names of Schism or Heresy in the Bible, but instead thereof, "disunion", and "sect", insomuch that for an Heretic, they said, "an author of Sects", what may we judge of it but as of wilful corruption? See ch. 4 #3.

14. If they translate so absurdly at the first, that themselves are driven to change it for shame: if must needs be at the first wilful corruption. For example, when it was in the first, "Temple", and in the latter "Altar": in the first always, "Congregation", in the latter always, "Church": in the first, "To the king as chief head", in the latter, "To the king as having pre-eminence". So did Beza first translate, "carcass", and afterward, "soul". Which alteration in all these places is so great, that it could not be negligence at the first or ignorance, but a plain heretical intention. See ch. 17 #15, ch. 5 #4-5, ch. 15 #22, ch. 7 #2.

15. If they will not stand to all their translations, but flee to that namely which now is read in their churches: and if that which is now read in their churches, differ in the points aforesaid, from that which was read in their churches in King Edward's time: and if from both these, they flee to the Geneva Bible, and from that again, to the other aforesaid: what shall we judge of the one or the other, but that all is voluntary and as they list? See ch. 3 #10-12, ch. 10 #12.

16. If they gladly use these words in ill part, where they are not in the original text, "procession", "shrines", "devotions", "excommunicate", "images": and avoid these words, which are in the original, "hymns", "grace", "mystery", "Sacrament", "Church", "altar", "Priests", "Catholic", "traditions", "justifications": is it not plain that they do it on purpose to disgrace, or suppress the said things and speeches used in the Catholic Church? See ch. 21 #5 & seq. ch. 12 #3.

17. If in a case that makes for them, they strain the very original signification of the word, and in a case that makes against them, they neglect it altogether: what is this but wilful and on purpose? See ch. 7 #36.

18. If in words of ambiguous and divers signification, they will have it signify here or there, as it pleases them: and that so vehemently, that here it must needs so signify, and there it must not: and both this, and that, to one end and in favour of one and the same opinion: what is this but wilful translation? So doth Beza urge  $\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\kappa\alpha$  to signify, "wife", and not to signify, "wife",

---

<sup>2</sup> Whitaker, p. 199.

both against virginity and chastity of Priests: and the English Bible translates accordingly. See ch. 15 #11-12.

19. If the Puritans and grosser Calvinists disagree about the translations, one part preferring the Geneva English Bible, the other the Bible read in their Church: and if the Lutherans condemn the Zwinglians' and Calvinists' translations, and contrariwise: and if all Sectaries reprove each another's translation: What does it argue, but that the translations differ according to their divers opinions? See their books written one against another.<sup>3</sup>

20. If the English Geneva Bibles themselves dare not follow their Master Beza, whom they profess to translate, because in their opinion he goes wide, and that in places of controversy: how wilful was he in so translating? See ch. 12 #6,8 ch. 13 #1.

21. If for the most part they reprehend the old vulgar translation, and appeal to the Greek: and yet in places of controversy sometimes for their more advantage (as they think) they leave the Greek, and follow our Latin translation: what is it else, but voluntary and partial translation? See ch. 2 #8, ch. 6 #10,21, ch. 7 #39, ch. 10 #6.

22. If otherwise they avoid this word, "justifications", altogether, and yet translate it when they cannot choose, but with a commentary<sup>4</sup> that it signifies good works that are testimonies of a lively faith: does not this heretical commentary show their heretical meaning, when they avoid the word altogether? See ch. 8 #1-3.

23. When by adding to the text at their pleasure<sup>5</sup>, they make the Apostle say, that by Adam's offence, "sin came" on all men, but that by Christ's justice, "the benefit" only "abounded toward" all men, not that justice "came" on all, whereas the Apostle makes the case alike, without any such divers additions, to wit<sup>6</sup>, that we are truly made just by Christ, as by Adam we are made sinners: is not this most wilful corruption for their heresy of imputative and fantastical justices. See ch. 11 #1.

24. But if in this case of justification, when the question is whether only faith justify, and we say no, having the express words of St. James<sup>7</sup>: they say, yea, having no express Scripture for it: if in this case they will add, "only", to the very text: is it not most horrible and devilish corruption? So did Luther, whom our English Protestants honour as their father<sup>8</sup>, and in this heresy of "only faith", are his own children. See ch. 12.

25. If these that account themselves the great Grecians and Hebricians of the world, will so translate for the advantage of their cause, as though they had no skill in the world, and as though they knew neither the signification of words, nor propriety of phrases in the said languages: is it not to be esteemed shameless corruption?

26. I will not speak of the German Heretics<sup>9</sup>, who to maintain this heresy, that all our works, be they never so good, are sin, translated, for *Tibi soli peccavi*, "to thee only have I sinned", thus, *Tibi solum peccavi*, that is, "I have nothing else but sinned: whatsoever I do, I sin": whereas neither the Greek (σὺ μόνος) nor the Hebrew (ךָ לְךָ) will possibly admit that sense. Let these pass as Lutherans, yet wilful corrupters, and acknowledged by our English Protestants as their good brethren. But if Beza translate,  $\tau\iota \nu\tau\omega\nu \mu\upsilon \theta\epsilon\nu$ , "when we were yet of no strength" (Ro. 5:6), as the Geneva English Bible also does interpret it, whereas every young Grecian knows that  $\theta\epsilon\nu\varsigma$  is weak, feeble, infirm, and not altogether without strength: is not this on purpose to take away man's free will altogether? See ch. 10 #13.

<sup>3</sup> Luc. 3:36, Act. 1:14, 2:23, 3:21, 26:20, 2 Thes. 2:25, 3:6

<sup>4</sup> Beza in c. 19, Apoc 8.

<sup>5</sup> Ro. 5:18, No. Test. an 1580. Bib. 1579.

<sup>6</sup> Ro. 5:19.

<sup>7</sup> Ja. 2:24, Ro. 3:28, Luth. tom. 2. fol. 405, edit. Witteb. an. 1551.

<sup>8</sup> Whitak. pag. 198.

<sup>9</sup> Brentius, Melancth. See Linda. Dubi. Dial. 1. c. 12, Psal. 51.

27. If Calvin translate, *Non ego, sed gratia Dei quae mihi aderat*<sup>10</sup>: may not mean Grecians control him, that he also translates falsely against free will, because the preposition σὺν does require some other participle to be understood, that should signify a cooperation with free will to wit, συγκοπιάσασα, “which laboured with me”? See ch. 10 #2.

28. If, when the Hebrew bears indifferently, to say, sin “lies” at the door: and, unto thee the desire “thereof” shall be subject, and thou shalt rule “over it” (Gen. 4:7): the Geneva English Bible of 1579 translates the first without scruple, and the latter not, because of the Hebrew grammar: is not this also most wilful against free will? See ch. 10 #9.

29. If Calvin affirm that ἰσχυροῦς cannot signify, *propter reverentiam*, because ἰσχυρὸς is not so used, and Beza avouches the same more earnestly, and the English Bible translates accordingly, which may be confuted by infinite examples in the Scripture itself, and is confuted by Illyricus the Lutheran: is it not a sign either of passing ignorance, or of most wilful corruption, to maintain the blasphemy that hereupon they conclude? See ch. 7 #42-43.

30. If Beza in the selfsame place content, that ἰσχυροῦς does not signify reverence or piety, but such a fear as has horror and astonishment of mind: and in another place says of this selfsame word, clean contrary: what is it but on purpose to uphold the said blasphemy? See ch. 7 #39-40.

31. If he translate for, God’s “foreknowledge”, God’s “providence”, for “soul”, “carcass”, for “hell”, “grave”<sup>11</sup>: to what end is this but for certain heretical conclusions? And if upon admonition he alter his translation for shame, and yet protests<sup>12</sup> that he understands it as he did before, did he not translate before willfully according to his obstinate opinion? See ch. 7.

32. If to this purpose he avouch<sup>13</sup> that, לֵוֶשֶׁת, signifies nothing else in Hebrew but a grave, whereas all Hebricians know that it is the most proper and usual word in the Scripture for Hell, as the other word קֶבֶר, is for a grave: who would think he would so endanger his estimation in the Hebrew tongue, but that an heretical purpose against Christ’s descending into hell, blinded him? See ch. 7.

33. And if all the English Bibles translate accordingly, to wit, for Hell, “grave”, wheresoever the Scripture may mean any lower place that is not the Hell of the damned: and where it must needs signify that Hell, where they never avoid so to translate it: is it not an evident argument that they know very well the proper signification, but on purpose they will never use it to their disadvantage in the questions of *Limbus*, Purgatory, Christ’s descending into Hell? Ch. 7.

34. If further yet in this kind of controversy, Beza would be bold to affirm (for so he says<sup>14</sup>) if the Grammarians would give him leave, that *chebel* with five points (חֵבֶל) signifies, *funem*, no less than *chebel* with six points<sup>15</sup> (חֵבֶלֶת): is he not wonderfully set to maintain his opinion, that will change the nature of words, if he might, for his purpose?

35. If passives must be turned into actives, and actives into passives, participles disagree in case from their substantives, or rather be plucked and separated from their true substantives, solecisms imagined, where the construction is most agreeable, errors devised to creep out of the margin, and such like: who would so presume in the text of Holy Scripture, to have all grammar, and words, and phrases, and constructions at his commandment, but Beza and his like, for the advantage of their cause? See ch. 5 #6 and the numbers next following in this chapter.

---

<sup>10</sup> 1 Cor. 15. ἰσχυρὸς ἰσχυροῦς.

<sup>11</sup> πρόγνωσις, Act 2:23, ψυχῶν, ἰσχυροῦς, Act 2:27.

<sup>12</sup> Annota. in no. Test. post. edit.

<sup>13</sup> Annot. in Act. 2:24.

<sup>14</sup> Annot. in Act. 2:24.

<sup>15</sup> That is, he would translate *Solutis funibus mortu*, not, *Solutis doloribus inferni*.

36. For example, St. Peter says, “Heaven must receive Christ (δέξαθαι. Act. 3:21).” He translates, “Christ must be contained in heaven”, which Calvin himself mislikes, the Geneva English Bible is afraid to follow, Illyricus the Lutheran reprehends: and yet Mr. Whitakers takes the advantage of this translation (p. 43), to prove that Christ’s natural body is so contained in heaven, that it cannot be upon the altar. For he knew that this was his master’s purpose and intent in so translating. This it is, when the blind follow the blind, yea rather when they see and will be blind: for certain it is (and I appeal to their greatest Grecians) that howsoever it be taken for good in their divinity, it will be esteemed most false in their Greek schools both of Oxford and Cambridge: and howsoever they may presume to translate the Holy Scriptures after this sort, surely no man, no not themselves, would so translate Demosthenes, for saving their credit and estimation in the Greek tongue. See ch. 17 #7-9.

37. But there is yet worse stuff behind: to wit, the famous place Luc. 22. where Beza translates thus, *Hoc poculum novum testamentum per meum sanguinem, qui pro vobis funditur*: whereas in the Greek, in all copies without exception, he confesses that in true Grammatical construction it must needs be said, *quid pro vobis funditur*, and therefore he says it is either a plain *soloecophanes*, (and according to that presumption he boldly translates) or a corruption crept out of the margin into the text. And as for the word *soloecophanes*, we understand him that he means a plain solecism and fault in grammar, and so doth Mr. Whitakers (pp. 34-5): but Mr. Fulke<sup>16</sup> says that he means no such thing, but that it is an elegancy and figurative speech, used by most eloquent authors: and it is a world to see, and a Grecian must needs smile at his devises, striving to make St. Luke’s speech here as he construes the words, an elegancy in the Greek tongue<sup>17</sup>. He sends us first to Budee’s commentaries, where there are examples of *soloecophanes*: and indeed Budee takes the word for that which may seem a solecism, and yet is an elegancy, and all his examples are of most fine and figurative phrases, but alas, how unlike to that in St. Luke. And here, Mr. Fulke was very foully deceived, thinking that Beza and Budee took the word in one sense: and so taking his mark amiss, as it were a counter for gold, where he found *soloecophanes* in Budee, there he thought all was like to St. Luke’s sentence, and that which Beza meant to be a plain solecism, he makes it like to Budee’s elegancies. Much like to those good searchers in Oxford (as it is said) masters of art, who having to seek for Papistical books in a lawyer’s study, and seeing there books with red letters, cried out, Mass books, Mass books: whereas it was the Code or some other book of the Civil or Canon Law.

38. This was lack of judgement in Mr. Fulke at the least, and no great sign of skill in Greek phrases, and he must no more call Dr. Sanders unlearned for not understanding Beza’s meaning, but himself, who indeed understood him not. For, if Beza meant that it was an elegancy used of the finest authors, and such as Budee does exemplify of, why does he say, “that he sees not why Luke should use *soloecophanes*”, but thinks rather, “it is a corruption crept into the margin”? Tell us, Mr. Fulke, we beseech you, whether is the better and more honest defense, to say, that it is an elegancy and fine phrase in St. Luke, or to say, it is a fault in the text, it came out of the margin, the Gospel is here corrupted. Think you Beza such a fool, that he would rather stand upon this latter, if he might have used the former, and had so meant by *soloecophanes*? Yea, what needed any defense at all, if it had been an usual and known elegance, as you would prove it?

39. For you say further, that τ□ is taken for □, and □ΣΤ□ is understood, and that this is a common thing in the best Greek authors. But you must add, that the said relative must always be referred to the antecedent of the same case, as this speech τ□ ποτήριον τ□ □κχυνόμενον

<sup>16</sup> Against D. Sand. Roeca p. 308

<sup>17</sup> See Com. Bud. *Figurata constructio*, or, σχ□μα Αττικ□ν.

may be resolved thus, τὸ ποτήριον ἢ ἢ κχυνόμενον ἢ ΣΤι, or rather ἢ ἢ κχύνεται, but that ἢν τὸ ἢματίμου, τὸ ἢ κχυνόμενον, may be resolved, ἢ ἢ κχυνόμενον ἢ ΣΤι, you shall never be able to bring one example, and you wilfully abuse whatsoever knowledge you have of the Greek tongue, to deceive the ignorant, or else you have no skill at all, that speak so barbarously and rustically of Greek elegancies. For if you have skill, you know in your conscience, that, ἢν τὸ ἢμ ἢματι τὸ ἢπ ἢρ ἢμ ἢν ἢ κχυνόμενον, is as great a solecism in Greek, and no more elegancy, than to say in Latin, *In meo sanguine fusus pro vobis*, which in the school deserves whipping. And yet you ask very vehemently (concerning these words, *Hi calyx novum Testamentum in meo sanguine qui pro vobis fundetur*;) what mean Grammarian would refer, *qui*, to *calyx*, and not to *sanguis*? I answer, that a mere Latinist, for ignorance of the Greek tongue, would refer it rather as you say: but he that knows the Greek, as you seem to do, though he be a very young Grammarian, will easily see it cannot so be referred: as in the like Act. 14. *Sacerdos quoque Jovis qui erat ante civitatem eorum*. Here, *qui* is ambiguous, but in the Greek (ἢ ἢερεἢς τοἢ διἢς τοἢ ἢντος.) we see that, *qui* must be referred to, *Jovis*, and cannot be referred to *Sacerdos*.

40. And this is one commodity among others, that we reap of the Greek text, to resolve the ambiguity that is sometime in the Latin: whereas you neither admit the one nor the other, but as you list, neither does the Greek satisfy you, be it never so plain and infallible, but you will devise that it is corrupted, that there is a solecism, that the same solecism is an elegancy, and thereupon you translate your own devise, and not the word of God. Which whence can it proceed, but of most wilful corruption? See ch. 17 #10-12.

41. If in ambiguous Hebrew words of doubtful signification, where the Greek gives one certain sense, you refuse the Greek, and take your advantage of the other sense: what is this but wilful partiality? So you do in, *Redime eleemosynis peccata tua, Dan. 4.* and *Inclinavi cor meum ad faciendas justifications tuas propter retributionem (Ps. 118 Octon. Nun.)*. And, *Nimis honorati sunt amici tui Deus &c. (Ps. 138)* and yet at another time you follow the determination of the Greek for another advantage: as Psalm 98. Adore his footstool, “because he is holy”. Whereas in the Hebrew (אֱהִי שִׁירָה) it may be as in our Latin, “because it is holy.” See ch. 13 #18, ch. 9 #23-24, ch. 18 #1-2. So you flee from the Hebrew to the Greek, and from this to that again, from both to the Vulgar Latin, as is shown in other places: and as St. Augustine says to Faustus the Manichee<sup>18</sup>, You are the rule of truth: whatsoever is for you, is true: whatsoever is against you, is not true.

42. What shall I speak of the Hebrew particle *vau* (וְ) (Gen. 14:18) must in no case be translated, “because”, lest it should prove that Melchisedek offered sacrifice of bread and wine, as all the Fathers expound it: but (Luc. 1:42) where they translate the equivalent Greek particle καὶ, there Beza proves the said particle to signify “because” (*Quia benedictus, for, & benedictus fructus ventris tui.*) and translates accordingly, and the English Bezites likewise. I will not urge them why, we like the sense well, and Theophylacte so expounds it. But if the Greek copulative may be so translated, why not the Hebrew copulative much more, which often in the Scripture is used in that sense? See ch. 17 #13-14.

43. But I would ask rather, why *κεχαριτωμένη* (Luc. 1:28) may not in any case be translated, “full of grace”: whereas ἢ κχωμένος (Luc. 26:20) is translated, “full of sores”, both words being of like form and force. See ch. 18 #4-5.

44. Again, why say they (Hebr. 13) “Let your conversation be without covetousness” (ἢ φυλάργυρος ἢ τρόπος), and say not, “Let marriage be honorable in all, and the bed undefiled”

<sup>18</sup> Li. 11. cont. Faust. c. 2

(τίμιος □ γάμος), both being expressed alike by the Apostle, and by way of exhortation, as the rest that goes before and follows? See ch. 15 #15.

45. Are we too suspicious think you? How can “fear”, be translated<sup>19</sup>, that which he feared: “repentance”, them that repent or amend their life: “tradition”, the doctrine delivered: “temples”, shrines: “idols”, devotions: “every human creature”, all ordinances of man: “foreknowledge”, providence: “soul”, carcass: “hell”, grave: “altar”, temple: “table”, altar: and such like?

46. What caused these strange speeches in their English Bibles, (Psal. 86, 13) “Thou shalt not leave my soul in the grave.” “Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest grave.” “A covetous man is a worshipper of images.” “By laying on of the hands of the Eldership.” “Hail freely beloved”. “*Sin* lies at the door, and thou shalt rule over *him*.” “Break of thy sins with righteousness.” for, “Redeem with alms.” “Jealousy is cruel as the grave.” for, “as hell.” Cant. 8. Bib. an. 1579. “The griefs of the grave caught me.” (Psal. 116) And, “God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave.” (Psal. 48) “O grave I will be thy destruction.” (Os. 13) and such like? What made Calvin so translate into Latin, that if you turn it into English, the sense is, that God poured water upon us abundantly (Tit. 3), meaning the Holy Ghost: what else but because he would take away the necessity of material water in Baptism, as in his commentary and Beza’s, it is evident?

47. I had meant to have but briefly skimmed over these things, but multitude of matter makes me too long, as it chances to a man that wades through miry and foul places, and yet the greatest demonstration that they are willful corrupters, is behind, which only I will add, and for the rest, refer the reader to the whole book.

48. Doubt you whether they translate on purpose and partiality, in favour of their opinions? You shall hear themselves say so and protest it. If I dealt with Lutherans, this one testimony of Luther were sufficient, who being asked why he added<sup>20</sup>, “only”, into the text Ro. 3: answered that he did it to explicate the Apostles sense more plainly. That is, to make the Apostle say more plainly, that faith only justified. And his disciple Illyricus disputes the matter, that the Apostle saying, “by faith without works”<sup>21</sup>, faith indeed, “only faith”. But because I deal rather with our English Calvinists, and Beza is their chief translator, and a captain among them, whom they profess to follow in the title of the New Testament of 1580, and by the very name of their Geneva Bibles, let us see what he says.

49. First concerning, μετανοε□τε, which the Vulgar Latin and Erasmus translate, *Agite pœnitentiam*, “Repent”, or, “Do penance”. “This interpretation,” says he, “I refuse for many causes, but for this especially, that many ignorant persons have taken hereby an occasion of the false opinions of *satisfaction*, wherewith the Church is troubled at this day.” Lo, on purpose against satisfaction he will not translate the Greek word, as it ought to be, and as it is proven to signify, both in this book, and in the Annotations upon the New Testament. A little after speaking of the same word, he says, “why I have changed the name, *pœnitentia* (Mat. 3:8), I have told a little before (*Loco supra citato*),” protesting that he will never use those words, but *resipiscere*, and *resipiscentia*, that is, amendment of life: because of their heresy, that repentance is nothing else but a mere amendment of former life, without recompense or satisfaction or penance for the sins before committed. See ch. 13.

50. Again concerning the word, “justifications (δικαιώματα), (Luc. 1:6)” which in the Scripture very often signify the commandments, he says thus. “The Greek interpreters of the Bible” (meaning the Septuagint) “applied this word to signify the whole Law of God, and

<sup>19</sup> Beza, Act. 26:20. 2 Thes. 2 & 3.

<sup>20</sup> Tom. 2. fol. 405. edit. Witteb. an. 1551.

<sup>21</sup> The express testimonies of Beza (whom the English Heretical translations follow herein) that he does willfully and on purpose translate against such and such Catholic assertions.

therefore commonly it is wont to be translated word for word, *Justificationes*: which interpretation therefore only I rejected, that I might take away this occasion also of caviling against justification by faith.” And so for, *justificationes*, he put *constituta*, Tully’s word forsooth, as he says. Can you have a more plain testimony of his heretical purpose?

51. Again, when he had rejected this translation (Act. 2:27) *Non derelinques animam meam in inferno*, “Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell”: because (as he says) hereupon grew the error of Christ’s descending into Hell, of Limbus, and of Purgatory: at length he concludes thus, “Whereas the doubtful interpretation of one or two words has brought forth so many monsters, I chose rather<sup>22</sup> simply, for soul, to say, carcass, for hell, grave: than to foster these foul errors.”

52. Again, when he had translated for, “Whom heaven must receive (□ν δε□ □υραν□ν δεξαθαι),” thus, “who must be contained in heaven”: he says, “whereas we have used the passive kind of speech, rather than the active” (which is in the Greek): “We did it to avoid all ambiguity, for it is very expedient, that there should be in the Church of God, this perspicuous testimony, against them, that for ascending by faith into heaven, so to be joined to our head, obstinately maintain that Christ must be called again out of heaven unto us.” Meaning His presence in the Blessed Sacrament, and inveighing no less against the Lutherans than the Catholics, as the Lutherans<sup>23</sup> do here against him for this wilful interpretation, and that by Calvin’s own judgement, who thinks it a forced translation.

53. But Beza goes forward still in this kind. Ro. 5:18 whereas Erasmus had put *propagatum est*, indifferently, both of Adam’s sin which made us truly sinners, and of Christ’s justice, which makes us truly just: he rejecting it, among other causes why it displeased him, says: “That old error of the Sophists” (meaning Catholics) “which for imputative justice put an inherent quality in the place, is so great, and so execrable to all good men, that I think nothing is so much to be avoided as it.”

54. These few examples prove unto us that the Scriptures translated verbatim, exactly, and according to the proper use and signification of the words, do by the Heretics’ confession make for the Catholics, and therefore Beza says he alters the words into other: and (I think) it may suffice any indifferent reader to judge of his purpose and meaning in other places of his translation, and consequently of theirs that either allow him, or follow him, which are our English Calvinists, and Bezites. Many other ways there are to make most certain proof of their wilfulness, as when the translation<sup>24</sup> is framed according to their false and heretical commentary: and, when they will avouch their translations out of profane writers, Homer, Plutarch, Pliny, Tully, Virgil, and Terence, and reject the Ecclesiastical use of words in the Scriptures and Fathers: which Beza does for the most part always. But it were infinite to note all the marks, and by these, the wise reader may conceive the rest.

55. But would you think that these men could notwithstanding speak very gravely and honestly against voluntary and wilful translations of Scripture, that so notoriously offend therein themselves? Hearken what Beza says against Castaleo and the like<sup>25</sup>: “The matter,” says he, “is now come to this point, that the translators of Scripture out of the Greek into Latin, or into any other tongue, think that they may lawfully do anything in translating. Whom if a man reprehend, he shall be answered by and by, that they do the office of a translator, not that translates word for word, but that expresses the sense. So it comes to pass, that, while every man will rather freely follow his own judgement, than be a religious interpreter of the Holy Ghost, he does rather pervert many things than translate them.” Is not this well said, if he had

---

<sup>22</sup> Lo how simply: *Anima*, carcass. *Infernus*, grave.

<sup>23</sup> Flac. Illyr.

<sup>24</sup> Calv. Heb. 5, 7 & Tit. 3, 6. Beza 2 Thessal. 2, 15. & 3, 6.

<sup>25</sup> Annot. act. 10:46.

done accordingly? But doing the clean contrary, as has been proven, he is a dissembling hypocrite in so saying, and a wilful Heretic in so doing, and condemned by his own judgement.

56. But after this general view of their wilful purpose and heretical intention, let us examine their false translations more particularly, and argue the case with them more at large, and press them to answer, whether in their conscience it be so or no, as hitherto is said: and that by several chapters of such CONTROVERSIES as their corruptions concern: and first of all (without further curiosity whence to begin, in cases so indifferent) of TRADITIONS.



## CHAPTER II.

### *Heretical translation of Holy Scripture against Apostolical TRADITIONS.*

This is a matter of such importance, that if they should grant any traditions of the Apostles, and not pretend the written word only: they know that by <sup>1</sup>such traditions mentioned in all antiquity, their religion were wholly defaced and overthrown. For remedy whereof, and for the defacing of all such traditions, they bend their translations against them in this wonderful manner. Wheresoever the Holy Scripture speaks against certain traditions of the Jews, partly frivolous, partly repugnant to the Law of God, there all the English translations follow the Greek (παράδοσις) exactly, never omitting this word, “tradition”. Contrarywise, wheresoever the Holy Scripture speaks in the commendation of Traditions, to wit, such traditions as the Apostles delivered to the Church, there all their said translations agree, not to follow the Greek, which is still the selfsame word, but for, “traditions”, they translate, “ordinances”, or “instructions”. Why so and to what purpose? We appeal to the worm of their conscience, which continually accuses them of an heretical meaning, whether, by urging the word, “traditions”, wheresoever they are discommended, and by suppressing the word, wheresoever they are commended, their purpose and intent be not, to signify to the Reader, that all traditions are naught, and none are good, all reprovably, none allowable.

2. For example, Mat. 15. Thus they translate, “Why do thy disciples transgress the *tradition* (παράδοσιν) of the Elders?” And again, “Why do you also transgress the commandments of God by your *tradition*?” And again, “Thus have you made the commandment of God of no effect by your *tradition*.” Here (I warrant you) all the bells sound tradition, and the word is never omitted, and it is very well and honestly translated, for so the Greek word does properly signify. But now on the other side, concerning good traditions, let us see their dealing. The Apostle by the selfsame word both in Greek and Latin, says thus: “Therefore, brethren, stand and hold fast the *traditions* (παραδόσεις) which you have learned either by word, or by our epistle.” (2 Thes. 2:15) And again, “Withdraw yourselves from every brother walking inordinately, and not according to the *tradition* which they have received of us.” (2 Thes. 3:6) And again (according to the Greek which they profess to follow): I praise you brethren, that in all things you are mindful of me, and as I have delivered unto you, you keep my *traditions*. (καθὼς παρέδοκα, τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε; 1 Cor 11:2)

3. Here we see plain mention of St. Paul’s traditions, and consequently of Apostolical traditions, yea and traditions by word of mouth, delivered to the said Churches without writing or Scripture. In all which places look, gentle reader, and seek all their English translations, and thou shalt <sup>2</sup>not once find the word, “tradition”, but instead thereof, “ordinances”, “instructions”, “preachings”, “institutions”, and any word else rather than “tradition”. Insomuch that Beza their master translates it *traditam doctrina*, “the doctrine delivered”, putting the singular number for the plural (*paradóseis*), and adding, “doctrine”, on his own. So framing the text of Holy Scripture according to his false commentary, or rather putting his commentary in the text, and making it the text of Scripture. Who would think their malice and partiality against traditions were so great, that they should all agree with one consent so duly and exactly in these and these places to conceal the word, which in other places do so gladly use it, the Greek word being all one in all the said places?

4. Yea they do elsewhere so gladly use this word, *tradition*, when it may tend to the discredit thereof: that they put the said word in all their English Bibles, with the likeful consent

---

<sup>1</sup> See the annotations of the New Testament 2 Thess. 2,13.

<sup>2</sup> Yet Mr. Fulke says, it is found there. p. 153 against D. Sand. Rocke. If he give not us an instance, let him give himself the lie.

as before, when it is not in the Greek at all. As when they translate thus, “If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world: why as though living in the world, *are ye led with traditions?*” (τὸ δογματίζεθε; Col. 2:20) and as another English translation of theirs (1579) reads more heretically, “Why are ye burdened with traditions?” Tell us sincerely you that profess to have skill in the Greek, and to translate according to the Greek: tell us we beseech you, whether this Greek word δόγμα do signify tradition, and δογματίζεθαι, to be led or burdened with traditions. You cannot be ignorant that it does not so signify, but as a little before in the same chapter (Col. 2:14), and in other places (Ephes. 2:15; δόγμασιν) yourselves translate δόγματα, “ordinances”, “decrees”: so τὸ δογματίζεθε, must be (as in the Vulgar Latin it is) *Quid decernitis?* Why do you “ordain” or “decree”, or, why are you led with “decrees”?

5. Justify your translation if you can, either out of Scriptures, Fathers, or Lexicon, and make us a good reason why you put the word, “traditions”, here, where it is not in the Greek<sup>3</sup>: and would not put it in the places before, where you know it is most evidently in the Greek. Yea you must tell us, why you translate for tradition, “ordinance”, and contrary for ordinance, “tradition”: so turning cat in pan (as they say) at your pleasure, and wresting both the one and the other to one end, that you may make the very name of traditions odious among the people, be they never so authentic, even from the Apostles: which your conscience knows, and you shall answer for it at the dreadful day.

6. Somewhat more excusable it is, but yet proceeding from the same heretical humour, and on your part (that should exactly follow the Greek) falsely translated, when you translate in St. Peter’s Epistle thus: “You were not redeemed with corruptible things from your vain conversation received by the tradition of the Fathers.” (1 Pet. 1:18) Where the Greek κεν τὸ ματάϊας μὲν παραστροφῶς παζοπᾶδόλου is thus rather to be translated, “from your vain conversation delivered by the Fathers,” but your fingers itched to foist in the word, “tradition”, and for “delivered”, to say, “received”, because it is the phrase of the Catholic Church, that it has “received” many things “by tradition”, which you would here control by likeness of words in this false translation.

7. But concerning the word “tradition”, you will say perhaps the sense thereof is included in the Greek word, “delivered”. We grant, but would you be content, if we should always expressly add, “tradition”, where it is so included? Then should we say in 1 Cor. 11:2 (*tradidi, παρέδωκα*). “I praise you that as I have delivered you [by tradition] you keep my precepts” or “traditions”. And again v. 23. “For I received of our Lord, which also I delivered unto you [by tradition] etc.” And Luc. 1:2. “As they [by tradition] delivered unto us, which from the beginning saw etc.” and such like, by your example, we should translate in this sort. But we use not this licentious manner in translating Holy Scriptures, neither is it a translator’s part, but an interpreter’s, and his that makes a commentary: neither does a good cause need other translation than the express text of the Scripture gives.

8. And if you will yet say, that our Vulgar Latin translation has here the word, “tradition”: we grant it has so, and therefore we also translate accordingly. But you profess to translate the Greek, and not the Vulgar Latin, which you in England condemn as Papistical, and <sup>4</sup>say it is the worst of all, though <sup>5</sup>Beza your master pronounce it to be the very best: and will you notwithstanding follow the said Vulgar Latin rather than the Greek, to make traditions odious? Yea such is your partiality one way, and inconstancy another way, that for your heretical purpose you are content to follow the old Latin translation, though it differ from the Greek,

<sup>3</sup> Παράδοσις they translate, “ordinance”: and δόγμα, “tradition”: clean contrary.

<sup>4</sup> Discover. of the Rock. p. 147.

<sup>5</sup> Prefat. in no. Test. 1556.

and again another time you will not follow it, though it be all one with the Greek most exactly. As in the place before alleged, where the Vulgar Latin translation has nothing of traditions, but, *Quid decernitis*, as it is in the Greek: you translate, “Why are ye burdened with traditions?” (Col. 2:20)

9. So that a blind man may see, you frame your translations to bolster your errors and heresies, without all respect of following sincerely either the Greek or the Latin. But for the Latin no marvel, the Greek at the least why do you not follow? Is it the Greek that induces you to say “ordinances” for “traditions” (παράδοσεις), “traditions” for “decrees” (δόγματα), “ordinances” for “justifications” (δικαιώματα), “Elder” for “Priest” (πρεσβύτερος), “grave” for “hell” (ἄδης), “image” for “idol” (ἰδωλον)? Tell us before God and in your conscience whether it be, because you will exactly follow the Greek: nay tell us truly, and shame the Devil, whether the Greek words do not sound and signify most properly that, which you on purpose will not translate, for disadvantaging your heresies? And first let us see concerning the question of Images.

### CHAPTER III.

#### *Heretical translation against sacred IMAGES.*

I beseech you what is the next and readiest and most proper English of *Idolum, idolatra, idololatria?* (Or, in Greek, ἰδῶλον, ἰδωλολάτρης, ἰδωλολατρεία.) Is it not “idol”, “idolater”, “idolatry”? Are not these plain English words, and well known in our language? Why sought you further for other terms and words, if you had meant faithfully? What needed that circumstance of three words for one, “worshipper of images”, and, “worshipping of images”?<sup>1</sup> Whether (I pray you) is the more natural and convenient speech, either in our English tongue, or for the truth of the thing, to say as the Holy Scripture does, “Covetousness is idolatry”, and consequently, “The covetous man is an idolater”: or as you translate, “Covetousness is worshipping of images”, and, “The covetous man is a worshipper of images”?

2. We say commonly in English, Such a rich man makes his money his God: and the Apostle says in like manner of form, “Whose belly is their God” (Phil. 3.) and generally every creature is our idol, when we esteem it so exceedingly that we make it our God. But whoever heard in English, that our money, or belly, were our images, and that by esteeming of them too much, we become worshippers of images? Among yourselves are there not some even of your Superintendents, of whom the Apostle speaks, that make an idol of their money and belly, by covetousness and belly cheer? Yet can we not call you therefore in any true sense, “worshippers of images”, neither would you abide it. You see then that there is a great difference betwixt idol and image, idolatry and worshipping of images: and even so great difference is there betwixt St. Paul’s words and your translations.

3. Will you see more yet to this purpose? In the English Bible printed the year 1562 you read thus: “How agrees the Temple of God with images?” (2 Cor. 6.) Can we be ignorant of Satan’s cogitations herein, that it was translated on purpose to delude the simple people and to make them believe that the Apostle speaks against sacred images in the churches, which were then in plucking down in England, when this your translation was first published in print? Whereas in very truth you know, that the Apostle here partly interprets himself to speak of men, as of God’s temples wherein he dwells, partly alludes to Solomon’s Temple, which did very well agree with images (for it had the Cherubim, which were the representations of Angels, and the figures of oxen to bear up the lavatory) but with idols it could not agree: and therefore the Apostles words are these, “How agrees the Temple of God with idols?” (μῦτ τῶν ἰδῶλον)

4. When Moses by God’s appointment erected a brazen serpent, and commanded the people that were stung with serpents, to behold it, and thereby they were healed: this was an image only, and as an image was it erected and kept and used by God’s commandment (Num. 21). But when it grew to be an idol (says St. Augustine<sup>2</sup>), that is, when the people began to adore it as God, then king Ezechias broke it into pieces to the great commendation of his piety and godly zeal (4 Kings 18). So when the children of Israel in the absence of Moses made a calf, and said, “These are thy Gods of Israel that brought thee out of Egypt” (Exod. 32), was it but an image which they made? Was that so heinous a matter that God would so have punished them as he did? No, they made it an idol also, saying, “These are thy gods of Israel”. And therefore the Apostle says to the Corinthians, “Be not idolaters, as some of them.” (1 Cor. 10). Which also you translate most falsely, “Be not worshippers of images, as some of them.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Bib. 1577. Eph. 5, Col. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Li. 10 de Civit. c. 8.

5. We see then that the Jews had images without sin, but not idols. Again for having idols they were accounted like unto the Gentiles, as the Psalm says, “They learned their works, and served their graven idols.” (Ps. 135) but they were not accounted like unto the Gentiles for having images, which they had in Solomon’s Temple, and in the brazen serpent. St. Jerome writes of the Ammonites and Moabites (who were Gentiles and Idolaters) that coming into the temple of Jerusalem, and seeing the Angelical images of the Cherubim covering the Propitiatory, they said (like to the Protestants), “Lo, even as the Gentiles, so Juda also has idols of their religion.” (Ezech. 25) These men did put no difference between their own idols, and the Jews’ lawful images. And are not you ashamed to be like to these? They accused Solomon’s Temple of Idols, because they saw there lawful images: you accuse the Churches of God of idolatry, because you see there the sacred images of Christ and his Saints.

6. But tell us yet I pray you, do the Holy Scriptures of either Testament speak of all manner of images, or rather of the idols of the Gentiles? Your conscience knows that they speak directly against the idols and the idolatry that was among the Pagans and Infidels: from which as the Jews in the Old Testament, so the first Christians in the New Testament were to be prohibited. But will you have a demonstration that your own conscience condemns you herein, and that you apply all translation to your heresy? What caused you being otherwise in all places so ready to translate, “images”: yet Esa. 31 and Zachar. 13 to translate, “idols”, in all your Bibles with full consent? Why in these places specially and so advisedly? No doubt because God says there, speaking of this time of the New Testament: “In that day every man shall cast out his idols of silver and idols of gold. And, I will destroy the names of the idols out of the earth, so that they shall no more be had in remembrance.” In which places if you had translated, “images”, you had made the prophecy false, because images have not been destroyed out of the world, but are, and have been in Christian countries with honour and reverence, even since Christ’s time. Marry in the idols of the Gentiles we see it verified, which are destroyed in all the world so far as Gentility is converted to Christ.

7. And what were the Pagans’ idols or their idolatry? St. Paul tells us, saying: “They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the similitude of the image of a corruptible man, and of birds and beasts and creeping things: and they served (or worshipped) the creature more than the creator.” (Ro. 1) Does he charge them for making the image of man or beast? Yourselves have hangings and clothes full of such paintings and embroiderings of imagery. Wherewith then are they charged? With giving the glory of God to such creatures, which was to make them idols, and themselves idolaters.

8. The case being thus, why do you<sup>3</sup> make it two distinct things in St. Paul, calling the Pagans, idolaters: and the Christians doing the same, worshippers of images: and that in one sentence, whereas the Apostle uses but one and the selfsame Greek word in speaking both of Pagans and Christians? It is a marvellous and wilful corruption, and well to be marked, and therefore I will put down the whole sentence, as it is in your English translation. “I wrote to you that you should not company with fornicators: and I meant not at all of the fornicators of this world, either of the covetous, or extortioners, either the idolaters etc. but that ye company not together, if any that is called a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous, or *a worshipper of images*, or an extortioner.” In the first, speaking of Pagans, your translator names “idolater” according to the text, but in the later part speaking of Christians, you translate the very selfsame Greek word *eidôlolâtrês* “worshipper of images”. Why so? Forsooth to make the reader think that St. Paul speaks here, not only of Pagan idolaters, but also of Catholic Christians that

---

<sup>3</sup> 1 Cor. 5, Bib. 1562.

reverently kneel in prayer before the Cross, the holy Rood, the images of our Saviour Christ and his Saints: as though the Apostle had commanded such to be avoided.

9. Where if you have yet the face to deny this your malicious and heretical intent, tell us, why all these other words are translated and repeated alike in both places, “covetous”, “fornicators”, “extortioners”, both Pagans and Christians: and only this word (idolaters) not so, but Pagans, idolaters: and Christians, worshippers of images. At the least you cannot deny but it was on purpose done, to make both seem all one, yea and to signify that the Christians doing the foresaid reverence before sacred images (which you call worshipping of images) are more to be avoided than the Pagan idolaters. Whereas the Apostle speaking of Pagans and Christians that committed one and the selfsame heinous sin whatsoever, commands the Christian in that case to be avoided for his amendment, leaving the Pagan to himself and to God, as having not to do to judge of him.

10. But to this the answer belike will be made, <sup>4</sup>as one of them has already answered in the like case, that in the English Bible appointed to be read in their churches it is otherwise, and even as we would have it corrected: and therefore (says he) “it had been good before we entered into such heinous accusations, to have examined our grounds that they had been true.” As though we accuse them not truly of false translation, unless it be false in that one Bible which for the present is read in their churches: or as though it pertained not to them how their other English Bibles be translated: or as though the people read not all indifferently without prohibition, and may be abused by every one of them: or as though the Bible which now is read (as we think) in their churches<sup>5</sup>, have not the like absurd translations, yea more absurd, even in this matter of images, as is before declared: or as though we must first learn what English translation is read in their church (which were hard to know, it changes so oft) before we may be bold to accuse them of false translation: or as though it were not the same Bible that was for many years read in their churches, and is yet in every man’s hands, which has this absurd translation whereof we have last spoken.

11. Surely the 1562 Bible that we most accuse not only in this point, but for sundry other most gross faults and heretical translations, spoken of in other places, is that Bible which was authorised by Cranmer their Archbishop of Canterbury, and read all King Edward’s time in their churches, and (as it seems by the late printing thereof again in 1562) a great part of this Queen’s reign. And certain it is, that it was so long read in all their churches with this venomous and corrupt translation of images always instead of idols, that it made the deceived people of their sect, to despise, condemn, and abandon the very sign and image of their salvation, the cross of Christ, the holly rood or crucifix representing the manner of his bitter Passion and death, the sacred images of the blessed Virgin Mary the Mother of God, and of St. John Evangelist, representing their standing by the Cross at the very time of his Passion (Jo. 19:26). Insomuch that now by experience we see the foul inconvenience thereof, to wit, that all other images and pictures of infamous harlots and Heretics, of Heathen tyrants and persecutors, are lawful in England at this day, and their houses, parlours and chambers are garnished with them: only sacred images, and representations of the holy mystery of our redemption, are esteemed idolatrous, and have been openly defaced in most spiteful manner and burned, to the great dishonour of our Saviour Christ and his Saints.

12. And as concerning the bible that at this day is read in their churches, if it be that of the year 1577, it is worse sometime in this matter of images, than the other. For where the other reads, “Covetousness, which is worshipping of idols (Col. 3:3): there this later (whereunto they appeal) reads thus, “Covetousness, which is worshipping of images”. And Eph. 5 it reads as

---

<sup>4</sup> W. Fulke, Confut. of John Howlet fo. 35.

<sup>5</sup> Bib. 1577. Col. 3:5.

absurdly as the other, “A covetous man, which is a worshipper of images”. Lo this <sup>6</sup>is the English bible which they refer us unto, as better translated, and as correcting the fault of the former. But because it is evident by these places, that this also is partly worse, and partly as ill as the other, therefore this great confuter of Mr. John Howlett flees once more, to the Geneva English Bible, saying, “Thus we read,” and, “so we translate”: to wit, “A covetous person, which is an idolater”. Where shall we have these good fellows, and how shall we be sure that they will stand to any of their translations? From the first read in their churches, they flee to that which is now read, and from this again, to the later Geneva English Bibles, neither read in their churches (as we suppose) nor of greatest authority among them: and we doubt not but they will as fast flee from this, to the former again, when this shall be proven in some places more false and absurd than the other.

13. But what matter is it how they read in their churches, or how they correct their former translations by the latter: when the old corruption remains still, being set on purpose in the top of every door within their churches, in these words: “Babes keep yourselves from images” (2 Jo. 5)? Why remains that written so often and so conspicuously in the walls of their churches, which in their Bibles they correct as a fault? Their later bibles say, “keep yourselves from idols”: their church walls say, “keep yourselves from images”. St. John speaking to the lately converted Gentiles, bids them beware of the idols from whence they were converted: they speaking to the old instructed Christians, bid them beware of the sacred image of Christ our Saviour, of the holy Crucifix, of the Cross, of every such representation and monument of Christ’s Passion, and our redemption. And therefore in the very same place where these holy monuments were wont to stand in Catholic times, to wit, in the rood loft and partition of the Church and chancel: there now stand these words as confronting and condemning the foresaid holy monuments, “Babes keep yourselves from images.” Which words whosoever esteems as the words of Scripture, and the words of St. John, spoken against Christ’s image, is made a very babe indeed, and sottishly abused by their scribbled doors, and false translations, to count that idolatry, which is indeed to no other purpose than to the great honour of Him whose image and picture it is.

14. But the gay confuter with whom I began<sup>6</sup>, says for further answer: “Admit that in some of our translations it be, ‘Children keep yourselves from images’ ” (for so he would have said if it were truly printed) “What great crime of corruption is here committed?” And when it is said again, this is the crime and fault thereof, that they mean by so translating to make the simple believe that idols and images are all one, which is absurd: he replies that it is no more absurdity, “than instead of a Greek word, to use a Latin” of the same signification. And upon this position he grants that according to the property of the Greek word a man may say, “God made man according to his idol” (*katà tiu eikóna*, Gen. 1.) and that generally, *idolum* may as truly be translated “an image”, as *Tyrannus* a king (which is very true, both being absurd) and here he cites many authors and dictionaries idly, to prove that *idolum* (ἰδωλον) may signify the same as “image” (ἰκον, hence “icon”).

15. But I beseech you Sir, if the dictionaries tell you that ἰδωλον may by the original property of the word signify an image, (which no man denies) do they tell you also that you may commonly and ordinarily translate it so, as the common usual signification thereof? Or do they tell you that image and idol are so all one, that wheresoever you find this word “image”, you may truly call it, “idol”? For these are the points that you should defend in your answer. For an example, do they teach you to translate in these places thus, “God has predestinated us to be made conformable to the idol of his Son.” (*imagini*, Rom. 8) And again, “As we have borne

---

<sup>6</sup> W. Fulke Confut. fol. 35.

the idol of the earthly:” (Adam) “so let us bear the idol of the heavenly” (Christ; *imaginem*, 1 Cor. 15). And again, “We are transformed into the same idol, even as of our Lord’s spirit.” (2 Cor. 3) And again, “The Law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very idol of the things.” (Hebr. 10) And again, Christ “who is the idol of the invisible God”? (Col. 1, 2 Cor. 4.) Is this (I pray you) a true translation? “Yea,” say you, “according to the property of the word: but because the name of idols, in the English tongue, for the great dishonour done to God in worshipping of images, is become odious, no Christian man would say so.

16. First note how foolishly and unadvisedly he speaks here, because he would confound images and idols, and make them falsely to signify one thing: when he says, the name of “idol”, is become odious in the English tongue because of worshipping of “images”, he should have said, “The dishonour done to God in worshipping Idols, made the name of Idols odious.” As in his own example of “Tyrant”, and king: he meant to tell us that “tyrant” sometime was a usual name for every king, and because certain such Tyrants abused their power, therefore the name of Tyrant became odious. For he will not say (I trow) that for the fault of kings, the name of Tyrant became odious. Likewise the Romans took away the name of Manlius for the crime of one Manlius, not for the crime of John at Nokes, or of any other name. The name of Judas is so odious that men now commonly are not so called. Why so? Because he that betrayed Christ, was called Judas: not because he was also Iscariot. The very name of Ministers is odious and contemptible, why? Because Ministers are so lewd, wicked, and unlearned, not because some Priests be naught. Even so the name of idol grew to be odious, because of the idols of the Gentiles, not because of holy images. For if the reverence done by Christians to holy images were evil, as it is not, it should in this case have made the name of images odious: and not the name of Idols. But God be thanked, the name of Images is no odious name among Catholic Christians, but only among heretics and iconoclasts, such as the second general Council of Nice has condemned therefore with the sentence of anathema. No more than the Cross is odious, which to all good Christians is honourable, because our Saviour Christ died on a Cross.

17. But to omit this man’s extraordinary and unadvised speeches which be too many and too tedious (as when he says in the same sentence, “Howsoever the name ‘idol’ is grown odious in the English tongue,” as though it were not also odious in the Latin and Greek tongues, but that in Latin and Greek a man might say according to his fond opinion, *Fecit hominem ad idolum suum*, and so in the other places where is *imago*) to omit these rash assertions I say, and to return to his other words where he says, that though the original property of the words has that signification, yet “no Christian man would say that God made man according to his idol, no more than a good subject would call his lawful Prince a tyrant.” Does he not here tell us that, which we would have, to wit, that we may not speak or translate according to the original property of the word, but according to the common usual and accustomed signification thereof? As we may not translate, *Phalaris tyrannus*, “Phalaris the king”, as sometime *tyrannus* did signify, and in ancient authors does signify: but, “Phalaris the tyrant”, as now this word *tyrannus* is commonly taken and understood. Even so we may not now translate, “My children keep yourselves from images” (*ab idolis*), as the word may and does sometime signify according to the original property thereof (□π□ τ□ν □ιδωλον, 1 Jo. 5), but we must translate, “keep yourselves from idols”, according to the common use and signification of the word in vulgar speech, and in the Holy Scriptures. Where the Greek word is so notoriously and usually peculiar to idols, and not unto images: that the holy Fathers of the second Nicene Council (which knew right well the signification of the Greek word, themselves being Grecians) do pronounce anathema to all such as interpret those places of the Holy Scripture that concern idols, of images or against sacred images, as now these Calvinists do, not only in their Commentaries upon the Holy Scriptures, but even in their translations of the text.



18. This then being so, that words must be translated as their common use and signification requires<sup>7</sup>, if you ask your old question, what great crime of corruption is committed in translating, “keep yourselves from images”, the Greek being ἰδῶλον? You have answered yourself, that in so translating, idol and image are made to signify one thing, which may not be done, no more than tyrant and king can be made to signify all one. And how can you say then, that “this is no more absurdity, than instead of a Greek word, to use a Latin of the same signification.” Are you not here contrary to yourself? Are idol and image, tyrant and king, of one signification? Said you not that in the English tongue, idol is grown to another signification, than image, as tyrant is grown to another signification than king? Your false translations therefore that in so many places make idols and images all one, not only forcing the word in the Holy Scriptures, but disgracing the sentence thereby (as Ephes. 5 & Col. 3<sup>8</sup>) are they not in your own judgement very corrupt: and as your own consciences must confess, of a malicious intent corrupted, to disgrace thereby the Church’s holy images by pretense of the Holy Scriptures that speak only of the Pagans’ idols.

19. But of the usual, and original signification of the words (whereof you take occasion of manifold corruptions) we will speak more anon, if first we touch some other your falsifications against holy images: as, where you affect to thrust the word “image” into the text, when there is no such thing in the Hebrew or Greek, as in that notorious example 2. Par. 36. (Bib. 1562). “Carved images that were laid to his charge.” Again, Ro. 11. “To the image of Baal.” (τῷ Βαλ) and Act. 19. “The image that came down from Jupiter.” (στήλῃ Num. c. 22). Where you are not content to understand image rather than idol, but also to thrust it into the text, being not in the Greek (τῷ διοπετέζ), as you know very well.

20. Of this kind of falsification is that which is crept as a leprosy throughout all your bibles, translating, *sculptile* and *conflatile*, “graven image”, “molten image”, namely in the first commandment, where you know in the Greek it is idol (ἰδῶλον) and in the Hebrew (לִּפְסֵף), such a word as signifies only a graven thing, not including this word “image”: and you know that God commanded to make the images of Cherubim, and of oxen in the Temple, and of the brazen serpent in the desert, and therefore your wisdoms might have considered, that he forbade not all graven images, but such as the Gentiles made and worshipped as gods: and therefore *Non facies tibi sculptile*, concurs with those words that go before, “Thou shalt have non other gods but me”. For so to have an image as to make it a god, is to make it more than an image: and therefore, when it is an Idol, as were the Idols of the Gentiles, then it is forbidden by this commandment. Otherwise, when the Cross stood many years upon the Table in the Queen’s Chapel, was it against this commandment? Or was it idolatry in the Queen’s Majesty and her Counsellors, that appointed it there, being the supreme head of your church? Or do the Lutherans your pew-fellows, at this day commit idolatry against this commandment, that have in their churches the crucifix, and the holy Images of the Mother of God, and of St. John the Evangelist? Or if the whole story of the Gospel concerning our Saviour Christ, were drawn in pictures and Images in your churches, as it is in many of ours, were it (trow you) against this commandment? Fie for shame, that you should thus with intolerable impudence and deceit abuse and bewitch the ignorant people, against your own knowledge and conscience. For, wot you not, that God many times expressly forbade the Jews both marriages and other conversation with the Gentiles, lest they might fall to worship their idols, as Solomon did (3 Reg. 11.) and as the Psalm reports of them (Ps. 105:35)? This then is the meaning of the

<sup>7</sup> Loco citato fo. 35.

<sup>8</sup> Eph. 5. A covetous man is a worshipper of images. And, Col. 3. Covetousness is worshipping of images.

commandment, neither to make the idols of the Gentiles, nor any other like unto them, and to that end, as did Jeroboam in Dan and Bethel.

21. This being a thing so plain as nothing more in all the Holy Scriptures, yet your itching humour of deceit and falsehood, for the most part does translate still, “images, images”, when the Latin and Greek and Hebrew have divers other words, and very seldom that which answer to “image”<sup>9</sup>. For when it is “image” in the Latin, or Greek or Hebrew texts, your translation is not reprehended: for we also translate sometimes, “images”, when the text of the Holy Scripture requires it. And we are not ignorant that there were images, which the Pagans adored for their gods: and we know that some idols are images, but not all images, idols. But when the Holy Scriptures call them by other names, rather than images, because they were not only images, but made idols: why do your translations, like cuckoo birds, sound continually, “images, images”, more than idols, or other words equivalent to idols, which are there meant?

22. Two places only we will at this time ask you the reason of: first why you translate the Hebrew and Greek that answer to *statua*, “image” (*matsebah*, *στήλη*) so often as you do? Whereas this word in the said tongues, is taken also in the better part, as when Jacob set up a stone and erected it for a title (Gen. 28:22), pouring oil upon it: and the prophet says, “our Lord’s altar shall be in Egypt, and his title beside it (Esa. 19:19)”. So that the word does signify generally a sign erected of good or evil, and therefore might very well (if it pleased you) have some other English than, “image”. Unless you will say that Jacob also set up an image: and, Our Lord’s image shall be in Egypt: which you will not say, though you might with more reason than in other places.

23. Secondly we demand, why your very last English Bible of 1579 has (Esa. 30:22): for two Hebrew words, *peselim*, *massechoth*, which are in Latin *sculptilia* and *conflatilia*, in Greek *ἰδωλα*, twice, “images, images”: neither word being Hebrew for an image: no more than if a man would ask, what is Latin for an image, and you would tell him *sculptile*. Whereupon he seeing a fair painted image in a table, might happily say, *Ecce egregium sculptile*. Which every boy in the Grammar school would laugh at. Which therefore we tell you, because we perceive your translations endeavour and as it were affect, to make *sculptile* and *image* (*יִצְלָפֶטֶן, יִלְדָּף; γλυπτῶν, ἰδωλῶν*) all one. Which is most evidently false and to your great confusion appears Abac. 2:18. Wherefore these words, *Quid prodest sculptile, quia sculpsit illud factor suus conflatile et imaginem falsam?* Which is according to the Hebrew and Greek: your later 1579 English translation has, “What profits the image? For the maker thereof has made it an image, and a teacher of lies”.

24. I would every common Reader were able to discern your falsehood in this place. First, you make *sculpere sculptile*, no more than “to make an image”. Which being absurd you know (because the painter or embroiderer making an image, cannot be said *sculpere sculptile*) might teach you that the Hebrew has in it no signification of image, no more than *sculpere* can signify, to make an image: and therefore the Greek (*γλυπτῶν*) and the Latin (*sculptile*) precisely (for the most part) express neither more nor less, than a thing graven: but yet mean always by these words, “a graven idol”, to which signification they are appropriated by use of Holy Scripture: as *simulacrum idolum*, *conflatile*, and sometimes *imago*. In which sense of signifying Idols, if you also did repeat “images” so often, although the translation were not precise, yet it were in some part tolerable, because the sense were so: but when you do it to bring all holy images into contempt,

---

<sup>9</sup> Hebr. *teraphim*, *matsebah*, *temunah*, *maschith*, *pesel*, *tselamim*, *tabnith*, *hamanim*, *saemel*, *massecah*, *nesachim*, *gillulim*, *miphletseth*. Greek *ἰδωλα*, *γάλματα*, *χειροποίητα*, *γλυπτῶν*, *μορφῶν*, *ἰκῶν*, *στῆλαι*, *στόλοι*, *χωνευτῶν*, all “image” and “images”, in their translations.

even the image of our Saviour Christ crucified, you may justly be controlled for false and heretical translators.

25. As in this very place, Abac. 2 (which is another falsehood like to another) *conflatile* you translate “image”, as you did *sculptile*, and so here again in Abacuck (as before in Esay is noted) for two distinct words, each signifying another divers thing from image, you translate, “images, images”. Thirdly, for *imaginem falsam*, “a false image”, you translate another thing, without any necessary pretence either of Hebrew or Greek, avoiding here the name of “image”, because this place tells you that the Holy Scripture speaks against false images, or as the Greek has, “false fantasies” (φαντασίαν ψευδ□), or as you translate the Hebrew, “such images as teach lies”, representing false Gods which are not, as the Apostle says, *Idolum nihil est* (1 Cor. 8), and, *Non sunt Dii qui manibus fiunt* (Act. 19). Which distinction of false and true images you will not have, because you condemn all images, even holy and sacred also, and therefore you make the Holy Scriptures to speak herein according to your own fancy.

26. Wherein you proceed so far, that when Daniel said to the king, “I worship not idols made with hands” (□ιδωλα χειροπόητα, Dan. 14:4) you make him say thus, “I worship not things that be made with hands” (Bib. 1562, 1577), leaving out the word “idols” altogether as though he had said, nothing made with hand were to be adored, not the Ark, the propitiatory, no nor the holy Cross itself that our Saviour shed his blood upon. As before you added to the text, so here you diminish and take from it at your pleasure.

27. But concerning the word “image”, which you make to be the English of all the Latin, Hebrew, and Greek words, be they never so many and so distinct, I beseech you what reason had you to translate γλυπτ□ “images”, Sap. 15:13: does the Greek word so signify? Does not the sentence following tell you that it should have been translated, “graven idols”? For thus it says, “They judged all the idols of the nations to be Gods”. Lo your images, or rather lo the true names of the Pagans’ gods, which it pleases you to call, “images, images”.

28. But (to conclude this point) you might, and it would have well become you, in translating or expounding the foresaid words, to have followed St. Jerome the great famous translator and interpreter of the Holy Scriptures<sup>10</sup>: who tells you two senses of the foresaid words: the one literal, of the idols of the Gentiles: the other mystical, of Heresies and errors. “*Sculptile*”, says he, “and *conflatile*: I take to be perverse opinions, which are adored of the authors that made them. See Arius, that graved to himself this idol, that Christ was only a creature, and adored that which he had graven. Behold Eunomius, how he melted and cast a false image, and bowed to that which he had molten.” Suppose he had exemplified of the two condemned heretics Jovinian and Vigilantius also: had he not touched your idols, that is, the old condemned heresies which you at this day adore?

29. These only (I mean heresies and heretics) are the idols and idolators (by the ancient Doctors’ judgement) which have been among Christians, since the idolatry of the Gentiles ceased according to the prophets (Zach. 13). Therefore St. Jerome says again, “If thou see a man that will not yield to the truth, but when the falsehood of his opinions is once shown, perseveres still in that he began: thou maist aptly say, *Sperat in figmento suo*, (Osee 11) and he makes dumn or deaf idols.” And again, “All Heretics have their gods: and whatsoever they have forged, they adore the same as *sculptile* and *conflatile*: that is, as a graven and molten idol.” And again, “He says well, I have found unto myself an idol”: For, “all the forgeries of heretics are as the idols of the Gentiles: neither do they much differ in impiety, though in name they seem to differ.” And again, “(In 5. Amos) Whatsoever according to the letter is spoken against the idolatry of the Jews, do thou refer all this unto them which under the name of Christ worship

---

<sup>10</sup> Comment. in Abac. 2.

idols, and forging to themselves perverse opinions, carry the tabernacle of their king the Devil, and the image of their idols. For they worship not an idol, but for variety of their doctrine they adore diverse Gods. And he put in very well, which you made to yourselves: for they received them not of God, but forged them of their own mind.” And of the idol of Samaria in 8 Amos he says, we always understand Samaria (and the idol of Samaria) in the person of Heretics, the same Prophet saying, “*Woe be to them that despise Sion, and trust in the mount of Samaria.* (Amos 6) For Heretics despise the Church of God, and trust in the falsehood of their opinions, erecting themselves against the knowledge of God: and saying, when they have divided the people [by schism], we have no part in David, nor inheritance in the son of Jesse.”

30. Thus the Reader may see that the Holy Scriptures which the Adversaries falsely translate against the holy images of our Saviour Christ and his saints, to make us idolaters, do indeed concern their idols, and condemn them as idolaters, which forge new opinions to themselves, such as the ancient Fathers knew not, and adore them and their own sense and interpretation of Scriptures, so far and so vehemently, that they prefer it before the approved judgement of all the general councils and holy Doctors, and for maintenance of the same, corrupt the Holy Scriptures at their pleasure, and make them speak according to their fancies, as we have partly shown, and now are to declare further.

## CHAPTER IV.

### *The ECCLESIASTICAL use of words turned into their ORIGINAL and PROFANE signification.*

We spoke a little before of the double signification of words, the one according to the original property [literal], the other according to the usual taking thereof in all vulgar speech and writing [literary]. These words (as by the way we showed before upon occasion of the Adversary's grant<sup>1</sup>) are to be translated in their vulgar and usual signification, not as they signify by their original property. As for example: *Maior* in the original signification is, "greater". But when we say, "The *Mayor* of London", now it is taken and sounds in every man's ear for such and Officer: and no man will say, "The *Greater* of London", according to the original property of it. Likewise, *Episcopus*, a Greek word, in the original sense is every overseer, as Tully uses it and other profane writers: but among Christians in Ecclesiastical speech it is a Bishop. And no man will say, "My Lord *overseer* of London," for my Lord *Bishop*. Likewise, we say, Seven "Deacons", St. Steven a "Deacon", no man will say, Seven "Ministers", St. Steven a "Minister", although that be the original signification of the word *Deacon*. But by Ecclesiastical use and appropriation being taken for a certain degree of the Clergy, so it sounds in every man's ear, and so it must be translated. As we say, Nero made many "Martyrs": not, Nero made many "witnesses": and yet Martyr by the first original property of the word is nothing else but a witness. We say "Baptism" is a Sacrament: not, "Washing" is a Sacrament. Yet Baptism and washing by the first original purpose of the word is all one.

2. Now then to come to our purpose, such are the absurd translations of the English Bibles, and altogether like unto these. Namely, when they translate "congregation" for Church, "Elder" for Priest, "image" for idol, "dissension" for Schism, "General" for Catholic, "secret" for Sacrament, "overseer" for Bishop, "messenger" for Angel, "ambassador" for Apostle, "minister" for Deacon, and such like<sup>2</sup>: to what other end be these deceitful translations but to conceal and obscure the name of the Church and dignities thereof mentioned in the Holy Scriptures: to dissemble the word "schism" (as they do also "Heresy" and "Heretic"<sup>3</sup>) for fear of disgracing their schisms and Heresies, to say of Matrimony, neither Sacrament which is the Latin, nor mystery which is the Greek, but to go as far as they can possibly from the common usual and Ecclesiastical words, saying, "This is a great *secret*" (Eph. 5:32): in favour of their heresy, that Matrimony is no Sacrament.

3. St. Paul says as plain as he can speak, "I beseech you brethren, that you all say one thing, and that there be no schisms among you." (1 Cor. 1:10) They translate for schisms, "dissensions": which may be in profane and worldly things, as well as in matters of religion, but schisms are those that divide the unity of the Church, whereof they know themselves guilty. St. Paul says as plainly as possible, "A man that is a Heretic avoid after the first and second admonition." (Tit. 3.; ἑρετικὸν ἢ ἄνθρωπον) They translated in their Bible of the year 1562, "A man that is an author of Sects", and where the Greek is, "Heresy" (ἑρέσεις), reckoned among damnable sins, they say, "Sects": favouring that name for their own sakes, and dissembling it, as though the Holy Scriptures spoke not against Heresy or Heretics, Schism or Schismatics.

4. As also they suppress the very name "Catholic", when it is expressly in the Greek, for malice toward Catholics and Catholic religion, because they know, themselves never shall be called or known by that name. And therefore their two English Bibles of 1562 and 1577 accustomed to be read in their church (therefore by like most authentical) leave it clean out in

---

<sup>1</sup> Chap. 3. nu. 17. 18. See also M. Whitaker pag. 209. & the 6 chap. of this book (#6-8, 13, etc.) much more of this matter.

<sup>2</sup> See chap. 15. #18 & 3, 4, & chap 21.

<sup>3</sup> Gal. 5. Tit. 3. 1 Cor. 11., Bib. 1562.

the title of all those Epistles, which have been known by the name of *Catholicae Epistolae* ever since the Apostles' time<sup>4</sup>: and their later English Bible (dealing somewhat more honestly) has turned the word "Catholic" into "General": saying, "The General Epistle of James, of Peter, etc." As if a man should say in his Creed, "I believe the general Church", because he would not say, "the Catholic Church": as the Lutheran Catechisms say for that purpose, "I believe the Christian Church"<sup>5</sup>. So that by this rule, when St. Augustine tells that the manner was in cities where there was liberty of religion, to ask, *Quantur ad Catholicam?* We must translate it, "Which is the way to the General?" And when St. Jerome says, "If we agree in faith with the Bishop of Rome, *ergo Catholici sumus*": we must translate it, "Then we are Generals". Is not this good stuff? Are they not ashamed thus to invert and pervert all words against common sense and use and reason? Catholic and General or Universal (we know) is by the original property of the word all one: but according to the use of both, as it is ridiculous to say, "A Catholic Council", for a general Council: so is it ridiculous and impious to say, "General" for "Catholic", in derogation thereof, and for to hide it under a bushel.

5. Is it because they would follow the Greek, that they turn καθολικόν, "general"? Even as just, as when they turn εἰδωλον, "image", παράδοσιν, "instruction", δικαίωμα, "ordinance", σχίσμα, "dissension", ἑρεσιν, "sect", μυστήριον, "secret", and such like, where they go as far from the Greek as they can, and will be glad to pretend for answer of their word, "sect", that they follow our Latin translation. Alas poor shift for them that otherwise pretend nothing but the Greek, to be tried by that Latin which themselves condemn. But we honour the said text, and translate it "sects" also, as we there find it, and as we do in other places follow the Latin text, and take not our advantage of the Greek text, because we know the Latin translation is good also and sincere, and approved in the Church by long antiquity, and it is in sense all one to us with the Greek: but not so to them, who in these days of controversy about the Greek and Latin text, by not following the Greek, which they profess sincerely to follow, betray themselves that they do it for a malicious purpose.

---

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. li. 2. Ec. hist. c. 22 in fine.

<sup>5</sup> Lind. in Dubitantio.

## CHAPTER V.

### *Heretical translation against the CHURCH.*

As they suppress the name “Catholic”, even so did they in their first English bible the name of “Church” itself: because at their first revolt and apostasy from that which was universally known to be the only true Catholic Church: it was a great objection against their schismatical proceedings, and it stuck much in the people’s consciences, that they forsook the Church, and that the Church condemned them. Whereupon very wily they suppressed the name Church in their English translation, so, that in all that Bible of 1562 so long read in their congregations, we cannot once find the name thereof. Judge by these places which seem of most importance for the dignity, pre-eminence, and authority of the Church.

2. Our Saviour says, “Upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.” (Mat. 16) They make him to say, “Upon this rock I will build my congregation.” Again, “If he hear not them, tell the Church: and if he hear not the Church, let him be to thee as a Heathen and as a publican.” (Mat. 18) They say, “Congregation”. Again, who would think they would have altered the word “Church” in the epistle to the Ephesians? Their English translation for many years read thus, “Ye husbands love your wives, as Christ loved the congregation, and cleansed it to make it unto himself a glorious congregation without spot or wrinkle.” (Eph. 5) And, “This is a great secret, but I speak of Christ and of the congregation.” And to Timothy, “The house of God, which is the congregation of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth.” (1 Tim. 3) Here is no word of “Church”, which in Latin and Greek is, *Ecclesia Dei vivi, columna et firmamentum veritatis*. Likewise to the Ephesians again, “He has made him head of the congregation, which is his body.” (Eph. 1) And to the Hebrews they are all bold to translate: “The congregation of the first-born,” (Heb. 12:23) where the Apostle names heavenly Jerusalem, the city of the living God, etc.

3. So that by this translation, there is no more Church militant and triumphant, but congregation, and he is not head of the Church, but of the congregation: and this congregation at the time of the making of this translation, was in a few new brethren of England, for whose sake the name Church was left out of the English Bible, to commend the name of congregation above the name of church<sup>1</sup>. Whereas St. Augustine tells them, that the Jews’ Synagogue (συναγωγῆ) was a congregation: the Church (ἐκκλησία) a convocation: and that a congregation, is of beasts also: a convocation, of reasonable creatures only: and that the Jews’ congregation is sometime called the “Church”, but the Apostles never called the Church, “Congregation”. Do you see then what a goodly change they have made, for Church, to say congregation: so making themselves a very Synagogue, and that by the property of the Greek word, which yet (as St. Augustine tells them most truly) signifies rather a convocation?

4. If they appeal here to their later translations, we must obtain of them to condemn the former, and to confess this was a gross fault committed therein, and that the Catholic Church of our country did not ill to forbid and burn such books which were so translated by Tyndale and the like, as being not indeed God’s book, word, or Scripture, but the Devil’s word. Yea they must confess, that the leaving out of this word Church altogether, was of a heretical spirit against the Catholic Roman Church, because then they had no Calvinistical church in any like form of religion and government to theirs now. Neither will it serve them to say after their manner, “And if a man should translate *Ecclesiam*, ‘congregation’: this is no more absurdity,

---

<sup>1</sup> In ps. 81 in initio.

than instead of a Greek word, to use a Latin of the same signification<sup>2</sup>." This (we trow) will not suffice them in the judgement of the simplest indifferent Reader.

5. But, my Masters, if you would confess the former faults and corruptions never so plainly, is that enough to justify your corrupt dealing in the Holy Scriptures? Is it not a horrible fault so wilfully to falsify and corrupt the word of God written by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost? May you abuse the people for certain years with false translations, and afterward say, "Lo we have amended it in our later translations?" Then might the Heretic Beza<sup>3</sup> be excused for translating instead of Christ's "soul in hell", his "carcass in the grave", and because some friend told him of that corruption, and he corrected it in the later editions, he should nevertheless in your judgement, be counted a right honest man. No (be ye sure) the discreet Reader cannot be so abused, but he will easily see, that there is a great difference in mending some oversights which may escape the best men: and in your gross false translations, who at the first falsify of a prepensed malice, and afterwards alter it for very shame. How be it, to say the truth, in the chiefest and principal place that concerns the Church's perpetuity and stability, you have not yet altered the former translation, but it remains as before, and is at this day read in your churches thus, "Upon this rock I will build my congregation." (Mat. 16:18, 1577 Bible) Can it be without some heretical subtlety, that in this place specially and (I think) only you change not the word congregation into Church? Give us a reason and discharge your credit.

6. What shall I say of Beza, whom the English bibles also follow, translating actively that Greek word (which in common use, and by St. Chrysostom's and the Greek Doctors' exposition is a plain passive), to signify, as in his Annotations is clear, that Christ may be without his Church, that is, a head without a body. The words be these in the heretical translation, "He gave him to be the head over all things to the Church, which [Church] is his body, the fullness of him that fills all in all." (το πληρουμένον, Eph. 1:22-3) St. Chrysostom, says Beza, (he might have said all the Greek and Latin ancient Fathers) takes it passively, in this sense, that Christ "is filled" all in all, because all faithful men as members, and the whole Church as the body, concur to the fullness and accomplishment of Christ the head. "But this," says he, "seems unto me a forced interpretation." Why so, Beza?

7. Mark his Doctors whom he opposes to the Fathers both Greek and Latin. Because Xenophon (says he) in such a place, and Plato in such a place, use the said Greek word actively. I omit this miserable match, and unworthy names of Xenophon and Plato in trial of St. Paul's words, against all the glorious Doctors: this is his common custom. I ask him rather of these his own doctors, how they use the Greek word in other places of their works? How use they it most commonly? Yea how do all other Greek writers either profane or sacred use it? What say the Greek readers of all universities? Surely not only they, but their scholars for the most part, cannot be ignorant, that the used of this word (πληρομα) and the like, is passive, though sometime it may also signify actively: but that is so rare in comparison of the other, that no man lightly will use it, and I am well assured it would be counted a fault and some lack of skill, if one now in his writings that would express this in Greek, "God fills all things with his blessing," should say, πληρομα πάντα: and "The wine fills the cup," ονος πληροται το ποτήριον. Ask them that have skill, and control me. Contrariwise, if one would say passively, "All things are filled with God's blessing", "The cup is filled with wine," "Such a prophecy is fulfilled", what mean Grecian would not say, as St. Chrysostom here expounds this word, πληροται, using it passively?

---

<sup>2</sup> Confut. of M. Howlett fo. 35.

<sup>3</sup> See his new Test. in Latin of the year 1556, printed by Robert Steven in fol. Act. 2:27.



8. Yet (says Beza) this is a forced interpretation, because Xenophon forsooth and Plato (once perhaps in all their whole works) use it otherwise. O heretical blindness or rather stubbornness, that calls that forced, which is most common and usual: and sees not that his own translation is forced, because it is against the common use of the word. But no marvel. For he that in other places thinks it no forced interpretation, to translate δέξαται, *recipere*, “to be contained”, which neither Xenophon, nor Plato, nor any Greek author will allow him to doe, and ψυχῶν, *animam*, “carcass”, and πρόγνωσιν, *prescientiam*, “providence”, and μετάνοιαν, *pœnitentiam*, “them that amend their lives,” may much more in this place dissemble his forced interpretation of πεπληρουμένου. But pretation forced, which is the common and usual interpretation, that has no more reason, than if a very thief should say to an honest man, “Thou art a thief, and not I.”

9. Is it forced Beza, that Christ “is filled all in all” by the Church? Does not St. Paul in the very next words before, call the Church the fullness of Christ, saying, “Which is the fullness of him that is filled all in all?” (Eph. 1.) If the Church be the fullness of him, then he is filled or has his fullness of the Church, so that he is not a maimed head without a body. This would St. Paul say, if you would give him leave, and this he does say, whether you will or no. But what is the cause that they will not suffer the Apostle to say so? Because (says Beza) “Christ needs no such complement.” And if he need it not, then may he be without a Church, and consequently it is no absurdity, if the Church has been for many years not only invisible, but also not at all. Would a man easily at the first imagine or conceive that there were such secret poison in their translation?

10. Again, it comes from the same puddle of Geneva, that in their bibles so-called, the English Bezites translate against the unity of the Catholic Church. For whereas themselves are full of sects and dissensions, and the true Church is known by unity, and has this mark given her by Christ himself (Cant. 6:8) in whose person Solomon speaking says, *Una est Columba mea*, that is, “One is my dove,” or, “My dove is one.” (μία, ἑξ) Therefore instead hereof, the foresaid bible says, “My dove is alone”: Neither Hebrew nor Greek word having that signification, but being as proper to signify one, as *Unus* in Latin.

11. But we beseech every indifferent Reader, even for his soul’s health to consider that one point especially before mentioned of their abandoning the name of Church for so many years out of their English Bibles: thereby to defeat the strongest argument that might and may possibly be brought against them and all other Heretics: to wit, the authority of the Church which is so many ways and so greatly recommended unto all Christians in Holy Scriptures. Consider (I pray you) what a malicious intention they had herein. First, that the name Church should never sound in the common people’s ears out of the Scriptures: secondly, that as in other things, so in this also it might seem to the ignorant a good argument against the authority of the Church, to say, “We find not this word (Church) in all the Holy Scriptures.” For as in other articles they say so, because they find not the express word in the Holy Scripture, so did they well provide, that the word (Church) in the Holy Scriptures should not stay or hinder their schismatical and heretical proceedings, as long as that was the only English translation, that was read and liked among the people: that is, so long till they had by preaching taken away the Catholic Church’s credit and authority altogether, among the ignorant by opposing the Scriptures thereunto, which themselves had thus falsely translated.

## CHAPTER VI.

### *Heretical translation against PRIEST and PRIESTHOOD.*

But because it may be, they will stand here upon their later translations, which have the name Church, (because by that time they saw the absurdity of changing the name, and now their number was increased, and themselves began to challenge to be the true Church, though not the Catholic: and for former times when they were not, they devised an invisible Church) If then they will stand upon their later translations, and refuse to justify the former: let us demand of them concerning all their English translations, why and to what end they suppress the name “Priest”, translating it “Elder”, in all places where the Holy Scripture would signify by *Presbyter* and *Presbyterium*, the Priests and Priesthood of the new Testament?

2. Understand gentle Reader, their wily policy therein is this. To take away the holy sacrifice of the Mass, they take away both altar and Priest, because they know right well that these three (Priest, sacrifice, and altar) are dependents and consequents one of another, so that they cannot be separated. If there be an external sacrifice, there must be an external Priesthood to offer it, an altar to offer the same upon. So had the Gentiles their sacrifices, Priests, and altars: so had the Jews: so Christ himself being a Priest according to the order of Melchisedec, had a sacrifice, his body: and an altar, his Cross: upon the which he offered it. And because he instituted this sacrifice to continue in his Church forever in commemoration and representation of his death, therefore did he withal ordain his Apostles Priests at his last supper, there and then instituted the holy order of Priesthood and Priests (saying, *hoc facite*, “Do this”, Luc. 22:19) to offer the selfsame sacrifice in a mystical and unbloody manner, until the world’s end.

3. To defeat all this and to take away all external Priesthood and sacrifice, they by corrupt translation of the Holy Scriptures, make them clean dumb as though they had not a word of any such Priests or Priesthood as we speak of. Their Bibles (we grant) have the name of Priests very often, but that is when mention is made either of the Priests of the Jews, or of the Priests of the Gentiles (especially when they are reprehended and blamed in the Holy Scriptures) and in such places our Adversaries have the name Priests in their translations to make the very name of Priest odious among the common ignorant people. Again they have also the name Priests, when they are taken for all manner of men, women, or children, that offer internal and spiritual sacrifices, whereby our Adversaries would falsely signify that there are no other priests, as one of them of late freshly avouches<sup>1</sup>, directly against St. Augustine, who in one brief sentence distinguishes Priests properly so called in the Church, and Priests as it is a common name to all Christians<sup>2</sup>. This name then of Priest and Priesthood properly so called (as St. Augustine says, which is an order distinct from the laity and vulgar people, ordained to offer Christ in an unbloody manner in sacrifice to his heavenly Father for us, to preach and minister the Sacraments, and to be the Pastors of the people) they wholly suppress in their translations, and in all places where the Holy Scripture calls them, *Presbyteros*, there they never translate “Priests”, but “Elders”. And that they do observe so duly and so warily and with so full and general consent in all their English Bibles as the Puritans do plainly confess<sup>3</sup>, and Mr. Whitgift denies it not that a man would wonder to see how careful they are, that the people may not once hear the name of any such Priest in all the Holy Scriptures.

4. As for example in their translations, when there fell a question about circumcision, “They determined that Paul and Barnabas should go up to Jerusalem unto the Apostles and *Elders* (*πρεσβυτέρους*), about this question.” (Act. 15.) And again, “They were received of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Whitakers, p. 199.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. 20 de Civit. Dei cap. 10.

<sup>3</sup> See the Puritans’ reply, p. 159, and Whitgift’s defence against the Puritans, p. 722.

congregation<sup>4</sup> and of the Apostles and *Elders*.” Again, “The Apostles and Elders came together to reason of this matter.” Again, “Then pleased it the Apostles and Elders with the whole congregation to send etc.” Again, “The Apostles and Elders and brethren send greeting etc.” Again, “They delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the Apostles and *Elders*.” (Act. 16.) If in all these places they had translated “Priests” (as indeed they should have done according to the Greek word) it had then disadvantaged them this much, that men would have thought, both the dignity of Priests to be great, and also their authority in Councils, as being here joined with the Apostles, to be greatly revered and obeyed. To keep the people from all such holy and reverent cogitation of Priests, they put “Elders”, a name wherewith our holy Christian forefathers’ ears were never acquainted, in that sense.

5. But let us go forward. We have heard often and of old time, of making of Priests: and of late years also, of making Ministers: but did ye ever hear in all England of making Elders? Yet by these men’s translations it has been in England a phrase of Scripture these thirty years: but it must needs be very strange, that this making of elders has not all this while been practiced and known, no not among themselves in any of their churches within the realm of England. To Titus they make the Apostle say thus, “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest ordain *elders* (τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις) in every city, etc.” (Tit. 1). Again of Paul and Barnabas, in the 1562 bible: “When they had ordained Elders by election, in every congregation.” (Act. 14) If they had said plainly as it is in the Greek, and as our forefathers were wont to speak, and the truth is: “Titus was left in Crete to ordain Priests in every city”: and, “Paul and Barnabas made Priests in every Church”: then the people would have understood them: they know such speeches of old, and it had been their joy and comfort to hear it specified in Holy Scriptures. Now they are told another thing, in such newness of speeches and words, of Elders to be made in every city and congregation, and yet not one city nor congregation to have any Elders in all England, that we know not what is profane novelty of words (1 Tim. 6), which the Apostle wills to be avoided, if this be not an exceeding profane novelty.

6. That it is novelty to all English Christian ears, it is evident. And it is also profane, because they do so English the Greek word of χειροτονεῖν, “ordaining” (for of the word “Presbyter” we will speak more anon) as if they should translate Demosthenes, or the laws of Athens concerning their choosing of Magistrates, which was by giving voices with lifting up their hands. So do they force this word here, to induce the people’s election, and yet in their churches in England the people elect not ministers, but their bishop. Whereas the Holy Scripture says, χειροτονήσαντες ἑαυτοῖς, they ordained to the people: and whatsoever force the word has, it is here spoken of the Apostles, and pertains not to the people, and therefore in the place to Titus it is another word which cannot be forced further (καταστήσαι, Tit. 1), than to ordain and appoint. And they might know (if malice and Heresy would suffer them to see and confess it) that the Holy Scriptures, and Fathers, and Ecclesiastical custom, has drawn this and the like words from their profane and common signification, to a more peculiar and Ecclesiastical speech: as Episcopus, an “overseer” in Tully, is a “Bishop” in the new Testament.

7. And concerning χειροτονία which we now speak of, St. Jerome tells them (in c.58. Esai.) that it signifies *Clericorum ordinationem*, that is, “giving of Holy Orders, which is done not only by prayer of the voice, but by imposition of the hand: according to St. Paul unto Timothy, *Manus cito nemini imposueris*. Impose” or “put hands quickly on no man.” That is, be not hasty or easy to give Holy Orders.<sup>5</sup> Where these great etymologists, that so strain the original nature of

<sup>4</sup> The later Bibles read “Church”.

<sup>5</sup> Greg. Nazian. in titul Ser. 1.4.5. Μετὰ τὴν πρεσβυτέρον χειροτονίαν. and, ἐπίσκοπος ἡ χειροτονηθῆ. Ignat. ep. 10. says of Bishops, βαπτίζουσι, ἐρουργοῦσι χειροτονοῦσι, χειροθετοῦσι: χειροτονία: πίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν.

this word to profane stretching forth the hand in elections, may learn another Ecclesiastical etymology thereof, as proper and as well deduced of the word as the other, to wit, “putting forth the hand” to give orders: and so they shall find it is all one with that which the Apostle calls imposition of hands, 1 Tim. 4., 2 Tim. 1: and consequently, for, “ordaining Elders by election”, they should have said, “ordaining” or “making Priests by imposition of hands”: as else where St. Paul, 1 Tim. 5. and the Acts of the Apostles (Act. 6. and 13) do speak in the ordaining of the seven Deacons and of Sts. Paul and Barnabas.

8. But they are so profane and secular, that they translate the Greek word *πρεσβύτερος* in all the New Testament, as if it had the old profane signification still, and were indifferent to signify the ancients of the Jews, the Senators of Rome, the elders of Lacedaemonia, and the Christian Clergy. Insomuch that they say, Paul “sent to Ephesus, and called the Elders of the Church”: Act. 20, and yet they were such as had their flocks, and cure of souls, as follows in the same place. They make St. Paul speak thus to Timothy (Bib. 1579, 1577), “Neglect not the gift” (*χάρισμα*, so they had rather say than “grace”, lest Holy Orders should be a Sacrament) “given thee with the laying on of the hands of the Eldership.” Or, “by the authority of the Eldership.” (*τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου*, *Presbyterii*, 1 Tim. 4.) What is this company of “Eldership”? Somewhat they would say like to the Apostles’ word, but they will not speak plainly, lest the world might hear out of the Scriptures, that Timothy was made Priest or Bishop even as the use is in the Catholic Church at this day. Let the Fourth Council of Carthage speak for both parts indifferently<sup>6</sup>, and tell us the Apostles’ meaning, “A Priest when he takes his orders, the Bishop blessing him and holding his hand upon his head, let all the Priests also that are present, hold their hands by the Bishops’ hand upon his head.” So do our Priests at this day, when a bishop makes priests: and this is the laying on of the hands of the company of Priests, which St. Paul speaks of, and which they translate, “the company of the Eldership.” Only their former translation of 1562 in this place (by what chance or consideration we know not) let fall out of the pen, “by the authority of Priesthood”.

9. Otherwise in all their English Bibles all the bells ring one note as, “The Elders that rule well, are worthy of double honour.” And, “Against an Elder receive no accusation, but under two or three witnesses.” (1 Tim. 5.) And, “If any be diseased among you, let him call for the Elders of the Church (*τοῦς πρεσβυτέρους τοῦ κκλησίας*) and let them pray over him, and anoint him with oil, etc.” (Jacob. 5.) Whereas St. Chrysostom out of this place proves<sup>7</sup> the high dignity of Priests in remitting sins, in his book entitled, *Of Priesthood*, unless they will translate that title also, “Of Eldership” (*περὶ ἡρωσύνης*.) Again they make St. Peter say thus: “The Elders which are among you, I exhort which am also an Elder, feed ye Christ’s flock, as much as lieth in you, etc.” (1 Pet. 5)

10. Where if they will tell us (as also in certain other places) that our Latin translation<sup>8</sup> has *Seniores* and *maiores natu*: we tell them, as heretofore we have told them, that this is nothing to them, who profess to translate the Greek. Again we say that if they meant no worse than the old Latin translator did, they would be as indifferent as he, to have said sometime Priests and Priesthood, when he has the words *Presbyteros* and *Presbyterium*: as we are indifferent in our translation, saying Seniors and Ancients, when we find it so in our Latin: being well assured that by sundry words he meant but one thing, as in Greek it is but one, and as both Erasmus, and also Beza himself always translate it, keeping the name *Presbyter* and *Presbyteri*: of whom by

<sup>6</sup> Ca. 3 in the year 436. Where St. Augustine was present and subscribed.

<sup>7</sup> Lib. 3. de Sacerdotio.

<sup>8</sup> St. Jerome reads, *Presbyteros ego compresbyter*, Ep. 85. and Evagr. and in 1 ad Gal: proving the dignity of Priests. And yet in 4 Gal. he reads according to the Vulgar Latin text, *Seniores in vobis rogo consenior et ipse*. Whereby it is evident, that *Senior* here and in the Acts is a Priest, and not contrary, *Presbyter*, an elder.

reason they should have learned, rather than of our Latin translator, whom otherwise they condemn. And if they say, they do follow them, and not him, because they translate not *Senior* and *maior natu*, but the word *Presbyter* or *πρεσβύτερος*, “an Elder”, in all places: we tell them, and herein we convent their conscience, that they do it to take away the external Priesthood of the New Testament, and to suppress the name Priest, against the Ecclesiastical, and (as now since Christ) very proper and usual signification thereof, in the New Testament, councils, and Fathers, in all common writing and speaking: especially the Latin *Presbyter*, which grew to this signification out of the Greek in the foresaid places of Holy Scripture.

11. Insomuch that immediately in the first Canons and Councils of the Apostles and their successors, nothing is more common than this distinction of Ecclesiastical degrees and names, *Si Episcopus, vel Presbyter, vel Diaconus etc.* “If any Bishop, or Priest, or Deacon” do this or that<sup>9</sup>. Which if the Protestants or Calvinists will translate after their manner thus, “If a Bishop, or Elder, or Deacon etc”<sup>10</sup>: they do against themselves, which make *Presbyter* or “Elder” a common name to all Ecclesiastical persons: and not a peculiar degree, next unto a Bishop. So that either they must condemn all antiquity for placing *Presbyter* in the second degree after a Bishop, or they must translate it Priest as we do, or they must make “Elder” to be their second degree, and so put Minister out of place.

12. And here we must ask them, how this name Minister came to be a degree distinct from Deacon (*διάκονος, Diaconus*), whereas by their own rule of translation, Deacon is nothing else but a minister: and why keep they the old and usual Ecclesiastical name of Deacon in translating *Diaconus*<sup>11</sup>, and not the name of “Priest”, in translating *Presbyter*? Does not “Priest” come from *Presbyter* as certainly and as agreeably as Deacon from *Diaconus*? Do not also the French and Italian words for Priest (*prêtre, prete*) come directly from the same? Will you always follow fancy and not reason, so what you list, translate as you list, and not as the truth is, and that in the Holy Scriptures, which you boast and vaunt so much of? Because yourselves have them whom you call Bishops, the name Bishop is in your English Bibles, which otherwise by your own rule of translation, should be called an Overseer or Superintendent: likewise Deacon you are content to use as an Ecclesiastical word so used in antiquity, because you also have those whom you call Deacons. Only Priests must be turned contemptuously out of the text of the Holy Scriptures, and “Elders” put in their place, because you have no Priests, not will none of them, and because that is in controversy between us. And as for Elders, you have none permitted in England, for fear of overthrowing your Bishop’s office and the Queen’s supreme government in all spiritual things and causes. Is not this to follow the humour of your heresy, by Machiavellian political rules without any fear of God?

13. Apostles you say for the most part in your translations (not always) as we do, and Prophets, and Evangelists, and Angels, and such like, and wheresoever there is no matter of controversy between you and us, there you can plead very gravely for keeping the ancient Ecclesiastical words, as your master Beza for example<sup>12</sup>, beside many other places where he bitterly rebukes his fellow Castaleon’s translation, in one place writes thus: (Mat. 3:11) “I cannot in this place dissemble the boldness of certain men, which would God it rested within the compass of words only. These men therefore concerning the word Baptizing (*baptizo*), though used of sacred writers in the mystery or Sacrament of the New Testament, and for so many years after, by the secret consent of all Churches, consecrated to this one Sacrament, so that it is now grown into the vulgar speeches (“baptism”) almost of all nations, yet they dare

---

<sup>9</sup> See can. Apost. Conc. 1. Nic. Epistol. Ignat. Conc. Carth. 4.

<sup>10</sup> Beza in 1 Pet. 5.

<sup>11</sup> 1 Tim. 3. Bib. 1577, 1579.

<sup>12</sup> Beza in c. 5., Mat. #25 & c. 10 #2.

presume rashly to change it, and in place thereof to use the word “washing”. Delicate men forsooth, which neither are moved with the perpetual authority of so many ages, not by the daily custom of the vulgar speech, can be brought to think that lawful for Divines, which all men grant to other Masters and professors of arts: that is, to retain and hold that as their own, which by long use and in good faith they have truly possessed. Neither may they pretend the authority of some ancient writers, as that Cyprian says *tingentes* for *baptizantes*, and Tertullian in a certain place calls *Sequestrem* for *mediatorem*. For that which was to those ancients as it were new, to us is old: and even then, that the selfsame words which we now use [*baptizo, mediator*], were familiar to the Church, it is evident, because it is very seldom that they speak otherwise. But these men by this novelty seek after vainglory, etc.

14. He speaks against Castaleon, who in his new Latin translation of the Bible, changed all Ecclesiastical words into profane and Heathenish, as *Angelos* into *genios*, *Prophetas* into *Fatidicos*, *Templum* into *fanum*, and so forth. But that which he did for foolish affectation of fineness and style, do not our English Calvinists the very same when they list, for furthering their Heresies? When the Holy Scripture says “idols” (ἰδωλον) according as Christians have always understood it for false gods, they come and tell us out of Homer and the Lexicos<sup>13</sup>, that it may signify an image, and therefore so they translate it. Do they not the like in the Greek word that by Ecclesiastical use signifies “penance” (μετάνοια), and “doing penance (μετάνοεσθαι), when they argue out of Plutarch, and by the profane sense thereof, that it is nothing else but changing of the mind or amendment of life? Whereas in the Greek Church, *Pœnitentes*, that is, they that were in the course of penance, and excluded from the Church as *Catechumeni*, and *Energumeni*, till they had accomplished their penance, the very same are called in the Greek ἱεὶς μετανόησθαι ἱεὶς ντες.<sup>14</sup>

15. They therefore leaving this Ecclesiastical signification, and translating it according to Plutarch, do they not much like Castaleon? Do they not the same, against the famous and ancient distinction of *Latria* and *Dulia*, when they tell us<sup>15</sup> out of Eustathius upon Homer, and Aristophanes the Grammarian, that these two are all one? Whereas we prove out of St. Augustine in many places, the second Council of Nice, Venerable Bede, and the long custom of the Church, that according to the Ecclesiastical sense and use deduced out of the Scriptures<sup>16</sup>, they differ very much. Do they not the like in *Mysterium* and *Sacramentum*, which they translate “a Secret” in the profane sense, whereas they know how these words are otherwise taken both in Greek and Latin, in the Church of God? Did they not the like in the word *Ecclesia*, when they translated it nothing else but “congregation”? Do they not the like in χειροτονία, which they translate, “ordaining by election”, as it was in the profane court of Athens: whereas St. Jerome tells them, that Ecclesiastical writers take it for giving Holy Orders by imposition of hands? Do they not the like in many other words, wheresoever it serves their heretical purpose? And as for profane translation, is there any more profane than Beza himself, that so often in his Annotations reprehends the old Translation by the authority of Tully and Terence, Homer and Aristophanes, and the like profane authors? Yea so fondly and childishly, that for *Olfactum* which Erasmus uses as Pliny’s word, he will needs say *odoratum*, because it is Tully’s word.

16. But to return to our English Translators: do not they the like to profane Castaleo, and do they not the very same that Beza their Master so largely reprehends, when they translate *Presbyterum*, “an Elder”? Is it not all one fault to translate so, and to translate, as Castaleo does

<sup>13</sup> Confut. of the Reas. fo. 35.

<sup>14</sup> Dionys. Ec. Hier. c. 3.

<sup>15</sup> Beza in 4. Mat. nu. 10.

<sup>16</sup> λατρεύω and λατρεία in the Scriptures, almost always used for the service and honour proper to God. *August. de Civit. Dei li 10, c. 1.*

*Baptism*, “washing”? Has not *Presbyter* been a peculiar and usual word for a Priest, as long as *Baptismus* for the Sacrament of regeneration, which Castaleo altering into a common and profane word, is worthily reprehended? We will prove it has, not for their sake, who know it well enough, but for the Reader’s sake, whom they abuse, as if they knew it not.

17. In the first and second Canon of the Apostles we read thus, *Episcopus a duobus aut tribus Episcopis ordinetur. Presbyter ab uno Episcopo ordinetur, et Diaconus, et alii Clerici*. That is, let a Bishop be consecrated or ordained by two or three Bishops. Let a Priest be made by one Bishop. See in the fourth Council of Carthage<sup>17</sup> the diverse manner of consecrating Bishops, Priests, Deacons, etc. where St. Augustine was present and subscribed. Again, *Si quis Presbyter contemnens Episcopum suum etc.* “If any Priest condemning his Bishop, make a several congregation, and erect another altar,” (that is, make a Schism or Heresy) “let him be deposed.” (Can. Apost. 32.) So did Arius being a Priest against his Bishop Alexander. Again, “Priests and Deacons let them attempt to do nothing without the Bishop.” (Can. 40.) The first Council of Nice says, “The holy Synod by all means forbids, that neither Bishop, nor Priest, nor Deacon etc. have with them any foreign woman, but the mother, or sister, etc. in whom there is no suspicion.” (Can. 3.) Again, “It is told the holy Council, that in certain places and cities, Deacons give the Sacraments to Priests. This neither rule nor custom has delivered, that they which have not authority to offer the Sacrifice, should give to them that offer, the body of Christ.” (Can. 14.) The third Council of Carthage wherein St. Augustine was, and to the which he subscribed, decrees, “That in the Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, there by no more offered, than our Lord himself delivered, that is, bread and wine mingled with water.” (Can. 24.) Which the sixth general Council of Constantinople repeating and confirming, adds: “If therefore any Bishop or Priest (ἱερεὺς ἢ ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος.) do not according to the order given by the Apostles, mingling water with wine, but offer an unmingled sacrifice, let him be deposed etc.” But of these speeches all Councils be full: where we would gladly know of these new Translators, how *Presbyter* must be translated: either an “Elder”, or a “Priest”.

18. Do not all the Fathers speak after the same manner, making always this distinction of Bishop and Priest, as of the first and second degree?<sup>18</sup> St. Ignatius the Apostle’s scholar does he not place *Presbyterium* as he calls it, and *Presbyteros* (Priests, or the College of Priests) next after Bishops, and Deacons in the third place, repeating it no less than thrice in one Epistle, and commending the dignity of all three unto the people?<sup>19</sup> Does not St. Jerome the very same, saying, “Let us honour a Bishop, do reverence to a Priest, rise up to a Deacon”?<sup>20</sup> And when he says, that as Aaron and his sons and the Levites were in the Temple, so are Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in the Church, for place and degree. And in another place, speaking of the outrages done by the Vandals and such like,<sup>21</sup> “Bishops were taken, Priests slain, and divers of other Ecclesiastical orders: Churches overthrown, the altars of Christ made stables for horses, the relics of Martyrs dug up, etc.” When he says of Nepotian, *sit Clericus, et per solitos gradus Presbyter ordinatur*: he becomes a man of the Clergy, and by the accustomed degrees is made, what? A Priest, or an Elder? When he says, *Mihi ante Presbyterum sedere non licet etc.* does he mean he could not sit above an Elder, or above a Priest, himself as then being not Priest? When he, and Vincentius (as St. Epiphanius writes<sup>22</sup>) of reverence to the degree, were hardly induced to be made *Presbyteri*: did they refuse the Eldership? What was the matter that John the Bishop

<sup>17</sup> Can. 2,3,4.

<sup>18</sup> Ep. 2. ad Trallianos.

<sup>19</sup> τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἢ πρεσβύτεροι. Comment in c. 7. Micheae.

<sup>20</sup> Ep. 85. ad Evagrium.

<sup>21</sup> Epitaph Nepotiani c. 9.

<sup>22</sup> Ep. 60 apud Hiero. ca. 1.

of Jerusalem, seemed to be so much offended with Epiphanius and St. Jerome? Was it not because Epiphanius made Paulianus, St. Jerome's brother, Priest within the said John's Diocese?<sup>23</sup>

19. When all antiquity says, Hieronymus Presbyter, Cecilius Presbyter, Ruffinus Presbyter, Philippus, Juvencus, Hesychius, Beda, Presbyteri: and when St. Jerome so often in his Catalogue says, Such a man "Presbyter": is it not for distinction of a certain order, to signify that they were Priests, and not Bishops? Namely when he says of St. Chrysostom, *Ioannes Presbyter Antiochenus*, does he not mean, he was as then but a Priest of Antioch? Would he have said so, if he had written of him, after he was Bishop of Constantinople?

20. But of all other places, we would desire these gay translators to translate this one place of St. Augustine, speaking of himself a Bishop and St. Jerome a Priest:<sup>24</sup> *Quanquam enim secundum honorum vocabula, quae iam Ecclesias usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Prebyterio maior sit: tamen in mutis rebus, Augustinus Hieronymo minor est.* Is not this the English thereof? "For although according to the titles or names of honour, which now by use of the Church have prevailed, the degree of Bishop be greater than Priesthood, yet in many things, Augustine is less than Jerome. Or, does it like them to translate it thus, "The degree of Bishop is greater than Eldership etc.?" Again, against Julian the Heretic when he has brought many testimonies of the holy Doctors that were all Bishops, as of Sts. Cyprian, Ambrose, Basil, Nazianzen, Chrysostom: at length he comes to St. Jerome who was no bishop, and says:<sup>25</sup> *Nec sanctum Hieronymum, quia Presbyter fuit, contemnendum arbitraris*, that is, "Neither must thou think that St. Jerome, because he was but a Priest, therefore is to be condemned: whose divine eloquence, has shone to us from the East even to the west, like a lamp," and so forth to his great commendation. Here is a plain distinction of an inferior degree to a Bishop, for the which the Heretic Julian did easily condemn him. Is not St. Cyprian full of the like places? Is not all antiquity so full, that while I prove this, methinks I prove nothing else but that snow is white?

21. In all which places if they will translate "Elder", and yet make the same a common name to all Ecclesiastical degrees, as Beza defines it,<sup>26</sup> let the indifferent Reader consider the absurd confusion, or rather the impossibility thereof: if not, but they will grant in all these places it signifies Priest, and so is meant: then we must beat them with Beza's rod of reprehension against Castaleon: that "we cannot dissemble the boldness of these men, which would God it rested within the custom of words only," and were not important matter, concerning their Heresy. "These men therefore touching the word *Priest*, though used of sacred writers in the mystery of the New Testament, and for so many years after by the secret consent of all Churches, consecrated to this one Sacrament, so that it is now grown to be the proper vulgar speech almost of all Nations: yet they dare presume rashly to change it, and in place thereof to use the word *Elder*. Delicate men forsooth" (yea worse a great deal, because these do it for heresy and not for delicacy) "which neither are moved with the perpetual authority of so many ages, nor by the daily custom of the vulgar speech can be brought to think that lawful for Divines, which all men grant to other Masters and Professors of arts, that is, to retain and hold that as their own, which by long use and in good faith they have truly possessed. Neither may they pretend the authority of any ancient writer" (as that the old Latin Translator says *Senior*, and *Seniores*;) "for that<sup>27</sup> which was to them as it were new, to us is old: and even then, that the

---

<sup>23</sup> Ep. 1 ad Heliod.

<sup>24</sup> Inter Epistolas Hiero. Ep. 97 in fine.

<sup>25</sup> Lib. 1. ca. 2. in fine.

<sup>26</sup> Annot. in 1 Pet. 5.

<sup>27</sup> *Presbyter* for Priest. *Baptismus* for the Sacrament of Baptism.



selfsame words which we now use, were more familiar to the Church, it is evident, because it is very seldom that they speak otherwise.”

22. Thus we have repeated Beza’s words again, only changing the word “Baptism” into “Priest”, because the case is all one: and so unwittingly Beza the successor of Calvin in Geneva, has given plain sentence against our English Translators in all such cases, as they go from the common received and usual sense to another profane sense, and out of use: as namely in this point of Priest and Priesthood. Where we must needs add a word or two, though we be too long, because their folly and malice is too too great herein.<sup>28</sup> For whereas the very name Priest never came into our English tongue but of the Latin *Presbyter* (for thereupon *sacerdos* also was so called only by a consequence) they translate *sacerdos*, Priest, and *Presbyter*, not Priest, but Elder, as wisely and as reasonably, as if a man should translate *Praetor Londini*, Mayor of London: and *Maior Londini*, not “Mayor” of London: but Greater of London: or *Academia Oxoniensis*, the University of Oxford: and *Universitas Oxoniensis*, not “the University”, but the Generality of Oxford: and such like.

23. Again, what exceeding folly is it, to think that by false and profane translation of *Presbyter* into “Elder”, they might take away the external Priesthood of the New Testament, whereas their own word *Sacerdos* which they do and must needs translate Priest, is as common and as usual in all antiquity, as *Presbyter*: and so much the more, for that it is used indifferently to signify both Bishops and Priests, which *Presbyter* lightly does not but in the New Testament. As when Constantine the Great said to the Bishops assembled in the Council of Nice,<sup>29</sup> *Deus vos constituit sacerdotes etc.* “God has ordained you priests, and has given you power to judge of us also.” And St. Ambrose,<sup>30</sup> “When didst thou ever hear, most Clement Prince, that laymen have judged Bishops. Shall we bend by flattery so far, that forgetting the right of our Priesthood, we should yield up to others that which God has commended to us?” And therefore does St. Chrysostom entitle his six books *De Sacerdotio*, “Of Priesthood”, concerning the dignity and calling, not only of mere Priests, but also of Bishops:<sup>31</sup> and St. Gregory Nazianzen handling the same argument says, that “they execute Priesthood together with *Christ*.” (Χριστὸν συνιερέυειν.) And St. Ignatius says,<sup>32</sup> “Do nothing without the Bishops, for they are priests, but thou the Deacons of the priests.” And in the Greek Liturgies or Masses, so often, ὁ ἱερεὺς, “Then the priest says this, and that,” signifying also the Bishop when he says Mass:<sup>33</sup> and St. Denis says sometime *Archisacerdotem cum sacerdotibus*, the high Priest or Bishop with the Priests: whereof come the words ἱερατεύειν, ἱερουργεῖν, ἱεράτευμα, ἱερατεία, ἱερουργία, in the ancient Greek Fathers, for the sacred function of Priesthood, and executing of the same.

24. If then the Heretics could possibly have extinguished priesthood in the word *presbyter*, yet you see, it would have remained still in the words *Sacerdos* and *Sacerdotium*, which themselves translate “Priest” and “Priesthood”: and therefore we must desire them to translate us a place or two after their own manner: first St. Augusting speaking thus,<sup>34</sup> *Quis unquam audivit sacerdotem ad altare stantem etiam super reliquias Martyrum, difere: offero tibi Petre, et Paule, vel Cypriane?* “Who ever heard that a *Priest* standing at the altar, even over the relics of the Martyrs, said, I offer to thee Peter, and Paul, or Cyprian?” So (we trow) they must translate it.

---

<sup>28</sup> See M. Whitgift’s defence against the Puritans’ reply. P. 721 where he affirms that this word “Priest”, comes of the word *Presbyter*, and not of the word *Sacerdos*.

<sup>29</sup> Ruffin. li. 1. ca. 2.

<sup>30</sup> Epist. 32. ad Valentinianum Imp.

<sup>31</sup> In Apolog. pro sua fug. orat. 1.

<sup>32</sup> Epist. 10 ad Hieronem. Sacerdotes.

<sup>33</sup> ὁ ἱερεὺς, διάκονος ἱερέων. ἱεράρχην σὺν τοῖς ἱερεῶσι.

<sup>34</sup> Li. 8. cap. 27, De Civ. Dei.

Again,<sup>35</sup> *Nos uni Deo et Martyrum et nostro, sacrificium immolamus, ad quod sacrificium sicut homines Dei, suo loco et ordine nominantur, non tamen à sacerdote invocantur. Deo quipped, non ipsis sacrificat, quam vis in memoria sacrificet eorum, quia Dei sacerdos est, non illorum. Ipsum verò sacrificium corpus est Christi.* We think they will and must translate it thus: “We offer sacrifice to the one only God both of Martyrs and ours, at the which Sacrifice, as men of God they [Martyrs] are named in their place and order: yet are they<sup>36</sup> not invocated of the priest that sacrifices. For he sacrifices to God, and no to them (though he sacrifice in the memory of them) because he is God’s Priest, and not theirs. And the sacrifice itself is the body of Christ.

25. Likewise when St. Ambrose says,<sup>37</sup> “The consecration [of the body of Christ] with what words is it, and by whose speech? Of our Lord Jesus. For in the rest that is said, there is praise given to God, prayer made for the people, for kings, and others: but when it comes that the venerable sacrament must be consecrated, now the Priest (*sacerdos*) uses not his own words, but he uses the words of Christ.” And St. Chrysostom in very many places says,<sup>38</sup> “The sacred oblation itself, whether Peter or Paul, or any meaner Priest (*sacerdos*) whatsoever offer it, is the very same that Christ gave to his disciples, and which now the priests (*sacerdotes*) do make or consecrate. Why so I pray thee? Because not men to sanctify this, but Christ himself, which before consecrated the same.” And again, “It is not man that makes the body and blood of Christ, but he that was crucified for us, Christ: the words are uttered by the Priest’s (*Sacerdotis*) mouth, and by God’s power and grace are the things proposed, consecrated. For this, says he, is my body. With this word are the things proposed, consecrated.

26. And so by these places, where themselves translate *Sacerdos* a Priest, they may learn also how to translate *Presbyteros* in St. Jerome saying the very same thing, “that at their (*presbyteri*) prayers, the body and blood of our Lord is made.” And in another place, “that with their sacred mouth, they make our Lord’s body.” Likewise when they read St. Ambrose against the Novatians, that God has granted licence “to his Priests (*Sacerdotibus*)” to release and forgive as well great sins as little without exception: and in the Ecclesiastical history, how the Novatian Heretics taught that such as were fallen into great sins, should not ask for remission of the Priest (*à sacerdote*), but of God only: they may learn how to translate *Presbyteros* in St. Jerome and in the Ecclesiastical history, where the one says this: *Episcopus et Presbyter, cum peccatorum audierit varietates, scit qui ligandus sit, qui solvendus.*<sup>39</sup> and the other speaks *de Presbytero Pœnitentiario*,<sup>40</sup> of an extraordinary Priest that heard confessions and enjoined penance, who afterward was taken away, and the people went to divers ghostly Fathers as before. And especially St. Chrysostom will make them understand what these *Presbyteri* were, and how they are to be called in English, who tells them in their own word,<sup>41</sup> that “*Sacerdotes*, the Priests of the New Law have powers not only to know, but to purge the filth of the soul, therefore whosoever despises them, is more worthy to be punished than the rebel Dathan and his accomplices.”

27. Now then (to conclude this point), seeing we have such a cloud of witnesses (as the Apostle speaks, Hebr. 12) even from Christ’s time, that testify not only for the name, but for the very principal functions of external Priesthood, in offering the sacrifice of Christ’s body and blood, in remitting sins, and so forth: what a peevish, malicious, and impudent corruption is

<sup>35</sup> Li. 22. Civit. c. 10.

<sup>36</sup> So as he said before, “I offer to thee Peter etc.”

<sup>37</sup> Li. 4. de Sacram. c. 4.

<sup>38</sup> Ho. 2. in 2 Timoth.

<sup>39</sup> Sozom. li. 7 c. 16.

<sup>40</sup> Socrat. li. 5 c. 19.

<sup>41</sup> Li. 3. de Sacerd.

this, for the defacing of the testimonies of the Holy Scriptures tending thereunto, to seek to scratch advantage of the word *Presbyter*, and to make it signify an Elder, not a Priest: *Presbyterium* Eldership rather than Priesthood: as if other newfangled companions that would forge a Heresy that there were no Apostles, should for that purpose translate it always “legates”: or that there were no Angels, and should translate it always “Messengers”: and that Baptism were but a Judaical ceremony, and should translate it “washing”: which Castalio did much more tolerably in his translation than any of these should, if he did it only of curiosity and folly. And if to take away all distinction of clergy and laity the Protestants should always translate *clerum*, “lot” or “lottery”, as they do translate it for the same purpose “parish” and “heritage”: might not <sup>42</sup>Beza himself control them, saying, “that the ancient Fathers transferred the name *clerus* to the College of Ecclesiastical Ministers”?

28. But alas, the effect of this corruption and heresy concerning Priests, has it not wrought within these few years such contempt of all Priests, that nothing is more odious in our country than that name: which before was so honorable and Venerable, and now is, among all good men? If ministry or Eldership were grown to estimation instead thereof, somewhat they had to say: but that is yet more contemptible, and especially Elders and Eldership for the Queen’s Majesty and her Counselors will permit none in government of any Church in England, and so they have brought all, to nothing else, but profane laity. And no marvel of these horrible inconveniences, for as the Sacrifice and Priesthood go together, and therefore were both honorable together: so when they had according to Daniel’s Prophecy, abolished the daily sacrifice, out of the Church, what remained, but the contempt of Priests and Clergy and their offices, so far forth, that for the holy Sacrifice sake, Priests are called in great despite, “Massing Priests”, of them that little consider, or less care, what notable holy learned Fathers of all ages since Christ’s time, this their reproach touches and concerns, as by the testimonies before alleged is manifest, and whereof the Reader may see a peculiar Chapter (Chap. 6) in the late Apology of the English Seminaries.

---

<sup>42</sup> In 1 Pet 3. See St. Jerome and Nepot. de vit. Clericorum ep. 2 c. 5.

## CHAPTER VII.

### *Heretical translation against PURGATORY, LIMBUS PATRUM, CHRIST'S DESCENDING INTO HELL.*

Having not discovered their corrupt translations for defacing of the Church's name, and abolishing of Priest and Priesthood: let us come to another point of very great importance also, and which by the wonted consequence or sequel of error, includes in it many erroneous branches. Their principal malice then being bent against Purgatory, that is, against a place where Christian souls be purged by suffering of temporal pains after this life, for surer maintenance of their erroneous denial hereof, they take away and deny all third places, saying that there was never from the beginning fo the world any other place for souls after this life, but only two: to wit, heaven for the blessed, and hell for the damned. And so it follows by their heretical doctrine, that the Patriarchs, Prophets, and other good holy men of the Old Testament, went not after their deaths, to the place called "Abraham's bosom", or *limbus partum*, but immediately to heaven: and so again by their erroneous doctrine it follows, that the fathers of the Old Testament were in heaven, before our Saviour Christ had suffered death for their redemption: and also by their erroneous doctrine it follows, that our Saviour Christ was not the first man that ascended and entered into heaven: and moreover by their heretical doctrine it follows, that our Saviour Christ descended not into any such third place, to deliver the fathers of the Old Testament out of their prison, and to bring them triumphantly with him into heaven, because by their erroneous doctrine they were never there: and so that article of the Apostles' Creed concerning our Saviour Christ his descending into hell, must either be put out by the Calvinists, as Beza did in his Confession of his faith printed in 1564, or it has some other meaning, to wit, either the lying of his body in the grave, or (as Calvin and the purer Calvinists his scholars will have it<sup>1</sup>) the suffering of hell pains and distresses upon the Cross. Lo the consequence and coherence of these errors and heresies.

2. These now being the heretical doctrines which they mean to avouch and defend whatsoever come of it: first, they are at a point not to care a rush for all the ancient holy Doctors,<sup>2</sup> that write with full consent to the contrary (as themselves confess, calling it their common error). Secondly, they translate the Holy Scriptures in favour thereof, most corruptly and willfully, as in Beza's false translation (who is Calvin's successor in Geneva) it is notorious, for he in his New Testament of the year 1556 printed by Robertus Stephanus in folio, with Annotations, makes our Saviour Christ say thus to his Father, *Non derelinques cadaver meum in sepulchro*, "thou shalt not leave my carcass in the grave" (Act. 2.) for that which the Hebrew, and the Greek, and the Latin, and St. Jerome according to the Hebrew,<sup>3</sup> say: *No derelinques animam meam in inferno*, as plainly as we say in English, "Thou shalt not leave my soul in hell." Thus the Prophet David spoke it in Hebrew, לֹא אֲשַׁלֵּחַ בְּשֵׂאוֹל (Ps. 15.), thus the Septuaginta uttered it in Greek, ψυχῶν τε καὶ σώματος, thus the holy Evangelist St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles cap. 2 records it, and for this, St. Augustine calls him an infidel that denies it: yet all this would not suffice to make Beza translate it so, because of certain errors (<sup>4</sup>as he heretically terms them) which he would full gladly avoid hereby, namely, the Catholic true doctrine of *limbus patrum*, and Purgatory. What need we say more? He translates *animam*, "a Carcass": (so calling our Saviour Christ's body, irreverently, and wickedly) he translates *infernum*, "grave".

3. Need we take any great labour to prove this to be a foul corruption, or that it is done purposely, when he confesses that he thus translates because else it would serve the Papists?

<sup>1</sup> Calvin's Institutions li. 2 c. 16. Sect. 10 & in his Catechism.

<sup>2</sup> Beza in Pet. 3:19. Calvin's Institutions li. 2. c. 16. Sect. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Hiero. in Ps. verso ex Hebraeo.

<sup>4</sup> See his Annot. in 2. Act.

Which is as much to say, as, the word of God if it be truly and sincerely translated, makes indeed for them. For the first part, we will not stand upon it, partly because it is of itself most absurd, and they are ashamed of it: partly, because it shall suffice to confute Beza, that two other as famous heretics as he, Castalio and Flaccus Illyricus write against him in this point, and confute him: partly also, because we speak not here universally of all heretical translations, but of the English corruptions specially, and therefore we may only note here, how gladly they also would say somewhat else for “soul”, even in the text, if they durst for shame: for in the margin of that English translation of 1579, they say, “or life, or person”: thereby advertising the Reader, that he may read thus, if it please him, “Thou shalt not leave my life in the grave,” or, “Thou shalt not leave my person.” As though either man’s soul or life were in the grave, or *anima*, might be translated “person”, which the selfsame English Bible does not (Act. 7:14), no not in those places where it is evident that it signifies the whole person. For though this word “soul”, by a figure, is sometime taken for the whole man, yet even there they do not, nor must not translate it otherwise than soul: because our tongue bears that figure as well as Latin, Greek, or Hebrew: but here, where it cannot signify the whole person, it is wicked to translate it so.

4. But as for the word “grave”, that they put boldly in the text, to signify that howsoever you interpret “soul”, or whatsoever you put for it, it is not meant according to St. Augustine and the faith of the whole Catholic Church, that his soul descended into Hell, whiles his body was in the grave: but that his soul also, was in the grave, howsoever that is to be understood. So making it a certain and resolute conclusion, that the Holy Scripture in this place speaks not of Christ’s being in Hell, but in the grave: and that according to his soul, or life, or person, or (as Beza will have it) “his Carcass or body”: and “so his soul in Hell,” as the Holy Scripture speaks, shall be, “his body in the grave”, as Beza plainly speaks, and the Bezites covertly insinuate:<sup>5</sup> and white shall be black, and chalk shall be cheese, and everything shall be anything that they will have it. And all this their evident false translation, must be to our miserable deceived poor souls, the Holy Scripture and God’s word.

5. Where we cannot but marvel, why they are afraid to translate the words plainly in this place, “of his soul being in Hell”: Whereas in the Creed they admit the words, and interpret them, that by suffering Hell pains upon the Cross, so he descended into Hell, and no otherwise. Why did they not here also keep the words for the credit of their translation, and afterward (if they would needs) give them that gloss for maintenance of their heresy? This mystery we know not, and we would gladly learn it of the Puritan Calvinists, whose English translation perhaps this is. For, the grosser Calvinists (being not so pure and precise in following Calvin as the Puritans be, that have well deserved that name above their fellows) they in their other English Bibles (1562, 1577) have in this place discharged themselves of false translation, saying plainly, “Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell.” But<sup>6</sup> in what sense they say so, it is very hard to guess: and perhaps themselves cannot tell yet what to make of it, as appears by Mr. Whitakers’ answer to Fr. Campion.<sup>7</sup> And he is now called a Bishop among them, and proceeded Doctor in Oxford, that could not obtain his grace to proceed Doctor in Cambridge, because he preached Christ’s descending into Hell, and the Puritans in their second admonition to the Parliament, pag. 43 cry out against the politic Calvinists, for that in the Creed of the Apostles (made in English meter and song openly in their Churches in these words: “His spirit did after this descend, into the lower parts, to them that long in darkness were the true light of their hearts”) they favour his descending into Hell very much, and so consequently may thereby build *Limbus*

---

<sup>5</sup> See Vigors sermons pag. 110, 115, & deinceps.

<sup>6</sup> See lind. dubit. pa. 19.

<sup>7</sup> Whitak. pag. 165. M. Hues B. of S. Asaph in Walles.

*Patrum*, and Purgatory. And the Puritans in their second reply against M. Whitegift's defense pag. 7. reprehend one of their chiefest Calvinistical martyrs for affirming (as they term it) a gross descending of our Saviour Christ into Hell. Thus the Puritans confess plainly their heretical doctrine against Christ's descending into Hell.

6. The truth is, howsoever the politic Calvinists speak, or write in this point more plausibly and covertly to the people, and more agreeably to the Article of our faith, than either Calvin or their earnest brethren the Puritans do, which write and speak as fantastically and madly as they think: yet neither do they believe this Article of the Apostles' Creed, or interpret it, as the Catholic Church and ancient holy Fathers always have done, neither can it stand with their new profession so to do, or with their English translations in other places. It cannot stand with their profession: for then it would follow that the Patriarchs and other just men of the Old Testament were in some third place of rest, called "Abraham's bosom", or *Limbus Patrum*, till our Saviour Christ descended thither, and delivered them from thence, which they deny in their doctrine, though they sing it in their meters. Neither can it stand with their English translations: because in other places where the Holy Scriptures evidently speak of such a place, calling it "Hell" (because that was a common name for every place and state of souls departed, in the Old Testament, till our Saviour Christ by his Resurrection and Ascension had opened heaven) there, for "Hell", they translate "Grave".

7. As when Jacob says, *Descendam ad filium meum lugens in infernum*: "I will go down to my son into Hell, mourning": they translate, "I will go down into the grave unto my son, mourning": as though Jacob thought, that his son Joseph had been buried in a grave, whereas Jacob thought, and said immediately before, as appears in the Holy Scripture, that a wild beast had devoured him, and so could not be presumed to be in any grave: or as though, if Joseph had been in a grave, Jacob would have gone down to him into the same grave. For so the words must needs import, if they take grave properly: but if they take grave improperly for the state of dead men after this life, why do they call it "grave", and not "Hell", as the word is in Hebrew (גֵּהֶנְמֹת), Greek (ᾍδης, "Hades"), and Latin (*Infernus*)? No doubt they do it, to make the ignorant Reader believe that the Patriarch Jacob spoke of his body only to descend into the grave to Joseph's body: for as concerning Jacob's soul, that was by their opinion, to ascend immediately after his death to heaven, and not to descend into the grave. But if Jacob were to ascend forthwith in soul, how could he say as they translate, "I will go down into the grave unto my son"? As if according to their opinion he should say, "My son's body is devoured of a beast, and his soul is gone up into heaven: well, I will go down to him into the grave."

8. Gentle Reader, that thou mayest the better conceive these absurdities, and the more detect their guileful corruptions, understand (as we began to tell thee before) that in the Old Testament, because there was yet no ascending into heaven, "the way of the holies" (Hebr. 9:8, as the Apostle in his epistle to the Hebrews speaks) "being not yet open," because our Saviour Christ was to dedicate and begin the entrance in his own person, and by his Passion to open heaven (Hebr. 10:20): therefore (we say) in the Old Testament the common phrase of the Holy Scripture is, even of the best men, as well as of the others, that dying they went down *ad inferos*, or *ad infernum*: to signify that such was the state of the Old Testament before our Saviour Christ's Resurrection and Ascension, that every man went down, and not up: descended, and not ascended: by descending I mean not to the grave, which received their bodies only: but *ad inferos*, that is, "to hell", a common receptacle or place for their souls also departed, as well of those souls that were to be in rest, as those that were to be in pains and torments. All the souls both good and bad that then died, went downward, and therefore the place of both sorts was called in all the tongues, by a word answerable to this word, "hell", to signify a lower place beneath, not only of torments, but also of rest.

9. So we say in our Creed, that our Saviour Christ himself descended into “hell”, according to his soul:<sup>8</sup> So St. Jerome speaks of the state of the Old Testament, says: *Si Abraham, Isaac, Jacob in inferno, quis in caelorum regno*, that is, “If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were in hell, who was in the kingdom of heaven?” And again, *Ante Christum, Abraham apud inferos: post Christum latro in Paradiso*. That is, “before the coming of Christ, Abraham was in hell: after his coming, the Thief was in Paradise.” And lest a man might object, that Lazarus being in Abraham’s bosom (Luc. 16), saw the rich glutton afar off in hell, and therefore both Abraham and Lazarus seem to have been in heaven:<sup>9</sup> the said holy Doctor resolves it, that Abraham and Lazarus also were in hell, but in a place of great rest and refreshing, and therefore very far off from the miserable wretched glutton that lay in torments.

10. His words be these in effect: If a man will say unto me, that Lazarus was seen in Abraham’s bosom, and a place of refreshing even before Christ’s coming: true it is, but what is that in comparison? *Quid simile infernus et regna caelorum?* “What has hell and heaven like?” As if he should say, Abraham indeed and Lazarus (and consequently many other) were in place of rest, as has no comparison with the joys of heaven. And St. Augustin disputing this matter<sup>10</sup> sometime, and doubting whether Abraham’s bosom be called hell in the Scripture, and whether the name of hell be taken at any time in the good part (for of Christ’s descending into hell, and of a third place where the Patriarchs remained until Christ’s coming, not heaven, but called Abraham’s bosom, he doubted not, but was most assured) the same holy Doctor in another place, as being better resolved, doubts not, upon these words of the Psalm, “Thou has delivered my soul from the lower hell,” (Psal. 85:13) to make this one good sense of this place, that the lower hell is it, wherein the damned are tormented: the higher hell is that, wherein the souls of the just rested, calling both places, by the name of hell.

11. And surely of his marvelous humility and wisdom, he would have been must more resolute herein, if he had heard the opinion of St. Jerome, whom he often consulted in such questions, and of other Fathers, who in this point speak most plainly, that Abraham’s bosom or the place where the Patriarchs rested, was some part of hell. Tertullian says,<sup>11</sup> “I know that the bosom of Abraham was no heavenly place, but only the higher hell,” or, “the higher part of hell.” Of which speech of the Fathers, rose afterward that other name, *limbus patrum*, that is the very brim or uppermost and outmost part of hell, where the Fathers of the Old Testament rested. Thus we see that the Patriarchs themselves were as then in hell, though they were there in a place of rest: insomuch that St. Jerome says again, *Ante Resurrectionem Christi notus in Judaea Deus, et ipsi qui noverant eum, tamen ad inferos trahebantur*, that is, “Before the Resurrection of Christ, God was known in Judea, and they themselves that knew him yet were drawn unto hell.” St. Chrysostom upon that place of Esay,<sup>12</sup> “I will break the brazen gates, and bruise the iron bars in pieces, and will open the treasures darkened, etc.” “So he called hell (Ἅδης, *infernus*),” says he, “for although it were hell, yet it held the holy souls and precious vessels, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.” Mark that he says, though it were hell, yet there were the just men at that time, till our Saviour Christ came to deliver them from thence.

12. Therefore did Jacob say, “I will go down to my son unto Hell.” (Gen. 42.) And again he says, “If any misfortune happen to [Benjamin] by the way, you shall bring my gray head with sorrow unto Hell,” which is repeated again twice in Chapter 44 by which phrase the Holy Scripture will signify, not only death, but also the descending at that time of all sorts of souls

---

<sup>8</sup> Epitaph. Nepot. c. 3.

<sup>9</sup> See S. Aug. in Psal. 85:13.

<sup>10</sup> Epist. 99. ad Evod. & de Gen. ad lit. li. 12. c. 33.

<sup>11</sup> Li. 4. advers. Marcion.

<sup>12</sup> Hom quod Christus sit Deus to.5.

into Hell, both good and bad. And therefore it is spoken of all sorts in the Holy Scripture, both of good and of bad (3 Reg. 2.). For all went then into hell, but some into a place there of rest, others into other places there of torments. And therefore St. Jerome says, speaking of Hell according to the Old Testament,<sup>13</sup> “Hell is a place wherein souls are included: either in rest, or in pains, according to the quality of their deserts.”

13. And in this sense it is also often said in the Holy Scriptures, that such and such were gathered or laid to their fathers, though they were buried in divers places, and died not in the same state of salvation or damnation: In that sense Samuel being raised up to speak with Saul, said, “Tomorrow thou and thy sons shall be with me.” that is, dead and in Hell, though not in the same place or state there: in this sense all such places of the Holy Scripture as have the word *Inferi*, or *Infernus* correspondent both to the Greek and Hebrew, ought to be, and may be most conveniently translated by the word, “Hell”. As when it is said, “Thou hast delivered my soul from the lower hell (*ab inferno inferiori*.)” (Ps. 85:13) that is as St. Augustine expounds it, Thou has preserved me from mortal sins that would have brought me into the lower Hell which is for the damned. Which place of Holy Scripture and the like when they translate “grave”, see how miserably it sounds: “Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest grave.” (1579 Bible) which they would never say for very shame, but that they are afraid to say in any place (be the Holy Scriptures never so plain) that any soul was delivered or returned from hell, lest thereof it might follow by and by, that the Patriarchs, and our Saviour Christ were in such a Hell.

14. And that this is their fear, it is evident, because in all other places where it is plain that the Holy Scriptures speak of the Hell of the damned, from whence is no return, there they translate the very same word “Hell,” and not grave. As for example, “The way of life is on high to the prudent, to avoid from Hell beneath.” (Proverb. 15:14) Lo, here that is translated “Hell beneath,” which before was translated “the lowest grave.” And again, “Hell and destruction are before the Lord, bow much more the hearts of the sons of men?” But when in the Holy Scriptures there is mention of delivery of a soul from Hell, then thus they translate: “God shall deliver my soul from the power of the grave (*de manu inferi*): for he will receive me.” (1579 Bible) Can you tell what they would say? Does God deliver them from the grave, or from temporal death, whom he receives to his mercy? Or has the grave any power over the soul? Again when they say, “What man lives and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?” (Ps. 89:48)

15. If they take “grave” properly, where man’s body is buried: it is not true either that every soul, yea or every body is buried in a grave. But if in all such places, they will say they mean nothing else but to signify death, and that to go down into the grave, and to die, is all one: we ask them why they follow not the words of the Holy Scripture to signify the same thing, which call it, going down to “Hell”, not, going down to the “grave”? Here they must needs open the mystery of Antichrist working in their translations, and say, that so they should make Hell a common place to all that departed in the Old Testament, which they will not, no not in the most important places of our belief concerning our Saviour Christ’s descending into Hell, and triumphing over the same. Yea, therefore on purpose they will not, only for to defeat that part of our Christian Creed.

16. As when the Prophet first, (Osee 13.) and afterward the Apostle, (1 Cor. 15) in the Greek, say thus: *Ero mors tua ô mors, morsus tuus ero inferne* (ἔρισψ, □δη). *Ubi est, mors, stimulus tuus? Ubi est, inferne, victoria tua?* “O death, I will be thy death: I will be thy sting, O Hell. Where is, O death, thy sting? Where is, O hell, thy victory?” They translate in both places (1579), “O

---

<sup>13</sup> in c. 13 Osee. Aug. in Psal. 85:13.



grave”, instead of “O hell”. What else can be their meaning hereby, but to draw the Reader from the common sense of our Saviour Christ’s descending into Hell, and conquering the same, and bringing out the Fathers and just men triumphantly from thence into heaven? Which sense has always been the common sense of the Catholic Church and holy Doctors,<sup>14</sup> especially upon this place of the Prophet. And what a kind of speech is this, and out of all tune, to make our Saviour Christ say, “O grave I will be thy destruction?” As though he had triumphed over the grave, and not over Hell: or over the grave, that is, over death: and so the Prophet should say death twice, and Hell not at all.

17. Why, my Masters, you that are so wonderful precise translators, admit that our Saviour Christ descended not into Hell beneath, as you say, yet I think you will grant that he triumphed over Hell, and was conqueror of the same. Why then did it not please you to suffer the Prophet to say so at the least, rather than that he had conquest only of death and the grave? You abuse your ignorant reader very impudently, and your own selves very damnably, not only in this, but in that you make “grave”, and “death”, all one, and so where the Holy Scripture often joins together “death” and “Hell”, as things different and distinct: you make them speak but one thing twice, idly and superfluously.

18. But will you know that you should not confound them, but that *Mors*, and *Infernus*, which are the words of the Holy Scripture in all tongues, are distinct: here what St. Jerome says, or if you will not hear, because you are of them which “have stopped their ears”, let the indifferent Christian Reader hearken to this holy Doctor, and great interpreter of the Holy Scriptures according to his singular knowledge in all the learned tongues. Upon the foresaid place of the Prophet, after he had spoken of our Saviour Christ’s descending into Hell, and overcoming of death, he adds:<sup>15</sup> “Between death and Hell this is the difference, that death is that whereby the soul is separated from the body: Hell is the place where souls are included, either in rest, or else in pains, according to the quality of their deserts. And that death is one thing, and Hell is another: the Psalmist also declares, saying: ‘There is not in death, that is mindful of thee, but in Hell who shall confess to thee?’ And in another place. ‘Let death come upon them, and let them go down into Hell alive.’ ”

19. By which difference of death and Hell, (whereof we must often advertise the Reader) are meant two things: death, and the going down of the soul into some receptacle of Hell, in that state of the Old Testament, at what time the Holy Scriptures used this phrase so often. Now, these impudent translators (1579) in all these places, translate it “grave”, on purpose to confound it and death together, and to make it but one thing, which St. Jerome shows to be different, in the very same sense that we have declared.

20. But alas, is it the very nature of the Hebrew, Greek, or Latin, that forces them so much to English it “grave”, rather than “Hell”? We appeal to all Hebricians, Grecians, and Latinists in the world: first, if a man would ask, what is Hebrew, or Greek, or Latin for “Hell”: whether they would not answer, these three words (לִישָׁן, ἄδης, *infernus*), as the very proper words to signify it, even as *Panis* signifies “bread”: secondly, if a man would ask, what is Hebrew, or Greek, or Latin for a “grave”: whether they would answer these words (קֶבֶר, τάφος, *sepulchrum*) and not three other which they know are as proper words for “grave”, as *lac*, is for milk.

21. Yea, note and consider diligently what we will say. Let them show me out of all the Bible one place, where it is certain and agreed among all, that it must needs signify “grave”, let them show me in any one such place, that the Holy Scripture uses any of those former three words for grave. As when Abraham bought a place of burial, whether he bought *Infernum* (Gen.

---

<sup>14</sup> See St. Jer. Comment. in 13 Osee.

<sup>15</sup> Jerome in Osee ca. 13.

49); or when it is said the kings of Israel were buried in the monuments or sepulchers of their fathers, whether it say, *in infernis patrum suorum*. So that not only Divines by this observation, but Grammarians also and children may easily see, that the proper and natural signification of the said words, is the English “Hell”, and not “grave”.

22. And therefore Beza does strangely abuse his Reader,<sup>16</sup> more than in one place, saying that the Hebrew word does properly signify “grave”, being deduced of a verb that signifies, to crave or ask, because it craves always new courses, as though the grave craved more than Hell does,<sup>17</sup> or swallowed more, or were more hardly satisfied and filled than Hell. For in all such places they translate “grave”. And in one such place they say, “The grave and destruction can never be full.” (Prov. 27:20) Whereas themselves a little before, translate the very same words, “Hell and destruction”: (Prov. 15:11) and therefore it might have pleased them to have said also, “Hell and destruction can never be full”, as their pew-fellows do in their translation,<sup>18</sup> and again, “We shall swallow them up, like Hell.” (Proverb. 1) “The Devil [we read] goes about continually like a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour,” (1 Pet. 5) who is called in the Apocalypse, *Abaddon*, that is, “destruction.” (Apoc. 9:11) And so very aptly “Hell” and “destruction” are joined together, and are truly said never to be filled. What madness and impudence is it then for Beza to write thus: “Who is ignorant that by the Hebrew word, rather is signified a grave, for that it seems after a sort to crave always new carcasses?”

23. And again, concerning our Saviour Christ’s descending into Hell, and delivering the fathers from thence, “It is marvel,” says Beza,<sup>19</sup> “that the most part of the ancient fathers were in this error, whereas with the Hebrews the word *Sheol*, signifies nothing else but ‘grave.’” Before, he pleaded upon the etymology or nature of the word, now also he pleads upon the authority of the Hebrews themselves. If he were not known to be very impudent and obstinate, we would easily mistrust his skill in the Hebrew, saying that among the Hebrews the word signifies “nothing else but grave.”

24. I would gladly know, what are those Hebrews? Does not the Hebrew text of the Holy Scripture best tell us the use of this word? Do not themselves translate it “Hell” very often? Do not the Septuagint always? If any Hebrew in the world, were asked, how he would turn these words into Hebrew, *Similes estis sepulchris dealbatis*. “You are like to whited graves”: And, *Sepulchrum eius apud vos est*: “His grave is among you”: would any Hebrew I say translate it by this Hebrew word (*sheolim, sheol*) which Beza says among the Hebrews signifies nothing else but “grave”? Ask your Hebrew Readers in this case, and see what they will answer.

25. What are those Hebrews then, that Beza speaks of? Forsooth certain Jews or later Rabbis, which, as they do falsely interpret all the Holy Scriptures against our Saviour Christ in other points of our belief, as against his Incarnation, Death, and Resurrection: so do they also falsely interpret the Holy Scriptures against his descending into Hell, which those Jewish Rabbis deny, because they look for another Messiah that shall not die at all, and consequently shall not after his death go down into Hell and deliver the fathers expecting his coming as our Saviour Christ did. And therefore those Jewish Rabbis hold as the Heretics do, that the fathers of the Old Testament were in heaven before our Saviour Christ’s Incarnation: and these Rabbis are they which also pervert the Hebrew word to the signification of “grave”. in such places of the Holy Scriptures as speak either of our Saviour Christ’s descending into Hell, or of the fathers going down into Hell, even in like manner as they pervert other Hebrew words, of the

---

<sup>16</sup> Annot. in Act. 2, 25:27. & in 1 Cor. 15, 55.

<sup>17</sup> Bib. 1579, Prover. 1,12. 30:15.16.

<sup>18</sup> Bib. 1562, 1577.

<sup>19</sup> Annot. in 2 Act. v, 24.

Holy Scripture as namely, *alma*, (Esa. 7) to signify a young woman, not a virgin, against our Saviour's birth of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

26. And if these later Rabbis be the Hebrews that Beza means, and which these gay English translators follow, we lament that they join themselves with such companions, being the sworn enemies of our Saviour Christ. Surely the Christian Hebrew in Rome and elsewhere, which of great Rabbis are become zealous doctors of Christianity, and therefore honour every mystery and article of our Christian faith concerning our Saviour Christ, they dispute as vehemently against those other Rabbis, as we do against the Heretics, and among other things they tell them, that Saul said, "Raise me up Samuel," (1 Reg. 28) and that the woman said, "I see gods ascending out of the earth." And "An old man is ascended or come up." and that Samuel said, "Why hast thou disturbed me, that I should be raised up?" and, "Tomorrow thou and thy sons shall be with me." And the book of Ecclesiasticus 46:23 says, that Samuel died, and afterward "lifted up his voice out of the earth, etc." All which the Holy Scripture would never have thus expressed (whether it were Samuel indeed or not) if Saul and the Jews then had believed, that their Prophets and Patriarchs had been in heaven above. And as for the Hebrew word, they make it (as every boy among the Jews does well know) as proper a word for "Hell", as *panis* is for bread; and as improper for a grave (though so it may be used by a figure of speech) as *Cymba Charontis* is Latin for death.

27. But what speak I of these? Do not the greatest and most ancient Rabbis (so to call them) the Septuagint always translate the Hebrew word, by the Greek  $\alphaδης$ ,<sup>20</sup> which is properly hell? Do not the Talmudists, and Chaldee paraphrases, and Rabbi Solomon Jarhi, handling these places of the Psalms, "He will deliver my soul from the hand of Sheol," interpret it by *Gehinum*, that is, *Gehenna*, "hell"? And yet the Calvinists bring this place for an example that it signifies "grave". Likewise upon this place, "Let all sinners be turned into *Sheol*": the foresaid Rabbis interpret it by *Gehinnum*, "hell". Insomuch that in Proverbs 15 and in Job 26, it is joined with *Abaddon*. Where Rabbi Levi according to the opinion of the Hebrews, expounds *Sheol*, to be the lowest region of the world, a deep place opposite to heaven, whereof it is written, "If I descended into Hell, thou art present": and so does Rabbi Abraham expound the same word in Chap. 2. Jonae.

28. This being the opinion and interpretation of the Hebrews, see the skill or the honesty of Beza, saying that *Sheol*, with the Hebrews signifies nothing but "grave". Whereas indeed (to speak skillfully, uprightly, and not contentiously) it may signify "grave" sometime secondarily, but "Hell", principally and properly, as is manifest, for that there is no other word so often used and so familiar in the Scriptures to signify Hell, as this, and for that the Septuagint do always interpret it by the Greek word  $\alphaδης$ .

29. The which Greek word is so notorious and peculiar for Hell, that the Pagans use it also for Pluto, whom they feigned to be god of hell, and not god of graves: and if they would stand with us in this point, we might beat them with their own kind of reasoning, out of Poets and profane writers, and out of all lexicons. Unless they will tell us (contrary to their custom) that we Christians must attend the Ecclesiastical use of this word in the Bible and in Christian writers, and that in them it signifies grave.<sup>21</sup> For so Beza seems to say, that the Greek Interpreters of the Bible translated the Hebrew word aforesaid by this Greek word, as signifying a dark place: whereas the Greek Poets used it for that which the Latins called *Inferos*, that is, "Hell". "Which ambiguity," says he, "of the word, made many err, affirming Christ's descending into Hell. So was *Limbus* built, whereunto afterward Purgatory was laid."

---

<sup>20</sup> Geneb. li. 3. de Trin.

<sup>21</sup> Annot. in Act. 2:27.

30. I see Beza his wiliness very well in this point. For here the man has uttered all his heart, and the whole mystery of his crafty meaning of this corrupt translation: that to avoid these three things, Christ's descending into Hell, *Limbus patrum*, and Purgatory, he and his companions wrest the foresaid words of the Holy Scriptures to the signification of grave. But let the indifferent Christian reader only consider Beza his own words in this place, point by point.

31. First he says, that the Greek Poets were wont to use the Greek word for Hell: secondly, that they which interpreted the Bible out of Hebrew into Greek, used the very same word for that Hebrew word whereof we have now disputed: thirdly, that the ancient fathers (for of them he speaks, as a little before he expresses)<sup>22</sup> understood the said Greek word for "Hell", and thereby grew to those errors (as he impudently affirms) of Christ's descending into Hell, and of the place in Hell where the fathers rested, expecting the coming of our Saviour, etc. Whereby the Reader does easily see, that both the profane and also the Ecclesiastical use of the word is for Hell, and not for grave.

32. And for the Latin word, it is the like case for all the world: and if a man will ask but his child that comes from the Grammar, what is *Infernus*, he will say "Hell", and not "grave": what is Latin for "grave"? He will answer *Sepulchrum*, or *monumentum*, but never *Infernus*, unless one of these Calvinistical Translators taught him so, to deceive his father.

33. Now then, to draw to a conclusion of this their corruption also in their English translation: whereas the Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin words do most properly and usually signify Hell: and both Greek, and Latin interpreters precisely in every place use for the Hebrew word, that one Greek word, and that one Latin word, which by all custom of speaking and writing, signify Hell:<sup>23</sup> it had been the part of sincere and true meaning translators, to have translated it also in English always by the word "Hell": and afterward to have disputed of the meaning thereof, whether and when it is to be taken for Hell, or grave, or lake, or death, or any such thing. As in one place they have done it very exactly and indifferently, namely when Jonah says (c. 2:2) out of the whale's belly, "Out of the belly of Hell, cried I, and thou heardest my voice." so all translate it, and well, whatsoever it signify in this place. They think that "Hell", here signifies nothing else but the whale's belly and the affliction of Jonah, and so the word may signify by a Metaphorical speech, as when we say in English, "It is a Hell to live thus": and<sup>24</sup> therefore no doubt they did here translate it so, to insinuate that in other places it might as well signify "grave", as here the whale's belly.

34. But then they should have translated it also Hell in other places, as they did in this, and afterward have interpreted it grave in their commentaries, and not presumptuously to straiten and limit the word of the Holy Ghost to their private sense and interpretation, and to prejudice the ancient and learned holy Fathers, which look far more deeply and spiritually into this prophecy, than to Jonah or the whale; our Saviour himself also applying it to his own person (Mat. 12), and to his being in the heart of the earth three days and three nights. And therefore St. Jerome says,<sup>25</sup> "This belly of Hell, according to the story is the whale's belly, but it may much better be referred to the person of Christ, which under the name of David, sings in the Psalm (Psal. 15), 'Thou shalt not leave my soul in Hell': Who was in Hell alive, "and free among the dead." (Psal. 87) And that which our Saviour says, "The Son of man shall be in the

---

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., v. 24.

<sup>23</sup> If they object unto us some Catholics, that translate it, *Sepulchrum*, as they do: it is a fault in them also, but so far Jesse then in the Protestants, as chance medley is in respect of willful murder.

<sup>24</sup> See their marginal annot. *Jonae 2,2. Bib. 1577.*

<sup>25</sup> Comment. in 2. *Jonae.*

heart of the earth,” he does interpret of his soul in Hell. “For as the heart is in the midst of the body, so is Hell said to be in the midst of the earth.”

35. Thus then presupposing (as we must) that Jonah speaks in the person, of our Saviour Christ, the principal sense is not of the whale’s belly, but of that hell whither our Saviour Christ descended, and from whence he delivered the fathers of the Old Testament, himself ascending into heaven, as their king and general captain before them, and opening the way of heaven unto them, as is signified in another prophet (Mich. 2:13): and was the first that entered heaven.

36. Against all which truths and every point thereof, these translators are so watchful and wary, that where the Apostle says, Christ “began” (ἤνεκαίνιρε, *initiavit*), and “dedicated” unto us the way into heaven (Heb. 10:20), they say, in their English translations with full consent nothing else but, “He prepared”. Why are they falser here than their Masters, Calvin, Beza, Illyricus, who read, *Dedicavit*? Is there nothing in the Greek word (χειροτονία μετάνοια), but bare preparation? Where be these etymologists now, that can strain and wring other words to the uttermost advantage of their heresy, and here are content for the like advantage, to dissemble the force of this word, which by all use and property signifies, to make new, to begin a thing, to be the first author, to dedicate: as St. Augustine might have taught them,<sup>26</sup> and their lexicons, and the Scriptures in many places. This translation (no doubt) is not done sincerely and indifferently by them, but for their own deceitful purpose, as is all the rest. When St. Paul speaks of preparation only, they know right well that he uses the usual word to prepare: as, “He has prepared (ἐτοίμασε) them a city”: and wheresoever is signified preparation only, let them bring us one example where it is expressed by the other Greek word, which now we speak of.

37. But it is of more importance, which follows, and appertaining altogether to this controversy. Hebr. 5:7 your translation (1577) is this, in the very English bible that now is read in your churches: “Which in days of his flesh offered up prayers with strong crying, unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that which he feared.” Is the Greek here, (ἐπὶ τῆς ὑλαβείας) “In that which he feared”? You know that no grammar nor lexicon allows you this translation. But either thus, “for reverence”, or as one of your own English Bibles has it, “because of his reverence”.

38. How is it then, that in your later English bibles you changed your former translation from better to worse? Or who taught you so to translate it? Forsooth the Heretic Beza, whose translation you follow for the most part in your later bibles, though here, in sense rather than in word. And who taught Beza? He says, Calvin was the first that ever found out this interpretation. And why? Surely for defense of no less blasphemy than this,<sup>27</sup> that our Saviour Jesus Christ upon the Cross was horribly afraid of damnation, that he was in the very sorrows and torments of the damned, and that this was his descending into Hell, and that otherwise he descended not. Let the Reader note these new teachers upon this place, and judge to what wicked end this translation tends.

39. A wonderful thing: when all antiquity with a general, and full consent has in that place of the Holy Scripture read thus, “that Christ was heard” (of his father) “for his reverence” (Jo. 11:42) (according as our Saviour himself also says in the raising of Lazarus, and signifies in his long prayer Jo. 17:) how a blasphemous and presumptuous Heretic should be so malapert thus to alter it, that “he was heard in that which he feared”, that is, that he was delivered from damnation and the eternal pains of Hell, which he was sore afraid of. To the maintenance of which blasphemy, Beza will seem to force the Greek thus. First (says he), ὑλάβεια does not here signify reverence or piety, but fear, and such a fear which he calls *pauorem et*

---

<sup>26</sup> Aug. tract. 48. in Joan.

<sup>27</sup> Calv. *Catech.* & Justitut. li. 2. c. 16.

*consternationem animi*, that is, dreadfulness and astonishment of mind, and other like words, to insinuate an exceeding horror and fear in our Saviour Christ. For confutation whereof, we might easily bring the common use of this Greek word in the Holy Scriptures to signify not every fear, but that religious fear which is in the best men, joined with godliness, holiness, and devotion, as when in Acts 8 they that buried St. Steven, are called *Viri timorati*, *andres* ἄνδρες ὑλαβεῖς, devout men such as feared God.

40. But we need not go far, for Beza will help us himself, who tells us in another place the very same. His words be these:<sup>28</sup> “ ὑλάβεια *significant non quemvis timorem, sed cum reverential potius quam cum animi trepidatione conjunctum; latini religionem vocant.* That is, “ ὑλάβεια does not signify every fear, but that which is joined with reverence rather than with astonishment of mind; that Latins do call it, ‘religion’ or ‘religious fear’.” If this be the true signification of ὑλάβεια, as Beza himself confesses, why does he not so translate it in the foresaid place to the Hebrews? Why forsakes he the old approved Latin translation and general consent of all ancient interpreters, and translates it, “that fear or astonishment of mind”, which he says the word does *not* signify?

41. And mark that in his foresaid annotation upon St. Luke he tells not a peculiar signification of the Greek word in that place, as though in some other places it might have another signification, but he tells generally what the very nature of the Greek word is, that is, that it signifies not every fear but a fear joined with reverence. And he said truly: and they shall hardly give an instance where it signifies that fear of astonishment, which both he and they translate in the foresaid place of St. Paul. Such a force has heresy to lead a man even contrary to his own knowledge, to falsify God’s holy Word.

42. Yea, Beza says further to this purpose (much more against his skill in the Greek tongue, if he had any at all) that π the preposition cannot bear this sense, “For which”, or “in respect whereof”. And therefore he translates the Greek into Latin thus: *Exauditus est ex metu*, “he was heard from fear”: not, “for fear”, or “for his reverence”. And because “from fear”, is a hard speech and dark, that seems to be the cause why our English translators say, “In that which he feared”, far from Beza in word, but agreeably in sense.

43. But for this matter we send them to Flaccus Illyricus, a captain Lutheran, who disputes this very point against the Calvinists: and teaches them that nothing is more common, than that signification of π. For proof whereof, we also refer them to these places of the Holy Scripture: Mat. 13 (π τς χαρς), Luc. 22 and 24 (π τς λύπης), Act 12 (π ταλαιπωρίας), Psal. 87 (π τς περηφανίας), and Machab. 5, 21 (δι τν μετεωρισμν τς καρδις) where π with a genitive, and δι with an accusative, signify all one, which Beza denies. Gentle Reader, bear with these tedious grammatications, fitter to be handled in Latin, but necessary in this case also, good for them that understand, and for the rest an occasion to ask of them that have skill in the Greek tongue, whether we accuse our adversaries justly or no, of falsely translating the Holy Scriptures.

44. And we beseech them to give us a good reason why they, professing to follow precisely the Greek, do not observe truly the Greek points, in such place as concerns this present controversy. For the place in the Apocalypse which they allege of our Saviour Christ’s suffering from the beginning (thereby to infer that the just men of the Old Testament might enter heaven then, as well as after his real and actual death) according to the Greek points says thus, “All that dwell upon the earth, shall worship him [the beast] whose names have not been written in the book of life of the Lamb slain, from the beginning of the world.” Where it is

<sup>28</sup> Annot. in Luc. 2:25.

evident, that the Greek text says not, “the lamb slain from the beginning”, but that the names of those Antichristian Idolaters were not written in God’s eternal book of predestination from the beginning, as it is also most plain without all ambiguity in Apoc. 17:8. If in a place of no controversy they had not been curious in points of the Greek, they might have great reason sometime to alter the same.

45. But if in points of controversy between us, they will say, divers pointing is of no importance, they know the contrary by the example of ancient heretics, which used this mean also to serve their false heretical purpose. If they say, our Vulgar Latin text points it so, let them profess before God and their conscience, that they do it of reverence to the said ancient Latin text, or because it is indifferent, and not for any other cause, and for this one place we will admit their answer.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### *Heretical translation concerning JUSTIFICATION.*

About the article of justification, as it has many branches, and their errors therein be manifold, so are their English translations accordingly many ways false and heretical. First against justification by good works and by keeping the commandments, they suppress the very name of “justification” in all such places where the word signifies the commandments of the Law of God, which is both in the Old and New Testament most common and usual, namely in the books of Moses; in Psalm 118 that begins thus, *Beati immaculati*; in Psalm 147:9; 1 Mac. 1:51 and 2:21; Luc. 1:6; and Ro. 2:26. In all which places and the like, where the Greek signifies “justices” and “justifications” (δικαιώματα) most exactly, according as our Vulgar Latin translates, *justitias* and *justificationes*: there the English translations say jointly and with one consent, “ordinances”, or “statutes”. For example, Ro. 2: “If the uncircumcision keep the *ordinances* of the Law (τὰ δικαιώματα), shall it not be counted for circumcision?” And Luc. 1:6. “They were both, righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and *ordinances* (δίκαιοι) of the Lord, blameless.” Why translate you it “ordinances”, and avoid the term “justifications”? Is it because you would follow the Greek? I beseech you is not δίκαιος, “just”, δικαιοῦμαι, “to be justified”, δικαιώματα, “justifications” or “justices”? In the Old Testament you might perhaps pretend, that you follow the Hebrew word, צִדְקָה, and therefore you translate, “statutes”, or “ordinances”. But even there also, are not the Seventy Greek interpreters sufficient to teach you the signification of the Hebrew word: who always interpret it, δικαιώματα, in English, “justifications”?

2. But be it, that you may control them in the Hebrew, which none but fools will grant unto you: in the New Testament what pretense have you? Do you there also translate the Hebrew word, or rather the Greek? The Greek undoubtedly you should translate. What reason then can you have why you do not? None other surely than that which Beza gives for himself, saying, that he rejected the word “justifications” (notwithstanding it expressed the Greek, *word for word*, notwithstanding the Seventy Greek interpreters used it *to signify the whole Law*, and in Latin it be commonly translated, *justificationes*) notwithstanding all this, for this only cause (says he<sup>1</sup>) did I reject it, to avoid the cavillations that might be made by this word, against justification by faith. As if he should say, This word truly translated according to the Greek, might minister great occasion to prove by so many places of Scripture, that man’s justification is not by faith only, but also by keeping the law, and observing the commandments, which therefore are called according to the Greek and Latin, “justifications”, because they concur to justification, and make a man just, as by St. Luke’s words also is well signified, which have this allusion, that they were both just, because they walked in all the justifications of our Lord. Which they on purpose suppress by other words.

3. And hereof also it rises, that when he cannot possibly avoid the word δικαιώματα in his translation (as Apoc. 19:8. *Bissinum enim justificationes sunt sanctorum*, “The silk is the justifications of Saints”:) there he helps the matter with this commentary,<sup>2</sup> That “justifications”, are “those good works which be the testimonies of a lively faith.” But our English translators have another way to avoid the word even in their translation. For they say here, “the righteousness of Saints”, because they could not say, “ordinances of Saints”, and they would not say, “justifications of saints”; knowing very well (by Beza’s own commentary) that this word includes the good works of saints: which works if they should in translating call their

<sup>1</sup> Annot. in Luc. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Beza Annot. in Apoc. 19.



justifications, it would go fore against justification by only faith. Therefore do they translate instead thereof, “ordinances”, and “statutes”, where they can, which are terms furthest off from justification: and where they cannot, there they say, “righteousness”, making it also the plural number, whereas the more proper Greek word for righteousness is ἁθύτης (Dan. 6:22) which there some of them translate “unguiltiness”: because they will not translate exactly, if you would hire them.

4. And therefore as for, “justice”, and “justifications”, they say “righteousness” (1577 Bible): so for, “just”, they translate, “righteous”, and by this means, “Joseph was a righteous man” (Mat. 1:19), rather than a just man: and Zachary and Elizabeth “were both righteous before God” (Luc. 1:6), rather than just: because when a man is called “just”, it founds that he is so in deed, and not by imputation only: as a wise man, is understood to be wise in deed, and not only so imputed. Therefore do they more gladly and more often say, “righteous men”, rather than “just men”, and when they do say, “just men”, as sometime they do lest they might seem wilful inexcusably: there they understand, just by imputation, and not in deed, as is to be seen in Beza’s Annotations upon the Epistle to the Romans. Note also that they put the word, “just”, when faith is joined withal, as Ro. 1. “The just shall live by faith”, to signify that justification is by faith. But if works be joined withal, and keeping the commandments, as in the place alleged Luc. 1. there they say, “righteous”, to suppress justification by works.

5. And certain it is, if there were no sinister meaning, they would in no place avoid to say, “just”, “justice”, “justification”, where both the Greek and Latin are so, word for word. As for example, 2 Tim. 4:8. In all their bibles, “Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of *righteousness* (τῶς δικαιοσύνης), which the Lord the *righteous* judge shall *give* me at that day (ὁ δίκαιος κρίτῶς ἁποδώσει etc.)” And again 2 Thess. 3: “Rejoice in tribulations which is a token of the *righteous judgement* (τῶς δικάιας κρίσεως) of God, that you may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God for which ye suffer. For it is a *righteous thing* (δίκαιον ἁστὶ; *justum est*) with God, to recompense tribulation to them that trouble you: and to you that are troubled, rest with us, in the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven.” And again Hebr. 6:10, “God is not *unrighteous* (ὁ ἁ γῆρ ἁδίκος; *non enim injustus est Deus*) to forget your good work and labour, etc.” These are very pregnant places to discover their false purpose in concealing the word, “justice”, in all their bibles. For if they will say, that justice is not a usual English word in this sense, and therefore they say, “righteousness”: yet I trow, “just”, and “unjust”, are usual and well known. Why then would they not say at the least, in the places alleged, “God the *just* judge,” “A token of the *just judgement* of God,” “It is a *just* thing with God”, “God is not *unjust* to forget, etc.”? Why is it not at the least in one of their English Bibles, being so both in Greek and Latin?

6. Understand gentle Reader, and mark well, that if St. Paul’s words were truly translated thus, “A crown of *justice* is laid up for me, which our Lord the *just* judge will *render* unto me at that day,” and so in the other places: it would infer, that men are justly crowned in heaven for their good works upon earth, and that it is God’s “justice” so to do, and that he will do so because he is a “just judge”, and because he will show his *just judgement*, and he will not forget so to do, because he is not “unjust” (Psal. 57. *Si utique est fructus justo, utique est Deus judicans eos in terra.*): as the ancient fathers (namely the Greek doctors St. Chrysostom, Theodorete, and Oecumenius upon these places) do interpret and expound, insomuch that Oecumenius says thus upon the foresaid place to the Thessalonians, ἁρα, ἁτι, etc. “See here, that to suffer for Christ procures the kingdom of heaven according to *just judgement*, and not according to grace.” (κῆτ δικαιοκρισίαν, κῆι ἁ κῆτ χάριν.) Which lest the Adversary might take in the worse part, as though it were only God’s justice or just judgement, and not his favour or grace also, St.

Augustine excellently declares how it is both the one and the other: to wit, his grace and favour and mercy, in making us by his grace to live and believe well, and so to be worthy of heaven: his justice and just judgement, to render and repay for those works which himself wrought in us, life everlasting. Which he expresses thus<sup>3</sup>: “How should he render or repay as a just judge, unless he had given it as a merciful father?” Where St. Augustine urges the words of “repaying” as due, and of being *a just judge* therefore, both which the said translators corrupt, not only saying “righteous judge”, for “just judge”: but, that he will “give” a crown, which is of a thing not due, for that which is in the Greek, “He will render” or “repay” (□ποδώσει): which is of a thing due and deserved, and has relation to works going before, for the which the crown is repaid. He said not (says Theophylacte upon this place) “he will give”, but “he will render” or “repay”, as a certain debt, for he being just, will define and limit the reward according to the labours. The crown therefore is due debt, because of the judge’s justice. So says he.

7. Which speeches being most true as being the express words of Holy Scripture, yet we know how odiously the Adversaries may and do misconstrue them to the ignorant, as though we challenged heaven by our own works, and as though we made God bound to us. Which we do not, God forbid. But because he has prepared good works for us (as the Apostle says, Eph. 2:10) to walk in them, and does by his grace cause us to do them, and has promised life everlasting for them, and tells us in all his Holy Scriptures, that to do them is the way to heaven: therefore not presuming upon our own works as our own or as of ourselves, but upon the good works wrought through God’s grace by us his seely instruments, we have great confidence (as the Apostle speaks, Hebr. 10) and are assured that these works proceeding of his grace, be so acceptable to him, that they are esteemed and be worthy and meritorious of the kingdom of heaven. Against which truth, let us see further, their heretical corruptions.

---

<sup>3</sup> Aug. de gra. et lib. arb. ca. 6.

## CHAPTER IX.

*Heretical translation against MERITS or MERITORIOUS WORKS and the REWARD for the same.*

When they translate thus (Bib. 1577): “I am certainly persuaded, that the afflictions of this time, *are not worthy of the glory* which shall be shown upon us (Ro. 8:18): do they not mean to signify to the reader, and must it not needs so sound in his ears, that the tribulations of this life, be they never so great, though suffered for Christ, yet do not merit nor deserve the heavenly glory? But in the Greek, it is far otherwise. I will not stand upon their first words, “I am certainly persuaded,” (λογίζομαι, “I suppose”) which is a far greater asseveration than the Apostle uses, and I marvel how they could so translate that Greek word, but that they were disposed, not only to translate the Apostle’s words falsely against meritorious works, but also to avouch and affirm the same lustly, with much more vehemence of words than the Apostle speaks. Well, let us pardon them this fault, and examine the words following. Where the Greek says not (οὐκ ἴσθια πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν; *non sunt condignae ad futuram gloriam*), as they translate with full consent in all their English Bibles, “The afflictions are not worthy of the glory etc.” but thus, “The afflictions of this time are not equal, correspondent, or comparable to the glory to come.”<sup>1</sup> because the afflictions are short, the glory is eternal: the afflictions small and few in comparison, the glory great and abundant above measure.

2. This is the Greek phrase and the Apostle’s meaning, which we need not greatly to prove, because their own Doctors Calvin and Beza do so interpret it, and therefore wonder it were that the Geneva English bibles also should forsake their Masters, and follow the error of the other English bibles, but that they thought the more voices the better. In the meantime the people see no other translation, and think it is the Apostle’s very words. But Beza himself tells them the contrary, translating thus: *Statuo minime esse paria quae presenti tempore perpetimur, futurae gloriae nobis revelandae*. That is, “I am of this opinion, that the things which we suffer in this present time, are not equal to the glory that shall be revealed to us.” And in his commentary, thus, “St. Paul’s discourse and matter handled in this place, declare, that he speaks not of the value or price of the afflictions which we suffer for Christ, but rather by comparing their quality and quantity with life everlasting, he gathers that we shall be infinitely happier with Christ, than we are miserable here. Therefore did he use the Greek word ἴσθια rightly and properly, which the Grammarians say is spoken of such things, as being poised or weighed, are found of one weight.” Thus far Beza.

3. If, then, a comparison only be signified, why do they not so translate it in English, that it may be taken for a comparison in our English phrase? For they know very well that if a man should say in English, according as they translate, Good works are “not worthy” of heaven, this man is “not worthy” of my favour, he is “not worthy” of such a living, of so great praises: every Englishman understands it thus, that they “deserve not” heaven, and that such a man “deserves not” this or that. Even so must the reader needs take it in this place, and they must needs have intended that he should so take it. For though the Greek phrase may signify a comparison (Prov. 3, ἴσθιον ὑπὲρ), being so uttered, yet not the English, and if it might, yet obscurely and ambiguously: and if it might, yet here they do falsely translate so, because here the Greek phrase is otherwise, and therefore should otherwise be Englished. For it is not, ἴσθια τὸς δόξης, which is, as they translate, “worthy of the glory”: but, ἴσθια πρὸς τὴν δόξαν, which cannot be so translated. For if it might, then these Greek phrases were all one, and might be used indifferently. And then I must desire them to turn me this into Greek, “He is not worthy of thanks,” and if they turn it by the Apostle’s phrase in this place, οὐκ ἴσθιος ὅστις πρὸς τὴν

<sup>1</sup> See St. Chrys. upon this place.

χάρिता, to all Grecians they shall be ridiculous. And yet this is as well turned out of English into Greek, as they have turned the other out of Greek into English.

4. Marry, if they would express a comparison of equality or inequality between thing and thing, then this is the proper Greek phrase thereof, and much more proper for this purpose, than by ἴσιος, and a genitive case. Which notwithstanding is often so used in the Scriptures, by way of comparison, as Prov. 3 concerning the praise of wisdom (πῶν τίμιον οὐκ ἴσιον οὐτῶς οὐστῆ). Where St. Augustine to express the comparison, reads thus, *Omne pretiosum non est illi dignum*: and St. Jerome according to the Hebrew (הַכֹּחַ-וְהַיִּשׁוּבִי לֹא יִשְׁפָּטֶנּוּ-לֶכֶּךָ) thus, *omnia quem desiderantur non valent huic comparari, or adaequari*; and Ecc. 26, we have the very like speech proceeding of the said Greek word ἴσιος, *Omnis ponderatio non est digna continentis animae*. Which the English Bibles translate thus, “There is no weight to be compared unto a mind that can rule itself.” Or, “with a continent mind.”

5. And if ἴσιος with a genitive case signify a comparison, and themselves so translate it in all their bibles, should not ἴσιος in the Apostle’s phrase (ἴσια πρὸς τῶν δόξαν) much more be so translated? I appeal to their own consciences. Again, if here in Ecclesiasticus they say not according to the Greek words, “There is no weight worthy of a continent mind” (ἴσιος ἰγκρατοῦς ψυχῆς), because they would by an English phrase express the comparison: is it not more than evident, that when they translate the Apostle by the very same words, “Worthy of the glory etc.”: they know it cannot, and they mean it should not signify a comparison? I cannot sufficiently express, but only to the learned and skilful reader, their partial and heretical dealing. Briefly I say, they translate, οὐκ ἴσιος ἰγκρατοῦς ψυχῆς, “Not to be compared with a continent mind,” being in Greek word for word “Not worthy of a continent mind”: and contrariwise they translate in St. Paul, οὐκ ἴσια πρὸς τῶν μέλλουσας δόξαν, “Not worthy of the glory to come,” being in the Greek, “Not to be compared to the glory to come.” According to the very like Latin phrase by *dignus*, Eccl. 6: *Amico fideli nulla est comparatio, et non est DIGNA ponderatio auri et argenti CONTRA BONITATEM FIDEI*, that is, according to their own translation, “A faithful friend has no peer, weight of gold and silver is not to be compared to the goodness of his faith.”

6. Now if they will say, though their translation of St. Paul’s words be not so exact and commodious, yet the sense and meaning is all one (for if these present afflictions be not equal or comparable to the glory to come, then neither are they worthy of it, nor can deserve or merit it) let the Christian reader mark the difference. First their Beza and Calvin tell them that the Apostle speaks of the one, and not of the other. Secondly, the passions and afflictions that Christ our Saviour suffered all his life, were not comparable to the eternal glory which he obtained thereby: yet did he thereby deserve and merit eternal glory, not only for himself but for all the world: yea by the least affliction he suffered, did he deserve all this. Unless you will deny also that he merited and deserved his glory, which your opinion a man might very well gather by some<sup>2</sup> of your false translations, but that you would think us too suspicious, which perhaps we will examine hereafter. Thirdly, the present pleasure of advoutry during a man’s life, is not comparable to the eternal torments of hellfire: and yet it does merit and deserve the same. Fourthly, the Apostle by making an incomparable difference of the glory to come with the afflictions of this time, does (as St. Chrysostom says; προτρέπει μειζόνως) exhort them the more vehemently and move them to sustain all things the more willingly: but if he said as they translate, “The afflictions are not worthy of heaven, you are never the nearer heaven for them, only believe,” this had not been to exhort them, but to discourage them. Fifthly, the Apostle,

<sup>2</sup> Heb. 2:9 in the New Testament of the year 1580 and Bib. 1579.

when he will elsewhere encourage them to suffer, says plainly, (2 Cor. 4:17) “Our tribulation which presently is for a moment and light, *works* (κατεργάζεται) above measure exceedingly, an eternal weight of glory in us.”

7. See you not a comparison between short and eternal, light tribulation, and exceeding weighty glory: and yet that one also “works” the other, that is, causes, purchases, and deserves the other? For, like as the little seed being not comparable to the great tree, yet causes it and brings it forth: so our tribulations and good works otherwise incomparable to eternal glory, by the virtue of God’s grace working in us, works, purchases, and causes the said glory. For so they know very well the Greek word imports: though here also they translate it most falsely, “prepares” (Bib. 1577).

8. Lastly, for most manifest evidence, that these present tribulations and other good works are meritorious and worthy of the joys to come, though not comparable to the same: you shall hear the holy Doctors say both in one passage or sentence. St. Cyprian thus:<sup>3</sup> “O what manner of day shall come, my brethren, when our Lord shall recount the *merits* (*singulorum merita*) of everyone, and pay us the reward or stipend of faith and devotion?” Here are merits and the reward for the same. It follows in the said Doctor, “What glory shall it be, and how great joy, to be admitted to see God, so to be honoured that thou receive the joy of eternal life with Christ thy Lord God, to receive there that which neither eye has seen, nor ear has heard, nor has ascended into the heart of man. For, that we shall receive greater things, than here either we do, or suffer, the Apostle” pronounces, saying, “The passions of this time are not condign or comparable to the glory to come.” Here we see that the stipend or reward of the merits aforesaid, are incomparably greater than the said merits.

9. Likewise St. Augustine:<sup>4</sup> “The exceeding goodness of God has provided this, that the labours should soon be ended, but the rewards of the *merits* (*praemia meritorum*) should endure without end: the Apostle testifying, ‘The Passions of this time are not comparable etc.’. For we shall receive greater bliss, than are the afflictions of all passions whatsoever.” Thus we see plainly, that short tribulations are true merits of endless glory, though not comparable to the same: which truth you impugn by your false and heretical translation. But let us see further your dealing in the selfsame controversy, to make it plainer that you bend your translations against it, more than the text of the Scripture does permit you.

10. In the book of Wisdom, where there is honorable mention of the merits of Saints and their rewards in heaven, the Holy Scripture says thus: “God has proven them, and finds them *meet for himself* (□ξίους □αυτο□; *dignos se*).” To omit here that you use the present tense (□πέπρασεν), whereas in the Greek they are preter tenses (ε□ρεν) (God knows why, only this we know, that it is no true nor sincere translation) but to wink at smaller faults, why say you here in all your Bibles, that God finds his Saints and holy servants “meet for himself,” and not, “worthy of himself”? See your partiality, and be ashamed.

11. In the Apostle’s places before examined, you said negatively, that the afflictions of this time were “not worthy” of the glory to come, the Greek not bearing that translation: but here, when you should say affirmatively, and that word for word after the Greek, that God found them “worthy of himself” (□ξίους □αυτο□), there you say, “meet for himself,” avoiding the term “worthy”, because merit is included therein. So that when you will in your translation deny merits, then *condignae ad (gloriam)*, signifies, “worthy of”: when you should in your translation affirm merits, then *dignus (dignos se)* with an ablative case does not signify “worthy of”. No marvel if such wilfulness will not see the word “merit”, or that which is equivalent

---

<sup>3</sup> Ep. 56. nu. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Ser. 37 de Sanctis.

thereto, in all the Scripture. For when you do see it, and should translate it, you suppress it by another word. But this is a case worthy of examination, whether the Scripture have the word “merit”, or the equivalent thereof. For we will force them even by their own translations, to confess that it is found there, and that they should translate it accordingly often when they do not, yea, that if we did not see it in the Vulgar Latin translation, yet they must needs see it and find it in the Greek.

12. First, when they translate the foresaid place thus, “The afflictions of this time are not worthy (ὄυκ ὀξία) of the glory to come,” they mean this, “deserve not the glory to come,” for to that purpose they do translate it, as has been declared. Again, when it is said, “The workman is worthy (ὀξιος τοῦ μισθοῦ, *dignus mercede sua*) of his wages,” what is meant, but that he deserves his wages? And more plainly Tob. 9 they translate thus: “Brother Azarias, if I should give myself to be thy servant, I shall not *deserve* thy providence.” (*Non ero condignus providentiae*) And such like. If then in these places, both the Greek and the Latin signify, “to be worthy of”, or, “not to be worthy of”, “to deserve,” or, “not to deserve”: then they must allow us the same signification and virtue of the same words in other like places. Namely Apoc. 5 of our Saviour’s merits, thus: “The lamb that was killed, *is worthy* (ὀξιος ὀστιν) to receive power, and riches, etc.” What is that to say, but, “*deserves* to receive”? For so I trust they will allow us to say of our Saviour, that he indeed deserved. Again, of the damned, thus: “Thou hast given them blood to drink, for they *are worthy*,” or, “*they have deserved*.” (Apoc. 16; ὀξιοι γάρ ὀισι) Is it not all one? Lastly of the elect, thus: “They shall walk with me in white, because they are worthy,” (Apoc. 3; οστι ὀξιοι ὀισιν, *Dignis sunt*) that is, because “they deserve it.” And so in the place before by them corrupted, “God found them worthy of him (ὀξίους ὀαυτοῦ, *Dignos se*): that is, such as “deserved” to be with him in eternal glory. Thus by their own translation of ὀξιος and *dignus*, are plainly deduced, worthiness, desert, and merit of saints, out of the Scripture.

13. But to proceed one step further, we prove it also to be in the Scriptures, thus. Themselves translate thus Heb. 10:29. “Of how much sorer punishment shall he be worthy, which treads under foot the Son of God?” (ὀξιωθῆναι & κῆτξιωθῆναι, *signifie deserte*), though one of their Bibles of the year 1562, very falsely and corruptly leaves out the words “worthy of”, saying thus, “How much sorer shall he be punished, etc.” (πόσῶ χείρονος ὀξιωθῆται τιμορίας): Fearing no doubt by translating the Greek word sincerely, this consequence that now I shall infer. To wit, if the Greek word here, by their own translation, signify “to be worthy of”, or, “to deserve”, being spoken of pains and punishment deserved, then must they grant us the same word so to signify else where in the New Testament, when it is spoken of deserving heaven and the kingdom of God? As in these places: (Luc. 21) “Watch therefore, all times praying, that you *may be worthy* (ὀνακαταξιωθῆτε σταθῆναι) to stand before the Son of Man.” (Luc. 20): “*They that are worthy* (ὀι κατῶξιωθέντες) to attain to that world and to the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are married.” (2 Thess. 1): “That you may *be worthy* (ὀις τῶ καταξιωθῆναι ὀμῶς τῶς βασιλείας.) of the kingdom of God, for which also ye suffer.”

14. Thus you should translate in all these places, according to your translation of the former place to the Hebrews: or at the leastwise you should have this sense and meaning, as the old Vulgar Latin has, translating in all these places, “counted worthy” (*Qui digni habebuntur; ut digni habeamini*), but meaning worthy indeed: as when it is said, “Abraham was reputed just”, it is meant he was just indeed. If you also have this meaning in your translations, which here follow the Vulgar Latin: then we appeal to yourselves, whether, to be counted worthy, and to be worthy, and to deserve, and to merit, be not all one: and so here also “merit” is deduced. But if you mean according to your heresy, to signify by translating, “counted worthy”, that they are

not indeed worthy: then your purpose is heretical, and translation false and repugnant to your translating the same word in other places, as is declared, and now further we will declare.

15. They whom God does “make worthy” (ξισαι), they are truly and in deed worthy, are they not? But, by your own translation of the same word in the active voice, God does make them worthy. Therefore, in the passive voice it must also signify “to be made” or “to be indeed worthy” (ξιοθναι). For example, 2 Thess. 1:11. You translate thus, “we also pray for you, that our God may make you worthy (να μς ξιώστος κλήσεως) of this calling.” According to which translation, why did you not also in the selfsame chapter a little before translate thus: “That you may be made worthy (ις τ καταξιοθναι μς τς βασιλείας)” (and so be worthy) “of the kingdom of God, for which also you suffer?” You know the case is like in both places. And in the Greek doctors you specially should know (by your ostentation of reading them in Greek) that they according to this use of Holy Scripture, very often use also this word both actively and passively, “to make worthy”, and “to be made”, or, “to be worthy”. See the Greek Liturgies.

16. Which St. Chrysostom, to put all out of doubt, explicates thus in other words, “That he make us worthy of the kingdom of heaven (να μς ξίους περγάσεται τς βασιλείας).”<sup>5</sup> And upon the epistle to Titus c. 3 in the same sense passively, “God grand we may all be made worthy” (or “be worthy”; ξιοθναι) “of the good things promised to them that love him.” And in another place of the said doctor it must needs signify “to be worthy”, as when he says in Colos. 1: “No man lives such a trade of life, that he is worthy of the kingdom but all is his gift (στε βασιλείας ξιοθναι).” For to say thus, “No man so lives that he can be counted worthy of the kingdom of heaven” is false, is against the Protestants’ own opinion, which say they are counted worthy, that are not. Again, to say, “No man so lives that he can be made worthy” is false, because God can make the worst man worthy. It remains then to say, “No man so lives that he is worthy,” which a little before he declares thus, “No man by his own proper merits obtains the kingdom of heaven (π απορθωμάτων ικείων),” that is, as his own, and of himself without the grace of God. And yet we must show further out of the Scriptures, that God makes us worthy, and so we are indeed worthy, and here also we must convince you of false and partial interpretation.

17. The Greek word κανς (I pray you), what does it signify? You must answer that it signifies not only “meet”, but also “worthy” (υκ ιμ κανς). For so Beza teaches you, and so you translate Mat. 3:11, Mat. 8:8, and 1 Cor. 15:9 “I am not worthy” in all three places. And why (I pray you) did you not likewise follow the old Latin interpreter one step further, saying, “Giving thanks to God the Father that has made us worthy (τ κανώσαντ μς ις τν μερίδα, Col. 1:12)” but translating rather thus, “Which has made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.” Here was the place where you should have shown your sincerity, and have said that God makes us worthy of heavenly bliss. Because you know if κανς be “worthy”, then κανσαι is “to make worthy”. But you are like to Beza your Master, who (as though all interpretation of words were at his commandment) says, here and here and so forth “I have followed the old Latin interpreter”,<sup>6</sup> translating it, “worthy”: but in such and such a place (meaning this for one) “I chose rather to say, meet (*idoneum dicere malu*)”. But that both he and you should here also have translated “worthy”, the Greek fathers shall teach you, if we be not worthy, or able to control so mighty Grecians, as you pretend to be

---

<sup>5</sup> Ser. 1. de orando Deo.

<sup>6</sup> Annot. in 3. Mat. No. Test. 1556.

when you crow upon your own dunghill, otherwise in your translations showing small skill, or great malice.

18. The Greek fathers (I say) interpret the Apostle's word here, thus:<sup>7</sup> Κατηξίωσεν ἡμῶς, κῆρι χάρισατο ἡμῶς κἀνοῶς γενέθαι, that is, has made us worthy, and given us the grace to be worthy. And St. Basil<sup>8</sup> making both Greek words all one, says, "*thou hast made us worthy* (κατηξίωσες ἡμῶς) to be ministers of thy holy altar." and anon after, "*make us worthy* (κἀνώσον ἡμῶς) for this ministry." And St. Chrysostom upon the Apostle's place, "God does not only give us society with the Saints, but makes us also worthy to receive so great dignity." And here is a goodly consideration of the goodness of God toward us, that does indeed by his grace make us worthy of so great things, who otherwise are most unworthy, vile, and abject. Which making of us worthy, is expressed by the said Greek words, more than by the Latin, *mereri*, because it declares whence our merit and worthiness proceeds, to wit, of God. Both which St. Chrysostom expresses excellently thus:<sup>9</sup> "When he brought in Publicans to the kingdom of heaven, he defamed not the kingdom of heaven, but magnified it also with great honours, showing that there is such a Lord of the kingdom of heaven, which has made even unworthy persons to be so much better, that they should deserve even the glory of that dignity (*ut etiam illius dignitatis gloriam mererentur*)." And Oecumenius says, "that it is God's glory, to make his servants worthy (ἐξιῶσαι) of such good things: and that it is their glory, to have been made worthy (ἐξιῶθαι) of such things (2 Thess. 1).

19. Thus, we see how the Holy Scripture uses equivalent words to signify, "merit", which you suppress as much as you can. So likewise we might tell you of other words and phrases that do plainly import and signify "merit", as when it is said "Every man shall find according to his works (Ecc. 16; κῆρι τῶ ἔργῳ ἕσται) Budee both your Master and ours in the Greek tongue, tells us that the Greek word ἕσται (to find) is properly to receive for that which a man has given or laboured (λαβεῖν ἢ ἔργον τίς δὲ κεν ἢ πόση). And to requite you with some profane authority, because you delight much in that kind, the whole oration of Demosthenes πρὸς λεπτινήν (ἕσται ἢ τέλειαν), will tell you the same. Now, to receive for that which a man has laboured or wrought, what does it else presuppose, but merit and desert? It is a common phrase of the Scripture (Ecc. 16, Psal. 61, Apoc. 22), that God will judge and reward or repay according to every man's works, does not this include merit and demerit of works? But I wot not how, nor wherefore, in this case you translate sometime, "deeds", for "works", saying, "Who will reward every man according to his deeds (κῆρι τῶ ἔργῳ ἕσται)", and again, "You see then how that of deeds a man is justified, and not of faith only (ἐξ ἔργων)."

20. I know you will tell us that you use to say "deeds" or "works" indifferently, as also you may say, that you put no difference between "just" and "righteous", "meet" and "worthy", but use both indifferently. To the ignorant this is a fair answer, and shall soon persuade them; but they that see further, must needs suspect you, till you give a good reason of your doing. For, the controversy being of faith and "works", of "justice" and "justification" by works, of the "worthiness" or value of works: why do you not precisely keep these terms pertaining to the controversy, the Greek words being always pregnant in that signification? Why should you once translate the Greek ἔργῳ, "deeds", rather than "works". You know it is properly, "works", as πράξεις, "deeds". It were very good in matters of controversy to be precise. Beza<sup>10</sup> makes it a

<sup>7</sup> Oecum. in Caten.

<sup>8</sup> in orat. Liturg.

<sup>9</sup> Ho. de Cruce et latrine.

<sup>10</sup> Prefat. in no. Test. 1556.



great fault in the old Vulgar Latin translator, that he expresses one Greek word in Latin divers ways. You chop and change significations here and there as you list, and you think you satisfy the reader marvelously well, if sometime you say “idol”, and now always, “images”; sometime “just”, and not always “righteous”: and if in other places you say “works”, or if one Bible has “works”, where another has “deeds”, you think this is very well and will answer all the matter sufficiently. God and your conscience be judge herein, and let the wise reader consider it deeply. The least thing that we demand the reason of, rather than charge you withal, is, why your Church bible says in the places before alleged, “The righteous judgement of God, which will reward every man according to his deeds,” and, “man is justified by deeds, and not by faith only.” Whereas you know the Greek is more pregnant for us than so, and the matter of controversy would better appear on our side, if you said thus: “The *just* judgement of God, which will reward every man according to his *works*,” and, “Man is justified by works, and not by faith only.”

21. But will you not yet see merit and meritorious works in the Scripture? I marvel your skill in the Greek teaches you nothing in this point. St. John says: “Look to yourselves, that you lose not the things which you have wrought, but that you may receive a full reward.” (2 Epist. v.8) Methinks, in these words the equivalent of merit is easily seen of any man that is not willfully blind, but you should see further than the common sort. For you know that the Greek here (□ □ργάσαθε) signifies, not only that which we work, but that which we work for. As in the Greek phrase of working for a man’s living (□ργάσασθαι τόν βίον), and as you translate Jo. 6:27: “Labour not for the meat (□ργάζεθε τ□ν βρ□σιν) that perishes, [but] for that meat which endures unto life everlasting.” Such labourers (□ργάται) God hired to work in his vineyard (Mat. 20), and “the workman (□ργάτης) is worthy of his hire.” (Luc. 10) So that the Apostle in the former words exhorts to perseverance, that we lose not the reward or pay, for which we work, and which by working we merit and deserve.

22. Again Beza tells us,<sup>11</sup> that □ντιμιθία signifies *mercedem quae meritis respondet*, that is, a reward answerable to the merits. And we find many words in the Scripture like unto this, μιθ□ς, □πόδοσις (Hebr. 1 & 11), μιθαποδόσια, μιθαποδότης, which are on God’s part, who is the rewarder and recompenser. And on our part we have (as the Apostle says), “great confidence” (Hebr. 10 & 4). “Confidence” (πα□□ησία), (says Photius a notable Greek father)<sup>12</sup> “of our works,” “confidence of our faith,” “of our temptations,” “of our patience,” etc. Yea we have □νταπ□δοσις and □ντάμειψις in the Scripture, which must needs signify as much as Beza’s □ντιμιθία. By the one, is said, “In keeping thy commandments is great reward” (□νταπ□δοσις πολλ□); again, “You shall receive *the retribution* (□νσαποδο□ναι) of inheritance.” (Col. 3:24 & 2 Thessal 1:6) God’s repaying just and retribution of Hell or Heaven for good and evil deserts, is expressed by the same word; and by the other, is said, “I have inclined my heart to keep thy justifications (or commandments) always *for reward*.” (δ□ □νσάμειψιν)

23. But all this will not suffice you. For wheresoever you can possibly you will have an evasion. And therefore in this latter place you run to the ambiguity of the Hebrew word (כָּפַר), and translate thus: “I have applied my heart to fulfill thy statutes always, *even unto the end*.” Alas my masters, are not the Seventy Greek interpreters sufficient to determine the ambiguity of this word? Is not St. Jerome, in his translation according to the Hebrew? Are not all the ancient fathers both Greek and Latin? It is ambiguous (say you) and therefore you take your liberty. You do so indeed, and that like Prince’s. For in another place, where the Greek has determined

<sup>11</sup> Annot. in Ro. c.1 v.27

<sup>12</sup> τ□ν □π□ τ□ν □ργων, etc. Phot. apud Oecu. in Hebr. 10. Ps. 18 & 118.

(□τ□ι □γ□ι□σ□σ□τ□ι), you follow it with all your heart, saying, “fall down before his footstool, because he his holy”: whereas the ambiguity of the Hebrew (קָרוֹשׁ הוּא) would have born you to say, as in the Vulgar Latin, “because it is holy”, and so it makes for holiness of places, which you cannot abide.

24. But you use (you say) the ambiguity of the Hebrew. Take heed that your liberty in taking all advantages, against the common and approved interpretation of the whole Church, be not very suspicious. For if it do signify also reward, as (you know) it does very commonly, and yourself to translate it (Psal. 18:11) when you cannot choose: and if the Septuagint do here so translate it in Greek, and St. Jerome<sup>13</sup> in his Latin translation according to the Hebrew, and the ancient fathers in their commentaries: what upstart new Masters are you that set all these to school again, and you teach the world a new translation? If you will say, you follow our own great Hebrician, Sanctes Pagninus, why did you follow him in his translation, rather than in his Lexicon called Thesaurus, where he interprets it as the whole Church did before him? Why did you follow him (or Benedictus Arias either) in this place, and do not follow them in the selfsame case, a little before translating that very Hebrew word which is in this place, *propter retributionem* (Psalm 118:1-2), “for reward”? So that you follow nothing, neither judgement, nor learning in Hebrew or Greek, but only your own error and Heresy, which is, that we may not do well in respect of reward, or, for reward. And therefore because the holy Prophet David said of himself the contrary, that he did bend his whole heart to keep God’s commandments “for reward”, you make him say another thing.

25. And to this purpose perhaps it is (for other cause I cannot guess) that you make such a marvelous transposition of words in your translation saying thus: “When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his majesty, ye that have followed me in the regeneration, shall sit also upon twelve seats.” (Mat. 19) Whereas the order of these words both in Greek and Latin, is this: “You that have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in his majesty, you also shall sit upon twelve seats.” To follow Christ in the regeneration, is not easily understood what it should mean: but to sit with Christ in the regeneration, that is, in the resurrection, upon twelve seats, this is familiar and every man’s interpretation, and concerns the great reward that they shall then have, which here follow Christ as the Apostles did.

26. The like transposition of words is in some of your Bibles<sup>14</sup> thus: “We see Jesus crowned with glory and honour, which was a little inferior to the Angels, through the suffering of death.” (Hebr. 2:9) Whereas both in Greek and Latin, the order of the words is thus: “Him that was made a little inferior to Angels, we see Jesus, through the passion of death, crowned with honour and glory.” In this latter, the Apostle says, that Christ was crowned for his suffering death, and so by his death merited his glory. But by your translation, he says that Christ was made inferior to Angels by his suffering death, that is (says Beza) “For to suffer death” (*ut mori posset*): and taking it so, that he was made inferior to Angels, that he might die, then the other sense is clean excludet, that for suffering death he was crowned with glory: and this is one place among others, whereby it may very well be gathered that some of you<sup>15</sup> think that Christ himself did not merit his own glory and exaltation. So obstinately are you set against merits and meritorious works. To the which purpose also you take away man’s free will, as having no ability to work toward his own salvation.

---

<sup>13</sup> Propter aeternam retributionem. Scz vitae aeternae, u team merear percipere. *in comment.*

<sup>14</sup> No. Test. 1580

<sup>15</sup> See Calvin in epist. ad Philip.

## CHAPTER X.

### *Heretical translation against FREE WILL.*

Against free will your corruptions be these. Where it is said, “As many as received him, he gave them power (ἐξουσίαν) to be made the sons of God” (Jo. 1:12): some of your translations say, he gave them “prerogative” to be the sons of God. Beza, “dignity”. Who protests that whereas in other places often he translated this Greek word, “power” and “authority”, here he refused both, indeed against free will, which he says the Sophists would prove out of this place (*ut liceret filios Dei fieri*), reprehending Erasmus for following them in his translation. But whereas the Greek word is indifferent to signify “dignity”, or “liberty”, he that will translate either of these, restrains the sense of the Holy Ghost and determines it to his own fancy. If you may translate “dignity”: may not we as well translate it “liberty”? Yes, surely. For you know it signifies the one as well as the other both in profane and Divine writers. And you can well call to mind ὑπεξούσιος, and τῷ ὑπεξούσιον, whence they are derived, and that the Apostle calls a man’s liberty of his own will, ἐξουσίαν περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου θελήματος (1 Cor. 7:17). Now then if *potestas* in Latin, and “power” in English, be words also indifferent to signify both dignity and liberty, translate so in the name of God, and leave the text of the Scripture indifferent as we do: and for the sense whether of the two it does here rather signify, or whether it does not signify both (as no doubt it does, and the fathers so expound it) let that be examined otherwise. It is a common fault with you and intolerable, by your translation to abridge the sense of the Holy Ghost to one particular understanding, and to defeat the exposition of so many fathers, that expound it in another sense and signification. As is plain in this example also following.

2. The Apostle (1 Cor. 15:10) says thus: “I laboured more abundantly than all they: yet not I but the grace of God with me (ἐν χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἐμοί). Which may have this sense, “not I, but the grace of God which is with me”, as St. Jerome sometime expounds it: or this, “not I, but the grace of God which laboured with me.” And by this latter is most evidently signified, that the grace of God and the Apostle, both laboured together, and not only grace, as though the Apostle had done nothing, like unto a block, forced only: but that the grace of God did so concur as the principal agent with all his labours, that his free will wrought withal. Against which truth and most approved interpretation of this place, you translate according to the former sense only, making it the very text, and so excluding all other senses and commentaries, as your Masters Calvin and Beza taught you, who should not have taught you if you were wise, to do that which neither they nor you can justify. They reprehend first the Vulgar Latin interpreter for neglecting the Greek article, and secondly them that by occasion thereof, would by this place prove free will; by which their commentary they do plainly declare their intent and purpose in their translation, to be directly against free will.

3. But concerning the Greek article omitted in translation (ἐν χάριτι ἐν ἐμοί), if they were but Grammarians in both tongues, they might know that the Greek article many times cannot be expressed in Latin, and that this is one felicity and prerogative of the Greek phrase above the Latin, to speak more briefly, commodiously, and significantly, by the article. What need we go to Terence and Homer, as they are wont? Is not the Scripture full of such speeches? *Iacobus Zebedaei, Iacobus Alphaei, Iudas Iacobi, Maria Cleophae*, and the like. Are not all these sincerely translated into Latin, though the Greek article be not expressed? Can you express the article, but you must add more than the article, and so add to the text, as you do very boldly in such speeches throughout the New Testament, yea you do it when there is no article in the Greek: as Jo. 5:36, and 1 ep. Jo. 2:2. Yea sometime of a heretical purpose: as Eph. 3 in the 1562 Bible: “By whom we have boldness and entrance with the confidence which is by the faith of him,” or “in him”, as it is in your other 1580 bible. You say, “confidence which is by faith”, as

though there were no confidence by works: you know the Greek (ἐν πεποιθήσει, διὰ τῆς πίστεως) bears not that translation, unless there were an article after “confidence”, which is not, but you add it to the text heretically. As also Beza does the like (in Ro. 8:2) and your Geneva English Testaments after him, for the heresy of imputative justice: as in his Annotations he plainly deduces, saying confidently, “I doubt not but a Greek article must be understood: τὸ πνεύματος (τοῦ) πίστις(α),” and therefore (forsooth) put into the text also. He does the same in Jas. 2:20: still debating the case in his Annotations why he does so, and when he has concluded in his fancy, that this or that is the sense, he puts it so in the text, and translates it accordingly. No marvel now, if they reprehend the Vulgar Latin interpreter for not translating the Greek article in the place which we began to treat of, when they find articles lacking in the Greek text itself, and boldly add them for their purpose in their translation. Whereas the Vulgar Latin interpretation is in all these places so sincere, that it neither adds nor diminishes, nor goes one iota from the Greek.

4. But you will say in the place to the Corinthians (*non ego, sed gratia Dei mecum*), there is a Greek article, and therefore there you do well to express it. I answer, first, the article may then be expressed in translation, when there can be but one sense of the same: secondly, that not only it may, but it must be expressed, when we cannot otherwise give the sense of the place. As Mat. 1:6: καὶ τῆς τοῦ Ουρίου, *ex ea quae fuit Uriae*, where you see the vulgar interpreter omits it not, but knows the force and signification thereof very well. Marry, in the place of St. Paul which we now speak of, where the sense is doubtful, and the Latin expresses the Greek sufficiently otherwise, he leaves it also doubtful and indifferent, not abridging it as you do, saying, for χάρις ἐστὶν μοι, “the grace of God which is with me”: nor as Calvin, *gratia quae mihi aderat*: nor as Illyricus, *gratia quae mihi adest*, which two latter are more absurd than yours, because they omit and neglect altogether the force of the preposition *cum* (ἐστὶν μοι), which you express saying “with me”. But because you say, “which is with me”: you mean heretically as they do, to take away the Apostles’ cooperation and labouring together with the grace of God, by his freewill: which is by the article and the preposition most evidently signified.

5. And here I appeal to all that have skill in Greek speeches and phrases, whether the Apostles’ words in Greek (κοπίασα: οὐκ ἔγω δὲ, ἀλλ’ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶν μοι [συγκοπίασα, συνεργουμένη etc.] τῷ πρεμὰ τῷ ἐν ἐμῷ.) sound not thus: “I laboured more abundantly than all they: yet not I, but the grace of God (that laboured) with me,” understanding not the participle of *sum*, but of the verb going before. As in the like case when our Saviour says, “It is not you that speak, but the Holy Ghost that speaketh in you.” If he had spoken short thus, “but the Holy Ghost in you”, you perhaps would translate as you do here, “the Holy Ghost *which is in you*,” but you see the verb going before is rather repeated, “Not you speak, but the Holy Ghost *that speaketh in you*.” Even so, “Not I laboured, but the grace of God labouring with me,” or, “*which laboured with me*.” So prays the wise man Sap. 9:10. “Send wisdom out of thy holy heavens, that she may be with me, *and labour with me (et mecum laboret)*,” as yourselves translate in the 1577 Bible.

6. And so the Apostle calls himself and his fellow preachers, “God’s coadjutors”, collabourers, or such as labour and work with God,<sup>1</sup> which also you falsely translate, “God’s labourers”, to take away all cooperation, and in some of your Bibles most foolishly and peevishly, as though you had sworn not to translate the Greek, “We together are God’s labourers,” as well might you translate, that “we together be Christ’s heirs (συγκληρονόμοι

<sup>1</sup> Θεοῦ συνεργοί, St. Augustine; *Cooperarii*, & 2 Cor. 6:1, συνεργοὶντες δὲ.

Χριστοῦ) (Ro. 8:17): for that, which the Apostle says “co-heirs”, or “joint heirs with him”: the phrase and speech (as you know) in Greek being all one. So does Beza most falsely translate, *Una vivificavit nos per Christum* (Eph. 2:5), for that which is plain in the Greek, “He hath quickened us together with Christ”, where the English Bezites leave also the Greek, and follow our Vulgar Latin translation rather than Beza, who goes so wide from the Greek, that for shame they dare not follow him. Fie upon such hypocrisy and pretended honour of God, that you will not speak in the same terms that the Holy Scripture speaks, but rather will teach the Holy Ghost how to speak, in not translating as he speaks. As though these phrases of Scripture, men are God’s coadjutors, coworkers with his grace, raised with Christ, coheirs with him, compartakers of glory with him, were all spoken to the dishonour of God and Christ, and as though these being the speeches of the Holy Ghost himself, needed your reformation in the English translations. Otherwise if you mean well, and would say as we say, that whatsoever good we do, we do it by God’s grace, and yet work the same by our free will together with God’s grace as the mover and helper and director of our will: why do you not translate in the foresaid place of St. Paul accordingly?

7. You say moreover in some of your Bibles (1562) thus: “So lieth it not then in a man’s will or running, but in the mercy of God (ὁ θεὸς θέλοντος, τρέχοντος, ἢ ἄλλοῦ λεόντος).” Whatsoever you mean, you know this translation is very dissolute and wide from the Apostle’s words, and not true in sense. For salvation is in willing and running: according to that famous saying of St. Augustine,<sup>2</sup> “He that made thee without thee, will not justify thee without thee”: that is, against thy will, or, unless thou be willing. And the Apostle says, “No man is crowned, unless he fight lawfully” (2 Tim. 2). And again, “So run *that you may obtain*” (1 Cor. 9). And again, “The doers of the Law shall be justified” (Rom. 2). And our Saviour, “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments” (Mat. 19). We see then that it is in willing, and running, and doing: but to will, or run, or do, are not of man, but of God’s mercy. And so the Apostle speaks, “It is not of the willer, nor runner, but of God that hath mercy.” And it is much to be marveled, why you said not, “It lieth not in the willer, nor in the runner”: which is near to the Apostle’s words, but so far off, “in a man’s will and running”.

8. Again, touching continency and the chaste single life, you translate thus: “All men cannot receive this saying” (Mat. 19:11; ὁ πάντες χωροῦσι). Now you wot well, that our Saviour says not, “All men cannot”, but “all men *do not*” receive it: and that therefore (as St. Augustine says<sup>3</sup>), because all will not. But when our Saviour afterward says, “He that *can* receive it, let him receive it”: he adds another Greek word (ὁ δυνάμενος χωρεῖν, χωρεῖτω) to express that sense. Whereas by your fond translation he might have said, ὁ χωρεῖν, χωρεῖτω, and again by your translation, you should translate these his latter words thus: “He that can or is able to receive it, let him be able to receive it.” For so you translate χωρεῖν before, as though it were all one with δυνάθαι χωρεῖν. Do you not see your folly, and falsehood, and boldness, to make the reader believe that our Saviour should say, Every man cannot live chaste, it is impossible for them, and therefore no man should vow chastity, because he knows not whether he can live so or no?

9. Again in some of your Bibles (1579) where God says plainly, that Cain should receive according as he did well or evil, because sin was subject to him, and he had the rule and dominion thereof (Gen. 4:7), evidently declaring his free will: you translate it thus, “If thou dost well, shalt thou not be accepted? And if thou dost not well, sin lieth at the door: and also unto thee *his* desire shall be subject, and thou shalt rule over *him*.” By which relatives falsely put in

<sup>2</sup> Aug. Serm. 15 de verb. Apostoli.

<sup>3</sup> De grat. & lib. arb. c.4

the masculine gender, you, exclude the true antecedent “sin”, and refer them to Abel Cain’s brother, as though God had said, not that *sin* should be in his dominion or subject to him, but his *brother Abel*. But that this is most false and absurd, we prove many ways. First, St. Augustine says directly the contrary:<sup>4</sup> *Tu dominaberis illius: nunquid Fratris? absit. cuius igitur nisi peccati*. “Thou shalt rule,” says he, “over what? Over thy brother? Not so. Over what then but sin?” St. Jerome also explicates this place thus:<sup>5</sup> “Because thou hast free will, I warn thee that sin have not dominion over thee, but thou over sin.” Moreover, the text itself, if nothing else, is sufficient to convince this absurdity. For where this word “sin”, goes immediately before in the same sentence, and not one word of Abel his brother in that speech of God to Cain, how is it possible, or what coherence can there be in saying as you translate, “Sin lieth at the door, and thou shalt have dominion over *him*,” that is, “thy brother”. But if we say thus, “Sin lieth at the door, and thou shalt have dominion *thereof* (over *it*)”: it has this direct and plain sense, if thou dost ill, sin lies at the door ready to condemn thee, because it is in thee to overrule it.

10. Now, if against the coherence of the text, and exposition of the holy Doctors and of the whole Church of God, you pretend the Hebrew grammar forsooth, as not bearing such construction: not to trouble the common reader that cannot judge of these things, and yet fully to satisfy every man even of common understanding, we request here the Adversaries themselves to tell us truly according to their knowledge and skill, whether the Hebrew construction or point of grammar be not all one in these words, “sin *lieth* at the door” (הַטָּעַת רָבִץ), and in these, “the desire *thereof* shall be subject to thee, and thou shalt over *it*.” (אֵלֶיךָ תִּשְׁיָקֶתוּ (תִּמְשָׁל-בוֹ) If they say (as they must needs) that the Hebrew construction or syntax is all one, then will it follow that the Hebrew bears the one as well as the other: and therefore when the selfsame translation of theirs makes no scruple of grammar in the former, but translate as we do, “sin lieth at the door”: a blind man may see that in the latter words also, the Hebrew is but a foolish pretence, and that the true cause of translating them otherwise, proceeds of a heretical humor, to obscure and deface this so plain and evident Scripture for man’s free will.

11. And as for the Hebrew grammar in this point, were it not for troubling the reader, we could tell them that the word “sin”, in Hebrew is not here of the feminine gender (as they suppose) but of the masculine. So says St. Jerome expressly upon this place,<sup>6</sup> who had as much knowledge in the Hebrew tongue as all these new Doctors. Aben Ezra also the great Rabbi, in his Hebrew commentaries upon this text, says, it is a mere forgery and fiction to refer the masculine relative otherwise then to the word, “sin”: which, though elsewhere it be the feminine gender, yet here it is a masculine, according to that rule of the Grammarians, that the doubtful gender must be discerned by the verb, adjective, pronoun, or participle joined with the same: as the said Hebrew doctor does in the word, “paradise” (Gen. 2) which there by the pronouns he pronounces to be a feminine, though elsewhere a masculine. Lastly, if the word “sin”, were here and always only a feminine, and never a masculine: yet they have little skill in the Hebrew tongue, that think it strange to match masculines and feminines together in very good and grammatical construction. Whereof they may see a whole chapter in Sanctes Pagninus with this title, *Foeminea masculeis juncta*. That is, “Feminines joined with masculines”.

12. Now for the last refuge, if they will say all this needed not, because in other their bibles it is as we would have it: we tell them, they must justify and make good all their translations, because the people read all, and is abused by all, and all come forth with privilege, printed by the Q. printer etc. If they will not, let them confess the faults, and call them in, and tell us

---

<sup>4</sup> Li. 15 c. 7 de Civit. Dei.

<sup>5</sup> Quaest. Heb. in Genes.

<sup>6</sup> q. Hebr. in Genes.

which translation or translations they will stand unto. In the meantime they must be content to hear of all indifferently, as there shall be cause and occasion to touch them.

13. Again, they translate in some of their Bibles (1580) against free will, thus, “Christ, when we were yet *of no strength*, died for the ungodly.” (Ro. 5:6;  $\square\nu\tau\omicron\nu \square\mu\square\nu \square\theta\epsilon\nu\square\nu$ ) The Apostle’s word does not signify that we have no strength, but that we were weak, feeble, infirm. Man was wounded in free will by the sin of Adam (as he that in the Gospel went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, which is a parable of this thing; Luc. 10) he was not slain altogether. But I stand not here, nor in any place to dispute the controversy, that is done elsewhere. This only I say, because they<sup>7</sup> falsely hold that free will was altogether lost by Adam’s sin, therefore they translate accordingly, “When we had no strength”. But the Greek word is well known both in profane authors and Ecclesiastical, and especially in the New Testament itself, throughout, to signify nothing else, but weak, feeble, sick, infirm (*multi inter vos infirmi sunt*, 1 Cor. 11:30; *cum infirmor, tum potens sum*, 2 Cor. 12:10 *et al.*). Look me through the New Testament, wheresoever, infirmity, feebleness, languishing, and the like are spoken of, there is found this Greek word to express it. What Grecian knows not (be he but simply acquainted with phrases and nature or words) what  $\square\theta\epsilon\nu\square\nu$ , and  $\square\theta\epsilon\nu\square\zeta \square\chi\epsilon\nu$ , do signify. When the Apostle says, *Quis infirmatur, et ego non uror?* “Who is weak and infirm, and I am not much grieved?” (2 Cor. 11:20), shall we translate, “who is of *no strength*, etc.” or let them give us an instance, where it is certain that this word must needs signify, “of no strength”. Will they pretend the etymology of the word? ( $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\square \textit{privatium}$ ;  $\square\square\square\omega\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\square\square\square\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon\square\nu$ ,  $\square\square\square\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\alpha$ ) A ridiculous and absurd evasion. We ask them of  $\square\acute{\omega}\mu\eta$ , a word of the very same signification, which being compounded in like manner as the other, what does it signify? Anything other than infirmity and feebleness? Yea, it is so far from signifying, “no strength”, that the greatest Grecians say,<sup>8</sup> it is not spoken properly of him that for weakness keeps his beard, which is  $\nu\omicron\sigma\epsilon\square\nu$ , but of him that is ill disposed and distempered in body ( $\pi\rho\square \tau\omicron\square \kappa\alpha\chi\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron\square\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma \tau\square \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ ). Yet the etymology is all one with that word which these men will have to signify him that has no strength. And if they will needs urge the etymology, we tell them, that  $\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$  and  $\square\acute{\omega}\mu\eta$  signify *robur*; that is, great strength such as in the strongest and stoutest champions. And so the etymology may take place, to signify a man of no great strength, not, of no strength. But Mr. Whitaker<sup>9</sup> puts us in good hope, they will not stand upon etymologies.

14. When they have bereaved and spoiled a man of his free will, and left him without all strength, they go so far in this point, that they say,<sup>10</sup> the regenerate themselves have not free will and ability, no not by and with the grace of God, to keep the commandments. To this purpose they translate thus: “His commandments are not grievous” (Jo. 5:3; *mandata eius gravia non sunt*;  $\alpha\square \square\nu \tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota} \beta\alpha\rho\epsilon\square\alpha\iota \square\upsilon\kappa \square\iota\sigma\square$ ), rather than thus, “His commandments are not heavy”. For in saying, “they are not heavy”, it would follow, they might be kept and observed, but in saying, “they are not grievous”, that may be true, were they never so heavy or impossible, through patience. As when a man cannot do as he would, yet it grieves him not, being patient and wise, because he is content to do as he can, and is able. Therefore do they choose to translate, that the commandments are not grievous, where the Apostle says rather, they are not heavy, much more agreeably to our Saviour’s words, “My burden is light”: and to the words of God by Moses, “This commandment which I command thee this day, is not above thee” (that is, beyond thy reach) “but the word is very near thee, in thy mouth and in thy heart,

<sup>7</sup> Whitakers p. 18.

<sup>8</sup> Lexicon magnum Basileae.

<sup>9</sup> Pag. 209.

<sup>10</sup> Beza in Annot. Ro. 2:27.

that thou mayest do it” (Deu. 30; οὐκ ἄπερογκος ἐστὶ; לֹא נִפְלְאָת מִמֶּךָ): and to the common signification of the Greek word βαρῦς, which is “heavy”. Beza would say somewhat in his commentary, how the commandments are heavy or light, but his conclusion is against free will, and that there can be no perfection in this life, inveighing against them that would prove it out of this place: which is as much to say (but he is ashamed to speak plainly) that we cannot keep the commandments: which the holy Doctors have long since condemned and abhorred as most absurd, that God should command that, under pain of damnation, which is impossible to be done.

15. Thus, having taken away free will to do good, and possibility to keep the commandments, and all merit or value and efficacy of good works, their next conclusion is, that we have no true justice or righteousness in us, but in imputative justice, that is, Christ’s justice imputed to us, be we never so foul and filthy in our souls, so that we believe only, and by faith apprehend Christ’s justice. For this purpose they corrupt the Scriptures in their English bibles, thus.



## CHAPTER XI.

*Heretical translation for IMPUTATIVE JUSTICE, against true inherent justice.*

One place might suffice, instead of many, where Beza does protest, that his adding or alteration of the text, is, especially against “the execrable error of inherent justice”,<sup>1</sup> which (he says) is to be avoided as nothing more. His false translation, thus our English Bezites and Calvinists follow in their Bibles. “Likewise then as by the offense of one,” the fault came “on all men to condemnation: so by the justifying of one,” the benefit abounded, “toward all men to the justification of life.” (Rom. 5) Where there are added to the text of the Apostle, six words: and the same so wilfully and voluntarily, that by the three first, they make the Apostle say, sin came on all men by Adam, and they were made sinners indeed: by the three latter, they make him say, not that justice or righteousness came likewise on all men by Christ, to make them just indeed, but that the benefit of Christ’s justice abounded towards them, as being imputed forsooth unto them. Whereas, if they would needs add to the text (which yet is intolerable, so much, and in so doubtful a case) they should at the least have made the case equal, as the Apostle himself teaches them to do, in the very next sentence, saying thus, “For as by one man’s disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many also be made righteous.” So they translate, rather than, “be made just”. For they are the loathest men in the world to say that we are made just, for fear of justice inherent in us, though the Scripture be never so plain, as here we see the Apostle makes the case like, that we are made just by Christ, as we were made sinners by Adam.

2. And it is a world to see, how Beza shifts from one signification of the word “justified”, or “made just”, to another. Sometime to be justified (*δικαιωθῆναι*, *absolui*, *δικαιοῦνται*, *absolvitur*), is to be pronounced quit from all sin, or declared just before God’s judgement seat: and so he translates it in the text of Act. 13:39. And as though his guilty conscience were afraid of a blow, he says he flees not the term of justifying or justification, because he uses it in other places. He does so indeed, but then his commentary supplies the turn: as Ro. 2:13, “Not the hearers of the Law are *righteous* before God” (so they delight to translate, rather than “*just* before God”) “but the doers of the Law shall be *justified*”. That is (says Beza), “shall be pronounced just” (*justi pronuntiabuntur*). The Apostle must needs say by the coherence and consequence of his words, not the hearers are just, but the doers shall be just or justified. Beza will in no case have it so, but either in text or commentary make the Apostle say as himself imagines.<sup>2</sup> Yet, in another place he protests very solemnly, that to be justified, is not, to be pronounced or accounted just, but rather to be just indeed: and that, he proves out of St. Paul, Ro. 5:19, who makes it (*δικαιοῦνται*, *δικαίον καθίσταθαι*) all one, “to be justified”, and, “to be made just”. And again by this reason, that it should be manifestly repugnant to God’s justice, to account him for just, that is not just, and therefore that man indeed is made just. Thus Beza. Would you not think, he were come to be of our opinion? But he revolts again, and interprets all these goodly words in his old sense, “Not that any quality is inwardly given unto us, of which we are named just: but because the justice of Christ is imputed to us by faith freely. (*Non quasi nobis indatur qualitas*)” By faith then at the least we are truly justified. Not so neither, but “faith” (says he) “is an instrument wherewith we apprehend Christ our justice”.<sup>3</sup> So that we have no more justice in us, than we have glory: for glory also we apprehend by faith.

---

<sup>1</sup> Annot. in Rom. 5:18.

<sup>2</sup> Annot. Ro. 3:20.

<sup>3</sup> Annot. in Ro. 4:2.

3. For this purpose both he and the English Bibles translate thus: “Abraham believed God, and it was reputed to him *for justice* (*pro justitia*, □ις δικαιοσύνην; Rom. 4:3,9), where he interprets, “for justice”, to be nothing else but, “in the stead and place of justice”: so also taking away true inherent justice even from Abraham himself. But to admit their translation (which notwithstanding in their sense is most false) must it needs signify, not true inherent justice, because the Scripture says, it was reputed for justice? Do such speeches import, that it is not so indeed, but is only reputed so? Then if we say, This shall be reputed to thee for sin: for a great benefit, and so forth: it should signify, it is no sin indeed, nor great benefit. But let them call to mind, that the Scripture uses to speak of sin and of justice alike. “It shall be sin in thee”, or “unto thee”, as they translate in the 1577 Bible (*reputabitur tibi in peccatum*, אַחַד בְּךָ הַיְהוָה, □σται □ν σι □μαρτία): or as St. Jerome translates, “It shall be reputed to thee for sin” (Deut 23, 24): and (as themselves translate) “it shall be righteousness unto thee, before the Lord thy God.” And again Deut 6: “This shall be our righteousness before the Lord our God, if we keep all the commandments, as he hath commanded us.” (נְלֵךְ הַיְהוָה הַקְּדוֹשׁ) If then justice only be reputed, sin also is only reputed: if sin be in us indeed, justice is in us indeed.

4. Again the Greek fathers make it plain,<sup>4</sup> “that to be reputed unto justice”, is to be true justice indeed, interpreting St. Pauls words in Greek (δικαιοσύνην □□ρε; το□το γ□ρ □στι τ□, □λογίθη □υτ□ □ις δικαιοσύνην; τουπέστιν, □τι □δικαιώθη) thus: “Abraham obtained justice, Abraham was justified.” For that is, say they, “It was reputed him to justice.” Does not St. James say the like (2:23), testifying, that in that Abraham was justified by faith and works, the Scripture was fulfilled, that says, “It was reputed him to justice” (Gen. 15:6)? In which words of Genesis, where these words were first written by Moses, in the Hebrew there is not, “for justice”, or “instead of justice” (which Beza pleads upon, by the Hebrew phrase הַקְּדוֹשׁ לִי הַיְהוָה) but thus, “He (God) reputed it unto him, justice.” Though here also the English Bibles add “for”, which, precisely translating the Hebrew they should not do, especially when they mean it was so counted or reputed for justice, that it was not justice indeed.

5. But as for either the Hebrew or Greek word, that is here used, to “repute” or “account”, they are then used, when it must needs signify, that the thing is so indeed, and not only so reputed. As, Psalm 118 octonario *Samec*. “I have reputed or accounted all the sinners of the earth, prevaricators” or “transgressors”. *Praevaricantes reputavi* (□λογισάμην). So did the Septuagint take the Hebrew word אֲחַד־בְּךָ and read it. And St. Paul, “So let a man repute” or “account us as the Ministers of Christ.” (1 Cor. 4; □μ□ς λογιζέθω) Let them go now and say, that neither they, were sinners indeed, nor these, Christ’s ministers indeed, because they were reputed for such. Let them say the children of the promise were not the seed of Abraham, because the Apostle says, “they are reputed for the seed.” (Ro. 9:8; λογίζεται □ις σπέρμα.) But howsoever it be, the Protestants will have it so to be taken, at the least in the matter of justification.

6. Again, where St. Paul says, “That we might be made the justice of God in him” (2 Cor. 5): they in their first translations, intolerably corrupt it thus (1562 Bible). “That we by his means should be that righteousness, which *before God is allowed.*” (δικαιοσύνη θεο□ □ν □υτ□) Who taught them to translate so dissolutely, *Iustitia Dei*, “the righteousness which before God is allowed”? Did not their error and heresy, which is, that God reputes and accounts us for just, though we be indeed most foul sinners, and that our justice being none at all in us, yet is allowed and accepted before him for justice and righteousness?

---

<sup>4</sup> Oecum. in caten. Photius.

7. Again to this purpose: they make St. Paul say that God “hath made us accepted”, or “freely accepted” (1 Eph. v. 6) in his beloved son as they make the Angel in St. Luke say to Our Lady, “Hail freely beloved” (□χαρίτωσε): to take away all grace inherent and resident in the Blessed Virgin, or in us: whereas the Apostle’s word signifies, that we are truly made gracious or grateful and acceptable, that is to say, that our soul is inwardly endowed and beautified with grace and the virtues proceeding thereof, and consequently is holy indeed before the sight of God, and not only so accepted or reputed, as they imagine. If they know not the true signification of the Greek word, and if their heresy will suffer them to learn it, let them hear St. Chrysostom not only a famous Greek Doctor, but an excellent interpreter of all St. Paul’s epistles: who in this place puts such force and significance in the Greek word, that he says thus by an allusion and distinction of words: “He said not, *which he freely gave us* (χαρίσαθαι), but, *wherein he made us grateful* (χαρίτ□σαι), that is, not only delivered us from sins, but also made us beloved and amiable, made our soul beautiful, grateful, such as the Angels and Archangels are desirous to see, and such as himself is in love withal, according to that in the Psalm, *the king shall desire, or, be in love with thy beauty.*” So St. Chrysostom and after him Theophylacte, who with many more words and similitudes explicate this Greek word and this making of the soul gracious and beautiful inwardly, truly, and inherently.

8. And I would gladly know of the Adversaries, if the like Greek words be not of that form and nature, to signify so much as, “to make worthy” (□ξι□σαι), “to make meet” (□καν□σαι): and whether he whom God makes worthy, or meet, or grateful, just, and holy, be not so in very deed, but by acceptation only. If not in deed (χαρίτ□σαι), then God makes him no better than he was before, but only accepts him for better: if he be so indeed, then the Apostle’s word signifies not, to make accepted, but to make such a one as being by God’s grace sanctified and justified, is worthy to be accepted, for such purity, virtue, and justice as is in him.

9. Again, for this purpose (□σθύτης □υρέθη □ν □μοι; יְִ תְִתִּי-שְִׁיִּי; Dan. 6:22) they will not translate according to Chaldean, Greek, and Latin, “Justice was found in me,” but they alter it thus, “My justice was found out”, and another of them, “My unguiltiness was found out” to draw it from inherent justice, which was in Daniel.

10. Again, it must needs be a spot of the same infection, that they translate thus, “As David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness.” (λέγει τ□ν μακαρισμ□ν τ□ν □νθρώπου; Ro. 4:6) as though imputed righteousness were the “description” of blessedness. They know the Greek does not signify “to describe”. I would once see them precise in following the Greek and the Hebrew. If not, we must look to their fingers.

## CHAPTER XII.

*Heretical translation for SPECIAL FAITH, vain security, and FAITH ALONE (ONLY FAITH).*

All other means of salvation being thus taken away, their only and extreme refuge is, faith alone, and the same, not the Christian faith of the articles of the Creed and such like, but a special faith and confidence, whereby every man must assuredly believe, that himself is the son of God, and one of the elect and predestinate to salvation. If he be not by faith as sure of this as of Christ's Incarnation, he shall never be saved.

2. For this heresy, they force the Greek to express the very word of assurance and certainty, thus: "Let us draw nigh with a true heart, *in assurance of faith.*" (ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως; Heb. 10:22), and Beza,<sup>1</sup> *certa persuasione fidei*, that is, "with a certain and assured persuasion of faith": interpreting himself more at large in another place, that he means thereby such a persuasion and so effectual, as by which we know assuredly without all doubt, that nothing can separate us from God. Which their heretical meaning makes their translation the less tolerable, because they neither express the Greek precisely, nor intend the true sense of the Apostle. They express not the Greek, which signifies properly the fullness and complement of anything, and therefore the Apostle joins it sometime with faith, elsewhere (*plêrophorían tês elpîdos*; Hebr. 6:11) with hope, with knowledge, or (πληροφορίας τῶς συνέσεως; Col. 2:2) understanding, to signify the fullness of all three, as the Vulgar Latin interpreter most sincerely (πληροφορηθεῖς, *plenissime sciens*; Ro. 4:21) always translates it: and to Timothy, (πληροφόρησον; 2 Tim. 4) he uses it to signify the full accomplishment and execution of his ministry in every point. Where a man may wonder that Beza to maintain his conceived signification of this word, translates here also accordingly, thus: *Ministerii tui plenam fidem facito*: but their more current church English Bibles (1577, 1562) are content to say with the Vulgar Latin interpreter, "fulfil thy ministry": or, "fulfil thine office to the utmost". And the Greek fathers do find no other interpretation.<sup>2</sup> Thus, when the Greek signifies fullness of faith, rather than assurance or certain persuasion, they translate not the Greek precisely.<sup>3</sup> Again, in the sense they err much more, applying the foresaid words to the certainty and assured faith that every man ought to have (as they say) of his own salvation. Whereas the Greek fathers<sup>4</sup> expound it of the full and assured faith that every faithful man must have of all such things in heaven as he sees not, namely that Christ is ascended thither, etc. adding further and proving out of the Apostle's words next following, that the Protestant

[2 pages, 190-191, skipped]

Bible, which is all one) "in the confidence by faith of him." (ἐν πεποιθήσει, διὰ τῶς πίστεως ὑπο.) The learned and skilful among you in the Greek tongue, know that this translation is false for two reasons. The one is, because the Greek in that case should be thus, ἐν τῷ πεποιθήσει τῷ διὰ τῶς πίστεως ὑπο; another reason is, the point after πεποιθήσει. So that the very simple and sincere translation is this, "we have affiance and access with confidence, by the faith of him", even as elsewhere it is said, we have confidence (2 Jo. 3) if our heart reprehend us not: we have confidence by keeping the commandments, by tribulations and afflictions and all good works, hope also gives us great confidence (Hebr. 10; 2 Cor. 3) Against all which, your translation is prejudicial, limiting and defining our confidence toward God, to be faith, as though we had no confidence by works, or otherwise.

<sup>1</sup> Annot. in 1 Luc. v. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Ignat. Ep. Smyrn.

<sup>3</sup> Εκκλησία θεοῦ πάντως πεπληροφορημένον ἐν πίστει καὶ γαπ ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως.

<sup>4</sup> Chrys. Theodoret. Theophyl. upon Ro. 10.

6. For this confidence by faith only, Beza translates so wilfully and perversely, that either you were ashamed to follow him, or you lacked a commodious English word correspondent to his Latin. “If I have all faith”, says the Apostle, “and have not charity, I am nothing.” (πισαν πιστιν) “*Totam fidem*,” says Beza, “I had rather translate, than, *omnem fidem*, because the Apostle means not all kind of faith,” to wit, “the faith that justifies”:<sup>5</sup> but he means that if a man have the faith of Christ’s omnipotence, or of any other article of the Creed, or of all wholly and entirely and perfectly, that is nothing without charity. This is Beza’s *tota fides*, “whole faith”, thinking by this translation to exempt from the Apostle’s words their special justifying faith, and wrestling to that purpose in his annotations against Pighius and other Catholic Doctors. Whereas every man of small skill may see, that the Apostle names all faith,<sup>6</sup> as he does all knowledge and all mysteries: comprehending all sorts of the one and of the other: all kind of knowledge, all kind of mysteries, all faith whatsoever, Christian, Catholic, historical, or special, which two latter, are Heretical terms newly devised.

7. And I would have any of the Bezites give me a sufficient reason, why he translated, *totam fidem*, and not also, *totam scientiam*. Undoubtedly there is no cause, but the heresy of special and only faith alone. And again, why he translates Ja. 2:22. “Thou seest, that faith was (*ministra*) a helper of his works”: and expounds it thus, “faith was an efficient cause and fruitful of good works”. Whereas the Apostle’s words be plain, that “faith wrought together with” his works, yea and that his faith was by works made perfect (συνήργει; τελειώθη). This is impudent handling of Scripture, to make works the fruit only and effect of faith, which is your heresy.

8. Which heresy also must needs be the cause, that, to suppress the excellence of charity (which the Apostle gives it above faith or any other gift whatsoever, in these words, “And yet I show you a more excellent way” (1 Cor. 12:31) he in one edition of the New Testament (1556) translates thus, “Behold moreover also I show you a way most diligently” (κατι καθ’ υπερβολαν δεικνυμι). What cold stuff is this, and how impertinent? In another edition (1565) he mended it thus: “And besides I show you a way to excellence”. In neither of both expressing the comparison of pre-eminence and excellence that charity has in the Apostle’s words, and in all the chapter following. Wherein you did well (for your credit) not to follow him (no not your Bezites themselves) but to translate after our Vulgar Latin interpreter, as it has always been read and understood in the Church.

9. Luther was so impudent in this case, that, because the Apostle spoke not plainly enough for only faith alone, he thrust (only) into the text of his translation,<sup>7</sup> as himself witnesses. You durst not hitherto presume to far in this question of faith alone though<sup>8</sup> in other controversies you have done the like, as is shown in their places. But I will ask you a smaller matter, which in words and show you may perhaps easily answer, but in your conscience there will remain a gnawing worm. In so many places of the Gospel,<sup>9</sup> where our Saviour requires the people’s faith, when he healed them of corporal diseases only, why do you so gladly translate thus, “Thy faith hath saved thee”: rather than thus, “thy faith hath healed thee”, or “made thee whole”? Is it not, by joining these words together, to make it sound in English ears, that faith saves or justifies a man? Insomuch that Beza notes in the margin thus, *fides salvat*: that is, “faith saves”. And your Geneva Bibles, in that place where it cannot be taken for faith that justifies, because it is not the parties’ faith, but her fathers that Christ required, there also translate thus, “Believe only, and she shall be saved.” (Luc. 8:50) Which translation, though very false and impertinent for

<sup>5</sup> 1 Cor. 13; Annot in No. Test. 1556.

<sup>6</sup> πισαν ταν γνσιν. παντα μυστηρια. πισαν ταν πιστιν.

<sup>7</sup> Luther. to 2. fol. 40s. edi. Wittemb. an. 1551.

<sup>8</sup> Act. 9:22, Bib. 1577; 1 Pet 1:25, 2 Par. 36:8, 2 Cor. 5:21, 1 Pet. 2:13, in the Bib. 1562.

<sup>9</sup> Mar. 10:52; Luc. 18:42 & 8:48.

justifying faith, as you seem to acknowledge by translating it otherwise in your other Bibles: yet indeed you must needs maintain and hold it for good, whiles you allege this place for faith alone, as is evident in your writings.<sup>10</sup>

10. This then you see is a fallacy, when faith alone is required to the health of the body, as in many such places (though not in all) there by translation to make it sound a justifying faith, as though faith alone were required to the health of the soul. Whereas that faith was of Christ's omnipotence only and power, which Beza confesses<sup>11</sup> may be in the devils themselves, and is far from the faith that justifies. If you say, the Greek signifies as you translate: it does so indeed, but it signifies also very commonly to be healed corporally, as (by your own 1577 translation) in these places: Marc. 5:28, Marc. 6:36, Luc. 8:36, 8:51. Where you translate, "I shall be whole." "They were healed." "He was healed." "She shall be made whole." And why do you here translate so? Because you know, "to be saved", imports rather another thing, to wit, salvation of the soul: and therefore when faith is joined withal, you translate rather, "saved", than "healed" (though the place be meant of bodily health only) to insinuate by all means your justification by faith alone.

---

<sup>10</sup> See Gough's sermon and Tomson's answer to the L. Abbot of Westminster.

<sup>11</sup> Annot. in 1 Cor. 13:2.

## CHAPTER XIII.

### *Heretical translation against PENANCE and SATISFACTION.*

Upon the heresy of faith alone justifying and saving a man, follows the denial of all penance and satisfaction for sins. Which Beza so abhors<sup>1</sup> that he makes protestation, that he avoids these terms, *pœnitentia* (μετάνοια), and *pœnitentiam agere* (μετανοεῖτε) on purpose: and that he will always use for them in translating the Greek words *resipiscentia*, and *resipiscere*. Which he does observe perhaps, but that sometimes he is worse than his promise,<sup>2</sup> translating most falsely and heretically for *resipiscentia*, *resipiscentes* (Mat. 3:8, Luc. 3:8): so that your English Bezites themselves are ashamed to translate after him. Who otherwise follow his rule for the most part, translating *resipiscentia*, “amendment of life”: and *resipiscite*, “amend your lives”. And the other English bibles when they translate best, say, “repentance”, and “repent”: but nont of them all once have the words, “penance”, and “do penance”. Which in most places is the very true translation, according to the very circumstance of the text, and use of the Greek word (μετανοεῖν) in the Greek Church, and the ancient Latin translation (*agere pœnitentiam*) thereof and all the fathers’ reading thereof, and their expositions of the same. Which four points I think not amiss, briefly to prove, that the reader may see the use and signification of these words, which they on purpose will not express, to avoid the terms of “penance” and “doing penance”.

2. First, that the circumstance of the text does give *metanoein* so to signify “to do penance”, we read in Matt. 11:21: “If in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the miracles that have been wrought in you, they had done penance (μετανόησαν ἄν; *pœnitentiam egissent*) in haircloth or sackcloth and ashes long ago.” And in Luc. 10:13: “They had done penance, sitting in sackcloth and ashes.” I beseech you, these circumstances of sackcloth and ashes adjoined, do they signify penance and affliction of the body, or only amendment of life, as you would have the word to signify? St. Basil says, “in Ps. 29, sackcloth makes for penance (ἄν; μετάνοιαν). For the fathers in old time sitting in sackcloth and ashes, did penance (μετενόησαν).” Unless you will translate St. Basil also after your fashion, whom you cannot any way translate, but the sense must needs be, “penance”, and “doing penance”. Again St. Paul says, “You were made sorry to penance” or “to repentance” (2 Cor. 7:9), say which you will: and “The sorrow which is according to God, worketh penance,” or, “repentance unto salvation.” Is not sorrow and bitter mourning and affliction, parts of penance? Did the incestuous man whom St. Paul excommunicated (1 Cor. 5), and afterward absolved him because of his exceeding sorrow and tears (2 Cor. 2), for fear lest he might be overwhelmed with sorrow, did he I say change his mind only or amend his life, as you translate the Greek word, and interpret repentance? Did he not penance also for his fault, enjoined of the Apostle (Mat. 3)? When St. John the Baptist says (Luc. 3), and St. Paul exhorts the like, “Do fruits worthy of penance” (Act. 26), or as you translate, “meet for repentance”: Do they not plainly signify penitential works, or the works of penance? Which is the very cause why Beza rather translated in those places, “Do the fruits meet for them that amend their lives” (*fructus dignos eis qui resipuerint; κάρπους ἄξιους τῆς μετανοίας.*) Or, give us some other good cause o ye Bezites, why your master does so foully falsify his translation.

3. Secondly, for the signification of this Greek word in all the Greek Church, and Greek fathers, even from St. Denys the Areopagite St. Paul’s scholar, who must needs deduce it from the Scriptures, and learn it of the Apostles: it is most evident, that they use this word for that penance which was done in the primitive Church according to the penitential canons, whereof

---

<sup>1</sup> Annot. in Mat. 3:2

<sup>2</sup> Act. 26:20 in No. Test an. 1556 and in his later translation 1565.

all antiquity of Councils and fathers is full.<sup>3</sup> Insomuch that St. Denys reckoning up the three sorts of persons that were excluded from seeing and participating of the divine mysteries of Christ's body and blood, to wit, Catechumens, Pœnitents (*Paenitentes*; ἱ μετανοοῦντες; ἱ ἰν μετανοίῳ ἰντες), and the possessed of ill spirits: for, Pœnitents, he says in the Greek, ἱ ἰν μετανοίῳ ἰντες. That is, such as were in their course of penance, or had not yet done their full penance. Which penance St. Augustine declares thus:<sup>4</sup> *Est pœnitentia gravior, etc.* "There is a more grievous and more mournful penance, whereby properly they are called in the Church, that are Pœnitents: removed also from partaking the sacrament of the altar." And the Greek Ecclesiastical history thus:<sup>5</sup> "In the Church of Rome there is a manifest and known place for the *pœnitents* (τῶν μετανοοῦντων).<sup>6</sup> And in it they stand sorrowful, and as it were mourning, and when the sacrifice is ended, being not made partakers thereof, with weeping and lamentations they cast themselves flat on the ground. Then the Bishop weeping also with compassion lifts them up, and after a certain time enjoined, absolves them from their *penance*. This, the Priests," or, "Bishops of Rome keep from the very beginning even until our time."

4. In these words and other in the same chapter,<sup>7</sup> and in Socrates' Greek history likewise when they speak of "Pœnitents", that confessed and lamented their sins, that were enjoined penance for the same, and did it: I would demand of our English Grecians, in what Greek words they express all this. Do they it not in the words which we now speak of, and which htherefore are proven most evidently to signify penance and doing penance? Again, when the most ancient Council of Laodicea can. 2, says, "That the time of penance should be given to offenders according to the proportion of their fault":<sup>8</sup> and again, can. 9: "That such shall not communicate till a certain time, but after they have done penance and confessed their fault, then to be received": and again can. 19: "After the Catechumens are gone out, that prayer be made of the Penitents, or them that are in doing penance": And when the first Council of Nice says, can. 12 about shortening or prolonging the days of penance (τῶν ἰν μετανοία),<sup>9</sup> "that they must well examine their purpose and manner of doing penance". That is, with what alacrity of mind, tears, patience, humility, good works, they accomplished the same, and accordingly to deal more mercifully with them, as is there expressed in the council: when St. Basil speaks<sup>10</sup> after the same sort: when St. Chrysostom calls the sackcloth and fasting of the Ninevites for certain days, *tot dierum pœnitentiam*, "so many days penance": in all these places, I would gladly know of our English Grecians, whether these speeches of penance and doing penance, are not expressed by the said Greek words, which they will in no case so to signify.

5. Or, I would also ask them, whether in these places they will translate, "repentance", and "amendment of life", where there is mentioned a prescript time of satisfaction for their fault by such and such penal means: whether there by any prescript times of repentance or amendment of life, to continue so long, and no longer: if not, then must it needs be translated, "penance", and, "doing penance", which is longer or shorter according to the fault and the manner of doing the same. I may repent in a moment, and amend my life at one instant, and this repentance and amendment ought to continue for ever. But the holy Councils and fathers speak of a thing to be done for certain years or days, and to be released at the Bishop's discretion: this therefore is

<sup>3</sup> Ec. Hier. c. 3. in principio.

<sup>4</sup> Ho. 27 inter 50 ho. and ep. 108.

<sup>5</sup> Sozom. li. 7. c. 16.

<sup>6</sup> See St. Jer. in epitaph. Fabiolae.

<sup>7</sup> Li. 5. c. 19.

<sup>8</sup> κατ' τῶν ἰναλογίαν τοῦ πταίσματος, καιροῦ μετανοίας δοθέντος.

<sup>9</sup> τῶν προαίρεσιν κατ' εἰδος τῶν μετανοίας.

<sup>10</sup> Can. 1. ad Amphiloeh.



penance, and not repentance only or amendment of life, and is expressed by the foresaid Greek words, as also by another equivalent (□ποπίπτειν) thereunto.

6. I omit that this very phrase, “to do penance”, is word for word expressed thus in Greek, ποιε□ν μετάνοιαν.<sup>11</sup> And Ausonias the Χpian. Poet (whom I may as well allege once, and use it not, as they do Virgil, Terrence, and the like very often) uses this Greek word (*metanoea*) so evidently in this sense, that Beza says,<sup>12</sup> he did it for his verse sake, because another word would not stand so well in the verse. But the reader (I trust) sees the use and signification of these Greek words by the testimony of the Greek fathers themselves, most ancient and approved.

7. Thirdly, that the ancient Latin Interpreter does commonly so translate these words (μετανοε□ν, *pœnitentiam agere*) throughout the New Testament, that needs no proof, neither will I stand upon it (though it be greater authority than they have any to the contrary) because the Adversaries know it and dislike it, and for that and other like points it is belike, that one of them says<sup>13</sup> it is the worst translation of all, whereas Beza his Master says<sup>14</sup> it is the best of all. So well they agree in judgement, the Master and the man.

8. I come to the fourth proof, which is, that all the Latin Church and the glorious Doctors thereof have always read as the Vulgar Latin interpreter translates these words, and expound the same of penance, and doing penance. To name one or two for an example, St. Augustine’s place<sup>15</sup> is very notable, which therefore I set down, and may be translated thus: “Men do penance before Baptism, of their former sins, yet so that they be also baptized, Peter saying thus, ‘Do ye penance, and let everyone be baptized. (*agunt hominess pœnitentiam*).’” (Act. 2) Men also do penance, if after Baptism they do so sin, that they deserve to be excommunicated and reconciled again, as in all Churches they do which be called, ‘Pœnitents’. (*sicut agunt qui Pœnitentes appellantur*) For of such penance spoke St. Paul, 2 Cor. 12:21, saying, ‘That I lament not many of them which before have sinned, and have not done penance for their uncleanness.’ We have also in the Acts (8:28), that Simon Magus being baptized, was admonished by Peter ‘to do penance’ for his grievous sin (*ut ageret pœnitentiam*). There is also in manner a daily Penance of the good and humble believers, in which we knock our breasts, saying, ‘Forgive us our debts’ (*quotidianam agere pœnitentiam*). For these [venial and daily offenses] fasts and alms and prayers are watchfully used, and humbling our souls we cease not after a sort to do daily penance.”

9. In these words of St. Augustine it is plain that he speaks of painful or penitential works for satisfaction of sins, that is, penance: again, that there are three kinds of the same, one before Baptism, another after Baptism for great offenses, greater and longer: the other daily for common and little venial faults which the best men also commit in this frail nature. Again, that the two former are signified and spoken of in the three places of Scripture by him alleged. Where we see, that he reads altogether as the vulgar interpreter translates, and expounds all three places of penance for sin, and so approves that signification of the Greek word. Yea in saying that for venial sins we knock our breast, fast, give alms, and pray, and so cease not *Quotidianam agere pœnitentiam*: what does he mean but daily penance and satisfaction? Read also St. Cyprian<sup>16</sup> (beside other places), where his citations of Scripture are according to the old Latin interpreter, and his exposition according, of doing penance, and making satisfaction for

---

<sup>11</sup> Letur. Chrys. in rubricis p. 69, 104.

<sup>12</sup> Annot. in Mat. v.2.

<sup>13</sup> Discou. of Saud. Rocke pag. 147.

<sup>14</sup> Praefat. in No. Test. an. 1556.

<sup>15</sup> Ep. 108.

<sup>16</sup> Epist. 52 no. 6

sins committed. But I need not proceed further in alleging either St. Cyprian or other ancient fathers for this purpose, because the Adversaries grant it. Howbeit in what terms they grant it, and how malapertly the accuse all the ancient fathers at once for the same, it shall not be amiss here to put down their words.

10. Whereas the reverend, godly, and learned Father, Edmund Campion, had objected in his book, the Protestants' accusation of St. Cyprian for the matter of penance: the good man that answers for both universities,<sup>17</sup> says thus to that point: "But whereas Magdeburgers [Lutheran writers from that city] complain that he depraved the doctrine of repentance (*doctrinam poenitentiae*), they do not feign or forge this crime against him, but utter or disclose it. For all men understand that it was too true. Neither was this Cyprian's fault alone, that he wrote of repentance (*de poenitentia*) many things incommodiously and unwisely (*imprudenter*), but all the most holy fathers almost at that time were in the same error. For whiles they desired to restrain men's manners by severe laws, they made the greatest part of repentance (*poenitentiae*) to consist in certain external discipline of life, which themselves prescribed. In that they punished vice severely, they were to be borne withal: but that by this means they thought to pay the pains due for sins, and to satisfy God's justice, and to procure to themselves assured impunity, remission, and justice, therein they derogated not a little from Christ's death, attributed too much to their own inventions, and finally depraved repentance." Thus far the Answerer.

11. Mark how he accuses the fathers in general of no less crime, than taking away from Christ the merits of his Passion, attributing it to their own penance and discipline. Which if they did, I marvel he should call them in this very place where he begins to charge them with such a crime, *sanctissimos patres*, most holy fathers. The truth is, he might as well charge St. Paul with the same, when he says, we shall "be the heirs of God, and coheirs with Christ, yet so, if we suffer with him, that we may also be glorified with him." (Rom. 8) St. Paul says, our suffering also with Christ, is necessary to salvation: Master Whitakers says, it is a derogation to Christ's suffering. Christ fasted for us, therefore our fasting makes nothing to salvation. He prayed for us, was scourged, and died for us: therefore our prayer, scourging, and imprisonment, yea and death itself for his sake, make nothing to life everlasting, and if we should think it does, we derogate from Christ's Passion. Alas, is this the divinity of England nowadays? To make the simple believe that the ancient fathers and holy men of the primitive Church by their severe life and voluntary penance for their sins and for the love of Christ, did therein derogate from Christ's merits and Passions?

12. I may not stand upon this point, neither need I. The principal matter is proven by the Adversary's confession, that the holy Doctors spoke, wrote, and thought of penance and doing penance as we do, in the same terms both Greek and Latin: and with Catholics it is always a good argument, and we desire no better proof, than this. The Protestants grant, all the ancient fathers were of our opinion, and they say it was their error. For, the first part being true, it is madness to dispute, whether all the ancient fathers erred, or rather the new Protestants; as it is more than madness to think that Luther alone might see the truth more than a thousand Augustines, a thousand Cyprians, a thousand Churches. Which notwithstanding the palpable absurdity thereof, yet Mr. Whitakers avouches it very solemnly.<sup>18</sup>

13. And yet again (that the reader may see how they play fast and loose at their pleasure) this is the man that when he has given us all the fathers on our side not only in the matter of penance, but also in invocation of Saints,<sup>19</sup> and in divers other errors, as he calls them: the very

---

<sup>17</sup> Whitak. p. 97. cont. ration. Edm. Camp.

<sup>18</sup> Pag. 101.

<sup>19</sup> Pag. 109.

same man (I say) in the very next leaves almost,<sup>20</sup> renews Mr. Ivel's old brag, that we have not one clear sentence for us of any one father within six hundred years after Christ, and again, that the same faith reigns now in England, which these fathers professed. What faith, Mr. Whitakers? Not their faith concerning penance, or invocation of Saints (as yourself confess) or other such like errors of theirs as you term them. Why are you so forgetful or rather so impudent to speak contraries in so little a room? Such simple answering will not serve your adversary's learned book, which you in vain go about by foolish rhetoric to disgrace, when the world sees you are driven to the wall, and either can say nothing, or do say that, which confutes itself with the evident absurdity thereof.

14. But to leave Mr. Whitakers (who is a simple companion, to sit in judgement upon all the ancient Doctors, and to condemn them of heinous error in the matter of penance) I trust the reader sees by the former discourse, the usual Ecclesiastical signification, and consequently both the true and false translation of the foresaid Greek words (μετάνοια, μετανοεῖν). Not that they must or may always be translated "penance" or "doing penance". For in the Scriptures God is said *poenitentiam agere* (μετανοεῖν), who cannot be said to do penance, no more than he can be said to amend his life, as the Protestants commonly translate this word. Therefore I conclude, that this word being spoken of God in the Scriptures, is no more prejudice against our translation of doing penance, than it is against theirs, of amendment of life. Likewise when it is spoken of the reprobate and damned in hell (Sap. 5; μετανοοῦντες, *poenitentiam agentes*): who as they cannot do penance properly, so much less amend their lives.

15. Moreover, it is purposely against penance, that they translate amiss both in Daniel 10 and Esdras 9, whose voluntary mourning, fasting, afflicting of themselves for their own sins and the peoples', is notoriously set forth in their books. There they make the Angel say thus to Daniel, "From the first day that thou didst set thine heart *to humble* thyself." (Dan. 12, Bib. 1579) What is this humbling himself? Can we gather any penance thereby? None at all. But if they had said according to the Hebrew (תַּחֲנוּן־עַל־הַלֵּב), Greek (κακωθῆναι), and Latin (*ut te affligeres*), "from the first day that thou didst set thine heart *to afflict* thyself," we should easily conceive works of penance, and it would include Daniel's mourning, fasting from flesh, wine, and other meats, abstaining from ointments, the space of the days, mentioned in the beginning of the same chapter.

16. Again, in all their bibles of the years 1562, 1577, 1579, they make Esdras (9:5) after his exceeding great penance, say only this, "About the evening sacrifice I arose up from my *heaviness*," neither translating the Hebrew (תַּחֲנוּן־עַל־הַלֵּב), which is the same word that in Daniel, nor the Greek (ἄπικ τος ταπεινώσεώς μου), which signifies affliction and humiliation.

17. Again, in the prophet Malachi (3:14) they translate thus: "Ye have said, It is but vain to serve God, and what profit is it that we have kept his commandments and walked *humbly* before his face?" What is this same, "humbly"? When we say in English, "he goes humbly": we imagine or conceive no more but this, that he is a humble man and behaves himself humbly. But they know very well, the Prophet speaks of another thing: and if it had pleased them to have translated the Hebrew word (תַּחֲנוּן) fully and significantly in the sense of the Holy Ghost, they might have learned by conference of other places where the same Hebrew word is used, that it signifies such heaviness, sadness, sorrowfulness, and affliction, as men express by black mourning garments, the nature of the word importing blackness, darkness, lowering, and the like. Which is far more than walking humbly, and which is wholly suppressed by so translating. See Psalm 34:14, Ps. 37:7, Ps. 41:10, where the Prophet uses many words and speeches to express sorrowful penance: and for that which in Latin is always *contristatus*, in Greek a word

<sup>20</sup> Pag. 114, 117.

more significant (πενθῶν καὶ σκυθρωπούζων), in Hebrew (תִּיבְרָקָה רַקִּי) that they translate “humbly”. Whereas indeed this word has no signification of humility properly, no not of that humility I mean which is rather to be called humiliation or affliction, as the Greek words (κακῶθῆναι, ταπεινωθῆναι) imply. But it signifies properly the very manner, countenance, gesture, habit of a pensive or forlorn man: and if they will say, that they so translate it in other places, the more is their fault, that knowing the nature of the word, they will notwithstanding suppress the force and signification thereof in any one place, and so translate it, that the reader must needs take it in another sense, and cannot possibly conceive that which the word imports. For, “to walk humbly”, sounds in all English ears, the virtue of humility, which this word does never signify, and not humility or humiliation by affliction, which it may signify, though secondarily and by deduction only.

18. Again, what is it else but against penance and satisfaction, that they deface these usual and known words of Daniel to the king, *Redime eleemosynis peccata tua*, “Redeem thy sins with alms” (Dan. 4:24): altering and translating it thus, “Break of thy sins by righteousness”. First the Greek (ὁν ἰλεεμοσύναις λύτρωσαι; Heb. בְּצִדְקָה פָּרַק) is against them, which is word for word according to the vulgar and common reading: Secondly, the Chaldee word which they translate “break of”, by Munster’s own judgement<sup>21</sup> signifies rather and more principally, “to redeem”. Thirdly, the other word which they translate, “righteousness”, in the Scriptures signifies also, *eleemosynam*, as the Greek interpreters translate it (Deut. 6 & 24) and it is most plain in St. Matthew, where our Saviour says (Mat. 6:1) “Beware you do not your justive before men” (δικαιοσύνην, ἰλεεμοσύνην), which is in other Greek copies, “your alms”. And St. Augustine (in Ps. 49:5) proves it by the very text. For (says he) “as though a man might ask, what justice? He adds, ‘when thou dost an alms deed.’ He signified therefore that alms are the works of justice.” And in Psalm 111 they are made one, “He distributed, he gave to the poor, his justice remains for ever and ever.” Which Beza translates, “his beneficence or liberality remains etc.” Again, St. Jerome a sufficient Doctor to tell the signification of the Hebrew or Chaldee words, both translates it so, and expounds it so in his commentary. Moreover, the words that immediately follow in Daniel, interpret it so unto us,<sup>22</sup> “And thy iniquities with mercies to the poor.” Lastly, Beza himself says, “that by the name of justice with the Hebrews, is also signified beneficence or beneficialness to the poor, yea and that in this place of Daniel it is specially taken for alms.” So that we see there is no impediment neither in the Chaldee nor Greek, why they might not have said, as the Church of God always has said, “Redeem thy sins with alms, and thy iniquities with mercies to the poor.” (2 Cor. 9) But their Heresy will not suffer them to speak after the Catholic manner, that alms and merciful deeds are a redemption, ransom, and satisfaction for sins.

19. And what a miserable humor is it in these cases, to fly as far as they can from the ancient received speech of Holy Scripture, that has so many years sounded in all faithful ears, and to invent new terms and phrases, when the original text both Greek and Hebrew favours the one as much, or more, than the other. As, that they choose to say in the Epistle to Titus (where the Apostle exceedingly exhorts to good works), “maintain good works”, and “show forth good works”, rather than according to the ancient Latin translation, *bonis operibus praeesse* (πρίσταθαι καλῶν ἔργων), “to be chief and principal in doing good works”, which is the very true and usual signification of the Greek word, and implies a virtuous emulation among good men, who shall do most good works or excel in that kind. But they that look to be saved by faith alone, no marvel if neither their doings nor translation tend to any such excellency.

<sup>21</sup> In lexico Chald.

<sup>22</sup> Annot. in Mat. 6:1.

## CHAPTER XIV.

### *Heretical translation against the holy SACRAMENTS, namely BAPTISM and CONFESSION.*

Another sequel of their faith alone is, that the Sacraments also help nothing toward our salvation, and therefore they partly take them clean away, partly deprive them of all grace, virtue, and efficacy, making them poor and beggarly elements, either worse, or no better than those of the Old Law.

2. For this purpose Beza is not content to speak as the Apostle does (Ro. 4:11, σφραγις) that circumcision was a seal of the justice of faith, but because he thinks that, too small a term for the dignity of circumcision, as himself confesses,<sup>1</sup> “he gladly avoids it” (I use his own words) and for the noun puts the verb, so dissolutely and presumptuously, that the English Bezites themselves here also dare not follow him in translation, though in opinion they agree. The cause of his wilful translation he declares in his Annotations upon the same place, to wit, the dignity of circumcision, equal with any Sacrament of the New Testament. His words be these: “What,” says he, “could be spoken more magnificent of any Sacrament? Therefore they that put a real difference between the Sacraments of the Old Testament and ours, never seem to have known how far Christ’s office extends.” Which he says, not to magnify the old, but to disgrace the new.

3. Which is also the cause why not only he, but the English Bibles (for commonly they join hands and agree together) to make no difference between John’s Baptism and Christ’s, translate thus concerning certain that had not yet received the Holy Ghost: “Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, unto John’s Baptism.” (Act. 19:3) Which Beza in a long discourse proves to be spoken of John’s doctrine, and not of his baptism in water. As though it were said, “what doctrine then do ye profess? And they said, John’s.” Whereas indeed the question is this, and ought thus to be translated, “In what then or wherein were you baptized? And they said, in John’s Baptism.” As who should say, we have received John’s Baptism, but not the Holy Ghost as yet. And therefore it follows immediately, “then they were baptized in the name of Jesus,” and after imposition of hands “the Holy Ghost came upon them.” Whereby is plainly gathered, that being baptized with John’s baptism before, and yet of necessity baptized afterward with Christ’s baptism also, there must needs be a great difference between the one baptism and the other, John’s being insufficient. And that this is the deduction which troubles these Bezites, and makes them translate accordingly, Beza (as commonly still he utters his grief) tells us in plain words thus.<sup>2</sup> “It is not necessary, that wheresoever there is mention of John’s Baptism, we should think it to be the very ceremony of Baptism. Therefore they that gather John’s Baptism to have been divers from Christ’s, because these a little after are said to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, have no sure foundation.” Lo, how on purpose he translates and expounds it John’s doctrine, not John’s Baptism, to take away the foundation of this Catholic conclusion, that his baptism differs and is far inferior to Christ’s.

4. Bot does the Greek (ἐν τῷ) lead him or force him to this translation, *In quid?* “Unto what?” First himself confesses in the very same place the contrary, that the Greek phrase is often used in the other sense, “wherein”, or “wherewith”, as it is in the Vulgar Latin and Erasmus: but that in his judgement it does not so signify here, and therefore he refuses it. Yet in the very next verse almost, where it is said by the same Greek phrase (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι), “that they were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ”, there both he and his, so translate it as we do, and not “unto the name of Christ”. Is it not plain, that all is voluntary, and at their pleasure?

---

<sup>1</sup> *Libent refugit. Quot obsignaret, for, sigillum.*

<sup>2</sup> Annot. in Act. 19.

For (I beseech them) if it be a right translation, “baptized in the name of Jesus”: why is it not right, “baptized in the name of John”? Is there any difference in the Greek? None. Where then? In their commentaries and imaginations only, against which we oppose and set both the text and the commentaries of all the fathers.

5. But no marvel if they disgrace the baptism of Christ, when they are bold also to take it away altogether: interpreting this Scripture, “Unless a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God” (Jo. 3:5), which a man would think were plain enough to prove that Baptism in water is necessary: interpreting (I say) this Scripture, “Of water and the Spirit”, thus: of water, that is, the Spirit:<sup>3</sup> making water to be nothing else in this place but the Spirit allegorically, and not material water. As though our Saviour had said to Nicodemus, “Unless a man be born of water, I mean, of the spirit, he cannot enter, etc.” According to this most impudent exposition of plain Scriptures, Calvin translates also as impudently for the same purpose in the epistle to Titus,<sup>4</sup> making the Apostle to say, that God poured the water of regeneration upon us abundantly, that is, the Holy Ghost. And lest we should not understand his meaning herein, he tells us in his commentary upon this place, that when the Apostle says, “Water poured out abundantly,” he speaks not of material water, but of the Holy Ghost. Now indeed the Apostle says not, that water was poured upon us, but the Holy Ghost. Neither does the Apostle make water and the Holy Ghost all one, but most plainly distinguish them, saying, that God “of his mercy has saved us by the laver of regeneration and renovation of the Holy Ghost, whom he hath poured upon us abundantly.”<sup>5</sup> See how plainly the Apostle speaks both of the material water or washing of Baptism, and of the effect thereof which is the Holy Ghost poured upon us. Calvin<sup>6</sup> takes away water clean and will have him speak only of the Holy Ghost, which Flaccus Illyricus the Lutheran himself wonders at, that any man should be so bold, and calls it plain sacrilege against the efficacy of the Sacraments.

6. And if we should here accuse the English translators also, that translate it thus, “by the fountain of the regeneration of the Holy Ghost, *which* be shed on us, etc.” making it indifferent, either “which fountain,” or “which Holy Ghost he shed, etc.”: they would answer by and by that the Greek also is indifferent: but if a man should ask them further, whether the Holy Ghost may be said to be shed, or rather a fountain of water, they must needs confess, not the Holy Ghost, but water: and consequently that they translating, “which he shed”, would have it meant of the fountain of water, and so they agree just with Calvin’s translation, and leave Beza, who in his translation refers it only to the Holy Ghost (*Sp. sancti, quem effudit*), as we do: but in his commentary plays the Heretic as Calvin does.

7. Of the Sacrament of Penance I have spoken before, concerning that part especially which is satisfaction: here I will only add of Confession, that to avoid this term (namely in such a place where the reader might easily gather Sacramental confession) they translate thus, “Acknowledge your faults one to another” (Ja. 5).<sup>7</sup> It is said a little before, If any be diseased, “let him bring in Priests, etc.”, and then it follows, “Confess your faults, etc.”. But they to make all sure, for, “confess”, say, “acknowledge”: and for “Priests”, “Elders”. What mean they by this? If this acknowledging of faults one to another before death be indifferently to be made to all men, why do they appoint in their Communion book (as it seems out of this place) that the sick person shall make a special confession to the Minister, and he shall absolve him in the very same form of absolution that Catholic Priests use in the Sacrament of Confession. Again, if this

---

<sup>3</sup> Beza in Jo. 4:10 and in Tit. 3:5.

<sup>4</sup> Tit. 3:5: *Per lavacrum regenerationis Sp. sancti QUOD effudit in nos abunde.*

<sup>5</sup> *Quem effudit*, as Beza himself translates.

<sup>6</sup> Comment. in hunc locum.

<sup>7</sup> ἡξομολογεῖσθε, whereof Confession is called in St. Cyprian and other fathers, *Exomologesis*.

acknowledging of faults be specially to be made to the Minister or Priest, why translate they it not by the word Confessing and confession, as well as by “Acknowledging”, and why is not this confession a Sacrament, where themselves acknowledge forgiveness of sins by the Minister? These contradictions and repugnance of their practice and translation, if they can wittily and wisely reconcile, they may perhaps in this point satisfy the reader. But whether the Apostle speak here of Sacramental confession or no, sincere translators should not have fled from the proper and most usual word of confession or confessing, consonant both to the Greek and Latin, and indifferent to whatsoever the Holy Ghost might mean, as this word, “acknowledge”, is not.

## CHAPTER XV.

### *Heretical translation against the Sacrament of HOLY ORDERS, and for the MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS and VOTARIES.*

Against the Sacrament of Orders what can they do more in translation, than in all their Bibles to take away the name of “Priest” and “Priesthood” of the New Testament altogether, and for it to say “Elder” and “Eldership”, whereof I treated more at large in Chapter 6? Here I add these few observations, that both for Priests and Deacons, which are two Holy Orders in the Catholic Church, they translate “Ministers”, to commend that new degree devised by themselves. As when they say in all their bibles, “Fear the Lord with all thy soul, and honour his ministers.” (Ecc. 7:31). In the Greek (□ερε□ς) it is plain thus, “and honour his Priests”, as the word always signifies, and in the very next sentence themselves so translate, “Fear the Lord and honour the Priests” (□ερέα). But they would needs borrow one of these places for the honour of Ministers. As also in 1 Tim. 3, where St. Paul talks of Deacons, and names them twice: they in the first place translate thus, “Likewise must the Ministers be honest etc.” and a little later, “Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife”.<sup>1</sup> Lo, the Greek word being one (Διάκονοι), and the Apostle speaking of one Ecclesiastical order of Deacons, and Beza so interpreting it in both places, yet our English translators have allowed the first place to their Ministers, and the second to Deacons. And so (because Bishops also went before) they have found us out their three orders, Bishops, Ministers, and Deacons. Alas poor souls, that can have no place in Scripture for their Ministers, but by making the Apostle speak three things for two.

2. There are in the Scripture that are called ministers in infinite places, and that by three Greek words commonly (□πηρέται, λειτουργο□, διάκονοι): but that is a large signification of minister, attributed to all that minister, wait, serve, or attend to do any service Ecclesiastical or temporal, sacred or profane. If the word be restrained to any one peculiar service or function, as one of the Greek words is, then does it signify Deacons only. Which if they know not, or will not believe me, let them see Beza himself in his Annotations upon St. Matthew 5:25, who protests that in his translation he uses always the same word, “Minister”, in the general signification: and, *Diaconus*, in the special and peculiar Ecclesiastical function of Deacons. So that yet we cannot understand, neither can they tell us, whence their peculiar calling and function of Minister comes, which is their second degree under a Bishop, and is placed instead of Priests.

3. Again, what can be more against the dignity of sacred orders and Ecclesiastical degrees, than to make them profane and secular by their terms and translations? For this purpose, as they translate, “Elders” and “Eldership”, for “Priests” and “Priesthood”, so do they most impudently term St. Peter and St. John, “laymen”:<sup>2</sup> they say for Apostle, “Ambassador”, and “Messenger” (Jo. 13:16): and for Apostles of the Churches, “Messengers” of the same (2 Cor. 8): for Bishops, “overseers” (Act. 20). Why my masters, does *idiota* signify a layman? Suppose a layman be as wise and learned as any other, is he *idiota*? Or that one of your Ministers be as unlearned and ignorant as any shepherd, is he not *idiota*? So then *idiota* is neither clerk nor layman, but every simple and ignorant man. They that spoke with miraculous tongues in the primitive Church, were they not laymen many of them? Yet the Apostle (1 Cor. 14, 23, 24) plainly distinguish them from *idiota*. So that this is more ignorantly or willfully translated, than *neophytus*, “a young scholar” (1 Tim. 3) in all your Bibles.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bib. 1562 and 1577.

<sup>2</sup> □δι□ται, Act. 4, Bib. 1562; □πόστολος for messenger and legate the Scripture uses these words, □γγελος, πρέσβευτ□ς, πρέσβευειν.



4. Now for changing the name Apostle into Messenger, though Beza do so also in the foresaid places, yet indeed he controls both himself and you in other places, saying of the same word, “Apostles”:<sup>3</sup> “A man may say in Latin, *legates*, but we have gladly kept the Greek word [Apostle] as many other words familiar to the Church of Christ.” And not only of the principal Apostles, but also of the other Disciples he both translates and interprets in his commentary,<sup>4</sup> that they are “notable Apostles”. And he proves that all “Ministers of the word” (as he terms them) are and may be so called. And for your “Overseers”, he says, *Episcopos*, and not *Superintendentes*. Which he might as well have said, as you, “Overseers”. But to say the truth, though he be too too profane, yet he does much more keep and use the Ecclesiastical received terms, than you do, often protesting it and as it were glorying therein, against Castaleon especially.<sup>5</sup> As, when he says *Presbyterum*, where you say “Elder”: *Diaconum*, where you say, “Minister”, and so forth. Where if you tell me that howsoever he translate, he means as profanely as you, I believe you, and therefore you shall go together, like Master, like Scholars, all false and profane translators. For, this Beza (who sometime so gladly keeps the name of Apostle) yet calls Epaphroditus *legatum Philippensium* (Phil. 2:15). Whereupon the English Bezites translate, “your messenger”, for “your Apostle”. As if St. Augustine who was our Apostle, should be called “our messenger”.

5. As also, when you translate of St. Matthias the Apostle (No. Test. 1580), that “he was by a common consent counted with the eleven Apostles” (Act. 1:26), what is it else but to make only a popular election of Ecclesiastical degrees, as Beza in his Annotations<sup>6</sup> would have us to understand, saying, “that nothing was done here peculiarly by Peter as one of more excellent dignity than the rest, but in common by the voices of the whole Church,” though in another place upon this election he notes Peter to be the chief or Corypheus. And as for the Greek word in this place (συγκατεψηφίθη), if partiality of the cause would suffer him to consider of it, he should find, that the proper signification thereof in this phrase of speech, is, as the Vulgar Latin interpreter, Erasmus, and Valla (all which he rejects) translate it, to with, “He was numbered” (*annumeratus est*), or, “counted (*cooptatus est*) with the eleven Apostles,” without all respect of common consent or not consent, as you also in your other bibles do translate.

6. Which diversity may proceed of the diversity of opinions among you. For we understand by Master Whitegift’s books<sup>7</sup> against the Puritans, that he and his fellows deny this popular election, and give preeminence, superiority, and difference in this case to Peter, and to Ecclesiastical Prelates, and therefore he proves at large the use and Ecclesiastical signification of the Greek word χειροτονία, not to be the giving of voices in popular elections, but to be the Ecclesiastical imposing of hands upon persons taken to the Church’s ministry. Which he says very truly, and needs the less here to be spoken of, especially being touched elsewhere in this book.<sup>8</sup>

7. One thing only we would know, why they that plead so earnestly against their brethren the Puritans, about the signification of this word, pretending herein only the primitive custom of imposition of hands in making their Ministers, why (I say) themselves translate not this word accordingly, but altogether as the Puritans, thus: “When they had ordained them elders by election (χειροτονήσαντες) in every Church.” (Act. 14:23) For if the Greek word signify here the people’s giving of voices (as Beza forces it only that way out of Tully and the popular

<sup>3</sup> Annot. in Mat. 10:2.

<sup>4</sup> Annot. in Ro. 16:7, and in 2 Cor. 8:23.

<sup>5</sup> In tit. Evang. Math. & in 3:11, 10:2, 5:25.

<sup>6</sup> Annot. ibid. & Act. 14:23.

<sup>7</sup> His defense, or 2 book p. 157.

<sup>8</sup> Chap. 6 nu. 7.

custom of old Athens) then the other signification of imposing hands is gone, which Master Whitegift defends, and the popular election is brought in, which he refells: and so by their translation they have in my opinion overshot themselves, and given advantage to their brotherly Adversaries. Unless indeed they translate as they think, because indeed they think as heretically as the other, but yet because their state of Ecclesiastical regiment is otherwise, they must maintain that also in their writings, howsoever they translate. For an example, they all agree to translate Elder for Priest: and Mr. Whitakers tells us afresh<sup>9</sup> in the name of them all, that there are no Priests now in the Church of Christ, that is (as he interprets himself):<sup>10</sup> “This name ‘Priest’ is never in the New Testament peculiarly applied to the Ministers of the Gospel”; this is their doctrine. But what is their practise in the regiment of their Church? Clean contrary. For in the order of the communion book, where it is appointed what the Minister shall do, it is indifferently said, “Then shall the Priest do or say this and that: and then shall the Minister, etc.” Whereby it is evident that they make Priest a proper and peculiar calling applied to their Ministers, and so their practice is contrary to their teaching and doctrine.

8. Now concerning imposition or laying on of hands in making their Ministers (which the Puritans also are forced to allow by other words of Scripture,<sup>11</sup> howsoever they dispute and jangle against χειροτονία) none of them all make more of it, than of the like Judaical ceremony in the Old Law, not acknowledging that there is any grace given withal, though the Apostle say there is, in express terms. But they will answer this text (as they are wont) with a favorable translation, turning “grace” into “gift” (1 Tim. 4:14). As, when the Apostle says thus, “Neglect not *the grace* (τοῦ χάρισματος) that is in thee, which is given thee by prophecy, with imposition of the hands of Priesthood”, they translate, “Neglect not the *gift*.” and Beza most impudently for, “by prophecy” (διὰ προφητείας), translates, “to prophecy”: making that only to be this gift, and withal adding this goodly exposition, that he had the gift of prophecy or preaching before, and now by imposition of hands was chosen only to execute that function. But because it might be objected that the Apostle says, “Which was given thee with the imposition of hands”, or (as he speaks in another place) “by imposition of hands” (2 Tim. 1), making this imposition of hands an instrumental cause of giving this grace, he says that it did only confirm the grace or gift before given.

9. Thus it is evident that, though the Apostle speak never so plain for the dignity of Holy Orders, that it gives grace, and consequently is a Sacrament, they pervert all to the contrary, making it a bare ceremony, suppressing the word “grace”, which is much more significant to express the Greek word χάρισμα, than “gift” is, because it is not every gift, but a gracious gift, or a gift proceeding of marvelous and mere grace. As when it is said, “To you it is given not only to believe, but also to suffer for him.” (Phil. 1:29) The Greek word (ἡ χάρις) signifies this much, “To you this grace is given, etc.” (Act. 27) So when God gave unto St. Paul all that sailed with him, this Greek word is used, because it was a great grace or gracious gift given unto him. When St. Paul pardoned the incestuous person before due time (2 Cor. 2), it is expressed by this word (κεχάρισμαι χάρισμα), because it was a grace (as Theodoret calls it) given unto him. And therefore also the alms of the Corinthians are called “their grace” (1 Cor. 16:3; τὸν χάριν ἡμῶν), which the Protestants translate, “liberality”, neglecting altogether the true force and signification of the Greek words.

10. But concerning the Sacrament of Orders, as in the first to Timothy, so in the second also (2 Tim. 1:6), they suppress the word “grace”, and call it barely and coldly, “gift”, saying: “I

---

<sup>9</sup> Pag. 200 ad rat. Camp.

<sup>10</sup> Pag. 210.

<sup>11</sup> Beza Annot. Act. 6:6.

put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands.” Where if they had said, “the grace” of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands: then were it plain that St. Paul by the ceremony of imposing hands upon Timothy in making him Priest or Bishop, gave him grace: and so it should be a very Sacrament of Holy Orders. For avoiding whereof they translate otherwise, or else let them give us another reason thereof, especially the Greek word much more signifying grace, than a bare gift, as is declared.

11. The more to profane this sacred Order, whereunto continenty and single life has been always annexed in the New Testament for the honour and reverence of the functions thereunto belonging, to profane the same (I say) and to make it mere laical and popular, they will have all to be married men, yea those that have vowed the contrary: and it is a great credit among them, for our Priests’ Apostates to take wives. This they would deduce from the Apostles’ custom, but by most false and impudent translation: making St. Paul say thus as of his own wife and the other Apostles’ wives, “Have not we power to lead about a wife being a sister, as well as the rest of the Apostles?” (1 Cor. 9:5; No. Test. 1580) Whereas the Apostle says nothing else but, “a woman a sister” (ἡ ἀδελφὴ ἡ γυναῖκα; Mat. 27), that is, a Christian woman, meaning such holy women as followed Christ, and the Apostles, to find and maintain them of their substance. So<sup>12</sup> does St. Jerome interpret it, and St. Augustine, both directly proving that it cannot be translated “wife”, but “woman”: and the Greke fathers most expressly. And as for the Greek word, if they say it is ambiguous, St. Augustine tells them<sup>13</sup> that as the Apostle has put it down with all the circumstances, there is no ambiguity at all that might deceive any man. Yea, let us set apart the circumstances, and consider the Greek word alone in itself, and Beza will tell us in other places,<sup>14</sup> that it signifies a woman rather than a wife: reprehending Erasmus for translating it “wife”, “because there is no<sup>15</sup> circumstance annexed why it should so signify”: thereby declaring that of itself it signifies “woman”, and therefore much more when the circumstance also (as St. Augustine says) makes it certain, that so it does signify.

12. Wherefore great must the impudence of Beza be (and of the English Bezites) that knowing this and protesting elsewhere in his Annotations, yet here translates, *sororem uxorem*, “a sister a wife”, and saying after his lordly manner, I doubted not so to translate it, disputing and reasoning against all other interpreters both ancient and later, for the contrary, yea and affirming that St. Paul himself, “did foolishly” (*inepte faceret*), if he spoke there, of other rich women. Such a fancy he has to make the Apostles not only married men, but that they carried about their wives with them, and that they were the Apostles’ wives (for so he translates it, *cum uxoribus*, Act. 1:14), that returned with them after our Lord’s ascension to Jerusalem, and continued together in prayer till the Holy Ghost came upon them. Whereas St. Luke there speaks so evidently of the other holy and faithful women which are famous in the Gospel (as the Marys and others) that the English Bezites themselves dare not here follow his translation. For I beseech you Master Beza (to turn my talk unto you a little), is there any circumstance or particle here added (σὺν γυναῖξιν) why it should be translate “wives”? None. Then, by your own reason before alleged it should rather be translated “women”. Again, did Erasmus translate well, saying, “It is good for a man not to touch a wife” (1 Cor. 7:1)? (*uxorem non tangere; γυναῖκας μὴ ἅπτειν*) No, say you, reprehending this translation, because it dehorts from marriage. If not, show your commission why you may translate it in the foresaid places, “wife”, and “wives”, at your pleasure: the Greek being all one, both where you will not in any wise have it translate “wife”, and also where you will have it so translated in any wise.

<sup>12</sup> Li. 1. advers. Jouin; De op. mon. cap. 4.

<sup>13</sup> In Collectam Oecu. super hunc locum.

<sup>14</sup> Annot. Mat. 5:28 and 1 Cor. 7:1.

<sup>15</sup> *Quia non additur* “τινός”, *aut* “ἀδελφοῦ”.

13. Again, to this purpose they make St. Paul say as to his wife, “I beseech thee also faithful yokefellow” (σύζυγε γνήσιε; Phil. 4:3): for in English what does it else sound but man and wife? But that St. Paul should here mean his wife, most of the Greek fathers count it ridiculous and foolish,<sup>16</sup> St. Chrysostom, Theodore, Oecumenius, Theophylactus. Beza and Calvin both mislike it, translating also in the masculine gender, St. Paul himself says the contrary that he had no wife (1 Cor. 7). And as for Clemens Alexandrinus who alleges it for Paul’s wife,<sup>17</sup> Eusebius plainly insuates, and Nicephorus expressly says, that he did it  $\square$ νταγωνιστικ $\square$ ς, by the way of contention and disputation, whiles he earnestly wrote against them that oppugned matrimony.

14. Again, for the marriage of Priests and of all sorts of men indifferently, they translate the Apostle thus: “wedlock is honorable among all men.” (Hebr. 13) Where one falsification is, that they say, “among all men”, and Beza, *inter quosuis*, and in the margin,<sup>18</sup> *in omni hominum, ordine*, “in every order or condition of men”, and in his Annotation he rails, to make this translation good: whereas the Greek ( $\square$ ν  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ ) is as indifferent to signify, that marriage is honorable by all means, in all respects, wholly, thoroughly, altogether. So does not only Erasmus, but also the Greek fathers expound it,<sup>19</sup> namely Theophylacte, whose words in the Greek be very significant, but too long here to trouble the reader with them. “Not in part,” says he, “honorable, and in part not: but wholly, throughout, by all means honorable and undefiled, in all ages, in all times.” Therefore to restrain it in translation to persons only (though it may also very well be understood of all persons that have no impediment to the contrary) that is to translate falsely.

15. Another and the like falsification in this same short sentence, is, that they make it an affirmative speech, by adding, “is”: whereas the Apostle’s words be these, “Marriage honorable in all, and the bed undefiled.” (τίμιος  $\square$  γάμος) Which is rather an exhortation, as if he should say, “Let marriage be honorable in all, and the bed undefiled.” How honorable? That (as St. Peter speaks, 1 Pet. c.3) men converse with their wives according to knowledge, imparting “honour” (τιμ $\square$ ν) unto them as to the weaker vessels: that is (as St. Paul also explicates it, 1 Thess. c.4) possessing every man his vessel in sanctification and honour ( $\square$ ν τιμ $\square$ ), not in the passion or lust of concupiscence, as the Gentiles, etc. Lo, what honorable marriage is, to wit, when the husband uses his wife honorably and honestly in all respects, not beastly and filthily according to all kind of lust and concupiscence. And that the Apostle here exhorts to this honorable usage of wedlock, rather than affirms anything, it is most probable both by that which goes before and that which immediately follows, all which are exhortations. And let the Protestants give us a reason out of the Greek text, if they can, why they translate the words following by way of exhortation, “Let your conversation be without covetousness” ( $\square$ φιλάργυρος  $\square$  τρόπος): and not these words also in like manner, “let marriage be honorable in all” (τίμιος  $\square$  γάμος). Certain it is that the Greek in both is all one phrase and speech, and Beza, is much troubled to find a good reason against Erasmus who thinks it is an exhortation. The sentence then being ambiguous and doubtful at the least, what jolly fellows are these, that will so restrain it in translation, that it cannot be taken in the other sense, and not rather leave it indifferently, as in the Greke and Vulgar Latin it is, lest the sense of the Holy Ghost be not that, or not only that, which they translate.

<sup>16</sup> *Socie germane*. Theophylacte says, if he spoke to a woman, it should be γνήσια in the Greek.

<sup>17</sup> Li. 2. c. 24.

<sup>18</sup> No. Test. an. 1565.

<sup>19</sup> See Oecum. in catena.

16. Moreover it is against the profession of continency in Priests and others, that they translate our Saviour's words of single life and the unmarried state, thus: "All men cannot receive this saying" (Mat. 19:11): as though it were impossible to live continent. Where Christ said not so, that all men cannot, but "All men do not receive this saying". But of this I have spoken more in the chapter on free will. Here I add only concerning the words following, that they translate them not exactly, nor perhaps with a sincere meaning. For if there be chastity in marriage as well as in the single life, as Paphnutius the Confessor most truly said, and they are wont much to allege it, then their translation does nothing express our Saviour's meaning, when they say, "There are some chaste, which have made themselves chaste for the kingdom of heaven's sake." (Bibl. 1562, 1577) For a man might say, all do so that live chastely in matrimony. But our Saviour speaks of them that are impotent and unable to generation, called eunuchs (εὐνοχοί) or gelded men, and that in three divers kinds: some that have that infirmity or maim from their birth, other some that are gelded afterward by men, and other that geld themselves for the kingdom of heaven, not by cutting off those parts which were a horrible mortal sin, but having those parts as other men have, yet geld themselves (for so is the Greek, εὐνούχισαν εὐνοχοί) and make themselves unable to generation. Which how it can be but by voluntary profession, promise, and vow of perpetual continency which they may never break, let the Protestants tell us. Christ then as it is most evident speaks of gelded men, either corporally, or spiritually (which are all such as profess perpetual continency): and they tell us of some that were born chaste, and some that were made chaste by men, and some that make themselves chaste: a most foolish and false translation of the Greek words, εὐνοχος and εὐνουχίζειν.

17. The Bezites here, are blameless, who translate it word for word, "eunuchs". But they are more to blame in another place, where in derogation of the privilege and dignity of priests, they translate this: "The Priests' lips should preserve knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his mouth." (Mal. 2:7). Where in the Hebrew (וְשָׂמְרוּ אֶת־הַדָּבָר וְיִשְׁאָלוּ אֶת־הַתּוֹרָה אֶת־פִּי) and Greek (φυλάξεται ἡὐχὴ τῶν ἱερέων) it is as plain as possibly can be spoken, "The Priests' lips shall keep knowledge, and they shall seek the Law at his mouth." Which is a marvelous privilege given to the Priests of the Old Law, for true determination of matters in controversy, and right expounding of the Law, as we read more fully (Deut. 17). Where they are commanded under pain of death to stand to the Priests' judgement, which in this place God by the Prophet Malachi (v.4) calls his covenant with Levi, and that he will have it to stand, to wit, in the New Testament, where Peter has such privilege for him and his successors, that his faith shall not fail, where the Holy Ghost is president in the Councils of Bishops and Priests. All which these Heretics would deface and defeat, by translating the words otherwise than the Holy Ghost has spoken them.

18. And when the Prophet adds immediately the cause of this singular prerogative of the Priest, *quia angelus Domini exercituum est*, "because he is the Angel of the Lord of hosts", which is also a wonderful dignity, so to be called: they after their cold manner of profane translation say, "because he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts." So do they in the next chapter call St. John the Baptist, "messenger" (Mal. 3:1): where the Scripture no doubt speaks more honorably of him as being Christ's precursor, than of a messenger, which is a term for posts also and lackeys. The Scripture I say speaks thus of St. John, "Behold I send mine angel before thee" (τὸ ἐπεμψέν μου ἄγγελόν μου; *angelum meum*): and our Saviour in the Gospel (Mat. 11, Luc. 7), telling the people the wonderful dignities of St. John, and that he was more than a prophet, cites this place and gives this reason, "For this is he of whom it is written, Behold I send mine Angel before thee." Which St. Jerome calls<sup>20</sup> *meritorum* ἀύξησις, "the increase and augmenting of John's merits or

<sup>20</sup> Comment. in hunc locum.

privileges, that in Malachi he is called an Angel”: and St. Gregory says,<sup>21</sup> he which came to bring tidings of Christ himself, “was worthily called an Angel, that in his very name there might be a dignity.” And all the fathers, and all wit and reason conceive a great excellence in this name: only our profane Protestants that think of all divine things and persons most basely, translate accordingly, even in the foresaid Gospel also, making our Saviour to say, that John was more than a prophet, because he was “a messenger”. Yea, where our Saviour himself is called, *Angelus Testamenti*, “the Angel of the Testament” (Mal. 3:1), there they translate, “the messenger of the covenant”.

19. If St. Jerome in all these places had translated, *nutium*, then the English were “messenger”: but translating it *angelum*, and the Church and all antiquity so reading and expounding it as a term of more dignity and excellence,<sup>22</sup> what mean these base companions to disgrace the very eloquence of the Scripture, which by such terms of amplification would speak more significantly and emphatically? What mean they (I say) that so inveigh against Castaleo for his profaneness, themselves to say, for Angel, “Messenger”, for Apostle, “Legate” or “Ambassador”, and the like? Are they afraid, lest by calling men Angels, it would be mistaken, as though they were Angels indeed by nature? Then St. Paul spoke dangerously, when he said to the Galatians, “As God’s Angel you received me, as Christ Jesus.” (Gal. 4:14) But to proceed.

20. It is much for the authority and dignity of God’s Priests, that they do bind and loose, and execute all Ecclesiastical function as in the person and power of Christ, whose ministers they are. So St. Paul says (2 Cor. 2:10), that when he pardoned or released the penance of the incestuous Corinthian, he did it “in the person of Christ” (ἐν προσώπῳ Χριστοῦ). That is (as St. Ambrose expounds it) in the name of Christ, in his stead, as his Vicar and deputy. But they translate it, “in the sight of Christ”. Where it is evident they cannot pretend the Greek, and if there be ambiguity in the Greek, the Apostle himself takes it away interpreting himself in the very same case, when he excommunicates the said incestuous person, saying, that he does it, “in the name and with the virtue of our Lord Jesus Christ” (1 Cor. 5:4): so expounding what he means also in this place.

21. And it may be, that for some such purpose they change the ancient and accustomed reading in these words of St. Matthew (Mat. 2), *Ex te enim exiet dux qui regat populum meum Israel*: translating thus (1580), “Out of thee shall come the Governor that shall feed my people Israel.” For, “that shall rule my people Israel”. This is certain that it is a false translation, because the Prophet’s word (Mich. 5; cited by St. Matthew) both in Hebrew (לְהִיֹּת מוֹשֵׁל) and Greek (τοῦ ἄρχοντα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ), signify only a ruler or Governor, and not a Pastor or feeder. Therefore it is either a great oversight, which is a small matter in comparison of the least corruption: or rather because they do the like in Act. 20:28, it is done to suppress the signification of Ecclesiastical power and government, that concurs with feeding, first in Christ, and from him in his Apostles and Pastors of the Church, both which are here signified in this one Greek word (ποιμαίνω), to wit, that Christ our Saviour shall rule and feed (Psal. 2, Apoc. 2:27), yea he shall rule in a rod of iron: and from him, Peter and the rest, by his commission given in the same word “feed and rule my sheep” (ποιμαίνε; Jo. 21): yea and that in a rod of iron, as when he struck Ananias and Sapphira to corporal death (Act. 5; 1 Cor. 4:21, 5:5; 2 Cor. 10:4, 10:8), as his successors do the like offenders to spiritual destruction (unless they repent) by the terrible rod of excommunication. This is imported in the double signification of the Greek word, which they to diminish Ecclesiastical authority, they translate, “feed”, rather than “rule”, or “govern”.

<sup>21</sup> Hom. 6. in Evang.

<sup>22</sup> See Apoc. c. 2 and 3. in the English Bibl. 1562. “To the messenger of the congregation, etc. *Angelo Ecclesiae*.”

22. To the diminishing of this Ecclesiastical authority, in the latter end of the reign of King Henry VIII, and during the reign of King Edward VI, the only translation of their English Bibles, was, “Submit yourselves unto all manner ordinance of man: whether it be *unto the king, as to the chief head.*” (1 Pet. 2; βασιλεῖ ὡς ἰππερέχοντι). Where in this Queen’s time, the later translators cannot find those words now in the Greek, but do translate thus, “To the king as having preeminence”: or, “to the king as the Superior.” (Bibl. 1577, 1579) Why so? Because then the King had first taken upon him this name of “Supreme head” of the Church, and therefore they flattered both him and his son, till their heresy was planted, making the Holy Scripture to say that the king was “the chief head”, which is all one with “supreme head”: but now being better advised in that point (by Calvin I suppose and the Lutherans of Magdeburg, who do jointly inveight against such title, and Calvin against that by name, which was first given to King Henry VIII)<sup>23</sup> and because they may be bolder with a Queen than with a king, and because now they think their kingdom is well established, therefore they suppress this title in their later translations, and would take it from her altogether if they could, to advance their own Ecclesiastical jurisdiction, without any dependence of the Queen’s supreme government of their church, which in their conscience (if they be true Calvinists, or Lutherans, or mixture of both) they do and must mislike.

23. But howsoever that be, let them justify their translation, or confess their fault. And as for the king’s supremacy over the Church, if they make any doubt, let them read St. Ignatius’ words,<sup>24</sup> who was in the Apostles’ time, even when St. Peter gave the foresaid admonition of subjection to the king, and knew very well how far his preeminence extended, and therefore says plainly in notorious words, that, we must first honour God, then the Bishop, and then the king. Because in all things nothing is comparable to God, and “in the Church, nothing greater than the Bishop, who is consecrated to God for the salvation of the whole world”, and<sup>25</sup> among magistrates and temporal rulers, none is like the king. See his<sup>26</sup> other words immediately following, where he prefers the Bishop’s office before the king’s and all other things of price among men.

24. But in the former sentence of St. Peter, though they have altered their translation about the king’s headship, yet there is one corruption remaining still in these words, “Submit yourselves *unto all manner ordinance of man.*” Whereas in the Greek (πάσιν ἰπθρωπίν κτίσει) it is word for word as in the old Vulgar Latin translation, *omni humanae creaturae*, and as we have translated, “to every human creature” (1 Pet. 2:13-14): meaning temporal Princes and Magistrates, as is plain by the exemplification immediately following, of “king”, and “dukes” and other “sent” or appointed “by him”. But they in favour of their temporal statutes, acts of Parliament, Proclamations and Injunctions made against the Catholic religion, do translate all with one consent, “Submit yourselves to all manner ordinance of man.” Does κτίσεις signify “ordinance”? Or is it all one to be obedient to every one of our Princes, and to all manner ordinance of the said Princes?

25. A strange case and much to be considered, how they wring and wrest the Holy Scriptures this way and that way and every way to serve their heretical proceedings. For when the question is of due obedience to Ecclesiastical canons, and decrees of the Church and general Councils, where the Holy Ghost by Christ’s promise is assistant, and whereof it is said, “If he hear not the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and publican.” (Mat. 18) And, “He that heareth you, heareth me: he that despiseth you, despiseth me” (Luc. 10): there they cry out

<sup>23</sup> Calv. in c. 7. Amos. Magdeb. in Praef. Cent. 7 fo. 9, 10.

<sup>24</sup> Epist. 7 ad Smyrnenses.

<sup>25</sup> ἰπ ἰρχουσιν.

<sup>26</sup> ἐροσύνη ἰστἰν, τἰ πάντων ἰγαθἰν ἰν ἰνθρώποις ἰναβεβηκἰς.

aloud, and odiously term all such ordinances, “men’s traditions”, and “commandments of men”, and most despitefully contemn and condemn them. But here, for obedience unto temporal edicts and Parliament statutes daily enacted in favour of their schism and heresies, they once maliciously forged, and still wickedly retain without alteration, a text of their own, making the Apostle to command submission unto all manner ordinance of man, whereof has ensued the false crime of treason and cruel death for the same, upon those innocent men and glorious martyrs, that chose to obey God and his Church’s holy ordinances, rather than man’s statutes and laws directly against the same.



## CHAPTER XVI.

### *Heretical translation against the Sacrament of MATRIMONY.*

But as they are injurious translators to the sacred Order of Priesthood, so a man would think they should be very friendly to the Sacrament of Matrimony. For they would seem to make more of Matrimony than we do, making it equal at the least with virginity. Yet the truth is, we make it, or rather the Church of God esteems it as a holy Sacrament, they do not: as giving grace to the married persons to live together in love, concord, and fidelity: they acknowledge no such thing. So that Matrimony with them is highly esteemed in respect of the flesh, or (to say the best) only for a civil contract, as it is among Jews and Pagans: but as it is peculiar to Christians, and (as St. Augustine says) “in the sanctification also and holiness of a Sacrament”, they make no account of it, but flatly deny it.

2. And to this purpose they translate in the epistle to the Ephesians, 5. Where the Apostle speaks of Matrimony, “This is a great secret” (*sacramentum hoc magnum est*). Whereas the Latin Church and all the Doctors thereof have ever read, “This is a great Sacrament”: the Greek Church and all the fathers thereof, “This is a great mystery”. Because that which is in Greek, mystery (μυστήριον): is in Latin, Sacrament: and contrariwise, the words in both tongues being equivalent. So that if one be taken in the large signification, the other also: as, Apoc. 17: “I will show thee the sacrament (*sacramentum*) of the woman. And I will show thee the mystery (μυστήριον) of the woman.” And so in sundry places. Again if one be restrained from the larger signification, and peculiarly applied, signify the Sacraments of the Church, the other also. As, “the Sacrament” of the body and blood of Christ: or, “the Mystery” of the body and blood of Christ: and the Calvinists in their Latin and Greek Catechism say, “two Sacraments” (*duo Sacramenta*), or, “two Mysteries” (δύο μυστήρια).

3. This being so, what is the fault of their translation in the place aforesaid? This, that they translate neither “Sacrament” nor “Mystery”. As for the word “Sacrament”, they are excused, because they translate not the Latin: but translating the Greek, why said they not, “Mystery”, which is the Greek word here in the Apostle? I mean, why said they not of Matrimony, “This is a great Mystery”? No doubt there can be no other cause, but to avoid both these words, which are used in the Latin and Greek Church, to signify the Sacraments. For in the Greek Church the Sacrament of the body and blood itself is called but a mystery or mysteries, which yet the Protestants themselves call a true Sacrament. Therefore if they should have called Matrimony also by that name, it might easily have sounded to be a Sacrament also. But in saying it is a great secret, they put it out of doubt, that it shall not be so taken.<sup>1</sup>

4. They will say unto me, Is not every sacrament and mystery, in English a secret? Yes, as Angel, is a messenger: and Apostle, one that is sent. But when the Holy Scripture uses these words to signify more excellent and divine things than those of the common sort, does it become translators to use baser terms instead thereof, and so to disgrace the writing and meaning of the Holy Ghost? I appeal to themselves, when they translate this word in other places, whether they say not thus, “And without doubt great was that *mystery* of godliness: God was shown manifestly in the flesh, etc.” (1 Tim. 3). Again, “The *mystery* which hath been hid since the world began, but now is opened to his saints.” (Col. 1:26) Again, “I show you a *mystery*, we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed.” (1 Cor. 15:51), and the like (Eph. 3:9). Where if they should translate “secret” instead of “mystery”, as the Bezites do in one of these places, saying, “I will show you a secret thing”: what a disgracing and debasing were it to those

---

<sup>1</sup> Were it honest or lawful to translate, *Baptiso*, “I wash”: or *Baptismus*, “washing”: or *Evangelium*, “good news”? Yet the words profanely taken, signify no more.

high mysteries there signified? And if it were so in these, is it not so in Matrimony, which the Apostle makes such a mystery, that it represents no less matter than Christ and his Church and whatsoever is most excellent in that conjunction? Now then, if in all other places of high mystery they translate it also “mystery”, as it is in the Greek, and only in Matrimony do not so, but say rather, “This is a great secret”, using so base a term in so high and excellent a mystery, must we not needs think (as no doubt it is) that they do it because of their Heretical opinion against the Sacrament of Matrimony, and for their base estimation thereof?

5. But they will yet reply again, and ask us, what we gain by translating it either Sacrament, or mystery? Does that make it one of the Sacraments properly so called, to wit, such a Sacrament as Baptism is? No surely. But howsoever we gain otherwise, at least we gain the commendation of true translators, whether it make with us or against us. For otherwise it is not the name that makes it such a peculiar Sacrament, for (as is said before) “Sacrament” is a general name in Scripture to other things. Neither do we therefore so translate it, as though it were forthwith one of the seven Sacraments, because of the name: but as in other places wheresoever we find this word in the Latin, we translate it, “Sacrament” (as in the Apocalypse, “the Sacrament of the woman”, Apoc. 17) so finding it here, we do here also so translate it. And as for the divers taking of it here, and elsewhere, that we examine otherwise, by circumstance of the text, and by the Church’s and Doctors’ interpretation: and we find that here it is taken for a Sacrament in that sense as we say, “seven Sacraments”: not so in the other places.

6. As when we read this name “Jesus” in Scripture common to our Saviour and to other men, we translate it always like, “Jesus”: but when it is JESUS Christ (Jude. v. 5), and when some other Jesus (Act. 7:45; Col. 4:11), we know by other circumstances. Likewise presuppose Baptism in the Scripture were called a sacrament: yet the Protestants themselves would not, nor could thereby conclude, that it were one of their two Sacraments. Yet I trow they would not avoid to translate it by the word sacrament, if they found it so called: even so we finding Matrimony so called, do so translate it, neither concluding thereby that it is one of the Seven, nor yet suppressing the name, which no doubt gave some occasion to the Church and the holy doctors to esteem it as one of the Seven. They contrariwise, as though it were never so called, suppress the name altogether, calling it “a secret”, to put it out of all question, that it is no Sacrament: which they would not have done, if the Scripture had said of Baptism or the Eucharist, “This is a great Sacrament”. So partial they are to their own opinions.

## CHAPTER XVII.

*Heretical translation against the BLESSED SACRAMENT, and SACRIFICE, and ALTARS.*

Now let us see concerning the Eucharist, which they allow for a Sacrament, how they handle the matter to the disgracing and defacing of the same also. They take away the operation and efficacy of Christ's blessing pronounced upon the bread and wine, making it only a thanksgiving to God: and to this purpose they translate more gladly, "thanksgiving", than "blessing". As in Mat. 26 the Greek words being two (εὐλογίας, εὐχαριστήσασ), the one signifying properly, "to bless": the other, "to give thanks": they translate both thus, "when he had given thanks" (Bib. 1562, 1577). Likewise Marc. 14 in the 1562 Bible. And when they translate it, "blessing", they mean nothing else but giving thanks, as Beza tells us in his Annotations to Mat. 26:26. We reply and by most manifest Scripture prove unto them, that the former Greek word does not signify thanksgiving properly, but blessing, and a blessing of creatures to the operation of some great effect in them: as when Christ took the give loaves and two fishes, to multiply them, "he blessed them" (*benedixit eis*; εὐλόγησεν ἄρτοϋς; Luc. 9) What say they to this, think you? Does not the Greek word here plainly signify, "blessing of creatures"? No, (says Beza),<sup>1</sup> "no doubt but here also it signifies giving thanks." How Beza? He adds, "Not as though Christ had given thanks to the bread, for that were too absurd: but we must mollify this interpretation thus, that he gave thanks to God the father for the loaves and the fishes." Is not this a notable exposition for these words, *benedixit eis*?

2. We ask him in the like cases, when God blessed Adam and Eve, and Noe and his children (Gen. 1 & 9), saying, "Increase and multiply": when "he blessed the children of Israel, and they multiplied exceedingly" (Psal. 106), when "he blessed the later things of Job more than the first" (Job 42). Was this also a giving of thanks, and not an effectual blessing upon these creatures? What will they say, or what difference will they make? As God blessed here, so he was God and man that blessed the loaves and fishes there. If they will say he did it as man, and therefore it was a giving of thanks to God his father: to omit that he blessed them as he multiplied them, that is, rather according to his divine nature than human: we ask them, when he blessed as man, was it always giving of thanks? He blessed the little children, he blessed his disciples when he ascended (Luc. 24): was this giving thanks for them, as Beza expounds his blessing of the loaves and fishes? When we bless the table or the meat upon the table, when St. Paul says, (1 Tim. 4) all meat is lawful that is sanctified (εὐιάζεται; which can never mean "give thanks") by the word and by prayer: is all this nothing but giving thanks? So says Beza<sup>2</sup> in express words.

3. We go forward, and prove the contrary yet more manifestly, in the very matter of the Blessed Sacrament, for the which they multiply all the foresaid absurdities. We tell them that St. Paul says this, "The chalice of blessing, which we bless," (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας κατασκευάζομεν) is it not etc. how could he speak more plainly, that the chalice or cup (meaning that in the cup) is blessed? Which St. Cyprian *de Can. Do.* explicates thus, *Calix solemnī benedictione sacratu* (εὐλογοῦντες κατασκευάζομεν), "The Chalice consecrated by solemn blessing". Oecumenius thus, "The Chalice which blessing, we prepare." That is, which we bless and so prepare. For so it must signify, and not as Beza would have it, "which with thanksgiving we prepare", and that I prove by his own words<sup>3</sup> immediately before, where he says that the Greek word being used of the Apostle transitively, that is, with a case following, cannot signify giving thanks. How then can it so signify in Oecumenius' words, who does

---

<sup>1</sup> Annot. in 9. Luc. v. 16.

<sup>2</sup> Beza, in loco citato.

<sup>3</sup> Annot. in 1 Cor. 10:16.

interpret the Apostle's meaning by the Apostle's own words and phrase? Yea (that you may note a notorious contradiction) how does Beza then in the place of Luke before alleged (where the same Greek word, εὐλόγησεν ἄρτον, is a plain transitive as in this place) expound it of giving thanks for the bread and fishes? A liar (they say) must be mindful, to make his tale agree in every point. He that before forced the word in every sentence to be nothing else but thanksgiving, even when it was a plain transitive, now confesses that he never read it in that signification, when it is a transitive. And so we have that the blessing of the cup or of the bread, is not giving thanks as they either translate it, or interpret it.

4. And surely in the word εὐλογεῖν this is most evident, that it signifies in this case the blessing and consecration of the creature or element: insomuch that St. Basil and St. Chrysostom in their Liturgies or Masses, say thus by the same Greek word: "Bless O Lord the sacred bread" (εὐλόγησον ἄρτον), and, "Bless O Lord the sacred cup" (εὐλόγησον ποτήριον). And why or to what effect? It follows, "changing it (μεταβαλεῖν) by the Holy Spirit". Where is signified the transmutation and consecration thereof into the body and blood. But in the other word εὐχαριστεῖν there may be some question, because it signifies properly to give thanks, and therefore may seem to be referred to God only, and not to the element and creature. But this also we find contrary in the Greek fathers, who use this word also transitively, saying, *panem et calicem eucharistisatos*, (εὐχαριστήσας τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον), or, *panem in quo gratiae actae sunt*. That is, "the bread and the cup made the Eucharist: the bread over which thanks are given": that is, "which by the word of prayer and thanksgiving is made a consecrated meat, the flesh and blood of Christ," as St. Justin *in fine 2 Apolgo.* and St. Irenaeus *li. 4. 34.* in the same places expound it. Whereas it may also signify that, for which thanks are given in that most solemn sacrifice of the Eucharist, as St. Denys in one place seems to take it (εὐχαριστήσας τὸν δῶρον).<sup>4</sup> Who in the selfsame chapter speaks of the consecration thereof most evidently.

5. Whereby we have to note that the Heretics in urging the word "Eucharist", as mere thanksgiving, thereby to take away blessing and consecration of the elements of bread and wine, do unlearnedly and deceitfully. Because all the fathers make mention of both: St. Paul also calls it, blessing of the chalice, which the Evangelists call, giving of thanks. Whose words Theophylacte explicates thus, "*The chalice of blessing*, that is, of the Eucharist". For holding it in our hands, we bless it, and give thanks to him that shed his blood for us. See here both blessing, and Eucharist, blessing the chalice, and thanksgiving to Christ. St. James and the Greek fathers in their Liturgies,<sup>5</sup> put both words in the consecration of each element, saying thus, "giving thanks", "sanctifying", "breaking": and, "giving thanks," "blessing", "sanctifying": and, "taking the cup", "giving thanks", "sanctifying", "blessing", "filling it with the holy Ghost, he gave it to us his Disciples." (εὐχαριστήσας, εὐλογήσας, ἐλάσας) St. Chrysostom who in many places of his works<sup>6</sup> speaks much of thanksgiving in these holy mysteries, does he not as often speak of the blessing, consecration, yea and the transmutation thereof, and that with what words, and by what power is it done? Does not St. Augustine say of the same,<sup>7</sup> *benedicitur & sanctificatur*, "it is blessed and sanctified", who often speaks of the solemn giving of thanks in the Sacrifice of the Church?<sup>8</sup> Does not the Church at this day use the very same terms, as in St. Augustine's time, *Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro*, "Let us give thanks to the Lord our God", and *Vere dignum & iustum est, semper & ubique tibi gratias agere &c.* "It is very meet and right, always and in all places to give thee thanks": Which the Greek Church also in their Liturgies express most

<sup>4</sup> Eccl. Hier. c. 3. in fine.

<sup>5</sup> Liturg. St. Jac. Basil. Chrys.

<sup>6</sup> Hom. 2. in Tim. 2; Hom. 83 in Mat., Ho. de Juda proditore.

<sup>7</sup> Aug. ep. 50.

<sup>8</sup> De bono viduit c. 16.

abundantly? Yet does there follow blessing and consecration, and whatsoever St. Ambrose describes to be done in this holy sacrifice, touching this point, writing thereof most excellently in his book *De iis qui initiantur mysteriis*, c. 9.

6. Of all which, this is the conclusion, that the Eucharist is a solemn name, taken from the word  $\square\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\square\nu$ , so called, because this Sacrament and sacrifice is blessed and consecrated with prayer and thanksgiving, as St. Justin speaks, and because in this sacrifice so blessed and consecrated into the body and blood of Christ, him we offer up a most acceptable oblation of thanksgiving, and a memory of all God's marvelous benefits toward us. In this sense the fathers and the holy Church speak of the Eucharist, including all the rest, to wit Sacrament, sacrifice, blessing, and consecration, without which this were no more to be called Eucharist, than any other common giving of thanks, as St. Irenaeus does plainly signify, when he declares,<sup>9</sup> "that being before bread, and receiving the invocation of God over it, now is no more common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the earthly, and the heavenly." So that it is made the Eucharist by circumstance of solemn words and ceremonies, and therefore is not a mere giving of thanks: and further we learn, that St. Justin's and St. Irenaeus' words before alleged, *Panis et calix Eucharistisatus*, signify, "the bread and chalice made the Eucharist": and consequently we learn that the active thereof, is, by thanksgiving to make the Eucharist. And because the other word of blessing and this of thanksgiving are used indifferently one for another in Christ's action about this Sacrament, we learn undoubtedly, that when it is said,  $\square\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ , or,  $\square\upsilon\chi\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$ , the meaning is, blessing, and giving thanks, he made the Eucharist of his body and blood, that is the Sacrament and Sacrifice of a singular thanksgiving, which (as St. Augustine often is wont to say) the faithful only do know and understand in the sacrifice of the Church: and because the faithful only understand, therefore the Protestants and Calvinists are so ignorant in this mystery, that to take away all the dignity thereof they bend both their expositions and translations.

7. After they have turned blessing or consecration into bare thanksgiving, which is one step toward the denying of the Real Presence, they come nearer, and so include Christ in heaven, that he cannot be withal upon the altar, translating thus: "Whom heaven must contain, until the times that all things be restored." ( $\square\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \square\ \square\upsilon\rho\alpha\nu\square\nu\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\theta\alpha\iota$ , Act. 3:21), and yet Beza worse, and he that alleges him, Mr. Whitakers:<sup>10</sup> "who must be contained in heaven", which is so far from the Greek, that not only Illyricus the Lutheran, but Calvin himself does not like it. Beza protests that he so translates on purpose to keep Christ's presence from the altar: and we marvel the less, because we are well acquainted with many the like his impudent Protestations. Mr. Whitakers only we do marvel at, that he should be either so deceived by another man's translation, or himself be so overseen in the Greek word ( $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\theta\alpha\iota$ ), that he knows not a mere deponent and only deponent, from a passive.

8. This does not become him that objects<sup>11</sup> ignorance of the Greek to another man, and that after he had well tried by public conference, that he was not ignorant: and so objects it as though he knew not three words in that tongue, whereas he had heard him read and interpret St. Basil, not the easiest of the Greek Doctors. This is palpable impudence and a face that cannot blush, and full of malice against the saints of God, who if they know not a word in the Greek tongue, were never the worse, nor the less learned, but among fools and children, that esteem learning by such trifles, which Grammarians know far better than great Divines. For were not he a wise man that would prefer one Master Humfrey, Master Fulke, Master

---

<sup>9</sup> Li. 4. c. 34.

<sup>10</sup> ad rat. camp. pag. 43.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid. pa. 84

Whitakers, or some of us poor men, because we have a little smack in the three tongues, before St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, St. Augustine, St. Gregory, or St. Thomas, that understood well, none but one? Howbeit if they esteem learning by knowledge of the tongues, they will not (I trow) compare with Catholics, either of former time, nor of these later ages, especially since their new Gospel began: and if they will compare with us herein for their simple credit, we may perhaps give them occasion ere it be long, to muster their men all at once, if they dare show their face before our camp of excellent Hebricians, Grecians, Latinists, of absolute linguists in the Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, etc. whom they must needs confess to have been, and to be even at this day, their Masters and teachers.

9. But to return to you Mr. Whitakers, greater is your fault in divinity, than in the tongues, when you make your argument against the Real Presence out of this place, as out of the Scripture and St. Peter, whereas they are Beza's words, and not St. Peter's. Again, whether you take Beza's words, or St. Peters, your argument fails very much, when you conclude that Christ's natural body is not in the Sacrament, because it is placed and contained in heaven. For St. Chrysostom tells you,<sup>12</sup> that "Christ ascending into heaven, both left us his flesh, and yet ascending hath the same." and again, "O miracle," says he, "he that sitteth above with the Father, in the same moment of time is handled with the hands of all." This is the faith of the ancient fathers, Mr. Whitakers, and this is the Catholic faith, and this is (I trow) another manner of faith and far greater, thus to believe the presence of Christ in both places at once, because he is omnipotent and has said the word: then your faith (whereof you boast so much) which believes no further than that he is ascended, and that therefore he cannot be present upon the altar, nor dispose of his body as he list.

10. Again it is a very famous place for the Real Presence of the blood (which we have handled at large elsewhere,<sup>13</sup> but here also must be briefly touched) when our Saviour says, "This is the Chalice, the new Testament in my blood, which [Chalice] is shed for you." (Luc. 22; τὸ ποτήριον τὸ κληνόμενον) For so (which) must needs be referred according to the Greek. In which speech, Chalice must needs be taken for that in the chalice, and that in the chalice must needs be the blood of Christ, and not wine, because his blood only was shed for us. And so we do plainly prove the Real Presence, according as St. Chrysostom also said,<sup>14</sup> *Hoc quod est in calice, illud est quod fluxit de latere.* "That which is in the Chalice, is the same that gushed out of his side." All which most necessary deduction Beza would defeat, by saying the Greek is corrupted in all the copies that are extant in the world, and by translating thus clean otherwise than the Greek will bear, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which [blood] is shed for you." (ὃν τὸ μὲν ἵματι τὸ κληνόμενον)

11. But what pertains this to the English Heretics, who translate "which is shed", so indifferently that it may signify, "which cup", or "which blood" is shed? Thus far it pertains, because they do not only defend this translation by all means,<sup>15</sup> but they tell us plainly, namely Fulke,<sup>16</sup> that they refer (which) to the word "blood", and not to the word "cup", even as Beza does, asking us what Grammarian would refer it otherwise in which question he shows himself a very simple Grammarian in the Greek, or a mad heretic, that either knows not, or will not know, that in the Greek it cannot be so referred, and consequently neither in Latin nor English,

---

<sup>12</sup> Ho. 2 ad po. Antioch.

<sup>13</sup> Chap. 1 no. 38.

<sup>14</sup> in 1 Cor. ca. 10 ho. 24.

<sup>15</sup> Ad rat. Camp. pag. 34.

<sup>16</sup> Against D. Sand. Rocke page. 309.

which in true translation must follow the Greek. But of these and other their foul and manifold shifts to avoid this place, I have spoken in another place of this book.<sup>17</sup>

12. Only Mr. Whitakers<sup>18</sup> (to say truly) has brought somewhat to the purpose, to wit, that St. Basil reads the Greek as they translate. But he does well to make light of it, because it is evident that St. Basil cited not the text of the Evangelist, but the sense, which Beza notes to be the custom of the ancient fathers,<sup>19</sup> telling us withal that therefore the reading of the fathers, is no certain rule to reform or alter the words of Scripture according to the same: and it is very like that if Beza or Fulke his advocate had thought St. Basil's reading of any importance, they would have used it long since, rather than so many other shifts and so absurd, as they do: unless we may think they knew it not, and therefore could not use it. But for St. Basil, according to the sense he cites it very truly: for, whether we say, "the Cup that is shed", or, "the blood that is shed", both signify the blood of Christ shed for us, as St. Basil cites it. The difference is, that referring it to the cup, as St. Luke has it, it signifies the blood both present in the cup, and also then shed in a Sacrament at the Last Supper: but referring it to the word "blood", as St. Basil does, and as they translate, it may signify the blood shed on the cross also, yea (as these translators mean and would have it) *only* that on the Cross, not considering that the Greek word is the present tense, and therefore rather signifies the present shedding of his blood then in mystical sacrifice, than the other visible shedding thereof, which was to come in the future tense. Lastly, they translate St. Luke's Gospel, and not St. Basil: and therefore not following St. Luke, they are false translators, howsoever St. Basil reads.

13. As this falsehood is both against Sacrament and Sacrifice, so against the Sacrifice also of the altar it is, that they control St. Jerome's translation in the Old Testament concerning the sacrifice of Melchizedek, "Who brought forth bread and wine (Gen. 14:18): that is, offered or sacrificed bread and wine: which we prove to be the true sense and interpretation (and that this bringing forth of bread and wine, was sacrificing thereof) not only by all the fathers' expositions that write of Melchizedek's priesthood,<sup>20</sup> and by the Hebrew word (אֵיזִיק; Jud. 6:18): and by the greatest Rabbis and Hebricians that write thereof, but we prove it also by these words of the very text itself, "He brought forth bread and wine, for he was the Priest of God most high." Which reason immediately following, "Because he was God's Priest", proves evidently that he brought it not forth in common manner as any other man might have done, but as God's Priest, whose office is to offer sacrifice. This consequence is so plain, that for avoiding thereof, the Adversaries will not have it translated in any wise, "For he was the Priest" (□□ δ□ □ερ□υς; והוא כהן), as though the Scripture gave a reason why he brought forth bread and wine: but, "and he was a Priest, etc.", wrangling about the signification of the Hebrew conjunction.

14. Wherein the reader may see their exceeding partiality and willfulness. For, besides infinite like places of Scripture, whereby we do easily show that this Hebrew particle is used to give a reason or cause of a thing, themselves also in another place prove it<sup>21</sup> for us, and that by the authority of Theophylacte, and allegation of examples out of the Scripture, and translate accordingly thus:<sup>22</sup> "Blessed art thou among women, because the fruit of thy womb is blessed." (*benedicta tu etc., et benedictus etc.*; κα□ □υλογημένος). Let them give us a reason, why the said Conjunction is here by their translation, *quia*, or, *enim*, where it was never so translated before,

---

<sup>17</sup> Chap. 1. no. 37, 38, etc.

<sup>18</sup> Pag. 35.

<sup>19</sup> Praef. in no. Test. an. 1556.

<sup>20</sup> Cypr. epist. 63, Epiph. haer. 55 & 79, Jero. in Mat. 26 & in epist. ad Evagrium.

<sup>21</sup> Beza annot. in 1 Luc. v. 42.

<sup>22</sup> No. Test. an. 1580.

and it must not be in any case in the other place of Genesis, where it has been so translated and generally received even in the primitive Church. In other places of Scripture also which Theophylacte alleges, and many more may be alleged, they confess and like very well it should so signify: only in the place of Genesis (14:18), they cannot abide any such sense or translation thereof: but, “He brought forth bread and wine, and he was the Priest, etc.” not, “*because* he was the Priest”. What is the cause of this their dealing? None other undoubtedly (and in all these cases I knock at their consciences) but that here they would avoid the necessary sequel of Melchizedek’s sacrifice, upon such translation, which typical sacrifice of bread and wine if it should be granted, then would follow also a sacrifice of the New Testament, made of bread and wine answering to the same, and so we should have the sacrifice of the altar, and their bare communion should be excluded.

15. For which purpose also their partial translation about, “altar”, and “table”, is notorious. For, the name of altar (as they know very well) both in the Hebrew (אֲבִיבָה) and Greek (θυσιαστήριον), and by the custom of all peoples both Jews and Pagans, implying and importing sacrifice, therefore we in respect of the sacrifice of Christ’s body and blood, say, “altar”, rather than, “table”, as all the ancient fathers<sup>23</sup> are wont to speak and write (namely when St. Jerome calls the bodies or bones of SS. Peter and Paul the altars of Christ, because of this sacrifice offered over and upon the same), though in respect of eating and drinking the body and blood, it is also called a table: so that with us it is both an altar and a table, whether it be of wood or of stone. But the Protestants, because they make it only a communion of bread and wine, or a supper, and no sacrifice, therefore they call it “table” only, and abhor from the word, “altar”, as Papistical. For the which purpose, in their first 1562 translation, when altars were then in digging down throughout England, they translated with no less malice, then they threw them down, putting the word, “temple”, instead of “altar”: which is so gross a corruption, that a man would have thought it had been done by oversight, and not on purpose, if they had not done it thrice immediately within two chapters, saying: “Know you not that they which wait of the *temple*, are partakers of the *temple*?” (1 Cor. 9) and, “Are not they which eat of the sacrifice, partakers of the *temple*?” (1 Cor. 10), in all which places the Apostle’s word in Greek is “altar” (θυσιαστήριον; 1 Cor. 9:13), and not “temple”. And see here their notorious peevishness, where the Apostle says “temple” (ἐρα), there the same translation says “sacrifice”: where the Apostle says, “altar”, there it says, “temple”.

16. Thus we see how they suppress the name of altar, where it should be: now let us see how they put it in their translation, where it should not be. This also they do thrice in one chapter, and that for to save the honour of their communion table. Namely in the story of Baal (Dan. 14 v. 12,17,20), where we have it thrice called the “table” of that idol, under which Baal’s priests “had made a privy entrance” and, “that the king looked upon the table”, and, “that they did eat up such things as were upon the table”: these wicked translators fearing lest the name of Baal’s table might redound to the dishonour of their Communion table, translate it “altar”, in all these places (1562, 1577). Wherein I cannot but pity their folly, and wonder exceedingly how they could imagine in any disgrace either for table or altar, if the Idols also had their tables and altars, whereas St. Paul so plainly names both together, “The table of our Lord, and the table of Devils.” (1 Cor. 10:21). If the table of Devils, why not the table of Baal? If that be no disgrace to the table of our Lord, why are you afraid of Baal’s table, lest it should disgrace yours? Or if you

---

<sup>23</sup> Chrys. ho. 53 and po. Antioch. and ho. 20 in 2 Cor. and in Demost. & Christus sit Deus, to. 5. Nazianz. de Gorgonta forore. Basil in Liturg. Socrat. li. 1. Hist. c. 20 & 25. Theodoret. hist. li. 4 c. 20. Theophyl. in 23 Mat. Cypr. epist. 63. Optat. cont. Parm. Aug. ep. 86. & li. 9. Confess. c. 11 & 13. & alibi saepe.



had no such fear, then you must tell us some other good reason of your unreasonable translation in this place, why you translate “altar” for “table”, that is, chalk for cheese.

17. And here by the way the Reader may note another exceeding folly in them, that think the name of table, makes against altar and sacrifice, their own translation here condemning them, where they call Baal’s table, an altar. And St. Paul, having said to the Corinthians, “the table of our Lord”, says to the Hebrews<sup>24</sup> of the selfsame, “we have an altar”. And again he says, “the table of Devils”, which I am sure they will not deny to have been a true altar of Idololatrical sacrifice. And Mal. 1:7 in one sentence it is called both altar and table, whereupon the Jews offered their external and true sacrifices. And all the fathers both Greek and Latin speaking of the sacrifice of the New Testament, call that whereupon it is offered, both altar and table: but the Greeks more often “table”, the Latin fathers more often “altar”: and why or in what respects it is called both this and that, we have before declared, and here might add the very same out of St. Germanus Arch. B. of Constantinople, in his Greek commentaries (called *mystica theoria*) upon the Liturgies or Masses of the Greek fathers. But to proceed.

18. There are also some places less evident, yet such as smatch of the like heretical humor against the Blessed Sacrament. In the Prophet Jeremy 11:19 we read thus according to the Latin and the Greek, “Let us cast wood upon his bread” (*lignum in panem eius*; ξύλον ἐπὶ τῷ ἄρτι), that is, says St. Jerome (in comment. huius loci) “the cross upon the body of our Saviour. For it is he that said, I am the bread that descended from heaven.” Where the Prophet so long before saying, “bread”, and meaning his body, alludes prophetically to his body in the Blessed Sacrament made of bread and under the form of bread, and therefore also called bread of the Apostle. So that both in the Prophet and the Apostle (1 Cor. 10), his bread and his body is all one. And lest we should think that the bread only signifies his body, he says, “let us put the Cross upon his bread”, that is, upon his very natural body which hung on the cross. Now for these words of the Prophet so usual and well known in the Church and all antiquity, how think you do these new Masters translate? In one bible thus, “Let us destroy the tree with the fruit thereof.” Another, “we will destroy his meat with wood.” or as they should have said rather, “the wood with his meat.” Do you see how properly they agree, whiles they seek novelties, and forsake the ancient usual translation?

19. They will say, the first Hebrew word cannot be as St. Jerome translates, and as it is in the Greek, and as all antiquity reads: but it must signify, “Let us destroy”. They say truly, according to the Hebrew word which now is. But is it not evident thereby, that the Hebrew word (הַרְחִיקוּ) now is not the same which the Septuagint translated into Greek (ἐμβάλωμεν), and St. Jerome into Latin (*mittamus*)? And consequently the Hebrew is altered and corrupted from the original copy which they had: perhaps by the Jews (as some other places, like Ps. 21) to obscure this prophecy also of Christ’s Passion, and their crucifying of him upon the Cross. Such Jewish Rabbis and new Hebrew words do our new masters gladly follow in the translation of the Old Testament, whereas they might easily conceive the old Hebrew word in this place, if they would employ their skill that way, and not only to novelties. For who sees not that the Greek Interpreters in number 70, and all Hebrews of best skill in their own tongue, St. Jerome also a great Hebrician did not read as now we have in the Hebrew, *Nashchitha* (*destruamus*), but, *Nashitha* (*ponamus*), or *Nashlichah* (*mittamus*)? Again the Hebrew word that now is, does so little agree with the words following, that they cannot tell how to translate it, as appears by the diversity and difference of their translations thereof before mentioned, and transposing the words in English otherwise than in the Hebrew, neither of both their translations having any commodious sense or understanding.

---

<sup>24</sup> Haimo. Oecumen.

20. But yet they will pretend that for the first word at the least, they are not to be blamed, because they follow the Hebrew that now is, not considering that if this were a good excuse, then might they as well follow the Hebrew that now is in Ps. 21:18: and so utterly suppress and take out of the Scripture this notable prophecy, “They pierced my hands and my feet”: Which yet they do not, neither can they do it for shame, if they will be counted Christians. So that indeed, to follow the Hebrew sometimes where it is corrupt, is no sufficient excuse for them, though it may have a pretence of true translation, and we promised in the preface, in such cases not to call it heretical translation.

21. But concerning the Blessed Sacrament, let us see once more how truly they follow the Hebrew. “The holy Ghost,” says St. Cyprian ep. 63 no. 2, “by Solomon foreshows a type of our Lord’s sacrifice, of the immolated host of bread and wine, saying, Wisdom hath killed her hosts, *she hath mingled her wine into the cup*. Come ye, eat of my bread, and drink the wine that *I have mingled* for you. Speaking of *wine mingled* (says this holy doctor) he foreshows prophetically the cup of our Lord, *mingled with water and wine*.” So does St. Jerome interpret this mixture or mingling of the wine in the chalice, so does the author of the commentaries upon this place<sup>25</sup> among St. Jerome’s works, so do the other fathers. So that there is great importance in these prophetic words of Solomon. “She hath mingled her wine into the cup,” and, “the wine which I have mingled,” as being a manifest prophecy of Christ’s mingling water and wine in the Chalice at his last supper, which the Catholic Church observes at this day, and whereof St. Cyprian writes the foresaid long epistle.

22. But the Protestants counting it an idle superstitious ceremony, here also frame their translation accordingly, suppressing altogether this mixture or mingling, and instead thereof saying, “She hath drawn her wine,” (1579) and, “drink the wine that I have drawn”: or (as in other of their bibles) “She hath poured out her wine,” (1577) and, “the wine which I have poured out”: neither translation agreeing either with Greek (κέρασεν, κεκέρακα) or Hebrew. Not with the Greek, which does evidently signify, mingling and mixture, as it is in the Latin (*miscuit, miscui*), and as all the Greek Church from the Apostles’ time has used this word in this very case whereof we now speak, of mingling water and wine in the chalice (λαβὼν τὸ ποτήριον; κέρασας). St. James and St. Basil in their Liturgies expressly testifying that Christ did so, as also St. Cyprian in the place alleged. St. Justin in the end of his second apology, calling it of the same Greek word, κρῶμα, that is (according to Plutarch) wine mingled with water (*mixtus calix*): likewise St. Irenaeus in his fifth book near the beginning. See the Sixth General Council<sup>26</sup> most fully treating hereof and deducing it from the Apostles and ancient fathers, and interpreting this Greek word (μῆγναι) by another equivalent, and more plain to signify this mixture.

23. Thus then the Greek is neither drawing of wine, nor pouring out thereof, as they translate, but mingling. But the Hebrew perhaps signifies both, or at the least one of the two, either to draw, or to pour out. Gentle reader, if thou have skill, look the Hebrew Lexicon of Pagnine esteemed the best: if thou have not skill, ask, and thou shalt understand that there is no such signification of this word (תִּשְׁקֶה) in all the bible, but that it signifies only mixture and mingling. A strange case, that to avoid this mingling of the cup, being a most certain tradition of the Apostles, they have invented two other significations of this Hebrew word, which it never had before.

---

<sup>25</sup> See St. Augustine de Civit. Dei li. 17 c. 20.

<sup>26</sup> Conc. Constantinop. 6. can. 32.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

*Heretical translation against the honour of SAINTS, namely of our BLESSED LADY.*

Let us pass from God's holy Sacraments to his honorable Saints in heaven, and we shall find that these translations pluck from them also as much honour as they may. In the Psalm 138 where the Catholic Church and all antiquity reads thus, *Nimis honorati sunt amici tui Deus etc.* "Thy friends O God are become exceeding honorable, their principedom is exceedingly strengthened": which verse is sung and said in the honour of the holy Apostles, agreeably to that in another Psalm (44), *Constitues eos principes super omnem terram*, "Thou shalt appoint them Princes over all the earth": what mean they in all their English Bibles to alter it thus: "How dear are thy councils (or thoughts) to me O God: O how great is the sum of them?" Does not the Hebrew (רַעְיִךְ) make more for the old received Latin translation, than for theirs, because the Hebrew word is used more commonly for to signify friends than cogitations? Does not St. Jerome so translate in his translation of the Psalms according to the Hebrew? Does not the great Rabbi R. Solomon? Does not the Greek (οἱ φίλοι σου) put it out of doubt, which is altogether according to the said ancient Latin translation?

2. And you my Masters that translate otherwise, I beseech you, is it in Hebrew (עֲצֻמַת רֵאשִׁיתֵיהֶם), "How great is the sum of them" and not rather word for word most plainly, "how are the heads of them strengthened", or "their principedoms", as in the Greek also (οἱ ἄρχαὶ οὐτῶν) it is most manifest? Why do you then hunt after novelties, and forsake the trodden path of the ancient, and pass the bounds which our holy forefathers have set and appointed, preferring your own singularities and new devises even there where you cannot justly pretend either the Hebrew or Greek? When the Hebrew Lexicon<sup>1</sup> has given the common interpretation of this place (רַעְיִךְ), and then says, *Quidam exponent*, Some expound it otherwise: why had you rather be of that lesser, "some that expound otherwise", than of the great society of all ancient interpreters?

3. But this newfangled singularity of teaching and translating otherwise than all antiquity has done, shall better appear in their dealing about our Blessed Lady, whose honour they have sought so many ways to diminish and deface, that the defense and maintenance thereof against the Heretics of our time is grown to a great book learnedly written by the great Clerk and Jesuit, Father Canisius, entitled, *Mariana*.

4. Concerning our purpose, what was ever more common, and is now more general and usual in all Christian Countries, than in the *Ave Maria* to say, *Gratia plena*, "full of grace", insomuch that in the first English Bible it has continued so still, and every child in our Country was taught so to say, till the *Ave Maria* was banished altogether and not suffered to be said neither in Latin nor English? What ancient father of the Latin Church has not always so read and expounded? What Church in all the West has not ever so sung and said? Only our new Translators have found a new kind of speech, translating thus: "Hail thou that art freely beloved" (1579) and, "Hail thou that art in high favour" (1577). Why this, and that, or any other thing, rather than, "Hail full of grace" (Luc. 1:15)? St. John the Baptist was full of the Holy Ghost even from his birth (Act. 7:8), St. Steven was full of grace, as the Scripture records of them both: why may not then our Lady much more be called full of grace, who (as St. Ambrose says)<sup>2</sup> "only obtained the grace, which no other women deserved, to be replenished with the author of grace"?

<sup>1</sup> Epito. Thesau. Pagn. an. 1570. in radice.

<sup>2</sup> Ambr. li. 2 in 1 Luc.

5. They will say, the Greek word does not so signify. Does it not? I make themselves witnesses of the contrary, and their own translation in other places shall confute them, where they translate another word of the selfsame nature and form and in all respects like to this, “full of sores” (Luc. 16:20). If ἄλκωμένος be full of sores, why is not κεχαριτωμένη full of grace? Let any Grecian of them all make me a difference in the nature and significance of these two words. Again if *ulcerosus* (as Beza translates) be full of sores, why is not *gratiosa* (as Erasmus translates) “full of grace”? Or why does Beza marvel that Erasmus translated, *gratiosa*, when himself translates the like word, *ulcerosus*. All which adjectives in *-osus* (you know) signify fullness, as, *periculosus*, *aerumnosus*. Yet what a stir does Beza keep here in his Annotations to make the Greek word signify, “freely beloved”?

6. But has it indeed any such signification? Tell us you that profess this great skill of the tongues, what syllable is there in this word (χαριτωσαι) that sounds to that signification? St. Chrysostom and the Greek Doctors that should best know the nature of this Greek word, say that it signifies,<sup>3</sup> to make gracious, and acceptable, and beloved, and beautiful, and amiable, and so to be desired as when the Psalm says, “The king shall desire thy beauty” (Psal. 44). Beza himself says, that it is word for word, *gratificata*, “made grateful”, and yet he expounds it, “accepted before God”, and translates it, “freely beloved”, because he will have no singular grace or goodness or virtue resident in our Blessed Lady, but all by imputation and acceptation, whereof I have spoken before. St. Athanasius a Greek Doctor says<sup>4</sup> that she had this title κεχαριτωμένη, because the Holy Ghost descended into the Virgin, filling her with all graces and virtues. And I beseech the reader to see his words, which are many more concerning this fullness of grace and all spiritual gifts. St. Jerome that knew the Greek word as well as the Protestants, reads, *Gratia plena*, and finds<sup>5</sup> no fault with this interpretation. But says plainly she was so saluted, “full of grace”, because she conceived him in whom all fullness of the deity dwelt corporally.

7. Now let the English Bezites come with their new term, “freely beloved”, and control these and all other ancient fathers both Greek and Latin, and teach them a new signification of the Greek word, which they knew not before. Let John Keltridge<sup>6</sup> one of their great preachers in London, come and tell us, “that the Septuagint and the best translations in Greek have no such words as we use in the *Ave Maria*,” but that the word which the Septuagint use, is κεχαριτωμένη etc. Who ever heard such a jest, that the preacher of the word of God in London (so he is called in the title of his book) and preacher before the “Jesuits and Seminaries in the tower”,<sup>7</sup> which is next degree to the disputers there, whose sermons be solemnly printed, and dedicated to one of the Queen’s Council, who seems to be such a Grecian that he confutes the Vulgar Latin translation by the signification of the Greek word, and in other places of his book alleges the Greek text:<sup>8</sup> that this man for all this, refers us to the Septuagint either as authors of St. Luke’s Gospel which is too ridiculous: or as translators thereof, as though St. Luke had written in Hebrew, yea as though the whole New Testament had been written in Hebrew (for so no doubt he presupposed) and that the Septuagint had translated it into Greek as they did the Old, who were dead three hundred years before St. Luke’s Gospel and the New Testament was written.

---

<sup>3</sup> Comment. in Eph. 1.

<sup>4</sup> St. Athan. de S. Deip.

<sup>5</sup> Ep. 140 in expos. Psal. 44.

<sup>6</sup> John Keltridge “preacher of the word” in London. In his sermons within the tower, printed. fo. 14.

<sup>7</sup> So he called the Priests of the Seminary, as if one would call a monk a “monastery” or a nun a “nunnery”.

<sup>8</sup> Pag. 37. of the 2 part.

8. All this is such a pitiful jest, as were incredible, if his printed book did not give testimony. Pitiful I say, because the simple people count such their preachers jolly fellows and great Clerks, because they can talk of the Greek and of the Hebrew text, as this man does also concerning the Hebrew letter Taw,<sup>9</sup> whether it had in old time the form of a cross or no, even as wisely and as skillfully, as he did before of the Septuagint and the Greek word in St. Luke's Gospel. Whose incredible folly and ignorance in the tongues perhaps I would never have mentioned (because I think the rest are sorry and ashamed of him) but that he boasts of that whereof he has no skill, and that the people may take him for a very pattern and example of many other like boasters and braggers among them, and that when they hear one talk lustily of the Hebrew and Greek, and cite the text in the said tongues, they may always remember John Keltridge their preacher, and say to themselves, what if this fellow also be like John Keltridge?

9. But to proceed: these great Grecians and Hebricians that control all antiquity and the approved ancient Latin translation by scanning the Greek and Hebrew words, that think it a great corruption to read, *Ipsa conteret caput tuum*, "she shall bruise thy head" (Gen. 3), because it pertains to our Lady's honour, calling it a corruption of the Popish Church,<sup>10</sup> whereas St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Gregory, St. Bernard, and the rest read so, as being the common received text in their time (though there has been also always the other reading even in the Vulgar Latin translation, and therefore it is not any late reformation of these new correctors, as though the Hebrew and greek text before had been unknown) these controllers I say of the Latin text by the Hebrew, against our Lady's honour, are in another place content to dissemble the Hebrew word, and that also for small devotion to the Blessed Virgin: namely Jerem. 7 and 44. where the Prophet inveighs against them that offer sacrifice to the "Queen of heaven". This they think is very well, because it may sound in the people's ears against the use of the Catholic Church, which calls our Lady, "Queen of heaven". But they know very well that the Hebrew word does not signify "Queen" in any other place of the Scripture, and that the Rabbis and later Hebricians (whom they gladly follow) deduce it otherwise, to signify rather the whole corpus and frame of heaven, consisting of all the beautiful stars and planets, and the Septuagint call it not only βασιλισσαν (ἡλιη), "Queen", but τὸν στρατιῶν (ἡλιη), "the host of heaven", Jerem. 7:<sup>11</sup> and St. Jerome not only *reginam*, but rather *militiam coeli*: and when he names it *reginam*, "Queen", he says we must understand it of the moon, to which and to the other stars they did sacrifice and commit idolatry. But the Protestants (against their custom of scanning the Hebrew and the Greek) translate here, "Queen of heaven", for no other cause in the world, but to make it sound against her, whom Catholics truly call and worthily honour as Queen of heaven, because her son is king, and she exalted above Angels and all other creatures.<sup>12</sup>

10. Again, why does the Geneva New Testament (1580) make St. Matthew to say, that "He [Joseph] called his name Jesus" (Mat. 1:25)? Why not she, as well as he? For in St. Luke the Angel says to our Lady also, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus" (Luc. 1:31). St. Matthew then speaking indifferently, and not limiting it to him or her, why do they give this preeminence to Joseph rather than to the Blessed Virgin? And not both Zachary and also Elizabeth his wife by revelation give the name of John to John the Baptist (Luc. 1:60,63)? Yea did not Elizabeth the mother first so name him, before Zachary her husband? Much more may we think that the Blessed Virgin the natural mother of our Saviour, gave him the name of Jesus, than Joseph his putative father. Especially if we consider that the Angel revealed the name first unto her, saying, that she should so call him: and the Hebrew word (Esa. 7) whereunto the Angel alludes,

<sup>9</sup> Fol. 11 part. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Sand. Rocke discou. pag. 145.

<sup>11</sup> See Pagn. in radice.

<sup>12</sup> See the New Test. Annot. Act. 1:14.

is the feminine gender, and referred by the great Rabbis, Rabbi Abraham and Rabbi David, unto her, saying expressly in their commentaries, *Et vocabit ipsa puella*: “and the made herself shall call.” and surely the usual pointing of the Greek text (for Beza makes other points of his own) is much more for that purpose. Now if they will say that Theophylacte understands it of Joseph, true it is, and so it may be understood very well: but if it may be understood of our Lady also, and rather of her than of him, why does your translation exclude this other interpretation?

11. Where, by the way I must tell you (and elsewhere perhaps more at large) that it is your common fault to make some one doctor’s interpretation, the text of your translation, and so to exclude all the rest that expound it otherwise, which you know is such a fault in a translator as can by no means be excused. Secondly the reader may here observe and learn, that if they shall hereafter defend their translation of any place, by some doctor’s exposition agreeable thereunto, that will not serve nor suffice them, because every Doctor may say his opinion in his commentaries,<sup>13</sup> but that must not be made the text of Scripture, because other doctors expound it otherwise: and being in itself and in the original tongue ambiguous and indifferent to divers senses, it may not be restrained or limited by translation, unless there be a mere necessity, when the translation cannot possibly or hardly express the ambiguity and indifference of the original text.

12. As (for example) in this controversy concerning Saints, St. Peter (2 Pet. 1:15) speaks so ambiguously, either that he will remember them after his death, or they shall remember him, that some of the Greek fathers gathered and concluded thereupon<sup>14</sup> that the Saints in heaven remember us on earth, and make intercession for us. Which ambiguity both in the Greek and the Latin, should be also kept and expressed in the English translation, and we have endeavoured as near as we could possibly so to make it, because of the divers interpretations of the ancient fathers. But it may seem perhaps to the reader that the said ambiguity cannot be kept in our English tongue, and that our own translation also can have but one sense. If it be so, and if there be a necessity of one sense, then (as I said) the translator in that respect is excused. But let the good reader consider also, that the Calvinists in restraining the sense of this place, follow not necessity, but their heresy, that Saints pray not for us (Beza). Which is evident by this, that they restrain it in their Latin translations also, where there is no necessity at all, but it might be as ambiguous and indifferent, as in Greek, if it pleased them:<sup>15</sup> yea when they print the Greek Testament only without any translation, yet here they put the Latin in the margin, according as they will have it read, and as though it might be read no otherwise than they prescribe.

---

<sup>13</sup> See chap. 1. no. 3. 43. Cha 10. no. 1.2. chap. 19. no. 1.

<sup>14</sup> Oecum. in Caten. Gagneius in hunc locum; μέμνηται τῶν τῆδε, καὶ πρεσβεύουσιν ἵππερ τῶν ζώντων.

<sup>15</sup> No. Test. Gr. Henr. Steph. an 1576.

## CHAPTER XIX.

### *Heretical translation against the distinction of Latria and Dulia.*

In this restraining of the Scripture to the sense of some one Doctor, there is a famous example in the epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 11:21), where the Apostle says either Jacob adored the top of Joseph's scepter, as many read and expound: or else, that he adored toward the top of his scepter, as other read and interpret: and beside these there is no other interpretation of this place in all antiquity, but in St. Augustine only, as Beza confesses:<sup>1</sup> yet are they so bold to make his exposition only, and his commentary peculiar to him alone, the text of the Scripture in their translation, saying, "Jacob leaning on the end of his staff, worshipped God", and so excluding all other senses and expositions of all the other fathers, excluding and condemning their own former translations (1562, 1577), adding two words more than are in the Greek text, "leaning", "God": forcing  $\square\upsilon\tau\omicron$  to signify  $\square\upsilon\tau\omicron$ , which may be, but it is as rare, as *virgae eius*, for *virgae suae*: turning the other words clean out of their order and place and form of construction which they must needs have correspondent and answerable to the Hebrew text from whence they were translated ( $\text{לַעֲבֹדָה עַל־רֹאשׁ הַמַּטְּהֵן}$ ; –  $\text{הָרִמָּה הַזֶּה}$ ): which Hebrew words themselves translate in this order, "He worshipped toward the bed's head" (Gen. 47:31). If "he worshipped toward the bed's head", according to the Hebrew: then "did he worship toward the top of his scepter", according to the Greek ( $\text{προσεκύνησεν} \square\pi \square \tau \square \text{κρον} \tau \square \zeta \square \text{ἀβδου} \square\upsilon\tau\omicron$ ): the difference of both being only in these words, "scepter", and, "bed" (because the Hebrew is ambiguous to both) and not in the order or construction of the sentence.

2. To make it more plain, when the Prophet David says, *Adorabo ad templum sanctum tuum* (Psal. 5, 137;  $\text{πρ} \square \zeta \text{να} \square \nu$ ) is not the true translation, and grammatical sequel of the words thus: "I will adore toward thy holy temple"? Is it not a common phrase in the Scripture,<sup>2</sup> that the people of God adored toward Jerusalem, toward his holy mount, before the ark, toward the place where his feet stood? May any man be so bold, by adding and transposing to alter and obscure all such places of Holy Scripture, that there may appear no manner of adoration toward or before a creature? And for worshipping or adoring toward the things aforesaid and the like, may we say, leaning upon those things to worship or adore God? Were they afraid lest those speeches of Holy Scripture might warrant and confirm the Catholic and Christian manner of adoring our Saviour Christ toward the holy Rood, at, or before his image and the Crucifix before the altar, and so forth? For had they not feared this, why should they translate  $\square\pi$ , "leaning upon", rather than "towards", yea, why in Genesis, "towards his bed's head", and here not, "towards"?

3. And (which is more) when the ancient Greek fathers,<sup>3</sup> put so little force either in this preposition  $\square\pi$  (or the other alleged,  $\text{πρ} \square \zeta$ ,  $\square\iota\zeta$ ) that they expound all those speeches as if the prepositions were of phrase only and not of signification, saying, "Jacob adored Joseph's scepter", "the people of Israel adored the temple", "the Ark", "the holy mount", "the place where his feet stood", ( $\text{τ} \square \square \text{ἀβδ} \square \text{προσεκύνησε; το} \square \zeta \text{τόποις θεο} \square, \text{τ} \square \text{να} \square \text{προσκυνε} \square \nu$ ) and the like, whereby St. Damascene proves the adoration of creatures named *Dulia*, namely of the cross and of sacred images: if I say they make so little force of the prepositions, that they infer not only adoration towards the thing, but adoration of the thing: how do these goodly translators, of all other words so strain and wrack the little particle  $\square\pi$  to signify "leaning upon", that it shall in no wise signify any thing tending towards adoration?

<sup>1</sup> Quaest. in Gen. Bib. 1579.

<sup>2</sup>  $\square\iota\zeta \square\pi\omicron\zeta$ . Dan. 6, 3 Reg. 8. Psal 98. Jos. 7.  $\square\iota\zeta \tau \square \nu \text{τόπον}$ . Ps. 131.

<sup>3</sup> Chrys. Oecum. in Collectan. Damasc. li. 1. pro imaginibus, Leont. apud Damasc.

4. And if the Greek Doctors suffice not to satisfy these great Grecians herein, tell me you that have skill in the Hebrew, whether in the foresaid speeches cited out of the Psalms, there by any force in the Hebrew propositions? (Ps. 98, 131; לְהַר) Surely no more than if we should say in English without prepositions, “Adore ye his holy hill”, “we will adore the place where his feet stood”, “adore ye his footstool” (לְהַרְוֹם רַגְלָיו; Ps. 95, 96; לְיְהוָה): For you know that there is the same preposition also when it is said, “Adore ye our Lord”: or as yourselves translate, “worship the Lord”: where there can be no force nor signification of the preposition. And therefore in these places also your translation is corrupt and wilful, when you say thus: “We will fall down before his footstool,” “Fall ye down before his footstool”, “before his holy mount”, or “worship him upon his holy hill”: Where you shun and avoid first the term of adoration, which the Hebrew (לָשֹׁתָהּ תִּוָּחַ) and Greek (προσκυνεῖν) duly express by terms correspondent in both languages, throughout the Bible, and are applied for the most part to signify adoring of creatures. Secondly you avoid the Greek phrase, which is at the least, to adore towards these holy things and places: and much more the Hebrew phrase, which is, to adore the very things rehearsed: “to adore God’s footstool because *it* is holy” (Ps. 98), or, “because *he* is holy”, whose footstool it is, as the Greek reads.

5. This being most manifest to all that have skill in these tongues, it is evident that you regard neither Hebrew nor Greek, but only your heresy: and that in St. Paul’s place aforesaid of adoring Joseph’s scepter, you alter it by your own fancy, and not by St. Augustine’s authority, whom I am sure you will not admit reading in the Psalm, “Adore ye his footstool”: and so precisely and religiously reading thus, that he examines the case, and finds thereby that the Blessed Sacrament must be adored, and that no good Christian does take it, before he adore it. Neither will you admit him when he reads thus of David, “he was carried in his own hands”,<sup>4</sup> and interprets it mystically of Christ, that he was carried in his own hands, when he gave his body and blood to his disciples. Yet are St. Augustine’s interpretations (howsoever you like or dislike them) very good, as also that above named of Jacob’s leaning upon his staff, and adoring, may be one good sense or commentary of that place, but yet a commentary, and one Doctor’s opinion, not the sacred text of Scripture, as you would make it by so translating.

6. And if St. Jerome like not the Greek Doctor’s interpretation in this place of adoring Joseph and his scepter, yet he also says that Jacob adored toward Joseph’s rod, or towards the bed’s head, and not “leaning upon his staff he adored”, which you make the text of Scripture. And though he think that in this place it not meant any adoration of Joseph, yet I am sure, for adoration of holy things, namely Relics, the holy land, and all the holy places and monuments of Christ’s being and doing upon the earth, you will not be tried by St. Jerome. And again, why St. Paul should say, that by faith he adored, and in respect of things to come, it is not otherwise easy to understand, but that he partly foresaw the kingdom of Ephraim, in the posterity of Joseph: partly the kingdom of Christ prefigured in Joseph then Prince of Egypt, and so by faith adored his scepter or toward his scepter (which is all one) as the Greek fathers for the most part expound it. But let us hasten toward an end.

---

<sup>4</sup> Praef. in Ps. 33.



## CHAPTER XX.

### *Heretical translation by ADDING TO THE TEXT.*

Because in the last corruption I spoke of adding to the text, though it be their common and universal fault in every controversy, as is to be seen in every chapter of this book: yet here I will add certain places not yet mentioned. As, (2 Paral. 36:8 in Bib. 1562) “The rest of the acts of Jehoakim, and his abominations which he did, and *carved images that were laid to his charge, behold they are written* etc.”, these words, “carved images laid to his charge”, are more than is either in the Greek or the Hebrew.

2. Again, (Act. 9:22 in Bib. 1577) “Saul confounded the Jews proving *by conferring one Scripture with another* that this is very Christ.” These words, “by conferring one scripture with another”, are added more than is in the Greek text: in favour of their presumptuous opinion, that conference of Scriptures is enough for any man to understand them, and so to reject both the commentaries of the Doctors, and exposition of holy Councils and Catholic Church. It is so much more I say than is in the Greek text, and a notorious corruption in their Bible read daily in their churches as most authentical. See the rest of their Bibles, and thou shalt find no more for all these words, but, “affirming”, or, “confirming” (συμβιβάζων). And the selfsame Bible in 1 Cor. 2:16 translates the same Greek word thus, “Who shall instruct”? (τίς συμβιβάσει; συμβιβάσεις) And indeed that is the true and usual signification of the word, both in the Old Testament, and in the New. And Deut. 4: “Thou shalt teach them thy children”. And Esa. 40. “Who shall instruct our Lord?” The Hebrew word (נְתִיב) also in both places signifying no more but instructing and teaching. And so does the Apostle cite it to the Corinthians out of Esay, and he uses it to the Colossians (2:2) in the same signification, as the Church reads and expounds it, and so consequently St. Luke in the place whereof we now treat, says nothing else, but that St. Paul earnestly taught or instructed them that Jesus is Christ. And yet our new Translators without respect of Hebrew or Greek, have coined a new signification, of conferring one Scripture with another. So ignorant they are in the signification of Greek words, or rather so wilfully malicious.

3. Again, in 1 Pet. 1:25 of their 1562 and 1577 Bibles they translate thus: “The word of the Lord endures ever: and this is the word which by the Gospel was preached unto you.” Where these words, “by the Gospel”, are added deceitfully and of ill intent, to make the reader think that there is no other word of God but the written word, for the common reader hearing this word, “Gospel”, conceives nothing else. But indeed all is the Gospel whatsoever the Apostles taught either by writing, or by tradition and word of mouth, as St. Paul speaks 2 Thess. 2 and St. Peter says nothing else in the place alleged, but, “This is the word which is preached among you” (τὸ ἄκουσμα τὸ εὐαγγελισθῆναι), as the Geneva bibles translate, or more significantly, “which is evangelized” among you, as we translate. For though there be greater significance in the Greek word, than is expressed by bare preaching or telling a thing, as having a goodly relation and allusion to the word *Evangelium*, “Gospel”: yet neither do they in any other place, neither can they translate it, “to preach by the Gospel”: but simply, to preach, to tell, to show. As, “preaching peace by Jesus Christ” (Act. 10:36; εὐαγγελιζόμενος) so themselves translate it. And Ps. 95 (or 96:2) “Be telling of his salvation from day to day” (εὐαγγελίζεθε). Which in other places is spoken by other Greek words, that have no signification at all of Gospel (εὐαγγεῖλαι). As immediately in the said Ps. 95 (or 96:3), Ps. 104 (or 105:1), Act. 13:5, Act. 17:23, and Jo. 1:3 (παγγείλατε, κατήγγελον, καταγγέλλω παγγέλλομεν).

4. All which words signify only to tell, to show, to declare, and are used indifferently for and with the other word which they here only translate, “to preach by the Gospel”. Whereas in

all other places when they will translate it most significantly, they express it by “bringing glad tidings” (Luc. 2:10, Act. 13:32, Gal. 3:8; *Dominus dabit verbum evangelizantibus; qui evangelizas Jerusalem*; Ps. 67, Isa. 40): and in some places where it should be expressed most significantly in respect of evangelizing or preaching the Gospel, there they translate it barely, “preachers”, and “preaching”. Only St. Peter’s place aforesaid, must be stretched to signify “The word preached by the Gospel”, to insinuate and uphold their heresy of the written Gospel only, or only written word (*sola scriptura*), against Apostolical traditions not written. If this be not their meaning, let them give us a good reason why they translate it so in this one place only.

5. It is written of Luther<sup>1</sup> that he for the selfsame heresy, in his first translation into the German tongue, left out these words of St. Peter altogether, “This is the word which is evangelized or preached to you.” Why so? Because St. Peter does here define what is the word of God: saying, “that which is preached to you”, and not that only which is written. Which false dealing of Luther is no small presumption against the like heretical meaning of our English Protestants, who (I am sure) in this point of controversy of the word written and unwritten, will not deny that they agree with the Lutherans.

6. Again, in the epistle of St. James (Ja. 4:6), they add the word “Scriptre” into the text, saying, “But the Scripture offers more grace”. Where the Apostle may say as well, and indifferently, “The Spirit or Holy Ghost gives more grace”, and it is much more probable, and is so expounded of many. Let the good reader see the circumstance of the place, and abhor their sauciness in the text of Holy Scripture.

7. One addition of theirs I would not speak of, but only to know the reason why they do it, because it is very strange, and I know not what they should mean by it. This I am sure, if they do it for no purpose, they do it very foolishly and forgetfully and contrary to themselves. In the Gospel of St. Mark (Marc. 3:16), in the reckoning of the Apostles, they add these words, “And the first was Simon” (Bibl. 1579), more than is in their Greek text. Which additino they learned off Beza, whose contradictions in this point are worthy noting. In St. Matthew (Mat. 10:2) where these words are, he suspects that, “first”, was added by some Papist, for Peter’s primacy: here, where the word is not, he avouches it to be the true text of the Gospel, and that because Matthew reads so. There he alleged this reason, why it could not be said, “the first, Simon”, because there is no consequence nor coherence of second, third, fourth, etc: here he says, that is no impediment, because there be many examples of such speech, and namely in the said place of St. Matthew. There he says it is not so, though all Greek copies have it so: here it must needs be so, though it be only found in certain odd Greek copies of Erasmus, which Erasmus himself (as Beza confesses) allowed not, but thought that these words were added in them out of St. Matthew. What these contradictions mean I know not, and I would learn the reason thereof, of his scholars our English translators, who by their Master’s authority have made the selfsame addition in their English translation also.

8. There is also another addition of theirs, either proceeding of ignorance, or of the accustomed humor, when they translate thus: “If ye continue established in the faith, and be not moved away from the hope of the Gospel, which ye have heard how it was preached to every creature” (Col. 1:23): or, “whereof ye have heard how that it is preached”: or, “whereof ye have heard, and which hath been preached to every creature, etc.” For, all these varities they have, and none according to the Greek text, which is word for word, as the Vulgar Latin interpreter has most sincerely translated it, “Unmoveable from the hope of the Gospel which you have heard, which is or hath been preached among all creatures, etc.” (□□ □κούσατε, το□ κηρυχθέντος) So that the Apostle’s exhortation is unto the Colossians, that they continue

---

<sup>1</sup> Lind. Dubit. pag. 88.

grounded and stable in the faith and Gospel which they have heard and received of their first Apostles: as in the Epistle to the Romans (16), and to the Galatians (1,2), and to the Thessalonians (2 Thess. 2), and to the Hebrews (13), and to Timothy (1 Tim. 6; 2 Tim. 1,2), and St. John in his first epistle (2:24): and St. Jude (3:20): all use the like exhortations.

9. But this does not so well like the Protestants which with Hymenaeus and Alexander and other old Heretics have fallen from their first faith, and therefore they alter the Apostle's plain speech (1 Tim. 1,6) with certain words of their own, and they will not have him say, Be unmoveable in the faith and Gospel which you have heard and received: but, "whereof you have heard how that it is preached": as though he spoke not of the Gospel preached to them, but of a Gospel which they had only heard of, that was preached in the world. Certain it is, these words, "whereof you have heard how it was preached", are not so in the Greek: but, "which you have heard, which hath been preached". Which is as much to say, as that they should continue constant in the faith and Gospel which themselves had received, and which was then preached and received in the whole world. So say we to our dear countrymen, Stand fast in the faith and be unmoveable from the hope of the Gospel which you heard of your first Apostles, which was and is preached in all the world. If the Protestants like not this exhortation, they do according to their translation.

## CHAPTER XXI.

*Certain other heretical TREACHERIES and CORRUPTIONS, worthy of observation.*

They hold this position, that the Scriptures are not hard to be understood, that so every one of them may presume to interpret and expound them. And because St. Peter says plainly (2 Pet. 3), that St. Paul's Epistles are hard, and other Scriptures also, which the unlearned (says he) pervert to their own destruction, therefore they labour tooth and nail to make this subtle difference, that St. Peter says not, Paul's epistles are hard but some things in St. Paul's epistles are hard (as though that were not all one) and therefore they translate so, that it must needs be understood of these things, and not of the Epistles, pretending the Greek (□v □□ζ), which yet they know in some copies cannot be referred to the things (□v □□ζ), but must needs be understood of the Epistles.<sup>1</sup> Wherefore, the Greek copies being indifferent to both, and the thing also in very deed being all one, whether the hardness be in the Epistles or in the matter (for when we say the Scripture is hard, we mean especially the matter) it is not only a Heretical but a foolish and peevish spirit that makes them so curious and precise in their translations, as here to limit and abridge the sense to the things only, Beza translating, *inter quae sunt multa difficilia*, and not, *in quibus*, as it is in the old Vulgar translation, most sincere, and indifferent both to epistles and things.

2. Another fashion they have, which cannot proceed of good meaning, that is, when the Greek text is indifferent to two senses, and one is received, read, and expounded by the greater part of the ancient fathers, and of all the Latin Church, there to follow the other sense not so generally received and approved. As in St. James' epistle where the common reading is, *Deus intentator malorum est*, "God is no tempter to evil", they translate, "God cannot be tempted with evil", which is so impertinent to the Apostle's speech here, as nothing more. But why will they not say, God is no tempter to evil, as well as the other? Is it because of the Greek word (□πειραστος κακ□v) which is a passive? Let them see their Lexicon, and it will tell them that it is both an active and passive. So say other learned Grecians (like Gagneius), interpreters of this place. So says the very circumstance of the words next going before, "Let no man say that he is tempted of God." Why so? "Because God is not tempted with evil", say they. Is this a good reason? Nothing less. How then? "Because God is no tempter to evil", therefore let no man say that he is tempted of God.

3. This reason is so coherent and so necessary in this place, that if the Greek word were only a passive (as it is not) yet it might beseem Beza to translate it actively, who has turned the active into a passive without scrupulosity, as himself confesses, and is before noted, against the Real Presence. Much more in this place might he be bold to translate that actively, which is both an active and a passive, especially having such an example and so great authority as is all the ancient Latin Church until this day. But why would he not? Surely because he would favour his and their heresy, which says clean contrary<sup>2</sup> to these words of the Apostle, to wit, "that God is a tempter to evil" (Mat. 6:13). Is that possible to be proved? Yea it is possible and plain. Beza's words be these, *Inducit Dominus in tentationem eos quos Satanae arbitrio permittit, aut in quos potius Satanam ipsum inducit, ut cor eorum impleat, ut loquitur Petrus Act. 5:3*. That is, "The Lord leads into temptation those whom he permits to Satan's arbitrement, or into whom rather he leads or brings in Satan himself to fill their heart, as Peter speaks." Mark that he said God brings Satan into a man, to fill his heart, as Peter said to Ananias, "Why hath Satan filled thy heart, to lie unto the Holy Ghost?" So then by this man's opinion God brought Satan into

---

<sup>1</sup> Test. Gr. Crisp.

<sup>2</sup> Annot. No. Test. an. 1556, Mat. 6:13.

Ananias' heart, to make him lie unto the Holy Ghost, and so led him into temptation, being author and causer of that heinous sin.

4. Is not this to say, God is a tempter to evil: clean contrary to St. James the Apostle? Or could he that is of this opinion, translate the contrary, "that God is no tempter to evil"? Is not this as much to say as that God also brought Satan into Judas to fill his heart, and so was author of Judas' treason, even as he was of Paul's conversion? Let Beza now and Master Whitakers or any other Heretic of them all,<sup>3</sup> wrest and wring themselves from the absurdity of this opinion, as they endeavour and labour to do exceedingly, because it is most blasphemous: yet shall they never be able to clear and discharge themselves from it, if they will allow and maintain their foresaid exposition of God's leading into temptation. Does not Beza for the same purpose translate, "God's providence", for "God's prescience" (προγνώσει, Act. 2:23)? Which is so false, that the English Bezites in their translation are ashamed to follow him.

5. Another exceeding treachery to deceive the reader, is this: that they use Catholic terms and speeches in such places where they may make them most odious, and where they must needs sound odiously in the people's ears. As for example, this term, "procession", they put very maliciously and falsely thus: "When the feast of Bacchus was kept, they were constrained to go in the procession of Bacchus." (2 Mach. 6:7, Bib. 1570; πομπέειν τὸ διονύσιον) Let the good reader see the Greek Lexicon, if there be anything in this word like to the Catholic Church's processions: or whether it signify so much as, "to go about", as their other bibles (1562, 1577) are translated, which meant also heretically, but yet durst not name, "procession".

6. Again, "He put down the Priests [of Baal] whom the kings of Judah had founded to burn incense." (4 Kings 23:5). So they translate (the Hebrew, נָתַן לְמִזְבֵּי, being simply to give, make, appoint) because in the Catholic Church there are foundations of chancery Priests, Chapels, dirges, etc. Neither is it sincerely and without ill meaning that they say here the "Priests" of Baal whom, etc. Because the Hebrew word signifies all those that ministered in the temples of false gods.

7. Again, "Silver shrines for Diana" (Act. 14:24). Because of the shrines (νάους) and tabernacles made to the image of our Blessed Lady: the Greek word signifying "temples", and Beza says, he cannot see how it may signify shrines.

8. Again, "As I passed by, and beheld your devotions (σεβάσματα), I found an altar" (Act. 17:23). So they call the superstition of the Athenians toward their false gods, because of Catholic peoples' devotions toward the true God, his Church, altars, Saints, etc., the Greek word σέβασμα signifying the things that are worshipped (as 2 Thess. 2:4 and Sap. 15:17), not the manner of worshipping.

9. Again, "The Jews had agreed, that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be excommunicated" (Jo. 9:22; να ἡ ποσυνάγωγος γένηται). And, "Jesus heard that they had excommunicated him" (Jo. 9:35), to make the Jews doing against them that confessed Christ, sound like to the Catholic Church's doing against Heretics in excommunicating them, and so to disgrace the Priest's power of excommunication: whereas the Jews had no such spiritual excommunication, but (as the Greek must needs only signify) they did, "put them out of the Synagogue" (*aposynagogum facere*), and so they should have translated, the Greek word including the very name of Synagogue. But they, as though the Church of Christ and the Synagogue of the Jews were all one, so translate, "excommunicating", and "putting out of the Synagogue", as all one.

10. I omit here as spoken before, that they call an Idol, "the Queen of heaven", because we call our Lady by that title: so to make both seem like. Also, that they say Baal's "altar" thrice,

<sup>3</sup> See Beza Annot. in Ro. 1:24, Act. 2:23; Whit. ad rat. Camp. p. 139,145.

for Baal's "table", to disgrace altars: and that for idols, they say "images", in despite of the Church's images: that they say "tradition" duly in the ill part, yea sometime when it is not in the Greek at all, to make traditions odious, and such like. Thus by similitude and like sound of words they beguile the poor people, not only in their false expositions concerning Judaical fasts, meats, observation of days (as is elsewhere shown) but also in their translations. So does Calvin's New Testament in French, for, *Nolite vocari Rabbi*, translate, "Be not called, *notre maître*, or, *Magister noster*" (Mat. 23): in derision and disgrace of this title and calling, which is peculiar to Doctors of Divinity in the Catholic Universities beyond the seas: even as Wycliffe their grandfather did upon the same words condemn such degrees in Universities. But their Rabbis can tell them that "Rabbi" signifies, "Magister", and not *Magister noster*. And St. John tells them so (Jo. 1:38, 3:2, 20:16) and yet it pleases them to translate otherwise and to abuse Christ's own sacred words against Catholic Doctors and schools: not considering that as Christ forbade them to be called "Rabbi", so he forbade them the name of father and fathers, and yet I trow they will not scoff at this name either in their own fathers, or in themselves so called of their children: though in Religious men, according to their heretical humor, they scoff also at this name, as they do at the other in Doctors.

11. Contrariwise as they are diligent to put some words odiously where they should not, so they are as circumspect not to put other words and terms, where they should. In their first bible (1562), not once the name of "Church": in the same, for charity, "love": for altar, "temple": for heretic, an "author of sects": and for heresy, "sect": because in those beginnings, all these words sounded exceedingly against them. The Church they had then forsaken, Christian charity they had broken by schism, altars they dug down, heresy and heretic they knew in their conscience were like in the people's ears to agree unto them, rather than to the old Catholic faith and professors of the same. Again in all their bibles indifferently, both former and latter, they had rather say, "righteous", than "just": "righteousness", than "justice": "gift", than "grace", especially in the sacrament of Holy Orders: "secret", rather than "mystery", especially in Matrimony: "dissension", than "schism": and these words not at all, "Priest" (to wit, of the New Testament), "Sacrament", "Catholic", "hymns", "confession", "penance", "justifications", and "traditions" in the good part: but instead thereof, "Elders", "secret", "general", "praises", "acknowledging", "amendment of life", "ordinances", "instructions". And which is, somewhat worse, "carcass" for "soul", and "grave" for "hell". We may say unto you as Demosthenes said to Aeschines (*peri stephánou*). Τὰ ταῦτα? ἤματα ἢ θάνατα? What are these? Words or wonders? Certainly they are wonders, and very wonderful in Catholic men's ears. And whether it be sincere and not heretical dealing, I appeal to the wise and indifferent reader of any sort.

## CHAPTER XXII.

*Other faults* JUDAICAL, PROFANE, *mere* VANITIES, FOLLIES, & NOVELTIES.

Now leaving matters of controversy, let us talk a little with you familiarly, and learn of you the reason of other points in your translation, which to us seem faults, and savour not of that spirit which should be in Christian Catholic translators.

2. First, you are so profane, that you say, “The ballet of ballets of Solomon”, so terming that divine book *Canticum Canticorum*, containing the high mystery of Christ and his Church, as if it were a ballet of love between Solomon and his concubine, as Castaleo wantonly translates it. But you say more profanely thus, “we have conceived, we have born in pain, as though we should have brought forth wind” (Esa. 26:18). I am ashamed to tell the literal commentary of this your translation. Why might you not have said, “We have conceived and as it were travailed to bring forth, and have brought forth the spirit”? Is there anything in the Hebrew to hinder you thus far? Why would you say “wind” rather than “spirit”, knowing that the Septuagint in Greek, and the ancient fathers, and St. Jerome himself who translates according to the Hebrew, yet for sense of the place, all<sup>1</sup> expound it both according to Hebrew and Greek, of the spirit of God, which is first conceived in us and begins by feat, which the Scripture calls the beginning of wisdom. Insomuch that in the Greek there are these goodly words, famous in all antiquity: “Through the fear of thee O Lord we conceived, and have travailed with pain, and have brought forth the spirit of thy salvation, which thou hast made upon the earth.” Which does excellently set before our eyes the degrees of a faithful man’s increase and proceeding in the spirit of God, which begins by the fear of his judgements, and is a good fear, though servile, and not sufficient. And it may be you condemning with Luther this servile fear as evil and hurtful, mean also some such thing by your translation. But indeed the place may be understood of the other fear also, which has his degrees more or less.

3. But to say, “we have brought forth wind”, can admit no such interpretation. But even as if a mere Jew should translate or understand it, who has no sense of God’s spirit, so have you excluded the true sense which concerns the Holy Ghost, and not the cold term of “wind”, and whatsoever naked interpretation thereof. And it is your fashion in all such cases, where the richer sense is of God’s Holy Spirit, there to translate “wind”, as Ps. 147:18 as you number the Psalms.

4. And it is not unlike to this, that you will not translate for the Angel’s honour that carried Habacuc, “He set him into Babylon, over the lake by the force of his spirit” (□ν □ουζ□ το□ πνεύματος □υτο□): but thus, “through a mighty wind”: so attributing it to the wind, not to the Angel’s power, and omitting clean the Greek pronoun □υτο□, “his”, which shows evidently that it was the Angel’s spirit, force, and power.

5. Again, where the Prophets speak most manifestly of Christ, there you translate clean another thing: as Esa. 30:20 (Bib. 1579). When St. Jerome translates thus, and the Church has always read accordingly, *Non faciet avolare ate ultra Doctorem tuum: et erunt oculi tui videntes praeceptorem tuum*. That is, “And [our Lord] shall not cause thy Doctor to fly from thee any more: and thine eyes shall see thy Master” (מורהך). Which is all one in effect with that which Christ says, “I will be with you unto the end of the world.” There you translate thus, “Thy rain shall be no more kept back: but thine eyes shall see thy rain.” So likewise Joel 2:23 where the holy church reads, “Rejoice ye children of Sion in the Lord your God: because he hath given you the Doctor of justice”: there you translate, “the rain of righteousness”. Does the Hebrew word (הרף) force you to this? You know that it signifies a teacher or Master. And therefore the

<sup>1</sup> Ambr. li. 2. de Interpel. c. 4; Chrys. in Ps. 7. prope finem; See St. Jer. upon this place.

Jews themselves,<sup>2</sup> partly understand it of Esdras, partly of Christ's Divinity. Why are you more profane (I will not say more Judaical) than the Jews themselves? Why might not St. Jerome a Christian Doctor and lacking no skill in the Hebrew (as you well know) satisfy you, who makes no doubt but the Hebrew in these places is, "Doctor", "Master", "teacher"? Who also (in Ps. 84:7) translates thus, "With blessings shall the Doctor be arrayed": meaning Christ. Where you with the later Rabbis the enemies of Christ translate, "The rain covers the pools". What cold stuff is this in respect of that other translation so clearly pointing to Christ our Master and Doctor?

6. And again, where St. Jerome translates, and the Church reads, and all the fathers interpret and expound accordingly, "There shall be faith in thy times" (Es. 33): to express the marvelous faith that shall be then, in the first Christians especially, even unto death, and in all the rest concerning the hidden mysteries of the New Testament: there you translate, "There shall be stability of thy times". The Prophet joines together there "judgement", "justice", "faith", "wisdom", "knowledge", the "fear of our Lord": you for a little ambiguity of the Hebrew word, turn "faith" into "stability".

7. If I should burden you with translating thus also concerning Christ, "Cease from the man whose breath in his nostrils: for wherein is he to be esteemed?" (Esa. 2) You would say I did you wrong, because it is so pointed now in the Hebrew (הַמַּבֵּן). Whereas you know very well by St. Jerome's commentary upon that place, that this is the Jews' pointing or reading of the word, against the honour of Christ: the true reading and translation being as he interprets it, "for he is reputed high": and therefore beware of him. Otherwise (as St. Jerome says) what a consequence were this, or who would commend any man thus, "Take heed ye offend no him, who is nothing esteemed"? Yet that is your translation. Neither does the Greek (οὐ τινὶ λογιᾶθη) help you which (if the accent be truly put) is thus, "because he is reputed for somebody or something" (Gal. 2:6): as St. Paul speaks of the chief Apostles, and it is our phrase in the commendation of a man.

8. The like excuse you would have by alleging the Hebrew vowels, if you were told that you much obscure a notable saying of the prophet concerning Christ, or rather the speech of Christ himself by his prophet, saying: "I have spoken by the Prophets, and I have multiplied vision, and in the hand of the Prophets (that is, by the Prophets) have I been resembled." Which latter words do exceedingly express, that all the Prophets spoke of Christ: as our Saviour himself declares, "beginning from Moses and all the Prophets to interpret unto the two disciples, the things that concerned him." (Luc. 24:27) And as St. Peter says in these words, "All the Prophets from Samuel and that spoke after him, did tell of these days." (Act. 3) This prophecy then being so consonant to these speeches of the New Testament, the Greek also being word for word so (οὐ χερσὶ προφητῶν μοιῶθη) the Hebrew by changing one little prick (which the later Jews have added at their own pleasure; הַמַּבֵּן to הַמַּבֵּן) being fully so as we read with the Catholic Church: why pretend you the Jews' authority to maintain another less Christian translation, which is thus: "I use similitudes by the ministry of the Prophets," as though there were nothing there concerning Christ or the second person peculiarly?

9. You will also perhaps allege not only the later Jews, but also some later Catholic men that so translate the Hebrew. But the difference between them and you, is, that they, with reverence and preferment always of St. Jerome's and the Church's ancient translation, tell us how it is now in the Hebrew: you, with derogation and disanulling the same altogether, set down your own as the only true interpretation according to the Hebrew: avouching the Hebrew that now is, and as now it is printed, to be the only authentical truth of the Old Testament.

---

<sup>2</sup> Lyra in 30 Esa.



Where you can never answer us, how that in the Psalm 22, “As a lion my hand and my feet” (as now it is in the Hebrew, יָרִיבָּ) can be the true and old authentical Hebrew, which none of the fathers knew, the ancient Rabbis condemn as a corruption, yourselves translate it not, but after the old accustomed reading, “They have pierced my hands and my feet”. Which is a notable prophecy of our Saviour’s kind and manner of Passion, being crucified on the Cross. Only the later Jews, and such Heretics as think he died upon a gallows or gibbet, and not upon the Cross, they like this Hebrew text well, and stand upon it, as you do upon all without exception, and yet when it comes to certain particulars, you are compelled to forsake it. As in certain other places, for example.

10. Where the Hebrew says, “Achaz king of Israel” (2 Paral. 28:19), which is not true, you are compelled to translate, “Achaz king of Judah”, and the truth is, and as it is in the Greek and the Vulgar Latin. Yet some of your Bibles (1579) follow the falsehood of the Hebrew.

11. Likewise, where the Hebrew says, “Zedecias his brother”, meaning the brother of Joachin, you translate, “Zedecias his father’s brother” (1579), as indeed the truth is, according to the Greek, and to the Scripture (4 Kings 24:19) and therefore your Bible which follows the Hebrew here also, translating “his brother”, yet in the margin puts down as more true, “uncle”.

12. Likewise in another place, the Hebrew is so out of frame, that some of your Bibles say, “he begat Azuba of his wife Azuba”, and othersome translate, “he begat Jerioth of his wife Azuba”: the Hebrew being thus, “he begat Azuba his wife and Jerioth”, which neither you nor any man else can easily tell what to make of. Thus you see how easy it were (if a man would multiply such examples) to show by your own testimonies the corruption of the Hebrew, and that yourselves do not, nor dare not exactly follow it, as of the Greek text of the New Testament also is declared elsewhere.

13. But it is greater marvel, why you follow not the Hebrew in other places also, where is no corruption. You protest to translate it according to the points or vowels that now it has, and that you call the Hebrew verity. Tell me then I beseech you, why do you in all your Bibles translate thus, “O Virgin daughter of Sion, he hath despised thee, and laughed thee to scorn: O daughter of Jerusalem he hath shaken his head at thee.” (Esa. 37:22) In the Hebrew (בְּזִוְיָהּ-לְעֵינֶיהָ), Greek (παρθένος, θυγάτηρ. τὸν κεφαλὴν ἔστρεψεν), St. Jerome’s translation and commentary, it is clean contrary, “The Virgin daughter of Sion hath despised thee (O Assur): the daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee.” All are the feminine gender, and spoken of Sion literally, and of the Church spiritually triumphing over Assur and all her enemies: you translate all as of the masculine gender, and apply it to Assur insulting against Jerusalem, etc. I cannot conceive what this translation means, and I would gladly know the reason, and I would have thought it some gross oversight, but that I find it so in all your English Bibles, and not only in this place of Esay, but also in the books of the kings (4 Reg. 19), where the same words are repeated. And it is no less marvel unto us that know not the reason for your doings, why you have left out “Alleluia” nine times in the six last Psalms (1577), being in the Hebrew (הַלְלוּ־הוֹיָהּ) nine times more than in your translation: especially when you know that it is the ancient and joyful song of the primitive Church.<sup>3</sup>

14. Again, you translate thus: “Many which had seen the first house, when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes, wept, etc.” Look well to your Hebrew, and you shall find it according both to the Greek and the Latin, thus: “Many which had seen the first house in the foundation thereof” (that is, yet standing upon the foundation, not destroyed) “and this temple before their eyes, wept.” You imagined that it should be meant, they saw Solomon’s temple, when it was first founded, which because it was impossible, therefore you translated otherwise

---

<sup>3</sup> See the new English Testament, Annot. Apoc. 19.

than is in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. But yet in some of your Bibles you should have considered the matter better, and translated accordingly.

15. And surely why you should translate (4 Reg. 23:13): “On the right hand of mount Olivet”, rather than as it is in the Vulgar Latin (לְהַר הַצֵּיטִי הַיְמָנִית, οὐ σωζόμενοι πικρὸν ἄθρον): and why, “Ye object of the Gentiles” (Esa. 45:20), rather than “ye that are saved of the Gentiles” (פְּלִיטֵי גוֹיִם): you belike know some reason, we do not, neither by the Hebrew nor the Greek.

16. Howbeit in these lesser things (though nothing in the Scripture is to be counted little) you might perhaps more freely have taken your pleasure, in following neither Hebrew nor Greek: but when it concerns a matter no less than usury, there by your false translation to give occasion unto the reader, or be a usurer, is no small fault either against true religion or against good manners (Bib. 1562, 1577). This you do most evidently in your most authencal translations, saying thus: “Thou shalt not hurt thy brother by usury of money, nor by usury of corn, nor by usury of anything that he may be hurt withal.” (Deut. 23:19) What is this to say, but that usury is not here forbidden, unless it hurt the party that borrows, which is so rooted in most men’s hearts, that they think such usury very lawful, and daily offend mortally that way. Where almighty God in this place of Holy Scripture has not a word of hurting or not hurting (as may be seen by the Geneva bibles), but says simply thus: “Thou shalt not lend to thy brother to usury, usury of money, usury of meat, usury of anything that is put to usury.” (אֶל רֵעִי לֹא תִשָּׂא הֶחָיִל לְאָחִיךָ; οὐκ κτοκι εἰς τὸ δελφὸν σου τόκον ἰργυρίου, etc.)

17. Mark the Hebrew and the Greek, and see, and be ashamed, that you strain and pervert it, to say for, *Non foenerabis fratri tuo*, which is word for word in the Greek and Hebrew, “Thou shalt not hurt thy brother by usury.” If the Hebrew word in the use of Holy Scripture do signify, to hurt by usury, why do you in the very next words following, in the selfsame Bibles translate it thus, “unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury, but not unto thy brother”? (Deut. 23:20) Why said you not, “A stranger thou mayest hurt with usury, but not thy brother”? Is it not all one word and phrase here and before? And if you had so translated it here also, the Jews would have thanked you, who by forcing the Hebrew word as you do, think it very good to hurt any stranger, that is, any Christian by any usury be it never so great.

18. What shall I tell you of other faults, which I would gladly account oversights or ignorances, such as we also desire pardon of, but all are not such, though some be. As, “Two thousand” (written at length) “to them that keep the fruit thereof.” (Cant. 8:12, Bib. 1579) In the Hebrew and Greek, “two hundred”. Again in the same book, “As the fruits of Cedar.” (Cant. 1:4) In the Hebrew and Greek, “tabernacles”. And, “Ask a sign either in the depth or in the height above”, for, “in the depth of Hell.” (Isa. 7:11) And, “Great works are wrought by him,” (Mat. 14:2) for, “do work in him”, as St. Paul uses the same word (2 Cor. 4:12; ενεργοσω εν υτ). And, “To make ready a bourse.” (Act. 23:24; Bib. 1577) In the Greek, “beasts” (να μλθον νόμος). And, “If a man on the Sabbath day receive circumcision without breaking of the law of Moses.” (Jo. 7:23), for “to the end that the law of Moses be not broken”. And, “The son of man must suffer many things, and be reproved of the elders.” (Mar. 8:31; ποδοκιμαθῆναι) For, “be rejected”. As in the psalm, “The stone which the builders rejected”, we say not, “reproving” of the said stone, which is Christ. And, νεόφυτος, a young scholar, in all your translations falsely (1 Tim. 3). And, “Simon of Chanaan” or “Simon the Canaanite” (Mar. 3), who is called otherwise, Zealots, that is Zealous, as an interpretation of the Hebrew word, *Cananaeus*: which I marvel you considered not, especially considering that the Hebrew word for Zealous, and the other for a Canaanite, begin with divers letters (צ.ק). And, “lest at any time we should let them slip” (Heb. 2:1), for, “lest we slip or run by”, and so be lost.

19. And as for the first bible (1562), which was done in haste, and not yet corrected, but is printed still afresh: that says, “With Herod’s servants” (Mat. 22), as though that were the only sense: that calls idiotas laymen: κιβωτῶν, “a ship” (Mat. 24): θόρυβον, “wondering” (Mar. 5): σβέννυται, “are gone out” (Mat. 25): ἰξουσίαν, “his substance” (Eph. 3): and, “To know the excellent love of the knowledge of Christ”, for, “the love of Christ that excells knowledge”. And, “of men that turn away the truth,” (Tit. 1), for, “that shun the truth and turn away from it.” And, “Mount Sina is Agar in Arabia.” for, “Agar is Mount Sina”, etc.

20. Let these and the like be small negligences or ignorances, such as you will pardon us also, if you find the like. Neither do we greatly mislike, that you leave these words, Urim and Thummim (Deut. 33), and Chemarim (4 Reg. 23), and Ziims, and Iims, (Jerem. 50) untranslated, because it is not easy to express them in English: and we would have liked it as well in certain other words, which you have translated, “images” (hamanim; Esa. 17), “images” (gillulim; Jer. 50), and still, “images” (miphletseth; 3 Ro. 15), being as hard to express the true signification of them, as the former. And we hope you will the rather bear with the late Catholic translation of the English Testament, that leaves also certain words untranslated, not only because they cannot be expressed, but also for reverence and religion (as St. Augustine says) and greater majesty of the same.

21. Of one thing we can by no means excuse you, but it must savour vanity, or novelty, or both. As when you affectate new strange words which the people are not acquainted withal, but it is rather Hebrew to them than English (Bib. 1579): μάλα σεμνῶς ἠνομάζοντες, as Demosthenes speaks, uttering with great countenance and majesty, “Against him came up Nabuchadnezzar king of Babel” (2 Par. 36:6), for, “Nabuchodonosor king of Babylon”: “Saneherib”, for “Sennacherib”: “Michaiah’s” prophecy, for “Michaeas”: “Jehoshaphat’s” prayer, for “Josaphat”: “Uzza” slain, for “Oza”. “When Zerubbabel went about to build the Temple”, for “Zorobabel”:<sup>4</sup> Remember what the Lord did to Miriam, for Mary (Deut. 34). And in your first translation (1562; 4 Reg. c. 15,16), “Elisa” for “Elisaeus”, “Pekahia” and “Pekah” for “Phaceia” and “Phacee”, “Uziah” for “Ozias”, “Thiglath-peleser” for “Teglath-Phalasar”, “Ahaziah” for “Ochozias”: “Peka the son of Remaliahu”, for “Phacee the sone of Romelia”. And why say you not as well “Shelomoh” for “Solomon”, and “Coresh” for “Cyrus”, and so alter every word from the known sound and pronunciation? Is this to teach the people, when you speak Hebrew rather than English? Were it a goodly hearing (think you) to say for Jesus, Ieshuah, and for Mary his mother, Miriam: and for Messiah Meshiach, and for John, Jachannan, and such like monstrous novelties? Which you might as well do, and the people would understand you as well, as when your preachers say, “Nabucadnezer king of Babel”.

22. When Zwingli your great Patriarch did read in Munster’s translation of the Old Testament,<sup>5</sup> Ishizkiah, Iehzechel, Choresh, Darianesch, Beltzezzar, and the like, for Ezechias, Ezechiel, Cyrus, Darius, Baltasar: he called them barbarous voices, and uncivil speeches, and said the word of God was soiled and depraved by them. Know you not that proper names alter and change, and are written and sounded in every language diversely? Might not all antiquity and the general custom both of reading and hearing the known names of Nabuchodonosor, and Michaeas, and Ozias, suffice you, but you must needs invent other which the people never heard, rather for vain ostentation to amaze and astonish them, than to edification and instruction. Which is an old Heretical fashion, noted by Eusebius,<sup>6</sup> and by the author of the imperfect commentaries upon St. Matthew,<sup>7</sup> and by St. Augustine.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> c. 32; Fo. 172, 173, 160.

<sup>5</sup> Praefat. in Esa.

<sup>6</sup> Lib. 4. c. 10:

<sup>7</sup> ho. 44

23. What shall I speak of your affectation of the word Jehova יהוה (for so it pleases you to accent it) instead of Dominus, “The Lord”: whereas the ancient fathers in the very Hebrew text did read and sound it rather Adonai, as appears both by St. Jerome’s translation and also his commentaries, and I would know of them the reason, why in the Hebrew Bible, whensoever this word is joined with Adonai, it is to be read Elohim, but only for avoiding Adonai, twice together. This I say we might justly demand of these that take a pride in using this word Jehova so oft both in English and Latin: though otherwise we are not superstitious, but as occasion serves, only in the Hebrew text we pronounce and read it. Again we might ask them, why they use not as well Elohim instead of Deus, “God”: and so of the rest, changing all into Hebrew, that they may seem gay fellows, and the people may wonder at their wonderful and mystical divinity.

24. To conclude, are not your scholars (think you) much bound unto you, for giving them instead of God’s blessed Word and his Holy Scriptures, such translations, heretical, Judaical, profane, false, negligent, fantastical, new, naught, monstrous? God open their eyes to see, and mollify your hearts to repent of all your falsehood and treachery, both that which is manifestly convinced against you and cannot be denied, as also that which may by some show of answer be shifted off in the sight of the ignorant, but in your consciences is as manifest as the other.

FINIS.

---

<sup>8</sup> lib. 3. c. 26 contra Cresconium.