Letters (part 2 of 3)

Jerome (c. AD 347–420)

SermonIndex.net / Church Fathers

Contents

Letter 76. To Abigaus. **1**

Letter 77. To Oceanus. **3**

Letter 79. To Salvina. **12**

Letter 80. From Rufinus to Macarius. **22**

Letter 81. To Rufinus. **25**

Letter 82. To Theophilus Bishop of Alexandria. **27**

Letter 83. From Pammachius and Oceanus. **35**

Letter 84. To Pammachius and Oceanus. **36**

Letter 85. To Paulinus. **46**

Letter 86. To Theophilus. **48**

Letter 87. From the Ophilus to Jerome. **49**

Letter 88. To Theophilus. **50**

Letter 89. From Theophilus to Jerome. **51**

Letter 90. From Theophilus to Epiphanius. **52**

Letter 91. From Epiphanius to Jerome. **54**

Letter 92. The Synodical Letter of Theophilus to the Bishops of Palestine and of Cyprus. **56**

Letter 93. From the Bishops of Palestine to Theophilus. **58**

Letter 95. From Pope Anastasius to Simplicianus. **59**

Letter 97. To Pammachius and Marcella. **61**

Letter 99. To Theophilus. 64

Letter 101. From Augustine. 66

Letter 102. To Augustine. 68

Letter 103. To Augustine. 70

Letter 104. From Augustine. 71

Letter 105. To Augustine. 74

Letter 106. To Sunnias and Fretela. 77

Letter 107. To Laeta. 98

Letter 108. To Eustochium. 108

Letter 109. To Riparius. 136

Letter 110. From Augustine. 140

Letter 111. From Augustine to Prsidius. 147

Letter 112. To Augustine. 148

Letter 113. From Theophilus to Jerome. 165

Letter 114. To Theophilus. 166

Letter 115. To Augustine. 168

Letter 116. From Augustine. 169

Letter 117. To a Mother and Daughter Living in Gaul. 190

Letter 118. To Julian. 198

Introduction 206

QUESTION #1 209

QUESTION #2 213

QUESTION #3 215

QUESTION #4 216

QUESTION #5 218

QUESTION #6 221

QUESTION #7 **222**

QUESTION #8 **223**

QUESTION #9 **226**

QUESTION #10 **231**

QUESTION #11 **235**

QUESTION #12 **239**

Letter 122. To Rusticus. **242**

Letter 123. To Ageruchia. **251**

Letter 124. To Avitus. **265**

Letter 76. To Abigaus.

Abigaus the recipient of this letter was a blind presbyter of Baetica in Spain. He had asked the help of Jerome's prayers in his struggles with evil and Jerome now writes to cheer and to console him. He concludes his remarks by commending to his especial care the widow Theodora. The letter should be compared with that addressed to Castrutius (LXVIII.). It was written at the same time with the preceding.

1. Although I am conscious of many sins and every day pray on bended knees, "Remember not the sins of my youth nor my transgressions, [Ps. 25:7] yet because I know that it has been said by the Apostle "let a man not be lifted up with pride lest he fall into the condemnation of the devil," [1 Tim. 3:6. AV. adapted] and that it is written in another passage, "God resisteth the proud but giveth grace to the humble," [James 4:6] there is nothing I have striven so much to avoid from my boyhood up as a swelling mind and a stiff neck, [Cf. Ps. 75:5] things which always provoke against themselves the wrath of God. For I know that my master and Lord and God has said in the lowliness of His flesh: "Learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart," [Matt. 11:29] and that before this He has sung by the mouth of David: "Lord, remember David and all his gentleness. Again we read in another passage, "Before destruction the heart of man is haughty; and before honour is humility." [Prov. 18:12] Do not, then, I implore you, suppose that I have received your letter and have passed it over in silence. Do not, I beseech you, lay to my charge the dishonesty and negligence of which others have been guilty. For why should I, when called on to respond to your kind advances, continue dumb and repel by my silence the friendship which you offer? I who am always forward to seek intimate relations with the good and even to thrust myself upon their affection. "Two," we read, "are better than one.... for if they fall, the one will lift up his fellow.... a three fold cord is not quickly broken, and a brother that helps his brother shall be exalted." Write to me, therefore, boldly, and overcome the effect of absence by frequent colloquies.

2. You should not grieve that you are destitute of those bodily eyes which ants, flies, and creeping things have as well as men; rather you should rejoice that you

possess that eye of which it is said in the Song of Songs, ”Thou hast ravished my heart, my sister, my spouse; thou hast ravished my heart with one of thine eyes.” [Cant. 4:9] This is the eye with which God is seen and to which Moses refers when he says:-”I will now turn aside and see this great sight.” [Ex. 3:3] We even read of some philosophers of this world that they have plucked out their eyes in order to turn all their thoughts upon the pure depths of the mind. And a prophet has said ”Death has entered through your windows.” [Jer. 9:21. LXX] Our Lord too tells the Apostles: ”Whosoever looketh upon a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” [Matt. 5:28] Consequently they are commanded to lift up their eyes and to look on the fields, for these are white and ready for harvest. [Joh. 4:35]

3. You request me by my exhortations to slay in you Nebuchadnezzar and Rab-shakeh and Nebuzar-adan and Holofernes. Were they alive in you, you would never have sought my aid. No, they are dead within you, and you have begun to build up the ruins of Jerusalem with the help of Zerubbabel and of Joshua the son of Josedech the high priest, of Ezra and of Nehemiah. You do not put your wages into a bag with holes, [Hagg. 1:6] but you lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, [Matt. 6:20] and if you seek my friendship, it is because you believe me to be a servant of Christ. I commend to you-although she needs no commendation but her own-my holy daughter Theodora, formerly the wife or rather the sister of Lucinius of blessed memory. Tell her that she must not grow weary of the path upon which she has entered, and that she can only reach the Holy Land by toiling through the wilderness. Warn her against supposing that the work of virtue is perfected when she has made her exodus from Egypt. Remind her that she must pass through snares innumerable to arrive at mount Nebo and the River Jordan, [Nu. 33:47, Nu. 33:48] that she must receive circumcision anew at Gilgal, [Josh. 5:2, Josh. 5:9] that Jericho must fall before her, overthrown by the blasts of priestly trumpets, [Josh. 6:20] that Adoni-zedec must be slain, [Josh. 10:1, Josh. 10:26] that Ai and Hazor, once fairest of cities, must both fall. [Josh. 8:10, Josh. 11:10]

The brothers who are with me in the monastery salute you, and I through you earnestly salute those reverend persons who deign to bestow upon me their regard.

Letter 77. To Oceanus.

The eulogy of Fabiola whoso restless life had come to an end in 399 a.d. Jerome tells the story of her sin and of her penitence (for which see Letter 55.), of the hospital established by her at Portus, of her visit to Bethlehem, and of her earnestness in the study of scripture. He relates how he wrote for her his account of the vestments of the high priest (Letter 64.) and how at the time of her death he was at her request engaged upon a commentary on the forty-two halting-places of the Israelites in the wilderness (Letter 79.). This last he now sends along with this letter to Oceanus. Jerome also bestows praise upon Pammachius as the companion of all Fabiola's labours. The date of the letter is 399 a.d. 1. Several years since I consoled the venerated Paula, whilst her affliction was still recent for the falling asleep of Blaesilla. Four summers ago I wrote for the bishop Heliodorus the epitaph of Nepotian, and expended what ability I possessed in giving expression to my grief at his loss. Only two years have elapsed since I sent a brief letter to my dear Pammachius on the sudden flitting of his Paulina. I blushed to say more to one so learned or to give him back his own thoughts: lest I should seem less the consoler of a friend than the officious instructor of one already perfect. But now, Oceanus my son, the duty that you lay upon me is one that I gladly accept and would even seek unasked. For when new virtues have to be dealt with, an old subject itself becomes new. In previous cases I have had to soften and restrain a mother's affection, an uncle's grief, and a husband's yearning; according to the different requirements of each I have had to apply from scripture different remedies.

2. To-day you give me as my theme Fabiola, the praise of the Christians, the marvel of the gentiles, the sorrow of the poor, and the consolation of the monks. Whatever point in her character I choose to treat of first, pales into insignificance compared with those which follow after. Shall I praise her fasts? Her alms are greater still. Shall I commend her lowliness? The glow of her faith is yet brighter. Shall I mention her studied plainness in dress, her voluntary choice of plebeian costume and the garb of a slave that she might put to shame silken robes? To change one's disposition is a greater achievement than to change one's dress. It is harder for us to part with arrogance than with gold and gems. For, even though we throw away these, we plume ourselves sometimes on a meanness that is really ostenta-

tious, and we make a bid with a saleable poverty for the popular applause. But a virtue that seeks concealment and is cherished in the inner consciousness appeals to no judgement but that of God. Thus the eulogies which I have to bestow upon Fabiola will be altogether new: I must neglect the order of the rhetoricians and begin all I have to say only from the cradle of her conversion and of her penitence. Another writer, mindful of the school, would perhaps bring forward Quintus Maximus, "the man who by delaying rescued Rome," and the whole Fabian family; he would describe their struggles and battles and would exult that Fabiola had come to us through a line so noble, shewing that qualities not apparent in the branch still existed in the root. But as I am a lover of the inn at Bethlehem and of the Lord's stable in which the virgin travailed with and gave birth to an infant God, I shall deduce the lineage of Christ's handmaid not from a stock famous in history but from the lowliness of the church.

3. And because at the very outset there is a rock in the path and she is overwhelmed by a storm of censure, for having forsaken her first husband and having taken a second, I will not praise her for her conversion till I have first cleared her of this charge. So terrible then were the faults imputed to her former husband that not even a prostitute or a common slave could have put up with them. If I were to recount them, I should undo the heroism of the wife who chose to bear the blame of a separation rather than to blacken the character and expose the stains of him who was one body with her. I will only urge this one plea which is sufficient to exonerate a chaste matron and a Christian woman. The Lord has given commandment that a wife must not be put away "except it be for fornication, and that, if put away, she must remain unmarried. [Matt. 19:9. 1 Cor. 7:11] Now a commandment which is given to men logically applies to women also. For it cannot be that, while an adulterous wife is to be put away, an incontinent husband is to be retained. The apostle says: "he which is joined to an harlot is one body. [1 Cor. 6:16] Therefore she also who is joined to a whoremonger and unchaste person is made one body with him. The laws of Caesar are different, it is true, from the laws of Christ: Papinianus commands one thing; our own Paul another.

Earthly laws give a free rein to the unchastity of men, merely condemning seduction and adultery; lust is allowed to range unrestrained among brothels and slave girls, as if the guilt were constituted by the rank of the person assailed and not by the purpose of the assailant. But with us Christians what is unlawful for women is equally unlawful for men, and as both serve the same God both are bound by the same obligations. Fabiola then has put away-they are quite right-a husband that was a sinner, guilty of this and that crime, sins-I have almost mentioned their names-with which the whole neighbourhood resounded but which the wife alone refused to disclose. If however it is made a charge against her that after repudiating her husband she did not continue unmarried, I readily admit this to have been a fault, but at the same time declare that it may have been a case of neces-

sity. ”It is better,” the apostle tells us, ”to marry than to burn. [1 Cor. 7:9] She was quite a young woman, she was not able to continue in widowhood. In the words of the apostle she saw another law in her members warring against the law of her mind; [Rom. 7:23] she felt herself dragged in chains as a captive towards the indulgences of wedlock. Therefore she thought it better openly to confess her weakness and to accept the semblance of an unhappy marriage than, with the flame of a monogamist, to ply the trade of a courtesan.

The same apostle wills that the younger widows should marry, bear children, and give no occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully. [1 Tim. 5:14] And he at once goes on to explain his wish: ”for some are already turned aside after Satan. [1 Tim. 5:15] Fabiola therefore was fully persuaded in her own mind: she thought she had acted legitimately in putting away her husband, and that when she had done so she was free to marry again. She did not know that the rigour of the gospel takes away from women all pretexts for re-marriage so long as their former husbands are alive; and not knowing this, though she contrived to evade other assaults of the devil, she at this point unwittingly exposed herself to a wound from him.

4. But why do I linger over old and forgotten matters, seeking to excuse a fault for which Fabiola has herself confessed her penitence? Who would believe that, after the death of her second husband at a time when most widows, having shaken off the yoke of servitude, grow careless and allow themselves more liberty than ever, frequenting the baths, flitting through the streets, shewing their harlot faces everywhere; that at this time Fabiola came to herself? Yet it was then that she put on sackcloth to make public confession of her error. It was then that in the presence of all Rome (in the basilica which formerly belonged to that Lateranus who perished by the sword of Caesar) she stood in the ranks of the penitents and exposed before bishop, presbyters, and people-all of whom wept when they saw her weep-her dishevelled hair, pale features, soiled hands and unwashed neck. What sins would such a penance fail to purge away? What ingrained stains would such tears be unable to wash out? By a threefold confession Peter blotted out his threefold denial. [Joh. 18:15-27: Joh. 21:15-17] If Aaron committed sacrilege by fashioning molten gold into the head of a calf, his brother’s prayers made amends for his transgressions. [Ex. 32:30-35] If holy David, meekest of men, committed the double sin of murder and adultery, he atoned for it by a fast of seven days. He lay upon the earth, he rolled in the ashes, he forgot his royal power, he sought for light in the darkness.

[2 Sam. 12:16] And then, turning his eyes to that God whom he had so deeply offended, he cried with a lamentable voice: ”Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight,” and ”Restore unto me the joy of thy salvation and uphold me with thy free spirit. [Ps. 51:4, Ps. 51:12] He who by his virtues teaches me how to stand and not to fall, by his penitence teaches me how, if I fall, I may rise

again. Among the kings do we read of any so wicked as Ahab, of whom the scripture says: ”there was none like unto Ahab which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord”? [1 Kings 21:25] For shedding Naboth’s blood Elijah rebuked him, and the prophet denounced God’s wrath against him: ”Hast thou killed and also taken possession? ...behold I will bring evil upon thee and will take away thy posterity” [1 K. 21:19, 1 K. 21:21] and so on. Yet when Ahab heard these words ”he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh, and fasted ...in sackcloth, and went softly. [1 K. 21:27] Then came the word of God to Elijah the Tishbite saying: ”Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself before me? Because he humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the evil in his days. [1 K. 21:28, 1 K. 21:29] O happy penitence which has drawn down upon itself the eyes of God, and which has by confessing its error changed the sentence of God’s anger!

The same conduct is in the Chronicles [2 Chr. 33:12, 2 Chr. 33:13] attributed to Manasseh, and in the book of the prophet Jonah [Jon. 3:5-10] to Nineveh, and in the gospel to the publican. [Luke 18:13] The first of these not only was allowed to obtain forgiveness but also recovered his kingdom, the second broke the force of God’s impending wrath, while the third, smiting his breast with his hands, ”would not lift up so much as his eyes to heaven. Yet for all that the publican with his humble confession of his faults went back justified far more than the Pharisee with his arrogant boasting of his virtues. This is not however the place to preach penitence, neither am I writing against Montanus and Novatus. Else would I say of it that it is ”a sacrifice ...well pleasing to God,” [Ph. 4:18] I would cite the words of the psalmist: ”the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit,” [Ps. 51:17] and those of Ezekiel ”I prefer the repentance of a sinner rather than his death,” [Cf. Ezek. 18:23] and those of Baruch, ”Arise, arise, O Jerusalem,” [Bar. 5:5, cf. Isa. 60:1] and many other proclamations madeby the trumpets of the prophets.

5. But this one thing I will say, for it is at once useful to my readers and pertinent to my present theme. As Fabiola was not ashamed of the Lord on earth, so He shall not be ashamed of her in heaven. [Luke 9:26] She laid bare her wound to the gaze of all, and Rome beheld with tears the disfiguring scar which marred her beauty. She uncovered her limbs, bared her head, and closed her mouth. She no longer entered the church of God but, like Miriam the sister of Moses, [Nu. 12:14] she sat apart without the camp, till the priest who had cast her out should himself call her back. She came down like the daughter of Babylon from the throne of her daintiness, she took the millstones and ground meal, she passed barefooted through rivers of tears. [Isa. 47:1, Isa. 47:2] She sat upon the coals of fire, and these became her aid. [Isa. 47:14, Vulg] That face by which she had once pleased her second husband she now smote with blows; she hated jewels, shunned ornaments and could not bear to look upon fine linen. In fact she bewailed the sin she had committed as bitterly as if it had been adultery, and went to the expense of many remedies in her eagerness to cure her one wound.

6. Having found myself aground in the shallows of Fabiola's sin, I have dwelt thus long upon her penitence in order that I might open up a larger and quite unimpeded space for the description of her praises. Restored to communion before the eyes of the whole church, what did she do? In the day of prosperity she was not forgetful of affliction; [Ecclus. 11:25] and, having once suffered shipwreck she was unwilling again to face the risks of the sea. Instead therefore of re-embarking on her old life, she broke up and sold all that she could lay hands on of her property (it was large and suitable to her rank), and turning it into money she laid out this for the benefit of the poor. She was the first person to found a hospital, into which she might gather sufferers out of the streets, and where she might nurse the unfortunate victims of sickness and want. Need I now recount the various ailments of human beings? Need I speak of noses slit, eyes put out, feet half burnt, hands covered with sores? Or of limbs dropsical and atrophied? Or of diseased flesh alive with worms? Often did she carry on her own shoulders persons infected with jaundice or with filth. Often too did she wash away the matter discharged from wounds which others, even though men, could not bear to look at. She gave food to her patients with her own hand, and moistened the scarce breathing lips of the dying with sips of liquid.

I know of many wealthy and devout persons who, unable to overcome their natural repugnance to such sights, perform this work of mercy by the agency of others, giving money instead of personal aid. I do not blame them and am far from construing their weakness of resolution into a want of faith. While however I pardon such squeamishness, I extol to the skies the enthusiastic zeal of a mind that is above it. A great faith makes little of such trifles. But I know how terrible was the retribution which fell upon the proud mind of the rich man clothed in purple for not having helped Lazarus. [Luke 16:19-24] The poor wretch whom we despise, whom we cannot so much as look at, and the very sight of whom turns our stomachs, is human like ourselves, is made of the same clay as we are, is formed out of the same elements. All that he suffers we too may suffer. Let us then regard his wounds as though they were our own, and then all our insensibility to another's suffering will give way before our pity for ourselves.

Not with a hundred tongues or throat of bronze Could I exhaust the forms of fell disease" [Virg. Aen. 6:625-627.] which Fabiola so wonderfully alleviated in the suffering poor that many of the healthy fell to envying the sick. However she showed the same liberality towards the clergy and monks and virgins. Was there a monastery which was not supported by Fabiola's wealth? Was there a naked or bedridden person who was not clothed with garments supplied by her? Were there ever any in want to whom she failed to give a quick and unhesitating supply? Even Rome was not wide enough for her pity. Either in her own person or else through the agency of reverend and trustworthy men she went from island to island and carried her bounty not only round the Etruscan Sea, but throughout the district of the Vols-

cians, as it stands along those secluded and winding shores where communities of monks are to be found.

7. Suddenly she made up her mind, against the advice of all her friends, to take ship and to come to Jerusalem. Here she was welcomed by a large concourse of people and for a short time took advantage of my hospitality. Indeed, when I call to mind our meeting, I seem to see her here now instead of in the past. Blessed Jesus, what zeal, what earnestness she bestowed upon the sacred volumes! In her eagerness to satisfy what was a veritable craving she would run through Prophets, Gospels, and Psalms: she would suggest questions and treasure up the answers in the desk of her own bosom. And yet this eagerness to hear did not bring with it any feeling of satiety: increasing her knowledge she also increased her sorrow, [Eccl. 1:18] and by casting oil upon the flame she did but supply fuel for a still more burning zeal. One day we had before us the book of Numbers written by Moses, and she modestly questioned me as to the meaning of the great mass of names there to be found. Why was it, she inquired, that single tribes were differently associated in this passage and in that, how came it that the soothsayer Balaam in prophesying of the future mysteries of Christ [Nu. 24:15-19] spoke more plainly of Him than almost any other prophet? I replied as best I could and tried to satisfy her enquiries.

Then unrolling the book still farther she came to the passage in which is given the list of all the halting-places by which the people after leaving Egypt made its way to the waters of Jordan. And when she asked me the meaning and reason of each of these, I spoke doubtfully about some, dealt with others in a tone of assurance, and in several instances simply confessed my ignorance. Hereupon she began to press me harder still, expostulating with me as though it were a thing unallowable that I should be ignorant of what I did not know, yet at the same time affirming her own unworthiness to understand mysteries so deep. In a word I was ashamed to refuse her request and allowed her to extort from me a promise that I would devote a special work to this subject for her use. Till the present time I have had to defer the fulfilment of my promise: as I now perceive, by the Will of God in order that it should be consecrated to her memory. As in a previous work I clothed her with the priestly vestments, so in the pages of the present she may rejoice that she has passed through the wilderness of this world and has come at last to the land of promise.

8. But let me continue the task which I have begun. Whilst I was in search of a suitable dwelling for so great a lady, whose only conception of the solitary life included a place of resort like Mary’s inn; suddenly messengers flew this way and that and the whole East was terror-struck. For news came that the hordes of the Huns had poured forth all the way from Maeotis (they had their haunts between the icy Tanais and the rude Massagetae where the gates of Alexander keep back

the wild peoples behind the Caucasus); and that, speeding hither and thither on their nimble-footed horses, they were filling all the world with panic and bloodshed. The Roman army was absent at the time, being detained in Italy on account of the civil wars. Of these Huns Herodotus [Hdt. 1:106, (of the Scythians)] tells us that under Darius King of the Medes they held the East in bondage for twenty years and that from the Egyptians and Ethiopians they exacted a yearly tribute. May Jesus avert from the Roman world the farther assaults of these wild beasts! Everywhere their approach was unexpected, they outstripped rumour in speed, and, when they came, they spared neither religion nor rank nor age, even for wailing infants they had no pity. Children were forced to die before it could be said that they had begun to live; and little ones not realizing their miserable fate might be seen smiling in the hands and at the weapons of their enemies.

It was generally agreed that the goal of the invaders was Jerusalem and that it was their excessive desire for gold which made them hasten to this particular city. Its walls uncared for in time of peace were accordingly put in repair. Antioch was in a state of siege. Tyre, desirous of cutting itself off from the land, sought once more its ancient island. We too were compelled to marl our ships and to lie off the shore as a precaution against the arrival of our foes. No matter how hard the winds might blow, we could not but dread the barbarians more than shipwreck. It was not, however, so much for our own safety that we were anxious as for the chastity of the virgins who were with us. Just at that time also there was dissension among us, and our intestine struggles threw into the shade our battle with the barbarians. I myself clung to my long-settled abode in the East and gave way to my deep-seated love for the holy places. Fabiola, used as she was to moving from city to city and having no other property but what her baggage contained, returned to her native land; to live in poverty where she had once been rich, to lodge in the house of another, she who in old days had lodged many guests in her own, and-not unduly to prolong my account-to bestow upon the poor before the eyes of Rome the proceeds of that property which Rome knew her to have sold.

9. This only do I lament that in her the holy places lost a necklace of the loveliest. Rome recovered what it had previously parted with, and the wanton and slanderous tongues of the heathen were confuted by the testimony of their own eyes. Others may commend her pity, her humility, her faith: I will rather praise her ardour of soul. The letter in which as a young man I once urged Heliodorus to the life of a hermit she knew by heart, and whenever she looked upon the walls of Rome she complained that she was in a prison. Forgetful of her sex, unmindful of her frailty, and only desiring to be alone she was in fact there where her soul lingered. The counsels of her friends could not hold her back; so eager was she to burst from the city as from a place of bondage. Nor did she leave the distribution of her alms to others; she distributed them herself. Her wish was that, after equitably dispensing her money to the poor, she might herself find support from others for the sake of

Christ. In such haste was she and so impatient of delay that you would fancy her on the eve of her departure. As she was always ready, death could not find her unprepared.

10. As I pen her praises, my dear Pammachius seems suddenly to rise before me. His wife Paulina sleeps that he may keep vigil; she has gone before her husband that he remaining behind may be Christ's servant. Although he was his wife's heir, others-I mean the poor-are now in possession of his inheritance. He and Fabiola contended for the privilege of setting up a tent like that of Abraham at Portus. The contest which arose between them was for the supremacy in shewing kindness. Each conquered and each was overcome. Both admitted themselves to be at once victors and vanquished for what each had desired to effect alone both accomplished together. They united their resources and combined their plans that harmony might forward what rivalry must have brought to nought. No sooner was the scheme broached than it was carried out. A house was purchased to serve as a shelter, and a crowd flocked into it. "There was no more travail in Jacob nor distress in Israel." [Num. 23:21. LXX] The seas carried voyagers to find a welcome here on landing. Travellers left Rome in haste to take advantage of the mild coast before setting sail. What Publius once did in the island of Malta for one apostle and-not to leave room for gainsaying-for a single ship's crew, [Acts 28:7] Fabiola and Pammachius have done over and over again for large numbers; and not only have they supplied the wants of the destitute, but so universal has been their munificence that they have provided additional means for those who have something already. The whole world knows that a home for strangers has been established at Portus; and Britain has learned in the summer what Egypt and Parthia knew in the spring.

11. In the death of this noble lady we have seen a fulfilment of the apostle's words:- "All things work together for good to them that fear God." Having a presentiment of what would happen, she had written to several monks to come and release her from the burthen under which she laboured; for she wished to make to herself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness that they might receive her into everlasting habitations. [Luke 16:9] They came to her and she made them her friends; she fell asleep in the way that she had wished, and having at last laid aside her burthen she soared more lightly up to heaven. How great a marvel Fabiola had been to Rome while she lived came out in the behaviour of the people now that she was dead. Hardly had she breathed her last breath, hardly had she given back her soul to Christ whose it was when

"Flying Rumour heralding the woe" [Virg. A. 11:139] gathered the entire city to attend her obsequies. Psalms were chaunted and the gilded ceilings of the temples were shaken with uplifted shouts of Alleluia. "The choirs of young and old extolled her deeds And sang the praises of her holy soul." [Virg. A. 8:287, 288] Her triumph

was more glorious far than those won by Furius over the Gauls, by Papirius over the Samnites, by Scipio over Numantia, by Pompey over Pontus. They had conquered physical force, she had mastered spiritual iniquities. [Eph. 6:12] I seem to hear even now the squadrons which led the van of the procession, and the sound of the feet of the multitude which thronged in thousands to attend her funeral. The streets, porches, and roofs from which a view could be obtained were inadequate to accommodate the spectators. On that day Rome saw all her peoples gathered together in one, and each person present flattered himself that he had some part in the glory of her penitence. No wonder indeed that men should thus exult in the salvation of one at whose conversion there was joy among the angels in heaven. [Luke 15:7, Luke 15:10]

12. I give you this, Fabiola, the best gift of my aged powers, to be as it were a funeral offering. Oftentimes have I praised virgins and widows and married women who have kept their garments always white [Eccl. 9:8; Rev. 3:4] and who follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth. [Rev. 14:4] Happy indeed is she in her encomium who throughout her life has been stained by no defilement. But let envy depart and censoriousness be silent. If the father of the house is good why should our eye be evil? [Matt. 20:15] The soul which fell among thieves has been carried home upon the shoulders of Christ. [Luke 10:30; Luke 15:5] In our father’s house are many mansions. [Joh. 14:2] Where sin hath abounded, grace hath much more abounded. [Rom. 5:20] To whom more is forgiventhe same loveth more. [Luke 7:47]

Letter 79. To Salvina.

A letter of consolation addressed by Jerome to Salvina (a lady of the imperial court) on the death of her husband Nebridius. After excusing his temerity in addressing a complete stranger Jerome eulogizes the virtues of Nebridius, particularly his chastity and his bounty to the poor. He next warns Salvina (in no courtier-like terms) of the dangers that will beset her as a widow and recommends her to devote all her energies to the careful training of the son and daughter who are now her principal charge. The tone of the letter is somewhat arrogant and it can hardly be regarded as one of Jerome's happiest efforts. Salvina, however, consecrated her life to deeds of piety, and became one of Chrysostom's deaconesses. Its date is 400 a.d.

1. My desire to do my duty may, I fear, expose me to a charge of self-seeking; and although I do but follow the example of Him who said: "learn of me for I am meek and lowly of heart," [Matt. 11:29] the course that I am taking may be attributed to a desire for notoriety. Men may say that I am not so much trying to console a widow in affliction as endeavouring to creep into the imperial court; and that, while I make a pretext of offering comfort, I am really seeking the friendship of the great. Clearly this will not be the opinion of any one who knows the commandment: "thou shall not respect the person of the poor," [Lev. 19:15] a precept given lest under pretext of shewing pitywe should judge unjust judgment. For each individualis to be judged not by his personal importance but by the merits of his case. His wealth need not stand in the way of the rich man, if he makes a good use of it; and poverty can be no recommendation to the poor if in the midst of squalor and want he fails to keep clear of wrong doing. Proofs of these things are not wanting either in scriptural times or our own; for Abraham, in spite of his immense wealth, was "the friend of God" [Isa. 41:8; Jas. 2:23] and poor men are daily arrested and punished for their crimes by law.

She whom I now address is both rich and poor so that she cannot say what she actually has. For it is not of her purse that I am speaking but of the purity of her soul. I do not know her face but I am well acquainted with her virtues; for report speaks well of her and her youth makes her chastity all the more commendable.

By her grief for her young husband she has set an example to all wives; and by her resignation she has proved that she believes him not lost but gone before. The greatness of her bereavement has brought out the reality of her religion. For while she forgets her lost Nebridius, she knows that in Christ he is with her still.

But why do I write to one who is a stranger to me? For three reasons. First, because (as a priest is bound to do) I love all Christians as my children and find my glory in promoting their welfare. Secondly because the father of Nebridius was bound to me by the closest ties. Lastly-and this is a stronger reason than the others-because I have failed to say no to my son Avitus. With an importunacy surpassing that of the widow towards the unjust judge [Luke 18:1-5] he wrote to me so frequently and put before me so many instances in which I had previously dealt with a similar theme, that he overcame my modest reluctance and made the resolve to do not what would best become me but what would most nearly meet his wishes.

2. As the mother of Nebridius was sister to the empress and as he was brought up in the bosom of his aunt, another might perhaps praise him for having so much endeared himself to the unvanquished emperor. Theodosius, indeed, procured him from Africa a wife of the highest rank, who, as her native land at this time was distracted by civil wars, became a kind of hostage for its loyalty. I ought to say at the very outset that Nebridius seems to have had a presentiment that he would die early. For amid the splendour of the palace and in the high positions to which his rank and not his years entitled him he lived always as one who believed that he must soon go to meet Christ. Of Cornelius, the centurion of the Italian band, the sacred narrative tells us that God so fully accepted him as to send to him an angel; and that this angel told him that to his merit was due the mystery whereby Peter from the narrow limits of the circumcision was conveyed to the wide field of the uncircumcision. He was the first Gentile baptized by the apostle, and in him the Gentiles were set apart to salvation. Now of this man it is written: ”there was a certain man in Caesarea called Cornelius, a centurion of the band called the Italian band, a devout man and one that feared God with all his house, which gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God alway.

[Acts 10:1, Acts 10:2] All this that is said of him I claim-with a change of name only-for my dear Nebridius. So ”devout” was this latter and so enamoured of chastity that at his marriage he was still pure. So truly did he ”fear God with all his house” that forgetting his high position he spent all his time with monks and clergymen. So profuse were the alms which he gave to the people that his doors were continually beset with swarms of sick and poor. And assuredly he ”prayed to God alway” that what was for the best might happen to him. Therefore ”speedily was he taken away lest that wickedness should alter his understanding ...for his soul pleased the Lord. [Wisdom 4:11, Wisdom 4:14] Thus I may truthfully apply to him the apostle’s words: ”Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he

that feareth Him and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him. [Acts 10:34, Acts 10:35] As a soldierNebridius took no harm from his cloak and sword-belt and troops of orderlies; for while he wore the uniform of the emperor he was enlisted in the service of God. On the other hand nothing is gained by men who while they affect coarse mantles, sombre tunics, dirt, and poverty, belie by their deeds their lofty pretensions. Of another centurion we find in the gospel this testimony from our Lord:-"I have not found so great faith, no not in Israel.

[Matt. 8:10] And, to go back to earlier times, we read of Joseph who gave proof of his integrity both when he was in want and when he was rich, and who inculcated freedom of soul both as slave and as lord. He was made next to Pharaoh and invested with the emblems of royalty; [Gen. 41:42-44] yet so dear was he to God that, alone of all the patriarchs, he became the father of two tribes. [Gen. 41:50-52] Daniel and the three children were set over the affairs of Babylon and were numbered among the princes of the state; yet although they wore the dress of Nebuchadnezzar, in their hearts they served God. Mordecai also and Esther amid purple and silk and jewels overcame pride with humility; and although captives were so highly esteemed as to be able to impose commands upon their conquerors.

3. These remarks are intended to shew that the youth of whom I speak used his kinship to the royal family, his abundant wealth, and the outward tokens of power, as helps to virtue. For, as the preacher says, "wisdom is a defence and money is a defence" [Eccl. 7:12] also. We must not hastily conclude that this statement conflicts with that of the Lord: "verily I say unto you that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven; and again I say unto you, It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven. [Matt. 19:23, Matt. 19:24] Were it so, the salvation of Zacchaeus the publican, described in scripture as a man of great wealth, would contradict the Lord's declaration. But that what is impossible with men is possible with God [Mark 10:27] we are taught by the counsel of the apostle who thus writes to Timothy:-"charge them that are rich in this world that they be not highminded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God who giveth us richly all things to enjoy, that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute. willing to communicate, laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come that they may lay hold on the true life.

We have learned how a camel can pass through a needle's eye, how an animal with a hump on its back, when it has laid down its packs, can take to itself the wings of a dove [Ps. 55:6] and rest in the branches of the tree which has grown from a grain of mustard seed. [Matt. 13:31, Matt. 13:32] In Isaiah we read of camels, the dromedaries of Midian and Ephah and Sheba, which carry gold and incense to the city of the Lord. [Isa. 60:6] On like typical camels the Ishmaelitish merchantmen [Gen. 37:25] bring down to the Egyptians perfume and incense and

balm (of the kind that grows in Gilead good for the healing of wounds [Jer. 8:22]); and so fortunate are they that in the purchase and sale of Joseph they have for their merchandise the Saviour of the world. And Aesop's fable tells us of a mouse which after eating its fill can no longer creep out as before it crept in. [Horace, Epist. I. 7:30, 31]

4. Daily did my dear Nebridius revolve the words: "they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare" of the devil "and into many lusts." [1 Tim. 6:9] All the money that the Emperor's bounty gave him or that his badges of office procured him he laid out for the benefit of the poor. For he knew the commandment of the Lord: "If thou wilt be perfect go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, and come and follow me." [Matt. 19:21] And because he could not literally fulfil these directions, having a wife and little children and a large household, he made to himself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness that they might receive him into everlasting habitations. [Luke 16:9] He did not once for all cast away his brethren, as did the apostles who forsook father and nets and ship, [Matt. 4:18-22] but by an equality he ministered to the want of others out of his own abundance that afterwards their wealth might be a supply for his own want. [2 Cor. 8:14] The lady to whom this letter is addressed knows that what I narrate is only known to me by hearsay, but she is aware also that I am no Greek writer repaying with flattery some benefit conferred upon me. Far be such an imputation from all Christians. Having food and raiment we are therewith content. [1 Tim. 6:8] Where there is cheap cabbage and household bread, a sufficiency to eat and a sufficiency to drink, these riches are superfluous and no place is left for flattery with its sordid calculations. You may conclude therefore that, where there is no motive to tell a falsehood, the testimony given is true.

5. It must not, however, be supposed that I praise Nebridius only for his liberality in alms-giving, although we are taught the great importance of this in the words: "water will quench a flaming fire; and alms maketh an atonement for sins. [Ecclus. 3:30] I will pass on now to his other virtues each one of which is to be found but in few men. Who ever entered the furnace of the King of Babylon without being burned? [Cf. Dan. 3:25] Was there ever a young man whose garment his Egyptian mistress did not seize? [Gen. 39:12] Was there ever a eunuch's wife contented with a childless marriage bed? Is there any man who is not appalled by the struggle of which the apostle says: "I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members? [Rom. 7:23] But wonderful to say Nebridius, though bred up in a palace as a companion and fellow pupil of the Augusti (whose table is supplied by the whole world and ministered to by land and sea); Nebridius, I say, though in the midst of abundance and in the flower of his age, shewed himself more modest than a girl and never gave occasion, even the slightest, forscandalous rumours.

Again though he was the friend, companion, and cousin of princes and had been educated along with them-a thing which makes even strangers intimate-he did not allow pride to inflate him or frown with contempt upon others who were less fortunate than he: no, he was kind to all, and while he loved the princes as brothers he revered them as sovereigns. He used to avow that his own health and safety were dependent upon theirs. Their attendants and all those officers of the palace who by their numbers add to the grandeur of the imperial court he had so well conciliated by shewing his regard for them, that men who were in reality inferior to him were led by his attention to believe themselves his peers. It is no easy task to throw one's rank into the shade by one's virtue, or to gain the affection of men who are forced to yield you precedence. What widow was not supported by his help? What ward did not find in him a father? To him the bishops of the entire East used to bring the prayers of the unfortunate and the petitions of the distressed. Whenever he asked the Emperor for a boon, he sought either alms for the poor or ransom for captives or clemency for the afflicted. Accordingly the princes also used gladly to accede to his requests, for they knew well that their bounty would benefit not one man but many.

6. Why do I farther postpone the end? "All flesh is grass and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field." [Isa. 40:6] The dust has returned to the dust. [Gen. 3:19] He has fallen asleep in the Lord and has been laid with his fathers, full of days and of light and fostered in a good old age. For "wisdom is the grey hair unto men." [Wisd. 4:9] "In a short time he" has "fulfilled a long time." [Wisd. 4:13] In his place we now have his charming children. His wife is the heir of his chastity. To those who miss his father the tiny Nebridius shews him once more, for "Such were the eyes and hands and looks he bore." [Virg. A. 3:490] A spark of the parent's excellence shines in the son: the child's face betrays like a mirror a resemblance in character. "That narrow frame contains a hero's heart." [Virg. G. 4:82]

And with him there is his sister, a basket of roses and lilies, a mixture of ivory and purple. Her face though it takes after that of her father inclines to be still more attractive; and, while her complexion is that of her mother, she is so like both her parents that the lineaments of each are reflected in her features. So sweet and honied is she that she is the pride of all her kinsfolk. The Emperor does not disdain to hold her in his arms, and the Empress likes nothing better than to nurse her on her lap. Everyone runs to be the first to catch her up. Now she clings to the neck of one, and now she is fondled in the arms of another. She prattles and stammers, and is all the sweeter for her faltering tongue.

7. You have, therefore, Salvina, those to nurse who may well represent to you your absent husband: "Lo, children are an heritage of the Lord; and the fruit of the womb is his reward. [Ps. 127:3] In the place of one husband you have received

two children, and thus your affection has more objects than before. All that was due to him you can give to them. Temper grief with love, for if he is gone they are still with you. It is no small merit in God's eyes to bring up children well. Hear the apostle's counsel: "Let not a widow be taken into the number under threescore years old, having been the wife of one man, well reported of for good works; if she have brought up children, if she have lodged strangers, if she have washed the saints' feet, if she have relieved the afflicted, if she have diligently followed every good work. [1 Tim. 5:9, 1 Tim. 5:10] Here you learn the roll of the virtues which God requires of you, what is due to the name of widow which you bear, and by what good deeds you can attain to that second degree of chastity which is still open to you. Do not be disturbed because the apostle allows none to be chosen as a widow under threescore years old, neither suppose that he intends to reject those who are still young.

Believe that you are indeed chosen by him who said to his disciple, "Let no man despise thy youth," [1 Tim. 4:12] your want of age that is, not your want of continence. If this be not his meaning, all who become widows under threescore years will have to take husbands. He is training a church still untaught in Christ, and making provision for people of all stations but especially for the poor, the charge of whom had been committed to himself and Barnabas. [Gal. 2:9, Gal. 2:10] Thus he wishes only those to be supported by the exertions of the church who cannot labour with their own hands, and who are widows indeed, [Cf. 1 Tim. 5:3] approved by their years and by their lives. The faults of his children made Eli the priest an offence to God. On the other hand He is appeased by the virtues of such as "continue in faith and charity and holiness with chastity. "O Timothy," cries the apostle, "keep thyself pure. [1 Tim. 5:22] Far be it from me to suspect you capable of doing anything wrong; still it is only a kindness to admonish one whose youth and opulence lead her into temptation. You must take what I am going to say as addressed not to you but to your girlish years. A widow "that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth. [1 Tim. 5:6] So speaks the "chosen vessel" [Acts 9:15] and the words are brought out from his treasure who could boldly say:

"Do ye seek a proof of Christ speaking in me? [2 Cor. 13:3, Vulg] Yet they are the words of one who in his own person admitted the weakness of the human body, saying: "The good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not that I do. [Rom. 7:19] And again: Therefore "I keep under my body and bring it into subjection lest that by any means when I have preached to others I myself should be a castaway. [1 Cor. 9:27] If Paul is afraid, which of us can venture to be confident? If David the friend of God and Solomon who loved God [1 K. 3:3] were overcome like other men, if their fall is meant to warn us and their penitence to lead us to salvation, who in this slippery life can be sure of not falling? Never let pheasants be seen upon your table, or plump turtledoves or black cock from Ionia, or any of those birds so expensive that they fly away with the largest properties. And do

not fancy that you eschew meat diet when you reject pork, hare, and venison and the savoury flesh of other quadrupeds. It is not the number of feet that makes the difference but delicacy of flavour. I know that the apostle has said: ”every creature of God is good and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving. [1 Tim. 4:4] But the same apostle says:

”it is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine,” [Rom. 14:21] and in another place: ”be not drunk with wine wherein is excess. [Eph. 5:18] ”Every creature of God is good”-the precept is intended for those who are careful how they may please their husbands. [1 Cor. 7:34] Let those feed on flesh who serve the flesh, whose bodies boil with desire, who are tied to husbands, and who set their hearts on having offspring. Let those whose wombs are burthened cram their stomachs with flesh. But you have buried every indulgence in your husband’s tomb: over his bier you have cleansed with tears a face stained with rouge and whitelead; you have exchanged a white robe and gilded buskins for a sombre tunic and black shoes; and only one thing more is needed, perseverance in fasting. Let paleness and squalor be henceforth your jewels. Do not pamper your youthful limbs with a bed of down or kindle your young blood with hot baths. Hear what words a heathen poet [Virgil, Aen. 4:28, 29] puts into the mouth of a chaste widow:

”He, my first spouse, has robbed me of my loves. So be it: let him keep them in the tomb.” If common glass is worth so much, what must be the value of a pearl of price? If in deference to a law of nature a Gentile widow can condemn all sensual indulgence, what must we expect from a Christian widow who owes her chastity not to one who is dead but to one with whom she shall reign in heaven?

8. Do not, I pray you, regard these general remarks-applying as they do to all young women-as intended to insult you or to take you to task. I write in a spirit of apprehension, yet pray that you may never know the nature of my fears. A woman’s reputation is a tender plant; it is like a fair flower which withers at the slightest blast and fades away at the first breath of wind. Especially is this so when she is of an age to fall into temptation and the authority of a husband is wanting to her. For the very shadow of a husband is a wife’s safeguard. What has a widow to do with a large household or with troops of retainers? As servants, it is true, she must not despise them, but as men she ought to blush before them. If a grand establishment requires such domestics, let her at least set over them an old man of spotless morals whose dignity may guard the honour of his mistress. I know of many widows who, although they live with closed doors, have not escaped the imputation of too great intimacy with their servants. These latter become objects of suspicion when they dress above their degree, or when they are stout and sleek, or when they are of an age inclined to passion, or when knowledge of the favour in which they are secretly held betrays itself in a too confident demeanour. For such pride, however carefully concealed, is sure to break out in a contempt for fellow-

servants as servants. I make these seemingly superfluous remarks that you may keep your heart with all diligence [Prov. 4:23] and guard against every scandal that may be broached concerning you.

9. Take no well-curled steward to walk with you, no effeminate actor, no devilish singer of poisoned sweetness, no spruce and smooth-shorn youth. Let no theatrical compliments, no obsequious adulation be associated with you. Keep with you bands of widows and virgins; and let your consolers be of your own sex. The character of the mistress is judged by that of the maid. So long as you have with you a holy mother, so long as an aunt vowed to virginity is at your side, you ought not to neglect them and at your own risk to seek the company of strangers. Let the divine scripture be always in your hands, and give yourself so frequently to prayer that such shafts of evil thoughts as ever assail the young may thereby find a shield to repel them. It is difficult, nay more it is impossible, to escape the beginnings of those internal motions which the Greeks with much significance call "προπάθειαι" that is 'predispositions to passion.' The fact is that suggestions of sin tickle all our minds, and the decision rests with our own hearts either to admit or to reject the thoughts which come. The Lord of nature Himself says in the gospel:-"out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." [Matt. 15:19] It is clear from the testimony of another book that "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," [Gen. 8:21] and that the soul wavers between the works of the flesh and of the spirit enumerated by the apostle, [Gal. 5:19-23] desiring now the former and now the latter. For

"From faults no mortal man is wholly free; The best is he who has but few of them." [Horace, Sat. I 3:68, 69] And, to quote the same poet, "At moles men cavil when they mark fair skins." [Horace, Sat. I. 6:66] To the same effect in different words the prophet says:-"I am so troubled that I cannot speak," [Ps. 77:4] and in the same book, "Be ye angry and sin not." [Ps. 4:4, LXX. Quoted Eph. 4:26] So Archytas of Tarentum once said to a careless steward: "I should have flogged you to death had I not been in a passion." For "the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God." [Jas. 1:20] Now what is here said of one form of perturbation may be applied to all. Just as anger is human and the repression of it Christian, so it is with other passions. The flesh always lusts after the things of the flesh, and by its allurements draws the soul to partake of deadly pleasures; but it is for us Christians to restrain the desire for sensual indulgence by an intenser love for Christ. It is for us to break in the mettlesome brute within us by fasting, in order that it may desire not lust but food and amble easily and steadily forward having for its rider the Holy Spirit.

10. Why do I write thus? To shew you that you are but human and subject, unless you guard against them, to human passions. We are all of us made of the same clay and formed of the same elements. Whether we wear silk or rags we are all at the mercy of the same desire. It does not fear the royal purple; it does not disdain

the squalor of the mendicant. It is better then to suffer in stomach than in soul to rule the body than to serve it, to lose one's balance than to lose one's chastity. Let us not lull ourselves with the delusion that we can always fall back on penitence. For this is at best but a remedy for misery. Let us shrink from incurring a wound which must be painful to cure. For it is one thing to enter the haven of salvation with ship safe and merchandise uninjured, and another to cling naked to a plank and, as the waves toss you this way and that, to be dashed again and again on the sharp rocks. A widow should be ignorant that second marriage is permitted; she should know nothing of the apostle's words:-"It is better to marry than to burn. [1 Cor. 7:9] Remove what is said to be worse, the risk of burning, and marriage will cease to be regarded as good. Of course I repudiate the slanders of the heretics; I know that "marriage is honourable ...and the bed undefiled.

[Heb. 13:4] Yet Adam even after he was expelled from paradise had but one wife. The accursed and blood-stained Lamech, descended from the stock of Cain, was the first to make out of one rib two wives; and the seedling of digamy then planted was altogether destroyed by the doom of the deluge. It is true that in writing to Timothy the apostle from fear of fornication is forced to countenance second marriage. His words are these:-"I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully. But he immediately adds as a reason for this concession; "for some are already turned aside after Satan. [1 Tim. 5:14, 1 Tim. 5:15] Thus we see that he is offering not a crown to those who stand but a helping hand to those who are down. What must a second marriage be if it is looked on merely as an alternative to the brothel! "For some," he writes, "are already turned aside after Satan. The upshot of the whole matter is that, if a young widow cannot or will not contain herself, she had better take a husband to her bed than the devil.

A noble alternative truly which is only to be embraced in preference to Satan! In old days even Jerusalem went a-whoring and opened her feet to every one that passed by. [Ezek. 16:25] It was in Egypt that she was first deflowered and there that her teats were bruised. [Ezek. 23:3] And afterwards when she had come to the wilderness and, impatient of the delays of her leader Moses, had said when maddened by the stings of lust: "these be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt," [Exod. 32:4] she received statutes that were not good and commandments that were altogether evil whereby she should not live [Ezek. 20:25] but should be punished through them. Is it surprising then that when the apostle had said in another place of young widows: "when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ they will marry, having damnation because they have cast off their first faith," [1 Tim. 5:11, 1 Tim. 5:12] he granted to such as should wax wanton statutes of digamy that were not good and commandments that were altogether evil? For the reason which he gives for allowing a second husband would justify a woman in marrying a third or even, if she liked, a twentieth. He

evidently wished to shew them that he was not so much anxious that they should take husbands as that they should avoid paramours.

These things, dearest daughter in Christ, I impress upon you and frequently repeat, that you may forget those things which are behind and reach forth unto those things which are before. [Phil. 3:13] You have widows like yourself worthy to be your models, Judith renowned in Hebrew story and Anna the daughter of Phanuel famous in the gospel. Both these lived day and night in the temple and preserved the treasure of their chastity by prayer and by fasting. One was a type of the Church which cuts off the head of the devil and the other first received in her arms the saviour of the world and had revealed to her the holy mysteries which were to come. [Luke 2:36-38] In conclusion I beg you to attribute the shortness of my letter not to want of language or scarcity of matter but to a deep sense of modesty which makes me fear to force myself too long upon the ears of a stranger, and causes me to dread the secret verdict of those who read my words.

Letter 80. From Rufinus to Macarius.

Rufinus on his return from Bethlehem to Rome published a Latin version of Origen's treatise "περι ᾽Αρχῶν", On First Principles. To this he prefixed the preface which is here printed among Jerome's letters. Professing to take as his model Jerome's own translations of Origen's commentaries which he greatly praises, he declares that, following his example, he has paraphrased the obscure passages of the treatise and has paraphrased the obscure passages of the treatise and has omitted as due to interpolators such parts as seem heretical. This preface with its insincere praise of Jerome (whose name, however, is not mentioned) and its avowed manipulation of Origen's text caused much perplexity at Rome (see Letters LXXXI., LXXXIII., and LXXXIV.), and gave rise to the controversy between Rufinus and Jerome described in the Prolegomena, and given at length in vol. iii. of this Series. The date is 398 a.d.

1. Large numbers of the brethren have, I know, in their zeal for the knowledge of the scriptures begged learned men skilled in Greek literature to make Origen a Roman by bringing home his teaching to Latin ears. One of these scholars, a dear brother and associate, at the request of bishop Damasus translated from Greek into Latin his two homilies on the Song of Songs and prefaced the work with an eloquent and eulogistic introduction such as could not fail to arouse in all an ardent desire to read and to study Origen. To the soul of that just man-so he declared-the words of the Song were applicable: "the king hath brought me into his chambers;" and he went on to speak thus: "while in his other books Origen surpasses all former writers, in dealing with the Song of Songs he surpasses himself." In his preface he pledges himself to give to Roman ears these homilies of Origen and as many of his other works as he can. His style is certainly attractive but I can see that he aims at a more ambitious task than that of a mere translator. Not content with rendering the words of Origen he desires to be himself the teacher. I for my part do but follow up an enterprise which he has sanctioned and commenced, but I lack his vigorous eloquence with which to adorn the sayings of this great man. I am even afraid lest my deficiencies and inadequate command of Latin may detract seriously from

the reputation of one whom this writer has deservedly termed second only to the apostles as a teacher of the Church in knowledge and in wisdom.

2. Often turning this over in my mind I held my peace and refused to listen to the brethren when-as frequently happened-they urged me to undertake the work. But your persistence, most faithful brother Macarius, is so great that even want of ability cannot resist it. Thus, to escape the constant importunings to which you subject me, I have given way contrary to my resolution; yet only on these terms that, so far as is possible, I am to be free to follow the rules of translation laid down by my predecessors, and particularly those acted upon by the writer whom I have just mentioned. He has rendered into Latin more than seventy of Origen's homiletical treatises and a few also of his commentaries upon the apostle; and in these wherever the Greek text presents a stumbling block, he has smoothed it down in his version and has so emended the language used that a Latin writer can find no word that is at variance with our faith. In his steps, therefore, I propose to walk, if not displaying the same vigorous eloquence at least observing the same rules. I shall not reproduce passages in Origen's books which disagree with or contradict his own statements elsewhere. The reason of these inconsistencies I have put more fully before you in the defence of Origen's writings composed by Pamphilianus which I have supplemented by a short treatise of my own.

I have given what I consider plain proofs that his books have been corrupted in numbers of places by heretics and ill-disposed persons, and particularly those which you now urge me to translate. The books "περὶ ᾽Αρχῶν", that is of Principles or of Powers, are in fact in other respects extremely obscure and difficult. For they treat of subjects on which the philosophers have spent all their days and yet have been able to discover nothing. In dealing with these themes Origen has done his best to make belief in a Creator and a rational account of things created subservient to religion and not, as with the philosophers, to irreligion. Wherever then in his books I have found a statement concerning the Trinity contrary to those which in other places he has faithfully made on the same subject, I have either omitted the passage as garbled and misleading or have substituted that view of the matter which I find him to have frequently asserted. Again, wherever-in haste to get on with his theme-he is brief or obscure relying on the skill and intelligence of his readers, I, to make the passage clearer, have sought to explain it by adding any plainer statements that I have read on the point in his other books. But I have added nothing of my own. The words used may be found in other parts of his writings: they are his, not mine. I mention this here to take from cavillers all pretext for once more finding fault.

But let such perverse and contentious persons look well to what they are themselves doing.

3. Meantime I have taken up this great task-if so be that God will grant your prayers-not to stop the mouths of slanderers (an impossible feat except perhaps to God) but to give to those who desire it the means of making progress in knowledge. In the sight of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, I adjure and require everyone who shall either read or copy these books of mine, by his belief in a kingdom to come, by the mystery of the resurrection from the dead, by the eternal fire which is "prepared for the devil and his angels;" [Matt. 25:41] as he hopes not to inherit eternally that place where "there is weeping and gnashing of teeth," [Matt. 22:13] and where "their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched," [Mark 9:44] let him add nothing to what is written, let him subtract nothing, let him insert nothing, let him alter nothing, but let him compare his transcript with the copies from which it is made, let him correct it to the letter, and let him punctuate it aright. Every manuscript that is not properly corrected and punctuated he must reject: for otherwise the difficulties in the text arising from the want of punctuation will make obscure arguments still more obscure to those who read them.

Letter 81. To Rufinus.

A friendly letter of remonstrance written by Jerome to Rufinus on receipt of his version of the "περὶ ᾽Αρχῶν" see the preceding letter). Being sent in the first instance to Pammachius this latter treacherously suppressed it and thus put an end to all hope of the reconciliation of the two friends. The date of the letter is 399 a.d. 1. That you have lingered some time at Rome your own language shews. Yet I feel sure that a yearning to see your spiritual parents would have drawn you to your native country, had not grief for your mother deterred you lest a sorrow scarce bearable away might have proved unbearable at home. As to your complaint that men listen only to the dictates of passion and refuse to acquiesce in your judgement and mine; the Lord is witness to my conscience that since our reconciliation I have harboured no rancour in my breast to injure anyone; on the contrary I have taken the utmost pains to prevent any chance occurrence being set down to ill-will. But what can I do so long as everyone supposes that he has a right to do as he does and thinks that in publishing a slander he is requiting not originating a calumny? True friendship ought never to conceal what it thinks.

The short preface to the books "περὶ ᾽Αρχῶν" which has been sent to me I recognize as yours by the style. You know best with what intention it was written; but even a fool can see how it must necessarily be understood. Covertly or rather openly I am the person aimed at. I have often myself reigned a controversy to practise declamation. Thus I might now recall this well-worn artifice and praise you in your own method. But far be it from me to imitate what I blame in you. In fact I have so far restrained my feelings that I make no charge against you, and, although injured, decline for my part to injure a friend. But another time, if you wish to follow any one, pray be satisfied with your own judgement. The objects which we seek are either good or bad. If they are good, they need no help from another; and if they are bad, the fact that many sin together is no excuse. I prefer thus to expostulate with you as a friend rather than to give public vent to my indignation at the wrong I have suffered. I want you to see that when I am reconciled to anyone I become his sincere friend and do not-to borrow a figure from Plautus [Plautus, Aul. 2:2, 18] -while offering him bread with one hand, hold a stone in the other.

2. My brother Paulinian has not yet returned from home and I fancy that you will see him at Aquileia at the house of the reverend pope Chromatius. I am also sending the reverend presbyter Rufinus on business to Milan by way of Rome, and have requested him to communicate to you my feelings and respects. I am sending the same message to the rest of my friends; lest, as the apostle says, ye bite and devour one another, ye be consumed one of another. [Gal. 5:15] It only remains for you and your friends to shew your moderation by giving no offence to those who are disinclined to put up with it. For you will hardly find everyone like me. There are few who can be pleased with pretended eulogies.

Letter 82. To Theophilus Bishop of Alexandria.

Two years after his former attempt (see Letter 63.) Theophilus again wrote to Jerome urging him to be reconciled with John of Jerusalem. Jerome replies that there is nothing he desires more earnestly than peace but that this must be real and not a hollow truce. He speaks very bitterly of John who has, he alleges, intrigued to procure his banishment from Palestine. He also deals with the ordination of his brother Paulinian (for which see Letter 51.) and defends himself for having translated Origen's commentaries by adducing the example of Hilary of Poitiers. This letter should be compared with the Treatise "Against John of Jerusalem" in this volume. Its date is 399 a.d.

1. Your letter shews you to possess that heritage of the Lord of which when going to the Father he said to the apostles, "peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you," [Joh. 14:27] and to own the happiness described in the words, "blessed are the peace-makers." [Matt. 5:9] You coax as a father, you teach as a master, you enjoin as a bishop. You come to me not with a rod and severity but in a spirit of kindness, gentleness, and meekness. [1 Cor. 4:21] Your opening words echo the humility of Christ who saved men not with thunder and lightning [Cf. Heb. 12:18] but as a wailing babe in the manger and as a silent sufferer upon the cross. You have read the prediction made in one who was a type of Him, "Lord, remember David and all his meekness," [Ps. 132:1, LXX] and you know how it was fulfilled afterwards in Himself. "Learn of me," He said, "for I am meek and lowly in heart." You have quoted many passages from the sacred books in praise of peace, you have flitted like a bee over the flowery fields of scripture, you have culled with cunning eloquence all that is sweet and conducive to concord. I was already running after peace, but you have made me quicken my pace: my sails were set for the voyage but your exhortation has filled them with a stronger breeze. I drink in the sweet streams of peace not reluctantly and with aversion but eagerly and with open mouth.

2. But what can I do, I who can only wish for peace and have no power to bring it about? Even though the wish may win its recompense with God, its futility must still sadden him who cherishes it. When the apostle said, "as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men," [Rom. 12:18] he knew quite well that the realisation of peace depends upon the consent of two parties. The prophet truly cries "They say Peace, peace: and yet there is no peace. [Jer. 11:14, LXX] To overthrow peace by actions while professing it in words is not hard. To point out its advantages is one thing and to strive for it another. Men's speeches may be all for unity but their actions may enforce bondage. I wish for peace as much as others; and not only do I wish for it, I ask for it. But the peace which I want is the peace of Christ; a true peace, a peace without rancour, a peace which does not involve war, a peace which will not reduce opponents but will unite friends. How can I term domination peace? I must call things by their right names. Where there is hatred there let men talk of feuds; and where there is mutual esteem, there only let peace be spoken of. For my part I neither rend the church nor separate myself from the communion of the fathers. From my very cradle, I may say, I have been reared on Catholic milk;

and no one can be a better churchman than one who has never been a heretic. But I know nothing of a peace that is without love or of a communion that is without peace. In the gospel I read:-"if thou bring thy gift to the altar and there remember-est that thy brother hath aught against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar and go thyway; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift. [Matt. 5:23, Matt. 5:24] If then we may not offer gifts that are our own unless we are at peace with our brothers; how much less can we receive the body of Christ if we cherish enmity in our hearts? How can I conscientiously approach Christ's eucharist and answer the Amen if I doubt the charity of him who ministers it?

3. Hear me, I beg you with patience and do not take truthfulness for flattery. Is any man reluctant to communicate with you? Does any turn his face away when you hold out your hand? Does any at the holy banquet offer you the kiss of Judas? At your approach the monks instead of trembling rejoice. They race to meet you and leaving their dens in the desert are fain to master you by their humility. What compels them to come forth? Is it not their love for you? What draws together the scattered dwellers in the desert? Is it not the esteem in which they hold you? A parent ought to love his children; and not only a parent but a bishop ought to be loved by his children. Neither ought to be feared. There is an old saying: "whom a man fears he hates; and whom he hates, he would fain see dead. Accordingly, while for the young the holy scripture makes fear the beginning of knowledge, it also tells us that "perfect love casteth out fear. [1 Joh. 4:18] You exact no obedience from them; therefore the monks obey you. You offer them a kiss; therefore they bow the neck. You shew yourself a common soldier; therefore they make you their general. Thus from being one among many you become one above many. Freedom is easily

roused if attempts are made to crush it. No one gets more from a free man than he who does not force him to be a slave.

I know the canons of the church; I know what rank her ministers hold; and from men and books I have daily up to the present learned and gathered many things. The kingdom of the mild David was quickly dismembered by one who chastised his people with scorpions and fancied that his fingers were thicker than his father's loins. [1 K. 12:10] The Roman people refused to brook insolence even in a king. Moses was leader of the host of Israel; he brought ten plagues upon Egypt; sky, earth, and sea alike obeyed his commands: yet he is spoken of as "very meek above all the men which were" at that time "upon the face of the earth. [Nu. 12:3] He maintained his forty-years' supremacy because he tempered the insolence of office with gentleness and meekness. When he was being stoned by the people he made intercession for them; [Exod. 17:4] nay more he wished to be blotted out of God's book sooner than that the flock committed to him should perish. [Exod. 32:31, Exod. 32:32] He sought to imitate the Shepherd who would, he knew, carry on his shoulders even the wandering sheep. "The good Shepherd"-they are the Lord's own words-"layeth down his life for the sheep. [Joh. 10:11, RV.; Luke 15:4, Luke 15:5] One of his disciples can wish to be anathema from Christ for his brethren's sake, his kinsmen according to the flesh who were Israelites.

[Rom. 9:3, Rom. 9:4, RV] If then Paul can desire to perish that the lost may not be lost, how much should good parents not provoke their children to wrath [Eph. 6:4] or by too great severity embitter those who are naturally mild.

4. The limits of a letter compel me to restrain myself; otherwise, indignation would make me diffuse. In an epistle which its writer regards as conciliatory but which to me appears full of malice my opponent admits that I have never calumniated him or accused him of heresy. Why then does he calumniate me by spreading a rumour that I am infected with that awful malady and am in revolt against the Church? Why is he so ready to spare his real assailants and so eager to injure me who have done nothing to injure him? Before my brother's ordination he said nothing of any dogmatic difference between himself and pope Epiphanius. What then can have "forced" him-I use his own word-publicly to argue a point which no one had yet raised? One so full of wisdom as you knows well the danger of such discussions and that silence is in such cases the safest course; except, indeed, on some occasion which renders it imperative to deal with great matters. What ability and eloquence it must have needed to compress into a single sermon-as he boasts to have done -all the topics which the most learned writers have treated in detail in voluminous treatises! But this is nothing to me: it is for the hearers of the sermon to notice and for the writer of the letter to realize. But as for me he ought of his own accord to acquit me of bringing the charge against him. I was not present and did not hear the sermon. I was only one of the many, indeed hardly one of them; for

while others were crying out I held my peace. Let us confront the accused and the accuser, and let us give credit to him whose services, life, and doctrine are seen to be the best.

5. You see, do you not, that I shut my eyes to many things and touch upon others only in the most cursory manner, hinting at what I suppose rather than saying out what I think. I understand and approve your manoeuvres; how in the interests of the peace of the Church you stop your ears when you come within range of the Sirens. Moreover, trained as you have been from childhood in sacred studies, you know exactly what is meant by each expression which you use. You knowingly employ ambiguous terms and carefully balanced sentences so as not to condemn others or repudiate us. But it is not a pure faith and a frank confession which look for quibbles or circumlocutions. What is simply believed must be professed with equal simplicity. For my part I could cry out-though it were amid the swords and fires of Babylon, "why does the answer evade the question? why is there no frank, straightforward declaration?" From beginning to end all is shrinking, compromise, ambiguity: as though he were trying to walk on spikes of corn. His blood boils with eagerness for peace; yet he will not give a straightforward answer! others are free to insult him; for, when he is insulted, he does not venture to retaliate. I meantime hold my peace: for the present I shall let it be thought that I am too busy, or ignorant, or afraid; for how would he treat me were I to accuse him, if when I praise him-as he admits himself that I do-he secretly traduces me?

6. His whole letter is less an exposition of his faith than a mass of calumnies aimed at myself. Without any of those mutual courtesies which men may use towards each other without flattery, he takes up my name again and again, flouts it, and bandies it about as though I were blotted out of the book of the living. He thinks that he has beaten me black and blue with his letter; and that I live for the trifles at which he aims, I who from my boyhood have been shut up in a monastic cell, and have always made it my aim to be rather than to seem a good man. Some of us, it is true, he mentions with respect, but only that he may afterwards wound us more deeply. As if, forsooth, we too have no open secrets to reveal! One of his charges is that we have allowed a slave to be ordained. Yet he himself has clergymen of the same class, and he must have read of Onesimus who, being made regenerate by Paul in prison, from a slave became a deacon. Then he throws out that the slave in question was a common informer; and, lest he should be compelled to prove the charge, declares he has it from hearsay only! Why, if I had chosen to repeat the talk of the crowd and to listen to scandal-mongers, he would have learned before now that I too know what all the world knows and have heard the same stories as other people.

He declares farther that ordination has been given to this slave as a reward for a slander spread abroad by him. Does not such cunning and subtlety appal one?

And is there any answer to eloquence so overwhelming? Which is best, to spread a calumny or to suffer from one? To accuse a man whose love you may afterwards wish for, or to pardon a sinner? And is it more tolerable that a common informer should be made a consul than that he should be made an aedile? He knows what I pass over in silence and what I say; what I myself have heard and what-from the fear of Christ-I perhaps refuse to believe.

7. He charges me with having translated Origen into Latin. In this I do not stand alone for the confessor Hilary has done the same, and we are both at one in this that while we have rendered all that is useful, we have cut away all that was harmful. Let him read our versions for himself, if he knows how (and as he constantly converses and daily associates with Italians, I think he cannot be ignorant of Latin); or else, if he cannot quite take it in, let him use his interpreters and then he will come to know that I deserve nothing but praise for the work on which he grounds a charge against me. For, while I have always allowed to Origen his great merit as an interpreter and critic of the scriptures, I have invariably denied the truth of his doctrines. Is it I then that let him loose upon the crowd? Is it I that act sponsor to other preachers like him? No, for I know that a difference must be made between the apostles and all other preachers. The former always speak the truth; but the latter being men sometimes go astray. It would be a strange defence of Origen surely to admit his faults and then to excuse them by saying that other men have been guilty of similar ones! As if, when you cannot venture to defend a man openly, you may hope to shield him by imputing his mistake to a number of others! As for the six thousand volumes of Origen of which he speaks, it is impossible that any one should have read books which have never been written: and I for my part find it easier to suppose that this falsehood is due to the man who professes to have heard it rather than to him who is said to have told it.

8. Again he avers that my brother is the cause of the disagreement which has arisen, a man who is content to stay in a monastic cell and who regards the clerical office as onerous rather than honourable. And although up to this very day he has spoon-fed us with insincere protestations of peace, he has caused commotion in the minds of the western bishops by telling them that a mere youth, hardly more than a boy, has been ordained presbyter of Bethlehem in his own diocese. If this is the truth, all the bishops of Palestine must be aware of it. For the monastery of the reverend pope Epiphanius-called the old monastery-where my brother was ordained presbyter is situated in the district of Eleutheropolis and not in that of Aelia. Furthermore his age is well known to your Holiness; and as he has now attained to thirty years I apprehend that no blame can attach to him on that score. Indeed this particular age is stamped as full and complete by the mystery of Christ's assumed manhood. Let him call to mind the ancient law, and he will see that after his twenty-fifth year a Levite might be chosen to the priesthood; [Nu. 4:3, LXX. AV. follows the Hebrew] or if in this passage he prefers to follow the Hebrew he will

find that candidates for the priesthood must be thirty years old. And that he may not venture to say that ”old things are passed away;

and, behold, all things are become new,” [2 Cor. 5:17] let him hear the apostle’s words to Timothy, ”Let no man despise thy youth. [1 Tim. 4:12] Certainly when my opponent was himself ordained bishop, he was not much older than my brother is now. And if he argues that youth is no hindrance to a bishop but that it is to a presbyter because a young elder is a contradiction in terms, I ask him this question: Why has he himself ordained a presbyter of this age or younger still, and that too to minister in another man’s church? But if he cannot be at peace with my brother unless he consents to submit and to renounce the bishop who has ordained him, he shews plainly that his object is not peace but revenge, and that he will not rest satisfied with the quietude of repose and peace unless he is able to inflict to the full every penalty that he now threatens. Had he himself ordained my brother, it would have made no difference to this latter. So dearly does he love seclusion that he would even then have continued to live quietly and would not have exercised his office. And should the bishop have seen fit to rend the church on that score, he would then have owed him nothing save the respect which is due to all who offer sacrifice.

9. So much for his prolix defence of himself or I should rather say his attack on me. In this letter I have only answered him briefly and cursorily that from what I have said he may perceive what I do not say, and may know that as I am a human being I am a rational animal and well able to understand his shrewdness, and that I am not so obtuse or brutish as to catch only the sound of his words and not their meaning. I now ask of you to pardon my chagrin and to allow that if it is arrogant to answer back, it is yet more arrogant to bring baseless charges. Yet my answer has indicated what I might have said rather than has actually said it. Why do men look for peace at a distance? and why do they wish to have it enforced by word of command? Let them shew themselves peacemakers, and peace will follow at once. Why do they use the name of your holiness to terrorize us, when your letter-strange contrast to their harsh and menacing words-breathes only peace and meekness? For that the letter which Isidore the presbyter has brought for me from you does make for peace and harmony I know by this, that these insincere professors of a wish for peace have refused to deliver it to me. Let them choose whichever alternative they please. Either I am a good man or I am a bad one. If I am a good one let them leave me in quiet: if I am a bad one, why do they desire to be in bad company? Surely my opponent has learnt by experience the value of humility. He who now tears asunder things which, formerly separate, he of his own will put together, proves that in severing now what he then joined, he is acting at the instigation of another.

10. Recently he sought and obtained a decree of exile against me, and I only wish that he had been able to carry it out, so that, as the will is imputed to him for the deed, so I too not in will only but in deed might wear the crown of exile. The church of Christ has been founded by shedding its own blood not that of others, by enduring outrage not by inflicting it. Persecutions have made it grow; martyrdoms have crowned it. Or if the Christians among whom I live are unique in their love of severity and know only how to persecute and not how to undergo persecution, there are Jews here, there are heretics professing various false doctrines, and in particular the foulest of all, I mean, Manichaeism. Why is it that they do not venture to say a word against them? Why am I the only person they wish to drive into exile? Am I who communicate with the church the only person of whom it can be said that he rends the church? I put it to you, is it not a fair demand either that they should expel these others as well as myself, or that, if they keep them, they should keep me too? All the same they honour men by sending them into exile, for by so doing they separate them from the company of heretics. It is a monk, shame to say, who menaces monks and obtains decrees of exile against them;

and that too a monk who boasts that he holds an apostolic chair. But the monastic tribe does not succumb to terrorism: it prefers to expose its neck to the impending sword rather than to allow its hands to be tied. Is not every monk an exile from his country? Is he not an exile from the whole world? Where is the need for the public authority, the cost of a rescript, the journeyings up and down the earth to obtain one? Let him but touch me with his little finger, and I will go into exile of myself. ”The earth is the Lord’s and the fulness thereof. [Ps. 24:1] Christ is not shut up in any one spot.

11. Moreover when he writes that, though I seem to be separated from communion with him, I in reality hold communion with him through you and through the church of Rome: he need not go so far afield, for I am connected with him in the same way also here in Palestine. And lest even this should appear distant, in this village of Bethlehem I hold communion with his presbyters as much as I can. Thus it is clear that a private chagrin is not to be taken for the cause of the church, and that one man’s choler, or even that of several stirred up by him, ought not to be styled the displeasure of the church. Accordingly I now repeat what I said at the beginning of my letter that I for my part am desirous of Christ’s peace, that I pray for harmony, and that I request you to admonish him not to exact peace but to purpose it. Let him be satisfied with the pain which he has caused by the insults that he has inflicted upon me in the past. Let him efface old wounds by a little new charity. Let him shew himself what he was before, when of his own choice he bestowed upon me his esteem. Let his words no longer be tinged with a gall that flows from the heart of another. Let him do what he wishes himself, and not what others force him to wish.

Either as a pontiff, let him exercise authority over all alike, or as a follower of the apostle, let him serve all for the salvation of all. [Cf. 1 Cor. 9:19] If he will shew himself such, I am ready freely to yield and to hold out my arms; he will find me a friend and a kinsman, and will perceive that in Christ I am submissive to him as to all the saints. ”Charity,” writes the apostle, ”suffereth long and is kind; charity envieth not; ...is not puffed up ...beareth all things, believeth all things. [1 Cor. 13:4-7] Charity is the mother of all virtues, and the apostle’s words about faith hope and charity [1 Cor. 13:13] are like that threefold cord which is not quickly broken. [Eccl. 4:12] We believe we hope, and through our faith and hope we are joined together in the bond of charity. [Cf. Col. 3:14] It is for these virtues that I and others have left our homes, it is for these that we would live peaceably without any contention in the fields and alone; paying all due veneration to Christ’s pontiffs-so long as they preach the right faith-not because we fear them as lords but because we honour them as fathers deferring also to bishops as bishops, but refusing to serve under compulsion, beneath the shadow of episcopal authority, men whom we do not choose to obey. I am not so much puffed up in mind as not to know what is due to the priests of Christ.

For he who receives them, receives not them but Him, whose bishops they are. [Cf. Joh. 13:20] But let them be content with the honour which is theirs. Let them know that they are fathers and not lords, especially in relation to those who scorn the ambitions of the world and count peace and repose the best of all things. And may Christ who is Almighty God grant to your prayers that I and my opponent may be united not in a feigned and hollow peace but in true and sincere mutual esteem, lest biting and devouring one another we be consumed one of another. [Gal. 5:15]

Letter 83. From Pammachius and Oceanus.

A letter from Pammachius and Oceanus in which they express the, perplexity into which they have been thrown by Rufinus's version of Origen's treatise, On First Principles (see Letter 80.) and request Jerome to make for them a literal translation of the work. Written in 399 or 400 a.d. 1. Pammachius and Oceanus to the presbyter Jerome, health. A reverend brother has brought to us sheets containing a certain person's translation into Latin of a treatise by Origen-entitled "περὶ ἀρχῶν". These contain many things which disturb our poor wits and which appear to us to be uncatholic. We suspect also that with a view of clearing the author many passages of his books have been removed which had they been left would have plainly proved the irreligious character of his teaching. We therefore request your excellency to be so good as to bestow upon this particular matter an attention which will benefit not only ourselves but all who reside in the city; we ask you to publish in your own language the abovementioned book of Origen exactly as it was brought out by the author himself; and we desire you to make evident the interpolations which his defender has introduced. You will also confute and overthrow all statements in the sheets which we have sent to your holiness that are ignorantly made or contradict the Catholic faith. The writer in the preface to his work has, with much subtlety but without mentioning your holiness's name, implied that he has done no more than complete a work which you had yourself promised, thus indirectly suggesting that you agree with him. Remove then the suspicions men cannot help feeling and confute your assailant; for, if you ignore his implications, people will say that you admit their truth.

Letter 84. To Pammachius and Oceanus.

A calm letter in which Jerome defines and justifies his own attitude towards Origen, but unduly minimizes his early enthusiasm for him. He admires him in the same way that Cyprian admired Tertullian but does not in any way adopt his errors. He then describes his own studies and recounts his obligations to Apollinaris, Didymus, and a Jew named Bar-anina. The rest of the letter deals with the errors of Origen, the state of the text of his writings, and the eulogy of him composed by the martyr Pamphilus (the authenticity of which Jerome assails without any sufficient reason). The date of the letter is 400 a.d. Jerome to the brothers Pammachius and Oceanus, with all good wishes. 1. The sheets that you send me cover me at once with compliments and confusion; for, while they praise my ability, they take away my sincerity in the faith. But as both at Alexandria and at Rome and, I may say, throughout the whole world good men have made it a habit to take the same liberties with my name, esteeming me only so far that they cannot bear to be heretics without having me of the number, I will leave aside personalities and only answer specific charges. For it is of no benefit to a cause to encounter railing with railing and to retaliate for attacks upon oneself by attacks upon one's opponents. We are commanded not to return evil for evil [1 Thess. 5:15] but to overcome evil with good, [Rom. 12:21] to take our fill of insults, and to turn the other cheek to the smiter. [Matt. 5:39]

2. It is charged against me that I have sometimes praised Origen. If I am not mistaken I have only done so in two places, in the short preface (addressed to Damasus) to his homilies on the Song of Songs and in the prologue to my book of Hebrew Names. In these passages do the dogmas of the church come into question? Is anything said of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost? or of the resurrection of the flesh? or of the condition and material of the soul? I have merely praised the simplicity of his rendering and commentary and neither the faith nor the dogmas of the Church come in at all. Ethics only are dealt with and the mist of allegory is dispelled by a clear explanation. I have praised the commentator but not the theologian, the man of intellect but not the believer, the philosopher but not the

apostle. But if men wish to know my real judgement upon Origen; let them read my commentaries upon Ecclesiastes, let them go through my three books upon the epistle to the Ephesians: they will then see that I have always opposed his doctrines. How foolish it would be to eulogize a system so far as to endorse its blasphemy! The blessed Cyprian takes Tertullian for his master, as his writings prove; yet, delighted as he is with the ability of this learned and zealous writer he does not join him in following Montanus and Maximilla.

Apollinaris is the author of a most weighty book against Porphyry, and Eusebius has composed a fine history of the Church; yet of these the former has mutilated Christ's incarnate humanity, while the latter is the most open champion of the Arian impiety. "Woe," says Isaiah, "unto them that call evil good and good evil; that put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter. [Isa. 5:20] We must not detract from the virtues of our opponents-if they have any praiseworthy qualities-but neither must we praise the defects of our friends. Each several case must be judged on its own merits and not by a reference to the persons concerned. While Lucilius is rightly assailed by Horace [Hor. S. 1. 10:1-4] for the unevenness of his verses, he is equally rightly praised for his wit and his charming style.

3. In my younger days I was carried away with a great passion for learning, yet I was not like some presumptuous enough to teach myself. At Antioch I frequently listened to Apollinaris of Laodicea, and attended his lectures; yet, although he instructed me in the holy scriptures, I never embraced his disputable doctrine as to their meaning. At length my head became sprinkled with gray hairs so that I looked more like a master than a disciple. Yet I went on to Alexandria and heard Didymus. And I have much to thank him for: for what I did not know I learned from him, and what I knew already I did not forget. So excellent was his teaching. Men fancied that I had now made an end of learning. Yet once more I came to Jerusalem and to Bethlehem. What trouble and expense it cost me to get Baraninas to teach me under cover of night. For by his fear of the Jews he presented to me in his own person a second edition of Nicodemus. [Joh. 3:2] Of all of these I have frequently made mention in my works. The doctrines of Apollinaris and of Didymus are mutually contradictory. The squadrons of the two leaders must drag me in different directions, for I acknowledge both as my masters. If it is expedient to hate any men and to loath any race, I have a strange dislike to those of the circumcision. For up to the present day they persecute our Lord Jesus Christ in the synagogues of Satan.

[Cf. Rev. 2:9] Yet can anyone find fault with me for having had a Jew as a teacher? Does a certain person dare to bring forward against me the letter I wrote to Didymus calling him my master? It is a great crime, it would seem, for me a disciple to give to one both old and learned the name of master. And yet when I ask leave to look at the letter which has been held over so long to discredit me at last, there is

nothing in it but courteous language and a few words of greeting. Such charges are both foolish and frivolous. It would be more to the point to exhibit a passage in which I have defended heresy or praised some wicked doctrine of Origen. In the portion of Isaiah which describes the crying of the two seraphim [Isa. 6:2] he explains these to be the Son and the Holy Ghost; but have not I altered this hateful explanation into a reference to the two testaments? I have the book in my hand as it was published twenty years ago. In numbers of my works and especially in my commentaries I have, as occasion has offered, mangled this heathen school. And if my opponents allege that I have done more than anyone else to form a collection of Origen's books, I answer that I only wish I could have the works of all theological writers that by diligent study of them, I might make up for the slowness of my own wits.

I have made a collection of his books, I admit; but because I know everything that he has written I do not follow his errors. I speak as a Christian to Christians: believe one who has tried him. His doctrines are poisonous, they are unknown to the Holy Scriptures, nay more, they do them violence. I have read Origen, I repeat, I have read him; and if it is a crime to read him, I admit my guilt: indeed, these Alexandrian writings have emptied my purse. If you will believe me, I have never been an Origenist: if you will not believe me, I have now ceased to be one. But if even this fails to convince you, you will compel me in self-defence to write against your favourite, so that, if you will not believe me when I disclaim him, you will have to believe me when I attack him. But I find readier credence when I go wrong than when I shew amendment. And this is not surprising, for my would-be friends suppose me a fellow-disciple with them in the arcana of their system. I am loath, they fancy, to profess esoteric doctrines before persons who according to them are brute-like and made of clay. For it is an axiom with them that pearls ought not to be lightly cast before swine, nor that which is holy given to the dogs. [Matt. 7:6] They agree with David when he says: "Thy word have I hid in mine heart that I might not sin against thee;

[Ps. 119:11] and when in another place he describes the righteous man as one "who speaketh truth with his neighbour," [Ps. 15:2, Ps. 15:3 from memory] that is with those who "are of the household of faith. [Gal. 6:10] From these passages they conclude that those of us who as yet are uninitiated ought to be told falsehoods, lest, being still unweaned babes, we should be choked by too solid food. Now that perjury and lying enter into their mysteries and form a bond between them appears most clearly from the sixth book of Origen's Miscellanies, in which he harmonizes the Christian doctrine with the conceptions of Plato.

4. What must I do then? deny that I am of Origen's opinion? They will not believe me. Swear that I am not? They will laugh and say that I deal in lies. I will do the one thing which they dread. I will bring forward their sacred rites and mysteries,

and will expose the cunning whereby they delude simple folk like myself. Perhaps, although they refuse credence to my voice when I deny, they may believe my pen when I accuse. Of one thing they are particularly apprehensive, and that is that their writings may some day be taken as evidence against their master. They are ready to make statements on oath and to disclaim them afterwards with an oath as false as the first. When asked for their signatures they use shifts and seek excuses. One says: ”I cannot condemn what no one else has condemned. Another says: ”No decision was arrived at on the point by the Fathers. It is thus that they appeal to the judgment of the world to put off the necessity of assenting to a condemnation. Another says with yet more assurance: ”how am I to condemn men whom the council of Nicaea has left untouched? For the council which condemned Arius would surely have condemned Origen too, had it disapproved of his doctrines. They were bound in other words to cure all the diseases of the church at once and with one remedy;

and by parity of reasoning we must deny the majesty of the Holy Ghost because nothing was said of his nature in that council. But the question was of Arius, not of Origen; of the Son, not of the Holy Ghost. The bishops at the council proclaimed their adherence to a dogma which was at the time denied; they said nothing about a difficulty which no one had raised. And yet they covertly struck at Origen as the source of the Arian heresy: for, in condemning those who deny the Son to be of the substance of the Father, they have condemned Origen as much as Arius. On the ground taken by these persons we have no right to condemn Valentine, Marcion, or the Cataphrygians, or Manichaeus, none of whom are named by the council of Nicaea, and yet there is no doubt that in time they were prior to it. But when they find themselves pressed either to subscribe or to leave the Church, you may see some strange twisting. They qualify their words, they arrange them anew, they use vague expressions; so as, if possible, to, hold both our confession and that of our opponents, to be called indifferently heretics and Catholics. As if it were not in the same spirit that the Delphian Apollo (or, as he is sometimes called, Loxias) gave his oracles to Croesus and to Pyrrhus; cheating with a similar device two men widely separated in time. To make my meaning clear I will give a few examples.

5. We believe, say they, in the resurrection of the body. This confession, if only it be sincere, is free from objection. But as there are bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial [1 Cor. 15:40] and as thin air and the aether are both according to their natures Called bodies, they use the word body instead of the word flesh in order that an orthodox person hearing them say body may take them to mean flesh while a heretic will understand that they mean spirit. This is their first piece of craft, and if this is found out, they devise fresh wiles, and, pretending innocence themselves, accuse us of malice. As though they were frank believers they say, ”We believe in the resurrection of the flesh. Now when they have said this, the ignorant crowd thinks it ought to be satisfied, particularly because these exact words are found

in the creed. If you go on to question them farther, a buzz of disapproval is heard in the ring and their backers cry out: "You have heard them say that they believe in the resurrection of the flesh; what more do you want? the popular favour is transferred from our side to theirs, and while they are called honest, we are looked on as false accusers.

But if you set your face steadily and keeping a firm hold of their admission about the flesh, proceed to press them as to whether they assert the resurrection of that flesh which is visible and tangible, which walks and speaks, they first laugh and then signify their assent. And when we inquire whether the resurrection will exhibit anew the hair and the teeth, the chest and the stomach, the hands and the feet, and all the other members of the body, then no longer able to contain their mirth they burst out laughing and tell us that in that case we shall need barbers, and cakes, and doctors, and cobblers. Do we, they ask us in turn, believe that after the resurrection men's cheeks will still be rough and those of women smooth, and that sex will differentiate their bodies as it does at present? Then if we admit this, they at once deduce from our admission conclusions involving the grossest materialism. Thus, while they maintain the resurrection of the body as a whole, they deny the resurrection of its separate members.

6. The present is not a time to speak rhetorically against a perverse doctrine. Neither the rich vocabulary of Cicero nor the fervid eloquence of Demosthenes could adequately convey the warmth of my feeling, were I to attempt to expose the quibbles by which these heretics, while verbally professing a belief in the resurrection, in their hearts deny it. For their women finger their breasts, slap their chests, pinch their legs and arms, and say, "What will a resurrection profit us if these frail bodies are to rise again? No, if we are to be like angels, [Cf. Matt. 22:30] we shall have the bodies of angels. That is to say they scorn to rise again with the flesh and bones wherewith even Christ rose. [Cf. Luke 24:39] Now suppose for a moment that in my youth I went astray and that, trained as I was in the schools of heathen philosophy, I was ignorant, in the beginning of my faith, of the dogmas of Christianity, and fancied that what I had read in Pythagoras and Plato and Empedocles was also contained in the writings of the apostle: Supposing, I say, that I believed all this, why do you yet follow the error of a mere babe and sucking child in Christ? Why do you learn irreligion of one who as yet knew not religion? After shipwreck one has still a plank to cling to; and one may atone for sin by a frank confession. You have followed me when I have gone astray;

follow me also now that I have been brought back. In youth we have wandered; now that we are old let us mend our ways. Let us unite our tears and our groans; let us weep together, and return to the Lord our Maker. [Ps. 95:6, Vulg] Let us not wait for the repentance of the devil; for this is a vain anticipation and one that will drag us into the deep of hell. Life must be sought or lost here. If I have

never followed Origen, it is in vain that you seek to discredit me: if I have been his disciple, imitate my penitence. You have believed my confession; credit also my denial.

7. But it will be said, ”If you knew these things, why did you praise him in your works? I should praise him today but that you and men like you praise his errors. I should still find his talent attractive, but that some people have been attracted by his impiety. ”Read all things,” says the apostle, ”hold fast that which is good. [1 Thess. 5:21] Lactantius in his books and particularly in his letters to Demetrian altogether denies the subsistence of the Holy Spirit, and following the error of the Jews says that the passages in which he is spoken of refer to the Father or to the Son and that the words ’holy spirit’ merely prove the holiness of these two persons in the Godhead. But who can forbid me to read his Institutes-in which he has written against the Gentiles with much ability-simply because this opinion of his is to be abhorred? Apollinaris has written excellent treatises against Porphyry, and I approve of his labours, although I despise his doctrine in many points because of its foolishness. If you too for your parts will but admit that Origen errs in certain things I will not say another syllable. Acknowledge that he thought amiss concerning the Son, and still more amiss concerning the Holy Spirit, point out the impiety of which he has been guilty in speaking of men’s souls as having fallen from heaven, and shew that, while in word he asserts the resurrection of the flesh, he destroys the force of this language by other assertions.

As, for instance, that, after many ages and one ”restitution of all things,” [Acts 3:21] it will be the same for Gabriel as for the devil, for Paul as for Caiaphas, for virgins as for prostitutes. When once youhave rejected these misstatements and have parted them with your censor’s wand from the faith of the Church, I may read what left with safety, and having first taken the antidote need no longer dread the poison. For instance it will do me no harm to say as I have said, ”Whereas in his other books Origen has surpassed all other writers, in commenting on the Song of Songs he has surpassed himself”; nor will I fear to face the words with which formerly in my younger days I spoke of him as a doctor of the churches. Will it be pretended, that I was bound to accuse a man whose works was translating by special request? that I was bound to say in my preface, ”This writer whose books I translate is a heretic: beware of him, reader, read him not, flee from the viper: or, if you are bent on reading him, know that the treatises which I have translated have been garbled by heretics and wicked men; yet you need not fear, for have corrected all the places which they have corrupted,” that in other words I ought to have said: ”the writer that I translate is a heretic, but I, his translator, am a Catholic.

The fact is that you and your party in your anxiety to be straightforward, ingenuous, and honest, have paid too little regard to the precepts of rhetoric and to the

devices of oratory. For in admitting that his books On First Principles are heretical and in trying to lay the blame of this upon others, you raise difficulties for your readers; you induce them to examine the whole life of the author and to form a judgment on the question from the remainder of his writings. I on the other hand have been wise enough to emend silently what I wished to emend: thus by ignoring the crime I have averted prejudice from the criminal. Doctors tell us that serious maladies ought not to be subjected to treatment, but should be left to nature, lest the remedies applied should intensify the disease. It is now almost one hundred and fifty years since Origen died at Tyre. Yet what Latin writer has ever ventured to translate his books On the Resurrection and On First Principles, his Miscellanies and his Commentaries or as he himself calls them his Tomes? Who has ever cared by so infamous a work to cover himself with infamy? I am not more eloquent than Hilary or truer to the faith than Victorinus who both have rendered his Homilies not in exact versions but in independent paraphrases. Recently also Ambrose appropriated his Six Days' Work, but in such a way that it expressed the views of Hippolytus and Basil rather than of Origen.

You profess to take me for your model, and blind as moles in relation to others you scan me with the eyes of gazelles. Well, had I been ill-disposed towards Origen, I might have translated these very books so as to make his worst writings known to Latin readers; but this I have never done; and, though many have asked me, I have always refused. For it has never been my habit to crow over the mistakes of men whose talents I admire. Origen himself, were he still alive, would soon fall out with you his would-be patrons and would say with Jacob: "Ye have troubled me to make me to stink among the inhabitants of the land. [Gen. 34:30]

8. Does any one wish to praise Origen? Let him praise him as I do. From his childhood he was a great man, and truly a martyr's son. At Alexandria he presided over the school of the church, succeeding a man of great learning the presbyter Clement. So greatly did he abhor sensuality that, out of a zeal for God but yet one not according to knowledge, [Rom. 10:2] he castrated himself with a knife. Covetousness he trampled under foot. He knew the scriptures by heart and laboured hard day and night to explain their meaning. He delivered in church more than a thousand sermons, and published innumerable commentaries which he called tomes. These I now pass over, for it is not my purpose to catalogue his writings. Which of us can read all that he has written? and who can fail to admire is enthusiasm for the scriptures? If some one in the spirit of Judas the Zealot brings up to me his mistakes, he shall have his answer in the words of Horace:

"Tis true that sometimes Homer sleeps, but then He's not without excuse: The fault is venial, for his work is long."

Let us not imitate the faults of one whose virtues we cannot equal. Other men have erred concerning the faith, both Greeks and Latins, but I must not mention their

names lest I should be supposed to defend Origen not by his own merits but by the errors of others. This, you will say, is to accuse them and not to excuse him. You would be right, if I had declared him not to have erred, or if I had professed a belief that the apostle Paul or an angel from heaven [Cf. Gal. 1:8] ought to be listened to in a depravation of the faith. But as it is seeing I frankly admit him to be wrong, I may read him on the same terms as I read others, because if he is wrong so also are they. But you may say, If error is common to many, why do you assail him alone? I answer, because he alone is praised by you as an apostle. Take away your exaggerated love for him, and I am ready to take away the greatness of my dislike. While you gather other men's faulty statements out of their books merely to defend Origen in his error, you extol this latter to the sky and will not allow that he has erred at all. Whosoever you are who are thus preaching new doctrines, I beseech you, spare the ears of the Romans, spare the faith of a church which an apostle has praised.

[Rom. 1:8] Why after four hundred years do you try to teach us Romans doctrines of which until now we have known nothing? Why do you publicly proclaim opinions which Peter and Paul refused to profess? Until now no such teaching has been heard of, and yet the world has become christian. For my part I will hold fast in my old age the faith wherein I was born again in my boyhood. They speak of us as claytowners, made out of dirt, brutish and carnal, because, say they, we refuse to receive the things of the spirit; but of course they themselves are citizens of Jerusalem and their mother is in heaven. [Gal. 4:26] I do not despise the flesh in which Christ was born and rose again, or scorn the mud which, baked into a clean vessel, reigns in heaven. And yet I wonder why they who detract from the flesh live after the flesh, and cherish and delicately nurture that which is their enemy. Perhaps indeed they wish to fulfil the words of scripture: "love your enemies and bless them that persecute you. [Matt 5:44 from memory] I love the flesh, but I love it only when it is chaste, when it is virginal, when it is mortified by fasting: I love not its works but itself, that flesh which knows that it must be judged, and therefore dies as a martyr for Christ, which is scourged and torn asunder and burned with fire.

9. The folly also of their contention that certain heretics and ill-disposed persons have tampered with Origen's writings may be shewn thus. Could any person be more wise, more learned, or more eloquent than were Eusebius and Didymus, Origen's supporters? Of these the former in the six volumes of his Apology asserts that Origen is of the same mind with himself; while the latter, though he tries to excuse his errors, admits that he has made them. Not being able to deny what he finds written, he endeavours to explain it away. It is one thing to say that additions have been made by heretics, but another to maintain that heretical statements are commendable. Origen's case would be unique if his writings were falsified all over the world and if in one day by an edict like that of Mithridates all the truth were

shorn from his volumes. Even supposing that some one treatise of his has been tampered with, can it be possible that all his works, published as they were at different times and places, have been corrupted? Origen himself in a letter written to Fabian, bishop of Rome, expresses penitence for having made erroneous statements, and charges Ambrose with over haste in making public what was meant only for private circulation. And yet to this day his disciples search for shifts to prove that all that excites disapprobation in his writings is due not to him but to others.

10. Moreover, when they speak of Pamphilus as one who praised Origen, I am personally much obliged to them for accounting me worthy to be calumniated with that martyr. For if, sirs, you tell me that Origen's books have been tampered with by his enemies to bring them into discredit; why may not I in my turn allege that his friends and followers have attributed to Pamphilus a volume composed by themselves to vindicate their master from disrepute by the testimony of a martyr? Lo and behold, you yourselves correct in Origen's books passages which (according to you) he never wrote: and yet you are surprised if a man is said to have published a book which as a matter of fact he did not publish. But while your statements can easily be brought to the test by an appeal to Origen's published works; as Pamphilus has published nothing else, it is easier for calumny to fix a book upon him. For shew me any other work of Pamphilus; you will nowhere find any, this is his only one. How then can I know that it is by Pamphilus? You will tell me, that the style and tone ought to inform me. Well, I shall never believe that a man so learned has dedicated the first fruits of his talent to defend doubtful and discredited positions. The very name of an apology which the treatise bears implies a previous charge made; for nothing is defended that is not first attacked.

I will now bring forward but a single argument, one, however, the force of which only folly and effrontery can deny. The treatise attributed to Pamphilus contains nearly the first thousand lines of Eusebius's sixth book in defence of Origen. Yet in the remaining parts of his work the writer brings forward passages by which he seeks to prove that Origen was a Catholic. Now Eusebius and Pamphilus were in such thorough harmony with each other that they seemed to have but one soul between them, and one even went so far as to adopt the other's name. How then could they have disagreed so fundamentally on this point, Eusebius in all his works proving Origen to be an Arian, and Pamphilus describing him as a supporter of the Nicene council, which had not yet been held? It is evident from this consideration that the book belongs not to Pamphilus but to Didymus or somebody else, who having cut off the head of Eusebius's sixth book supplied the other members himself. But I am willing to be generous and to allow that the book is written by Pamphilus, only by Pamphilus not yet a martyr. For he must have written the book before he underwent martyrdom. And why, you will say, was he accounted worthy of martyrdom? Surely that he might efface his error by a martyr's death, and wash away his

one fault by shedding his blood. How many martyrs there have been all the world over who before their deaths have been the slaves of sins!

Are we then to palliate the sins because those who committed them have afterwards become martyrs?

11. This reply to your letter, my most loving brothers, I have dictated in all haste; and, overcoming my scruples, I have taken up my pen against a man whose ability I once eulogized. I would sooner, indeed, risk my reputation than my faith. My friends have placed me in the awkward dilemma that if I say nothing I shall be held guilty, and if I offer a defence I shall be accounted an enemy. Both alternatives are hard; but of the two I will choose that which is the least so. A quarrel can be made up, but blasphemy can find no forgiveness. I leave to your judgment to discover how much labour I have expended in translating the books On First Principles; for on the one hand if one alters anything from the Greek the work becomes less a version than a perversion; and on the other hand a literal adherence to the original by no means tends to preserve the charm of its eloquence.

Letter 85. To Paulinus.

Paulinus had asked Jerome two questions,(1) how can certain passages of scripture (Exod. vii. 13: Rom. ix. 16) be reconciled with Free Will? and (2) Why are the children of believers said to be holy (1 Cor. vii. 14) apart from baptismal grace? For the first of these questions Jerome refers Paulinus to his version (newly made) of Origen's treatise, On First Principles. For the second he quotes the explanation of Tertullian. Written in 400 a.d. 1. Your words urge me to write to you but your eloquence deters me from doing so. For as a letter-writer you are almost as good as Tully. You complain that my letters are short and unpolished: this is not due to carelessness but to fear of you, lest writing to you at greater length I should but send you more sentences to find fault with. Moreover, to make a clean breast of it to a good man like you, just about the time the vessels sail for the west, so many letters are demanded of me at once that, if I were to reply to all my correspondents, I should be unable to accomplish my task. Hence it happens that, neglecting the niceties of composition and not revising the work of my secretaries, I dictate whatever first comes into my head. Thus when I write to you I regard you as a friend and not as a critic.

2. Your letter propounds two questions, the first, why God hardened Pharaoh's heart, and why the apostle said: "So then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy;" [Rom. 9:16] and other things which appear to do away with free will: the second, how those are holy who are born of believing, that is, of baptized parents, [1 Cor. 7:14] seeing that without the gift of grace afterwards received and kept they cannot be saved. 3. Your first question is most ably answered by Origen in his treatise on First Principles which, at the request of my friend Pammachius, I have recently translated. This task has occupied me so fully that I am unable to keep my word with you and must again postpone the sending my commentary on Daniel. Indeed, distinguished and devoted to me as Pammachius is, had he been alone in his request, I should have deferred it to another time, but, as it was, almost all our brothers at Rome urged the same demand declaring that many persons were in danger, and that some even accepted Origen's heretical teaching. I have found myself forced therefore to translate a book in which there is more of bad than of good, and to keep to this rule that I

should neither add nor subtract but should preserve in Latin in its integrity the true sense of the Greek. You will be able to borrow a copy of my version from the aforesaid brother, though in your case the Greek will serve quite as well neither should you, who can drink from the fountain head, turn to the muddy streamlets supplied by my poor wits.

4. Moreover, as I am speaking to an educated man, well versed both in the sacred scriptures and in secular literature, I desire to give your excellency this note of warning. Do not suppose that I am a clumsy buffoon [Cf. Hor. S. II. 8:21] who condemn everything that Origen has written,-as his injudicious friends falsely assert-or that I have changed my mind as suddenly as the philosopher Dionysius. The fact is that I repudiate merely his objectionable dogmas. For I know that one curse hangs over those who call evil good and over those who call good evil, over those who put bitter for sweet, and over those who put sweet for bitter. [Isa. 5:20] Who would go so far in praise of another man's teaching as to acquiesce in blasphemy? 5. Your second question is discussed by Tertullian in his books an Monogamy [Ad. Ux. 2:2] where he declares that the children of believers are l called holy because they are as it were candidates for the faith and have suffered no pollution from idolatry. Consider also that the vessels of which we read in the tabernacle are called holy and everything else required for the ceremonial worship: although in strictness of speech there can be nothing holy except creatures which know of and worship God. But it is a scriptural usage sometimes to give the name of holy to those who are clean, or who have been purified, or who have made expiation. For instance, it is written of Bathsheba that she was made holy from her uncleanness, [2 Sam. 11:4] and the temple itself is called the holy place.

6. I beg that you will not silently in your mind accuse me either of vanity or of insincerity. God bears me witness in my conscience that the unavoidable circumstances mentioned above drew me back when I was just going to grapple with my commentary; and you know that what is done when the mind is pre-occupied is never well done. I gladly accept the cap that you have sent me, a mark, though small, of no small affection and just the thing to keep an old man's head warm. I am delighted alike with the gift and with the giver.

Letter 86. To Theophilus.

Jerome congratulates Theophilus on the success of his crusade against Origenism, and speaks of the good work done in Palestine by his emissaries Priscus and Eubulus. He then (by a singular change in his sentiments) asks Theophilus to forgive John of Jerusalem for having unwittingly received an excommunicated Egyptian. The date of the Letter is 400 a.d.

Jerome to the most blessed Pope Theophilus. I have recently received despatches from your blessedness setting right your long silence and summoning me to return to my duty. So, though the reverend brothers Priscus and Eubulus have been slow in bringing me your letters, yet, as they are now hastening in the ardour of faith from end to end of Palestine and scattering and driving into their holes the basilisks of heresy, I write a few lines to congratulate you on your success. The whole world glories in your victories. An exultant crowd of all nations gazes on the standard of the cross raised by you at Alexandria and upon the shining trophies which mark your triumph over heresy. Blessings on your courage! blessings on your zeal! You have shewn that your long silence has been due to policy and not to inclination. I speak quite openly to your reverence. I grieved to find you too forbearing, and, knowing nothing of the course shaped by the pilot, I yearned for the destruction of those abandoned men. But, as I now see, you have had your hand raised and, if you have delayed to strike, it has only been that you might strike harder. As regards the welcome given to a certain person, you have no reason to be vexed with the prelate of this city; for as you gave no instructions on the point in your letter, it would have been rash in him to decide a case of which he knew nothing. Still I think that he would neither wish nor venture to annoy you in any way.

Letter 87. From the Ophilus to Jerome.

Theophilus informs Jerome that he has expelled the Origenists from the monasteries of Nitria, and urges him to shew his zeal for the faith by writing against the prevalent heresy. The date of the letter is 400 a.d. Theophilus, bishop, to the well-beloved and most loving brother, the presbyter Jerome. The reverend bishop Agatho with the well-beloved deacon Athanasius is accredited to you with tidings relating to the church. When you learn their import I feel no doubt but that you will approve my resolution and will exult in the church's victory. For we have cut down with the prophet's sickle [Joel 3:13] certain wicked fanatics who were eager to sow broadcast in the monasteries of Nitria the heresy of Origen. We have remembered the warning words of the apostle, "rebuke with all authority." [Tit. 2:15] Do you therefore on your part, as you hope to receive a share in this reward, make haste to bring back with scriptural discourses those who have been deceived. It is our desire, if possible, to guard in our days not only the Catholic faith and the rules of the church, but the people committed to our charge, and to give a quietus to all strange doctrines.

Letter 88. To Theophilus.

Replying to the preceding letter Jerome again congratulates Theophilus on the success of his efforts to put down Origenism, and informs him that they have already borne fruit as far west as Italy. He then asks him for the decrees of his council (held recently at Alexandria). The date of the letter is 400 a.d.

Jerome to the most blessed pope Theophilus. The letter of your holiness has given me a twofold pleasure, partly because it has had for its bearers those reverend and estimable men, the bishop Agatho and the deacon Athanasius, and partly because it has shewn your zeal for the faith against a most wicked heresy. The voice of your holiness has rung throughout the world, and to the joy of all Christ's churches the poisonous suggestions of the devil have been silenced. The old serpent [Rev. 12:9] hisses no longer, but, writhing and disembowelled, lurks in dark caverns unable to bear the shining of the sun. I have already, before the writing of your letter, sent missives to the West pointing out to those of my own language some of the quibbles employed by the heretics. I hold it due to the special providence of God that you should have written to the pope Anastasius at the same time as myself, and should thus without knowing it have been the means of confirming my testimony. Now that you have directly urged me to do so, I shall shew myself more zealous than ever to recall from their error simple souls both near and far. Nor shall I hesitate, if needful, to incur odium with some, for we ought to please God rather than men: [Acts 5:29] although indeed they have been much more forward to defend their heresy than I and others have been to attack it.

At the same time I beg that if you have any synodical decrees bearing upon the subject you will forward them to me, that, strengthened with the authority of so great a prelate, I may open my mouth for Christ with more freedom and confidence. The presbyter Vincent has arrived from Rome two days ago and humbly salutes you. He tells me again and again that Rome and almost the whole of Italy owe their deliverance after Christ to your letters. Shew diligence therefore, most loving and most blessed pope, and whenever opportunity offers write to the bishops of the West not to hesitate-in your own words -to cut down with a sharp sickle the sprouts of evil.

Letter 89. From Theophilus to Jerome.

This letter (probably earlier in date than the three preceding) commends to Jerome the monk Theodore, who, having come from Rome to declare the condemnation of Origenism by the church there, had visited the monasteries of Nitria now purged of heresy, and wished before returning to the West to see the Holy Places as well. The date of the letter is 400 a.d.

Theophilus, bishop, to the well-beloved lord and most loving brother the presbyter Jerome. I have learned the project of the monk Theodore-which will be known also to your holiness-and I approve of it. Having to leave us on a voyage for Rome, he has been unwilling to set out without first visiting and embracing as his own flesh and blood you and the reverend brothers who are with you in the monastery. You will, I am sure, rejoice in the news with which he will meet your welcome, that quiet has been restored to the church here. He has seen all the monasteries of Nitria and can tell you of the continence and meekness of the monks in them; as also how the Origenists have been put down and scattered, how peace has been restored to the church, and how the discipline of the Lord is being upheld. How gladly would I see the mask of hypocrisy laid aside by those also who near you are said to be undermining the truth. I feel obliged to write thus because the brothers in your neighbourhood are mistaken concerning them. Wherefore take heed to yourselves and shun men of this type; even as it is written:-"if any man bring not to you the faith of the church, bid him not God speed." It may, indeed, be superfluous to write thus to you who can recall the erring from their error, yet no harm is done when those careful for the faith admonish even the wise and learned. Kindly salutein my name all the brothers who are with you.

Letter 90. From Theophilus to Epiphanius.

Theophilus writes to Epiphanius to convoke a council in Cyprus for the condemnation of Origenism and asks him to transmit to Constantinople by a trustworthy messenger a copy of it's decrees together with the synodical letter of Theophilus himself. His anxiety about this last point is caused by the news that certain of the excommunicated monks have set sail for Constantinople to lay their case before the bishop, John Chrysostom. The date of the letter is 400 a.d. Theophilus to his well-beloved lord, brother, and fellow-bishop Epiphanius.

The Lord has said to his prophet "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms to root out and to pull down and to destroy and…to build and to plant. [Jer. 1:10] In every age he bestows the same grace upon his church, that His Body [Eph. 1:23] may be preserved intact and that the poison of heretical opinions may nowhere prevail over it. And now also do we see the words fulfilled. For the church of Christ "not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing" [Eph. 5:27] has with the sword of the gospel cut down the Origenist serpents crawling out of their caves, and has delivered from their deadly contagion the fruitful host of the monks of Nitria. I have compressed a short account of my proceedings (it was all that time would allow) into the general letter which I have addressed indiscriminately to all. As your excellency has often fought in contests of the kind before me, it is your present duty to strengthen the hands of those who are in the field and to gather together to this end the bishops of your entire island. A synodical letter should be sent to myself and the bishop of Constantinople and to l any others whom you think fit; that by universal consent Origen himself may be expressly condemned and also the infamous heresy of which he was the author.

I have learned that certain calumniators of the true faith, named Ammonius, Eusebius, and Euthymius, filled with a fresh access of enthusiasm in behalf of the heresy, have taken ship for Constantinople, to ensnare with their deceits as many new converts as they can and to confer anew with the old companions of their impiety. Let it be your care, therefore, to set forth the course of the matter to all

the bishops throughout Isauria and Pamphylia and the rest of the neighbouring provinces: moreover, if you think fit, you can add my letter, so that all of us gathered together in one spirit with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ may deliver these men unto Satan for the destruction of the impiety which possesses them. [Cf. 1 Cor. 5:4, 1 Cor. 5:5] And to ensure the speedy arrival of my despatches at Constantinople, send a diligent messenger, one of the clergy (as I send fathers from the monasteries of Nitria with others also of the monks, learned men and continent) that when they arrive they may be able themselves to relate what has been done. Above all I beg of you to offer up earnest prayers to the Lord that we may be able in this contest also to gain the victory; for no small joy has filled the hearts of the people both in Alexandria and throughout all Egypt, because a few men have been expelled from the Church that the body of it might be kept pure. Salute the brothers who are with you.

The people with us salute you in the Lord.

Letter 91. From Epiphanius to Jerome.

An exultant letter from Epiphanius in which he describes the success of his council (convened at the suggestion of Theophilus), sends Jerome a copy of its synodical letter. and urges him to go on with his work of translating into Latin documents beating on the Origenistic controversy. Written in 400 a.d.

To his most loving lord, son, and brother, the presbyter Jerome, Epiphanius sends greeting in the Lord. The general epistle written to all Catholics belongs particularly to you; for you, having a zeal for the faith against all heresies, particularly oppose the disciples of Origen and of Apollinaris whose poisoned roots and deeply planted impiety almighty God has dragged forth into our midst, that having been unearthed at Alexandria they might wither throughout the world. For know, my beloved son, that Amalek has been destroyed root and branch and that the trophy of the cross has been set up on the hill of Rephidim. [Cf. Exod. 17:8-14] For as when the hands of Moses were held up on high Israel prevailed, so the Lord has strengthened His servant Theophilus to plant His standard against Origen on the altar of the church of Alexandria; that in him might be fulfilled the words: ”Write this for a memorial, for I will utterly put out Origen’s heresy from under heaven together with that Amalek himself. And that I may not appear to be repeating the same things over and over and thus to be making my letter tedious, I send you the actual missive written to me that you may know what Theophilus has said to me, and what a great blessing the Lord has granted to my last days in approving the principles which I have always proclaimed by the testimony of so great a prelate.

I fancy that by this time you also have published something and that, as I suggested in my former letter to you on this subject, you have elaborated a treatise for readers of your own language. For I hear that certain of those who have made shipwreck [1 Tim. 1:19] have come also to the West, and that, not content with their own destruction, they desire to involve others in death with them; as if they thought that the multitude of sinners lessens the guilt of sin and the flames of Gehenna do not grow in size in proportion as more logs are heaped upon them. With you and

by you we send our best greetings to the reverend brothers who are with you in the monastery serving God.

Letter 92. The Synodical Letter of Theophilus to the Bishops of Palestine and of Cyprus.

The synodical letter of the council held at Alexandria in 400 a.d. to condemn Origenism. Written originally in Greek it was translated into Latin by Jerome. This letter has been sent in identical terms to the Bishops of Palestine and to those of Cyprus. We reproduce the headings of both copies. That to the Bishops of Palestine commences thus: To the well-beloved lords, brothers, and fellow-bishops, Eulogius, John, Zebianus, Auxentius, Dionysius, Gennadius, Zeno, Theodosius, Dicterius, Porphyry, Saturninus, Alan, Paul, Ammonius, Helianus, Eusebius, the other Paul, and to all the Catholic bishops gathered together at the dedication festival of Aelid, Theophilus [sends] greeting in the Lord. The Cyprians he addresses thus: To the well-be-loved lords, brothers, and fellow-bishops, Epiphanius, Marcianus, Agapetus, Boethius, Helpidius, Entasius, Norbanus, Macedonius. Aristo, Zeno, Asiaticus, Heraclides, the other Zeno, Cyriacus, and Aphroditus, Theophilus [sends] greeting in the Lord. The scope of the letter is as follows: We have personally visited the monasteries of Nitria and find that the Origenistic heresy has made great ravages among them. It is accompanied by a strange fanaticism: men even maim themselves or cut out their tongues to show how they despise the body. I find that some men of this kind have gone from Egypt into Syria and other countries where they speak against us and the truth.

The books of Origen have been read before a council of bishops and unanimously condemned. The following are his chief errors, mainly found in the ”περὶ ᾽Αρχῶν”. 1. The Son compared with us is truth, but compared with the Father he is falsehood. 2. Christ’s kingdom will one day come to an end. 3. We ought to pray to the Father alone, not to the Son. 4. Our bodies after the resurrection will be corruptible and mortal. 5. There is nothing perfect even in heaven; the angels themselves are faulty, and some of them feed on the Jewish sacrifices. 6. The stars are conscious of their own movements, and the demons know the future by their courses. 7.

Magic, if real, is not evil. 8. Christ suffered once for men; he will suffer again for the demons. The Origenists have tried to coerce me; they have even stirred up the heathen by denouncing the destruction of the Serapeum; and have sought to withdraw from the ecclesiastical jurisdiction two persons accused of grave crimes. One of these is the woman who was wrongly placed on the list of widows by Isidore, the other Isidore himself. He is the standard-bearer of the heretical faction, and his wealth supplies them with unbounded resources for their violent enterprises. They have tried to murder me; they seized the monastery church at Nitria, and for a time prevented the bishops from entering and the offices from being performed. Now, like Zebul (Beelzebub) they go to and fro on the earth.

I have done them no harm; I have even protected them. But I would not let an old friendship (with Isidore) impair our faith and discipline. I implore you to oppose them wherever they come, and to prevent them from unsettling the brethren committed to you.

Letter 93. From the Bishops of Palestine to Theophilus.

The synodical letter of the council of Jerusalem sent to Theophilus in reply to the preceding. The translation as before is due to Jerome. The following is an epitome: We have done all that you wished, and Palestine is almost wholly free from the taint of heresy. We wish that not only the Origenists, but Jews, Samaritans and heathen also, could be put down. Origenism does not exit among us. The doctrines you describe are never heard here. We anathematize those who hold such doctrines, and also those of Apollinaris, and shall not receive anyone whom you excommunicate.

Letter 95. From Pope Anastasius to Simplicianus.

At the request of Theophilus Anastasius, bishop of Rome, writes to Simplicianus, bishop of Milan, to inform him that he, like Theophilus, has condemned Origen whose blasphemies have been brought under his notice by Eusebius of Cremona. This latter had shown him a copy of the version by Rufinus of the treatise On First Principles. The date of the letter is 400 a.d. To his lord and brother Simplicianus, Anastasius. 1. It is felt right that a shepherd should bestow great care and watchfulness upon his flock. In like manner too from his lofty tower the careful watchman keeps a lookout day and night on behalf of the city. So also in the hour of tempest when the sea is dangerous the shipmaster suffers keen anxiety lest the gale and the violence of the waves shall dash his vessel upon the rocks. It is with similar feelings that the reverend and honourable Theophilus our brother and fellow-bishop, ceases not to watch over the things that make for salvation, that God's people in the different churches may not by reading Origen run into awful blasphemies.

2. Being informed, then, by a letter of the aforesaid bishop, we inform your holiness that we in like manner who are set in the city of Rome in which the prince of the apostles, the glorious Peter, first founded the church and then by his faith strengthened it; to the end that no man may contrary to the commandment read these books which we have mentioned, have condemned the same; and have with earnest prayers urged the strict observance of the precepts which God and Christ have inspired the evangelists to teach. We have charged men to remember the words of the venerable apostle Paul, prophetic and full of warning:-"if any than preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." [Gal. 1:8] Holding fast, therefore, this precept, we have intimated that everything written in days gone by Origen that is contrary to our faith is even by us rejected and condemned.

3. I send this letter to your holiness by the hand of the presbyter Eusebius, a man filled with a glowing faith and love for the Lord. He has shewn to me some blasphemous chapters which made me shudder as I passed judgement on them.

If Origen has put forth any other writings, you are to know that they and their author are alike condemned by me. The Lord have you in safe keeping, my lord and brother deservedly held in honour.

Letter 97. To Pammachius and Marcella.

With this letter Jerome sends to Pammachius and Marcella a translation of the paschal letter issued by Theophilus for the year 402 a.d. together with the Greek original. He takes the precaution of sending this latter because in the preceding year complaints have been made that his translation was not accurate. Written in 402 a.d. 1. Once more with the return of spring I enrich you with the wares of the east and send the treasures of Alexandria to Rome: as it is written, ”God shall come from the south and the Holy One from Mount Paran, even a thick shadow.” [Hab. 3:3, LXX] (Hence in the Song of Songs the joyous cry of the bride: ”I sat down under his shadow with great delight and his fruit was sweet to my taste.” [Cant. 2:3]) Now truly is Isaiah’s prophecy fulfilled: ”In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the land of Egypt.” [Isa. 19:19] ”Where sin hath abounded, grace doth much more abound.” [Rom. 5:20] They who fostered the infant Christ now with glowing faith defend Him in His manhood; and they who once saved Him from the hands of Herod are ready to save Him again from this blasphemer and heretic. Demetrius expelled Origen from the city of Alexander; but he is now thanks to Theophilus outlawed from the whole world. Like him to whom Luke has dedicated the Acts of the Apostles [Acts 1:1] this bishop derives his name from his love to God. Where now is the wriggling serpent? In what plight does the venomous viper find himself? His is

A human face with wolfish body joined. [Virg. A. 3:426] Where now is that heresy which crawled hissing through the world and boasted that both the bishop Theophilus and I were partisans of its errors? Where now is the yelping of those shameless hounds who, to win over the simple minded, falsely proclaimed our adherence to their cause? Crushed by the authority and eloquence of Theophilus they are now like demon-spirits only able to mutter and that from out of the earth. [Cf. I. Sam. 28:13] For they know nothing of Him who, as He comes from above, [Joh. 8:23] speaks only of the things that are above.

2. Would that this generation of vipers [Matt. 3:7] would either honestly accept our doctrines, or else consistently defend its own; that we might know whom we are to esteem and whom we are to shun. As it is they have invented a new kind of penitence, hating us as enemies though they dare not deny our faith. What, I ask, is this chagrin of theirs which neither time nor reason seems able to cure? When swords flash in battle and men fall and blood flows in streams, hostile hands are often clasped in amity and the fury of war is exchanged for an unexpected peace. The partisans of this heresy alone can make no terms with churchmen; for they repudiate mentally the verbal assent that is extorted from them. When their open blasphemy is made plain to the public ear, and when they perceive their hearers clamouring against them; then they assume an air of simplicity, declaring that they hear such doctrines for the first time and that they have no previous knowledge of them as taught by their master. And when you hold their writings in your hand, they deny with their lips what their hands have written. Why, sirs, need you beset the Propontis, shift your abode, wander through different countries, and rend with foaming mouths a distinguished prelate of Christ and his followers? If your recantations are sincere, you should replace your former zeal for error with an equal zeal for the faith.

Why do you patch together from this quarter and from that these rags of cursing? And why do you rail at the lives of men whose faith you cannot resist? Do you cease to be heretics because according to you sundry persons believe us to be sinners? And does impiety cease to disfigure your lips because you can point to scars on our ears? So long as you have a leopard's spots and an Ethiopian's skin, [Jer. 13:23] how can it help your perfidy to know that I too am marked by moles? See, Pope Theophilus is freely allowed to prove Origen a heretic; and the disciples do not defend the master's words. They merely pretend that they have been altered by heretics and tampered with, like the works of many other writers. Thus they seek to maintain his cause not by their own belief but by other people's errors. So much I would say against heretics who in the fury of their unjust hostility to us betray the secret feelings of their minds and prove the incurable nature of the wound that rankles in their breasts.

3. But you are Christians and the lights of the senate: accept therefore from me the letter which I append. This year I send it both in Greek and Latin that the heretics may not again lyingly assert that I have made many changes in and additions to the original. I have laboured hard, I must confess, to preserve the charm of the diction by a like elegance in my version: and keeping within fixed lines and never allowing myself to deviate from these I have done my best to maintain the smooth flow of the writer's eloquence and to render his remarks in the tone in which they are made. Whether I have succeeded in these two objects or not I must leave to your judgement to determine. As for the letter itself you are to know that it is divided into four parts. In the first Theophilus exhorts believers to celebrate the

Lord's passover; in the second he slays Apollinarius; in the third he demolishes Origen; while in the fourth and last he exhorts the heretics to penitence. If the polemic against Origen should seem to you to be inadequate, you are to remember that Origenism was fully treated in last year's letter; and that this which I have just translated, as it aims at brevity, was not bound to dwell farther upon the subject. Besides, its terse and clear confession of faith directed against Apollinarius is not lacking in dialectical subtlety. Theophilus first wrests the dagger from his opponent's hand, and then stabs him to the heart.

4. Entreat the Lord, therefore, that a composition which has won favour in Greek may not fail to win it also in Latin, and that what the whole East admires and praises Rome may gladly take to her heart. And may the chair of the apostle Peter by its preaching confirm the preaching of the chair of the evangelist Mark. Popular rumour, indeed, has it that the blessed pope Anastasius is of like zeal and spirit with Theophilus and that he has pursued the heretics even to the dens in which they lurk. Moreover his own letters inform us that he condemns in the West what is already condemned in the East. May he live for many years so that the reviving sprouts of heresy may in course of time by his efforts be made to wither and to die.

Letter 99. To Theophilus.

Jerome forwards to Theophilus a translation of the latter's paschal letter for 404 a.d. and apologizes for his delay in sending it, on the ground that ill-health and grief for the death of Paula have prevented him from doing literary work. The date of the letter is 404 a.d. To the most blessed pope Theophilus, Jerome. 1. From the time that I received the letters of your holiness together with the paschal treatise until the present day I have been so harassed with sorrow and mourning, with anxiety, and with the different reports which have come from all quarters concerning the condition of the church, that I have hardly been able to turn your volume into Latin. You know the truth of the old saying, grief chokes utterance; and it is more than ever true when to sickness of the mind is added sickness of the body. I have now been five days in bed in a burning fever: consequently it is only by using the greatest haste that I can dictate this very letter. But I wish to shew your holiness in a few words what pains I have taken, in translating your treatise, to transfer the charm of diction which marks every sentence in the original, and to make the style of the Latin correspond in some degree with that of the Greek.

2. At the outset you use the language of philosophy; and, without appearing to particularize, you slay one while you instruct all. In the remaining sections-a task most difficult of accomplishment-you combine philosophy and rhetoric and draw together for us Demosthenes and Plato. What diatribes you have launched against self-indulgence! What eulogies you have bestowed upon the virtue of continence! With what secret stores of wisdom you have spoken of the interchange of day and night, the course of the moon, the laws of the sun, the nature of our world; always appealing to the authority of scripture lest in a paschal treatise you should appear to have borrowed anything from secular sources! To be brief, I am afraid to praise you for these things lest I should be charged with offering flattery. The book is excellent both in the philosophical portions and where, without making personal attacks, you plead the cause which you have espoused. Wherefore, I beseech you, pardon me my backwardness: I have been so completely overcome by the falling asleep of the holy and venerable Paula that except my translation of this book I have hitherto written nothing bearing on sacred subjects. As you yourself know, I have suddenly lost the comforter whom I have led about with me, not-the Lord

is my witness-to minister to my own needs, but for the relief and refreshment of the saints upon whom she has waited with all diligence. Your holy and estimable daughter Eustochium (who refuses to be comforted for the loss of her mother), and with her all the brotherhood humbly salute you. Kindly send me the books which you say that you have lately written that I may translate them or, if not that, at least read them. Farewell in Christ.

Letter 101. From Augustine.

A letter from Augustine in which he denies that he has written a book against Jerome and sent it to Rome but confesses that he has criticized him although without giving details. Written in 402 a.d. In collections labeled Augustine's Letter 40, or Jerome's Letter 67. To My Lord Most Beloved and Longed For, My Honoured Brother in Christ, and Fellow-Presbyter, Jerome, Augustine Sends Greeting in the Lord. 1. I have heard that my letter has come to your hand. I have not yet received a reply, but I do not on this account question your affection; doubtless something has hitherto prevented you. Wherefore I know and avow that my prayer should be, that God would put it in your power to forward your reply, for He has already given you power to prepare it, seeing that you can do so with the utmost ease if you feel disposed.

2. I have hesitated whether to give credence or not to a certain report which has reached me; but I felt that I ought not to hesitate as to writing a few lines to you regarding the matter. To be brief, I have heard that some brethren have told your Charity that I have written a book against you and have sent it to Rome. Be assured that this is false: I call God to witness that I have not done this. But if perchance there be some things in some of my writings in which I am found to have been of a different opinion from you, I think you ought to know, or if it cannot be certainly known, at least to believe, that such things have been written not with a view of contradicting you, but only of stating my own views. In saying this, however, let me assure you that not only am I most ready to hear in a brotherly spirit the objections which you may entertain to anything in my writings which has displeased you, but I entreat, nay implore you, to acquaint me with them; and thus I shah be made glad either by the correction of my mistake, or at least by the expression of your goodwill.

3. Oh that it were in my power, by our living near each other, if not under the same roof, to enjoy frequent and sweet conference with you in the Lord! Since, however, this is not granted, I beg you to take pains that this one way in which we can be together in the Lord be kept up; nay more, improved and perfected. Do not refuse to write me in return, however seldom. Greet with my respects our holy brother

Paulinianus, and all the brethren who with you, and because of you, rejoice in the Lord. May you, remembering us, be heard by the Lord in regard to all your holy desires, my lord most beloved and longed for, my honoured brother in Christ.

Letter 102. To Augustine.

Jerome’s reply to the foregoing in which, it has been said, friendship struggles with suspicion and resentment. He warns Augustine not to provoke him, lest old as he is he may prove a dangerous opponent; and encloses part of his reply to the apology of Rufinus. Written in 402 a.d. Sometimes numbered as Augustine Letter 68. To Augustine, My Lord, Truly Holy and Most Blessed Father, Jerome Sends Greeting in Christ.

1. When my kinsman, our holy son Asterius, subdeacon, was just on the point of beginning his journey, the letter of your Grace arrived, in which you clear yourself of the charge of having sent to Rome a book written against your humble servant. I had not heard that charge; but by our brother Sysinnius, deacon, copies of a letter addressed by some one apparently to me have come hither. In the said letter I am exhorted to sing the παλινωδία, confessing mistake in regard to a paragraph of the apostle’s writing, and to imitate Stesichorus, who, vacillating between disparagement and praises of Helen, recovered, by praising her, the eyesight which he had forfeited by speaking against her. Although the style and the method of argument appeared to be yours, I must frankly confess to your Excellency that I did not think it right to assume without examination the authenticity of a letter of which I had only seen copies, lest perchance, if offended by my reply, you should with justice complain that it was my duty first to have made sure that you were the author, and only after that was ascertained, to address you in reply. Another reason for my delay was the protracted illness of the pious and venerable Paula. For, while occupied long in attending upon her in severe illness, I had almost forgotten your letter, or more correctly, the letter written in your name, remembering the verse, ”Like music in the day of mourning is an unseasonable discourse.” [Sirach 22:6] Therefore, if it is your letter, write me frankly that it is so, or send me a more accurate copy, in order that without any passionate rancour we may devote ourselves to discuss scriptural truth; and I may either correct my own mistake, or show that another has without good reason found fault with me.

2. Far be it from me to presume to attack anything which your Grace has written. For it is enough for me to prove my own views without controverting what others

hold. But it is well known to one of your wisdom, that every one is satisfied with his own opinion, and that it is puerile self-sufficiency to seek, as young men have of old been wont to do, to gain glory to one's own name by assailing men who have become renowned. I am not so foolish as to think myself insulted by the fact that you give an explanation different from mine; since you, on the other hand, are not wronged by my views being contrary to those which you maintain. But that is the kind of reproof by which friends may truly benefit each other, when each, not seeing his own bag of faults, observes, as Persius has it, the wallet borne by the other. Let me say further, love one who loves you, and do not because you are young challenge a veteran in the field of Scripture. I have had my time, and have run my course to the utmost of my strength. It is but fair that I should rest, while you in your turn run and accomplish great distances; at the same time (with your leave, and without intending any disrespect), lest it should seem that to quote from the poets is a thing which you alone can do, let me remind you of the encounter between Dares and Entellus, and of the proverb, "The tired ox treads with a firmer step." With sorrow I have dictated these words. Would that I could receive your embrace, and that by converse we might aid each other in learning!

3. With his usual effrontery, Calphurnius, surnamed Lanarius, has sent me his execrable writings, which I understand that he has been at pains to disseminate in Africa also. To these I have replied in past, and shortly; and I have sent you a copy of my treatise, intending by the first opportunity to send you a larger work, when I have leisure to prepare it. In this treatise I have been careful not to offend Christian feeling in any, but only to confute the lies and hallucinations arising from his ignorance and madness. Remember me, holy and venerable father. See how sincerely I love you, in that I am unwilling, even when challenged, to reply, and refuse to believe you to be the author of that which in another I would sharply rebuke. Our brother Communis sends his respectful salutation.

Letter 103. To Augustine.

A letter of introduction in which Jerome commends the deacon Praesidius to the kind offices of Augustine. Written in 403 a.d. See Augustine, vol. i., Letter 39. To My Lord Augustine, a Father Truly Holy and Most Blessed, Jerome Sends Greeting in Christ. 1. Last year I sent by the hand of our brother, the subdeacon Asterius, a letter conveying to your Excellency a salutation due to you, and readily rendered by me; and I think that my letter was delivered to you. I now write again, by my holy brother the deacon Præsidius, begging you in the first place not to forget me, and in the second place to receive the bearer of this letter, whom I commend to you with the request that you recognise him as one very near and dear to me, and that you encourage and help him in whatever way his circumstances may demand; not that he is in need of anything (for Christ has amply endowed him), but that he is most eagerly desiring the friendship of good men, and thinks that in securing this he obtains the most valuable blessing. His design in travelling to the West you may learn from his own lips.

2. As for us, established here in our monastery, we feel the shock of waves on every side, and are burdened with the cares of our lot as pilgrims. But we believe in Him who has said, ”Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world,” [John 16:33] and are confident that by His grace and guidance we shall prevail against our adversary the devil. I beseech you to give my respectful salutation to the holy and venerable brother, our father Alypius. The brethren who, with me, devote themselves to serve the Lord in this monastery, salute you warmly. May Christ our Almighty God guard you from harm, and keep you mindful of me, my lord and father truly holy and venerable.

Letter 104. From Augustine.

In this letter Augustine (1) commends to Jerome the deacon Cyprian, (2) explains how it is that his first letter (Letter 56.) has miscarried, and (3) urges Jerome to base his scriptural labours not on the Hebrew text but on the version of the LXX. The date of the letter is 403 a.d. Sometimes numbered as Augustine Letter 71. To My Venerable Lord Jerome, My Esteemed and Holy Brother and Fellow-Presbyter, Augustine Sends Greeting in the Lord. 1. Never since I began to write to you, and to long for your writing in return, have I met with a better opportunity for our exchanging communications than now, when my letter is to be carried to you by a most faithful servant and minister of God, who is also a very dear friend of mine, namely, our son Cyprian, deacon. Through him I expect to receive a letter from you with all the certainty which is in a matter of this kind possible. For the son whom I have named will not be found wanting in respect of zeal in asking, or persuasive influence in obtaining a reply from you; nor will he fail in diligently keeping, promptly bearing, and faithfully delivering the same. I only pray that if I be in any way worthy of this, the Lord may give His help and favour to your heart and to my desire, so that no higher will may hinder that which your brotherly goodwill inclines you to do.

2. As I have sent you two letters already to which I have received no reply, I have resolved to send you at this time copies of both of them, for I suppose that they never reached you. If they did reach you, and your replies have failed, as may be the case, to reach me, send me a second time the same as you sent before, if you have copies of them preserved: if you have not, dictate again what I may read, and do not refuse to send to these former letters the answer for which I have been waiting so long. My first letter to you, which I had prepared while I was a presbyter, was to be delivered to you by a brother of ours, Profuturus, who afterwards became my colleague in the episcopate, and has since then departed from this life; but he could not then bear it to you in person, because at the very time when he intended to begin his journey, he was prevented by his ordination to the weighty office of bishop, and shortly afterwards he died. This letter I have resolved also to send at this time, that you may know how long I have cherished a burning desire for conversation with you, and with what reluctance I submit to the remote separation

which prevents my mind from having access to yours through our bodily senses, my brother, most amiable and honoured among the members of the Lord.

3. In this letter I have further to say, that I have since heard that you have translated Job out of the original Hebrew, although in your own translation of the same prophet from the Greek tongue we had already a version of that book. In that earlier version you marked with asterisks the words found in the Hebrew but wanting in the Greek, and with obelisks the words found in the Greek but wanting in the Hebrew; and this was done with such astonishing exactness, that in some places we have every word distinguished by a separate asterisk, as a sign that these words are in the Hebrew, but not in the Greek. Now, however, in this more recent version from the Hebrew, there is not the same scrupulous fidelity as to the words; and it perplexes any thoughtful reader to understand either what was the reason for marking the asterisks in the former version with so much care that they indicate the absence from the Greek version of even the smallest grammatical particles which have not been rendered from the Hebrew, or what is the reason for so much less care having been taken in this recent version from the Hebrew to secure that these same particles be found in their own places. I would have put down here an extract or two in illustration of this criticism; but at present I have not access to the manuscript of the translation from the Hebrew. Since, however, your quick discernment anticipates and goes beyond not only what I have said, but also what I meant to say, you already understand, I think, enough to be able, by giving the reason for the plan which you have adopted, to explain what perplexes me.

4. For my part, I would much rather that you would furnish us with a translation of the Greek version of the canonical Scriptures known as the work of the Seventy translators. For if your translation begins to be more generally read in many churches, it will be a grievous thing that, in the reading of Scripture, differences must arise between the Latin Churches and the Greek Churches, especially seeing that the discrepancy is easily condemned in a Latin version by the production of the original in Greek, which is a language very widely known; whereas, if any one has been disturbed by the occurrence of something to which he was not accustomed in the translation taken from the Hebrew, and alleges that the new translation is wrong, it will be found difficult, if not impossible, to get at the Hebrew documents by which the version to which exception is taken may be defended. And when they are obtained, who will submit to have so many Latin and Greek authorities pronounced to be in the wrong? Besides all this, Jews, if consulted as to the meaning of the Hebrew text, may give a different opinion from yours: in which case it will seem as if your presence were indispensable, as being the only one who could refute their view; and it would be a miracle if one could be found capable of acting as arbiter between you and them.

5. A certain bishop, one of our brethren, having introduced in the church over which he presides the reading of your version, came upon a word in the book of the prophet Jonah, of which you have given a very different rendering from that which had been of old familiar to the senses and memory of all the worshippers, and had been chanted for so many generations in the church. [Jonah 4:6] Thereupon arose such a tumult in the congregation, especially among the Greeks, correcting what had been read, and denouncing the translation as false, that the bishop was compelled to ask the testimony of the Jewish residents (it was in the town of Oea). These, whether from ignorance or from spite, answered that the words in the Hebrew manuscripts were correctly rendered in the Greek version, and in the Latin one taken from it. What further need I say? The man was compelled to correct your version in that passage as if it had been falsely translated, as he desired not to be left without a congregation — a calamity which he narrowly escaped. From this case we also are led to think that you may be occasionally mistaken. You will also observe how great must have been the difficulty if this had occurred in those writings which cannot be explained by comparing the testimony of languages now in use.

6. At the same time, we are in no small measure thankful to God for the work in which you have translated the Gospels from the original Greek, because in almost every passage we have found nothing to object to, when we compared it with the Greek Scriptures. By this work, any disputant who supports an old false translation is either convinced or confuted with the utmost ease by the production and collation of manuscripts. And if, as indeed very rarely happens, something be found to which exception may be taken, who would be so unreasonable as not to excuse it readily in a work so useful that it cannot be too highly praised? I wish you would have the kindness to open up to me what you think to be the reason of the frequent discrepancies between the text supported by the Hebrew codices and the Greek Septuagint version. For the latter has no mean authority, seeing that it has obtained so wide circulation, and was the one which the apostles used, as is not only proved by looking to the text itself, but has also been, as I remember, affirmed by yourself. You would therefore confer upon us a much greater boon if you gave an exact Latin translation of the Greek Septuagint version: for the variations found in the different codices of the Latin text are intolerably numerous; and it is so justly open to suspicion as possibly different from what is to be found in the Greek, that one has no confidence in either quoting it or proving anything by its help.

I thought that this letter was to be a short one, but it has somehow been as pleasant to me to go on with it as if I were talking with you. I conclude with entreating you by the Lord kindly to send me a full reply, and thus give me, so far as is in your power, the pleasure of your presence.

Letter 105. To Augustine.

Jerome’s answer to the foregoing. He complains that even now he has not received Augustine’s letter and asks him to Send him a copy of it. Popular rumour, be declares, credits Augustine with a deliberate suppression of the letter in order that he may seem to win an easy victory over his opponent. Jerome next deals with Augustine’s denial of having made a written attack upon him and concludes by refusing for the present all discussion of points of criticism. Sometimes numbered as Augustine Letter 72. To Augustine, My Lord Truly Holy, and Most Blessed Father, Jerome Sends Greeting in the Lord. 1. You are sending me letter upon letter, and often urging me to answer a certain letter of yours, a copy of which, without your signature, had reached me through our brother Sysinnius, deacon, as I have already written, which letter you tell me that you entrusted first to our brother Profuturus, and afterwards to some one else; but that Profuturus was prevented from finishing his intended journey, and having been ordained a bishop, was removed by sudden death; and the second messenger, whose name you do not give, was afraid of the perils of the sea, and gave up the voyage which he had intended. These things being so, I am at a loss to express my surprise that the same letter is reported to be in the possession of most of the Christians in Rome, and throughout Italy, and has come to every one but myself, to whom alone it was ostensibly sent. I wonder at this all the more, because the brother Sysinnius aforesaid tells me that he found it among the rest of your published works, not in Africa, not in your possession, but in an island of the Adriatic some five years ago.

2. True friendship can harbour no suspicion; a friend must speak to his friend as freely as to his second self. Some of my acquaintances, vessels of Christ, of whom there is a very large number in Jerusalem and in the holy places, suggested to me that this had not been done by you in a guileless spirit, but through desire for praise and celebrity, and éclat in the eyes of the people, intending to become famous at my expense; that many might know that you challenged me, and I feared to meet you; that you had written as a man of learning, and I had by silence confessed my ignorance, and had at last found one who knew how to stop my garrulous tongue. I, however, let me say it frankly, refused at first to answer your Excellency, because I did not believe that the letter, or as I may call it (using a proverbial expression),

the honeyed sword, was sent from you. Moreover, I was cautious lest I should seem to answer uncourteously a bishop of my own communion, and to censure anything in the letter of one who censured me, especially as I judged some of its statements to be tainted with heresy. Lastly, I was afraid lest you should have reason to remonstrate with me, saying, "What! Had you seen the letter to be mine — had you discovered in the signature attached to it the autograph of a hand well known to you, when you so carelessly wounded the feelings of your friend, and reproached me with that which the malice of another had conceived?"

3. Wherefore, as I have already written, either send me the identical letter in question subscribed with your own hand, or desist from annoying an old man, who seeks retirement in his monastic cell. If you wish to exercise or display your learning, choose as your antagonists, young, eloquent, and illustrious men, of whom it is said that many are found in Rome, who may be neither unable nor afraid to meet you, and to enter the lists with a bishop in debates concerning the Sacred Scriptures. As for me, a soldier once, but a retired veteran now, it becomes me rather to applaud the victories won by you and others, than with my worn-out body to take part in the conflict; beware lest, if you persist in demanding a reply, I call to mind the history of the way in which Quintus Maximus by his patience defeated Hannibal, who was, in the pride of youth, confident of success.

"Omnia fert ætas, animum quoque. Sæpe ego longos Cantando puerum memini me condere soles; Nunc oblita mihi tot carmina: vox quoque Mœrin Jam fugit ipsa." Or rather, to quote an instance from Scripture: Barzillai of Gilead, when he declined in favour of his youthful son the kindnesses of King David and all the charms of his court, taught us that old age ought neither to desire these things, nor to accept them when offered.

4. As to your calling God to witness that you had not written a book against me, and of course had not sent to Rome what you had never written, adding that, if perchance some things were found in your works in which a different opinion from mine was advanced, no wrong had thereby been done to me, because you had, without any intention of offending me, written only what you believed to be right; I beg you to hear me with patience. You never wrote a book against me: how then has there been brought to me a copy, written by another hand, of a treatise containing a rebuke administered to me by you? How comes Italy to possess a treatise of yours which you did not write? Nay, how can you reasonably ask me to reply to that which you solemnly assure me was never written by you? Nor am I so foolish as to think that I am insulted by you, if in anything your opinion differs from mine. But if, challenging me as it were to single combat, you take exception to my views, and demand a reason for what I have written, and insist upon my correcting what you judge to be an error, and call upon me to recant it in a humble παλινῳδι'α, and

speak of your curing me of blindness; in this I maintain that friendship is wounded, and the laws of brotherly union are set at nought.

Let not the world see us quarrelling like children, and giving material for angry contention between those who may become our respective supporters or adversaries. I write what I have now written, because I desire to cherish towards you pure and Christian love, and not to hide in my heart anything which does not agree with the utterance of my lips. For it does not become me, who have spent my life from youth until now, sharing the arduous labours of pious brethren in an obscure monastery, to presume to write anything against a bishop of my own communion, especially against one whom I had begun to love before I knew him, who also sought my friendship before I sought his, and whom I rejoiced to see rising as a successor to myself in the careful study of the Scriptures. Wherefore either disown that book, if you are not its author, and give over urging me to reply to that which you never wrote; or if the book is yours, admit it frankly; so that if I write anything in self-defense, the responsibility may lie on you who gave, not on me who am forced to accept, the challenge.

5. You say also, that if there be anything in your writings which has displeased me, and which I would wish to correct, you are ready to receive my criticism as a brother; and you not only assure me that you would rejoice in such proof of my goodwill toward you, but you earnestly ask me to do this. I tell you again, without reserve, what I feel: you are challenging an old man, disturbing the peace of one who asks only to be allowed to be silent, and you seem to desire to display your learning. It is not for one of my years to give the impression of enviously disparaging one whom I ought rather to encourage by approbation. And if the ingenuity of perverse men finds something which they may plausibly censure in the writings even of evangelists and prophets, are you amazed if, in your books, especially in your exposition of passages in Scripture which are exceedingly difficult of interpretation, some things be found which are not perfectly correct? This I say, however, not because I can at this time pronounce anything in your works to merit censure. For, in the first place, I have never read them with attention; and in the second place, we have not beside us a supply of copies of what you have written, excepting the books of Soliloquies and Commentaries on some of the Psalms; which, if I were disposed to criticise them, I could prove to be at variance, I shall not say with my own opinion, for I am nobody, but with the interpretations of the older Greek commentators.

Farewell, my very dear friend, my son in years, my father in ecclesiastical dignity; and to this I most particularly request your attention, that henceforth you make sure that I be the first to receive whatever you may write to me.

Letter 106. To Sunnias and Fretela.

A long letter in which Jerome answers a number of questions put to him by two sojourners in Getica, Sunnias and Fretela. Diligent students of scripture, these men were at a loss to understand the frequent differences between Jerome's Latin psalter of 383 a.d. (the so-called Roman psalter) and the LXX, and accordingly sent him a long list of passages with a request for explanation. Jerome in his reply deals fully with all these and points out to his correspondents that they have been misled by their edition of the LXX. (the "common" edition) which differs widely from the critical text of Origen as given in the Hexapla and used by himself. He also expresses his joy to find that even among the Getae the scriptures are now diligently studied. The date of the letter is about 403 a.d. Translated by Michael Metlen. With parallel Latin. To My Beloved Brethren Sunja and Frithila and All Those Who with You are Serving the Lord, Hieronymus.

1. Certainly these apostolic and prophetic words have been fulfilled in you: Their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world?2 Who would believe that the barbarous language of the Goths would try to compete with the Hebrew in establishing the true text of the Scriptures, and that, while the Greeks are indolent and contentious, even Germany3 would scrutinize the words of the Holy Spirit? Truly I have found out that God is no respecter of persons, but that among every nation he who feareth him and cloth what is right will be acceptable to him.4 Already the hands callous from wielding the sword, and the fingers fitter to handle the bow are getting accustomed to using the pen, and the men hardened in warfare are learning Christian gentleness. Now we see the prophecy of Isaiah fulfilled indeed: They will beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks; nation will not lift up the sword against nation, neither will they learn war any more.5 And again in the same: The wolf will eat with the lamb, and the leopard will lie down with the kid, and the calf and the lion and the bull will feed together, and a little child will lead them; and the cow and the bear will eat together, and their young ones will be friends, and the lion and the ox will eat

straw,6 not in order that meekness shall become ferocious, but that ferocity shall learn meekness.

2. You are requesting of me a difficult thing and one beset with trouble, a matter which does not require so much of ingenuity as rather learning, exposing me, as it does, while trying to judge about others, to public criticism. You wish namely, according to your letter, that I indicate to you, wherever there is in the Psalter a discrepancy between the Latin and Greek texts, which of the readings in question expresses the corresponding Hebrew text more faithfully. In connection with this let me advise you at the outset briefly that there is one edition which Origines and Eusebius of Caesarea and all Greek writers call the κοινή,7 that is, the common or vulgar text, and which now goes mostly by the name of Lukian, the other is the Septuagint, which is also to be found in the Hexapla8 and has been translated by me faithfully into Latin, and is used at Jerusalem and in the oriental churches. About this matter also my holy son Avitus has inquired often, and since our brother, the presbyter Firmus, who brought me your letter, affords me a chance, I am going to answer it jointly, thus acquitting myself of a duty of friendship which cannot be exaggerated.

And as, in dealing with the New Testament, whenever among the Latin writers a doubt arises, and there occurs a discrepancy between individual copies, we have recourse to the original Greek, in which the New Testament was written, so also in the Old Testament, if there are discrepancies between the Greek and Latin texts, we go back to the Hebrew, in order that we may trace to their origins the individual variant readings. The κοινή that is the common edition, however, is the same as the Septuagint, but with the difference that the κοινή is the old edition, which became corrupted through the whims of the individual writers and the accidents of the times and of the places [where the copies were made],9 whereas the one which is contained in the Hexapla and which I have translated is the pure and unadulterated version of the Septuagint, as it is found in the texts of learned scholars. There is no doubt that whatever differs from this differs also from the Hebrew text.10

3. Your first question concerns the place in the 5th Psalm: Neque habitabit juxta te malignus which reads in the Greek: οὔτε παροικήσει σοι πονηρὸς, which reading the vulgar11 edition contains; and you are wondering why the Latin translator has not rendered the word παροικίαν by ”incolatum,” and why he has used instead the word ”habitationem,” which is in the Greek κατοικία. He has done the same in another place, viz. in: Heu mihi, quia incolatus meus prolongatus est. And in the 14th Psalm he uses again ”habitationem” for ”incolatu”: Domine, quis habitabit in tabernaculo tuo ? It is to be noted that if we want to say: ”Domine, quis incolet tabernaculum tuum ?”,” or in the 5th Psalm, ”Neque incolet juxta te malignus,” it won’t sound right and, while translating literally, the rendering will not be correct. It should, therefore, be the rule of a good translator to express the idioms of a for-

eign language by the corresponding idioms of his own tongue. This also Tullius has done in Plato's Protagora and in the Οἰκονομικῷ of Xenophon and in the Oration of Demosthenes against Aeschines, as well as the very learned men Plautus, Terence, and Caelius in their translations of Greek comedies. Nobody should, however, on that account consider the Latin language not flexible enough because it cannot translate literally [and idiomatically at one and the same time],9 since the Greeks, too, mostly translate our works idiomatically and take care also not to render the Hebrew literally, but idiomatically.

4. In the same Psalm: Dirige in conspectu meo viam tuam. For this the Greek has: κατεύθυνον ἐνώπιον σου τὴν ὁδόν μου, that is: "Dirige in conspectu tuo viam meam"; the former version neither the Septuagint has, nor Aquila, nor Symmachus, nor Theodotion, but only the κοινή edition. Finally, I have found also in the Hebrew this reading: oser laphanoi darchach, which all [not mentioned]9 have translated the same way: "Dirige in conspectu meo viam tuam," according to what is said also in the Lord's Prayer: Pater noster, qui es in cælis, sanctificetur nomen tuum. This does not mean that by our prayers should be hallowed what is holy in itself, but it means that we are praying that that which is sacred in virtue of its own nature be also hallowed in us. In the same way the prophet is now also asking that the way of the Lord, which is right in itself, be made likewise right for him.

5. In Psalm 6: Erubescant et conturbentur vehementer omnes inimici mei. You say that "vehementer" is not found in the Greek. I know it, but the Vulgate11 has it. Besides, there is in the Hebrew the word mod, which means "vehementer," and all have translated σφόδρα similarly. 6. In Psalm 7: Judica me, domine, secundum justitiam meam, for which the Greek has κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου, that is, "juxta justitiam tuam." But that is wrong, for the Hebrew has sedechi, which is "justitia mea," and not "sedecach," which means "justitiam tuam." But all translators have likewise rendered "justitiam meam." And nobody should think it foolish that the Psalmist asks to be judged according to his own justice, since the following verse means the same thing: Et secundum innocentiam meam super me, while also the 16th Psalm starts this way: Exaudi, domine, justitiam meam, and the 17th has this: Retribuet mihi dominus secundum justitiam meam et secundum puritatem manuum mearum reddet mihi. Furthermore, we find also in the 25th Psalm this reading: Proba me, domine, et tempta me; ure renes meos et cor meum, and in the 4th: Quum invocarem, exaudivit me Deus justitiæ meæ, and in the 85th: Custodi animam meam, quoniam sanctus sum. Jacob also says in Genesis: Exaudiet me cras justitia mea.

7. In Psalm 8: Quoniam videbo cælos tuos. You say that the Greek does not have "tuos." That is true, but in the Hebrew we find samacha, which means "cælos tuos," and which has been added in the Septuagint from Theodotion's text under an asterisk. Here I shall briefly explain this matter. Whenever there occurs in the

Greek an omission, which the Hebrew has, Origenes added such omission from Theodotion's translation, putting an asterisk — that is a star — in order that it should light up and make clear that which was previously obscure. On the other hand, whenever something is found in the Greek texts which is not in the Hebrew, he placed an obelus in front of it, that is, a horizontal line, which we may call in Latin a dart [in English an arrow]9 to indicate that that which is not found in the authentic texts should be extirpated. These signs are also found in Greek and Latin poems.

8. Psalm 14: Oculi tui videant æquitates. [You say that in the Greek]12 you have read: οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου, that is, "oculi mei." But it is more correct to say "oculi tui" because the prophet had said before: De vultu tuo judicium meum prodeat, in order that God's eyes should not see in the work of the prophet the wrong but the right things. In the same: Custodi me ut pupillam oculi. You say that your Greek version is: Custodi me, Domine. This is found, however, neither in the Hebrew, nor in any translator. In the same: Exurge, Domine, præveni eum et supplanta eum. For this you say the Greek has πρόφθασον αὐτούς, that is, "Præveni eos et supplanta eos." The singular number is here better, however, if the statement is made concerning the evil one, to whom applies also what immediately follows: Præveni eum et supplanta eum ; eripe animam meam ab impio. There is no doubt that this refers to the devil.

9. Psalm 17: Grando et carbones ignis, and you ask why in the Greek text not two other verses are inserted before the repetition of this one. It is to be noted, however, that this one has been added, in the Septuagint, under an asterisk from the Hebrew and the text of Theodotion. In the same: Qui perfecit pedes meos tamquam cervorum. For this you say the Greek has: ὡσεὶ ἐλάφου, that is, "tamquam cervi," using the singular number for the plural. But in the Hebrew the plural "chaialoth" is used, and all translators have used the plural here. In the same: Et dedisti mihi protectionem salutis tuæ. For this you say you have read in the Greek: τῆς σωτηρίας μου, that is, "salutis meæ." But in the Hebrew "iesacha" means "salutis tuæ" and not "meæ." And all translators have this reading. In the same: Supplantasti insurgentes in me subtus me. For this you say you have found in the Greek: Omnes insurgentes . However, "omnes" has been added. In the same: Vivit Dominus et benedictus Deus meus. You say that in the Greek "meus" is lacking. This has not been added under an asterisk, but has been translated from the Hebrew by the very translators of the Septuagint, and all translators agree in this particular. In the same: Liberator meus de gentibus iracundis. For this you say you have found in the Greek: "Ab inimicis meis fortibus," or "potentibus." But since we are interested in the truth, let me say that if anything has been changed owing to the hurry of the translator or the fault of the transcriber, we simply have to admit it and correct the wrong form. The Hebrew has nothing else but: "Liberator meus ab inimicis meis." The translators of the Septuagint, however, have added

"iracundis." And for "gentibus" the Greek text and all translators have "inimici." I wonder how the form "gentes" has slipped in for "inimicis."

10. Psalm 18: Exultavit ut gigas ad currendam viam suam. You say that in the Greek "suam" does not occur. But we find this word added here under an arrow, and it is apparent that it does not occur in the Hebrew. 11. Psalm 19: Tribuat tibi secundum cor tuum. You say that you have found that in the Greek the name of the Lord is added in this verse. This is superfluous because it is understood from the context of the preceding words {Ἐπακούσαι σου Κύριος} with which the Psalm begins: "Exaudiat te Dominus in die tribulationis," so that the Psalmist continues here in the same vein: Tribuat tibi secundum cor tuum, which statement refers to the Lord himself who has been mentioned before. In the same: Et exaudi nos in die, qua invocaverimus te. For this you say you have read: "in quocumque die." But the former reading agrees with the Hebrew, where we find biom, which means "in die."

12. Psalm 21: Tu autem, Domine, ne elongaveris auxilium tuum a me. For this you say you have found "meum." This is true and should be corrected accordingly. In short: If anything has been changed through an error of the transcribers, it would be foolish to defend such error. In the same: Universum semen Jacob, magnificate eum. For this you say the Greek has: δοξάσατε αὐτόν, that is: "glorificate eum." But it is to be noted that wherever the Greek has "glorificate," the Latin translator has rendered this by "magnificate," on the basis of what is said in Exodus: Cantemus Domino; gloriose enim magnificatus est, for which in the Greek "glorificatus est" is written. This, however, sounds awkward in the Latin translation, so that I, when revising the Psalter, did not want to deviate from the practice of the old translators, provided no change of sense was involved, in order not to disturb the reader by too many innovations.

13. Psalm 22: Calix meus inebrians quam præclarus est. For this you say you have read in the Greek: "calix tuus." But in the κοινή version this reading is a mistake. Besides, the Septuagint, the Hebrew and all translators have calix meus, which means in the Hebrew chosi; for calix tuus would be chosach. 14. Psalm 24: Confundantur omnes iniqua agentes. You say that "omnes" does not occur in the Greek. That's right, for it does not occur in the Hebrew either, and it is added in the Septuagint under an arrow. In the same: Innocentes et recti adhæserunt mihi, quia sustinui te, and you say that you have found "Domine" in the Greek. This, however, is superfluous. 15. Psalm 26: Et nunc ecce exaltavit caput meum. But "ecce" is superfluous. In the same: Exquisivit facies mea, for which you say the Greek has: Quaesivit te facies mea. The former reading is the better one, however.

16. Psalm 27: Exaudi vocem deprecationis meæ, for which you say you have found: Exaudi, Domine. But "Domine" also has been added. 17. Psalm 28: Et in templo ejus omnis dicet gloriam. For this you say the Greek contains πᾶς τίς. But if

we should want to translate verbatim “omnis quis,” the result would be a mere transliteration and an absurd rendering. In the same: Dominus diluvium inhabitare facit, for which you say you have read: Dominus diluvium inhabitat. The former rendering refers to the blessings of the faithful, the latter to the dwelling place of him in whom they believe. However, since iasaph is an ambiguous word which may mean either of two things — for it signifies both “sessio” and “habitatio” and refers in the Psalm in question to the grace of Baptism: Vox Domini super aquas ; Dominus super aquas multas; and Vox Domini præparantis cervos et revelabit condensa, et in templo ejus omnis dicet gloriam —, I prefer to understand it of those who glorify the Lord, and have thus translated it, Dominus diluvium inhabitare facit.

18. Psalm 30: Quoniam tu es protector meus. Again in this place the Lord’s name has been added. Let me say once for all that you should not forget that the name of our Lord and God is often added, and that you should observe the corrections I have made on the basis of the Hebrew and the Septuagint. In the same: Ego autem dixi in excessu mentis meæ. For this the Latin texts had: in pavore meo, and I translated according to the Greek: ἐν τῇ ἐκστάσει μου, that is, “in excessu mentis meæ.” For the Latin cannot express ἔκστασιν except by “mentis excessum.” I know that I have read in the Hebrew the differing version: “in stupore et in admiratione mea.” 19. Psalm 31: Nec est in spiritu ejus dolus. For this you say you have read in the Greek: ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, that is, “in ore ejus,” which Symmachus alone has. On the other hand, the Septuagint, Theodotion, the Fifth and Sixth editions,13 Aquila, and the Hebrew itself have “in spiritu ejus,” which is in the Hebrew brucho. If the meaning were, however, “in ore ejus,” baffio would be written in the Hebrew. In the same: Conversus sum in ærumna mea. You say that the Hebrew does not have “mea,” which has been added under an asterisk from the Hebrew and Theodotion’s translation, and which in the Hebrew reads lasaddi; lasaddi . . . [there is a gap here].9

20. Psalm 34: Omnia ossa mea dicent: « Domine… ». Here, you say, you have found in the Greek the word “Domine” twice. It is to be noted, however, that there are many Hebrew copies which have the word “Dominum” not even once. 21. Psalm 36: Et viam ejus volet. You say that you have read in the Greek “volet nimis.” But “nimis” has been added and is not found in any one of the translators. 22. Psalm 38: Verumtamen vane conturbatur omnis homo. You say that you have not found in the Greek the word “conturbatur.” But this also has been added in the Septuagint under an arrow, and from this you and most of the rest have incurred an error because everything is mixed up through the negligence of the scribes in omitting the arrows and asterisks. 23. Psalm 39: Et legem tuam in medio cordis mei. For this you say you have found in the Greek: “in medio ventris mei,” which also in the Hebrew occurs in batthoch meai. This, however, has in the Latin texts euphemistically been changed to “in corde.” However, we should not change the meaning of anything. In the same: “Domine, in adjutorium meum respice.” For this

you say you have found in the Greek: σπεῦσον, that is, “festina.” In the Septuagint, however, πρόσχες, that is “respice,” is written.

24. Psalm 40: Et si ingrediebatur, ut videret, and you say that “si” does not occur in the Greek, although it is very clearly written in the Hebrew and has been rendered by all translators. The Septuagint, too, renders it thus: καὶ εἰ εἰσεπορεύετο τοῦ ιδεῖν. 25. Psalm 41: Salutare vultus mei, Deus meus. For this you say you have found: “et Deus meus.” But it is to be noted that this [viz. “deus meus”]9 is found twice in that Psalm, and that in the first place “salutare vultus mei, deus meus” is written, while in the second place, viz., at the end of the Psalm, “salutare vultus mei et Deus meus” is used, but so that the conjunction “et” has been added under an asterisk from the Hebrew and Theodotion. In the same: Exprobraverunt mihi, qui tribulant me. For this you say you have found: οἱ ἐχθροί μου, that is, “inimici mei,” while the Septuagint has: οἱ θλίβοντές με, and the Hebrew sorarai, that is, “hostes mei.” In the same: Spera in deo, quoniam adhuc confitebor illi. You say that “adhuc” is not found in the Greek. But it has been added under an asterisk. In the Hebrew likewise we find written chi od, which means ὅτι ἔτι and is rendered in Latin by “quoniam adhuc.” The same applies to Psalm 42.

26. Psalm 43: Et non egredieris in virtutibus nostris . For this you say you have found in the Greek: “Et non egredieris, Deus.” But “Deus” is superfluous. In the same: “Posuisti nos in similitudinem gentibus,” for which you say the Greek has: ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν. However, if we should say in Latin: “in similitudinem in gentibus,” it would sound badly, and on that account a proper rendering has been maintained without damage to the sense. On the other hand, I have found in the Hebrew text: “Posuisti nos proverbium in gentibus.” In the same: Exurge, adjuva nos. To this, as usually, the Lord’s name has been added in the Greek. 27. Psalm 44: Sagittae tuae acutæ. For this you say you have read in the Greek: “acutæ, potentissime.” But this is wrong, as “potentissime” has been added from a preceding verse in which we read: “Accingere gladio tuo super femur tuum, potentissime.”

28. Psalm 47: Quoniam ecce reges congregati sunt. For this you say you have found in the Greek: “quoniam ecce reges ejus congregati sunt.” The context of the reading itself shows that “ejus” is wrong. The old Latin texts had here “reges terræ,” which I omitted because it is found neither in the Hebrew nor in the Septuagint. In the same: “sicut audivimus, sic vidimus.” For this you say you have found in the Greek: “sic et vidimus.” This is wrong, for the Hebrew has here chen rainu, which is translated by οὕτως ἴδομεν, that is, “sic vidimus.” In the same: Suscepimus, Deus, misericordiam tuam in medio templi tui. For the expression which I have translated, in accordance with the Hebrew and the Septuagint, by “templi tui,” you say you have read in the Greek “populi tui,” which is wrong, for in the Hebrew echalach is written, which means τοῦ ναοῦ σου, that is, “templi tui,” and not ammach, which signifies “populum tuum.”

29. Psalm 48: Homo, quum in honore esset. For this you say you have found in the Greek: "Et homo, in honore quum esset." But it is to be noted that the verse in question occurs twice in this Psalm, and that in the first place the conjunction "et" is added, but in the second not. In the same: "et dominabuntur eorum justi." For "justis" you say you have read in the Greek εὐθεῖς, which means "rectos." However, "justi" has been substituted in the Latin on account of the context. Besides, also in that place in which we find the expression: "in libro εὐθεῖς," we understand "justorum libro." Hence, we should not translate so literally that, while splitting hairs about syllables, we lose sight of the sense. In the same: "De manu inferni quum liberaverit me." For this you say you have read in the Greek: "quum acceperit me." This I also have translated that way from the Septuagint, and I am wondering who has changed it in your text.

30. Psalm 49: Sedens adversus fratrem tuum loquebaris. For this you say you have found in the Greek: κατὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου κατελάλεις, and you think that it is not translated well because I said: "adversus fratrem tuum loquebaris," and that I should have said: "adversus fratrem tuum detrahebas." But even a fool realizes that that is wrong and not idiomatic in our language. Neither am I ignorant of the fact that καταλαλία means "detractio." However, if we want to use that, we cannot say: "adversus fratrem tuum detrahebas," but we must say: "de fratre tuo detrahebas." However, if we do so, some hairsplitter of words will inquire again why we do not say: κατὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, that is, "adversus fratrem tuum." All that, however, is nonsense, and we should not embark upon a useless quibbling about words, as long as the meaning remains one and the same, because every language, as I said before, has its own idiomatic way of expressing itself. In the same: "Ne quando rapiat, et sit qui eripiat." You say that you have found in the Greek: "Et non sit qui eripiat," which I also have translated thus and is to be found that way in my texts. Hence I wonder why you blame the translator for the negligence of a drowsy transcriber, unless the reading is perchance: "Ne quando rapiat, nec sit qui eripiat," so that the copyist wrote "et" for "nec." In the same: "Sacrificium laudis honorificabit me," for which the Greek has: δοξάσει με, that is, "glorificabit me," which I explained already a little while ago. In the Gospel we read in the Latin "Pater, clarifica me," in the place where the Greek has: Πάτερ, δόξασόν με τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον παρὰ σοι πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον γενέσθαι. Thus I did not want to change a time-honored reading because there was no difference of meaning.

31. Psalm 54: Exspectabam eum qui salvum me fecit, and you say that you have found in the Greek: "Exspectabam Deum," but "Deum" has been added. In the same: "A pusillanimitate spiritus," and you say you have found in the Greek: ἀπὸ ὀλιγοψυχίας, which in effect means "pusillanimitas." It is to be noted, however, that for ὀλιγοψυχία Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and the Fifth Edition have the rendering ἀπὸ πνεύματος, that is, "a spiritu," that the Hebrew has merucha, and

that the complete sense is, in the texts referred to: Festinabo, ut salver a spiritu tempestatis et turbidinis. In the same: "Quoniam si inimicus maledixisset." In the Greek we have ὠνείδισεν, that is, "exprobrasset." But there is no difference in meaning between "maledicta" and "opprobria." 32. Psalm 55: Quoniam multi bellantes adversum me, ab altitudine diei timebo. You say that you have found in the Greek: non timebo. Here "non" has been added. The sense is: "quoniam multi dimicant adversum me, idcirco ego ab altitudine diei timebo," that is: "non bellantes adversum me, sed tuum excelsum timebo lumen." In the same: "In ira populos confringes." For this the Greek has: ἐν ὀργῇ λαοὺς κατάξεις [that is "dejicies," and not κατεάξεις],12 that is, "confringes." In Latin a bad error has crept in here, viz. "confringes," that is κατεάξεις, for κατάξεις, which means "dejicies." For the Hebrew has here hored, meaning καταβίβασον, which we may translate by "depone," and which Symmachus has translated by κατάγαγε.

33. Psalm 58: Quia deus susceptor meus, for which the Greek has: Susceptor meus es tu. But it is to be noted that the Hebrew has neither "es" nor "tu," and that these words appear only in the Septuagint. In the same: "Deus meus, voluntas ejus præveniet me." For this the Greek has: τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ, that is, "misericordia ejus," which is more correct. The Hebrew, on the other hand, has: "Misericordia mea præveniet me." In the same: "Deus ostendit mihi inter inimicos meos," for which the Greek has: "Deus meus." But "meus" has been added. In the same: "Ne occidas eos, ne quando obliviscantur populi tui," for which the Greek has: "legis tuæ." But in the Septuagint and in the Hebrew, "populi tui" does not occur, but populi mei, and I have translated it thus. In the same: "Et scient, quia Deus dominator Jacob finium terræ." For this the Greek has: "Et finium terræ." The conjunction "et" has been added, however. The sense is: "Scient quia Deus Jacob dominator finium terræ."

34. Psalm 59: Quis deducet me usque in Idumaeam ? For this the Greek has: aut quis deducet me ?, which is wrong. 35. Psalm 60: Quoniam tu, Deus meus, exaudisti orationem meam, for which you say your Greek text has: Quia tu, Deus, exaudisti me. This reading does not occur either in the Hebrew or in the Septuagint, but only in the Latin. In the same: "Psallam nomini tuo in sæculum sæculi, for which you say your Greek text has: "in sæculum." The Hebrew has once laed, that is, "in æternum," and not lolam, which means "in sæculum." 36. Psalm 61: Quia Deus adjutor noster in æternum, for which the Greek has: "Deus adjutor noster." Hence "in æternum" is to be omitted. 37. Psalm 62: Sitivit tibi anima mea, for which you say your Greek text has: Sitivit in te anima mea. The Hebrew, however, has not attha, which means "te," but lach, which means "tibi." All translators have rendered accordingly. Hence it has been translated properly into the Latin.

38. Psalm 63: Sagittae parvulorum factæ sunt plagæ eorum, for which your Greek text has: Sagitta paruulorum. But if we say: "Sagitta parvulorum factæ sunt plagæ

eorum," the rendering is wrong from the standpoint of Latin. Instead, the Hebrew version, "Percutiet eos Deus jaculo repentino et inferentur plagæ eorum," is better. 39. Psalm 64: Qui conturbas profundum maris, sonum fluctuum ejus. You say your Greek text has the addition: "Quis sustinebit ?" This is wrong, for the sense is: "qui conturbas profundum maris et conturbas sonum fluctuum ejus." In the same: Parasti cibum illorum, quoniam ita est præparatio ejus, and you say that your Greek text does not have "ejus," although in the Hebrew thechina clearly means "præparationem ejus," viz. "ejus terræ," of which the Psalmist had earlier said: "Visitasti terram et inebriasti eam." 40. Psalm 65: Holocausta medullata offeram tibi cum incenso arietum, for which you say you have found: Cum incensu et arietibus. But that is wrong, for the Hebrew has: em catoroth helim, which means μετὰ θυμιάματος κριῶν, that is, "cum incenso arietum." In the same: Propterea exaudivit Deus, for which you say you have found in the Greek: Exaudivit me Deus. Here, "me" is superfluous.

41. Psalm 67: Et exsultent in conspectu ejus, for which you say you have found in the Greek: Et exsultate in conspectu ejus. This I, too, have translated that way, but I cannot know who has tampered with it in your text. In the same: Etenim non credunt inhabitare Dominum, for which you say you have read in the Greek: καὶ γὰρ ἀπειθοῦντες τοῦ κατασκηνῶσαι. Both of these versions are wrong, for I translated: Etenim non credentes inhabitare Dominum, which is the correct meaning depending upon the preceding: "Ascendisti in altum, cepisti captivitatem, accepisti dona in hominibus (et eos qui non credebant Dominum inhabitare posse mortalibus). In the same: Deus benedictus Dominus die cottidie, for which you say you have found in the Greek: Dominus benedictus Deus, benedictus Dominus die cottidie. But the former reading is better and truer. In the same: Viderunt ingressus tui, Deus, for which you say your Greek has: Visi sunt ingressus tui, Deus. The Hebrew has the following: rachua alichatach, which Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and the Fifth and Sixth editions have translated: Viderunt itinera tua, Deus, and what follows: Itinera Dei mei regis, qui est in sancto. Hence we should read thus: Viderunt ingressus tuos, Deus, and not imitate the mistake of the transcriber who put the nominative for the accusative, although in the Septuagint and in the Hexapla I have found: ἐθεωρήσαν αἱ πορεῖαί σου, ὁ θεός, and for ἐθεωρήσαν, that is, "viderunt," in many texts ἐθεωρήθησαν is found, which reading custom has maintained. In the same:

Ingressus Dei mei, regis mei, qui est in sancto, the meaning of which is: "Viderunt ingressus Dei mei, regis mei. But your statement that "mei" is not added in the Greek after "rege" is clearly erroneous; for both "Dei mei" and "regis mei" are used here pleonastically by way of affection to express the fervent desire that he who is God and king of all should in a special sense be the prophet's God and king because of his condition as a servant of God. Finally, the Hebrew text has heli melchi, which means "Deum meum et regem meum. In the same: Regna terræ, cantate Deo,

psallite Domino, and you say that "Psallite Domino" does not occur in that verse because there follows immediately: Diapsalma. Psallite Deo, qui ascendit super cælum cæli ad orientem, whereas that verse should rather read according to the Hebrew: Cantate Deo, psallite Domino, and what follows at the beginning of the other verse, viz., "Psallite Deo," does not occur in the authentic texts, but has an arrow in front of it. Thus you, too, should adhere to the true version lest, while adopting a spurious reading, you lose sight of what the prophet has written.

42. Psalm 68: Laudabo nomen Dei cum cantico. For this you say you have found in your Greek text: "Dei mei." But "mei" is superfluous. 43. Psalm 70: Deus, ne elongeris a me. You say that your Greek text reads: Deus meus, but "meus" is superfluous. In the same: Deus, docuiste me e juventute mea. Also here "meus" after "Deus," which you say you have found in the Greek, is superfluous. In the same: Donec annuntiem brachium tuum. You say you have found in the Greek: mirabilia tua. This, however, is from the preceding verse: Et usque nunc pronuntiabo mirabilia tua. The word "brachium" is hence correct here. 44. Psalm 71: Et adorabunt eum omnes reges. You say that you have found in your Greek text: "reges terræ, but "terræ" is superfluous. In the same: Benedictus Dominus Deus, Deus Israël. You say that in your Greek text "Deus" does not occur twice, although it is in the Hebrew, and the threefold occurrence in the Septuagint of the name of our Lord and God very clearly indicates the mystery of the Holy Trinity.14 In the same: Et benedictum nomen majestatis ejus in æternum. You say that you have found in the Greek: In æternum et in sæculum sæculi. But please remember that the additional words have redundantly been added by the Greeks, as they occur neither in the Hebrew nor in the Septuagint.

45. Psalm 72: prodiet quasi ex adipe, and you say that you have found in the Greek: ἐξελεύσονται, that is, "prodient," which is wrong; for also the Septuagint has this: ἐξελεύσεται ὡς ἐκ στέατος ἡ ἀδικία αὐτῶν. In the same: Quomodo scit Deus. You say that the Greek does not have the word "Deum," although the Septuagint has: Πῶς ἔγνω ὁ θεός, and all translators have rendered it similarly from the Hebrew. In the same: Intellegam in novissimis eorum, for which you say have read in the Greek: Et intellegam. However, here the conjunction "et" is superfluous. In the same: Defecit caro mea et cor meum, for which some have changed the word-order in an awkward way, thus: Defecit cor meum et caro mea. In the same: Ut annuntiem omnes prædicationes tuas, for which you say you have read in the Greek: τὰς αἰνέσεις σου, that is, "laudes tuas." It is to be noted, however, that the Hebrew has malochothach, which Aquila has translated by ἀγγελίας σου, that is, "nuntios tuos," the Septuagint by τὰς ἐπαγγελίας σου, that is, "prædicationes" or "promissa," although "laus" and "prædicatio" mean one and the same thing.

46. Psalm 73: Ut quid, Deus, reppulisti in finem ?, for which the Greek with an awkward word-order says: Ut quid reppulisti, Deus ? In the same: Quanta ma-

lignatus est inimicus in sancto ! I wonder who has corrected a mistake into your copy by substituting “sanctis” for “sancto,” since also my copy has the form “in sancto. In the same: Incendamus omnes dies festos Dei a terra, for which the Greek has καταπαύσωμεν, and I translated thus: Quiescere faciamus omnes dies festos Dei a terra. I wonder why some rash fellow has thought that the note: “the correct form is not καταπαύσωμεν, as some think, but κατακαύσωμεν, that is, incendamus,” which was placed by me for the guidance of the reader into the margin, should be put into the body of the text. And since the holy presbyter Firmus, who was in charge of this work, has told me that this question has been discussed by many, I am going to explain it somewhat more in detail. The Hebrew text reads: sarphu chol moedahu hel baares, which Aquila and Symmachus have rendered: ἐνεπύρισαν πάσας τὰς συναγὰς τοῦ Θεοῦ, that is, incenderunt omnes solemnitates Dei in terra. The Fifth Edition renders: κατέκαυσαν, that is, combusserunt, the Sixth: κατακαύσωμεν, that is, comburamus, which also the Septuagint evidently translates according to the copies [by καταπαύσομεν].9 Also Theodotion renders: ἐνεπυρίσαμεν, that is, succendimus {= perfect tense}. From this it is clear that my rendering should be used, although sight should not be lost of the true Hebrew version.

For the reading of the Septuagint should be used in the churches, because of its antiquity, whereas the scholars should, for the sake of the accuracy of the Scriptures, not forget the true version. Thus, whenever anything has been added in the margin for the sake of taking note of, this should not be put into the body of the text, in order not to corrupt the original translation according to the whim of the transcribers. In the same: Contribulasti capita draconum in aquis ; tu confregisti capita draconis. This is the correct form of the reading; hence “tu” should not occur in the first verse, but in the second, and “aquæ” should be in the plural, instead of in the singular, the same as Aquila has translated the Hebrew word ammaim by τῶν ὑδάτων, that is, “aquarum. In the same: Ne obliviscaris voces inimicorum tuorum, for which you say the Greek has τῶν ἱκετῶν σου, that is, “deprecantium te. In the Hebrew sorarach is used, which Aquila has translated by “hostium tuorum,” Symmachus by “bellantium contra te,” the Septuagint and the Sixth Edition by “inimicorum tuorum. The meaning is clear from the preceding: Memor esto improperiorum tuorum, eorum, quæ ab insipiente sunt tota die ; ne obliviscaris voces inimicorum tuorum (that is, the voices which blaspheme you and disparage against you amongst your people). Whereupon follows: Superbia eorum, qui te oderunt, ascendit semper, that is: “while you are deferring the punishment, they increase their blasphemies.”

47. Psalm 74: Narrabimus mirabilia tua. For this the Greek has the wrong reading: Narrabo omnia mirabilia tua. 48. Psalm 75: Omnes viri divitiarum manibus suis, and not, as you have read in the text spoiled by, God knows, whom: in manibus suis. In the same: Terribili et ei qui aufert spiritus principum. You say that “ei” is

not in the Greek. That's true, but unless we add "ei," the Latin is not complete. For we cannot say correctly: "Terribili et qui aufert spiritus principum." 49. Psalm 76: Et meditatus sum node cum corde meo et exercitabar et scopebam spiritum meum. For this we read in the Hebrew: Recordabar Psalmorum meorum in nocte ; cum corde meo loquebar, et scopebam spiritum meum. For "exercitatione" the Septuagint translates ἀδολεσχίαν, meaning some sort of "decantationem" and "meditationem," and for what we call "scopebam," it puts ἔσκαλλον, which Symmachus has translated by ἀνηρεύνων, that is, "perscrutabar," or "quærebam." The Fifth Edition uses a similar form. Σκαλισμός, however, refers in agriculture properly to the hoeing of the soil for the purpose of destroying the weeds. And as there the weeds which are to be destroyed are loosened with a hoe, so here the Psalmist uses this figure in connection with the imperfect state of his mind. But it is to be noted that ἔσκαλον {aorist tense} refers to one, ἔσκαλλον {imperfect tense} to a repeated occurrence. In the same: A generatione in generationem. You say that this is followed in the Greek by: consummavit verbum. But that would be an error in the Latin text, and no translator has it.

50. Psalm 77: Et narrabunt filiis suis. For this the Greek has ἀναγγελοῦσιν, which means "annuntiabunt. It is to be noted, however, that the Hebrew has iasaphpheru, which Aquila and Symmachus have translated by "narrabunt. In the same: Et occidit pingues eorum. This reading also the Hebrew has, viz. bamasmnehem, which Aquila translated by ἐν λιπαροῖς αὐτῶν, Symmachus by τοὺς λιπαρωτέρους αὐτῶν, the Septuagint, Theodotion and the Fifth Edition by ἐν τοῖς πίοσιν αὐτῶν. Some ignorant fellows, however, have supposed that πλείοσιν was written for πίοσιν. In the same: Dilexerunt eum in ore suo et lingua sua mentiti sunt ei. The Hebrew likewise has the same reading, viz. icazbulo, and all have translated similarly: ἐψεύσαντο αὐτῷ, that is, "mentiti sunt ei. Who, however, should want to put for "ei," "eum"? I shall, forsooth, not be a party to adulterating the Scriptures. In the same: Et propitius fiet peccatis eorum et non disperdet eos. You say that "eos" does not occur in the Greek, which is true. I, however, in order to avoid a loose construction, have completed the statement according to Latin usage. If anyone, however, should think that διαφθερεῖ does not mean "perditionem," but "corruptionem," let him remember the place which reads: εἰς τὸ τέλος μὴ διαφθείρῃς, that is, "in finem ne disperdas," and not, as most have translated erroneously, "ne corrumpas. In the same: Et induxit eos in montem sanctificationis suæ, montem quem acquisivit dextera ejus.

For this the Septuagint has the reading: ὄρος τοῦτο, ὁ ἐκτήσατο ἡ δεξία αὐτοῦ — and not, as you write, ὃ ἐκτίσατο [= "founded" or "created"]9 —, that is, quem acquisivit dextera ejus. Thus Symmachus has translated correctly according to the Hebrew: montem quem acquisivit dextera ejus. In the same: Et averterunt se et non servaverunt pactum, quemadmodum patres eorum. I know that the word "pactum" does not occur in the Hebrew, but since all have translated in a simi-

lar way ἠσυνθέτησαν, and since the Greek form συνθήκη means "pactum," the meaning of the whole [i.e. ἠσυνθέτησαν]9 is "non servaverunt pactum," although the Septuagint has ἠθέτησαν. In the same: In terra quam fundavit in sæcula, for which you say you have found: In terra fundavit eam in sæcula. The Hebrew has the following version, which also Symmachus renders the same way: εἰσ τὴν γῆν ἣν ἐθεμελίωσεν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. If the statement, however, does not mean that the earth has been created, but something else which is supposed to have been founded on earth, let those who think so prove from the context what the meaning is, as I do not know what which is not expressed should be founded on earth. If they think, however, that a sanctuary has been founded upon the earth, the version should be: in terra fundavit illud in sæcula. In the same: Et in intellectibus manuum suarum deduxit eos. The singular ἐν τῇ συνέσει is not used here, as you say, but ἐν ταῖς συνέσεσιν, which means "intelligentias.

This idea is contained also in the Hebrew bathabunoth, which means "intellectibus."

51. Psalm 78: Posuerunt Hierusalem in pomorum custodiam, which in the Greek means εἰς ὀπωροφυλάκιον and cannot be translated differently from the way I have rendered it. The word indicates a watchtower or lookout, such as the wardens of the fields and orchards were accustomed to have, so that of the extensive city hardly a cottage was left [which was not under their watchful eye].9 This is the sense according to the Greek. Besides, in the Hebrew lichin is written, which Aquila translated by λιθαόριον, that is a pile of stones which the farmers are wont to pick from their vineyards and fields. 52. Psalm 79: Et plantasti radices ejus hinc. You say that "hinc" does not occur in the Greek. That's all right, for it does not occur in my texts either, so that I am wondering which dunce has altered your copies. 53. Psalm 82: « Hereditate possideamus sanctuarium Dei ! », and you say that the Greek has « Κληρονομήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς ! », that is, "possideamus nobis." This is a useless question, for when we say "possideamus," "nobis" is likewise included.

54. Psalm 83: Cor meum et caro mea exsultavit in deum vivum. For this you say the Greek has exsultaverunt. There is no contradiction in this, for when we read "exsultavit," the meaning is: "cor meum exsultavit et caro mea exsultavit." If, on the other hand, the form "exsultaverunt" is used, two exult at one and the same time, viz. the heart and the flesh. Let me request you to avoid this type of nonsense and useless questions where there is no difference in the sense. In the same: Beatus vir, cujus est auxilium abs te. You say that you have found in the Greek: cui est auxilium ejus abs te, and I am criticized, as you say, for having avoided this rendering in my Latin translation. However, who does not understand that if we should say "cui est auxilium ejus," this would be a manifest error, and that if "cui" precedes, "ejus" cannot follow, unless I am criticized for having avoided a mistake. In the same: In valle lacrimarum, for which you say the Greek has

κλαυθμῶνος, that is, “plorationis.” However, it makes no difference whether we say “ploratum” or “planctum” or “fletum” or “lacrimas”; the meaning remains one and the same, so that I follow the rule that, where there is no change of sense, I write as it sounds best in Latin.

55. Psalm 84: Benedixisti, domine, terram tuam. You say that for “benedixisti” you have found in the Greek Εὐδόκησας, and you ask how that word should be expressed in Latin. If we want to quibble about words and syllables, we may say: “Bene placuit, Domine, terra tua” and, while translating words, we lose sight of the sense. At any rate, something should be added to give a proper meaning, and we might say: “Complacuit tibi, Domine, terra tua.” However, if we do this, some one might ask again why we have added “tibi,” since it is found neither in the Greek, nor in the Hebrew. However, we should always follow the rule which I have repeated so often, viz., that where there is no difference in the sense, we should translate idiomatically and use a polished language. In the same: Misericordia et veritas obviaverunt sibi. You say that “sibi” is not in the Greek. However, it is neither in the Hebrew and is given in the Septuagint under an arrow. When these signs [viz. arrow and asterisk]9 are omitted as superfluous, as it were, through the carelessness of most transcribers, the reader is badly led astray. If “sibi” were not added, it would be thought that pity and truth had not met each other, but someone else, nor that justice and peace had given a kiss to each other, but to somebody else.

56. Psalm 85: Et non proposuerunt te in conspectu suo. You say that “te” is not in your text. Add “te” and thus, while correcting the blunder of the transcriber, you will correct at the same time your own error. In the same: Et tu, Domine Deus, miserator et misericors. You say that you have found in the Greek: Et tu, Domine Deus meus. But “meus” is superfluous here, as it is neither in the Hebrew nor in the Septuagint. 57. Psalm 88: Magnus et horrendus, for which you say you have found in the Greek φοβερός, which means “terribilis,” “timendus,” “formidandus.” I think it means, in the above expression, just “horrendum” (not, however, as the common people think, “despiciendum” and “squalidum”), according to the following: Mihi frigidus horror, Membra quatit (Virgil. *Æneid* 3:29-30). and: Horror ubique animo, simul ipsa silentia terrent (Virgil. *Æneid* 2:755) and: Monstrum horrendum, ingens (Virgil. *Æneid* 3:658) as well as in many similar places. In the same: Tunc locutus es in visione sanctis tuis, for which you say you have found in the Greek filiis tuis. It is to be noted, however, that the Hebrew has here laasidach, which all have translated by τοῖς ὁσίοις σου, that is, “sanctis tuis,” except the Sixth Edition, which translates prophetis tuis, expressing the sense rather than the words. In the κοινῇ only, however, I have found “filios” for “sanctis.” In the same: Tu vero reppulisti et respexisti, for which you say you have found in the Greek ἐξουδένωσας. How big an error has resulted here from the change of one letter! — for I did not translate “respexisti,” but “despexisti et pro nihilo duxisti” — unless perchance you think that

ἐξουδένωσας should not be rendered by “despexisti” but, according to the most learned translator of those times, by “annihilasti,” or “annullasti,” or “nullificasti,” or by any other word-monster which the inexpert may invent.

58. Psalm 89: A sæculo et usque in sæculum tu es, Deus, and you say that the word “Deus” is not contained in the Greek. It is clear that it is missing there, since it is in the Hebrew. Besides, all other translators and the Septuagint have the corresponding rendering: ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, καὶ ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος σὺ εἶ, ὁ Θεός, which means in the Hebrew: meolam ad olam atah el. In the same: Quoniam superuenit mansuetudo, et corripiemur. You say that you have found in the Greek: Mansuetudo super nos. But “super nos” is superfluous. 59. Psalm 90: Dicet Domino, « Susceptor meus es tu », and you say that in the Greek text “es” does not occur. But let me reply to you that in the Hebrew neither “es” occurs nor ”tu,” but that the Septuagint and the Latin texts use these words idiomatically. 60. Psalm 93: Beatus homo quem tu erudieris, Domine. You say that in the Greek “tu” does not occur, which is true. The Latin texts, however, use it idiomatically. For if we say: “Beatus homo quem erudieris, Domine,” the rendering does not sound so well. And when we say “Domine,” addressing the Lord, the sense is not perverted by the addition of “tu.” In the same: Et in malitia eorum disperdet eos. You say that the preposition “in” is absent from the Greek, and that the reading is: Malitiam eorum disperdet. It is to be noted, however, that both the Hebrew and all the translators have: In malitia eorum disperdet eos. But if we should want to read “Malitiam eorum disperdet,” then the word “eos,” which follows in the Septuagint at the end of the verse, would be superfluous and wrong.

61. Psalm 97: Recordatus est misericordiæ suæ, for which you say you have found in the Greek: Misericordiæ suæ Jacob. However, the name “Jacob” is superfluous here. 62. Psalm 100: Oculi mei ad fideles terræ, ut sederent mecum, for which you say you have found in the Greek: τοῦ συγκαθῆσθαι αὐτοὺς μετ’ εμοῦ. Who, however, would not avoid such a translation that, rendering verbatim, he would say: “Ut consederent ipsi mecum ?”

63. Psalm 101: Vigilavi et factus sum sicut passer solitarius in tecto. You say you have found in the Greek ἐπὶ δώματι, which the ancient Latin texts have rendered by in ædificio. Δῶμα has in the regions of the Orient the same meaning as “tectum” in Latin; for in Palestine and Egypt, where the Divine Books were either written or translated, the roofs have no tops but δώματα, which at Rome are called either “solaria” or “Mæniana,” that is, flat roofs which are supported by transverse beams. Further, when Peter in the Acts of the Apostles ascended unto the δῶμα, he is to be believed to have ascended to the roof of the building, and when we are told to put a “coronam” on our δώματι, it means that we should place a railing around it in order to avoid falling down. Likewise in the Gospel the statement, Quæ, says he, auditis in aure, dicite super δώματα, means on the roof. The same in Isaiah:

Quid vobis est, quod omnes ascendistis in tecta vana ? ; and in many other similar places. In the same: Factus sum sicut νυκτικόραξ in domicilio, which is expressed in the same way in the Greek, and you ask what the word νυκτικόραξ means in Latin. In the Hebrew the word "bos" is written for "nycticorace. This Aquila, the Septuagint, Theodotion and the Fifth Edition have translated by "nycticoracem," Symmachus "upupam," the Sixth Edition by "noctuam," which I, too, rather follow. Further, where in the Latin and Greek the reading:

Factus sum sicut νυκτικόραξ in domicilio, occurs, the Hebrew says: Factus sum sicut noctua in ruinosis. The majority think the word "bubonem" to have an ambiguous meaning. In the same: A facie iræ et indignationis tuæ. For this you say you have found in the Greek: A facie iræ tuæ, although it is clear that both the Hebrew and the Septuagint have the following version: ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς ὀργῆς σου καὶ τοῦ θυμοῦ σου. In the same: Quoniam placuerunt servis tuis lapides ejus, et terræ ejus miserebuntur. For "terra" the word afar is used in the Hebrew, which all have translated by χοῦν, and which may mean either "pulvis" or "humus," that is, "terra."

64. Psalm 102: Non in perpetuo irascetur, for which you say you have found in the Greek: Non in finem. However, the Hebrew word nese may mean either "perpetuum" or "finis" or "victoria," depending upon the context.

65. Psalm 103: Qui facis angelos tuos spiritus, for which you say you have found in the Greek: ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ, that is, Qui facit angelos suos. In this connection examine why, since God is being addressed, the prophet suddenly changes, as though talking to some one else, especially as he begins thus: Domine, Deus meus, magnificatus es vehementer. Confessionem et decorem induisti, and: Qui tegis in aquis superiora ejus — that is to say, of the sky — Qui ponis nubem ascensum tuum, qui ambulas super pennas ventorum ; and then immediately continues: Qui facis angelos tuos spiritus, et ministros tuos ignem urentem. Qui fundasti terram super stabilitatem suam; and a little further: Ab increpatione tua fugient ; a voce tonitrui tui formidabunt; and: In loco quem fundasti eis. Qui emittis fontes in convallibus; and then: Ut educas panem de terra. If, thus, all this is addressed to the Second Person — that is, to God —, why is in one verse the Third Person suddenly and without connection introduced? In the same: A voce tonitrui tui formidabunt. The Hebrew, too, has here tonitrui tui, so that I am wondering how it has been omitted in the Latin texts through an error of the transcribers. In the same: Hoc mare magnum et spatiosum manibus. You say that in the Greek the word "manibus" is lacking. I know it, but it has been added in the Septuagint under an asterisk from the Hebrew and Theodotion's edition. Furthermore, the Hebrew also has this reading:

ze haiam gadol uarab idaim, which Aquila has translated thus: αὐλὴ καὶ πλατεῖα χερσίν, while all translators say, according to the Hebrew text, metaphorically:

αὕτη ἡ θάλασσα ἡ μεγάλη καὶ εὐρύχωρος χερσίν, as though the sea with outstretched hands were taking everything unto itself. In the same: Ut educas panem de terra, for which you say you have found: Ut educat. However, one thing cannot be addressed to God, and the other said about him. The prophet either addresses everything to God, or he says it to some one else about him. Since, however, the larger part is addressed to God, also the doubtful portions are to be addressed to his person. In the same: Herodii domus dux est eorum. For "herodio" ["heron"],9 which in the Hebrew is asida, Symmachus uses ἰκτῖνα, that is, "milvum" ["kite"].9 I, too, have translated thus into the Latin: Ibi aves nidificabunt ; milvi abies domus est, viz., because it is accustomed to build its nest always in high and inaccessible trees. Hence the Sixth Edition translates with greater clarity yet: Milvo cupressi ad nidificandum. The Hebrew, however, uses for "abietibus" and "cupressis" barusim, which means "abietes" rather than κυπαρίσσους. In the same:

Petra refugium erinaciis ["hedgehogs"],9 for which the Hebrew has sphannim, and all have used the similar form τοῖς χοιρογρυλλίοις ["porcupines"],9 excepting the Septuagint, which uses "lepores" ["hares," "rabbits"].9 It is to be noted, however, that reference is had to an animal not larger than the hedgehog, which has characteristics of both the mouse and the bear, for which reason it is called in Palestine ἀρκτόμῦς ["marmot"].9 These animals are very abundant in those regions and are wont to live in recesses of rocks or in holes in the ground.

66. Psalm 104: Dedit terra eorum ranas, for which you say you have read in the Greek ἐξῆρψεν, which may be translated thus: "Ebullivit terra eorum ranas." However, in this there is no difference of meaning either, so that I, following the ancient version, did not want to change what was not wrong. In the same: Et contrivit lignum finium eorum, for which you say you have found in the Greek: omne lignum. But here "omne" has been added and is superfluous. In the same: Quoniam memor fuit verbi sancti sui, quod habuit ad Abraham, puerum suum, for which you say you have found in the Greek ὃν διέθετο, that is, quod disposuit. The Hebrew and the Septuagint, however, have the following reading: ἐμνήσθη τοῦ λόγου τοῦ ἁγίου αὐτοῦ, τοῦ πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ. Hence the Greek words ὃν διέθετο are wrong in this place and should be erased.

67. Psalm 105: Confitemini Domino, quoniam bonus, for which you say you have found in the Greek: Quoniam χρηστός, that is, suavis. It is to be noted, however, that χρηστός may be translated either by "bonum" or by "suave." Furthermore, the Hebrew also has the reading: chi tob, which all have translated similarly: quia bonus, from which it is clear that also χρηστός is meant to stand for "bonus." In the same: Non fuerunt memores multitudinis misericordiae tuæ. You say that you have found in the Greek: Et non fuerunt memores. But the conjunction "et" is superfluous. In the same: Et irritaverunt ascendentes in mare, Mare Rubrum, for which you say you have found in the Greek: καὶ παραπίκρανaν, and you think

that the expression has to be translated literally: “et amaricaverunt.” But this rendering is similar to “annullationi” or “annihilationi.”15 Read Ezechiel and you will find that παραπικρασμός always stands for “irritationem et exacerbationem” where the expression οἶκος παραπικραίνων, that is, domus exasperans, occurs. In the same: Et vidit, quum tribularentur, et audivit orationem eorum. What you say you have found in the Greek besides this is superfluous.

68. Psalm 106: Et statuit procellam ejus in auram et siluerunt fluctus ejus. What you say you have found in the Greek for this, viz.: καὶ ἐπετίμησεν τῇ καταιγίδι αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔστη εἰς αὔραν, is wrong. In the same: Et deduxit eos in portum voluntatis eorum. For this you say you have found: In portum voluntatis suæ. However, the Hebrew does not have ephsau, which means “voluntatis suæ,” but ephsam, which stands for “voluntatis eorum.” 69. Psalm 107: Exsurge, gloria mea. What you say does not occur in the Latin is rightly not in this Psalm, because it is neither found in the Hebrew, nor in any translation, but is contained in the 56th Psalm, and it seems to me that somebody has transferred it from that place to this. In the same: Mihi alienigenæ amici facti sunt. For this you say you have found in the Greek ὑπετάγησαν, that is, “subditi sunt.” This, however, occurs in the 59th Psalm. In the present Psalm, however, we find in all translations the reading: ἐμοὶ ἀλλόφυλοι ἐφιλίασαν, which means: amici facti sunt, and is expressed in the Hebrew by ethrohe.

70. Psalm 109: Virgam virtutis tuæ emittet Dominus e Sion. You say that “virtutis tuæ” does not occur in your Greek texts. It occurs, however, evidently in the Hebrew and in the Septuagint. In the same: Dominare in medio inimicorum tuorum. You say that the Greek has: et dominare. But the conjunction “et” is neither in the Hebrew nor in the Septuagint and is superfluous. 71. Psalm 110: Confitebor tibi, Domine, in toto corde. In the Greek you say you have found: in toto corde meo. But “meo,” too, is here superfluous. 72. Psalm 113: Deus autem noster in cælo, for which you say you have read in the Greek: in cælo et in terra. But the addition “et in terra” is superfluous. 73. Psalm 114: Et in diebus meis invocabo te. You say that “te” is not in the Greek, and that’s all right. Hence it should be erased from your copies. In the same: Placebo Domino in regione vivorum, for which you say you have read in the Greek: Placebo in conspectu Domini. But this is wrong.

74. Psalm 117: Et in nomine Domini, quia ultus sum in eos. You say that “quia” is not found in the Greek texts. It should be added, however, in the Latin copies under an asterisk.

75. Psalm 118: Et meditabar in mandatis tuis quæ dilexi. You say that in the Greek the word vehementer is added. But this is superfluous. In the same: Levavi manus meas ad mandata tua quæ dilexi. You say that you have read in the Greek, “ad mandata tua quæ dilexi [vehementer]”12; but “vehementer” is superfluous. In the same: Cogitavi vias meas. You say that you have read in the Greek, “[juxta]12 vias

tuas," but "juxta" is superfluous and "meas" is more correct. In the same: Et verti pedes meos in testimonia tua. You say you have read in the Greek, "et averti"; but the prefix is superfluous. In the same: Ego autem in toto corde scrutabor mandata tua. You say that you have read in the Greek, "in toto corde meo"; but "meo" is superfluous here. In the same: anima mea in manibus meis semper ; et legem tuam non sum oblitus. For this you say you have read in the Greek, "Anima mea in manibus tuis semper. It is to be noted, however, that the Hebrew the Septuagint and all other translators have here "in manibus meis," and not "in manibus tuis," which is in the Hebrew bachaffi. All ecclesiastical writers among the Greeks interpret this place that way, and its sense is briefly the following: "I am daily in danger and hold my life, as it were, in my very hands, and yet I do not forget your law. In the same: Exitus aquarum deduxerunt oculi mei, quia non custodierunt legem tuam.

For this you say you have read in the Greek, "quia non custodivi legem tuam. But this is wrong because also the Hebrew text has: Rivi aquarum fluebant de oculis meis, quia non custodierunt legem tuam. In the same: Pronuntiabit lingua mea eloquium tuum. You say that you have read in the Greek for "pronuntiabit" φθέγξεται, which word means either "pronuntiabit," "effabitur," or "loquetur," as these are synonymous. Finally, from the Hebrew I have also translated thus: Loquetur lingua mea sermonem tuum.

76. Psalm 119: Domine, libera animam meam a labiis iniquis, a lingua dolosa. You say you have read in the Greek, "et a lingua dolosa"; but "et" is superfluous. 77. Psalm 126: Beatus vir qui implebit desiderium suum ex ipsis. You say that in your Greek text the word "vir" does not occur. It is, however, clearly expressed in both the Hebrew and the Septuagint. 78. Psalm 129: Propter legem tuam sustinui te, Domine. You say that you have found in the Greek: Propter nomen tuum. I confess that a number of texts have that reading. But since we are investigating the truth, we simply must adhere to what we find in the Hebrew. And there we find for "nomine" or "lege" the word thira, which Aquila translates by φόβον, that is, "timorem," Symmachus and Theodotion by νόμον, that is "legem," thinking, as they did, that the Hebrew had the word thora on account of the similarity between jod { י } and waw { ו }, which differ only in size. The Fifth Edition has "terrorem," the Sixth "verbum."

79. Psalm 131: Sicut juravit Domino, votum vovit Deo Jacob. You say that you have found in the Greek, for my rendering "votum vovit," the form ηὔξατο, and you think that I should have translated "oravit"! This, however, is wrong, for εὐχή means either "orationem" or "votum," according to the context, as in: Redde Deo vota tua, that is: τὰς εὐχάς σου. 80. Psalm 135: Qui fecit luminaria magna. You say that you have found in the Greek: magna solus. But "solus" has been added from a preceding verse, where we read: Qui fecit mirabilia magna solus. Hence

you should insert it there and omit it here as superfluous. 81. Psalm 137: Quoniam magnificasti super omne, nomen sanctum tuum. You say that you have found in the Greek: super omnes. The Septuagint, however, has: ὅτι ἐμεγάλυνας ἐπὶ πᾶν τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἅγιόν σου, as I, too, have translated into the Latin. Besides, remember that the Hebrew has this reading: Quia magnificasti super omne nomen tuum, Verbum tuum. According to the Latin version, however, the meaning is: "Quoniam magnificasti super omne nomen" — that is, above everything that may be called holy in Heaven and on earth — "filium tuum."

82. Psalm 138: Quia non est sermo in lingua mea. For this you say you have read in the Greek: Quia non est dolus in lingua mea. But only the Sixth Edition has this reading. Besides, both the Septuagint and all translators and the very Hebrew text have either λαλιὰν or λόγον, that is, "eloquium" and "verbum." The Hebrew word in question is mala. 83. Psalm 139: Funes extenderunt in laqueum. For this you say the Greek has: Funes extenderunt laqueum pedibus meis. But that is wrong in this place. In the same: You say that you have found in the Greek, for "Habitabunt recti cum vultu tuo," the reading: Et habitabunt. But the conjunction "et" is superfluous here. 84. Psalm 140: Dissipata sunt ossa nostra secus infernum, for which you say you have read in the Greek: ossa eorum. That reading, however, is wrong, too. 85. Psalm 146: Nec in tibiis viri beneplacitum erit ei. You say that for "ei" you have read "Domino," which does not occur.

86. And since you are asking at the end of your missive, and my holy son Avitus likewise has requested me often, how certain Greek words should be translated, I shall note these briefly. Νεομηνία is the beginning of the month, which in Latin we may properly call "kalendas." However, since the Hebrews calculate the month on the basis of the revolution of the moon around the earth, and since the Greeks call the moon μήνη, νεομηνία means, as it were, "new moon"; ἐρῆμος means "desertum" or "solitudinem"; θρόνος signifies "sedem" or "solium," νυκτικόραξ, as I have said already,16 "noctuam"; κυνόμυϊα is wrongly written with the Greek letter υ and consequently translated by the Latins as "musca canina," whereas it should be written, according to the Hebrew, with the diphthong οι, so that the form becomes κοινόμυϊα, which means "omne muscarum genus"; this Aquila translated by πάνμικτον, that is, "omnimodam muscam." Finally, the word λαξευτήριον, which has been rendered into the Latin by "asciam," I consider a type of tool with which stone is worked. Thus, translating from the Hebrew, I said: Et nunc sculpturas ejus pariter bipenne et dolatoriis deraserunt. Hence λαξευτήριον may be rendered by "dolatorium."

Letter 107. To Laeta.

Laeta, the daughter-in-law of Paula, having written from Rome to ask Jerome how she ought to bring up her infant daughter (also called Paula) as a virgin consecrated to Christ, Jerome now instructs her in detail as to the child's training and education. Feeling some doubt, however, as to whether the scheme proposed by him will be practicable at Rome, he advises Laeta in case of difficulty to send Paula to Bethlehem where she will be under the care of her grandmother and aunt, the eider Paula and Eustochium. Laeta subsequently accepted Jerome's advice and sent the child to Bethlehem where she eventually succeeded Eustochium as head of the nunnery rounded by her grandmother. The date of the letter is 403 a.d.

1. The apostle Paul writing to the Corinthians and instructing in sacred discipline a church still untaught in Christ has among other commandments laid down also this: "The woman which hath an husband that believeth not, and if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him. For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband; else were your children unclean but now are they holy. Should any person have supposed hitherto that the bonds of discipline are too far relaxed and that too great indulgence is conceded by the teacher, let him look at the house of your father, a man of the highest distinction and learning, but one still walking in darkness; and he will perceive as the result of the apostle's counsel sweet fruit growing from a bitter stock and precious balsams exhaled from common canes. You yourself are the offspring of a mixed marriage; but the parents of Paula-you and my friend Toxotius-are both Christians. Who could have believed that to the heathen pontiff Albinus should be born-in answer to a mother's vows-a Christian granddaughter; that a delighted grandfather should hear from the little one's faltering lips Christ's Alleluia, and that in his old age he should nurse in his bosom one of God's own virgins? Our expectations have been fully gratified. The one unbeliever is sanctified by his holy and believing family.

For, when a man is surrounded by a believing crowd of children and grandchildren, he is as good as a candidate for the faith. I for my part think that, had he possessed so many Christian kinsfolk when he was a young man, he might then have been

brought to believe in Christ. For though he may spit upon my letter and laugh at it, and though he may call me a fool or a madman, his son-in-law did the same before he came to believe. Christians are not born but made. For all its gilding the Capitol is beginning to look dingy. Every temple in Rome is covered with soot and cobwebs. The city is stirred to its depths and the people pour past their half-ruined shrines to visit the tombs of the martyrs. The belief which has not been accorded to conviction may come to be extorted by very shame.

2. I speak thus to you, Laeta my most devout daughter in Christ, to teach you not to despair of your father's salvation. My hope is that the same faith which has gained you your daughter may win your father too, and that so you may be able to rejoice over blessings bestowed upon your entire family. You know the Lord's promise: "The things which are impossible with men are possible with God." [Luke 18:27] It is never too late to mend. The robber passed even from the cross to paradise. [Cf. Luke 23:42, Luke 23:43] Nebuchadnezzar also, the king of Babylon, recovered his reason, even after he had been made like the beasts in body and in heart and had been compelled to live with the brutes in the wilderness. [Dan. 4:33-37] And to pass over such old stories which to unbelievers may well seem incredible, did not your own kinsman Gracchus whose name betokens his patrician origin, when a few years back he held the prefecture of the City, overthrow, break in pieces, and shake to pieces the grotto of Mithras and all the dreadful images therein? Those I mean by which the worshippers were initiated as Raven, Bridegroom, Soldier, Lion, Perseus, Sun, Crab, and Father? Did he not, I repeat, destroy these and then, sending them before him as hostages, obtain for himself Christian baptism?

Even in Rome itself paganism is left in solitude. They who once were the gods of the nations remain under their lonely roofs with horned-owls and birds of night. The standards of the military are emblazoned with the sign of the Cross. The emperor's robes of purple and his diadem sparkling with jewels are ornamented with representations of the shameful yet saving gibbet. Already the Egyptian Serapis has been made a Christian; while at Gaza Marnas mourns in confinement and every moment expects to see his temple overturned. From India, from Persia, from Ethiopia we daily welcome monks in crowds. The Armenian bowman has laid aside his quiver, the Huns learn the psalter, the chilly Scythians are warmed with the glow of the faith. The Getae, ruddy and yellow-haired, carry tent-churches about with their armies: and perhaps their success in fighting against us may be due to the fact that they believe in the same religion.

3. I have nearly wandered into a new subject, and while I have kept my wheel going, my hands have been moulding a flagon when it has been my object to frame an ewer. For, in answer to your prayers and those of the saintly Marcella, I wish to address you as a mother and to instruct you how to bring up our dear Paula, who has been consecrated to Christ before her birth and vowed to His service before

her conception. Thus in our own day we have seen repeated the story told us in the Prophets, of Hannah, who though at first barren afterwards became fruitful. You have exchanged a fertility bound up with sorrow for offspring which shall never die. For I am confident that having given to the Lord your first-born you will be the mother of sons. It is the first-born that is offered under the Law. [Ex. 13:2] Samuel and Samson are both instances of this, as is also john the Baptist who when Mary came in leaped for joy. [Luke 1:41] For he heard the Lord speaking by the mouth of the Virgin and desired to break from his mother's womb to meet Him. As then Paula has been born in answer to a promise, her parents should give her a training suitable to her birth. Samuel, as you know, was nurtured in the Temple, and John was trained in the wilderness. The first as a Nazarite wore his hair long, drank neither wine nor strong drink, and even in his childhood talked with God. The second shunned cities, wore a leathern girdle, and had for his meat locusts and wild honey. [Matt. 3:4] Moreover, to typify that penitence which he was to preach, he was clothed in the spoils of the hump-backed camel.

4. Thus must a soul be educated which is to be a temple of God. It must learn to hear nothing and to say nothing but what belongs to the fear of God. It must have no understanding of unclean words, and no knowledge of the world's songs. Its tongue must be steeped while still tender in the sweetness of the psalms. Boys with their wanton thoughts must be kept from Paula: even her maids and female attendants must be separated from worldly associates. For if they have learned some mischief they may teach more. Get for her a set of letters made of boxwood or of ivory and called each by its proper name. Let her play with these, so that even her play may teach her something. And not only make hergrasp the right order of the letters and see that she forms their names into a rhyme, but constantly disarrange their order and put the last letters in the middle and the middle ones at the beginning that she may know them all by sight as well as by sound. Moreover, so soon as she begins to use the style upon the wax, and her hand is still faltering, either guide her soft fingers by laying your hand upon hers, or else have simple copies cut upon a tablet; so that her efforts confined within these limits may keep to the lines traced out for her and not stray outside of these.

Offer prizes for good spelling and draw her onwards with little gifts such as children of her age delight in. And let her have companions in her lessons to excite emulation in her, that she may be stimulated when she sees them praised. You must not scold her if she is slow to learn but must employ praise to excite her mind, so that she may be glad when she excels others and sorry when she is excelled by them, Above all you must take care not to make her lessons distasteful to her lest a dislike for them conceived in childhood may continue into her maturer years. The very words which she tries bit by bit to put together and to pronounce ought not to be chance ones, but names specially fixed upon and heaped together for the purpose, those for example of the prophets or the apostles or the list of

patriarchs from Adam downwards as it is given by Matthew and Luke. In this way while her tongue will be well-trained, her memory will be likewise developed. Again, you must choose for her a master of approved years, life, and learning. A man of culture will not, I think, blush to do for a kinswoman or a highborn virgin what Aristotle did for Philip's son when, descending to the level of an usher, he consented to teach him his letters. Things must not be despised as of small account in the absence of which great results cannot be achieved.

The very rudiments and first beginnings of knowledge sound differently in the mouth of an educated man and of an uneducated. Accordingly you must see that the child is not led away by the silly coaxing of women to form a habit of shortening long words or of decking herself with gold and purple. Of these habits one will spoil her conversation and the other her character. She must not therefore learn as a child what afterwards she will have to unlearn. The eloquence of the Gracchi is said to have been largely due to the way in which from their earliest years their mother spoke to them. Hortensius became an orator while still on his father's lap. Early impressions are hard to eradicate from the mind. When once wool has been dyed purple who can restore it to its previous whiteness? An unused jar long retains the taste and smell of that with which it is first filled. [Horace, Epist. I. 2:69] Grecian history tells us that the imperious Alexander who was lord of the whole world could not rid himself of the tricks of manner and gait which in his childhood he had caught from his governor Leonides. We are always ready to imitate what is evil; and faults are quickly copied where virtues appear inattainable. Paula's nurse must not be intemperate, or loose, or given to gossip. Her bearer must be respectable, and her foster-father of grave demeanour.

When she sees her grandfather, she must leap upon his breast, put her arms round his neck, and, whether he likes it or not, sing Alleluia in his ears. She may be fondled by her grandmother, may smile at her father to shew that she recognizes him, and may so endear herself to everyone, as to make the whole family rejoice in the possession of such a rosebud. She should be told at once whom she has for her other grandmother and whom for her aunt; and she ought also to learn in what army it is that she is enrolled as a recruit, and what Captain it is under whose banner she is called to serve. Let her long to be with the absent ones and encourage her to make playful threats of leaving you for them.

5. Let her very dress and garb remind her to Whom she is promised. Do not pierce her ears or paint her face consecrated to Christ with white lead or rouge. Do not hang gold or pearls about her neck or load her head with jewels, or by reddening her hair make it suggest the fires of gehenna. Let her pearls be of another kind and such that she may sell them hereafter and buy in their place the pearl that is "of great price. [Matt. 13:46] In days gone by a lady of rank, Praetextata by name, at the bidding of her husband Hymettius, the uncle of Eustochium, altered that

virgin's dress and appearance and arranged her neglected hair after the manner of the world, desiring to overcome the resolution of the virgin herself and the expressed wishes of her mother. But lo in the same night it befell her that an angel came to her in her dreams. With terrible looks he menaced punishment and broke silence with these words, 'Have you presumed to put your husband's commands before those of Christ? Have you presumed to lay sacrilegious hands upon the head of one who is God's virgin? Those hands shall forthwith wither that you may know by torment what you have done, and at the end of five months you shall be carried off to hell.

And farther, if you persist still in your wickedness, you shall be bereaved both of your husband and of your children.' All of which came to pass in due time, a speedy death marking the penitence too long delayed of the unhappy woman. So terribly does Christ punish those who violate His temple, [Cf. 1 Cor. 3:17] and so jealously does He defend His precious jewels. I have related this story here not from any desire to exult over the misfortunes of the unhappy, but to warn you that you must with much fear and carefulness keep the vow which you have made to God.

6. We read of Eli the priest that he became displeasing to God on account of the sins of his children; [1 Sam. 2:27-36] and we are told that a man may not be made a bishop if his sons are loose and disorderly. [1 Tim. 3:4] On the other hand it is written of the woman that "she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with chastity. If then parents are responsible for their children when these are of ripe age and independent; how much more must they be responsible for them when, still unweaned and weak, they cannot, in the Lord's words, "discern between their right hand and their left: [Jon. 4:11] -when, that is to say, they cannot yet distinguish good from evil? If you take precautions to save your daughter from the bite of a viper, why are you not equally careful to shield her from "the hammer of the whole earth"? to prevent her from drinking of the golden cup of Babylon? to keep her from going out with Dinah to see the daughters of a strange land? to save her from the tripping dance and from the trailing robe? No one administers drugs till be has rubbed the rim of the cup with honey; so, the better to deceive us, vice puts on the mien and the semblance of virtue.

Why then, you will say, do we read:-"the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son," but "the soul that sinneth it shall die"? [Ezek. 18:20] The passage, I answer, refers to those who have discretion, such as he of whom his parents said in the gospel:-"he is of age …he shall speak for himself. [John 9:21] While the son is a child and thinks as a child and until he comes to years of discretion to choose between the two roads to which the letter of Pythagoras points, his parents are responsible for his actions whether these be good or bad. But perhaps you imagine that, if they are not baptized, the

children of Christians are liable for their own sins; and that no guilt attaches to parents who withhold from baptism those who by reason of their tender age can offer no objection to it. The truth is that, as baptism ensures the salvation of the child, this in turn brings advantage to the parents. Whether you would offer your child or not lay within your choice, but now that you have offered her, you neglect her at your peril. I speak generally for in your case you have no discretion, having offered your child even before her conception. He who offers a victim that is lame or maimed or marked with any blemish is held guilty of sacrilege.

[Deut. 15:21] How much more then shall she be punished who makes ready for the embraces of the king a portion of her own body and the purity of a stainless soul, and then proves negligent of this her offering?

7. When Paula comes to be a little older and to increase like her Spouse in wisdom and stature and in favour with God and man, [Luke 2:52] let her go with her parents to the temple of her true Father but let her not come out of the temple with them. Let them seek her upon the world's highway amid the crowds and the throng of their kinsfolk, and let them find her nowhere but in the shrine of the scriptures, [Cf. Luke 2:43-46] questioning the prophets and the apostles on the meaning of that spiritual marriage to which she is vowed. Let her imitate the retirement of Mary whom Gabriel found alone in her chamber and who was frightened, [Luke 1:29] it would appear, by seeing a man there. Let the child emulate her of whom it is written that "the king's daughter is all glorious within." [Ps. 45:13] Wounded with love's arrow let her say to her beloved, "the king hath brought me into his chambers." [Cant. 1:4] At no time let her go abroad, lest the watchmen find her that go about the city, and lest they smite and wound her and take away from her the veil of her chastity, [Cant. 5:7] and leave her naked in her blood. [Cf. Ezek. 16:1-10] Nay rather when one knocketh at her door [Cant. 5:2] let her say: "I am a wall and my breasts like towers. [Cant. 8:10] I have washed my feet; how shall I defile them?" [Cant. 5:3]

8. Let her not take her food with others, that is, at her parents' table; test she see dishes she may long for. Some, I know, hold it a greater virtue to disdain a pleasure which is actually before them, but I think it a safer self-restraint to shun what must needs attract you. Once as a boy at school I met the words: 'It is ill blaming what you allow to become a habit.' Let her learn even now not to drink wine "wherein is excess." [Eph. 5:18] But as, before children come to a robust age, abstinence is dangerous and trying to their tender frames, let her have baths if she require them, and let her take a little wine for her stomach's sake. [1 Tim. 5:23] Let her also be supported on a flesh diet, lest her feet fail her before they commence to run their course. But I say this by way of concession not by way of command; because I fear to weaken her, not because I wish to teach her self-indulgence. Besides why should not a Christian virgin do wholly what others do in part? The superstitious Jews

reject certain animals and products as articles of food, while among the Indians the Brahmans and among the Egyptians the Gymnosophists subsist altogether on porridge, rice, and apples. If mere glass repays so much labour, must not a pearl be worth more labour still? Paula has been born in response to a vow. Let her life be as the lives of those who were born under the same conditions. If the grace accorded is in both cases the same, the pains bestowed ought to be so too. Let her be deaf to the sound of the organ, and not know even the uses of the pipe, the lyre, and the cithern.

9. And let it be her task daily to bring to you the flowers which she has culled from scripture. Let her learn by heart so many verses in the Greek, but let her be instructed in the Latin also. For, if the tender lips are not from the first shaped to this, the tongue is spoiled by a foreign accent and its native speech debased by alien elements. You must yourself be her mistress, a model on which she may form her childish conduct. Never either in you nor in her father let her see what she cannot imitate without sin. Remember both of you that you are the parents of a consecrated virgin, and that your example will teach her more than your precepts. Flowers are quick to fade and a baleful wind soon withers the violet, the lily, and the crocus. Let her never appear in public unless accompanied by you. Let her never visit a church or a martyr's shrine unless with her mother. Let no young man greet her with smiles; no dandy with curled hair pay compliments to her. If our little virgin goes to keep solemn eves and all-night vigils, let her not stir a hair's breadth from her mother's side. She must not single out one of her maids to make her a special favourite or a confidante. What she says to one all ought to know.

Let her choose for a companion not a handsome well-dressed girl, able to warble a song with liquid notes but one pale and serious, sombrely attired and with the hue of melancholy. Let her take as her model some aged virgin of approved faith, character, and chastity, apt to instruct her by word and by example. She ought to rise at night to recite prayers and psalms; to sing hymns in the morning; at the third, sixth, and ninth hours to take her place in the line to do battle for Christ; and, lastly, to kindle her lamp and to offer her evening sacrifice. In these occupations let her pass the day, and when night comes let it find her still engaged in them. Let reading follow prayer with her, and prayer again succeed to reading. Time will seem short when employed on tasks so many and so varied.

10. Let her learn too how to spin wool, to hold the distaff, to put the basket in her lap, to turn the spinning wheel and to shape the yarn with her thumb. Let her put away with disdain silken fabrics, Chinese fleeces, and gold brocades: the clothing which she makes for herself should keep out the cold and not expose the body which it professes to cover. Let her food be herbs and wheaten bread with now and then one or two small fishes. And that I may not waste more time in giving precepts for the regulation of appetite (a subject I have treated more at

length elsewhere) let her meals always leave her hungry and able on the moment to begin reading or chanting. I strongly disapprove-especially for those of tender years-of long and immoderate fasts in which week is added to week and even oil and apples are forbidden as food. I have learned by experience that the ass toiling along the high way makes for an inn when it is weary. Our abstinence may turn to glutting, like that of the worshippers of Isis and of Cybele who gobble up pheasants and turtle-doves piping hot that their teeth may not violate the gifts of Ceres. If perpetual fasting is allowed, it must be so regulated that those who have a long journey before them may hold out all through; and we must take care that we do not, after starting well, fall halfway.

However in Lent, as I have written before now, those who practise self-denial should spread every stitch of canvas, and the charioteer should for once slacken the reins and increase the speed of his horses. Yet there will be one rule for those who live in the world and another for virgins and monks. The layman in Lent consumes the coats of his stomach, and living like a snail on his own juices makes ready a paunch for rich foods and feasting to come. But with the virgin and the monk the case is different; for, when these give the rein to their steeds, they have to remember that for them the race knows of no intermission. An effort made only for a limited time may well be severe, but one that has no such limit must be more moderate. For whereas in the first case we can recover our breath when the race is over, in the last we have to go on continually and without stopping.

11. When you go a short way into the country, do not leave your daughter behind you. Leave her no power or capacity of living without you, and let her feel frightened when she is left to herself. Let her not converse with people of the world or associate with virgins indifferent to their vows. Let her not be present at the weddings of your slaves and let her take no part in the noisy games of the household. As regards the use of the bath, I know that some are content with saying that a Christian virgin should not bathe along with eunuchs or with married women, with the former because they are still men. at all events in mind, and with the latter because women with child offer a revolting spectacle. For myself, however, I wholly disapprove of baths for a virgin of full age. Such an one should blush and feel overcome at the idea of seeing herself undressed. By vigils and fasts she mortifies her body and brings it into subjection. By a cold chastity she seeks to put out the flame of lust and to quench the hot desires of youth. And by a deliberate squalor she makes haste to spoil her natural good looks. Why, then, should she add fuel to a sleeping fire by taking baths?

12. Let her treasures be not silks or gems but manuscripts of the holy scriptures; and in these let her think less of gilding, and Babylonian parchment, and arabesque patterns, than of correctness and accurate punctuation. Let her begin by learning the psalter, and then let her gather rules of life out of the proverbs of Solomon.

From the Preacher let her gain the habit of despising the world and its vanities. Let her follow the example set in Job of virtue and of patience. Then let her pass on to the gospels never to be laid aside when once they have been taken in hand. Let her also drink in with a willing heart the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. As soon as she has enriched the storehouse of her mind with these treasures, let her commit to memory the prophets, the heptateuch, the books of Kings and of Chronicles, the rolls also of Ezra and Esther. When she has done all these she may safely read the Song of Songs but not before: for, were she to read it at the beginning, she would fail to perceive that, though it is written in fleshly words, it is a marriage song of a spiritual bridal. And not understanding this she would suffer hurt from it. Let her avoid all apocryphal writings, and if she is led to read such not by the truth of the doctrines which they contain but out of respect for the miracles contained in them;

let her understand that they are not really written by those to whom they are ascribed, that many faulty elements have been introduced into them, and that it requires infinite discretion to look for gold in the midst of dirt. Cyprian's writings let her have always in her hands. The letters of Athanasius and the treatises of Hilary she may go through without fear of stumbling. Let her take pleasure in the works and wits of all in whose books a due regard for the faith is not neglected. But if she reads the works of others let it be rather to judge them than to follow them.

13. You will answer, 'How shall I, a woman of the world, living at Rome, surrounded by a crowd, be able to observe all these injunctions?' In that case do not undertake a burthen to which you are not equal. When you have weaned Paula as Isaac was weaned and when you have clothed her as Samuel was clothed, send her to her grandmother and aunt; give up this most precious of gems, to be placed in Mary's chamber and to rest in the cradle where the infant Jesus cried. Let her be brought up in a monastery, let her be one amid companies of virgins, let her learn to avoid swearing, let her regard lying as sacrilege, let her be ignorant of the world, let her live the angelic life, while in the flesh let her be without the flesh, and let her suppose that all human beings are like herself. To say nothing of its other advantages this course will free you from the difficult task of minding her, and from the responsibility of guardianship. It is better to regret her absence than to be for ever trembling for her. For you cannot but tremble as you watch what she says and to whom she says it, to whom she bows and whom she likes best to see. Hand her over to Eustochium while she is still but an infant and her every cry is a prayer for you. She will thus become her companion in holiness now as well as her successor hereafter.

Let her gaze upon and love, let her "from her earliest years admire" one whose language and gait and dress are an education in virtue. [Comp. Ecclus. 19:30] Let her sit in the lap of her grandmother, and let this latter repeat to her granddaugh-

ter the lessons that she once bestowed upon her own child. Long experience has shewn Paula how to rear, to preserve, and to instruct virgins; and daily inwoven in her crown is the mystic century which betokens the highest chastity. O happy virgin! happy Paula, daughter of Toxotius, who through the virtues of her grandmother and aunt is nobler in holiness than she is in lineage! Yes, Laeta: were it possible for you with your own eyes to see your mother-in-law and your sister, and to realize the mighty souls which animate their small bodies; such is your innate thirst for chastity that I cannot doubt but that you would go to them even before your daughter, and would emancipate yourself from God's first decree of the Law [Gen. 1:28] to put yourself under His second dispensation of the Gospel. [1 Cor. 7:1] You would count as nothing your desire for other offspring and would offer up yourself to the service of God.

But because "there is a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracing," [Eccl. 3:5] and because "the wife hath not power of her own body," [1 Cor. 7:4] and because the apostle says "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called" [1 Cor. 7:20] in the Lord, and because he that is under the yoke ought so to run as not to leave his companion in the mire, I counsel you to pay back to the full in your offspring what meantime you defer paying in your own person. When Hannah had once offered in the tabernacle the son whom she had vowed to God she never took him back; for she thought it unbecoming that one who was to be a prophet should grow up in the same house with her who still desired to have other children. Accordingly after she had conceived him and given him birth, she did not venture to come to the temple alone or to appear before the Lord empty, but first paid to Him what she owed; and then, when she had offered up that great sacrifice, she returned home and because she had borne her firstborn for God, she was given five children for herself. [1 Sam. 2:21] Do you marvel at the happiness of that holy woman? Imitate her faith. Moreover, if you will only send Paula, I promise to be myself both a tutor and a foster father to her.

Old as I am I will carry her on my shoulders and train her stammering lips; and my charge will be a far grander one than that of the worldly philosopher; for while he only taught a King of Macedon who was one day to die of Babylonian poison, I shall instruct the handmaid and spouse of Christ who must one day be offered to her Lord in heaven.

Letter 108. To Eustochium.

This, one of the longest of Jerome’s letters, was written to console Eustochium for the loss of her mother who had recently died. Jerome relates the story of Paula in detail; speaking first of her high birth, marriage, and social success at Rome, and then narrating her conversion and subsequent life as a Christian ascetic. Much space is devoted to an account of her journey to the East which included a visit to Egypt and to the monasteries of Nitria as well as a tour of the most sacred spots in the Holy Land. The remainder of the letter describes her daily routine and studies at Bethlehem, and recounts the many virtues for which she was distinguished. It then concludes with a touching description of her death and burial and gives the epitaph placed upon her grave. The date of the letter is 404 a.d.

1. If all the members of my body were to be converted into tongues, and if each of my limbs were to be gifted with a human voice, I could still do no justice to the virtues of the holy and venerable Paula. Noble in family, she was nobler still in holiness; rich formerly in this world’s goods, she is now more distinguished by the poverty that she has embraced for Christ. Of the stock of the Gracchi and descended from the Scipios, the heir and representative of that Paulus whose name she bore, the true and legitimate daughter of that Martia Papyria who was mother to Africanus, she yet preferred Bethlehem to Rome, and left her palace glittering with gold to dwell in a mud cabin. We do not grieve that we have lost this perfect woman; rather we thank God that we have had her, nay that we have her still. For ”all live unto” God, [Luke 20:38] and they who return unto the Lord are still to be reckoned members of his family. We have lost her, it is true, but the heavenly mansions have gained her; for as long as she was in the body she was absent from the Lord [2 Cor. 5:6] and would constantly complain with tears:-”Woe is me that I sojourn in Mesech, that I dwell in the tents of Kedar; my soul hath been this long time a pilgrim.

It was no wonder that she sobbed out that even she was in darkness (for this is the meaning of the word Kedar) seeing that, according to the apostle, ”the world lieth in the evil one; [1 Joh. 5:19] and that, ”as its darkness is, so is its light; [Ps. 139:12, A.V. marg] and that ”the light shineth in darkness and the darkness

comprehended it not. [Joh. 1:5] She would frequently exclaim: ”I am a stranger with thee and a sojourner as all my fathers were,” [Ps. 39:12] and again, I desire ”to depart and to be with Christ. [Phil. 1:23] As often too as she was troubled with bodily weakness (brought on by incredible abstinence and by redoubled fastings), she would be heard to say: ”I keep under my body and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway; [1 Cor. 9:27] and ”It is good neither to eat flesh nor to drink wine; [Rom. 14:21] and ”I humbled my soul with fasting; [Ps. 35:13] and ”thou wilt make all” my ”bed in” my ”sickness; [Ps. 41:3] and ”Thy hand was heavy upon me: my moisture is turned into the drought of summer. [Ps. 32:4] And when the pain which she bore with such wonderful patience darted through her, as if she saw the heavens opened [Cf. Acts 7:56] she would say ”Oh that I had wings like a dove! for then would I fly away and be at rest. [Ps. 55:6]

2. I call Jesus and his saints, yes and the particular angel who was the guardian and the companion of this admirable woman to bear witness that these are no words of adulation and flattery but sworn testimony every one of them borne to her character. They are, indeed, inadequate to the virtues of one whose praises are sung by the whole world, who is admired by bishops, regretted by bands of virgins, and wept for by crowds of monks and poor. Would you know all her virtues, reader, in short? She has left those dependent on her poor, but not so poor as she was herself. In dealing thus with her relatives and the men and women of her small household-her brothers and sisters rather than her servants-she has done nothing strange; for she has left her daughter Eustochium-a virgin consecrated to Christ for whose comfort this sketch is made-far from her noble family and rich only in faith and grace.

3. Let me then begin my narrative. Others may go back a long way even to Paula’s cradle and, if I may say so, to her swaddling-clothes, and may speak of her mother Blaesilla and her father Rogatus. Of these the former was a descendant of the Scipios and the Gracchi; whilst the latter came of a line distinguished in Greece down to the present day. He was said, indeed, to have in his veins the blood of Agamemnon who destroyed Troy after a ten years siege. But I shall praise only what belongs to herself, what wells forth from the pure spring of her holy mind. When in the gospel the apostles ask their Lord and Saviour what He will give to those who have left all for His sake, He tells them that they shall receive an hundredfold now in this time and in the world to come eternal life. [Mark 10:28-30] From which we see that it is not the possession of riches that is praiseworthy but the rejection of them for Christ’s sake; that, instead of glorying in our privileges, we should make them of small account as compared with God’s faith. Truly the Saviour has now in this present time made good His promise to His servants and handmaidens. For one who despised the glory of a single city is to-day famous throughout the world;

and one who while she lived at Rome was known by no one outside it has by hiding herself at Bethlehem become the admiration of all lands Roman and barbarian.

For what race of men is there which does not send pilgrims to the holy places? And who could there find a greater marvel than Paula? As among many jewels the most precious shines. most brightly, and as the sun with its beams obscures and puts out the paler fires of the stars; so by her lowliness she surpassed all others in virtue and influence and, while she was least among all, was greater than all. The more she cast herself down, the more she was lifted up by Christ. She was hidden and yet she was not hidden. By shunning glory she earned glory; for glory follows virtue as its shadow; and deserting those who seek it, it seeks those who despise it. But I must not neglect to proceed with my narrative or dwell too long on a single point forgetful of the rules of writing.

4. Being then of such parentage, Paula married Toxotius in whose veins ran the noble blood of neas and the Julii. Accordingly his daughter, Christ's virgin Eustochium, is called Julia, as he Julius. A name from great lulus handed down. [Virg. A. 1:292.] I speak of these things not as of importance to those who have them, but as worthy of remark in those who despise them, Men of the world look up to persons who are rich in such privileges. We on the other hand praise those who for the Saviour's sake despise them; and strangely depreciating all who keep them, we eulogize those who are unwilling to do so. Thus nobly born, Paula through her fruitfulness and her chastity won approval from all, from her husband first, then from her relatives, and lastly from the whole city. She bore five children; Blaesilla, for whose death I consoled her while at Rome; Paulina, who has left the reverend and admirable Pammachius to inherit both her vows and property, to whom also I addressed a little book on her death; Eustochium, who is now in the holy places, a precious necklace of virginity and of the church; Rufina, whose untimely end overcame the affectionate heart of her mother; and Toxotius, after whom she had no more children. You can thus see that it was not her wish to fulfil a wife's duty, but that she only complied with her husband's longing to have male offspring.

5. When he died, her grief was so great that she nearly died herself: yet so completely did she then give herself to the service of the Lord, that it might have seemed that she had desired his death. In what terms shall I speak of her distinguished, and noble, and formerly wealthy house; all the riches of which she spent upon the poor? How can I describe the great consideration she shewed to all and her far reaching kindness even to those whom she had never seen? What poor man, as he lay dying,was not wrapped in blankets given by her? What bedridden person was not supported with money from her purse? She would seek out such with the greatest diligence throughout the city, and would think it a misfortune were any hungry or sick person to be supported by another's food. So lavish was her charity that she robbed her children; and, when her relatives remonstrated with her for

doing so, she declared that she was leaving to them a better inheritance in the mercy of Christ.

6. Nor was she long able to endure the visits and crowded receptions, which her high position in the world and her exalted family entailed upon her. She received the homage paid to her sadly, and made all the speed she could to shun and to escape those who wished to pay her compliments. It so happened that at that time the bishops of the East and West had been summoned to Rome by letter from the emperors to deal with certain dissensions between the churches, and in this way she saw two most admirable men and Christian prelates, Paulinus bishop of Antioch and Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis or, as it is now called, Constantia, in Cyprus. Epiphanius, indeed, she received as her guest; and, although Paulinus was staying in another person's house, in the warmth of her heart she treated him as if he too were lodged with her. Inflamed by their virtues she thought more and more each moment of forsaking her home. Disregarding her house, her children, her servants, her property, and in a word everything connected with the world, she was eager-alone and unaccompanied (if ever it could be said that she was so)-to go to the desert made famous by its Paula and by its Antonies. And at last when the winter was over and the sea was open, and when the bishops were returning to their churches, she also sailed with them in her prayers and desires.

Not to prolong the story, she went down to Portus accompanied by her brother, her kinsfolk and above all her own children eager by their demonstrations of affection to overcome their loving mother. At last the sails were set and the strokes of the rowers carried the vessel into the deep. On the shore the little Toxotius stretched forth his hands in entreaty, while Rufina, now grown up, with silent sobs besought her mother to wait till she should be married. But still Paula's eyes were dry as she turned them heaven wards; and she overcame her love for her children by her love for God. She knew herself no more as a mother, that she might approve herself a handmaid of Christ. Yet her heart was rent within her, and she wrestled with her grief, as though she were being forcibly separated from parts of herself. The greatness of the affection she had to overcome made all admire her victory the more. Among the cruel hardships which attend prisoners of war in the hands of their enemies, there is none severer than the separation of parents from their children. Though it is against the laws of nature, she endured this trial with unabated faith; nay more she sought it with a joyful heart: and overcoming her love for her children by her greater love for God, she concentrated herself quietly upon Eustochium alone, the partner alike of her vows and of her voyage. Meantime the vessel ploughed onwards and all her fellow-passengers looked back to the shore.

But she turned away her eyes that she might not see what she could not behold without agony. No mother, it must be confessed, ever loved her children so dearly.

Before setting out she gave them all that she had, disinheriting herself upon earth that she might find an inheritance in heaven.

7. The vessel touched at the island of Pontia ennobled long since as the place of exile of the illustrious lady Flavia Domitilla who under the Emperor Domitian was banished because she confessed herself a Christian; and Paula, when she saw the cells in which this lady passed the period of her long martyrdom, taking to herself the wings of faith, more than ever desired to see Jerusalem and the holy places. The strongest winds seemed weak and the greatest speed slow. After passing between Scylla and Charybdis she committed herself to the Adriatic sea and had a calm passage to Methone. Stopping here for a short time to recruit her wearied frame "She stretched her dripping limbs upon the shore: Then sailed past Malea and Cythera's isle, The scattered Cyclades, and all the lands That narrow in the seas on every side." [Virg. A. 3:126-8] Then leaving Rhodes and Lycia behind her, she at last came in sight of Cyprus, where failing at the feet of the holy and venerable Epiphanius, she was by him detained ten days; though this was not, as he supposed, to restore her strength but, as the facts prove, that she might do God's work. For she visited all the monasteries in the island, and left, so far as her means allowed, substantial relief for the brothers in them whom love of the holy man had brought thither from all parts of the world. Then crossing the narrow sea she landed at Seleucia, and going up thence to Antioch allowed herself to be detained for a little time by the affection of the reverend confessor Paulinus. Then, such was the ardour of her faith that she, a noble lady who had always previously been carried by eunuchs, went her way-and that in midwinter-riding upon an ass.

8. I say nothing of her journey through Coele-Syria and Phoenicia (for it is not my purpose to give you a complete itinerary of her wanderings); I shall only name such places as are mentioned in the sacred books. After leaving the Roman colony of Berytus and the ancient city of Zidon she entered Elijah's town on the shore at Zarephath and therein adored her Lord and Saviour. Next passing over the sands of Tyre on which Paul had once knelt [Acts 21:5] she came to Acco or, as it is now called, Ptolemais rode over the plains of Megiddo which had once witnessed the slaying of Josiah, [2 K. 23:29] and entered the land of the Philistines. Here she could not fail to admire the ruins of Dor, once a most powerful city; and Struto's Tower, which though at one time insignificant was rebuilt by Herod king of Judaea and named Caesarea in honour of Caesar Augustus. Here she saw the house of Cornelius now turned into a Christian church; and the humble abode of Philip; and the chambers of his daughters the four virgins "which did prophesy. [Acts 21:8, Acts 21:9] She arrived next at Antipatris, a small town half in ruins, named by Herod after his father Anti-pater, and at Lydda, now become Diospolis, a place made famous by the raising again of Dorcas [Acts 9:36-41] and the restoration to health of Aeneas.

[Acts 9:32-34] Not far from this are Arimathaea, the village of Joseph who buried the Lord, [John 19:38] and Nob, once a city of priests but now the tomb in which their slain bodies rest. [1 Sam. 22:17-19] Joppa too is hard by, the port of Jonah's flight; [Jon. 1:3] which also-if I may introduce a poetic fable-saw Andromeda bound to the rock. Again resuming her journey, she came to Nicopolis, once called Emmaus, where the Lord became known in the breaking of bread; [Luke 24:13, Luke 24:28-31] an action by which He dedicated the house of Cleopas as a church. Starting thence she made her way up lower and higher Bethhoron, cities founded by Solomon [2 Chr. 8:5] but subsequently destroyed by several devastating wars; seeing on her right Ajalon and Gibeon where Joshua the son of Nun when fighting against the five kings gave commandments to the sun and moon, [Josh. 10:12-14] where also he condemned the Gibeonites(who by a crafty stratagem had obtained a treaty) to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. At Gibeah also, now a complete ruin, she stopped for a little while remembering its sin, and the cutting of the concubine into pieces, and how in spite of all this three hundred men of the tribe of Benjamin were saved that in after days Paul might be called a Benjamite.

9. To make a long story short, leaving on her left the mausoleum of Helena queen of Adiabene who in time of famine had sent corn to the Jewish people, Paula entered Jerusalem, Jebus, or Salem, that city of three names which after it had sunk to ashes and decay was by Aelius Hadrianus restored once more as Aelia. And although the proconsul of Palestine, who was an intimate friend of her house, sent forward his apparitors and gave orders to have his official residence placed at her disposal, she chose a humble cell in preference to it. Moreover, in visiting the holy places so great was the passion and the enthusiasm she exhibited for each, that she could never have torn herself away from one had she not been eager to visit the rest. Before the Cross she threw herself down in adoration as though she beheld the Lord hanging upon it: and when she entered the tomb which was the scene of the Resurrection she kissed the stone which the angel had rolled away from the door of the sepulchre. [Matt. 28:2] Indeed so ardent was her faith that she even licked with her mouth the very spot on which the Lord's body had lain, like one athirst for the river which he has longed for. What tears she shed there, what groans she uttered, and what grief she poured forth, all Jerusalem knows; the Lord also to whom she prayed knows. Going out thence she made the ascent of Zion;

a name which signifies either "citadel" or "watch-tower. This formed the city which David formerly stormed and afterwards rebuilt. [2 Sam. 5:7, 2 Sam. 5:9] Of its storming it is written, "Woe to Ariel, to Ariel"-that is, God's lion, (and indeed in those days it was extremely strong)-"the city which David stormed: [Isa. 29:1. Vulg] and of its rebuilding it is said, "His foundation is in the holy mountains: the Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob. [Ps. 87:1, Ps. 87:2] He does not mean the gates which we see to-day in dust and ashes; the gates he means are those against which hell prevails not [Matt. 16:18] and through

which the multitude of those who believe in Christ enter in. [Rev. 22:14] There was shewn to her upholding the portico of a church the bloodstained column to which our Lord is said to have been bound when He suffered His scourging. There was shewn to her also the spot where the Holy Spirit came down upon the souls of the one hundred and twenty believers, thus fulfilling the prophecy of Joel. [Acts 2:16-21]

10. Then, after distributing money to the poor and her fellow-servants so far as her means allowed, she proceeded to Bethlehem stopping only on the right side of the road to visit Rachel's tomb. (Here it was that she gave birth to her son destined to be not what his dying mother called him, Benoni, that is the "Son of my pangs" but as his father in the spirit prophetically named him Benjamin, that is "the Son of the right hand). [Gen. 35:18, Gen. 35:19] After this she came to Bethlehem and entered into the cave where the Saviour was born. Here, when she looked upon the inn made sacred by the virgin and the stall where the ox knew his owner and the ass his master's crib, [Isa. 1:3] and where the words of the same prophet had been fulfilled "Blessed is he that soweth beside the waters where the ox and the ass trample the seed under their feet: [Isa. 32:20, LXX] when she looked upon these things I say, she protested in my hearing that she could behold with the eyes of faith the infant Lord wrapped in swaddling clothes and crying in the manger, the wise men worshipping Him, the star shining overhead, the virgin mother, the attentive foster-father, the shepherds coming by night to see "the word that was come to pass" [Luke 2:15, rhma] and thus even then to consecrate those opening phrases of the evangelist John "In the beginning was the word" and "the word was made flesh.

She declared that she could see the slaughtered innocents, the raging Herod, Joseph and Mary fleeing into Egypt; and with a mixture of tears and joy she cried: 'Hail Bethlehem, house of bread, wherein was born that Bread that came down from heaven. [Joh. 6:51] Hail Ephratah, land of fruitfulness and of fertility, whose fruit is the Lord Himself. Concerning thee has Micah prophesied of old, "Thou Bethlehem Ephratah art not the least among the thousands of Judah, for out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting. Therefore wilt thou [Mic. 5:2, Mic. 5:3, Cf. Matt. 2:6] give them up, until the time that she which travaileth hath brought forth: then the remnant of his brethren shall return unto the children of Israel. [Ps. 110:3, Vulg] For in thee was born the prince begotten before Lucifer. [Acts 13:46] Whose birth from the Father is before all time: and the cradle of David's race continued in thee, until the virgin brought forth her son and the remnant of the people that believed in Christ returned unto the children of Israel and preached freely to them in words like these: "It Was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you; but seeing ye put it from you and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. [Matt. 15:24] For the Lord hath said:

”I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. At that time also the words of Jacob were fulfilled concerning Him, ”A prince shall not depart from Judah nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until He come for whom it is laid up, [Gen. 49:10, LXX] and He shall be for the expectation of the nations. Well did David swear, well did he make a vow saying: ”Surely I will not come into the tabernacle of my house nor go up into my bed: I will not give sleep to mine eyes, or slumber to my eyelids, or rest to the temples of my head, [Ps. 132:2-5] until I find out a place for the Lord, an habitation for the . .

God of Jacob.” [Ps. 132:6, Vulg] And immediately he explained the object of his desire, seeing with prophetic eyes that He would come whom we now believe to have come. ”Lo we heard of Him at Ephratah: we found Him in the fields of the wood.” The Hebrew word Zo as have learned from your lessons [Ps. 132:7] means not her, that is Mary the Lord’s mother, but him that is the Lord Himself. Therefore he says boldly: ”We will go into His tabernacle: we will worship at His footstool.” [Ps. 132:14] I too, miserable sinner though I am, have been accounted worthy to kiss the manger in which the Lord cried as a babe, and to pray in the cave in which the travailing virgin gave virgin gave birth to the infant Lord. ”This is my rest” for it is my Lord’s native place; ”here will I dwell” [Ps. 132:17, Vulg] for this spot has my Saviour chosen. ”I have prepared a lamp for my Christ” [Ps. 22:29, 30, LXX] ”My soul shall live unto Him and my seed shall serve Him.” [Gen. 35:21, Mic. 4:8]

After this Paul, went a short distance down the hill to the tower of Edar, [Luke 2:14] that is ’of the flock,’ [Jud. 6:37] near which Jacob fed his flocks, and where the shepherds keeping watch by night were privileged to hear the words: ”Glory to God in the highest and on earth peace, goodwill toward men.” [Ex. 12:21-23] While they were keeping their sheep they found the Lamb of God; whose fleece bright and clean was made wet with the dew of heaven when it was dry upon all the earth beside, [Joh. 1:29] and whose blood when sprinkled on the doorposts drove off the destroyer of Egypt [Jer. 13:23] and took away the sins of the world. [Acts 8:27-39]

11. Then immediately quickening her pace she began to move along the old road which leads to Gaza, that is to the ’power’ or ’wealth’ of God, silently meditating on that type of the Gentiles, the Ethiopian eunuch, who in spite of the prophet changed his skin and whilst he read the old testament found the fountain of the gospel. [Nu. 13:23, Nu. 13:24] Next turning to the right she passed from Bethzur [Isa. 63:3] to Eshcol which means ”a cluster of grapes. It was hence that the spies brought back that marvellous cluster which was the proof of the fertility of the land and a type of Him who says of Himself: ”I have trodden the wine press alone; and of the people there was none with me. [Joh. 8:56, cf. Gen. 18:1, R.V.-q.v] Shortly afterwards she entered the home of Sarah and beheld the birthplace of Isaac and the traces of Abraham’s oak under which he saw Christ’s day and was glad. [Cor.

3:6] And rising up from thence she went up to Hebron, that is Kirjath-Arba, or the City of the Four Men. These are Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the great Adam whom the Hebrews suppose (from the book of Joshua the son of Nun) to be buried there. [Jud. 1:13-15] But many are of opinion that Caleb is the fourth and a monument at one side is pointed out as his. After seeing these places she did not care to go on to Kirjath-sepher, that is "the village of letters;

because despising the letter that killeth she had found the spirit that giveth life. She admired more the upper springs and the nether springs which Othniel the son of Kenaz the son of Jephunneh received in place of a south land and a waterless possession, [Gen. 18:23-33] and by the conducting of which he watered the dry fields of the old covenant. For thus did he typify the redemption which the sinner finds for his old sins in the waters of baptism. On the next day soon after sunrise she stood upon the brow of Capharbarucha, [Isa. 15:5] that is, "the house of blessing," the point to which Abraham pursued the Lord when he made intercession with Him. [Gen. 14:2] And here, as she looked down upon the wide solitude and upon the country once belonging to Sodom and Gomorrah, to Admah and Zeboim, she beheld the balsam vines of Engedi and Zoar. By Zoar I mean that "heifer of three years old" [Eph. 5:18] which was formerly called Bela [Gen. 19:30-38] and in Syriac is rendered Zoar that is 'little.' She called to mind the cave in which Lot found refuge, and with tears in her eyes warned the virgins her companions to beware of "wine wherein is excess; [Cant. 1:7] for it was to this that the Moabites and Ammonites owe their origin. [Gen. 43:16]

12. I linger long in the land of the midday sun for it was there and then that the spouse found her bridegroom at rest [Amos 1:1] and Joseph drank wine with his brothers once more. [Luke 24:50, Luke 24:51, Acts 1:9-12] I will return to Jerusalem and, passing through Tekoa the home of Amos, [Nu. 19:1-10] I will look upon the glistening cross of Mount Olivet from which the Saviour made His ascension to the Father. [Ezek. 10:18, Ezek. 10:19] Here year by year a red heifer was burned as a holocaust to the Lord and its ashes were used to purify the children of Israel. Here also according to Ezekiel the Cherubim after leaving the temple founded the church of the Lord. [Matt. 21:1-7]

After this Paula visited the tomb of Lazarus and beheld the hospitable roof of Mary and Martha, as well as Bethphage, 'the town of the priestly jaws.' Here it was that a restive foal typical of the Gentiles received the bridle of God, and covered with the garments of the apostles [Luke 10:30-35] offered its lowly back for Him to sit on. From this she went straight on down the hill to Jericho thinking of the wounded man in the gospel, of the savagery of the priests and Levites who passed him by, and of the kindness of the Samaritan, that is, the guardian, who placed the half-dead man upon his own beast and brought him down to the inn of the church. [Luke 19:4] She noticed the place called Adomim [Matt. 20:30-34] or the Place of Blood, so-called

because much blood was shed there in the frequent incursions of marauders. She beheld also the sycamore tree of Zacchaeus, by which is signified the good works of repentance whereby he trod under foot his former sins of bloodshed and rapine, and from which he saw the Most High as from a pinnacle of virtue. She was shewn too the spot by the wayside where the blind men sat who, receiving their sight from the Lord, [1 Kings 16:34] became types of the two peoples [Josh. 5:3] who should believe upon Him. Then entering Jericho she saw the city which Hiel founded in Abiram his firstborn and of which he set up the gates in his youngest son Segub.

[Rom. 2:28, Rom. 2:29] She looked upon the camp of Gilgal and the hill of the foreskins [Josh. 4:3, Josh. 4:20] suggestive of the mystery of the second circumcision: [Rev. 21:14] and she gazed at the twelve stones brought thither out of the bed of Jordan to be symbols of those twelve foundations on which are written the names of the twelve apostles. [Mal. 4:2] She saw also that fountain of the Law most bitter and barren which the true Elisha healed by his wisdom changing it into a well sweet and fertilising. [Josh. 3:17] Scarcely had the night passed away when burning with eagerness she hastened to the Jordan, stood by the brink of the river, and as the sun rose recalled to mind the rising of the sun of righteousness; [Josh. 7:24-26] how the priest's feet stood firm in the middle of the river-bed; [Zech. 3:9] how afterwards at the command of Elijah and Elisha the waters were divided hither and thither and made way for them to pass; and again how the Lord had cleansed by His baptism waters which the deluge had polluted and the destruction of mankind had defiled.

13. It would be tedious were I tell of the valley of Achor, that is, of 'trouble and crowds,' where theft and covetousness were condemned; [Isa. 28:16] and of Bethel, 'the house of God,' where Jacob poor and destitute slept upon the bare ground. Here it was that, having set beneath his head a stone which in Zechariah is described as having seven eyes [Gen. 28:12, Gen. 28:13] and in Isaiah is spoken of as a corner-stone, [Josh. 24:30] he beheld a ladder reaching up to heaven; yes, and the Lord standing high above it [Josh. 24:33] holding out His hand to such as were ascending and hurling from on high such as were careless. Also when she was in Mount Ephraim she made pilgrimages to the tombs of Joshua the son of Nun and of Eleazar the son of Aaron the priest, exactly opposite the one to the other; that of Joshua being built at Timnath-serah "on the north side of the hill of Gaash," [Cf. 1 Sam. 1:3] and that of Eleazar "in a hill that pertained to Phinehas his son. [Judg. 21:19-23: cf. Liv. 1:9] She was somewhat surprised to find that he who had had the distribution of the land in his own hands had selected for himself portions uneven and rocky. What shall I say about Shiloh where a ruined altar [From Joh. 4:5] is still shewn to-day, and where the tribe of Benjamin anticipated Romulus in the rape of the Sabine women?

Passing by Shechem (not Sychar as many wrongly read [Luke 7:28]) or as it is now called Neapoils, she entered the church built upon the side of Mount Gerizim around Jacob's well; that well where the Lord was sitting when hungry and thirsty He was refreshed by the faith of the woman of Samaria. Forsaking her five husbands by whom are intended the five books of Moses, and that sixth not a husband of whom she boasted, to wit the false teacher Dositheus, she found the true Messiah and the true Saviour. Turning away thence Paula saw the tombs of the twelve patriarchs, and Samaria which in honour of Augustus Herod renamed Augusta or in Greek Sebaste. There lie the prophets Elisha and Obadiah and John the Baptist than whom there is not a greater among those that are born of women. [1 Kings 18:4] And here she was filled with terror by the marvels she beheld; for she saw demons screaming under different tortures before the tombs of the saints, and men howling like wolves, baying like dogs, roaring like lions, hissing like serpents and bellowing like bulls. They twisted their heads and bent them backwards until they touched the ground; women too were suspended head downward and their clothes did not fall off. [Matt. 14:13-21] Paula pitied them all, and shedding tears over them prayed Christ to have mercy on them. And weak as she was she climbed the mountain on foot;

for in two of its caves Obadiah in a time of persecution and famine had fed a hundred prophets with bread and water. Then she passed quickly through Nazareth the nursery of the Lord; Cana and Capernaum familiar with the signs wrought by Him; the lake of Tiberias sanctified by His voyages upon it; the wilderness where countless Gentiles were satisfied with a few loaves while the twelve baskets of the tribes of Israel were filled with the fragments left by them that had eaten. She made the ascent of mount Tabor whereon the Lord was transfigured. [Jud. 5:21, Vulg] In the distance she beheld the range of Hermon; [Luke 7:11-15] and the wide stretching plains of Galilee where Sisera and all his host had once been overcome by Barak; and the torrent [Jud. 15:17-19, R.V] Kishon separating the level ground into two parts. Hard by also the town of Nain was pointed out to her, where the widow's son was raised. [Micah 1:1, Micah 1:14] Time would fail me sooner than speech were I to recount all the places to which the revered Paula was carried by her incredible faith.

14. I will now pass on to Egypt, pausing for a while on the way at Socoh, and at Samson's well which he clave in the hollow place that was in the jaw. [Jer. 2:18] Here I will lave my parched lips and refresh myself before visiting Moresheth; in old days famed for the tomb of the prophet Micah, [Isa. 19:18] and now for its church. Then skirting the country of the Horites and Gittites, Mareshah, Edom, and Lachish, and traversing the lonely wastes of the desert where the tracks of the traveller are lost in the yielding sand, I will come to the river ofEgypt called Sihor, [Ps. 78:12] that is "the muddy river," and go through the five cities of Egypt which speak the language of Canaan, and through the land of Goshen and the plains of

Zoan on which God wrought his marvellous works. And I will visit the city of No, which has since become Alexandria; and Nitria, the town of the Lord, where day by day the filth of multitudes is washed away with the pure nitre of virtue. No sooner did Paula come in sight of it than there came to meet her the reverend and estimable bishop, the confessor Isidore, accompanied by countless multitudes of monks many of whom were of priestly or of Levitical rank. [Ps. 6:6] On seeing these Paula rejoiced to behold the Lord's glory manifested in them; but protested that she had no claim to be received with such honour.

Need I speak of the Macarii, Arsenius, Serapion, or other pillars of Christ! Was there any cell that she did not enter? Or any man at whose feet she did not throw herself? In each of His saints she believed that she saw Christ Himself; and whatever she bestowed upon them she rejoiced to feel that she had bestowed it upon the Lord. Her enthusiasm was wonderful and her endurance scarcely credible in a woman. Forgetful of her sex and of her weakness she even desired to make her abode, together with the girls who accompanied her, among these thousands of monks. And, as they were all willing to welcome her, she might perhaps have sought and obtained permission to do so; had she not been drawn away by a still greater passion for the holy places. Coming by sea from Pelusium to Maioma on account of the great heat, she returned so rapidly that you would have thought her a bird. Not long afterwards, making up her mind to dwell permanently in holy Bethlehem, she took up her abode for three years? a miserable hostelry; till she could build the requisite cells and monastic buildings, to say nothing of a guest house for passing travellers where they might find the welcome which Mary and Joseph had missed. At this point I conclude my narrative of the journeys that she made accompanied by Eustochium and many other virgins.

15. I am now free to describe at greater length the virtue which was her peculiar charm; and in setting forth this I call God to witness that I am no flatterer. I add nothing. I exaggerate nothing. On the contrary I tone down much that I may not appear to relate incredibilities. My carping critics must not insinuate that I am drawing on my imagination or decking Paula, like sop's crow, with the fine feathers of other birds. Humility is the first of Christian graces, and hers was so pronounced that one who had never seen her, and who on account of her celebrity had desired to see her, would have believed that he saw not her but the lowest of her maids. When she was surrounded by companies of virgins she was always the least remarkable in dress, in speech, in gesture, and in gait. From the time that her husband died until she fell asleep herself she never sat at meat with a man, even though she might know him to stand upon the pinnacle of the episcopate. She never entered a bath except when dangerously ill. Even in the severest fever she rested not on an ordinary bed but on the hard ground covered only with a mat of goat's hair; if that can be called rest which made day and night alike a time of

almost unbroken prayer. Well did she fulfil the words of the psalter: ”All the night make I my bed to swim; I water my couch with my tear”!

[2 Cor. 8:13, 2 Cor. 8:14] Her tears welled forth as it were from fountains, and she lamented her slightest faults as if they were sins of the deepest dye. Constantly did I warn her to spare her eyes and to keep them for the reading of the gospel; but she only said: ’I must disfigure that face which contrary to God’s commandment I have painted with rouge, white lead, and antimony. I must mortify that body which has been given up to many pleasures. I must make up for my long laughter by constant weeping. I must exchange my soft linen and costly silks for rough goat’s hair. I who have pleased my husband and the world in the past, desire now to please Christ.’ Were I among her great and signal virtues to select her chastity as a subject of praise, my words would seem superfluous; for, even when she was still in the world, she set an example to all the matrons of Rome, and bore herself so admirably that themost slanderous never ventured to couple scandal with her name. No mind could be more considerate than hers, or none kinder towards the lowly. She did not court the powerful; at the same time, if the proud and the vainglorious sought her, she did not turn from them with disdain. If she saw a poor man, she supported him: and if she saw a rich one, she urged him to do good. Her liberality alone knew no bounds.

Indeed, so anxious was she to turn no needy person away that she borrowed money at interest and often contracted new loans to pay off old ones. I was wrong, I admit; but when I saw her so profuse in giving, I reproved her alleging the apostle’s words: ”I mean not that other men be eased and ye burthened; but by an equality that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want. [Matt. 5:7] I quoted from the gospel the Saviour’s words: ”he that hath two coats, let him impart one of them to him that hath none”; [Ecclus. 3:30] and I warned her that she might not always have means to do as she would wish. Other arguments I adduced to the same purpose; but with admirable modesty and brevity she overruled them all. ”God is my witness,” she said, ”that what I do I do for His sake. My prayer is that I may die a beggar not leaving a penny to my daughter and indebted to strangers for my winding sheet. She then concluded with these words: ”I, if I beg, shall find many to give to me; but if this beggar does not obtain help from me who by borrowing can give it to him, he will die; and if he dies, of whom will his soul be required?

I wished her to be more careful in managing her concerns, but she with a faith more glowing than mine clave to the Saviour with her whole heart and poor in spirit followed the Lord in His poverty, giving back to Him what she had received and becoming poor for His sake. She obtained her wish at last and died leaving her daughter overwhelmed with a mass of debt. This Eustochium still owes and

indeed cannot hope to pay off by her own exertions; only the mercy of Christ can free her from it.

16. Many married ladies make it a habit to confer gifts upon their own trumpeters, and while they are extremely profuse to a few, with hold all help from the many. From this fault Paula was altogether free. She gave her money to each according as each had need, not ministering to self-indulgence but relieving want. No poor person went away from her empty handed. And all this she was enabled to do not by the greatness of her wealth but by her careful management of it. She constantly had on her lips such phrases as these: ”Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy:” [Luke 16:9] and ”water will quench a flaming fire; and alms maketh an atonement for sins;” [Luke 11:41] and ”make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness that ...they may receive you into everlasting habitations;” [Dan. 4:27, LXX] and ”give alms ...and behold all things are clean unto you;” [Zech. 9:16, LXX] and Daniel’s words to King Nebuchadnezzar in which he admonished him to redeem his sins by almsgiving. [Rev. 21:14] She wished to spend her money not upon these stones, that shall pass away with the earth and the world, but upon those living stones, which roll over the earth; [Rev. 21:19-21] of which in the apocalypse of John the city ofthe great king is built; [Job 2:4, Job 2:5] of which also the scripture tells us that they shall be changed into sapphire and emerald and jasper and other gems. [Matt. 23:27]

17. But these qualities she may well share with a few others and the devil knows that it is not in these that the highest virtue consists. For, when Job has lost his substance and when his house and children have been destroyed, Satan says to the Lord: ”Skin for skin, yea all that a man hath, will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face.” We know that many persons while they have given alms have yet given nothing which touches their bodily comfort; and while they have held out a helping hand to those in need are themselves overcome with sensual indulgences; they whitewash the outside but within they are ”full of dead men’s bones.” [Wisd. 2:24] Paula was not one of these. Her self-restraint was so great as to be almost immoderate; and her fasts and labours were so severe as almost to weaken her constitution. Except on feast days she would scarcely ever take oil with her food; a fact from which may be judged what she thought of wine, sauce, fish, honey, milk, eggs, and other things agreeable to the palate. Some persons believe that in taking these they are extremely frugal; and, even if they surfeit themselves with them, they still fancy their chastity safe.

18. Envy always follows in the track of virtue: as Horace says, it is ever the mountain top that is smitten by the lightning. It is not surprising that I declare this of men and women, when the jealousy of the Pharisees succeeded in crucifying our Lord Himself. All the saints have had illwishers, and even Paradise was not free

from the serpent through whose malice death came into the world. [2 Cor. 12:7] So the Lord stirred up against Paula Hadad the Edomite [Gen. 27:41-46: Gen. 28:1-5] to buffet her that she might not be exalted, and warned her frequently by the thorn in her flesh [1 Sam. 21:10] not to be elated by the greatness of her own virtues or to fancy that, compared with other women, she had attained the summit of perfection. For my part I used to say that it was best to give in to rancour and to retire before passion. So Jacob dealt with his brother Esau; so David met the unrelenting persecution of Saul. I reminded her how the first of these fled into Mesopotamia; [Matt. 5:39] and how the second surrendered himself to the Philistines, [Rom. 12:21] and chose to submit to foreign foes rather than to enemies at home. She however replied as follows:- 'Your suggestion would be a wise one if the devil did not everywhere fight against God's servants and handmaidens, and did he not always precede the fugitives to their chosen refuges. Moreover, I am deterred from accepting it by my love for the holy places;

and I cannot find another Bethlehem elsewhere. Why may I not by my patience conquer this ill will? Why may I not by my humility break down this pride, and when I am smitten on the one cheek offer to the smiter the other? [Phil. 2:7, Phil. 2:8] Surely the apostle Paul says "Overcome evil with good. [Job 40:8, LXX] Did not the apostles glory when they suffered reproach for the Lord's sake? Did not even the Saviour humble Himself, taking the form of a servant and being made obedient to the Father unto death, even the death of the cross, [Matt. 5:10] that He might save us by His passion? If Job had not fought the battle and won the victory, he would never have received the crown of righteousness, or have heard the Lord say: "Thinkest thou that I have spoken unto thee for aught else than this, that thou mightest appear righteous. In the gospel those only are said to be blessed who suffer persecution for righteousness' sake. [Ps. 38:13] My conscience is at rest, and I know that it is not from any fault of mine that I am suffering; moreover affliction in this world is a ground for expecting a reward hereafter.' When the enemy was more than usually forward and ventured to reproach her to her face, she used to chant the words of the psalter: "While the wicked was before me, I was dumb with silence; I held my peace even from good:

[Ps. 38:14] and again, "I as a deaf man heard not; and I was as a dumb man that openeth not his mouth: [Deut. 13:3] and "I was as a man that heareth not, and in whose mouth are no reproofs. [Isa. 28:9-11, LXX] When she felt herself tempted, she dwelt upon the words in Deuteronomy: "The Lord your God proveth you, to know whether ye love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul. [Rom. 5:3-5] In tribulations and afflictions she turned to the splendid language of Isaiah: "Ye that are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breasts, look for tribulation upon tribulation, for hope also upon hope: yet a little while must these things be by reason of the malice of the lips and by reason of a spiteful tongue. This passage of scripture she explained for her own consolation as meaning that

the weaned, that is, those who have come to full age, must endure tribulation upon tribulation that they may be accounted worthy to receive hope upon hope. She recalled to mind also the words of the apostle, ”we glory in tribulations also: knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope: and hope maketh not ashamed” [2 Cor. 4:16] and ”though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day”: and ”our light affliction which is but for a moment worketh in us [2 Cor. 4:17, 2 Cor. 4:18] an eternal weight of glory;

while we look not at the things which are seen but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal but the things which are not seen are eternal. [Isa. 49:8] She used to say that, although to human impatience the time might seem slow in coming, yet that it would not be long but that presently help would come from God who says: ”In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in a day of salvation have I helped thee. [Isa. 51:7, Isa. 51:8] We ought not, she declared, to dread the deceitful lips and tongues of the wicked, for we rejoice in the aid of the Lord who warns us by His prophet: ”fear ye not the reproach of men, neither be ye afraid of their revilings; for the moth shall eat them up like a garment, and the worm shall eat them like wool”: [Luke 21:19, R.V] and she quoted His own words, ”In your patience ye shall win your souls”: [Rom. 8:18] as well as those of the apostle, ”the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed? us”: [1 Th. 3:4, R.V] and in another place, ”we are to suffer affliction” [Prov. 14:29] that we may be patient in all things that befall us, for ”he that is slow to wrath is of great understanding: but he that is hasty of spirit exalteth folly. [2 Cor. 12:10]

19. In her frequent sicknesses and infirmities she used to say, ”when I am weak, then am I strong: [2 Cor. 4:7] ”we have our treasure in earthen vessels” [1 Cor. 15:54] until ”this corruptible shall have put on incorruption and this mortal shall have put on immortality” [2 Cor. 1:5] and again ”as the sufferings of Christ abound in us, so our consolation also aboundeth by Christ: [2 Cor. 1:7] and then as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so shall ye be also of the consolation. [Ps. 42:11] In sorrow she used to sing: ”Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? hope thou in God for I shall yet praise him who is the health of my countenance and my God. [Luke 9:23] In the hour of danger she used to say: ”If any man will come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me: [Luke 9:24] and again ”whosoever will save his life shall lose it,” and ”whosoever will lose his life for my sake the same shall save it. [Matt. 16:26] When the exhaustion of her substance and the ruin of her property were announced to her she only said: ”What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul: [Job 1:21] and ”naked came I out of my mother’s womb, and naked shall I return thither.

The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord: [1 Joh. 2:15-17] and Saint John's words, "Love not the world neither the things that are in the world. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life, is not of the Father but is of the world. And the world passeth away and the lust thereof. [Ps. 77:4, Vulg] I know that when word was sent to her of the serious illnesses of her children and particularly of Toxotius whom she dearly loved, she first by her self-control fulfilled the saying: "I was troubled and I did not speak," [Matt. 10:37] and then cried out in the words of scripture, "He that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. [Ps. 79:11, LXX] And she prayed to the Lord and said: Lord "preserve thou the children of those that are appointed to die," [1 Cor. 4:9] that is, of those who for thy sake every day die bodily. I am aware that a talebearer-a class of persons who do a great deal of harm-once told her as a kindness that owing to her great fervour in virtue some people thought her mad and declared that something should be done for her head.

She replied in the words of the apostle, "we are made a spectacle unto the world and to angels and to men," [1 Cor. 4:10] and "we are fools for Christ's sake" [1 Cor. 1:25] but "the foolishness of God is wiser than men. [Ps. 69:5] It is for this reason she said that even the Saviour says to the Father, "Thou knowest my foolishness," [Ps. 71:7] and again "I am as a wonder unto many, but thou art my strong refuge. [Ps. 73:22, Ps. 73:23] "I was as a beast before thee; nevertheless I am continually with thee. [Mark 3:21] In the gospel we read that even His kinsfolk desired to bind Him as one of weak mind. [Joh. 8:48] His opponents also reviled him saying "thou art a Samaritan and hast a devil," [Luke 11:15] and another time "he casteth out devils through Beelzebub the chief of the devils. [2 Cor. 1:12] But let us, she continued, listen to the exhortation of the apostle, "Our rejoicing is this, the testimony of our conscience that in simplicity and sincerity ...by the grace of God we have had our conversation in the world. [Joh. 15:19] And let us hear the Lord when He says to His apostles, "If ye were of the world the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world ...therefore the world hateth you. [Cf.

Ps. 44:21] And then she turned to the Lord Himself, saying, "Thou knowest the secrets of the heart," [Ps. 44:17, Ps. 44:18] and "all this is come upon us; yet have we not forgotten thee, neither have we dealt falsely in thy covenant; our heart is not turned back. [Ps. 44:22] "Yea for thy sake are we killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep for the slaughter. [Ps. 118:6, P.B.V] But "the Lord is on my side: I will not fear what man doeth unto me. [Prov. 7:2, LXX] She had read the words of Solomon, "My son, honour the Lord and thou shalt be made strong; and beside the Lord fear thou no man. [Cf. 1 Cor. 9:11] These passages and others like them she used as God's armour against the assaults of wickedness, and particularly to defend herself against the furious onslaughts of envy; and thus by patiently enduring wrongs she soothed the violence of the most savage breasts. Down to the very day of her death two things were conspicuous in her life, one her

great patience and the other the jealousy which was manifested towards her. Now jealousy gnaws the heart of him who harbours it: and while it strives to injure its rival raves with all the force of its fury against itself.

20. I shall now describe the order of her monastery and the method by which she turned the continence of saintly souls to her own profit. She sowed carnal things that she might reap spiritual things; she gave earthly things that she might receive heavenly things; she forewent things temporal that she might in their stead obtain things eternal. Besides establishing a monastery for men, the charge of which she left to men, she divided into three companies and monasteries the numerous virgins whom she had gathered out of different provinces, some of whom are of noble birth while others belonged to the middle or lower classes. But, although they worked and had their meals separately from each other, these three companies met together for psalm-singing and prayer. After the chanting of the Alleluia-the signal by which they were summoned to the Collect -no one was permitted to remain behind. But either first or among the first Paula used to await the arrival of the rest, urging them to diligence rather by her own modest example than by motives of fear. At dawn, at the third, sixth, and ninth hours, at evening, and at midnight they recited the psalter each in turn. [1 Cor. 4:21] No sister was allowed to be ignorant of the psalms, and all had every day to learn a certain portion of the holy scriptures. On the Lord’s day only they proceeded to the church beside which they lived, each company following its own mother-superior.

Returning home in the same order, they then devoted themselves to their allotted tasks, and made garments either for themselves or else for others. If a virgin was of noble birth, she was not allowed to have an attendant belonging to her own household lest her maid having her mind full of the doings of old days and of the license of childhood might by constant converse open old wounds and renew former errors. All the sisters were clothed alike. Linen was not used except for drying the hands. So strictly did Paula separate them from men that she would not allow even eunuchs to approach them; lest she should give occasion to slanderous tongues (always ready to cavil at the religious) to console themselves for their own misdoing. When a sister was backward in coming to the recitation of the psalms or shewed herself remiss in her work, Paula used to approach her in different ways. Was she quick-tempered? Paula coaxed her. Was she phlegmatic? Paula chid her, copying the example of the apostle who said: ”What will ye? Shall I come to you with a rod or in love and in the spirit of meekness? [1 Tim. 6:8] Apart from food and raiment she allowed no one to have anything she could call her own, for Paul had said, ”Having food and raiment let us be therewith content. She was afraid lest the custom of having more should breed covetousness in them;

an appetite which no wealth can satisfy, for the more it has the more it requires, and neither opulence nor indigence is able to diminish it. [Ecclus. 13:2] When the

sisters quarrelled one with another she reconciled them with soothing words. If the younger ones were troubled with fleshly desires, she broke their force by imposing redoubled fasts; for she wished her virgins to be ill in body rather than to suffer in soul. If she chanced to notice any sister too attentive to her dress, she reproved her for her error with knitted brows and severe looks, saying; "a clean body and a clean dress mean an unclean soul. A virgin's lips should never utter an improper or an impure word, for such indicate a lascivious mind and by the outward man the faults of the inward are made manifest. When she saw a sister verbose and talkative or forward and taking pleasure in quarrels, and when she found after frequent admonitions that the offender shewed no signs of improvement; she placed her among the lowest of the sisters and outside their society, ordering her to pray at the door of the refectory instead of with the rest, and commanding her to take her food by herself, in the hope that where rebuke had failed shame might bring about a reformation. The sin of theft she loathed as if it were sacrilege; and that which among men of the world is counted little or nothing she declared to be in a monastery a crime of the deepest dye.

How shall I describe her kindness and attention towards the sick or the wonderful care and devotion with which she nursed them? Yet, although when others were sick she freely gave them every indulgence, and even allowed them to eat meat; when she fell ill herself, she made no concessions to her own weakness, and seemed unfairly to change in her own case to harshness the kindness which she was always ready to shew to others.

21. No young girl of sound and vigorous constitution could have delivered herself up to a regimen so rigid as that imposed upon herself by Paula whose physical powers age had impaired and enfeebled. I admit that in this she was too determined, refusing to spare herself or to listen to advice. I will relate what I know to be a fact. In the extreme heat of the month of July she was once attacked by a violent fever and we despaired of her life. However by God's mercy she rallied, and the doctors urged upon her the necessity of taking a little light wine to accelerate her recovery; saying that if she continued to drink water they feared that she might become dropsical. I on my side secretly appealed to the blessed pope Epiphanius to admonish, nay even to compel her, to take the wine. But she with her usual sagacity and quickness at once perceived the stratagem, and with a smile let him see that the advice he was giving her was after all not his but mine. Not to waste more words, the blessed prelate after many exhortations left her chamber; and, when I asked him what he had accomplished, replied, "Only this that old as I am I have been almost persuaded to drink no more wine. I relate this story not because I approve of persons rashly taking upon themselves burthens beyond their strength (for does not the scripture say: "Burden not thyself above thy power"?

[Ps. 63:1]) but because I wish from this quality of perseverance in her to shew the passion of her mind and the yearning of her believing soul; both of which made her sing in David's words, "My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth after thee. [e.g. Aristotle, E.N. 2:6] Difficult as it is always to avoid extremes, the philosophers are quite right in their opinion that virtue is a mean and vice an excess, or as we may express it in one short sentence "In nothing too much. [Rom. 7:24] While thus unyielding in her contempt for food Paula was easily moved to sorrow and felt crushed by the deaths of her kinsfolk, especially those of her children. When one after another her husband and her daughters fell asleep, on each occasion the shock of their loss endangered her life. And although she signed her mouth and her breast with the sign of the cross, and endeavoured thus to alleviate a mother's grief; her feelings overpowered her and her maternal instincts were too much for her confiding mind. Thus while her intellect retained its mastery she was overcome by sheer physical weakness. On one occasion a sickness seized her and clung to her so long that it brought anxiety to us and danger to herself. Yet even then she was full of joy and repeated every moment the apostle's words: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? [2 Tim. 4:7, 2 Tim. 4:8]

The careful reader may say that my words are an invective rather than an eulogy. I call that Jesus whom she served and whom I desire to serve to be my witness that so far from unduly eulogizing her or depreciating her I tell the truth about her as one Christian writing of another; that I am writing a memoir and not a panegyric, and that what were faults in her might well be virtues in others less saintly. I speak thus of her faults to satisfy my own feelings and the passionate regret of us her brothers and sisters, who all of us love her still and all of us deplore her loss.

22. However, she has finished her course, she has kept the faith, and now she enjoys the crown of righteousness. [Rev. 14:4] She follows the Lamb whithersoever he goes. [Cf. Luke 6:21] She is filled now because once she was hungry. [Ps. 48:8] With joy does she sing: "as we have heard, so have we seen in the city of the Lord of hosts, in the city of our God. [Jer. 2:13] O blessed change! Once she wept but now laughs for evermore. Once she despised the broken cisterns of which the prophet speaks; [Joh. 4:14] but now she has found in the Lord a fountain of life. [Ps. 30:11] Once she were haircloth but now she is clothed in white raiment, and can say: "thou hast put off my sackcloth, and girded me with gladness. [Ps. 102:9] Once she ate ashes like bread and mingled her drink with weeping; [Ps. 42:3] saying "my tears have been my meat day and night; [Cf. Ps. 78:25] but now for all time she eats the bread of angels [Ps. 34:8] and sings: "O taste and see that the Lord is good; [Ps. 45:1, R.V] and "my heart is overflowing with a goodly matter; I speak the things which I have made touching the king. [Isa. 65:13, Isa. 65:14] She now sees fulfilled Isaiah's words, or rather those of the Lord speaking through Isaiah:

”Behold, my servants shall eat but ye shall be hungry: behold, my servants shall drink but ye shall be thirsty:

behold, my servants shall rejoice, but ye shall be ashamed: behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall bowl for vexation of spirit. [Ps. 42:1, Ps. 42:2] I have said that she always shunned the broken cisterns: she did so that she might find in the Lord a fountain of life, and that she might rejoice and sing: ”as the hart panteth after the waterbrooks, so panteth my soul after Thee, O God. When shall I come and appear before God? [Wisd. 9:15]

23. I must briefly mention the manner in which she avoided the foul cisterns of the heretics whom she regarded as no better than heathen. A certain cunning knave, in his own estimation both learned and clever, began without my knowledge to put to her such questions as these: What sin has an infant committed that it should be seized by the devil? Shall we be young or old when we rise again? If we die young and rise young, we shall after the resurrection require to have nurses. If however we die young and rise old, the dead will not rise again at all: they will be transformed into new beings. Will there be a distinction of sexes in the next world? Or will there be no such distinction? If the distinction continues, there will be wedlock and sexual intercourse and procreation of children. If however it does not continue, the bodies that rise again will not be the same. For, he argued, ”the earthy tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things,” [1 Cor. 15:44] but the bodies that we shall have in heaven will be subtle and spiritual according to the words of the apostle: ”it is sown a natural body: it is raised a spiritual body. [Ps. 74:19, R.V] From all of which considerations he sought to prove that rational creatures have been for their faults and previous sins subjected to bodily conditions; and that according to the nature and guilt of their transgression they are born in this or that state of life.

Some, he said, rejoice in sound bodies and wealthy and noble parents; others have for their portion diseased frames and poverty stricken homes; and by imprisonment in the present world and in bodies pay the penalty of their former sins. Paula listened and reported what she heard to me, at the same time pointing out the man. Thus upon me was laid the task of opposing this most noxious viper and deadly pest. It is of such that the Psalmist speaks when he writes: ”deliver not the soul of thy turtle dove unto the wild beast,” [Ps. 68:30, R.V] and ”Rebuke the wild beast of the reeds; [Matt. 22:29, Matt. 22:30] creatures who write iniquity and speak lies against the Lord and lift up their mouths against the Most High. As the fellow had tried to deceive Paula, I at her request went to him, and by asking him a few questions involved him in a dilemma. Do you believe, said I, that there will be a resurrection of the dead or do you disbelieve? He replied, I believe. I went on: Will the bodies that rise again be the same or different? He said, The same. Then

I asked: What of their sex? Will that remain unaltered or will it be changed? At this question he became silent and swayed his head this way and that as a serpent does to avoid being struck. Accordingly I continued, As you have nothing to say I will answer for you and will draw the conclusion from your premises.

If the woman shall not rise again as a woman nor the man as a man, there will be no resurrection of the dead. For the body is made up of sex and members. But if there shall be no sex and no members what will become of the resurrection of the body, which cannot exist without sex and members? And if there shall be no resurrection of the body, there can be no resurrection of the dead. But as to your objection taken from marriage, that, if the members shall remain the same, marriage must inevitably be allowed; it is disposed of by the Saviour's words: "ye do err not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God. For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are as the angels. When it is said that they neither marry nor are given in marriage, the distinction of sex is shewn to persist. For no one says of things which have no capacity for marriage such as a stick or a stone that they neither marry nor are given in marriage; but this may well be said of those who while they can marry yet abstain from doing so by their own virtue and by the grace of Christ. But if you cavil at this and say, how shall we in that case be like the angels with whom there is neither male nor female, hear my answer in brief as follows.

What the Lord promises to us is not the nature of angels but their mode of life and their bliss. And therefore John the Baptist is called an angel [Joh. 20:26-28] even before he is beheaded, and all God's holy men and virgins manifest in themselves even in this world the life of angels. When it is said "ye shall be like the angels," likeness only is promised and not a change of nature.

24. And now do you in your turn answer me these questions. How do you explain the fact that Thomas felt the hands of the risen Lord and beheld His side pierced by the spear? [Job. 21:4] And the fact that Peter saw the Lord standing on the shore [Luke 24:42, Luke 24:43] and eating a piece of a roasted fish and a honeycomb. [Mark 5:43] If He stood, He must certainly have had feet. If He pointed to His wounded side He must have also had chest and belly for to these the sides are attached and without them they cannot be. If He spoke, He must have used a tongue and palate and teeth. For as the bow strikes the strings, so to produce vocal sound does the tongue come in contact with the teeth. If His hands were felt, it follows that He must have had arms as well. Since therefore it is admitted that He had all the members which go to make up the body, He must have also had the whole body formed of them, and that not a woman's but a man's; that is to say, He rose again in the sex in which He died. And if you cavil farther and say: We shall eat then, I suppose, after the resurrection; or How can a solid and material body

enter in contrary to its nature through closed doors? you shall receive from me this reply. Do not for this matter of food find fault with belief in the resurrection:

for our Lord after raising the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue commanded food to be given her. [Joh. 12:2] And Lazarus who had been dead four days is described as sitting at meat with Him, [Joh. 20:19] the object in both cases being to shew that the resurrection was real and not merely apparent. And if from our Lord's entering in through closed doors [Matt. 14:25] you strive to prove that His body was spiritual and aerial, He must have had this spiritual body even before He suffered; since-contrary to the nature of heavy bodies-He was able to walk upon the sea. [Matt. 14:29] The apostle Peter also must be believed to have had a spiritual body for he also walked upon the waters with buoyant step. [Matt. 14:31] The true explanation is that when anything is done against nature, it is a manifestation of God's might and power. And to shew plainly that in these great signs our attention is asked not to a change in nature but to the almighty power of God, he who by faith had walked on water began to sink for the want of it and would have done so had not the Lord lifted him up with the reproving words, "O thou of little faith wherefore didst thou doubt? [Joh. 20:27] I wonder that you can display such effrontery when the Lord Himself said, "reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless but believing.

[Luke 24:39, Luke 24:40] and in another place, "behold my hands and my feet that it is I myself: handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have. And when he had thus spoken he shewed them his hands and his feet. You hear Him speak of bones and flesh, of feet and hands; and yet you want to palm off on me the bubbles and airy nothings of which the stoics rave! [Ps. 36:6]

25. Moreover, if you ask how it is that a mere infant which has never sinned is seized by the devil, or at what age we shall rise again seeing that we die at different ages; my only answer-an unwelcome one, I fancy-will be in the words of scripture: "The judgments of God are a great deep," [Rom. 11:33, Rom. 11:34] and "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?" No difference of age can affect the reality of the body. Although our frames are in a perpetual flux and lose or gain daily, these changes do not make us different individuals. I was not one person at ten years old, another at thirty and another at fifty; nor am I another now when all my head is gray. [Eph. 4:13] According to the traditions of the church and the teaching of the apostle Paul, the answer must be this; that we shall rise as perfect men in the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ. [Jas. 1:19] At this age the Jews suppose Adam to have been created and at this age we read that the Lord and Saviour rose again. Many other arguments did I adduce from both testaments to stifle the outcry of this heretic.

26. From that day forward so profoundly did Paula commence to loathe the man- and all who agreed with him in his doctrines-that she publicly proclaimed them as enemies of the Lord. I have related this incident less with the design of confuting in a few words a heresy which would require volumes to confute it, than with the object of shewing the great faith of this saintly woman who preferred to subject herself to perpetual hostility from men rather than by friendships hurtful to herself to provoke or to offend God.

27. To revert then to that description of her character which I began a little time ago; no mind was ever more docile than was hers. She was slow to speak and swift to hear, [Deut. 27:9, R.V] remembering the precept, "Keep silence and hearken, O Israel. The holy scriptures she knew by heart, and said of the history contained in them that it was the foundation of the truth; but, though she loved even this, she still preferred to seek for the underlying spiritual meaning and made this the keystone of the spiritual building raised within her soul. She asked leave that she and her daughter might read over the old and new testaments under my guidance. Out of modesty I at first refused compliance, but as she persisted in her demand and frequently urged me to consent to it, I at last did so and taught her what I had learned not from myself-for self-confidence is the worst of teachers-but from the church's most famous writers. Wherever I stuck fast and honestly confessed myself at fault she would by no means rest content but would force me by fresh questions to point out to her which of many different solutions seemed to me the most probable. I will mention here another fact which to those who are envious may well seem incredible. While I myself beginning as a young man have with much toil and effort partially acquired the Hebrew tongue and study it now unceasingly lest if I leave it, it also may leave me;

Paula, on making up her mind that she too would learn it, succeeded so well that she could chant the psalms in Hebrew and could speak the language without a trace of the pronunciation peculiar to Latin. The same accomplishment can be seen to this day in her daughter Eustochium, who always kept close to her mother's side, obeyed all her commands, never slept apart from her, never walked abroad or took a meal without her never had a penny that she could call her own, rejoiced when her mother gave to the poor her little patrimony, and fully believed that in filial affection she had the best heritage and the truest riches. I must not pass over in silence the joy which Paula felt when she heard her little granddaughter and namesake, the child of Laeta and Toxotius-who was born and I may even say conceived in answer to a vow of her parents dedicating her to virginity-when, I say, she heard the little one in her cradle sing "alleluia" and falter out the words "grandmother" and "aunt. One wish alone made her long to see her native land again; that she might know her son and his wife and child [Matt. 8:25, Luke 8:24] to have renounced the world and to be serving Christ. And it has been granted to her in part. For while her granddaughter is destined to take the veil, her daughter-

in-law has vowed herself to perpetual chastity, and by faith and alms emulates the example that her mother has set her.

She strives to exhibit at Rome the virtues which Paula set forth in all their fulness at Jerusalem.

28. What ails thee, my soul? Why dost thou shudder to approach her death? I have made my letter longer than it should be already; dreading to come to the end and vainly supposing that by saying nothing of it and by occupying myself with her praises I could postpone the evil day. Hitherto the wind has been all in my favour and my keel has smoothly ploughed through the heaving waves. But now my speech is running upon the rocks, the billows are mountains high, and imminent shipwreck awaits both you and me. We must needs cry out: "Master; save us we perish: [Ps. 44:23] and "awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord? [Eccles. 9:2] For who could tell the tale of Paula's dying with dry eyes? She fell into a most serious illness and thus gained what she most desired, power to leave us and to be joined more fully to the Lord. Eustochium's affection for her mother, always true and tried, in this time of sickness approved itself still more to all. She sat by Paula's bedside, she fanned her, she supported her head, she arranged her pillows, she chafed her feet, she rubbed her stomach, she smoothed down the bedclothes, she heated hot water, she brought towels. In fact she anticipated the servants in all their duties, and when one of them did anything she regarded it as so much taken away from her own gain.

How unceasingly she prayed, how copiously she wept, how constantly she ran to and fro between her prostrate mother and the cave of the Lord! imploring God that she might not be deprived of a companion so dear, that if Paula was to die she might herself no longer live, and that one bier might carry to burial her and her mother. Alas for the frailty and perishableness of human nature! Except that our belief in Christ raises us up to heaven and promises eternity to our souls, the physical conditions of life are the same for us as for the brutes. "There is one event to the righteous and to the wicked; to the good and to the evil; to the clean and to the unclean; to him that sacrificeth and to him that sacrificeth not: as is the good so is the sinner; and he that sweareth as he that feareth an oath. [Ps. 26:8] Man and beast alike are dissolved into dust and ashes.

29. Why do I still linger, and prolong my suffering by postponing it? Paula's intelligence shewed her that her death was near. Her body and limbs grew cold and only in her holy breast did the warm beat of the living soul continue. Yet, as though she were leaving strangers to go home to her own people, she whispered the verses of the psalmist: "Lord, I have loved the habitation of thy house and the place where thine honour dwelleth," [Ps. 84:1, Ps. 84:2] and "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts! My soul longeth yea even fainteth for the courts of the Lord," [Ps. 84:10, Vulg] and "I had rather be an outcast in the house of my God than to dwell

in the tents of wickedness. When I asked her why she remained silent refusing to answer my call, and whether she was in pain, she replied in Greek that she had no suffering and that all things were to her eyes calm and tranquil. After this she said no more but closed her eyes as though she already despised all mortal things, and kept repeating the verses just quoted down to the moment in which she breathed out her soul, but in a tone so low that we could scarcely hear what she said. Raising her finger also to her mouth she made the sign of the cross upon her lips. Then her breath failed her and she gasped for death;

yet even when her soul was eager to break free, she turned the death-rattle (which comes at last to all) into the praise of the Lord. The bishop of Jerusalem and some from other cities were present, also a great number of the inferior clergy, both priests and levites. [Cant. 2:10-12, Vulg] The entire monastery was filled with bodies of virgins and monks. As soon as Paula heard the bridegroom saying: ”Rise up my love my fair one, my dove, and come away: for, lo,the winter is past, the rain is over and gone,” she answered joyfully ”the flowers appear on the earth; the time to cut them has come” [Ps. 27:13] and ”I believe that I shall see the good things of the Lord in the land of the living. [Acts 9:39]

30. No weeping or lamentation followed her death, such as are the custom of the world; but all present united in chanting the psalms in their several tongues. The bishops lifted up the dead woman with their own hands, placed her upon a bier, and carrying her on their shoulders to the church in the cave of the Saviour, laid her down in the centre of it. Other bishops meantime carried torches and tapers in the procession, and yet others led the singing of the choirs. The whole population of the cities of Palestine came to her funeral. Not a single monk lurked in the desert or lingered in his cell. Not a single virgin remained shut up in the seclusion of her chamber. To each and all it would have seemed sacrilege to have withheld the last tokens of respect from a woman so saintly. As in the case of Dorcas, [Ps. 131:2] the widows and the poor shewed the garments Paula had given them; while the destitute cried aloud that they had lost in her a mother and a nurse. Strange to say, the paleness of death had not altered her expression; only a certain solemnity and seriousness had overspread her features. You would have thought her not dead but asleep.

One after another they chanted the psalms, now in Greek, now in Latin, now in Syriac; and this not merely for the three days which elapsed before she was buried beneath the church and close to the cave of the Lord, but throughout the remainder of the week. All who were assembled felt that it was their own funeral at which they were assisting, and shed tears as if they themselves had died. Paula’s daughter, the revered virgin Eustochium, ”as a child that is weaned of his mother,” [Corbona. See Matt. 27:6, Vulg] could not be torn away from her parent. She kissed her

eyes, pressed her lips upon her brow, embraced her frame, and wished for nothing better than to be buried with her.

31. Jesus is witness that Paula has left not a single penny to her daughter but, as I said before, on the contrary a large mass of debt; and, worse even than this, a crowd of brothers and sisters whom it is hard for her to support but whom it would be undutiful to cast off. Could there be a more splendid instance of self-renunciation than that of this noble lady who in the fervour of her faith gave away so much of her wealth that She reduced herself to the last degree of poverty? Others may boast, if they will, of money spent in charity, of large sums heaped up in God's treasury, [1 Cor. 2:9] of votive offerings hung up with cords of gold. None of them has given more to the poor than Paula, for Paula has kept nothing for herself. But now she enjoys the true riches and those good things which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have they entered into the heart of man. [Cant. 5:10] If we mourn, it is for ourselves and not for her; yet even so, if we persist in weeping for one who reigns with Christ, we shall seem to envy her her glory.

32. Be not fearful, Eustochium: you are endowed with a splendid heritage. The Lord is your portion; and, to increase your joy, your mother has now after a long martyrdom won her crown. It is not only the shedding of blood that is accounted a confession: the spotless service of a devout mind is itself a daily martyrdom. Both alike are crowned; with roses and violets in the one case, with lilies in the other. Thus in the Song of Songs it is written: "my beloved is white and ruddy;" [Gen. 12:1] for, whether the victory be won in peace or in war, God gives the same guerdon to those who win it. Like Abraham your mother heard the words: "get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, unto a land that I will shew thee;" [Jer. 51:6] and not only that but the Lord's command given through Jeremiah: "flee out of the midst of Babylon, and deliver every man his soul." [Ruth 1:16] To the day of her death she never returned to Chalda, or regretted the fleshpots of Egypt or its strong-smelling meats. Accompanied by her virgin bands she became a fellow-citizen of the Saviour; and now that she has ascended from her little Bethlehem to the heavenly realms she can say to the true Naomi: "thy people shall be my people and thy God my God."

33. I have spent the labour of two nights in dictating for you this treatise; and in doing so I have felt a grief as deep as your own. I say in 'dictating' for I have not been able to write it myself. As often as I have taken up my pen [Horace, C. III. 30:1] and have tried to fulfil my promise; my fingers have stiffened, my hand has fallen, and my power over it has vanished. The rudeness of the diction, devoid as it is of all elegance or charm, bears witness to the feeling of the writer. 34. And now, Paula, farewell, and aid with your prayers the old age of your votary. Your faith and your works unite you to Christ; thus standing in His presence you will the more readily gain what you ask. In this letter "I have built" to your memory "a

monument more lasting than bronze," [2 Cor. 3:6] which no lapse of time will be able to destroy. And I have cut an inscription on your tomb, which I here subjoin; that, wherever my narrative may go, the reader may learn that you are buried at Bethlehem and not uncommemorated there.

"The Inscription On Paula's Tomb. Within this tomb a child of Scipio lies, A daughter of the farfamed Pauline house, A scion of the Gracchi, of the stock Of Agamemnon's self, illustrious: Here rests the lady Paula, well-beloved Of both her parents, with Eustochium For daughter; she the first of Roman dames Who hardship chose and Bethlehem for Christ." In front of the cavern there is another inscription as follows:- "Seest thou here hollowed in the rock a grave, 'Tis Paula's tomb; high heaven has her soul. Who Rome and friends, riches and home forsook Here in this lonely spot to find her rest. For here Christ's manger was, and here the kings To Him, both God and man, their offerings made." 35. The holy and blessed Paula fell asleep on the seventh day before the Kalends of February, on the third day of the week, after the sun had set. She was buried on the fifth day before the same Kalends, in the sixth consulship of the Emperor Honorius and the first of Aristnetus. She lived in the vows of religion five years at Rome and twenty years at Bethlehem. The whole duration of her life was fifty-six years eight months and twenty-one days.

Letter 109. To Riparius.

Riparius, a presbyter of Aquitaine had written to inform Jerome that Vigilantius (for whom see Letter 61.) was preaching in southern Gaul against the worship of relics and the keeping of night vigils; and this apparently with the consent of his bishop. Jerome now replies in a letter more noteworthy for its bitterness than for its logic. Nevertheless he offers to write a full confutation of Vigilantius if Riparius will send him the book containing his heresies. This Riparius subsequently did and then Jerome wrote his treatise Against Vigilantius, the most extreme and least convincing of all his works. The date of the letter is 404 a.d.

1. Now that I have received a letter from you, if I do not answer it I shall be guilty of pride, and if I do I shall be guilty of rashness. For the matters concerning which you ask my opinion are such that they cannot either be spoken of or listened to without profanity. You tell me that Vigilantius (whose very name Wakeful is a contradiction: he ought rather to be described as Sleepy) has again opened his fetid lips and is pouring forth a torrent of filthy venom upon the relics of the holy martyrs; and that he calls us who cherish them ashmongers and idolaters who pay homage to dead men's bones. Unhappy wretch! to be wept over by all Christian men, who sees not that in speaking thus he makes himself one with the Samaritans and the Jews who hold dead bodies unclean and regard as defiled even vessels which have been in the same house with them, following the letter that killeth and not the spirit that giveth life. [Eph. 1:21] We, it is true, refuse to worship or adore, I say not the relics of the martyrs, but even the sun and moon, the angels and archangels, the Cherubim and Seraphim and "every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come. [Rom. 1:25] For we may not serve the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed for ever.

[Matt. 10:40] Still we honour the relics of the martyrs, that we may adore Him whose martyrs they are. We honour the servants that their honour may be reflected upon their Lord who Himself says:-"he that receiveth you receiveth me. [Deut. 34:6] I ask Vigilantius, Are the relics of Peter and of Paul unclean? Was the body of Moses unclean, of which we are told (according to the correct Hebrew text) that it was buried by the Lord Himself? And do we, every time that we enter the basilicas

of apostles and prophets and martyrs, pay homage to the shrines of idols? Are the tapers which burn before their tombs only the tokens of idolatry? I will go farther still and ask a question which will make this theory recoil upon the head of its inventor and which will either kill or cure that frenzied brain of his, so that simple souls shall be no more subverted by his sacrilegious reasonings. Let him answer me this, Was the Lord's body unclean when it was placed in the sepulchre? And did the angels clothed in white raiment merely watch over a corpse dead and defiled, that ages afterwards this sleepy fellow might indulge in dreams and vomit forth his filthy surfeit, so as, like the persecutor Julian, either to destroy the basilicas of the saints or to convert them into heathen temples?

2. I am surprised that the reverend bishop [Ps. 2:9] in whose diocese he is said to be a presbyter acquiesces in this his mad preaching, and that he does not rather with apostolic rod, nay with a rod of iron, shatter this useless vessel [1 Cor. 5:5] and deliver him for the destruction of the flesh that the spirit may be saved. [Ps. 50:18] He should remember the words that are said: "When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst unto him; and hast been partaker with adulterers; [Ps. 101:8] and in another place, "I will early destroy all the wicked of the land; that I may cut off all wicked doers from the city of the Lord; and again "Do not I hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? and am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? I hate them with perfect hatred. [Ps. 139:21, Ps. 139:22] If the relics of the martyrs are not worthy of honour, how comes it that we read "Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints? [Ps. 116:15] If dead men's bones defile those that touch them, how came it that the dead Elisha raised another man also dead, and that life came to this latter from the body of the prophet which according to Vigilantius must have been unclean? In that case every encampment of the host of Israel and the people of God was unclean;

for they carried the bodies of Joseph and of the patriarchs with them in the wilderness, and carried their unclean ashes even into the holy land. In that case Joseph, who was a type of our Lord and Saviour, was a wicked man; for he carried up Jacob's bones with great pomp to Hebron merely to put his unclean father beside his unclean grandfather and great grandfather, that is, one dead body along with others. The wretch's tongue should be cut out, or he should be put under treatment for insanity. As he does not know how to speak, he should learn to be silent. I have myself before now seen the monster, and have done my best to bind the maniac with texts of scripture, as Hippocrates binds his patients with chains; but "he went away, he departed, he escaped, he broke out," [Cic. Cat. 2:1, of Catiline] and taking refuge between the Adriatic and the Alps of King Cotius declaimed in his turn against me. For all that a fool says must be regarded as mere noise and mouthing.

3. You may perhaps in your secret thoughts find fault with me for thus assailing a man behind his back. I will frankly admit that my indignation overpowers me; I cannot listen with patience to such sacrilegious opinions. I have read of the javelin of Phinehas, [Nu. 25:7, Nu. 25:8] of the harshness of Elijah, [1 K. 18:40] of the jealous anger of Simon the zealot, of the severity of Peter in putting to death Ananias and Sapphir, [Acts 5:1-10] and of the firmness of Paul who, when Elymas the sorcerer withstood the ways of the Lord, doomed him to lifelong blindness. [Acts 13:8-11] There is no cruelty in regard for God's honour. Wherefore also in the Law it is said: "If thy brother or thy friend or the wife of thy bosom entice thee from the truth, thine hand shall be upon them and thou shalt shed their blood, [Deut. 13:6-9] and so shalt thou put the evil away from the midst of Israel." [Deut. 13:5] Once more I ask, Are the relics of the martyrs unclean? If so, why did the apostles allow themselves to walk in that funeral procession before the body-the unclean body-of Stephen? Why did they make great lamentation over him, [Acts 8:2] that their grief might be turned into our joy?

You tell me farther that Vigilantius execrates vigils. In this surely he goes contrary to his name. The Wakeful one wishes to sleep and will not hearken to the Saviour's words, "What, could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is weak." [Matt. 26:40, Matt. 26:41] And in another place a prophet sings: "At midnight I will rise to give thanks unto thee because of thy righteous judgments." [Ps. 119:62] We read also in the gospel how the Lord spent whole nights in prayer [Luke 6:12] and how the apostles when they were shut up in prison kept vigil all night long, singing their psalms until the earth quaked, and the keeper of the prison believed, and the magistrates and citizens were filled with terror. [Acts 16:25-38] Paul says: "continue in prayer and watch in the same," [Col. 4:2] and in another place he speaks of himself as "in watchings often." [2 Cor. 11:27] Vigilantius may sleep if he pleases and may choke in his sleep, destroyed by the destroyer of Egypt and of the Egyptians. But let us say with David: "Behold, he that keepeth Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep." [Ps. 121:4] So will the Holy One and the Watcher come to us. And if ever by reason of our sins He fall asleep, let us say to Him: "Awake, why sleepest thou, O Lord;" [Ps. 44:23] and when our ship is tossed by the waves let us rouse Him and say, "Master, save us: we perish." [Matt. 8:25, Luke 8:24]

4. I would dictate more were it not that the limits of a letter impose upon me a modest silence. I might have gone on, had you sent me the books which contain this man's rhapsodies, for in that case I should have known what points I had to refute. As it is I am only beating the air [Cf. 1 Cor. 9:26.] and revealing not so much his infidelity-for this is patent to all-as my own faith. But if you wish me to write against him at greater length, send me those wretched dronings of his and in my answer he shall hear an echo of John the Baptist's words "Now also the axe is

laid unto the root of the trees; therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." [Matt. 3:10]

Letter 110. From Augustine.

Augustine's answer to Letter 102. He now tries to soothe Jerome's wounded feelings. begs him to overlook the offence that he has committed, and implores him not to break off the friendly relations hitherto maintained between them. He touches on the quarrel between Jerome and Rufinus and sincerely hopes that no such breach may ever separate Jerome from himself. The tone of the letter is throughout conciliatory and is marked in places with deep feeling. More than once Augustine dwells on Jerome's words ("would that I could embrace you and that by mutual converse we might learn one from the other," Letter 102.§2) and speaks of the comfort which they have brought to him. The date of the letter is 404 a.d. Sometimes numbered as Augustine letter 73. To Jerome, My Venerable and Most Esteemed Brother and Fellow-Presbyter Augustine Sends Greeting in the Lord.

1. Although I suppose that, before this reaches you, you have received through our son the deacon Cyprian, a servant of God, the letter which I sent by him, from which you would be apprised with certainty that I wrote the letter of which you mentioned that a copy had been brought to you; in consequence of which I suppose that I have begun already, like the rash Dares, to be beaten and belaboured by the missiles and the merciless fists of a second Entellus in the reply which you have written; nevertheless I answer in the meantime the letter which you have deigned to send me by our holy son Asterius, in which I have found many proofs of your most kind goodwill to me, and at the same time some signs of your having in some measure felt agrieved by me. In reading it, therefore, I was no sooner soothed by one sentence than I was buffeted in another; my wonder being especially called forth by this, that after alleging, as your reason for not rashly accepting as authentic the letter from me of which you had a copy, the fact that, offended by your reply, I might justly remonstrate with you, because you ought first to have ascertained that it was mine before answering it, you go on to command me to acknowledge the letter frankly if it is mine, or send a more reliable copy of it, in order that we may, without any bitterness of feeling, address ourselves to the discussion of scriptural doctrine.

For how can we engage in such discussion without bitterness of feeling, if you have made up your mind to offend me? Or, if your mind is not made up to this, what reason could I have had, when you did not offend me, for justly complaining as having been offended by you, that you ought first to have made sure that the letter was mine, and only then to have replied, that is to say, only then to have offended me? For if there had been nothing to offend me in your reply, I could have had no just ground of complaint. Accordingly, when you write such a reply to that letter as must offend me, what hope is left of our engaging without any bitterness in the discussion of scriptural doctrine? Far be it from me to take offense if you are willing and able to prove, by incontrovertible argument, that you have apprehended more correctly than I have the meaning of that passage in Paul's Epistle [to the Galatians], or of any other text in Holy Scripture: nay, more, far be it from me to count it anything else than gain to myself, and cause of thankfulness to you, if in anything I am either informed by your teaching or set right by your correction.

2. But, my very dear brother, you could not think that I could be offended by your reply, had you not thought that you were offended by what I had written. For I could never have entertained concerning you the idea that you had not felt yourself offended by me if you so framed your reply as to offend me in return. If, on the other hand, I have been supposed by you to be capable of such preposterous folly as to take offense when you had not written in such a way as to give me occasion, you have in this already wronged me, that you have entertained such an opinion of me. But surely you who are so cautious, that although you recognised my style in the letter of which you had a copy, you refused to believe its authenticity, would not without consideration believe me to be so different from what your experience has proved me to be. For if you had good reason for seeing that I might justly complain had you hastily concluded that a letter not written by me was mine, how much more reasonably may I complain if you form, without consideration, such an estimate of myself as is contradicted by your own experience! You would not therefore go so far astray in your judgment as to believe, when you had written nothing by which I could be offended, that I would nevertheless be so foolish as to be capable of being offended by such a reply.

3. There can therefore be no doubt that you were prepared to reply in such a way as would offend me, if you had only indisputable evidence that the letter was mine. Accordingly, since I do not believe that you would think it right to offend me unless you had just cause, it remains for me to confess, as I now do, my fault as having been the first to offend by writing that letter which I cannot deny to be mine. Why should I strive to swim against the current, and not rather ask pardon? I therefore entreat you by the mercy of Christ to forgive me wherein I have injured you, and not to render evil for evil by injuring me in return. For it will be an injury to me if you pass over in silence anything which you find wrong in either word or action of mine. If, indeed, you rebuke in me that which merits no rebuke, you do wrong

to yourself, not to me; for far be it from one of your life and holy vows to rebuke merely from a desire to give offense, using the tongue of malice to condemn in me that which by the truth-revealing light of reason you know to deserve no blame. Therefore either rebuke kindly him whom, though he is free from fault, you think to merit rebuke; or with a father's kindness soothe him whom you cannot bring to agree with you.

For it is possible that your opinion may be at variance with the truth, while notwithstanding your actions are in harmony with Christian charity: for I also shall most thankfully receive your rebuke as a most friendly action, even though the thing censured be capable of defense, and therefore ought not to have been censured; or else I shall acknowledge both your kindness and my fault, and shall be found, so far as the Lord enables me, grateful for the one, and corrected in regard to the other.

4. Why, then, shall I fear your words, hard, perhaps, like the boxing-gloves of Entellus, but certainly fitted to do me good? The blows of Entellus were intended not to heal, but to harm, and therefore his antagonist was conquered, not cured. But I, if I receive your correction calmly as a necessary medicine, shall not be pained by it. If, however, through weakness, either common to human nature or peculiar to myself, I cannot help feeling some pain from rebuke, even when I am justly reproved, it is far better to have a tumour in one's head cured, though the lance cause pain, than to escape the pain by letting the disease go on. This was clearly seen by him who said that, for the most part, our enemies who expose our faults are more useful than friends who are afraid to reprove us. For the former, in their angry recriminations, sometimes charge us with what we indeed require to correct; but the latter, through fear of destroying the sweetness of friendship, show less boldness on behalf of right than they ought. Since, therefore, you are, to quote your own comparison, an ox worn out, perhaps, as to your bodily strength by reason of years, but unimpaired in mental vigour, and toiling still assiduously and with profit in the Lord's threshing-floor; here am I, and in whatever I have spoken amiss, tread firmly on me: the weight of your venerable age should not be grievous to me, if the chaff of my fault be so bruised under foot as to be separated from me.

5. Let me further say, that it is with the utmost affectionate yearning that I read or recollect the words at the end of your letter, "Would that I could receive your embrace, and that by converse we might aid each other in learning. For my part, I say — Would that we were even dwelling in parts of the earth less widely separated; so that if we could not meet for converse, we might at least have a more frequent exchange of letters. For as it is, so great is the distance by which we are prevented from any kind of access to each other through the eye and ear, that I remember writing to your Holiness regarding these words in the Epistle to the Galatians when I was young; and behold I am now advanced in age, and have not yet received a

reply, and a copy of my letter has reached you by some strange accident earlier than the letter itself, about the transmission of which I took no small pains. For the man to whom I entrusted it neither delivered it to you nor returned it to me. So great in my esteem is the value of those of your writings which we have been able to procure, that I should prefer to all other studies the privilege, if it were attainable by me, of sitting by your side and learning from you.

Since I cannot do this myself, I propose to send to you one of my sons in the Lord, that he may for my benefit be instructed by you, in the event of my receiving from you a favourable reply in regard to the matter. For I have not now, and I can never hope to have, such knowledge of the Divine Scriptures as I see you possess. Whatever abilities I may have for such study, I devote entirely to the instruction of the people whom God has entrusted to me; and I am wholly precluded by my ecclesiastical occupations from having leisure for any further prosecution of my studies than is necessary for my duty in public teaching.

6. I am not acquainted with the writings speaking injuriously of you, which you tell me have come into Africa. I have, however, received the reply to these which you have been pleased to send. After reading it, let me say frankly, I have been exceedingly grieved that the mischief of such painful discord has arisen between persons once so loving and intimate, and formerly united by the bond of a friendship which was well known in almost all the Churches. In that treatise of yours, any one may see how you are keeping yourself under restraint, and holding back the stinging keenness of your indignation, lest you should render railing for railing. If, however, even in reading this reply of yours, I fainted with grief and shuddered with fear, what would be the effect produced in me by the things which he has written against you, if they should come into my possession! ”Woe unto the world because of offenses! [Matthew 18:7] Behold the complete fulfilment of which He who is Truth foretold: ”Because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. [Matthew 24:12] For what trusting hearts can now pour themselves forth with any assurance of their confidence being reciprocated? Into whose breast may confiding love now throw itself without reserve? In short, where is the friend who may not be feared as possibly a future enemy, if the breach that we deplore could arise between Jerome and Rufinus? Oh, sad and pitiable is our portion!

Who can rely upon the affection of his friends because of what he knows them to be now, when he has no foreknowledge of what they shall afterwards become? But why should I reckon it cause for sorrow, that one man is thus ignorant of what another may become, when no man knows even what he himself is afterwards to be? The utmost that he knows, and that he knows but imperfectly, is his present condition; of what he shall hereafter become he has no knowledge.

7. Do the holy and blessed angels possess not only this knowledge of their actual character, but also a foreknowledge of what they shall afterward become? If they

do, I cannot see how it was possible for Satan ever to have been happy, even while he was still a good angel, knowing, as in this case he must have known, his future transgression and eternal punishment. I would wish to hear what you think as to this question, if indeed it be one which it would be profitable for us to be able to answer. But mark here what I suffer from the lands and seas which keep us, so far as the body is concerned, distant from each other. If I were myself the letter which you are now reading, you might have told me already what I have just asked; but now, when will you write me a reply? When will you get it sent away? When will it come here? When shall I receive it? And yet, would that I were sure that it would come at last, though meanwhile I must summon all the patience which I can command to endure the unwelcome but unavoidable delay! Wherefore I come back to those most delightful words of your letter, filled with your holy longing, and I in turn appropriate them as my own: "Would that I might receive your embrace, and that by converse we might aid each other in learning,"— if indeed there be any sense in which I could possibly impart instruction to you.

8. When by these words, now mine not less than yours, I am gladdened and refreshed, and when I am comforted not a little by the fact that in both of us a desire for mutual fellowship exists, though meanwhile unsatisfied, it is not long before I am pierced through by darts of keenest sorrow when I consider Rufinus and you, to whom God had granted in fullest measure and for a length of time that which both of us have longed for, so that in most close and endearing fellowship you feasted together on the honey of the Holy Scriptures, and think how between you the blight of such exceeding bitterness has found its way, constraining us to ask when, where, and in whom the same calamity may not be reasonably feared; seeing that it has befallen you at the very time when, unencumbered, having cast away secular burdens, you were following the Lord and were living together in that very land which was trodden by the feet of our Lord, when He said, "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you; [John 14:27] being, moreover, men of mature age, whose life was devoted to the study of the word of God. Truly "man's life on earth is a period of trial.

If I could anywhere meet you both together — which, alas, I cannot hope to do — so strong are my agitation, grief, and fear, that I think I would cast myself at your feet, and there weeping till I could weep no more, would, with all the eloquence of love, appeal first to each of you for his own sake, then to both for each other's sake, and for the sake of those, especially the weak, "for whom Christ died," [1 Corinthians 8:11] whose salvation is in peril, as they look on you who occupy a place so conspicuous on the stage of time; imploring you not to write and scatter abroad these hard words against each other, which, if at any time you who are now at variance were reconciled, you could not destroy, and which you could not then venture to read lest strife should be kindled anew.

9. But I say to your Charity, that nothing has made me tremble more than your estrangement from Rufinus, when I read in your letter some of the indications of your being displeased with me. I refer not so much to what you say of Entellus and of the wearied ox, in which you appear to me to use genial pleasantry rather than angry threat, but to that which you have evidently written in earnest, of which I have already spoken perhaps more than was fitting, but not more than my fears compelled me to do — namely, the words, "lest perchance, being offended, you should have reason to remonstrate with me. If it be possible for us to examine and discuss anything by which our hearts may be nourished, without any bitterness of discord I entreat you let us address ourselves to this. But if it is not possible for either of us to point out what he may judge to demand correction in the other's writings, without being suspected of envy and regarded as wounding friendship, let us, having regard to our spiritual life and health, leave such conference alone. Let us content ourselves with smaller attainments in that [knowledge] which puffs up, if we can thereby preserve unharmed that [charity] which edifies. [1 Corinthians 8:1] I feel that I come far short of that perfection of which it is written, "If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man;

[James 3:2] but through God's mercy I truly believe myself able to ask your forgiveness for that in which I have offended you: and this you ought to make plain to me, that through my hearing you, you may gain your brother. [Matthew 18:18] Nor should you make it a reason for leaving me in error, that the distance between us on the earth's surface makes it impossible for us to meet face to face. As concerns the subjects into which we inquire, if I know, or believe, or think that I have got hold of the truth in a matter in which your opinion is different from mine, I shall by all means endeavour, as the Lord may enable me, to maintain my view without injuring you. And as to any offense which I may give to you, so soon as I perceive your displeasure, I shall unreservedly beg your forgiveness.

10. I think, moreover, that your reason for being displeased with me can only be, that I have either said what I ought not, or have not expressed myself in the manner in which I ought: for I do not wonder that we are less thoroughly known to each other than we are to our most close and intimate friends. Upon the love of such friends I readily cast myself without reservation, especially when chafed and wearied by the scandals of this world; and in their love I rest without any disturbing care: for I perceive that God is there, on whom I confidingly cast myself, and in whom I confidingly rest. Nor in this confidence am I disturbed by any fear of that uncertainty as to the morrow which must be present when we lean upon human weakness, and which I have in a former paragraph bewailed. For when I perceive that a man is burning with Christian love, and feel that thereby he has been made a faithful friend to me, whatever plans or thoughts of mine I entrust to him I regard as entrusted not to the man, but to Him in whom his character makes it evident that he dwells: for "God is love, and he that dwells in love dwells in God, and God

in him; [1 John 4:16] and if he cease to dwell in love, his forsaking it cannot but cause as much pain as his abiding in it caused joy.

Nevertheless, in such a case, when one who was an intimate friend has become an enemy, it is better that he should search out what ingenuity may help him to fabricate to our prejudice, than that he should find what anger may provoke him to reveal. This every one most easily secures, not by concealing what he does, but by doing nothing which he would wish to conceal. And this the mercy of God grants to good and pious men: they go out and in among their friends in liberty and without fear, whatever these friends may afterwards become: the sins which may have been committed by others within their knowledge they do not reveal, and they themselves avoid doing what they would fear to see revealed. For when any false charge is fabricated by a slanderer, either it is disbelieved, or, if it is believed, our reputation alone is injured, our spiritual wellbeing is not affected. But when, any sinful action is committed, that action becomes a secret enemy, even though it be not revealed by the thoughtless or malicious talk of one acquainted with our secrets. Wherefore any person of discernment may see in your own example how, by the comfort of a good conscience, you bear what would otherwise be insupportable — the incredible enmity of one who was formerly your most intimate and beloved friend;

and how even what he utters against you, even what may to your disadvantage be believed by some, you turn to good account as the armour of righteousness on the left hand, which is not less useful than armour on the right hand [2 Corinthians 6:7] in our warfare with the devil. But truly I would rather see him less bitter in his accusations, than see you thus more fully armed by them. This is a great and a lamentable wonder, that you should have passed from such amity to such enmity: it would be a joyful and a much greater event, should you come back from such enmity to the friendship of former days.

Letter 111. From Augustine to Prsidius.

Augustine asks Prsidius to forward the preceding letter to Jerome and also to write himself to urge him to forgive Augustine. Sometimes numbered as Augustine Letter 74. To My Lord Præsidius, Most Blessed, My Brother and Partner in the Priestly Office, Truly Esteemed, Augustine Sends Greeting in the Lord. 1. I write to remind you of the request which I made to you as a sincere friend when you were here, that you would not refuse to send a letter of mine to our holy brother and fellow presbyter Jerome; in order, moreover, to let your Charity know in what terms you ought to write to him on my behalf. I have sent a copy of my letter to him, and of his to me, by reading which your pious wisdom may easily see both the moderation of tone which I have been careful to preserve, and the vehemence on his part by which I have been not unreasonably filled with fear. If, however, I have written anything which I ought not to have written, or have expressed myself in an unbecoming way, let it not be to him, but to myself, in brotherly love, that you send your opinion of what I have done, in order that, if I am convinced of my fault by your rebuke, I may ask his forgiveness.

Letter 112. To Augustine.

On receiving Letter 104 together with duly authenticated copies of Letters 56 and 67, Jerome in three days completes an exhaustive reply to all the questions which Augustine had raised. He explains what is the true title of his book On Illustrious Men, deals at great length with the dispute between Paul and Peter, expounds his views with regard to the Septuagint, and shews by the story of ”the gourd” how close and accurate his translations are. His language throughout is kind but rather patronising: indeed in this whole correspondence Jerome seldom sufficiently recognizes the greatness of Augustine. The date of the letter is 404 a.d. Sometimes numbered as Augustine letter 75. Jerome’s answer to Augustine’s Letters 28, 40 and 71. To Augustine, My Lord Truly Holy, and Most Blessed Father, Jerome Sends Greeting in Christ.

1. I have received by Cyprian, deacon, three letters, or rather three little books, at the same time, from your Excellency, containing what you call sundry questions, but what I feel to be animadversions on opinions which I have published, to answer which, if I were disposed to do it, would require a pretty large volume. Nevertheless I shall attempt to reply without exceeding the limits of a moderately long letter, and without causing delay to our brother, now in haste to depart, who only three days before the time fixed for his journey asked earnestly for a letter to take with him, in consequence of which I am compelled to pour out these sentences, such as they are, almost without premeditation, answering you in a rambling effusion, prepared not in the leisure of deliberate composition, but in the hurry of extemporaneous dictation, which usually produces a discourse that is more the offspring of chance than the parent of instruction; just as unexpected attacks throw into confusion even the bravest soldiers, and they are compelled to take to flight before they can gird on their armour.

2. But our armour is Christ; it is that which the Apostle Paul prescribes when, writing to the Ephesians, he says, ”Take unto you the whole armour of God, that you may be able to withstand in the evil day; and again, ”Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield

of faith, wherewith you shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked: and take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. [Ephesians 6:13-17] Armed with these weapons, King David went forth in his day to battle; and taking from the torrent's bed five smooth rounded stones, he proved that, even amidst all the eddying currents of the world, his feelings were free both from roughness and from defilement; drinking of the brook by the way, and therefore lifted up in spirit, he cut off the head of Goliath, using the proud enemy's own sword as the fittest instrument of death, smiting the profane boaster on the forehead and wounding him in the same place in which Uzziah was smitten with leprosy when he presumed to usurp the priestly office; [2 Chronicles 16:19] the same also in which shines the glory that makes the saints rejoice in the Lord, saying, "The light of Your countenance is sealed upon us, O Lord.

Let us therefore also say, "My heart is fixed, O God, my heart is fixed: I will sing and give praise: awake up, my glory; awake, psaltery and harp; I myself will awake early; that in us may be fulfilled that word, "Open your mouth wide, and I will fill it; and, "The Lord shall give the word with great power to them that publish it. I am well assured that your prayer as well as mine is, that in our contendings the victory may remain with the truth. For you seek Christ's glory, not your own: if you are victorious, I also gain a victory if I discover my error. On the other hand, if I win the day, the gain is yours; for "the children ought not to lay up for the parents, but the parents for the children. [2 Corinthians 12:14] We read, moreover, in Chronicles, that the children of Israel went to battle with their minds set upon peace, [1 Chronicles 12:17-18] seeking even amid swords and bloodshed and the prostrate slain a victory not for themselves, but for peace. Let me therefore, if it be the will of Christ, give an answer to all that you have written, and attempt in a short dissertation to solve your numerous questions. I pass by the conciliatory phrases in your courteous salutation: I say nothing of the compliments by which you attempt to take the edge off your censure: let me come at once to the matters in debate.

3. You say that you received from some brother a book of mine, in which I have given a list of ecclesiastical writers, both Greek and Latin, but which had no title; and that when you asked the brother aforesaid (I quote your own statement) why the title-page had no inscription, or what was the name by which the book was known, he answered that it was called "Epitaphium," i.e. "Obituary Notices:" upon which you display your reasoning powers, by remarking that the name Epitaphium would have been properly given to the book if the reader had found in it an account of the lives and writings of deceased authors, but that inasmuch as mention is made of the works of many who were living when the book was written, and are at this day still living, you wonder why I should have given the book a title so inappropriate. I think that it must be obvious to your own common sense, that you might have discovered the title of that book from its contents, without

any other help. For you have read both Greek and Latin biographies of eminent men, and you know that they do not give to works of this kind the title Epitaphium, but simply "Illustrious Men," e.g. "Illustrious Generals," or "philosophers, orators, historians, poets," etc., as the case may be. An Epitaphium is a work written concerning the dead; such as I remember having composed long ago after the decease of the presbyter Nepotianus, of blessed memory. The book, therefore, of which you speak ought to be entitled, "Concerning Illustrious Men," or properly, "Concerning Ecclesiastical Writers," although it is said that by many who were not qualified to make any correction of the title, it has been called "Concerning Authors."

4. You ask, in the second place, my reason for saying, in my commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, that Paul could not have rebuked Peter for that which he himself had done, [Galatians 2:14] and could not have censured in another the dissimulation of which he was himself confessedly guilty; and you affirm that that rebuke of the apostle was not a manœuvre of pious policy, but real; and you say that I ought not to teach falsehood, but that all things in Scripture are to be received literally as they stand.

To this I answer, in the first place, that your wisdom ought to have suggested the remembrance of the short preface to my commentaries, saying of my own person, What then? Am I so foolish and bold as to promise that which he could not accomplish? By no means; but I have rather, as it seems to me, with more reserve and hesitation, because feeling the deficiency of my strength, followed the commentaries of Origen in this matter. For that illustrious man wrote five volumes on the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians, and has occupied the tenth volume of his Stromata with a short treatise upon his explanation of the epistle. He also composed several treatises and fragmentary pieces upon it, which, if they even had stood alone, would have sufficed. I pass over my revered instructor Didymus (blind, it is true, but quick-sighted in the discernment of spiritual things), and the bishop of Laodicea, who has recently left the Church, and the early heretic Alexander, as well as Eusebius of Emesa and Theodorus of Heraclea, who have also left some brief disquisitions upon this subject. From these works if I were to extract even a few passages, a work which could not be altogether despised would be produced. Let me therefore frankly say that I have read all these;

and storing up in my mind very many things which they contain, I have dictated to my amanuensis sometimes what was borrowed from other writers, sometimes what was my own, without distinctly remembering the method, or the words, or the opinions which belonged to each. I look now to the Lord in His mercy to grant that my want of skill and experience may not cause the things which others have well spoken to be lost, or to fail of finding among foreign readers the acceptance with which they have met in the language in which they were first written. If, therefore, anything in my explanation has seemed to you to demand correction, it

would have been seemly for one of your learning to inquire first whether what I had written was found in the Greek writers to whom I have referred; and if they had not advanced the opinion which you censured, you could then with propriety condemn me for what I gave as my own view, especially seeing that I have in the preface openly acknowledged that I had followed the commentaries of Origen, and had dictated sometimes the view of others, sometimes my own, and have written at the end of the chapter with which you find fault: "If any one be dissatisfied with the interpretation here given, by which it is shown that neither did Peter sin, nor did Paul rebuke presumptuously a greater than himself, he is bound to show how Paul could consistently blame in another what he himself did.

By which I have made it manifest that I did not adopt finally and irrevocably that which I had read in these Greek authors, but had propounded what I had read, leaving to the reader's own judgment whether it should be rejected or approved.

5. You, however, in order to avoid doing what I had asked, have devised a new argument against the view proposed; maintaining that the Gentiles who had believed in Christ were free from the burden of the ceremonial law, but that the Jewish converts were under the law, and that Paul, as the teacher of the Gentiles, rightly rebuked those who kept the law; whereas Peter, who was the chief of the "circumcision," [Galatians 2:8] was justly rebuked for commanding the Gentile converts to do that which the converts from among the Jews were alone under obligation to observe. If this is your opinion, or rather since it is your opinion, that all from among the Jews who believe are debtors to do the whole law, you ought, as being a bishop of great fame in the whole world, to publish your doctrine, and labour to persuade all other bishops to agree with you. As for me in my humble cell, along with the monks my fellow-sinners, I do not presume to dogmatize in regard to things of great moment; I only confess frankly that I read the writings of the Fathers, and, complying with universal usage, put down in my commentaries a variety of explanations, that each may adopt from the number given the one which pleases him. This method, I think, you have found in your reading, and have approved in connection with both secular literature and the Divine Scriptures.

6. Moreover, as to this explanation which Origen first advanced, and which all the other commentators after him have adopted, they bring forward, chiefly for the purpose of answering, the blasphemies of Porphyry, who accuses Paul of presumption because he dared to reprove Peter and rebuke him to his face, and by reasoning convict him of having done wrong; that is to say, of being in the very fault which he himself, who blamed another for transgressing, had committed. What shall I say also of John, who has long governed the Church of Constantinople, and holding pontifical rank, who has composed a very large book upon this paragraph, and has followed the opinion of Origen and of the old expositors? If, therefore, you censure me as in the wrong, suffer me, I pray you, to be mistaken in company with such

men; and when you perceive that I have so many companions in my error, you will require to produce at least one partisan in defense of your truth. So much on the interpretation of one paragraph of the Epistle to the Galatians.

7. Lest, however, I should seem to rest my answer to your reasoning wholly on the number of witnesses who are on my side, and to use the names of illustrious men as a means of escaping from the truth, not daring to meet you in argument, I shall briefly bring forward some examples from the Scriptures.

In the Acts of the Apostles, a voice was heard by Peter, saying unto him, ”Rise, Peter, slay and eat,” when all manner of four-footed beasts, and creeping things, and birds of the air, were presented before him; by which saying it is proved that no man is by nature [ceremonially] unclean, but that all men are equally welcome to the gospel of Christ. To which Peter answered, ”Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean. And the voice spoke unto him again the second time, ”What God has cleansed, call not common. Therefore he went to Cæsarea, and having entered the house of Cornelius, ”he opened his mouth and said, Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that fears Him and works righteousness is accepted with Him. Thereafter ”the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word; and they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. Then answered Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. [Acts 10:13-48] ”And the apostles and brethren that were in Judea heard that the Gentiles had also received the word of God.

And when Peter had come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, You went in to men uncircumcised, and ate with them. To whom he gave a full explanation of the reasons of his conduct, and concluded with these words: ”Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as He did unto us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ, what was I, that I could withstand God? When they heard these things, they held their peace, and glorified God, saying, Then has God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life. [Acts 11:1-18] Again, when, long after this, Paul and Barnabas had come to Antioch, and ”having gathered the Church together, rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how He had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles, certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren, and said, Unless you are circumcised after the manner of Moses, you cannot be saved. When therefore Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas, and certain other of them, should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question. And when they had come to Jerusalem, there rose

up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying that it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses.

And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, with his wonted readiness, "and said, Men and brethren, you know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knows the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith. Now therefore why do you tempt God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that, through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, we shall be saved, even as they. Then all the multitude kept silence; and to his opinion the Apostle James, and all the elders together, gave consent.

8. These quotations should not be tedious to the reader, but useful both to him and to me, as proving that, even before the Apostle Paul, Peter had come to know that the law was not to be in force after the gospel was given; nay more, that Peter was the prime mover in issuing the decree by which this was affirmed. Moreover, Peter was of so great authority, that Paul has recorded in his epistle: "Then, after three years, I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. [Galatians 1:18] In the following context, again, he adds: "Then, fourteen years after, I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, and took Titus with me also. And I went up by revelation, and communicated unto them that gospel which I preach among the Gentiles; proving that he had not had confidence in his preaching of the gospel if he had not been confirmed by the consent of Peter and those who were with him. The next words are, "but privately to them that were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or had run, in vain. Why did he this privately rather than in public? Lest offense should be given to the faith of those who from among the Jews had believed, since they thought that the law was still in force, and that they ought to join observance of the law with faith in the Lord as their Saviour.

Therefore also, when at that time Peter had come to Antioch (although the Acts of the Apostles do not mention this, but we must believe Paul's statement), Paul affirms that he "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For, before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they had come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw," he says, "that they walked not up-rightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter before them all, If you, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why do you compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews? etc. No one can doubt, therefore, that the Apostle Peter was himself the author of that rule with deviation from which he is charged. The cause of that deviation, moreover, is

seen to be fear of the Jews. For the Scripture says, that ”at first he did eat with the Gentiles, but that when certain had come from James he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. Now he feared the Jews, to whom he had been appointed apostle, lest by occasion of the Gentiles they should go back from the faith in Christ; imitating the Good Shepherd in his concern lest he should lose the flock committed to him.

9. As I have shown, therefore, that Peter was thoroughly aware of the abrogation of the law of Moses, but was compelled by fear to pretend to observe it, let us now see whether Paul, who accuses another, ever did anything of the same kind himself. We read in the same book: ”Paul passed through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches. Then came he to Derbe and Lystra: and, behold, a certain disciple was there, named Timotheus, the son of a certain woman which was a Jewess, and believed; but his father was a Greek: which was well reported of by the brethren that were at Lystra and Iconium. Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and he took and circumcised him, because of the Jews which were in those quarters: for they knew all that his father was a Greek. O blessed Apostle Paul, who had rebuked Peter for dissimulation, because he withdrew himself from the Gentiles through fear of the Jews who came from James, why are you, notwithstanding your own doctrine, compelled to circumcise Timothy, the son of a Gentile, nay more, a Gentile himself (for he was not a Jew, having not been circumcised)? You will answer, ”Because of the Jews which are in these quarters? If, then, you forgive yourself the circumcision of a disciple coming from the Gentiles, forgive Peter also, who has precedence above you, his doing some things of the same kind through fear of the believing Jews. Again, it is written:

”Paul after this tarried there yet a good while, and then took his leave of the brethren, and sailed thence into Syria, and with him Priscilla and Aquila; having shorn his head in Cenchrea, for he had a vow. [Acts 18:18] Be it granted that he was compelled through fear of the Jews in the other case to do what he was unwilling to do; wherefore did he let his hair grow in accordance with a vow of his own making, and afterwards, when in Cenchrea, shave his head according to the law, as the Nazarites, who had given themselves by vow to God, were wont to do, according to the law of Moses?

10. But these things are small when compared with what follows. The sacred historian Luke further relates: ”And when we had come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly; and the day following, James, and all the elders who were with him, having expressed their approbation of his gospel, said to Paul: ”You see, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law: and they are informed of you, that you teach all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? The

multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that you have come. Do therefore this that we say to you: We have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify yourself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning you, are nothing; but that you yourself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law. Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them, entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until an offering should be offered for every one of them. [Acts 21:17-26] O Paul, here again let me question you:

Why did you shave your head, why did you walk barefoot according to Jewish ceremonial law, why did you offer sacrifices, why were victims slain for you according to the law? You will answer, doubtless, "To avoid giving offense to those of the Jews who had believed. To gain the Jews, you pretended to be a Jew; and James and all the other elders taught you this dissimulation. But you did not succeed in escaping, after all. For when you were on the point of being killed in a tumult which had arisen, you were rescued by the chief captain of the band, and was sent by him to Cæsarea, guarded by a careful escort of soldiers, lest the Jews should kill you as a dissembler, and a destroyer of the law; and from Cæsarea coming to Rome, you did, in your own hired house, preach Christ to both Jews and Gentiles, and your testimony was sealed under Nero's sword.

11. We have learned, therefore, that through fear of the Jews both Peter and Paul alike pretended that they observed the precepts of the law. How could Paul have the assurance and effrontery to reprove in another what he had done himself? I at least, or, I should rather say, others before me, have given such explanation of the matter as they deemed best, not defending the use of falsehood in the interest of religion, as you charge them with doing, but teaching the honourable exercise of a wise discretion; seeking both to show the wisdom of the apostles, and to restrain the shameless blasphemies of Porphyry, who says that Peter and Paul quarrelled with each other in childish rivalry, and affirms that Paul had been inflamed with envy on account of the excellences of Peter, and had written boastfully of things which he either had not done, or, if he did them, had done with inexcusable presumption, reproving in another that which he himself had done. They, in answering him, gave the best interpretation of the passage which they could find; what interpretation have you to propound? Surely you must intend to say something better than they have said, since you have rejected the opinion of the ancient commentators.

12. You say in your letter: "You do not require me to teach you in what sense the apostle says, 'To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews;' [1 Corinthians 9:20] and other such things in the same passage, which are to be ascribed to the compassion of pitying love, not to the artifices of intentional deceit. For he

that ministers to the sick becomes as if he were sick himself, not indeed falsely pretending to be under the fever, but considering with the mind of one truly sympathizing what he would wish done for himself if he were in the sick man's place. Paul was indeed a Jew; and when he had become a Christian, he had not abandoned those Jewish sacraments which that people had received in the right way, and for a certain appointed time. Therefore, even when he was an apostle of Christ, he took part in observing these, but with this view, that he might show that they were in no wise hurtful to those who, even after they had believed in Christ, desired to retain the ceremonies which by the law they had learned from their fathers; provided only that they did not build on these their hope of salvation, since the salvation which was fore-shadowed in these has now been brought in by the Lord Jesus.

The sum of your whole argument, which you have expanded into a most prolix dissertation, is this, that Peter did not err in supposing that the law was binding on those who from among the Jews had believed, but departed from the right course in this, that he compelled the Gentile converts to conform to Jewish observances. Now, if he compelled them, it was not by use of authority as a teacher, but by the example of his own practice. And Paul, according to your view, did not protest against what Peter had done personally, but asked wherefore Peter would compel those who were from among the Gentiles to conform to Jewish observances.

13. The matter in debate, therefore, or I should rather say your opinion regarding it, is summed up in this: that since the preaching of the gospel of Christ, the believing Jews do well in observing the precepts of the law, i.e. in offering sacrifices as Paul did, in circumcising their children, as Paul did in the case of Timothy, and keeping the Jewish Sabbath, as all the Jews have been accustomed to do. If this be true, we fall into the heresy of Cerinthus and Ebion, who, though believing in Christ, were anathematized by the fathers for this one error, that they mixed up the ceremonies of the law with the gospel of Christ, and professed their faith in that which was new, without letting go what was old. Why do I speak of the Ebionites, who make pretensions to the name of Christian? In our own day there exists a sect among the Jews throughout all the synagogues of the East, which is called the sect of the Minei, and is even now condemned by the Pharisees. The adherents to this sect are known commonly as Nazarenes; they believe in Christ the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary; and they say that He who suffered under Pontius Pilate and rose again, is the same as the one in whom we believe. But while they desire to be both Jews and Christians, they are neither the one nor the other.

I therefore beseech you, who think that you are called upon to heal my slight wound, which is no more, so to speak, than a prick or scratch from a needle, to devote your skill in the healing art to this grievous wound, which has been opened by a spear driven home with the impetus of a javelin. For there is surely no proportion between the culpability of him who exhibits the various opinions held by the fathers

in a commentary on Scripture, and the guilt of him who reintroduces within the Church a most pestilential heresy. If, however, there is for us no alternative but to receive the Jews into the Church, along with the usages prescribed by their law; if, in short, it shall be declared lawful for them to continue in the Churches of Christ what they have been accustomed to practise in the synagogues of Satan, I will tell you my opinion of the matter: they will not become Christians, but they will make us Jews.

14. For what Christian will submit to hear what is said in your letter? ”Paul was indeed a Jew; and when he had become a Christian, he had not abandoned those Jewish sacraments which that people had received in the right way, and for a certain appointed time. Therefore, even when he was an apostle of Christ, he took part in observing these; but with this view, that he might show that they were in no wise hurtful to those who, even after they had believed in Christ, desired to retain the ceremonies which by the law they had learned from their fathers. Now I implore you to hear patiently my complaint. Paul, even when he was an apostle of Christ, observed Jewish ceremonies; and you affirm that they are in no wise hurtful to those who wish to retain them as they had received them from their fathers by the law. I, on the contrary, shall maintain, and, though the world were to protest against my view, I may boldly declare that the Jewish ceremonies are to Christians both hurtful and fatal; and that whoever observes them, whether he be Jew or Gentile originally, is cast into the pit of perdition. ”For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believes,” [Romans 10:4] that is, to both Jew and Gentile; for if the Jew be excepted, He is not the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believes.

Moreover, we read in the Gospel, ”The law and the prophets were until John the Baptist. Also, in another place: ”Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He had not only broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God. [John 5:18] Again: ”Of His fullness have all we received, and grace for grace; for the law was given Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ. [John 1:16-17] Instead of the grace of the law which has passed away, we have received the grace of the gospel which is abiding; and instead of the shadows and types of the old dispensation, the truth has come by Jesus Christ. Jeremiah also prophesied thus in God’s name: ”Behold, the days come, says the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt. [Jeremiah 31:31-32] Observe what the prophet says, not to Gentiles, who had not been partakers in any former covenant, but to the Jewish nation. He who has given them the law by Moses, promises in place of it the new covenant of the gospel, that they might no longer live in the oldness of the letter, but in the newness of the spirit.

Paul himself, moreover, in connection with whom the discussion of this question has arisen, delivers such sentiments as these frequently, of which I subjoin only a few, as I desire to be brief: ”Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. Again: ”Christ has become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; you are fallen from grace. Again: ”If you be led of the Spirit, you are not under the law. From which it is evident that he has not the Holy Spirit who submits to the law, not, as our fathers affirmed the apostles to have done, feignedly, under the promptings of a wise discretion, but, as you suppose to have been the case, sincerely. As to the quality of these legal precepts, let us learn from God’s own teaching: ”I gave them,” He says, ”statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live. [Ezekiel 20:25] I say these things, not that I may, like Manichæus and Marcion, destroy the law, which I know on the testimony of the apostle to be both holy and spiritual; but because when ”faith came,” and the fullness of times, ”God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons,” [Galatians 4:4] and might live no longer under the law as our schoolmaster, but under the Heir, who has now attained to full age, and is Lord.

15. It is further said in your letter: ”The thing, therefore, which he rebuked in Peter was not his observing the customs handed down from his fathers, which Peter, if he wished, might do without being chargeable with deceit or inconsistency. Again I say: Since you are a bishop, a teacher in the Churches of Christ, if you would prove what you assert, receive any Jew who, after having become a Christian, circumcises any son that may be born to him, observes the Jewish Sabbath, abstains from meats which God has created to be used with thanksgiving, and on the evening of the fourteenth day of the first month slays a paschal lamb; and when you have done this, or rather, have refused to do it (for I know that you are a Christian, and will not be guilty of a profane action), you will be constrained, whether willingly or unwillingly, to renounce your opinion; and then you will know that it is a more difficult work to reject the opinion of others than to establish your own. Moreover, lest perhaps we should not believe your statement, or, I should rather say, understand it (for it is often the case that a discourse unduly extended is not intelligible, and is less censured by the unskilled in discussion because its weakness is not so easily perceived), you inculcate your opinion by reiterating the statement in these words:

”Paul had forsaken everything peculiar to the Jews that was evil, especially this, that ’being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, they had not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God.’ [Romans 10:3] In this, moreover, he differed from them, that after the passion and resurrection of Christ, in whom had been given and made manifest the mystery of grace, according to the order of Melchizedek, they still considered it binding on

them to celebrate, not out of mere reverence for old customs, but as necessary to salvation, the sacraments of the old dispensation; which were indeed at one time necessary, else had it been unprofitable and vain for the Maccabees to suffer martyrdom as they did for their adherence to them. [2 Maccabbees 7:1] Lastly, in this also Paul differed from the Jews, that they persecuted the Christian preachers of grace as enemies of the law. These, and all similar errors and sins, he declares that he counted but loss and dung, that he might win Christ."

16. We have learned from you what evil things peculiar to the Jews Paul had abandoned; let us now learn from your teaching what good things which were Jewish he retained. You will reply: "The ceremonial observances in which they continued to follow the practice of their fathers, in the way in which these were complied with by Paul himself, without believing them to be at all necessary to salvation. I do not fully understand what you mean by the words, "without believing them to be at all necessary to salvation. For if they do not contribute to salvation, why are they observed? And if they must be observed, they by all means contribute to salvation; especially seeing that, because of observing them, some have been made martyrs: for they would not be observed unless they contributed to salvation. For they are not things indifferent — neither good nor bad, as philosophers say. Self-control is good, self-indulgence is bad: between these, and indifferent, as having no moral quality, are such things as walking, blowing one's nose, expectorating phlegm, etc. Such an action is neither good nor bad; for whether you do it or leave it undone, it does not affect your standing as righteous or unrighteous. But the observance of legal ceremonies is not a thing indifferent; it is either good or bad. You say it is good. I affirm it to be bad, and bad not only when done by Gentile converts, but also when done by Jews who have believed.

In this passage you fall, if I am not mistaken, into one error while avoiding another. For while you guard yourself against the blasphemies of Porphyry, you become entangled in the snares of Ebion; pronouncing that the law is binding on those who from among the Jews have believed. Perceiving, again, that what you have said is a dangerous doctrine, you attempt to qualify it by words which are only superfluous: viz., "The law must be observed not from any belief, such as prompted the Jews to keep it, that this is necessary to salvation, and not in any misleading dissimulation such as Paul reproved in Peter."

17. Peter therefore pretended to keep the law; but this censor of Peter boldly observed the things prescribed by the law. The next words of your letter are these: "For if Paul observed these sacraments in order, by pretending to be a Jew, to gain the Jews, why did he not also take part with the Gentiles in heathen sacrifices, when to them that were without law he became as without law, that he might gain them also? The explanation is found in this, that he took part in the Jewish rites as being himself a Jew; and that when he said all this which I have quoted, he meant not that

he pretended to be what he was not, but that he felt with true compassion that he must bring such help to them as would be needful for himself if he were involved in their error. Herein he exercised not the subtlety of a deceiver, but the sympathy of a compassionate deliverer. A triumphant vindication of Paul! You prove that he did not pretend to share the error of the Jews, but was actually involved in it; and that he refused to imitate Peter in a course of deception, dissembling through fear of the Jews what he really was, but without reserve freely avowed himself to be a Jew. Oh, unheard of compassion of the apostle! In seeking to make the Jews Christians, he himself became a Jew! For he could not have persuaded the luxurious to become temperate if he had not himself become luxurious like them;

and could not have brought help, in his compassion, as you say, to the wretched, otherwise than by experiencing in his own person their wretchedness! Truly wretched, and worthy of most compassionate lamentation, are those who, carried away by vehemence of disputation, and by love for the law which has been abolished, have made Christ's apostle to be a Jew. Nor is there, after all, a great difference between my opinion and yours: for I say that both Peter and Paul, through fear of the believing Jews, practised, or rather pretended to practise, the precepts of the Jewish law; whereas you maintain that they did this out of pity, "not with the subtlety of a deceiver, but with the sympathy of a compassionate deliverer. But by both this is equally admitted, that (whether from fear or from pity) they pretended to be what they were not. As to your argument against our view, that he ought to have become to the Gentiles a Gentile, if to the Jews he became a Jew, this favours our opinion rather than yours: for as he did not actually become a Jew, so he did not actually become a heathen; and as he did not actually become a heathen, so he did not actually become a Jew. His conformity to the Gentiles consisted in this, that he received as Christians the uncircumcised who believed in Christ, and left them free to use without scruple meats which the Jewish law prohibited; but not, as you suppose, in taking part in their worship of idols.

For "in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision avails anything, nor uncircumcision, but the keeping of the commandments of God."

18. I ask you, therefore, and with all urgency press the request, that you forgive me this humble attempt at a discussion of the matter; and wherein I have transgressed, lay the blame upon yourself who compelled me to write in reply, and who made me out to be as blind as Stesichorus. And do not bring the reproach of teaching the practice of lying upon me who am a follower of Christ, who said, "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." [John 14:6] It is impossible for me, who am a worshipper of the Truth, to bow under the yoke of falsehood. Moreover, refrain from stirring up against me the unlearned crowd who esteem you as their bishop, and regard with the respect due the priestly office the orations which you deliver in the church,

but who esteem lightly an old decrepit man like me, courting the retirement of a monastery far from the busy haunts of men; and seek others who may be more fitly instructed or corrected by you. For the sound of your voice can scarcely reach me, who am so far separated from you by sea and land. And if you happen to write me a letter, Italy and Rome are sure to be acquainted with its contents long before it is brought to me, to whom alone it ought to be sent.

19. In another letter you ask why a former translation which I made of some of the canonical books was carefully marked with asterisks and obelisks, whereas I afterwards published a translation without these. You must pardon my saying that you seem to me not to understand the matter: for the former translation is from the Septuagint; and wherever obelisks are placed, they are designed to indicate that the Seventy have said more than is found in the Hebrew. But the asterisks indicate what has been added by Origen from the version of Theodotion. In that version I was translating from the Greek: but in the later version, translating from the Hebrew itself, I have expressed what I understood it to mean, being careful to preserve rather the exact sense than the order of the words. I am surprised that you do not read the books of the Seventy translators in the genuine form in which they were originally given to the world, but as they have been corrected, or rather corrupted, by Origen, with his obelisks and asterisks; and that you refuse to follow the translation, however feeble, which has been given by a Christian man, especially seeing that Origen borrowed the things which he has added from the edition of a man who, after the passion of Christ, was a Jew and a blasphemer. Do you wish to be a true admirer and partisan of the Seventy translators? Then do not read what you find under the asterisks; rather erase them from the volumes, that you may approve yourself indeed a follower of the ancients. If, however, you do this, you will be compelled to find fault with all the libraries of the Churches; for you will scarcely find more than one manuscript here and there which has not these interpolations.

20. A few words now as to your remark that I ought not to have given a translation, after this had been already done by the ancients; and the novel syllogism which you use: ”The passages of which the Seventy have given an interpretation were either obscure or plain. If they were obscure, it is believed that you are as likely to have been mistaken as the others; if they were plain, it is not believed that the Seventy could have been mistaken.”

All the commentators who have been our predecessors in the Lord in the work of expounding the Scriptures, have expounded either what was obscure or what was plain. If some passages were obscure, how could you, after them, presume to discuss that which they were not able to explain? If the passages were plain, it was a waste of time for you to have undertaken to treat of that which could not possibly have escaped them. This syllogism applies with peculiar force to the book

of Psalms, in the interpretation of which Greek commentators have written many volumes: viz. 1 st, Origen: 2 d, Eusebius of Cæsarea; 3 d, Theodorus of Heraclea; 4 th, Asterius of Scythopolis; 5 th, Apollinaris of Laodicea; and, 6 th, Didymus of Alexandria. There are said to be minor works on selections from the Psalms, but I speak at present of the whole book. Moreover, among Latin writers the bishops Hilary of Poitiers, and Eusebius of Verceil, have translated Origen and Eusebius of Cæsarea, the former of whom has in some things been followed by our own Ambrose. Now, I put it to your wisdom to answer why you, after all the labours of so many and so competent interpreters, differ from them in your exposition of some passages? If the Psalms are obscure, it must be believed that you are as likely to be mistaken as others; if they are plain, it is incredible that these others could have fallen into mistake. In either case, your exposition has been, by your own showing, an unnecessary labour; and on the same principle, no one would ever venture to speak on any subject after others have pronounced their opinion, and no one would be at liberty to write anything regarding that which another has once handled, however important the matter might be.

It is, however, more in keeping with your enlightened judgment, to grant to all others the liberty which you tolerate in yourself for in my attempt to translate into Latin, for the benefit of those who speak the same language with myself, the corrected Greek version of the Scriptures, I have laboured not to supersede what has been long esteemed, but only to bring prominently forward those things which have been either omitted or tampered with by the Jews, in order that Latin readers might know what is found in the original Hebrew. If any one is averse to reading it, none compels him against his will. Let him drink with satisfaction the old wine, and despise my new wine, i.e. the sentences which I have published in explanation of former writers, with the design of making more obvious by my remarks what in them seemed to me to be obscure.

As to the principles which ought to be followed in the interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures, they are stated in the book which I have written, and in all the introductions to the divine books which I have in my edition prefixed to each; and to these I think it sufficient to refer the prudent reader. And since you approve of my labours in revising the translation of the New Testament, as you say — giving me at the same time this as your reason, that very many are acquainted with the Greek language, and are therefore competent judges of my work — it would have been but fair to have given me credit for the same fidelity in the Old Testament; for I have not followed my own imagination, but have rendered the divine words as I found them understood by those who speak the Hebrew language. If you have any doubt of this in any passage, ask the Jews what is the meaning of the original.

21. Perhaps you will say, ”What if the Jews decline to answer, or choose to impose upon us?” Is it conceivable that the whole multitude of Jews will agree together

to be silent if asked about my translation, and that none shall be found that has any knowledge of the Hebrew language? Or will they all imitate those Jews whom you mention as having, in some little town, conspired to injure my reputation? For in your letter you put together the following story:— ”A certain bishop, one of our brethren, having introduced in the Church over which he presides the reading of your version, came upon a word in the book of the prophet Jonah, of which you have given a very different rendering from that which had been of old familiar to the senses and memory of all the worshippers, and had been chanted for so many generations in the Church. Thereupon arose such a tumult in the congregation, especially among the Greeks, correcting what had been read, and denouncing the translation as false, that the bishop was compelled to ask the testimony of the Jewish residents (it was in the town of Oea). These, whether from ignorance or from spite, answered that the words in the Hebrew manuscripts were correctly rendered in the Greek version, and in the Latin one taken from it. What further need I say? The man was compelled to correct your version in that passage as if it had been falsely translated, as he desired not to be left without a congregation — a calamity which he narrowly escaped. From this case we also are led to think that you may be occasionally mistaken.”

22. You tell me that I have given a wrong translation of some word in Jonah, and that a worthy bishop narrowly escaped losing his charge through the clamorous tumult of his people, which was caused by the different rendering of this one word. At the same time, you withhold from me what the word was which I have mistranslated; thus taking away the possibility of my saying anything in my own vindication, lest my reply should be fatal to your objection. Perhaps it is the old dispute about the gourd which has been revived, after slumbering for many long years since the illustrious man, who in that day combined in his own person the ancestral honours of the Cornelii and of Asinius Pollio, brought against me the charge of giving in my translation the word ”ivy” instead of ”gourd. I have already given a sufficient answer to this in my commentary on Jonah. At present, I deem it enough to say that in that passage, where the Septuagint has ”gourd,” and Aquila and the others have rendered the word ”ivy” (κίσσος), the Hebrew manuscript has ”ciceion,” which is in the Syriac tongue, as now spoken, ”ciceia. It is a kind of shrub having large leaves like a vine, and when planted it quickly springs up to the size of a small tree, standing upright by its own stem, without requiring any support of canes or poles, as both gourds and ivy do.

If, therefore, in translating word for word, I had put the word ”ciceia,” no one would know what it meant; if I had used the word ”gourd,” I would have said what is not found in the Hebrew. I therefore put down ”ivy,” that I might not differ from all other translators. But if your Jews said, either through malice or ignorance, as you yourself suggest, that the word is in the Hebrew text which is found in the Greek and Latin versions, it is evident that they were either unacquainted with

Hebrew, or have been pleased to say what was not true, in order to make sport of the gourd-planters.

In closing this letter, I beseech you to have some consideration for a soldier who is now old and has long retired from active service, and not to force him to take the field and again expose his life to the chances of war. Do you, who are young, and who have been appointed to the conspicuous seat of pontifical dignity, give yourself to teaching the people, and enrich Rome with new stores from fertile Africa. I am contented to make but little noise in an obscure corner of a monastery, with one to hear me or read to me.

Letter 113. From Theophilus to Jerome.

Theophilus, bishop of Alexandria, had compiled an invective against John Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople who was nosy (largely through his efforts) an exile from his see. This he now sends to Jerome with a request that the latter will render it into Latin for dissemination in the West. The invective (of which only a few fragments remain) is of the most violent kind. Nevertheless Jerome translated it along with this letter, the date of which is 405 a.d. The latter part of the letter has perished. To the well-beloved and most loving brother Jerome, Theophilus sends greeting in the Lord. 1. At the outset the verdict which is in accordance with the truth satisfies but few. But the Lord speaking by the prophet says: ”my judgment goeth forth as the light?” [Hos. 6:5, LXX] and they who are surrounded with a horror of darkness and do not with clear comprehension perceive the nature of things, are covered with eternal shame and know by the issues of their acts that their efforts have been in vain. Wherefore we also have always desired for John who has for a time ruled the church of Constantinople grace that he might please God, and we have been slow to attribute to him the rash acts which have caused his downfall. But, not to speak of his other misdeeds, he has taken the Origenists into his confidence, has advanced many of them to the priesthood, and by committing this crime has saddened with no slight grief that man of God, Epiphanius of blessed memory, who has shone throughout all the world a bright star among bishops. And therefore he has rightly come to hear the words of doom: ”Babylon is fallen, is fallen.” [Isa. 21:9]

2. Knowing then that the Saviour has said: ”judge not according to the appearance but judge righteous judgment.” [Joh. 7:24.] ...

Letter 114. To Theophilus.

Jerome writes to Theophilus to apologize for his delay in sending Latin versions of the latter's letter (CXIII.) and invective against John Chrysostom. Possibly, however. the allusion may be not to these but to some other work of Theophilus (e.g. a paschal letter.) This delay he attributes to the disturbed state of Palestine, the severity of the winter, the prevalent famine, and his own ill-health. He now sends the translations that he has made and, while he deprecates criticism on his own work, praises that of Theophilus, quoting with particular approval the directions given by this latter for the reverent care of the vessels used in celebrating the holy communion. The date of the letter is 405 a.d. To the most blessed pope Theophilus, Jerome.

1. My delay in sending back to your holiness your treatise translated into Latin is accounted for by the many interruptions and obstacles that I have met with. There has been a sudden raid of the Isaurians; Phoenicia and Galilee have been laid waste; Palestine has been panic-stricken, and particularly Jerusalem; we have all been engaged in making not books but walls. There has also been a severe winter and an almost unbearable famine; and these have told heavily upon me who have the charge of many brothers. Amid these difficulties the work of translation went on by night, as I could save or snatch time to give to it. At last I got it done and by Lent nothing remained but to collate the fair copy with the original. However, just then a severe illness seized me and I was brought to the threshold of death, from which I have only been saved by God's mercy and your prayers; perhaps for this very purpose that I might fulfil your behest and render with its writer's elegance the charming volume which you have adorned with the scripture's fairest flowers. But bodily weakness and sorrow of heart have, I need hardly say, dulled the edge of my intellect and obstructed the free flow of my language.

2. I admire in your work its practical aim, designed as it is to instruct by the authority of scripture ignorant persons in all the churches concerning the reverence with which they must handle holy things and minister at Christ's altar; and to impress upon them that the sacred chalices, veils, and other accessories used in the celebration of the Lord's passion are not mere lifeless and senseless objects de-

void of holiness, but that rather, from their association with the body and blood of the Lord, they are to be venerated with the same awe as the body and the blood themselves. 3. Take back then your book, nay mine or better still ours; for when you flatter me you will but flatter yourself. It is for you that my brain has toiled; it is for you that I have striven with the poor resources of the Latin tongue to find an equivalent for the eloquence of the Greek. I have not indeed given a word-for-word rendering, as skilled translators do, nor have I counted out the money you have given to me coin by coin; but I have given you full weight. Some words may be missing but none of the sense is lost. Moreover I have translated into Latin and prefixed to this volume the letter that you sent to me, so that all who read it may know that I have acted under the commands of your holiness, and have not rashly and over-confidently undertaken a task that is beyond my powers. Whether I have succeeded in it I must leave to your judgment. Even though you may blame my weakness, you will at least give me credit for my good intention.

Letter 115. To Augustine.

A short but most friendly letter in which Jerome excuses himself for the freedom with which he has dealt with Augustine's questions (the allusion is to Letter 112.) and hopes that henceforth they may be able to avoid controversy and to labour like brothers in the field of scripture. Written probably in 405 a.d. Sometimes numbered as Augustine letter 81. To Augustine, My Lord Truly Holy, and Most Blessed Father, Jerome Sends Greeting in the Lord.

Having anxiously inquired of our holy brother Firmus regarding your state, I was glad to hear that you are well. I expected him to bring, or, I should rather say, I insisted upon his giving me, a letter from you; upon which he told me that he had set out from Africa without communicating to you his intention. I therefore send to you my respectful salutations through this brother, who clings to you with a singular warmth of affection; and at the same time, in regard to my last letter, I beg you to forgive the modesty which made it impossible for me to refuse you, when you had so long required me to write you in reply. That letter, moreover, was not an answer from me to you, but a confronting of my arguments with yours. And if it was a fault in me to send a reply (I beseech you hear me patiently), the fault of him who insisted upon it was still greater. But let us be done with such quarrelling; let there be sincere brotherliness between us; and henceforth let us exchange letters, not of controversy, but of mutual charity. The holy brethren who with me serve the Lord send you cordial salutations. Salute from us the holy brethren who with you bear Christ's easy yoke; especially I beseech you to convey my respectful salutation to the holy father Alypius, worthy of all esteem. May Christ, our almighty God, preserve you safe, and not unmindful of me, my lord truly holy, and most blessed father.

If you have read my commentary on Jonah, I think you will not recur to the ridiculous gourd-debate. If, moreover, the friend who first assaulted me with his sword has been driven back by my pen, I rely upon your good feeling and equity to lay blame on the one who brought, and not on the one who repelled, the accusation. Let us, if you please, exercise ourselves in the field of Scripture without wounding each other.

Letter 116. From Augustine.

A long letter in which Augustine for the third time (see Letters 56, 67) restates his opinion about Jerome's theory of the dispute between Peter and Paul at Antioch. In doing so, however, he disclaims all desire to hurt Jerome's feelings, apologizes for the tone of his previous letters, and again explains that it is not his fault that they have failed so long to reach Jerome. Written shortly after the preceding. Sometimes numbered as Augustine letter 82. A reply to Augustine letters 72, 75 and 81. To Jerome, My Lord Beloved and Honoured in the Bowels of Christ, My Holy Brother and Fellow-Presbyter, Augustine Sends Greeting in the Lord.

1. Long ago I sent to your Charity a long letter in reply to the one which you remember sending to me by your holy son Asterius, who is now not only my brother, but also my colleague. Whether that reply reached you or not I do not know, unless I am to infer this from the words in your letter brought to me by our most sincere friend Firmus, that if the one who first assaulted you with his sword has been driven back by your pen, you rely upon my good feeling and equity to lay blame on the one who brought, not on the one who repelled, the accusation. From this one indication, though very slight, I infer that you have read my letter. In that letter I expressed indeed my sorrow that so great discord had arisen between you and Rufinus, over the strength of whose former friendship brotherly love was wont to rejoice in all parts to which the fame of it had come; but I did not in this intend to rebuke you, my brother, whom I dare not say that I have found blameable in that matter. I only lamented the sad lot of men in this world, in whose friendships, depending as they do on the continuance of mutual regard, there is no stability, however great that regard may sometimes be. I would rather, however, have been informed by your letter whether you have granted me the pardon which I begged, of which I now desire you to give me more explicit assurance; although the more genial and cheerful tone of your letter seems to signify that I have obtained what I asked in mine, if indeed it was dispatched after mine had been read by you, which is, as I have said, not clearly indicated.

2. You ask, or rather you give a command with the confiding boldness of charity, that we should amuse ourselves in the field of Scripture without wounding each

other. For my part, I am by all means disposed to exercise myself in earnest much rather than in mere amusement on such themes. If, however, you have chosen this word because of its suggesting easy exercise, let me frankly say that I desire something more from one who has, as you have, great talents under the control of a benignant disposition, together with wisdom enlightened by erudition, and whose application to study, hindered by no other distractions, is year after year impelled by enthusiasm and guided by genius: the Holy Spirit not only giving you all these advantages, but expressly charging you to come with help to those who are engaged in great and difficult investigations; not as if, in studying Scripture, they were amusing themselves on a level plain, but as men punting and toiling up a steep ascent. If, however, perchance, you selected the expression ”ludamus” [let us amuse ourselves] because of the genial kindliness which befits discussion between loving friends, whether the matter debated be obvious and easy, or intricate and difficult, I beseech you to teach me how I may succeed in securing this;

so that when I am dissatisfied with anything which, not through want of careful attention, but perhaps through my slowness of apprehension, has not been demonstrated to me, if I should, in attempting to make good an opposite opinion, express myself with a measure of unguarded frankness, I may not fall under the suspicion of childish conceit and forwardness, as if I sought to bring my own name into renown by assailing illustrious men; and that if, when something harsh has been demanded by the exigencies of argument, I attempt to make it less hard to bear by stating it in mild and courteous phrases, I may not be pronounced guilty of wielding a ”honeyed sword. The only way which I can see for avoiding both these faults, or the suspicion of either of them, is to consent that when I am thus arguing with a friend more learned than myself, I must approve of everything which he says, and may not, even for the sake of more accurate information, hesitate before accepting his decisions.

3. On such terms we might amuse ourselves without fear of offending each other in the field of Scripture, but I might well wonder if the amusement was not at my expense. For I confess to your Charity that I have learned to yield this respect and honour only to the canonical books of Scripture: of these alone do I most firmly believe that the authors were completely free from error. And if in these writings I am perplexed by anything which appears to me opposed to truth, I do not hesitate to suppose that either the manuscript is faulty, or the translator has not caught the meaning of what was said, or I myself have failed to understand it. As to all other writings, in reading them, however great the superiority of the authors to myself in sanctity and learning, I do not accept their teaching as true on the mere ground of the opinion being held by them; but only because they have succeeded in convincing my judgment of its truth either by means of these canonical writings themselves, or by arguments addressed to my reason. I believe, my brother, that this is your own opinion as well as mine. I do not need to say that I do not suppose

you to wish your books to be read like those of prophets or of apostles, concerning which it would be wrong to doubt that they are free from error. Far be such arrogance from that humble piety and just estimate of yourself which I know you to have, and without which assuredly you would not have said, ”Would that I could receive your embrace, and that by converse we might aid each other in learning!”

4. Now if, knowing as I do your life and conversation, I do not believe in regard to you that you have spoken anything with an intention of dissimulation and deceit, how much more reasonable is it for me to believe, in regard to the Apostle Paul, that he did not think one thing and affirm another when he wrote of Peter and Barnabas: ”When I saw that they walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter before them all, ’If you, being a Jew, livest after the manner of the Gentiles, and not as to the Jews, why do you compel the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?’” [Galatians 2:14] For whom can I confide in, as assuredly not deceiving me by spoken or written statements, if the apostle deceived his own ”children,” for whom he ”travailed in birth again until Christ (who is the Truth) were formed in them”? [Galatians 4:19] After having previously said to them, ”The things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not,” could he in writing to these same persons state what was not true, and deceive them by a fraud which was in some way sanctioned by expediency, when he said that he had seen Peter and Barnabas not walking uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, and that he had withstood Peter to the face because of this, that he was compelling the Gentiles to live after the manner of the Jews?

5. But you will say it is better to believe that the Apostle Paul wrote what was not true, than to believe that the Apostle Peter did what was not right. On this principle, we must say (which far be it from us to say), that it is better to believe that the gospel history is false, than to believe that Christ was denied by Peter; [Matthew 26:75] and better to charge the book of Kings [second book of Samuel] with false statements, than believe that so great a prophet, and one so signally chosen by the Lord God as David was, committed adultery in lusting after and taking away the wife of another, and committed such detestable homicide in procuring the death of her husband. [2 Samuel 11:4, 17] Better far that I should read with certainty and persuasion of its truth the Holy Scripture, placed on the highest (even the heavenly) pinnacle of authority, and should, without questioning the trustworthiness of its statements, learn from it that men have been either commended, or corrected, or condemned, than that, through fear of believing that by men, who, though of most praiseworthy excellence, were no more than men, actions deserving rebuke might sometimes be done, I should admit suspicions affecting the trustworthiness of the whole ”oracles of God.”

6. The Manichæans maintain that the greater part of the Divine Scripture, by which their wicked error is in the most explicit terms confuted, is not worthy of credit,

because they cannot pervert its language so as to support their opinions; yet they lay the blame of the alleged mistake not upon the apostles who originally wrote the words, but upon some unknown corrupters of the manuscripts. Forasmuch, however, as they have never succeeded in proving this by more numerous and by earlier manuscripts, or by appealing to the original language from which the Latin translations have been drawn, they retire from the arena of debate, vanquished and confounded by truth which is well known to all. Does not your holy prudence discern how great scope is given to their malice against the truth, if we say not (as they do) that the apostolic writings have been tampered with by others, but that the apostles themselves wrote what they knew to be untrue?

7. You say that it is incredible that Paul should have rebuked in Peter that which Paul himself had done. I am not at present inquiring about what Paul did, but about what he wrote. This is most pertinent to the matter which I have in hand — namely, the confirmation of the universal and unquestionable truth of the Divine Scriptures, which have been delivered to us for our edification in the faith, not by unknown men, but by the apostles, and have on this account been received as the authoritative canonical standard. For if Peter did on that occasion what he ought to have done, Paul falsely affirmed that he saw him walking not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel. For whoever does what he ought to do, walks uprightly. He therefore is guilty of falsehood who, knowing that another has done what he ought to have done, says that he has not done uprightly. If, then, Paul wrote what was true, it is true that Peter was not then walking uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel. He was therefore doing what he ought not to have done; and if Paul had himself already done something of the same kind, I would prefer to believe that, having been himself corrected, he could not omit the correction of his brother apostle, than to believe that he put down any false statement in his epistle; and if in any epistle of Paul this would be strange, how much more in the one in the preface of which he says, ”The things which I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not”!

8. For my part, I believe that Peter so acted on this occasion as to compel the Gentiles to live as Jews: because I read that Paul wrote this, and I do not believe that he lied. And therefore Peter was not acting uprightly. For it was contrary to the truth of the gospel, that those who believed in Christ should think that without those ancient ceremonies they could not be saved. This was the position maintained at Antioch by those of the circumcision who had believed; against whom Paul protested constantly and vehemently. As to Paul’s circumcising of Timothy, [Acts 16:3] performing a vow at Cenchrea, [Acts 18:18] and undertaking on the suggestion of James at Jerusalem to share the performance of the appointed rites with some who had made a vow, [Acts 21:26] it is manifest that Paul’s design in these things was not to give to others the impression that he thought that by these observances salvation is given under the Christian dispensation, but to prevent

men from believing that he condemned as no better than heathen idolatrous worship, those rites which God had appointed in the former dispensation as suitable to it, and as shadows of things to come. For this is what James said to him, that the report had gone abroad concerning him that he taught men "to forsake Moses." [Acts 21:21] This would be by all means wrong for those who believe in Christ, to forsake him who prophesied of Christ, as if they detested and condemned the teaching of him of whom Christ said, "Had ye believed Moses, you would have believed Me; for he wrote of Me."

9. For mark, I beseech you, the words of James: "You see, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law: and they are informed of you, that you teach all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? The multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that you have come. Do therefore this that we say to you: We have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify yourself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning you, are nothing; but that you yourself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law. As touching the Gentiles which have believed, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication.

[Acts 21:20-25] It is, in my opinion, very clear that the reason why James gave this advice was, that the falsity of what they had heard concerning him might be known to those Jews, who, though they had believed in Christ, were jealous for the honour of the law, and would not have it thought that the institutions which had been given by Moses to their fathers were condemned by the doctrine of Christ as if they were profane, and had not been originally given by divine authority. For the men who had brought this reproach against Paul were not those who understood the right spirit in which observance of these ceremonies should be practised under the Christian dispensation by believing Jews — namely, as a way of declaring the divine authority of these rites, and their holy use in the prophetic dispensation, and not as a means of obtaining salvation, which was to them already revealed in Christ and ministered by baptism. On the contrary, the men who had spread abroad this report against the apostle were those who would have these rites observed, as if without their observance there could be no salvation to those who believed the gospel. For these false teachers had found him to be a most zealous preacher of free grace, and a most decided opponent of their views, teaching as he did that men are not justified by these things, but by the grace of Jesus Christ, which these ceremonies of the law were appointed to foreshadow.

This party, therefore, endeavouring to raise odium and persecution against him, charged him with being an enemy of the law and of the divine institutions; and there was no more fitting way in which he could turn aside the odium caused by this false accusation, than by himself celebrating those rites which he was supposed to condemn as profane, and thus showing that, on the one hand, the Jews were not to be debarred from them as if they were unlawful, and on the other hand, that the Gentiles were not to be compelled to observe them as if they were necessary.

10. For if he did in truth condemn these things in the way in which he was reported to have done, and undertook to perform these rites in order that he might, by dissembling, disguise his real sentiments, James would not have said to him, "and all shall know," but, "all shall think that those things whereof they were informed concerning you are nothing;" [Acts 21:24] especially seeing that in Jerusalem itself the apostles had already decreed that no one should compel the Gentiles to adopt Jewish ceremonies, but had not decreed that no one should then prevent the Jews from living according to their customs, although upon them also Christian doctrine imposed no such obligation. Wherefore, if it was after the apostle's decree that Peter's dissimulation at Antioch took place, whereby he was compelling the Gentiles to live after the manner of the Jews, which he himself was not compelled to do, although he was not forbidden to use Jewish rites in order to declare the honour of the oracles of God which were committed to the Jews — if this, I say, were the case, was it strange that Paul should exhort him to declare freely that decree which he remembered to have framed in conjunction with the other apostles at Jerusalem?

11. If, however, as I am more inclined to think, Peter did this before the meeting of that council at Jerusalem, in that case also it is not strange that Paul wished him not to conceal timidly, but to declare boldly, a rule of practice in regard to which he already knew that they were both of the same mind; whether he was aware of this from having conferred with him as to the gospel which both preached, or from having heard that, at the calling of the centurion Cornelius, Peter had been divinely instructed in regard to this matter, or from having seen him eating with Gentile converts before those whom he feared to offend had come to Antioch. For we do not deny that Peter was already of the same opinion in regard to this question as Paul himself was. Paul, therefore, was not teaching Peter what was the truth concerning that matter, but was reproving his dissimulation as a thing by which the Gentiles were compelled to act as Jews did; for no other reason than this, that the tendency of all such dissembling was to convey or confirm the impression that they taught the truth who held that believers could not be saved without circumcision and other ceremonies, which were shadows of things to come.

12. For this reason also he circumcised Timothy, lest to the Jews, and especially to his relations by the mother's side, it should seem that the Gentiles who had believed in Christ abhorred circumcision as they abhorred the worship of idols;

whereas the former was appointed by God, and the latter invented by Satan. Again, he did not circumcise Titus, lest he should give occasion to those who said that believers could not be saved without circumcision, and who, in order to deceive the Gentiles, openly declared that this was the view held by Paul. This is plainly enough intimated by himself, when he says: "But neither Titus, who was with me, being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: and that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." [Galatians 2:3-5] Here we see plainly what he perceived them to be eagerly watching for, and why it was that he did not do in the case of Titus as he had done in the case of Timothy, and as he might otherwise have done in the exercise of that liberty, by which he had shown that these observances were neither to be demanded as necessary to salvation, nor denounced as unlawful.

13. You say, however, that in this discussion we must beware of affirming, with the philosophers, that some of the actions of men lie in a region between right and wrong, and are to be reckoned, accordingly, neither among good actions nor among the opposite; and it is urged in your argument that the observance of legal ceremonies cannot be a thing indifferent, but either good or bad; so that if I affirm it to be good, I acknowledge that we also are bound to observe these ceremonies; but if I affirm it to be bad, I am bound to believe that the apostles observed them not sincerely, but in a way of dissimulation. I, for my part, would not be so much afraid of defending the apostles by the authority of philosophers, since these teach some measure of truth in their dissertations, as of pleading on their behalf the practice of advocates at the bar, in sometimes serving their clients' interests at the expense of truth. If, as is stated in your exposition of the Epistle to the Galatians, this practice of barristers may be in your opinion with propriety quoted as resembling and justifying dissimulation on the part of Peter and Paul, why should I fear to allege to you the authority of philosophers whose teaching we account worthless, not because everything which they say is false, but because they are in most things mistaken, and wherein they are found affirming truth, are notwithstanding strangers to the grace of Christ, who is the Truth?

14. But why may I not say regarding these institutions of the old economy, that they are neither good nor bad: not good, since men are not by them justified, they having been only shadows predicting the grace by which we are justified; and not bad, since they were divinely appointed as suitable both to the time and to the people? Why may I not say this, when I am supported by that saying of the prophet, that God gave unto His people "statutes that were not good"? [Ezekiel 20:25] For we have in this perhaps the reason of his not calling them "bad," but calling them "not good," i.e. not such that either by them men could be made good, or that without them men could not possibly become good. I would esteem it a favour to be informed

by your Sincerity, whether any saint, coming from the East to Rome, would be guilty of dissimulation if he fasted on the seventh day of each week, excepting the Saturday before Easter. For if we say that it is wrong to fast on the seventh day, we shall condemn not only the Church of Rome, but also many other churches, both neighbouring and more remote, in which the same custom continues to be observed. If, on the other hand, we pronounce it wrong not to fast on the seventh day, how great is our presumption in censuring so many churches in the East, and by far the greater part of the Christian world!

Or do you prefer to say of this practice, that it is a thing indifferent in itself, but commendable in him who conforms with it, not as a dissembler, but from a seemly desire for the fellowship and deference for the feelings of others? No precept, however, concerning this practice is given to Christians in the canonical books. How much more, then, may I shrink from pronouncing that to be bad which I cannot deny to be of divine institution!— this fact being admitted by me in the exercise of the same faith by which I know that not through these observances, but by the grace of God through our Lord Jesus Christ, I am justified.

15. I maintain, therefore, that circumcision, and other things of this kind, were, by means of what is called the Old Testament, given to the Jews with divine authority, as signs of future things which were to be fulfilled in Christ; and that now, when these things have been fulfilled, the laws concerning these rights remained only to be read by Christians in order to their understanding the prophecies which had been given before, but not to be of necessity practised by them, as if the coming of that revelation of faith which they prefigured was still future. Although, however, these rites were not to be imposed upon the Gentiles, the compliance with them, to which the Jews had been accustomed, was not to be prohibited in such a way as to give the impression that it was worthy of abhorrence and condemnation. Therefore slowly, and by degrees, all this observance of these types was to vanish away through the power of the sound preaching of the truth of the grace of Christ, to which alone believers would be taught to ascribe their justification and salvation, and not to those types and shadows of things which till then had been future, but which were now newly come and present, as at the time of the calling of those Jews whom the personal coming of our Lord and the apostolic times had found accustomed to the observance of these ceremonial institutions.

The toleration, for the time, of their continuing to observe these was enough to declare their excellence as things which, though they were to be given up, were not, like the worship of idols, worthy of abhorrence; but they were not to be imposed upon others, lest they should be thought necessary, either as means or as conditions of salvation. This was the opinion of those heretics who, while anxious to be both Jews and Christians, could not be either the one or the other. Against this opinion you have most benevolently condescended to warn me, although I never

entertained it. This also was the opinion with which, through fear, Peter fell into the fault of pretending to yield concurrence, though in reality he did not agree with it; for which reason Paul wrote most truly of him, that he saw him not walking uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, and most truly said of him that he was compelling the Gentiles to live as did the Jews. Paul did not impose this burden on the Gentiles through his sincerely complying, when it was needful, with these ceremonies, with the design of proving that they were not to be utterly condemned (as idol-worship ought to be); for he nevertheless constantly preached that not by these things, but by the grace revealed to faith, believers obtain salvation, lest he should lead any one to take up these Jewish observances as necessary to salvation. Thus, therefore, I believe that the Apostle Paul did all these things honestly, and without dissimulation;

and yet if any one now leave Judaism and become a Christian, I neither compel nor permit him to imitate Paul's example, and go on with the sincere observance of Jewish rites, any more than you, who think that Paul dissembled when he practised these rites, would compel or permit such an one to follow the apostle in that dissimulation.

16. Shall I also sum up "the matter in debate, or rather your opinion concerning it" (to quote your own expression)? It seems to me to be this: that after the gospel of Christ has been published, the Jews who believe do rightly if they offer sacrifices as Paul did, if they circumcise their children as Paul circumcised Timothy, and if they observe the "seventh day of the week, as the Jews have always done, provided only that they do all this as dissemblers and deceivers. If this is your doctrine, we are now precipitated, not into the heresy of Ebion, or of those who are commonly called Nazarenes, or any other known heresy, but into some new error, which is all the more pernicious because it originates not in mistake, but in deliberate and designed endeavour to deceive. If, in order to clear yourself from the charge of entertaining such sentiments, you answer that the apostles were to be commended for dissimulation in these instances, their purpose being to avoid giving offense to the many weak Jewish believers who did not yet understand that these things were to be rejected, but that now, when the doctrine of Christ's grace has been firmly established throughout so many nations, and when, by the reading of the Law and the Prophets throughout all the churches of Christ, it is well known that these are not read for our observance, but for our instruction, any man who should propose to feign compliance with these rites would be regarded as a madman.

What objection can there be to my affirming that the Apostle Paul, and other sound and faithful Christians, were bound sincerely to declare the worth of these old observances by occasionally honouring them, lest it should be thought that these institutions, originally full of prophetic significance, and cherished sacredly by their most pious forefathers, were to be abhorred by their posterity as profane inventions

of the devil? For now, when the faith had come, which, previously foreshadowed by these ceremonies, was revealed after the death and resurrection of the Lord, they became, so far as their office was concerned, defunct. But just as it is seemly that the bodies of the deceased be carried honourably to the grave by their kindred, so was it fitting that these rites should be removed in a manner worthy of their origin and history, and this not with pretence of respect, but as a religious duty, instead of being forsaken at once, or cast forth to be torn in pieces by the reproaches of their enemies, as by the teeth of dogs. To carry the illustration further, if now any Christian (though he may have been converted from Judaism) were proposing to imitate the apostles in the observance of these ceremonies, like one who disturbs the ashes of those who rest, he would be not piously performing his part in the obsequies, but impiously violating the sepulchre.

17. I acknowledge that in the statement contained in my letter, to the effect that the reason why Paul undertook (although he was an apostle of Christ) to perform certain rites, was that he might show that these ceremonies were not pernicious to those who desired to continue that which they had received by the Law from their fathers, I have not explicitly enough qualified the statement, by adding that this was the case only in that time in which the grace of faith was at first revealed; for at that time this was not pernicious. These observances were to be given up by all Christians step by step, as time advanced; not all at once, lest, if this were done, men should not perceive the difference between what God by Moses appointed to His ancient people, and the rites which the unclean spirit taught men to practise in the temples of heathen deities. I grant, therefore, that in this your censure is justifiable, and my omission deserved rebuke. Nevertheless, long before the time of my receiving your letter, when I wrote a treatise against Faustus the Manichæan, I did not omit to insert the qualifying clause which I have just stated, in a short exposition which I gave of the same passage, as you may see for yourself if you kindly condescend to read that treatise; or you may be satisfied in any other way that you please by the bearer of this letter, that I had long ago published this restriction of the general affirmation.

And I now, as speaking in the sight of God, beseech you by the law of charity to believe me when I say with my whole heart, that it never was my opinion that in our time, Jews who become Christians were either required or at liberty to observe in any manner, or from any motive whatever, the ceremonies of the ancient dispensation; although I have always held, in regard to the Apostle Paul, the opinion which you call in question, from the time that I became acquainted with his writings. Nor can these two things appear incompatible to you; for you do not think it is the duty of any one in our day to feign compliance with these Jewish observances, although you believe that the apostles did this.

18. Accordingly, as you in opposing me affirm, and, to quote your own words, "though the world were to protest against it, boldly declare that the Jewish ceremonies are to Christians both hurtful and fatal, and that whoever observes them, whether he was originally Jew or Gentile, is on his way to the pit of perdition," I entirely endorse that statement, and add to it, "Whoever observes these ceremonies, whether he was originally Jew or Gentile, is on his way to the pit of perdition, not only if he is sincerely observing them, but also if he is observing them with dissimulation. What more do you ask? But as you draw a distinction between the dissimulation which you hold to have been practised by the apostles, and the rule of conduct befitting the present time, I do the same between the course which Paul, as I think, sincerely followed in all these examples then, and the matter of observing in our day these Jewish ceremonies, although it were done, as by him, without any dissimulation, since it was then to be approved, but is now to be abhorred. Thus, although we read that "the law and the prophets were until John," [Luke 16:16] and that "therefore the Jews sought the more to kill Him, because He not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was His Father, making Himself equal with God," [John 5:18] and that "we have received grace for grace for the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ;

[John 1:16-17] and although it was promised by Jeremiah that God would make a new covenant with the house of Judah, not according to the covenant which He made with their fathers; [Jeremiah 31:31] nevertheless I do not think that the Circumcision of our Lord by His parents was an act of dissimulation. If any one object that He did not forbid this because He was but an infant, I go on to say that I do not think that it was with intention to deceive that He said to the leper, "Offer for your cleansing those things which Moses commanded for a testimony unto them," [Mark 1:44] — thereby adding His own precept to the authority of the law of Moses regarding that ceremonial usage. Nor was there dissimulation in His going up to the feast, [John 7:10] as there was also no desire to be seen of men; for He went up, not openly, but secretly.

19. But the words of the apostle himself may be quoted against me: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. [Galatians 5:2] It follows from this that he deceived Timothy, and made Christ profit him nothing, for he circumcised Timothy. Do you answer that this circumcision did Timothy no harm, because it was done with an intention to deceive? I reply that the apostle has not made any such exception. He does not say, If you be circumcised without dissimulation, any more than, If you be circumcised with dissimulation. He says unreservedly, "If you be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. As, therefore, you insist upon finding room for your interpretation, by proposing to supply the words, "unless it be done as an act of dissimulation," I make no unreasonable demand in asking you to permit me to understand the words, "if you be circumcised," to be in that passage addressed to those who demanded circumcision, for this rea-

son, that they thought it impossible for them to be otherwise saved by Christ. Whoever was then circumcised because of such persuasion and desire, and with this design, Christ assuredly profited him nothing, as the apostle elsewhere expressly affirms, If righteousness come by the law, Christ is dead in vain. [Galatians 2:21] The same is affirmed in words which you have quoted: ”Christ has become of no effect to you, whosoever of you is justified by the law; you are fallen from grace.

[Galatians 5:4] His rebuke, therefore, was addressed to those who believed that they were to be justified by the law, — not to those who, knowing well the design with which the legal ceremonies were instituted as foreshadowing truth, and the time for which they were destined to be in force, observed them in order to honour Him who appointed them at first. Wherefore also he says elsewhere, ”If you be led of the Spirit, you are not under the law,” [Galatians 5:18] — a passage from which you infer, that evidently ”he has not the Holy Spirit who submits to the Law, not, as our fathers affirmed the apostles to have done, feignedly under the promptings of a wise discretion, but”— as I suppose to have been the case — ”sincerely.”

20. It seems to me important to ascertain precisely what is that submission to the law which the apostle here condemns; for I do not think that he speaks here of circumcision merely, or of the sacrifices then offered by our fathers, but now not offered by Christians, and other observances of the same nature. I rather hold that he includes also that precept of the law, ”You shall not covet,” which we confess that Christians are unquestionably bound to obey, and which we find most fully proclaimed by the light which the Gospel has shed upon it. ”The law,” he says, ”is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good; and then adds, ”Was, then, that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. ”But sin, that it might appear sin, wrought death in me by that which is good; that sin, by the commandment, might become exceeding sinful. [Romans 7:13] As he says here, ”that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful,” so elsewhere, ”The law entered that the offense might abound; but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound. [Romans 5:20] Again, in another place, after affirming, when speaking of the dispensation of grace, that grace alone justifies, he asks, ”Wherefore then serves the law? and answers immediately, ”It was added because of transgressions, until the Seed should come to whom the promises were made.

[Galatians 3:19] The persons, therefore, whose submission to the law the apostle here pronounces to be the cause of their own condemnation, are those whom the law brings in guilty, as not fulfilling its requirements, and who, not understanding the efficacy of free grace, rely with self-satisfied presumption on their own strength to enable them to keep the law of God; for ”love is the fulfilling of the law. [Romans 13:10] Now ”the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts,” not by our own power, but ”by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us. [Romans 5:5] The satisfactory discussion of this, however, would require too long a digression, if not a separate

volume. If, then, that precept of the law, ”You shall not covet,” holds under it as guilty the man whose human weakness is not assisted by the grace of God, and instead of acquitting the sinner, condemns him as a transgressor, how much more was it impossible for those ordinances which were merely typical, circumcision and the rest, which were destined to be abolished when the revelation of grace became more widely known, to be the means of justifying any man! Nevertheless they were not on this ground to be immediately shunned with abhorrence, like the diabolical impieties of heathenism, from the first beginning of the revelation of the grace which had been by these shadows prefigured; but to be for a little while tolerated, especially among those who joined the Christian Church from that nation to whom these ordinances had been given.

When, however, they had been, as it were, honourably buried, they were thenceforward to be finally abandoned by all Christians.

21. Now, as to the words which you use, ”non dispensative, ut nostri voluere majores,” — ”not in a way justifiable by expediency, the ground on which our fathers were disposed to explain the conduct of the apostles,”— pray what do these words mean? Surely nothing else than that which I call ”officiosum mendacium,” the liberty granted by expediency being equivalent to a call of duty to utter a falsehood with pious intention. I at least can see no other explanation, unless, of course, the mere addition of the words ”permitted by expediency” be enough to make a lie cease to be a lie; and if this be absurd, why do you not openly say that a lie spoken in the way of duty is to be defended? Perhaps the name offends you, because the word ”officium” is not common in ecclesiastical books; but this did not deter our Ambrose from its use, for he has chosen the title ”De Officiis” for some of his books that are full of useful rules. Do you mean to say, that whoever utters a lie from a sense of duty is to be blamed, and whoever does the same on the ground of expediency is to be approved? I beseech you, consider that the man who thinks this may lie whenever he thinks fit, because this involves the whole important question whether to say what is false be at any time the duty of a good man, especially of a Christian man, to whom it has been said, ”Let your yea be yea, and your nay, nay, lest ye fall into condemnation,” [James 5:12; Matthew 5:37] and who believes the Psalmist’s word, ”You will destroy all them that speak lies.”

22. This, however, is, as I have said, another and a weighty question; I leave him who is of this opinion to judge for himself the circumstances in which he is at liberty to utter a lie: provided, however, that it be most assuredly believed and maintained that this way of lying is far removed from the authors who were employed to write holy writings, especially the canonical Scriptures; lest those who are the stewards of Christ, of whom it is said, ”It is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful,” [1 Corinthians 4:2] should seem to have proved their fidelity by learning as an important lesson to speak what is false when this is expedient for the truth’s sake,

although the word fidelity itself, in the Latin tongue, is said to signify originally a real correspondence between what is said and what is done. Now, where that which is spoken is actually done, there is assuredly no room for falsehood. Paul therefore, as a "faithful steward" doubtless is to be regarded as approving his fidelity in his writings; for he was a steward of truth, not of falsehood. Therefore he wrote the truth when he wrote that he had seen Peter walking not uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, and that he had withstood him to the face because he was compelling the Gentiles to live as the Jews did.

And Peter himself received, with the holy and loving humility which became him, the rebuke which Paul, in the interests of truth, and with the boldness of love, administered. Therein Peter left to those that came after him an example, that, if at any time they deviated from the right path, they should not think it beneath them to accept correction from those who were their juniors — an example more rare, and requiring greater piety, than that which Paul's conduct on the same occasion left us, that those who are younger should have courage even to withstand their seniors if the defense of evangelical truth required it, yet in such a way as to preserve unbroken brotherly love. For while it is better for one to succeed in perfectly keeping the right path, it is a thing much more worthy of admiration and praise to receive admonition meekly, than to admonish a transgressor boldly. On that occasion, therefore, Paul was to be praised for upright courage, Peter was to be praised for holy humility; and so far as my judgment enables me to form an opinion, this ought rather to have been asserted in answer to the calumnies of Porphyry, than further occasion given to him for finding fault, by putting it in his power to bring against Christians this much more damaging accusation, that either in writing their letters or in complying with the ordinances of God they practised deceit.

23. You call upon me to bring forward the name of even one whose opinion I have followed in this matter, and at the same time you have quoted the names of many who have held before you the opinion which you defend. You also say that if I censure you for an error in this, you beg to be allowed to remain in error in company with such great men. I have not read their writings; but although they are only six or seven in all, you have yourself impugned the authority of four of them. For as to the Laodicean author, whose name you do not give, you say that he has lately forsaken the Church; Alexander you describe as a heretic of old standing; and as to Origen and Didymus, I read in some of your more recent works, censure passed on their opinions, and that in no measured terms, nor in regard to insignificant questions, although formerly you gave Origen marvellous praise. I suppose, therefore, that you would not even yourself be contented to be in error with these men; although the language which I refer to is equivalent to an assertion that in this matter they have not erred. For who is there that would consent to be knowingly mistaken, with whatever company he might share his errors? Three of the seven therefore alone remain, Eusebius of Emesa, Theodorus of Heraclea, and

John, whom you afterwards mention, who formerly presided as pontiff over the Church of Constantinople.

24. However, if you inquire or recall to memory the opinion of our Ambrose, and also of our Cyprian, on the point in question, you will perhaps find that I also have not been without some whose footsteps I follow in that which I have maintained. At the same time, as I have said already, it is to the canonical Scriptures alone that I am bound to yield such implicit subjection as to follow their teaching, without admitting the slightest suspicion that in them any mistake or any statement intended to mislead could find a place. Wherefore, when I look round for a third name that I may oppose three on my side to your three, I might indeed easily find one, I believe, if my reading had been extensive; but one occurs to me whose name is as good as all these others, nay, of greater authority — I mean the Apostle Paul himself. To him I betake myself; to himself I appeal from the verdict of all those commentators on his writings who advance an opinion different from mine. I interrogate him, and demand from himself to know whether he wrote what was true, or under some plea of expediency wrote what he knew to be false, when he wrote that he saw Peter not walking uprightly, according to the truth of the gospel, and withstood him to his face because by that dissimulation he was compelling the Gentiles to live after the manner of the Jews. And I hear him in reply proclaiming with a solemn oath in an earlier part of the epistle, where he began this narration, "The things that I write unto you, behold, before God, I lie not." [Galatians 1:20]

25. Let those who think otherwise, however great their names, excuse my differing from them. The testimony of so great an apostle using, in his own writings, an oath as a confirmation of their truth, is of more weight with me than the opinion of any man, however learned, who is discussing the writings of another. Nor am I afraid lest men should say that, in vindicating Paul from the charge of pretending to conform to the errors of Jewish prejudice, I affirm him to have actually so conformed. For as, on the one hand, he was not guilty of pretending conformity to error when, with the liberty of an apostle, such as was suitable to that period of transition, he did, by practising those ancient holy ordinances, when it was necessary to declare their original excellence as appointed not by the wiles of Satan to deceive men, but by the wisdom of God for the purpose of typically foretelling things to come; so, on the other hand, he was not guilty of real conformity to the errors of Judaism, seeing that he not only knew, but also preached constantly and vehemently, that those were in error who thought that these ceremonies were to be imposed upon the Gentile converts, or were necessary to the justification of any who believed.

26. Moreover, as to my saying that to the Jews he became as a Jew, and to the Gentiles as a Gentile, not with the subtlety of intentional deceit, but with the compassion of pitying love, it seems to me that you have not sufficiently considered my meaning in the words; or rather, perhaps, I have not succeeded in making it

plain. For I did not mean by this that I supposed him to have practised in either case a feigned conformity; but I said it because his conformity was sincere, not less in the things in which he became to the Jews as a Jew, than in those in which he became to the Gentiles as a Gentile — a parallel which you yourself suggested, and by which I thankfully acknowledge that you have materially assisted my argument. For when I had in my letter asked you to explain how it could be supposed that Paul's becoming to the Jews as a Jew involved the supposition that he must have acted deceitfully in conforming to the Jewish observances, seeing that no such deceptive conformity to heathen customs was involved in his becoming as a Gentile to the Gentiles; your answer was, that his becoming to the Gentiles as a Gentile meant no more than his receiving the uncircumcised, and permitting the free use of those meats which were pronounced unclean by Jewish law. If, then, when I ask whether in this also he practised dissimulation, such an idea is repudiated as palpably most absurd and false: it is an obvious inference, that in his performing those things in which he became as a Jew to the Jews, he was using a wise liberty, not yielding to a degrading compulsion, nor doing what would be still more unworthy of him, viz. stooping from integrity to fraud out of a regard to expediency.

27. For to believers, and to those who know the truth, as the apostle testifies (unless here too, perhaps, he is deceiving his readers), "every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving. [1 Timothy 4:4] Therefore to Paul himself, not only as a man, but as a steward eminently faithful, not only as knowing, but also as a teacher of the truth, every creature of God which is used for food was not feignedly but truly good. If, then, to the Gentiles he became as a Gentile, by holding and teaching the truth concerning meats and circumcision although he feigned no conformity to the rites and ceremonies of the Gentiles, why say that it was impossible for him to become as a Jew to the Jews, unless he practised dissimulation in performing the rites of their religion? Why did he maintain the true faithfulness of a steward towards the wild olive branch that was engrafted, and yet hold up a strange veil of dissimulation, on the plea of expediency, before those who were the natural and original branches of the olive tree? Why was it that, in becoming as a Gentile to the Gentiles, his teaching and his conduct are in harmony with his real sentiments; but that, in becoming as a Jew to the Jews, he shuts up one thing in his heart, and declares something wholly different in his words, deeds, and writings? But far be it from us to entertain such thoughts of him.

To both Jews and Gentiles he owed "charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned; [1 Timothy 1:5] and therefore he became all things to all men, that he might gain all, [1 Corinthians 9:19-22] not with the subtlety of a deceiver, but with the love of one filled with compassion; that is to say, not by pretending himself to do all the evil things which other men did, but by using the

utmost pains to minister with all compassion the remedies required by the evils under which other men laboured, as if their case had been his own.

28. When, therefore, he did not refuse to practise some of these Old Testament observances, he was not led by his compassion for Jews to feign this conformity, but unquestionably was acting sincerely; and by this course of action declaring his respect for those things which in the former dispensation had been for a time enjoined by God, he distinguished between them and the impious rites of heathenism. At that time, moreover, not with the subtlety of a deceiver, but with the love of one moved by compassion, he became to the Jews as a Jew, when, seeing them to be in error, which either made them unwilling to believe in Christ, or made them think that by these old sacrifices and ceremonial observances they could be cleansed from sin and made partakers of salvation, he desired so to deliver them from that error as if he saw not them, but himself, entangled in it; thus truly loving his neighbour as himself, and doing to others as he would have others do to him if he required their help — a duty to the statement of which our Lord added these words, "This is the law and the prophets." [Matthew 7:12]

29. This compassionate affection Paul recommends in the same Epistle to the Galatians, saying: "If a man be overtaken in a fault, you which are spiritual restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering yourself, lest you also be tempted." [Galatians 6:2] See whether he has not said, "Make yourself as he is, that you may gain him." Not, indeed, that one should commit or pretend to have committed the same fault as the one who has been overtaken, but that in the fault of that other he should consider what might happen to himself, and so compassionately render assistance to that other, as he would wish that other to do to him if the case were his; that is, not with the subtlety of a deceiver, but with the love of one filled with compassion. Thus, whatever the error or fault in which Jew or Gentile or any man was found by Paul, to all men he became all things — not by feigning what was not true, but by feeling, because the case might have been his own, the compassion of one who put himself in the other's place — that he might gain all.

30. I beseech you to look, if you please, for a little into your own heart — I mean, into your own heart as it stands affected towards myself — and recall, or if you have it in writing beside you, read again, your own words in that letter (only too brief) which you sent to me by Cyprian our brother, now my colleague. Read with what sincere brotherly and loving earnestness you have added to a serious complaint of what I had done to you these words: "In this friendship is wounded, and the laws of brotherly union are set at nought. Let not the world see us quarrelling like children, and giving material for angry contention between those who may become our respective supporters or adversaries. These words I perceive to be spoken by you from the heart, and from a heart kindly seeking to give me good advice. Then you add, what would have been obvious to me even without your stating it: "I

write what I have now written, because I desire to cherish towards you pure and Christian love, and not to hide in my heart anything which does not agree with the utterance of my lips. O pious man, beloved by me, as God who sees my soul is witness, with a true heart I believe your statement;

and just as I do not question the sincerity of the profession which you have thus made in a letter to me, so do I by all means believe the Apostle Paul when he makes the very same profession in his letter, addressed not to any one individual, but to Jews and Greeks, and all those Gentiles who were his children in the gospel, for whose spiritual birth he travailed, and after them to so many thousands of believers in Christ, for whose sake that letter has been preserved. I believe, I say, that he did not "hide in his heart anything which did not agree with the utterance of his lips."

31. You have indeed yourself done towards me this very thing — becoming to me as I am —"not with the subtlety of deception, but with the love of compassion," when you thought that it behooved you to take as much pains to prevent me from being left in a mistake, in which you believed me to be, as you would have wished another to take for your deliverance if the case had been your own. Wherefore, gratefully acknowledging this evidence of your goodwill towards me, I also claim that you also be not displeased with me, if, when anything in your treatises disquieted me, I acquainted you with my distress, desiring the same course to be followed by all towards me as I have followed towards you, that whatever they think worthy of censure in my writings, they would neither flatter me with deceitful commendation nor blame me before others for that of which they are silent towards myself; thereby, as it seems to me, more seriously "wounding friendship and setting at nought the laws of brotherly union." For I would hesitate to give the name of Christian to those friendships in which the common proverb, "Flattery makes friends, and truth makes enemies," is of more authority than the scriptural proverb, "Faithful are the wounds of a friend, but the kisses of an enemy are deceitful." [Proverbs 27:6]

32. Wherefore let us rather do our utmost to set before our beloved friends, who most cordially wish us well in our labours, such an example that they may know that it is possible for the most intimate friends to differ so much in opinion, that the views of the one may be contradicted by the other without any diminution of their mutual affection, and without hatred being kindled by that truth which is due to genuine friendship, whether the contradiction be in itself in accordance with truth, or at least, whatever its intrinsic value is, be spoken from a sincere heart by one who is resolved not "to hide in his heart anything which does not agree with the utterance of his lips. Let therefore our brethren, your friends, of whom you bear testimony that they are vessels of Christ, believe me when I say that it was wholly against my will that my letter came into the hands of many others before it

reached your own, and that my heart is filled with no small sorrow for this mistake. How it happened would take long to tell, and this is now, if I am not mistaken, unnecessary; since, if my word is to be taken at all in regard to this, it suffices for me to say that it was not done by me with the sinister intention which is supposed by some, and that it was not by my wish, or arrangement, or consent, or design that this has taken place.

If they do not believe this, which I affirm in the sight of God, I can do no more to satisfy them. Far be it, however, from me to believe that they made this suggestion to your Holiness with the malicious desire to kindle enmity between you and me, from which may God in His mercy defend us! Doubtless, without any intention of doing me wrong, they readily suspected me, as a man, to be capable of failings common to human nature. For it is right for me to believe this concerning them, if they be vessels of Christ appointed not to dishonour, but to honour, and made meet by God for every good work in His great house. [2 Timothy 2:20-21] If, however, this my solemn protestation come to their knowledge, and they still persist in the same opinion of my conduct, you will yourself see that in this they will do wrong.

33. As to my having written that I had never sent to Rome a book against you, I wrote this because, in the first place, I did not regard the name "book" as applicable to my letter, and therefore was under the impression that you had heard of something else entirely different from it; in the second place, I had not sent the letter in question to Rome, but to you; and in the third place, I did not consider it to be against you, because I knew that I had been prompted by the sincerity of friendship, which should give liberty for the exchange of suggestions and corrections between us. Leaving out of sight for a little while your friends of whom I have spoken, I implore yourself, by the grace whereby we have been redeemed, not to suppose that I have been guilty of artful flattery in anything which I have said in my letters concerning the good gifts which have been by the Lord's goodness bestowed on you. If, however, I have in anything wronged you, forgive me. As to that incident in the life of some forgotten bard, which, with perhaps more pedantry than good taste, I quoted from classic literature, I beg you not to carry the application of it to yourself further than my words warranted for I immediately added:

"I do not say this in order that you may recover the faculty of spiritual sight — far be it from me to say that you have lost it!— but that, having eyes both clear and quick in discernment, you may turn them to this matter. I thought a reference to that incident suitable exclusively in connection with the παλινῳδία, in which we ought all to imitate Stesichorus if we have written anything which it becomes our duty to correct in a writing of later date, and not at all in connection with the blindness of Stesichorus, which I neither ascribed to your mind, nor feared as likely to befall you. And again, I beseech you to correct boldly whatever you see

needful to censure in my writings. For although, so far as the titles of honour which prevail in the Church are concerned, a bishop's rank is above that of a presbyter, nevertheless in many things Augustine is in inferior to Jerome; albeit correction is not to be refused nor despised, even when it comes from one who in all respects may be an inferior.

34. As to your translation, you have now convinced me of the benefits to be secured by your proposal to translate the Scriptures from the original Hebrew, in order that you may bring to light those things which have been either omitted or perverted by the Jews. But I beg you to be so good as state by what Jews this has been done, whether by those who before the Lord's advent translated the Old Testament— and if so, by what one or more of them — or by the Jews of later times, who may be supposed to have mutilated or corrupted the Greek manuscripts, in order to prevent themselves from being unable to answer the evidence given by these concerning the Christian faith. I cannot find any reason which should have prompted the earlier Jewish translators to such unfaithfulness. I beg of you, moreover, to send us your translation of the Septuagint, which I did not know that you had published. I am also longing to read that book of yours which you named De optimo genere interpretandi, and to know from it how to adjust the balance between the product of the translator's acquaintance with the original language, and the conjectures of those who are able commentators on the Scripture, who, notwithstanding their common loyalty to the one true faith, must often bring forward various opinions on account of the obscurity of many passages; although this difference of interpretation by no means involves departure from the unity of the faith; just as one commentator may himself give, in harmony with the faith which he holds, two different interpretations of the same passage, because the obscurity of the passage makes both equally admissible.

35. I desire, moreover, your translation of the Septuagint, in order that we may be delivered, so far as is possible, from the consequences of the notable incompetency of those who, whether qualified or not, have attempted a Latin translation; and in order that those who think that I look with jealousy on your useful labours, may at length, if it be possible, perceive that my only reason for objecting to the public reading of your translation from the Hebrew in our churches was, lest, bringing forward anything which was, as it were, new and opposed to the authority of the Septuagint version, we should trouble by serious cause of offense the flocks of Christ, whose ears and hearts have become accustomed to listen to that version to which the seal of approbation was given by the apostles themselves. Wherefore, as to that shrub in the book of Jonah, if in the Hebrew it is neither "gourd" nor "ivy," but something else which stands erect, supported by its own stem without other props, I would prefer to call it "gourd" in all our Latin versions; for I do not think that the Seventy would have rendered it thus at random, had they not known that the plant was something like a gourd.

36. I think I have now given a sufficient answer (perhaps more than sufficient) to your three letters; of which I received two by Cyprian, and one by Firmus. In replying, send whatever you think likely to be of use in instructing me and others. And I shall take more care, as the Lord may help me, that any letter which I may write to you shall reach yourself before it falls into the hand of any other, by whom its contents may be published abroad; for I confess that I would not like any letter of yours to me to meet with the fate of which you justly complain as having befallen my letter to you. Let us, however, resolve to maintain between ourselves the liberty as well as the love of friends; so that in the letters which we exchange, neither of us shall be restrained from frankly stating to the other whatever seems to him open to correction, provided always that this be done in the spirit which does not, as inconsistent with brotherly love, displease God. If, however, you do not think that this can be done between us without endangering that brotherly love, let us not do it: for the love which I should like to see maintained between us is assuredly the greater love which would make this mutual freedom possible; but the smaller measure of it is better than none at all.

Letter 117. To a Mother and Daughter Living in Gaul.

A monk of Gaul had during a visit to Bethlehem asked Jerome for advice under the following circumstances. His mother was a church-widow and his sister a religious virgin but the two could not agree. They were accordingly living apart but neither by herself. For each had taken into her house a monk ostensibly to act as steward but really to be a paramour. At the request of his visitor Jerome now writes to both mother and daughter urging them to dismiss their companions; or at any rate to live together: and pointing out the grave scandal that must otherwise be caused. From the treatise against Vigilantius (§3) we learn that ill-natured critics maintained that the persons and circumstances described in the letter were alike fictitious and that Jerome in writing it was but exercising his ingenuity on a congenial theme. The date is a.d. 405. Introduction.

1. A certain brother from Gaul has told me that his virgin-sister and widowed mother, though living in the same city, have separate abodes and have taken to themselves clerical protectors either as guests or stewards; and that by thus associating with strangers they have caused more scandal than by living apart. When I groaned and expressed what I felt more by silence than words; ”I beseech you,” said he, ”rebuke them in a letter and recall them to mutual harmony; make them once more mother and daughter. To whom I replied, ”a nice task this that you lay upon me, for me a stranger to reconcile two women whom you, a son and brother, have failed to influence. You speak as though I occupied the chair of a bishop instead of being shut up? a monastic cell where, far removed from the world’s turmoil, I lament the sins of the past and try to avoid the temptations of the present. Moreover, it is surely inconsistent, while one buries oneself out of sight, to allow one’s tongue free course through the world. ”You are too fearful,” he replied; ”where is that old hardihood of yours which made you ’scour the world with copious salt,’ as Horace says of Lucilius? [Hor. Sat. I. 10:3, 4] ”It is this,” I rejoined, ”that makes me shy and forbids me to open my lips. For through accusing crime I have been myself made out a criminal.

Men have disputed and denied my assertions until, as the proverb goes, I hardly know whether I have ears or feeling left. The very walls have resounded with curses levelled at me, and 'I was the song of drunkards.' Under the compulsion of an unhappy experience I have learned to be silent, thinking it better to set a watch before my mouth and to keep the door of my lips than to incline my heart to any evil thing, [Ps. 141:3, Ps. 141:4] or, while censuring the faults of others, myself to fall into that of detraction. In answer to this he said: "Speaking the truth is not detraction. Nor will you lecture the world by administering a particular rebuke; for there are few persons, if any, open to this special charge. I beg of you, therefore, as I have put myself to the trouble of this long journey, that you will not suffer me to have come for nothing. The Lord knows that, after the sight of the holy places, my principal object in coming has been to heal by a letter from you the division between my sister and my mother. "Well," I replied, "I will do as you wish, for after all the letters will be to persons beyond the sea and words written with reference to definite persons can seldom offend other people. But I must ask you to keep what I say secret. You will take my advice with you to encourage you by the way;

if it is listened to, I will rejoice as much as you; while if, as I rather think, it is rejected, I shall have wasted my words and you will have made a long journey for nothing."

The Letter. 2. In the first place my sister and my daughter, I wish you to know that I am not writing to you because I suspect anything evil of you. On the contrary I implore you to live in harmony, so as to give no ground for any such suspicions. Moreover had I supposed you fast bound in sin-far be this from you-I should never have written, for I should have known that my words would be addressed to deaf ears. Again, if I write to you somewhat sharply, I beg of you to ascribe this not to any harshness on my part but to the nature of the ailment which I attempt to treat. Cautery and the knife are the only remedies when mortification has once set in; poison is the only antidote known for poison; great pain can only be relieved by inflicting greater pain. Lastly I must say this that even if your own consciences acquit you of misdoing, yet the very rumour of such brings disgrace upon you. Mother and daughter are names of affection; they imply natural ties and reciprocal duties; they form the closest of human relations after that which binds the soul to God. If you love each other, your conduct calls for no praise: but if you hate each other, you have committed a crime. The Lord Jesus was subject to His parents. [Luke 2:51] He reverenced that mother of whom He was Himself the parent; He respected the foster-father whom He had Himself fostered; for He remembered that He had been carried in the womb of the one and in the arms of the other. Wherefore also when He hung upon the cross He commended to His disciple [Joh. 19:26, Joh. 19:27] the mother whom He had never before His passion parted from Himself.

3. Well, I shall say no more to the mother, for perhaps age, weakness, and loneliness make sufficient excuses for her; but to you the daughter I say: ”Is a mother’s house too small for you whose womb was not too small? When you have lived with her for ten months in the one, can you not bear to live with her for one day in the other? or are you unable to meet her gaze? Can it be that one who has borne you and reared you, who has brought you up and knows you, is dreaded by you as a witness of your homelife? If you are a true virgin, why do you fear her careful guardianship; and, if you have fallen, why do you not openly marry? Wedlock is like a plank offered to a shipwrecked man and by its means you may remedy what previously you have done amiss. I do not mean that you are not to repent of your sin or that you are to continue in evil courses; but, when a tie of the kind has been formed, I despair of breaking it altogether. However, a return to your mother will make it easier for you to bewail the virginity which you have lost through leaving her. Or if you are still unspotted and have not lost your chastity, be careful of it for you may lose it. Why must you live in a house where you must daily struggle for life and death? Can any one sleep soundly with a viper near him? No; for, though it may not attack him it is sure to frighten him. It is better to be where there is no danger, than to be in danger and to escape. In the one case we have a calm; in the other careful steering is necessary. In the one case we are filled with joy; in the other we do but avoid sorrow.

4. But you will perhaps reply: ”my mother is not well-behaved, she desires the things of the world, she loves riches, she disregards fasting, she stains her eyes with antimony, she likes to walk abroad in gay attire, she hinders me from the monastic vow, and so I cannot live with her. But first of all, even though she is as you say, you will have the greater reward for refusing to forsake her with all her faults. She has carried you in her womb, she has reared you; with gentle affection she has borne with the troublesome ways of your childhood. She has washed your linen, she has tended you when sick, and the sickness of maternity was not only borne for you but caused by you. She has brought you up to womanhood, she has taught you to love Christ. You ought not to be displeased with the behaviour of a mother who has consecrated you as a virgin to the service of your spouse. Still if you cannot put up with her dainty ways and feel obliged to shun them, and if your mother really is, as people so often say, a woman of the world, you have others, virgins like yourself, the holy company of chastity. Why, when you forsake your mother, do you choose for companion a man who perhaps has left behind him a sister and mother of his own? You tell me that she is hard to get on with and that he is easy;

that she is quarrelsome and that he is amiable. I will ask you one question: Did you go straight from your home to the man, or did you fall in with him afterwards? If you went straight to him, the reason why you left your mother is plain. If you fell in with him afterwards, you shew by your choice what you missed under your

mother's roof. The pain that I inflict is severe and I feel the knife as much as you. "He that walketh uprightly walketh surely. [Prov. 10:9] Only that my conscience would smite me, I should keep silence and be slow to blame others where I am not guiltless myself. Having a beam in my own eye I should be reluctant to see the mote in my neighbour's. But as it is I live far away among Christian brothers; my life with them is honourable as eyewitnesses of it can testify; I rarely see, or am seen by, others. It is most shameless, therefore, in you to refuse to copy me in respect of self-restraint, when you profess to take me as your model. If you say: "my conscience is enough for me too. God is my judge who is witness of my life. I care not what men may say; let me urge upon you the apostle's words: "provide things honest" not only in the sight of God but also "in the sight of all men. [Rom. 12:17] If any one carps at you for being a Christian and a virgin, mind it not;

you have left your mother it may be said to live in a monastery among virgins, but censure on this score is your glory. When men blame a maid of God not for self-indulgence but only for insensibility to affection, what they condemn as callous disregard of a parent is really a lively devotion towards God. For you prefer to your mother Him whom you are bidden to prefer to your own soul. [Luke 14:26] And if the day ever comes that she also shall so prefer Him, she will find in you not a daughter only but a sister as well.

5. "What then?" you will say, "is it a crime to have a man of religion in the house with me?" You seize me by the collar and drag me into court either to sanction what I disapprove or else to incur the dislike of many. A man of religion never separates a daughter from her mother. He welcomes both and respects both.A daughter may be as religious as she pleases; still a mother who is a widow is a guaranty for her chastity. If this person whoever he is is of the same age with yourself, he should honour your mother as though she were his own; and, if he is older, he should love you as a daughter and subject you to a mother's discipline. It is not good either for your reputation or for his that he should like you more than your mother; for his affection might appear to be less for you than for your youth. This is what I should say if a monk were not your brother and if you had no relatives able to protect you. But what excuse has a stranger for thrusting himself in where there are both a mother and a brother, the one a widow and the other a monk? It is good for you to feel that you are a daughter and a sister. However, if you cannot manage both, and if your mother is too hard a morsel to swallow, your brother at any rate should satisfy you. Or, if he is too harsh, she that bore you may prove more gentle. Why do you turn pale? Why do you get excited? Why do you blush, and with trembling lips betray the restlessness of your mind? One thing only can surpass a woman's love for her mother and brother; and that is her passion for her husband.

6. I am told, moreover, that you frequent suburban villas and their pleasant gardens in the company of relatives and intimate friends. I have no doubt that it is

some female cousin or connexion who for her own satisfaction carries you about with her as a novel kind of attendant. Far be it from me to suspect that you would desire men's society; even though they should be those of your own family. But pray, maiden, answer me this; do you appear alone in your kinsfolk's society? or do you bring your favourite with you? Shameless as you may be, you will hardly venture to flaunt him in the eyes of the world. If you ever do so, your whole circle will cry out about both you and him; every one's finger will be pointed at you; and your cousins who in your presence to please you call him a monk and a man of religion, will laugh at you behind your back for having such an unnatural husband. If on the other hand you go out alone-which I rather suppose to be the case-you will find yourself clothed in sober garb among slave youths, women married or soon to be so, wanton girls, and dandies with long hair and tight-fitting vests. Some bearded fop will offer you his hand he will hold you up if you feel tired, and the pressure of his fingers will either be a temptation to you, or will shew that you are a temptation to him.

Again when you sit down to table with married men and women, you will have to see kisses in which you have no part, and dishes partaken of which are not for you. Moreover it cannot but do you harm to see other women attired in silk dresses and gold brocades. At table also whether you like it or not, you will be forced to eat flesh and that of different kinds. To make you drink wine they will praise it as a creature of God. To induce you to take baths they will speak of dirt with disgust; and, when on second thoughts you do as you are bid, they will with one voice salute you as spotless and open, a thorough lady. Meantime some singer will give to the company a selection of softly flowing airs; and as he will not venture to look at other men's wives, he will constantly fix his eyes on you who have no protector. He will speak by nods and convey by his tone what he is afraid to put into words. Amid inducements to sensuality so marked as these, even iron wills are apt to be overcome with desire; an appetite which is the more imperious in virgins because they suppose. that sweetest of which they have no experience. Heathen legends tell us that sailors actually ran their ships on the rocks that they might listen to the songs of the Sirens; and that the lyre of Orpheus had power to draw to itself trees and animals and to soften flints.

In the banquet-hall chastity is hard to keep. A shining skin shews a sin-stained soul.

7. As a schoolboy I have read of one-and have seen his effigy true to the life in the streets-who continued to cherish an unlawful passion even when his flesh scarcely clung to his bones, and whose malady remained uncured until death cured it. What then will become of you a young girl physically sound, dainty, stout, and ruddy, if you allow yourself free range among flesh-dishes, wines, and baths, not to mention married men and bachelors? Even if when solicited you refuse to consent, you will

take the fact of your being asked as evidence that you are considered handsome. A sensual mind pursues dishonourable objects with greater zest than honourable ones; and when a thing is forbidden hankers after it with greater pleasure. Your very dress, cheap and sombre as it is, is an index of your secret feelings. For it has no creases and trails along the ground to make you appear taller than you are. Your vest is purposely ripped asunder to shew what is beneath and while hiding what is repulsive, to reveal what is fair. As you walk, the very creaking of your black and shiny shoes attracts the notice of the young men. You wear stays to keep your breasts in place, and a heaving girdle closely confines your chest. Your hair covers either your forehead or your ears. Sometimes too you let your shawl drop so as to lay bare your white shoulders; and, as if unwilling that they should be seen, you quickly conceal what you have purposely disclosed. And when in public you for modesty's sake cover your face, like a practised harlot you only shew what is likely to please.

8. You will exclaim "How do you know what I am like, or how, when you are so far away, can you see what I am doing?" Your own brother's tears and sobs have told me, his frequent and scarcely endurable bursts of grief. Would that he had lied or that his words had been words of apprehension only and not of accusation. But, believe me, liars do not shed tears. He is indignant that you prefer to himself a young man, not it is true clothed in silk or wearing his hair long but muscular and dainty in the midst of his squalor; and that this fellow holds the purse-strings, looks after the weaving, allots the servants their tasks, rules the household, and buys from the market all that is needed. He is at once steward and master, and, as he anticipates the slaves in their duties, he is carped at by all the domestics. Everything that their mistress has not given them they declare that he has stolen from them. Servants as a class are full of complaints; and no matter what you give them, it is always too little. For they do not consider how much you have but only how much you give; and they make up for their chagrin in the only way they can, that is, by grumbling. One calls him a parasite, another an impostor, another a money-seeker, another by some novel appellation that hits his fancy. They noise it abroad that he is constantly at your bed-side, that when you are sick he runs to fetch nurses, that he holds basins, airs sheets, and folds bandages for you. The world is only too ready to believe scandal, and stories invented at home soon get afloat abroad. Nor need you be surprised if your servantmen and servantmaids get up such tales about you, when even your mother and your brother complain of your conduct.

9. Do, therefore, what I advise you and entreat you to do: if possible, be reconciled with your mother; or, if this may not be, at least come to terms with your brother. Or if you are filled with an implacable hatred of relationships usually so dear, separate at all events from the man, whom you are said to prefer to your own flesh and blood, and, if even this is impossible for you, (for, if you could leave him, you would

certainly return to your own) pay more regard to appearances in harbouring him as your companion. Live in a separate building and take your meals apart; for if you remain under one roof with him slanderers will say that you share with him your bed. You may thus easily get help from him when you feel you need it, and yet to a considerable degree escape public discredit. Yet you must take care not to contract the stain of which Jeremiah tells us that no nitre or fuller's soap can wash it out. [Jer. 2:22] When you wish him to come to see you, always have witnesses present; either friends, or freedmen, or slaves. A good conscience is afraid of no man's eyes. Let him come in unembarrassed and go out at his ease. Let his silent looks, his unspoken words and his whole carriage, though at times they may imply embarrassment, yet indicate peace of mind. Pray, open your ears and listen to the outcry of the whole city.

You have already both of you lost your own names and are known each by that of the other. You are spoken of as his, and he is said to be yours. Your mother and your brother have heard this and are ready to take you in between them. They implore you to consent to this arrangement, so that the scandal of your intimacy with this man which is confined to yourself may give place to a glory common to all. You can live with your mother and he with your brother. You can more boldly shew your regard for one who is your brother's comrade; and your mother will more properly esteem one who is the friend of her son and not of her daughter. But if you frown and refuse to accept my advice, this letter will openly expostulate with you. 'Why,' it will say, 'do you beset another man's servant? Why do you make Christ's minister your slave? Look at the people and scan each face as it comes under your view. When he reads in the church all eyes are fixed upon you; and you, using the licence of a wife, glory in your shame. Secret infamy no longer contents you; you call boldness freedom; "you have a whore's forehead and refuse to be ashamed. [From Jer. 3:3]

10. Once more you exclaim that I am over-suspicious, a thinker of evil, too ready to follow rumours. What? I suspicious? I ill-natured? I, who as I said in the beginning have taken up my pen because I have no suspicions? Or is it you that are careless, loose, disdainful? You who at the age of twenty-five have netted in your embrace a youth whose beard has scarcely grown? An excellent instructor he must be, able no doubt by his severe looks both to warn and frighten you! No age is safe from lust, yet gray hairs are some security for decent conduct. A day will surely come (for time glides by imperceptibly) when your handsome young favourite will find a wealthier or more youthful mistress. For women soon age and particularly if they live with men. You will be sorry for your decision and regret your obstinacy in a day when your means and reputation shall be alike gone, and when this unhappy intimacy shall be happily broken off. But perhaps you feel sure of your ground and see no reason to fear a breach where affection has had so long a time to develop and grow.

11. To you also, her mother, I must say a word. Your years put you beyond the reach of scandal; do not take advantage of this to indulge in sin. It is more fitting that your daughter should learn from you how to part from a companion than that you should learn from her how to give up a paramour. You have a son, a daughter, and a son-in-law, or at least one who is your daughter's partner. Why then should you seek other society than theirs, or wish to kindle anew expiring flames?It would be more becoming in you to screen your daughter's fault than to make it an excuse for your own misdoing. Your son is a monk, and, if he were to live with you, he would strengthen you in your religious profession and in your vow of widowhood. Why should you take in a complete stranger, especially in a house not large enough to hold a son and a daughter? You are old enough to have grand-children. Invite the pair home then. Your daughter went away by herself; let her return with this man. I say 'man' and not 'husband' that none may cavil. The word describes his sex and not his relation to her. Or if she blushes to accept your offer or finds the house in which she was born too narrow for her, then move both of you to her abode. However limited may be its accommodation, it can take in a mother and a brother better than a stranger.

In fact, if she lives in the same house and occupies the same room with a man, she cannot long preserve her chastity. It is different when two women and two men live together. If the third person concerned -he, I mean, who fosters your old age-will not make one of the party and causes only dissension and confusion, the pair of you can do without him. But if the three of you remain together, then your brother and son will offer him a sister and a mother. Others may speak of the two strangers as step-father and son-in-law; but your son must speak of them as his foster-father and his brother.

Note. 12. Working quickly I have completed this letter in a single night anxious alike to gratify a friend and to try my hand on a rhetorical theme. Then early in the morning he has knocked at my door on the point of starting. I wish also to shew my detractors that like them I too can say the first thing that comes into my head. I have, therefore, introduced few quotations from the scriptures and have not, as in most of my books, interwoven its flowers in my discourse. The letter has been, in fact, dictated off-hand and poured forth by lamp-light so fast that my tongue has outstripped my secretaries' pens and that my volubility has baffled the expedients of shorthand. I have said this much that those who make no allowances for want of ability may make some for want of time.

Letter 118. To Julian.

Jerome writes to Julian, a wealthy nobleman apparently of Dalmatia (§5), to console him for the loss of his wife and two daughters all of whom had recently died. He reminds Julian of the trials of Job and recommends him to imitate the patience of the patriarch. He also urges him to follow the example set by Pammachius and Paulinus, that is, to give up his riches and to become a monk for the sake of Christ. The date of the letter is 406 a.d. I. At the very instant of his departure Ausonius, a son to me as he is a brother to you, gave me a late glimpse of himself but quickly hurried away again, saying good-morning and good-bye together. Yet he thought that be would return empty-handed unless he could bring you some trifle from me however hastily written. Clothed in scarlet as befitted his rank, he had already strapped on his sword-belt and sent down a requisition to have a stage-horse saddled. Still he made me send for my secretary and dictate a letter to him. This I did with such rapidity that his nimble hand could hardly keep pace with my words or manage to put down my hurried sentences. Thus hasty dictation has taken the place of careful writing; and, if I break my long silence, it is but to offer you an expression of good will. This is an impromptu letter without logical order or charm of style. You must look on me for once as a friend only; you will find, I assure you, nothing of the orator here. Bear in mind that it has been dashed off on the spur of the moment and given as a provision for the way to one in a hurry to depart.

Holy scripture says: ”a tale out of season is as musick in mourning.” [Ecclus. 22:6] Accordingly I have disdained the graces of rhetoric and those charms of eloquence which boys find so captivating, and have fallen back on the serious tone of the sacred writings. For in these are to be found true medicines for wounds and sure remedies for sorrow. In these a mother receives back her only son even on the bier. [Luke 7:11-15] In these a crowd of mourners hears the words: ”the maid is not dead but sleepeth.” [Matt. 9:24] In these one that is four days dead comes forth bound at the call of the Lord. [Joh. 11:39, Joh. 11:43, Joh. 11:44]

2. I hear that in a short space of time you have suffered. several bereavements, that you have buried in quick succession two young unmarried daughters, and that

Faustina, most chaste and loyal of wives, your sister in the fervour of her faith and your one comfort in the loss of your children, has suddenly fallen asleep and been taken from you. You have been like a shipwrecked man, who has no sooner reached the shore than he falls into the hands of brigands, or in the eloquent language of the prophet like one "who did flee from a lion, and a bear met him; or went into the house, and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him. [Amos 5:19] Pecuniary losses have followed your bereavements; the entire province has been overrun by a barbarian enemy, and in the general devastation your private property has been destroyed, your flocks and herds have been driven off, and your poor slaves either made prisoners or else slain. To crown all, your only daughter, made all the more dear to you by the loss of the others, has for her husband a young nobleman who, to say nothing worse of him, has given you more occasion for sorrow than for rejoicing. Such is the list of the trials that have been laid upon you; such is the conflict waged by the old enemy against Julian a raw recruit to Christ's standard.

If you look only to yourself your troubles are indeed great but if you look to the strong Warrior, [Cf. Rev. 19:11-16] they are but child's play and the conflict is only the semblance of one. After untold trials a wicked wife was still left to the blessed Job, the devil hoping that he might learn from her to blaspheme God. You on the other hand have been deprived of an excellent one that you might learn to go without consolation in the hour of misfortune. Yet it is far harder to put up with a wife whom you dislike than it is to mourn for one whom you dearly love. Moreover when Job's children died they found a common tomb beneath the ruins of his house, and all he could do to shew his parental affection was to rend his garments to fall upon the ground and to worship, saying: "Naked came I out of my mother's womb, and naked shall I return thither: the Lord gave and the Lord hath taken away: it has been as the Lord pleased: blessed be the name of the Lord. [Job 1:20, 21, LXX] But you, to put the matter briefly, have been allowed to perform the obsequies of your dear ones; and those obsequies have been attended by many respectful kinsmen and comforting friends. Again Job lost all his wealth at once; and, as, one after another, the messengers of woe unfolded new calamities, he flinched as little as the sage of whom Horace writes: [Horace, C. III. 3:7, 8] -

"Shatter the world to atoms if you will. Fearless will be the man on whom it falls." But with you the case is different. The greater part of your substance has been left to you, and your trials have not been greater than you can bear. For you have not yet attained to such perfection that the devil has to marshal all his forces against you.

3. Long ago this wealthy proprietor and still wealthier father was made by a sudden stroke destitute and bereaved. But as, in spite of all that befel him, he had not sinned before God or spoken foolishly, the Lord-exulting in the victory of his servant

and regarding Job's patience as His own triumph-said to the devil: "Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil? and still he holdeth fast his integrity? [Job 2:3] He finely adds the last clause because it is difficult for innocence to refrain from murmuring when it is overborne by misfortune; and to avoid making a shipwreck of faith when it sees that its sufferings are unjustly inflicted. The devil answered the Lord and said: "Skin for skin, yea, all that a man hath will he give for his life. But put forth thine hand now, and touch his bone and his flesh, and he will curse thee to thy face. [Job 2:4, Job 2:5] See how crafty the adversary is, and how hardened in sin his evil days have made him! He knows the difference between things external and internal. He knows that even the philosophers of the world call the former "ἀ διάφορα" that is indifferent, and that the perfection of virtue does not consist in losing or disdaining them. It is the latter, those that are internal and objects of preference, the loss of which inevitably causes chagrin.

Wherefore he boldly contradicts what God has said and declares that Job deserves no praise at all; since he has yielded up no part of himself but only what is outside himself, since he has given for his own skin the skins of his children, and since he has but laid down his purse to secure the health of his body. From this your sagacity may perceive that your trials have so far only reached the point at which you give hide for hide, skin for skin, and are ready to give all that you have for your life. The Lord has not yet stretched forth His hand upon you, or touched your flesh, or broken your bones. Yet it is when such afflictions as these are laid upon you that it is Bard not to groan and not to 'bless' God to His face, that is to curse Him. The word 'bless' is used in the same way in the books of Kings where it is said of Naboth that he 'blessed' God and the king and was therefore stoned by the people. [1 K. 21:10, Vulg. But the Lord knew His champion and felt sure that this great hero would even in this last and severest conflict prove unconquerable. Therefore He said: "Behold he is in thine hand; but save his life. [Job 2:6] The holy man's flesh is placed at the devil's disposal, but his vital powers are withheld.

For if the devil had smitten that on which sensation and mental judgment depend, the guilt arising from a misuse of these faculties I would have lain at the door not of him who committed the sin but of him who had overthrown the balance of his mind.

4. Others may praise you if they will, and celebrate your victories over the devil. They may eulogize you for the smiling face with which you bore the loss of your daughters, or for the resolution with which, forty days after they fell asleep, you exchanged your mourning for a white robe to attend the dedication of a martyr's bones; unconcerned for a bereavement which was the concern of the whole city, and anxious only to share in a martyr's triumph. Nay, say they, when you bore your

wife to burial, it was not as one dead but as one setting forth on a journey. But I shall not deceive you with flattering words or take the ground from under your feet with slippery praises. Rather will I say what it is good for you to hear: ”My son, if thou come to serve the Lord, prepare thy soul for temptation,” [Ecclus. 2:1] and ”when thou shalt have done all those things which are commanded thee, say, I am an unprofitable servant; I have done that which was my duty to do.” [Luke 17:10 (adapted)] Say to God: ”the children that thou hast taken from me were Thine own gift. The hand-maiden that Thou hast taken to Thyself Thou also didst lend to me for a season to be my solace. I am not aggrieved that Thou hast taken her back, but thankful rather that Thou hast previously given her to me.”

Once upon a time a rich young man boasted that he had fulfilled all the requirements of the law, but the Lord said to him (as we read in the gospel): ”One thing thou lackest: if thou wilt be perfect, go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor; and come and follow me. [Mark 10:21] He who declared that he had done all things gave way at the first onset to the power of riches. Wherefore they who are rich find it hard to enter the kingdom of heaven, a kingdom which desires for its citizens souls that soar aloft free from all ties and hindrances. ”Go thy way,” the Lord says, ”and sell” not a part of thy substance but ”all that thou hast, and give to the poor; not to thy friends or kinsfolk or relatives, not to thy wife or to thy children. I will even go farther and say: keep back nothing for yourself because you fear to be some day poor, lest by so doing you share the condemnation of Ananias and Sapphira; [Acts 5:1-10] but give everything to the poor and make to yourself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness that they may receive you into everlasting habitations. [Luke 16:9] Obey the Master’s injunction ”follow me,” [Matt. 9:9] and take the Lord of the world for your possession; that you may be able to sing with the prophet, ”The Lord is my portion,” [Ps. 16:5] and like a true Levite [Nu. 18:20-24] may possess no earthly inheritance.

I cannot but advise you thus if you wish to be perfect, if you desire to attain the pinnacle of the apostles’ glory, if you wish to take up your cross and to follow Christ. When once you have put your hand to the plough you must not look back; [Luke 9:62] when once you stand on the housetop you must think no more of your clothes within; to escape your Egyptian mistress [Gen. 39:12] you must abandon the cloak that belongs to this world. Even Elijah, in his quick translation to heaven could not take his mantle with him, but left in the world the garments of the world. [2 K. 2:11, 2 K. 2:13] Such conduct, you will object, is for him who would emulate the apostles, for the man who aspires to be perfect. But why should not you aspire to be perfect? Why should not you who hold a foremost place in the world hold a foremost place also in Christ’s household? Is it because you have been married? Peter was married too, but when he forsook his ship and his nets he forsook his wife also. [But see 1 Cor. 9:5] The Lord who wills that all men shall be saved and prefers the repentance of a sinner to his death [1 Tim. 2:4; 2 Pet. 3:9] has, in His

almighty providence, removed from you this excuse. Your wife can no longer draw you earthwards, but you can follow her as she draws you heavenwards.

Provide good things for your children who have gone home before you to the Lord. Do not let their portions go to swell their sister's fortune, but use them to ransom four own soul and to give sustenance to the needy. These are the necklaces your daughters expect from you; these are the jewels they wish to see sparkle on their foreheads. The money which they would have wasted in buying silks may well be considered saved when it provides cheap clothing for the poor. They ask you for their portions. Now that they are united to their spouse they are loth to appear poor and undistinguished: they desire to have the ornaments that befit their rank.

5. Nor may you excuse yourself on the score of your noble station and the responsibilities of wealth. Look at Pammachius and at Paulinus that presbyter of glowing faith both of whom have offered to the Lord not only their riches but themselves. In spite of the devil and his shuffling they have by no means given skin for skin, but have consecrated their own flesh and bones, yea and their very souls unto the Lord. Surely these may lead you to higher things both by their example and by their preaching, that is, by their deeds and words. You are of noble birth, so are they: but in Christ they are made nobler still. You are rich and held in repute, so once were they: but now instead of being rich and held in repute they are poor and obscure, yet, because it is for Christ's sake, they are really richer and more famous than ever. You too, it is true, shew yourself beneficent, you are said to minister to the wants of the saints, to entertain monks, and to present large sums of money to churches. This however is only the a b c of your soldiership. You despise money; the world's philosophers have done the same. One of these -to say nothing of the rest-cast the price of many possessions into the sea, saying as he did so "To the bottom with you, ye provokers of evil lusts. I shall drown you in the sea that you may never drown me in sin.

If then a philosopher-a creature of vanity whom popular applause can buy and sell-laid down all his burthen at once, how can you think that you have reached virtue's crowning height when you have yielded up but a portion of yours? It is you yourself that the Lord wishes for, "a living sacrifice ...acceptable unto God. [Rom. 12:1] Yourself, I say, and not what you have. And therefore, as he trained Israel by subjecting it to many plagues and afflictions, so does He now admonish you by sending you trials of different kinds. "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth. [Heb. 12:6] The poor widow did but cast two mites into the treasury; yet because she cast in all that she had it is said of her that she surpassed all the rich in offering gifts to God. [Mark 12:43, Mark 12:44] Such gifts are valued not by their weight but by the good-will with which they are made. You may have spent your substance upon numbers of people, and a portion of your fellows may have reason to rejoice in your bounty; yet those who

have received nothing at your hands are still more numerous. Neither the wealth of Darius nor the riches of Croesus would suffice to satisfy the wants of the world's poor.

But if you once give yourself to the Lord and resolve to follow the Saviour in the perfection of apostolic virtue, then you will come to see what your place has hitherto been, and how you have lagged in the rear of Christ's army. Hardly had you begun to mourn for your dead daughters when the fear of Christ dried the tears of paternal affection upon your cheeks. It was a great triumph of faith, true. But how much greater was that won by Abraham who was content to slay his only son, of whom he had been told that he was to inherit the world, yet did not cease to hope that after death Isaac would live again. [Cf. Heb. 11:17-19] Jephthah too offered up his virgin daughter, and for this is placed by the apostle in the roll of the saints. [Judg. 11:34-40; Heb. 11:32] I would not therefore have you offer to the Lord only what a thief may steal from you or an enemy fall upon, or a proscription confiscate, what is liable to fluctuations in value now going up and now down, what belongs to a succession of masters who follow each other as fast as in the sea wave follows wave, and-to say everything in a word-what, whether you like it or not, you must leave behind you when you die.

Rather offer to God that which no enemy can carry off and no tyrant take from you, which will go down with you into the grave, nay on to the kingdom of heaven and the enchantments of paradise. You already build monasteries and support in the various islands of Dalmatia a large number of holy men. But you would do better still if you were to live among these holy men usa holy man yourself. "Be ye holy, saith the Lord, for I am holy. [Lev. 19:2; 1 Pet. 1:16] The apostles boasted that they had left all things and had followed the Saviour. [Luke 18:28] We do not read that they left anything except their ship and their nets; yet they were crowned with the approval of Him who was to be their judge. Why? Because in offering up themselves they had indeed left all that they had.

6. I say all this not in disparagement of your good works or because I wish to under rate your generosity in almsgiving, but because I do not wish you to be a monk among men of the world and a man of the world among monks. I shall require every sacrifice of you for I hear that your mind is devoted to the service of God. If some friend, or follower, or kinsman tries to combat this counsel of mine and to recall you to the pleasures of a handsome table, be sure that he is thinking less of your soul than of his own belly, and remember that death in a moment terminates both elegant entertainments and all other pleasures provided by wealth. Within the short space of twenty days you have lost two daughters, the one eight years old and the other six; and do you suppose that one so old as you are yourself can live much longer? David tells you how long a time you can look for: "the days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of strength they be fourscore

years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow. [Ps. 90:10] Happy is he and to be held worthy of the highest bliss whom old age shall find a servant of Christ and whom the last day shall discover fighting for the Saviour's cause. "He shall not be ashamed when he speaketh with his enemies in the gate.

[Ps. 127:5] On his entrance into paradise it shall be said to him: "thou in thy lifetime receivedst evil things but nowhere thou art comforted. [Luke 16:25 (adapted)] The Lord will not avenge the same sin twice. Lazarus, formerly poor and full of ulcers, whose sores the dogs licked and who barely managed to live, poor wretch, on the crumbs that fell from the rich man's table, is now welcomed into Abraham's bosom and has the joy of finding a father in the great patriarch. It is difficult nay impossible for a man to enjoy both the good things of the present and those of the future, to satisfy his belly here and his mind yonder, to pass from the pleasures of this life to the pleasures of that, to be first in both worlds, and to be held in honour both on earth and in heaven.

7. And if in your secret thoughts you are troubled because I who give you this advice am not myself what I desire you to be, and because you have seen some after beginning well fall midway on their journey; I shall briefly plead in reply that the words which I speak are not mine but those of the Lord and Saviour, and that I urge upon you not the standard which is possible to myself but the ideal which every true servant of Christ must wish for and realize. Athletes as a rule are stronger than their backers; yet the weaker presses the stronger to put forth all his efforts Look not upon Judas denying his Lord but upon Paul confessing Him. Jacob's father was a man of great wealth; yet, when Jacob went to Mesopotamia, he went alone and destitute leaning upon his staff. When he felt weary he had to lie down by the wayside and, delicately nurtured as he had been by his mother Rebekah, was forced to content himself with a stone for a pillow. Yet it was then that he saw the ladder set up from earth to heaven, and the angels ascending and descending on it, and the Lord above it holding out a helping hand to such as fall and encouraging the climbers to fresh efforts by the vision of Himself. Therefore is the spot called Bethel or the house of God; for there day by day there is ascending and descending. When they are careless, even holy men lose their footing; and sinners, if they wash away their stains with tears regain their place. I say this not that those coming down may frighten you but that those going up may stimulate you. For evil can never supply a model and even in worldly affairs incentives to virtue come always from the brighter side.

But I have forgotten my purpose and the limits set to my letter. I should have liked to say a great deal more. Indeed all that I can say is inadequate alike to satisfy the seriousness of the subject and the claims of your rank. But here is our Ausonius beginning to be impatient for the sheets, hurrying the secretaries, and in his impatience at the neighing of his horse, accusing my poor wits of slowness. Remember

me, then, and prosper in Christ. And one thing more; follow the example set you at home by the holy Vera, who like a true follower of Christ does not fear to endure the hardships of pilgrimage. Find in a woman your 'leader in this high emprise.'

Introduction

At the request of Hedibia, a lady of Gaul much interested in the study of scripture, Jerome deals with the following twelve questions. It will be noticed that several of them belong to the historical criticism of our own day. (1) How can anyone be perfect? and How ought a widow without children to live to God? (2) What is the meaning of Matt. xxvi. 29? (3) How are the discrepancies in the evangelical narratives to be accounted for? How can Matt. xxviii. I be reconciled with Mark xvi. I, Mark xvi. 2 (4) How can Matt. xxviii. 9 (Saturday evening) be reconciled with John xx. 1-181-18 (Sunday morning)? (5) How can Matt. xxviii. 9 be reconciled with John xx. 17? (6) How was it that, if there was a guard of soldiers at the sepulchre, Peter and John were allowed to go in freely? (Matt. xxvii. 66: John xx. 1-8.)

(7) How is the statement of Matthew and Mark that the apostles were ordered to go into Galilee to see Jesus there to be reconciled with that of Luke and John who make Him appear to them in Jerusalem? (8) What is the meaning of Matt. xxvii. 50, Matt. xxviii. 51? (9) How is the statement of John xx. 22 that Jesus breathed on his apostles the Holy Ghost to be reconciled with that of Luke (Luke xxiv. 49: Acts i. 4) that He would send it to them after His ascension? (10) What is the meaning of the passage, Rom. ix. 14-29? (11) What is the meaning of 2 Cor. ii. 16? (12) What is the meaning of I Th. v. 23? The date of the letter is 406 or 407 a.d. The below translation sourced from tertullian.org, with the following note: English translation by James Snapp, Jr. via Google Translate

Having found, side-by-side at http://remacle.org/bloodwolf/eglise/jerome/hedibia.htm , the Latin text of Jerome's Epistle 120 — To Hedibia, I used the online Google Translate tool to render the French text into a mechanical sort of English. I then took my best guesses about what the text meant. In the Preface and in the first three questions, I consulted the English translation already made by Roger Pearse, and Burgon's rendering of part of the text, found on pages 53-54 of his 1871 The Last Twelve Verses of Mark. What you read here should not be considered completely reliable as far as details are concerned, and here and there I suspect that I completely obscured the actual meaning of Jerome's statements.

Nevertheless, this rough English text has some value because it is, as far as I know, currently the only complete English translation of Jerome's Epistle 120. Also, by comparing this material to James Kelhoffer's English translation of Ad Marinum, anyone can see that Jerome, as he dictated this letter, depended heavily and extensively upon Ad Marinum. For example, in the first paragraph of Jerome's reply to Question #4; he seeks to resolve a perceived discrepancy by asserting that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, and that an interpreter is responsible for changing a precise and harmonious Hebrew expression into a less appropriate term. This is exactly what Eusebius does in his reply to the second question of Marinus (cf. Kelhoffer, The Witness of Eusebius' ad Marinum, p. 88).

Gratitude is expressed to the creators of the Remacle website, Roger Pearse for announcing the existence of this material at the Remacle website, and to Stephen Carlson, who told Roger about the site. Yours in Christ, James Snapp, Jr.

PREFACE

Although I have never had the honor of seeing your face, I know very well the reputation that you have gained in the world by your ardent faith. So, from far-off Gaul you have written to me, coming to seek me in my solitary repose in the wilderness near Bethlehem, so that I may respond to some little questions on Holy Scripture. And you come on the recommendation of the man of God, my son Apodemius, as if there was not anyone in your province suitably knowledgeable about God's law who could instruct you to see the way through your doubts. But perhaps, instead of seeking to be instructed yourself, you seek me in order to test my ability, and after having consulted others on the difficulties that have caused you to hesitate, you still want to know what I think. Your ancestors Paterus and Delphidus — the first of whom taught rhetoric at Rome before I was born, and the second of whom, during my youth, was illustrious among all the Gauls due to the power of his prose and poetry — both now dead, may not validly chasten me for the liberty I take by instructing a member of their family. They excelled, I admit, in eloquence and in the literature of the humanities, but I daresay, without fear of stealing their glory, that they were less knowledgeable about God's law, in which no one can be instructed except by the Father of lights, who enlightens every man coming into this world, and who is found in the midst of the faithful who are gathered in his name.

So I declare, without fear of being accused of vanity, that in this letter I will not use any pompous words, which belong to the human wisdom that God must destroy one day, but instead the language of faith, treating spiritually spiritual things. Thus the deep of the Old Testament calls to the deep of the gospel with the noise of the waterfall, that is, the prophets and the apostles, and the truth of the Lord shall rise up to the clouds, which He has forbidden to shed rain upon the unbelieving Jews, but rather to water the lands of the Gentiles, and to soften the torrent of thorns, and to sooth the waters of the Dead Sea. So pray that the true Elijah will invigorate

the dead and sterile waters within me, and season the meats that I present to you with the salt of the apostles, to whom He said, ”You are the salt of the earth.” For nothing can be offered to God that is not seasoned with salt. Do not look here for the thunder of that worldly eloquence that Jesus Christ saw fall from heaven like lightning; instead cast your eyes upon this man acquainted with sorrow, who had neither beauty nor attraction, who understands infirmity. And believe that as I respond to your questions, I do not depend on my own training and ability, but on the promise of Him who said, ”Open your mouth and I will fill it.”

QUESTION #1

You ask me how a person can become perfect, and how a childless widow should manage her life. Such a question was put to Jesus Christ by a doctor of the law: ”Master,” he said to him, ”what is it that I do to gain eternal life?” The Lord replied, ”Do you know the commandments?” ”Which commandments?” replied the doctor. Jesus said, ”Do not kill, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal, you shall not bear false witness, honor your father and your mother, and love your neighbor as yourself.” This doctor answered him, ”I kept all these commandments since my youth.” Jesus Christ said, ”You still lack one thing: if you want to be perfect, go, sell what you have and give to the poor; then come and follow me.” So, madam, in response to the question you pose, I will employ the words of Jesus: if you want to be perfect, carry your cross, follow the Savior, emulating Saint Peter, who said, ”You see, Lord, that we have left everything to follow you.” Go, sell everything you have, give to the poor and follow the Savior.

Christ does not say, ”Give it to your children, your brothers, your parents,” for by this standard, even if you had such, the Lord must have first preference: ”Give it to the poor,” or rather, to Christ, whom you assist in the person of the poor. He, being rich, became poor due to love of us — He who said in the thirty-ninth Psalm, ”As for me, I was poor and needy, and the Lord took care of me.” And, at the beginning of the following psalm, ”Blessed is he who is attentive to the needs of the poor and the needy.” Indeed attentiveness is needed to discern the poor from the many people who live in their sins as much as in squalor and poverty; what is meant is those of the sort of whom the apostle Paul spoke when he says, ”They only asked us not to forget the poor.” It was for the relief of these poor people that Paul and Barnabas carefully collected alms on the first day of the week in the congregations of the Gentile converts to the faith, and they disciplined themselves, not sending others, to bring it to those who had been stripped of their property for Jesus Christ — those who suffered persecution, and who told their father and their mother, their wives and their children, ”We do not know you.” These are the authentic poor, who have performed the will of the heavenly Father, and of the Savior who said, ”These are my mother and my brothers: those who carry out the will of My Father.”

In saying this, I do not mean that to prevent alms-giving to Jews, to Gentiles, and to all other poor people of any nation whatsoever. But we must always prefer the Christian to the unbeliever, and among the Christians themselves, we must make a great distinction between a poor man whose life is pure and innocent and one whose life is corrupt and disorderly. For this reason the Apostle Paul, who in many places in his epistles urges the faithful to exercise charity toward the poor, recommends that they do so primarily to fellow believers — to one with whom we are united in the same religion, and who is not separated from the brotherhood by disruptive and corruptive immorality. Inasmuch as Saint Paul commands us to give food to our enemies when they are hungry, and to give them something to drink when thirsty, and thereby to pour coals of fire upon their head, how much more ought we to do so for those who are not our enemies, and who profess a holy Christian life?

It is necessary to take in a beneficial way, and not in a bad sense, what is said by the apostle: ”Thereby you pour coals of fire on his head.” He meant that in doing good to our enemies, we overcome their malice and hatred with our expressions of goodness, and thus we will soften their adamancy; we banish the bitterness and fury to make room for friendship and affection. Thus we pour upon their heads those coals about which it is written, ”A mighty hand launches sharp arrows with devouring coals.” For, just as the seraph of whom Isaiah speaks purified the prophet’s lips with a fiery coal which he had taken from the altar, we shall purify the sins of our enemies, overcoming evil with good, blessing those who curse us, and imitating our Father in heaven, who ”makes his sun rise on the good and the evil, and sends rain on the just and the sinners.”

Since you have no little children, ”use the wealth from swindling to make more friends for yourself, that you may be received in the eternal dwelling-places.” It is not for no reason that the Gospel refers to the earthly riches of wealth as unjust, because they have no source other than the injustice of men, and one cannot gain unless someone else loses. So I consider the axiom to be true, that those with much property are either swindlers, or the heirs of swindlers.

This doctor of the law, being told by Jesus Christ that to be perfect we should renounce all the wealth we possess, could not resolve to do so, because he was rich. Then the Savior, turning to His disciples, said, ”How difficult it is for the rich to enter the kingdom of heaven!” He does not say it is impossible, but it is difficult, although the example that He gives shows an absolute impossibility: ”It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God.” But this is impossible rather than difficult, for it will never be possible for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle; therefore a rich man can never enter the kingdom of heaven. But the camel is a terribly hunchbacked animal, and it usually carries heavy burdens. And when we wander off the path

that Jesus Christ blazed, and follow bad paths that lead to sin, we are loaded with the burden of riches or the weight of our sins, and it is impossible for us to enter the kingdom of God. But if we unload this oppressive weight, and put on the wings of a dove, then we will fly away ourselves; we will find rest, and we will say, ”When you can sleep in the middle of the campfires, you will become like the dove, whose wings are silver, and whose back is as bright as gold.” With our back, which was deformed by the heavy burden that was crushing us, covered with this bright gold, representing the spiritual sense of the divine Scriptures, and with these ”silver wings,” which signify the literal sense, we will be able to enter into the kingdom of God.

The apostles, saying that they had abandoned all their possessions, boldly sought from Jesus Christ a proper reward for this virtue, and the Lord replied, ”Whoever, for My name, shall abandon his house, or his brothers, or his sisters, or his father or mother, or wife, or children, will receive a hundredfold and will inherit eternal life.” What blessedness to have Jesus Christ himself as your debtor, and to receive much in return for little things — the eternal in exchange for the temporary, and durable and strong goods in exchange for our fragile and perishable wealth.

So, if a widow has children, especially if her family is upper-class, she must not leave them in poverty. Let her love them equally, and have regard for her soul, treating it like one of her own children. She must apportion the property together with them, and not abandon everything to them; rather, she must make Christ a fellow-heir. You could perhaps say that this is difficult, and revolting, and that such treatment of children opposes your tender instincts. But you will hear the Lord reply: ”The one who is able to perform such a thing, let him do so,” ”If you want to be perfect, go, sell all that you possess,” etc. In saying, ”If you want to be perfect,” He does not make this burden a requirement, but allows freedom to pursue either course regarding children. Do you want to be perfect and raise yourself to the highest level of virtue? Imitate the apostles, sell everything you have, give to the poor, and follow the Lord. Separated from all creatures and stripped of everything that you own in the world, follow Him bare, with only a cross. Or, are you content not to be perfect, and to remain in the second-highest level of virtue? Then abandon everything you have, and give it to your children and parents. No one will rebuke you, if you follow this lesser way, provided that you also agree that it is fair that you defer to one whose way tends toward perfection.

You will want to tell me that such sublime virtue is for the men and apostles, but it is impossible for a refined woman, who needs a thousand things to maintain her way of life. Hear therefore what the apostle Paul says: ”I do not mean that others are helped and that you are overburdened, but that, to relieve inequality, your abundance compensates for their poverty, so that your poverty is also relieved by their abundance.” That is why the Lord says in the Gospel, ”Whoever has two coats,

let him give to him who has none." Now, if we lived among the ice of Scythia and the snow of the Alps, where not only two and three coats, but even the animal-skins are scarcely sufficient protection from the harsh cold climate, would we be obliged to strip ourselves to clothe others? We must understand "coat" to mean all that is necessary to clothe us and provide what is naturally required, since we are born naked. And by "the provisions of a single day" is meant, whatever is necessary to feed ourselves. In this sense we fathom the commandment in the Gospel, "Do not worry about tomorrow," that is, about the future, and the apostle's statement, "While we have food and covering, we must be content."

If you have more than you need, give to the poor, and know that you are thus paying a debt. Ananias and Sapphira deserved to be condemned by the apostle Saint Peter, because they had quietly set aside part of their property. Is it a crime, you might ask, not to donate everything one has? No, but the apostle punished them with the death penalty because they had lied to the Holy Spirit, for while reserving for themselves what they needed to live, they pretended to surrender completely all earthly things — thus seeking, in vain, only the approval and esteem of men. Notwithstanding that we are free to give or not to give, he who renounces all his goods in order to be perfect must expect that one day in the future his poverty will be rewarded with property. Regarding the life that a widow must lead, the apostle sets the rules in a few words, when he says, "The widow who lives in luxury is dead, although she seems alive." I have dealt with this matter thoroughly in the two books that I have dedicated to Furia and Salvina.

QUESTION #2

How shall we understand what the Savior said in Saint Matthew: ”And I tell you that henceforth I will not drink of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink with you again in the kingdom of My Father”? This passage has caused some authors to invent a certain fable, claiming that Christ will reign in the flesh for a thousand years, and will drink the wine which He has not drunk from that time until the end of the world. But as for us, we believe about the bread, which the Lord broke and gave to His disciples, is nothing but the body of our Lord and Savior, as He Himself said to them, ”Take, eat, this is my body.” And the cup is the one about which He said, ”Drink of this, all of you, for this is My blood of the new covenant, which is shed for many.” This is the cup of which we read in the prophet, ”I take the cup of salvation,” and elsewhere, ”How admirable is your cup which overwhelms me!” So, inasmuch as ”the bread which came down from heaven” is the body of the Lord, and if the wine He gave to His disciples is his blood, ”the blood of the new covenant, which was poured out for many for the remission of sins,” let us reject the Jewish fables, and assemble with the Lord in this great upper room, furnished and prepared, in which He kept the Passover with His apostles, and there, receiving from His hand the cup of the new covenant, and celebrating Easter with Him, let us become intoxicated with that wine of sobriety. For the kingdom of God is not drink and food, but justice, and joy, and peace in the Holy Spirit.

It was not Moses, but our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave us the true bread — He who is both the diner and the dinner, the eater and that which is to be eaten. It is His blood we drink, and we cannot drink it without Him. Every day in His sacrifices, we press the grapes of the true vine, and of the vine of Sorek, which means ”Chosen,” and we drink in this wine of the kingdom of the Father, not according to the letter, but in the newness of the spirit, singing a new song which no one can sing except in the kingdom of the church, which is the kingdom of the Father. The patriarch Jacob desired to eat this bread, saying, ”If the Lord God is with me, and gives me bread to eat and clothes to wear,” and so forth. ”For when we are baptized into Jesus Christ, we are protected by Christ. We eat the bread of angels, and we heard the Lord telling us, ”My food is to do the will of my Father who sent Me, and to accomplish His work.” Let us therefore also do the will of the Father who sent

us, and carry out His work, and Christ will drink His blood in the kingdom of the church with us.

QUESTION #3

Why do the evangelists speak differently about the resurrection of our Lord, and how He appeared to His apostles? Here you first ask why Matthew says that our Lord rose "on the evening of the Sabbath, when the first day of the following week was just beginning to shine," and Saint Mark, on the contrary, said that He arose in the morning, "Jesus arising on the first day of the week in the morning appeared to Mary Magdalene, from whom He had expelled seven demons. And she, departing, told those who were His companions, as they mourned and wept. And these, hearing that He was alive, and that she had seen Him, did not believe in Him." This problem has a twofold solution. Either we do not accept the testimony of Mark, because this final portion is not contained in most of the Gospels that bear his name — almost all the Greek codices lacking it — or else must affirm that Matthew and Mark have both told the truth, that our Lord rose on the evening of the Sabbath, and that He was seen by Mary Magdalene in the morning of the first day of the following week.

So this is how this passage of Saint Mark should be read: "Jesus arising," place a little pause here, then add, "on the first day of the week in the morning appeared to Mary Magdalene," so that, being raised, according to Saint Matthew, in the evening of the last day of the week, He appeared to Mary Magdalene, according to Saint Mark, "the morning of the first day of the week," which is how John also represents the events, stating that He was seen on the morning of the next day. [Hort, Notes, p. 32, describing the parallel to Question #4 in Eusebius' Ad Marinum: "Strangely enough, the answer given by Eusebius to the next question, relating to a supposed contradiction between Mt xxviii 1 and Jo xx 1, is, taken by itself, inconsistent with his former answer: it implicitly excludes that interpretation of οψε σαββατου in Mt which had been there assumed as a standard for correcting the construction of Mc xvi 9. This second answer, evidently founded on the Epistle of Dionysius of Alexandria to Basilides, is however in effect, though not in form, a third alternative to the first difficulty. It thus merely affords an additional demonstration of the indecision often displayed by Eusebius, especially in presence of a conflict of traditional authorities."]

QUESTION #4

How can what Saint Matthew says — that Mary Magdalene saw Jesus Christ ”on the evening of the last day of the week” — agree with what John said, that ”the morning of the first day of the week,” she wept at the tomb?

By ”the first day of the week” is meant Sunday, because the Jews concluded the week on the Sabbath, and pagans marked the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth days of the week with the names of idols and planets. So the apostle Paul instructs the believers in Corinth to collect, on ”the first day of the week,” the alms they designated for the relief of the poor. So do not imagine that Saint Matthew and Saint John do not agree together: they supply different names for only one hour, which is midnight and the singing of the rooster. For Saint Matthew said that our Lord appeared to Mary Magdalene ”on the evening of the last day of the week,” that is, when it was already late and the night was not only underway, but even far advanced, almost gone. And he adds, in further explanation, that the first day of the week was already approaching. As for John, he does not only say, ”The first day of the week, Mary Magdalene came early in the morning to the tomb,” but adds, ”When it was still unclear.” So they both agree about the time, which is the rooster-song and midnight; one of which marked the beginning and the other marked the end. It seems to me that the text of Saint Matthew, who wrote his Gospel in Hebrew, is, ”When it was already late,” and not ”evening,” which the interpreter, who was not aware of the true meaning of this word, translated as ”evening” instead of saying, ”When it was already late.” In the ordinary use of the Latin language, the word means ”elgonza,” late [sero], and we can use it when, for example, we say to someone, ”You came too late,” meaning that a prearranged meeting-time has passed long ago.

Now we meet the objection, ”How can Mary Magdalene, after seeing the risen Lord, come again to the tomb, as the Gospel says, weeping?” We must answer, according to a keen sense of perception, that in accordance with all the gifts that Christ had given, she ran several times to his tomb, either alone or in the company of other women, and that sometimes she gazed adoringly at what she saw, and sometimes she wept as she waited. Some believe, however, that there were two Mary Mag-

dalenes, both natives of the village of Magdelon, and the one who met the risen Christ, according to Saint Matthew, is different from the one which, according to Saint John, appeared so forlorn. What is certain is that the Gospel makes mention of four women called Mary: the first is the mother of our Lord, and the second is Mary, wife of Cleophas and aunt of Jesus Christ, being His mother's sister, and the third is Mary, mother of James and Joses, and the fourth is Mary Magdalene. Some, however, confused the mother of James and Joses with the aunt of Jesus Christ.

Others, to get rid of this difficulty, say that the true reading speaks of Saint Mary, and that he did not include the name of Magdalene, but the scribes have added it inappropriately. As for me, it seems to me that we can meet this challenge in a simpler and less embarrassing way, by saying that these holy women, unable to bear the absence of Jesus Christ, were in transit all night, and went to observe His grave not only once and twice, but constantly, especially as their sleep was disturbed and interrupted by the earthquake, by the sound of splitting stones, by the eclipse of the sun, by all sorts of confusion and inconvenience, and especially by the desire they had to see the Savior.

QUESTION #5

How can we reconcile what Saint Matthew says, that on the evening of the last day of the week, Mary Magdalene, along with another Mary, bowed at the feet of the Savior, and what we read in John, that Jesus said, ”Do not touch me, for I am not yet ascended to my Father?” Mary Magdalene, with the other one, had already seen the risen Christ Jesus, and had fallen prostrate at His feet, but the concern that she felt due to the absence of the Savior did not permit her to remain quiet in her house. She returned to the tomb during the night and, seeing that the stone had been removed which was previously used to close the tomb, she ran to tell Peter and the other disciple whom Jesus dearly loved that they had taken the Lord’s body, and she did not know where he was laid. The woman was simultaneously subject to her piety and her error: her piety, as she sought with such eagerness to seek after the King, and her error, as she said that they had removed the Lord.

Saint Peter and Saint John then went into the tomb, and having seen on one side the body-wrappings, and the other on the shroud that had enveloped the head of the Savior, they were convinced of the resurrection of their divine master, whose body was no longer in the tomb. But Mary stood outside, near the tomb weeping, and bending down to look inside, she saw two angels dressed in white, seated in the place where the body of Jesus had been, one at the head and one at the feet, so that she might observe that it was impossible that men had been capable of removing a body that angels had been guarding, and thus she should have been overjoyed to see these famous and powerful protectors.

These angels, when she saw them, said, ”Woman, why do you weep?”, as Jesus Christ had once said to his mother, ”Woman, what is common between you and me? My time is not yet come.” They address her as ”Woman,” and in saying, ”Why do you weep?” they point out the uselessness of her tears. But the Magdalene was so beside herself, not knowing what to believe, and full of awe at the wonders she saw — wrapped in a cloud, as it were, which was so thick that without realizing that she was speaking to angels, she replied, ”I weep because they have taken away my Lord, and I do not know where they laid him.” O Mary, if you are convinced he is the Lord, and your Lord in particular, how can you believe they have removed

Him? You do not know, you say, where they have gone? How can you ignore what you gaze at, this very moment? She sees angels without realizing it, caught up in fear and amazement, and occupied only by the desire to see the Lord; she turns her head and casts her eyes all around.

Finally, having looked behind her, she saw Jesus standing, without realizing, however, that it was Him. Not that Jesus Christ, as some claim — Manes and other heretics — had changed his figure so as to appear when he wanted in different forms, but rather, the Magdalene, surprised and amazed at all the wonders, thought she was seeing a gardener, such was her anxiety and eagerness. Jesus therefore said to her, as the angels had said, ”Woman, why do you weep?” And He added, ”Who are you looking for?” Mary replied, ”Lord, if you have removed Him, tell me where you put Him and I will take Him thence.” It is an expression of a truly humble faith when she calls to the Savior, ”Lord,” an address which would require a gardener to respond with respect and honesty. But notice, please, the extent of her error and her blindness: she imagines that the gardener was able to remove only the body of Jesus Christ, which was guarded by a company of soldiers, whose tomb was under the protection of angels, and forgetting her inherent weakness, she is persuaded that, alone and frightened as she is, she nevertheless has enough strength to transport the body of a man of full age, and who, never mind the rest, had been embalmed with a hundred pounds of myrrh. Jesus having called by name, so that she knew at least the voice of Him whose face she did not perceive, the woman, still occupied her mistake, said not ”Lord,” but ”Rabboni,” that is to say, ”Teacher.” What reversal of mind! What a way of thinking! She bestows upon a gardener the title of ”Lord,” and calls Jesus Christ as ”Teacher.”

After she had sought among the dead for a man full of life, and she and the other one had run away, without her weakness, her wandering imagination guided her to seek for the dead body of Him whom she had seen alive, whose feet she had fallen before, worshiping Him. So the Lord said to her, ”Do not touch me, because I am not yet ascended to my Father. That is, since you are seeking a dead man, you do not deserve to touch my life. If you believe that I am not yet ascended to my Father, and that men came stealthily to remove my body, you are unworthy to touch me. Jesus told her this, not to cool her zeal or to prevent the confirmation which she sought, but to show her that this fragile and mortal body which He had occupied was surrounded by all the glory and all the radiance of divinity, and that she would not have wished to see the Lord in a tangible and material body, if her faith had been better cultivated, and if she had learned that He would now be with His Father. Indeed, the faith of the apostles seems much more lively and more vibrant, because, unlike the Magdalene, without having seen the angels or the Savior, they merely found the contents of the tomb where His body had been, and they immediately thought that he was truly resurrected.

Some believe that Mary Magdalene, as reported by Saint John, first came to the tomb and saw that the stone which had closed its entrance had been removed, and then, after going back to tell Saint Peter and Saint John, she remained alone, and they see this as a lack of faith, which justly attracted the Lord's rebuke. After they had returned to their homes, she returned again to the tomb with the other Mary, with whom she met the angel who told her that Jesus had risen. Then she left the place of His burial, and bowed at His feet in adoration, as it says, "You will be given salvation. "They came to the Savior," says the Gospel, "and held His feet and worshiped Him. At this time their faith became so strong and so ardent that they were considered worthy to go to the apostles and tell them this happy and pleasant news: Jesus said first, "Do not be afraid," and then, "God tell my brethren that they are to go into Galilee, where they will see Me."

QUESTION #6

How could Saint Peter and Saint John have so easily entered the tomb, which was guarded by a company of soldiers, without any of these guards attempting to defend against their entry? Here is the reason that Saint Matthew gives us: ”The Sabbath being past,” he says, ”and the first day of the next week just beginning to shine, Mary Magdalene and the other Mary came to see the tomb. And suddenly there was a great earthquake, and an angel of the Lord descended from heaven and came to turn the stone which closed the tomb, and sat on it. His face was shining like lightning and his clothing was white as snow, and the guards were so seized with fear that they turned dead-like. Consider these soldiers, consumed by a fear so great that they seemed dead: we ought to believe that they left the tomb, or that they were so stunned and mortified that they did not dare to object. I do not say their non-objection was against men, but to the women who wanted to enter. For this very large stone that had been removed from the tomb’s entrance to the tomb, and the earthquake that seemed to threaten the universe with a general upheaval, and the angel who had descended from heaven, and whose face was so bright that it did not resemble the artificial torches that men are accustomed to turn to their uses, but was like a flash of light that spreads its brightness everywhere — with all these frightening objects, they could easily see through the night, and their souls had been thrown into fear and dread. Thus Saint Peter and Saint John came easily and without hindrance into the tomb.

In fact Mary Magdalene, who had learned the news of the Savior’s resurrection, had already noticed that His body was removed from the tomb, and that the stone which had closed the entrance was removed. Moreover we must not imagine that the angel descended from heaven expressly to remove the stone and open the tomb for Jesus Christ, but the Lord had arisen when He wanted to, without any man knowing, and this heavenly spirit came to teach the faithful what had happened, and to show the evidence, the stone was overthrown; the body of Jesus was no longer in the tomb, and this could be easily discovered through the bright light coming out of his face, removing all the horror of the darkness of the night.

QUESTION #7

How should we understand what we read in Saint Matthew and Saint Mark, that the women who went to the tomb were ordered to tell the apostles that they had to go to Galilee, and there they saw the Lord, along with what is said by Saint Luke and Saint John, that He was seen in Jerusalem? There are many differences in the ways in which the Savior appeared to the eleven apostles. When, out of fear of the Jews' forcefulness, they remained in hiding, He entered the place where they were, the doors being closed, and "He showed them the wounds of his hands and his side" to convince them that it was not a spirit as they imagined, and besides, He showed Himself alive to them when He saw fit, as Luke said, "by overwhelming evidence that He was alive, being seen for forty days, and speaking of the kingdom of God," and, "Eating with them, He ordered them not to leave Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father." For in this way, by appearing and conversing with His disciples and eating the same normal food that they ate, He was consoling His apostles and dispelling their fear, anticipating that He would shortly disappear suddenly from before their eyes. That is why the Apostle Paul says that Jesus Christ appeared at the same time to more than five hundred of His followers. We also read in John that as the apostles were fishing, He appeared on the shore and ate "a piece of roasted fish and a honeycomb," so that He was seen by them to have truly risen in a physical form. And can we not see that He did something similar in Jerusalem?

[Latin text of the last two sentences: "And in Joanne legimus, quod piscantibus apostolis, in steterit littorea and assi partem pisces, favumque comederit resurrectionis indicia quae vera sunt. In Jerusalem autem nihil horum fecisse narratur."]

QUESTION #8

How should we account for these words of Saint Matthew: ”Jesus, crying out with a loud voice, yielded up His spirit, and at the same time the veil of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom, the earth shook, the rocks were split, the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints who were in the sleep of death revived, and exiting out of their tombs after His resurrection, they came to the holy city, and were seen by many people”? I have already explained this passage in my comments on Saint Matthew. It should be noted first that God is the only one who can stop and start living a physical life as He pleases. For this reason the centurion, when he saw that Jesus, after saying, ”Father, I commend my soul into Your hands,” had immediately given up the spirit, was touched by this great miracle, and he said, ”This man was really the son of God.”

This phrase, ”The veil of the temple was torn in two,” verifies what was told to Joseph, that the angels guarding the temple said, ”Go out of here.” The Gospel that Saint Matthew wrote in Hebrew does not say that the veil was torn, but that the top of the portal, which was of prodigious size, was completely reversed. ”The earth shook,” because it could not support the weight attached to its God on the cross. ”The stones split,” to see how far was the hardness of the Jews who refused to recognize the Son of God they saw with their eyes. ”The tombs were opened,” to signify that we must be resurrected one day. ”And many bodies of saints out of their tombs, came to the holy city, and were seen by several people.” By this ”holy city” Jerusalem is meant, and it must not be confused with all the other cities where people adored idols, because in that city alone the people had a temple dedicated the Lord, and where true religion was professed, in which God alone is worshipped. These saints, who ”came out of their tombs,” did not appear indiscriminately to everyone, but only to numerous people who were committed to Jesus Christ. Now to explain this place in a spiritual sense: ”Jesus Christ died, with a loud cry, and at the same time the veil of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom.” This was so that all nations could see uncovered all the mysteries of the law, before they were hidden. The veil is torn ”in two,” to tell us that everything is bound up in the Old and New Testaments. It is torn ”from the top down,” to make manifest what has happened since the beginning of the world and the creation of man, and

the sacred history we reported, and all that will be until the consummation of the world.

But we must consider whether it is the first veil, on the outside, or the veil inside, that was torn at the death of the Savior.2 To me, it seems to me that whoever was within the temple at the entrance of the tabernacle, is at what is called the outer veil, because ”now we can see and do things very imperfectly, but when we are in a perfect state,” then the outer veil tears, and all the mysteries of the house of God, which are now hidden, will be revealed to us. And we will know what is signified by these two cherubim, the oracle, and the golden vase that contained the manna. ”We now see as though in a mirror, darkly.” Indeed, the veil there, which hid from us the stories of Scripture, is torn, and we can enter the courtyard of the tabernacle of the Lord. But all the secrets and mysteries of the heavenly Jerusalem are always veiled, and we cannot enter there.

The earth shook at the death of the Savior, and we saw the fulfillment of what the prophet Haggai: ”A little time and I will shake heaven and earth, and all desired nations will come,” so that ”many come from east and west and take their place in the kingdom of heaven with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.” ”The stones split,” that is, that the death of Jesus Christ for the Gentiles pierced and broke the hardness of their hearts. For these ”stones” can still hear the prophets, which as well as the apostles carried this name in relation to Jesus Christ, who is the true ”stone.” These stones are ”split,” so that the saints may unlock, release, and discover all the prophecies that had been obscured from them by the thick veil of the law. These ”tombs” are like those about which Jesus spoke in the Gospel, ”You are like white-washed tombs on the outside, but inside are full of dead bones.” ”These graves,” I said, ”opened,” so that those who had died earlier in their infidelity, ”leaving their tombs,” and being given a new life with Christ, arise and enter into the heavenly Jerusalem, to be citizens of heaven rather than of earth, and thus the man who died in an earthly manner is raised in a heavenly manner.

Moreover, to return to the literal meaning of this passage, we must not be surprised that after the death of the Savior, Jerusalem is called ”the holy city,” since, until its complete collapse, the apostles are shown to have had no apprehension about entering the temple, and even observe the ceremonies of the law for fear of scandalizing those of Jews who had embraced the faith of Jesus Christ. We even see that the Savior loved this city so much that the misfortunes which threatened it elicited tears from His eyes; when He was crucified, He said to His Father, ”Forgive them, Father, because they do know what they do.” His prayer was answered, for shortly after His death the Jews believed in Him by thousands, and God gave to this unfortunate city forty-two years to do penance. But finally its citizens, having failed to benefit, and still persisting in their wickedness — Vespasian and Titus together formed an anti-type of what is mentioned in our Scriptures, when they

came out of the woods and killed and mauled these ”children,” because of their blasphemous insults to the real Elisha when ascending to the house of God (for that is what ”Bethel” means in Hebrew).3

Since that time, Jerusalem has been called ”the holy city,” but having lost the holiness implied by the name she bore before, it has been called in a spiritual sense ”Egypt” and ”Sodom,” and in its place we have built a new city, ”a river delighted by the abundance of its waters,” and the center of which releases a spring that has purified the bitterness of the waters of all the earth, so that the unfortunate Jews, stripped of their former glories, are reduced to whining on the ruins of their temple, while Christians have the pleasure of seeing new churches being built every day, and they say to the people of Zion, ”The place where I am is too narrow.” In this we see the fulfillment of the prophecy of the prophet Isaiah: ”His grave will be glorious.”

QUESTION #9

How is it that Saint John reports that the Savior gave that Holy Spirit to His apostles by blowing on them, which according to Luke, He promised to send to them after His ascension? One can easily solve this problem if one considers, as Saint Paul says, that the Holy Spirit gives us many kinds of grace. ”There are a variety of spiritual gifts,” says the apostle in his first epistle to the faithful of Corinth, ”but they have the same Spirit. There are diversities of ministries, but there is a single Lord. There are diversities of supernatural works, but there is only one God who works all in all. But the gifts which testify to the Holy Spirit are given out to everyone for the profit of the Church. One receives from the Holy Spirit the gift of speaking with exalted wisdom; another, by the same Spirit, is given the gift of speaking with knowledge; another receives faith by the same Spirit; another, through the same Spirit, has the gift of healing disease, and another the gift of working miracles, another the gift of prophecy, another the discernment of spirits, and another the gift of speaking different languages, another the interpretation of languages. Yet it is one and the same Spirit at work in all these things, distributing these gifts to each individual as He pleases.”

For this reason the Lord, as reported in Luke’s Gospel, said to His apostles after His resurrection, ”I will send you the promised gift from My Father, but continue living in the city until you are protected by the power from on high.” And in Acts of the Apostles, according to the same evangelist, ”He ordered them not to leave Jerusalem, but to ’Wait until the promise of the Father, which,’ He said, ’you have heard of from My mouth. For John baptized in water, but in a few days you will be baptized in the Holy Spirit.’” Saint John also reported in the end of his Gospel, about the day when Jesus Christ rose, that is, on Sunday, He entered into the place where the apostles were, the doors being closed, and that they have it said to them for the second time, ”Peace be with you.” He said, ”As my Father sent me, so I send you also.” ”After which He breathed on them and said, ’Receive the Holy Spirit; the sins of those whom you forgive are forgiven, and they are retained of those whose you retain.’”

On the first day, therefore, when the Savior was resurrected, the apostles received the grace of the Holy Spirit to forgive sins, to baptize, to make men into children of God, and to share with the faithful the spirit of adoption, even as Jesus Christ himself had said, ”The sins are forgiven to those whom you forgive, and the sins of those whose sins you retain, they shall be retained.” But on the day of Pentecost, the Savior promised more excellent gifts excellent, so that they would be baptized in the Holy Spirit and bear the power from above to preach the gospel to all nations, as we read at the sixty-seventh Psalm: ”The Lord will give his heralds the floor of his glory so they will proclaim with great power.” Thus they would then receive the gift of healing diseases, performing miracles, and speaking different languages, for they were destined to preach the gospel to many nations, and in this way the people could listen to what each of the apostles was proclaiming about the truth of the gospel. Hence the Apostle Paul, who brought the Gospel in this vast tract of country which is from Jerusalem to Illyricum, and who was to go through Rome to go to Spain, thanked God because he had received the gift of tongues more than all the other apostles, because in order to preach the gospel to many nations, he should also speak multiple languages.

However, it was on the tenth day after His ascension, as Luke relates, that the Savior fulfilled the promise He made to His apostles to send them the Holy Spirit. ”When the days of Pentecost were accomplished,” says the sacred historian, ”the disciples were all together in one place, and we suddenly heard a loud noise like a violent and impetuous wind that came from heaven, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. At the same time they saw what looked like divided tongues of fire, standing on each one. Immediately they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they began to speak different languages, as the Holy Spirit put words in their mouths.” And then we saw the fulfillment of what was spoken by the prophet Joel: ”In the end-times,” says the Lord, ”I will pour out My Spirit upon all flesh: your son and your daughters shall prophesy; your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions.” This word, ”I will pour out,” involves an abundance of graces, and goes back to what the Lord had promised His apostles: that in a few days they would be baptized in the Holy Spirit. Indeed this baptism was so abundant that it filled all the house where the disciples were sitting, and He provided the fire of the Holy Spirit in their hearts, in accordance with His designs, and sent them the gift of tongues, and their lips were purified to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ in all its purity, as a seraph had purified those of Isaiah, who complained of having unclean and dirty lips.

We read in the prophet about the shouts of two seraphim who were around the throne of God, and about the posts of the temple door being shaken, ”and the whole house was filled with smoke,” that is, with the error of darkness and ignorance. But at the beginning of the gospel, and therefore the birth of Christianity, the Holy Spirit fills the whole Church, to purify its fervor and by His grace to purge away

all the sins of the faithful by fire, even by the Holy Spirit that Jesus Christ had promised to His apostles, by whose lips His name has been carried and shared throughout the world. Although John said that the Savior gave the Holy Spirit to His apostles on the first day of his resurrection, and Saint Luke said that He was sent to them fifty days later, we should not imagine that these two evangelists are at odds: they only desired to make distinctions between degrees of the grace that Jesus Christ communicated to His apostles, who, having first received the power to forgive sins, then received the power to perform miracles, and all other gifts detailed by Saint Paul, of which we spoke about above — but particularly to speak various languages, which was even more necessary than others so that, in the ministry which they were expected to announce the gospel of Jesus Christ to all nations of the earth, they would not need to use an interpreter. Because of this the Lycaonians, after hearing Saint Paul and Saint Barnabas speak their language, considered them gods bearing a human form.

With regard to this virtue from on high that Jesus Christ had promised to bestow upon His disciples, this is nothing more than the grace of the Holy Spirit, who, having taken possession of the hearts of the apostles, inspired both their strength and courage; they feared neither the courts, nor judges, nor the purple of kings. That is what the Savior had promised before his passion, saying, ”When you are delivered into the hands of men, do not worry about how or what you shall say, because what you need to say will be given at that very time, for it is not you who speak, but the Spirit of Your Father who speaks in you.” For me, I am not afraid to say that since the apostles had believed in Jesus Christ, they always had the Holy Spirit, for without this the gift they could never have done all the miracles they did; but those deeds were the expressions and results of this gift.

That is why Jesus Christ said aloud in the temple, ”’If anyone thirsts, let him come to me and drink, and if someone believes in me, rivers of living water will come out of his heart,’ as Scripture says. He meant by this the Spirit, whom those who believed in Him were yet to receive,” and the evangelist adds in the same place, ”For the Holy Spirit had not yet been given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.” This is not to say there was no Holy Spirit, for the Savior Himself said, ”If I cast out demons by speaking through the Holy Spirit,” but what is meant is that this Holy Spirit who was in the Son of God had not yet entirely filled the hearts of the apostles. For from their hearts there came the fear with which they were seized at the Passion of the Savior, and on account of this was that renunciation with an oath against knowing Him at all. But after being baptized in the Holy Spirit, they were filled with grace that was prevalent in their hearts; they boldly tell the rulers of the Jews, ”We must obey God rather than men.” So they can resurrect the dead, triumph in the midst of turmoil, spread their blood for Jesus Christ, and be crowned via their own torments.

So the apostles had the Holy Spirit; yet spiritual graces were not flowing from their heart, because the Lord was not yet glorified. And what is the glory that He expected? He explains himself in the Gospel, when He says, ”My Father, glorify me with the glory I had with you before the world was.” The glory of the Savior is the cross where He triumphed; there He was crucified as a man, and is glorified as God. Do you want proof of His glory? Observe that there the sun disappears, the moon changes to blood, the earth is shaken by an extraordinary earthquake; the graves are opened, the dead walk; the rocks split. This glory of Jesus Christ is what was foretold through the mouth of the prophet-king when he says, ”Arise, my glory; awaken, my lute and my harp,” and the glory, that is, the holy humanity, replied: ”I will adjourn the morning,” to thus verify the title of the twenty-first Psalm, which reads, ”For the relief of the morning.”

When I say this, I do not separate Jesus Christ into two different people, one divine and one human, as the new heretics falsely accuse us. There is in Jesus Christ one and the same person, who is both Son of God and Son of Man, but in all that has been said about the divine Savior, there are some who recorded His divine glory, and others who did not guard their own salvation. It is to us that it was written: ”He did not believe it was for Him a theft be equal to God, but He has nevertheless humbled Himself, and taking up the form and nature of a servant, He became obedient, to the point of death, even the death of the cross,” and to us it is said that ”The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.”

Therefore the Lord told his disciples, ”I am departing, and I will send you another Comforter.” Luke also records that this assuring promise was given by Jesus Christ to the apostles. I am surprised that Montanus and the two crazy women4 accompanying his sect and his errors, who are only failed prophets, argue that this promise of the Savior was not fulfilled until them, long after it was given, because it was to the apostles that the Savior said, ”I will send you the promised gift of my Father. But live in the city until you are clothed with the power from on high.” It was upon the apostles, not Montanus, Prisca, and Maxilla, that Jesus Christ has breathed, thus giving them the Holy Spirit. To the apostles it is said, ”The sins of those whom you forgive are forgiven, and they will be retained of those whose you retain.” It is the apostles that He ordered not to leave Jerusalem but to wait for the promise of His Father, a promise that Luke allows us to see being fulfilled, when he said, ”They were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and they began to speak different languages, as the Holy Spirit put their words in their mouths,” because The Holy Spirit ”blows where He wills.” When Jesus Christ promised His apostles that He would send to send them ”another Comforter,” it was already satisfying to know that He was himself the consolation of his apostles, and to know the apostle Paul’s concept of God the Father, when he calls Him the ”God of mercy and all comfort.” But if the Father is ”Comforter,” if the Son is ”Comforter,” if the Holy Spirit is ”Comforter,” and if we baptize the faithful in the name of the Father, Son

and Holy Spirit, who are only one God, it follows that, having the same name of God, even ”Consolation,” they also have a similar nature.

Besides, the prophets received the Holy Spirit as well as the apostles. This is why David said, ”Do not remove me from your Holy Spirit.” We also read in Scripture that Daniel was animated by the Spirit of God, and that it was through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit that David said, ”The Lord said to my Lord, Sit on my right hand, until I make your enemies a footstool.” Only by the illumination of the Holy Spirit could the prophets have predicted things to come. ”By the word of the Lord,” said the Psalmist, ”the heavens were consolidated, and by the breath of His mouth all their virtue was founded.” All the substance possessed by the Father and the Son is also the substance of the Holy Spirit. When He is sent, it is the Father and Son who send Him. The Scripture calls Him in a thousand places ”the Spirit of God the Father” and ”the Spirit of Jesus Christ.” Hence, as was reported in the Acts of the Apostles, that those who had received the baptism of John, and who believed in God the Father and Jesus Christ, but who did not even know there was a Holy Spirit, were baptized again, and we can say that this was the occasion when they truly baptized, because without the Holy Spirit the Trinity cannot exist. We read again in the same place, where Saint Peter said to Ananias and Sapphira, who had lied to the Holy Spirit, that it was to God and not to men that they had lied.

QUESTION #10

How do we understand what the Apostle Paul says to the Romans, from the place, ”What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid that we have this thought!” To the place, ”If the Lord of hosts had not left us a seed, we would have become like Sodom and Gomorrah”? The entire epistle to the Romans needs careful explanation, because it is full of obscure difficulties that cannot be understood without the help of the Holy Spirit who has Himself guided the mouth of the apostle. But the most difficult and most embarrassing passage is the one you have asked about. Some, to maintain whole the righteousness of God, claim that if Jacob was selected and Esau was rejected when they were still in the Rebecca’s womb, this could only be for reasons that have preceded their birth. Similarly He also chose Jeremiah and John the Baptist from the wombs of their mothers, and the Apostle Paul was chosen before he was born, to preach the Gospel.

For me, I can only agree with what is received by all the faithful, and what I teach, I can teach publicly without fear in the church, without fear of falling into the illusions and dreams of Pythagoras, Plato, and those disciples who wished to mold the opinions of the pagans into the dogmas of religion, saying that souls are fallen from heaven, and that their individual merits have been expressed together in their bodies so as to compensate for their past sins. I think it is much better to forthrightly admit our ignorance, and to categorize this passage of Saint Paul among the deep mysteries which we cannot fathom. This admission is preferable to the option, taken under the pretext of justifying the conduct of God, of embracing the heresy of Basilides and Manès, teaching monstrous opinions asserted by a certain Egyptian, and the chimerical visions with which he has misled the Spaniards.[5] Therefore I shall explain this passage the best I can, and objectively follow Saint Paul’s footprints as far as I can, objectively.

This apostle, having taken even the Holy Spirit as a witness to the sincere pain which penetrated his heart, first lamented about the blindness of his brothers and his parents according to the flesh, that is, the Israelites who had failed and rejected the Son of God, to whom belonged the adoption, his glory, his covenant, his law, his worship, and his promises, and which Jesus Christ Himself received, coming forth

in the flesh, being born of Mary. And the pressure of the pain he feels is so strong that he desired for himself to become anathema, and to be separated from Christ, that is, to die alone, if it would in any way prevent Israel from perishing. Here the objecting reader could not fail to tell him, ”What is this? Are all the Israelites lost? Have not you yourself recognized Jesus Christ as the Son of God? Have not the other apostles and an infinite number of Jewish people also recognized this?” And here is his response to this objection. The Scripture depicts two different concepts of Israel, expressed under the figure of two children, one of which is in the flesh and the other in the spirit and promise. Abraham had two children, Ishmael and Isaac. The one who was born there according to the flesh did not share the legacy of his father, but the one who was born of Sarah, as promised, is the child called by God, according to what Scripture says: ”This is Isaac, which will be called your son.” That is, those that are ”children in the flesh” are not therefore God’s children, but those are the ”children of promise” who are considered to be children of Abraham.

This truth seems to apply not only to Ishmael and Isaac, but also to the two children who were within Rebecca, Esau and Jacob: of whom God chose one, and rejected the other. Saint Paul claims to see than in the elder members of these pairs of brothers, Ishmael and Esau, is the representation of the reprobation of the Jewish people, and that in the younger of the pairs, Isaac and Jacob, we see a representation of the favorable choice that God has made, and those Jews who have believed in Jesus Christ. But in order to make his meaning clear, he used the example of two twin brothers, Esau and Jacob, of which it is written, ”The older will be subject to the younger,” and taking what was said by the prophet Malachi, ”Jacob have I loved, and Esau I hated,” he adapted it to counter the objection, and having addressed it in this way, he refuted it.

If it is true, says the apostle, that Jacob received election and Esau disapproval, ”not yet being born, nor having done good nor evil,” and the reception of the kindnesss or the wrath of God is not an effect of their own merits, but it depends on the will of the One who chose one and rejected the other, ”What shall we say then? Is it that God is unfair?” According to what He Himself said to Moses, ”I will have upon whom I bestow mercy, and I will pity whoever it pleases Me to pity.” If we believe that God does whatever He wants, and chooses one and rejects the other without any regard to their merit and their works, ”it is not of those who desire, or of those running, but of God who shows mercy,” as indeed appears to be the true sense of these words that the same God says, in Scripture, to Pharaoh: ”For I have prepared you to display My power in you, and to make My name famous throughout the world.” But if this is so, and if God, as He pleases, shows mercy to Israel and hardens Pharaoh, is it not therefore wrong when, pointing out errors, He blames us for not doing well, of for doing evil? For without regard either to our good or our evil deeds, He can, when He pleases, choose one and condemn others, especially the man was too weak to oppose His will.

But this is what the apostle Paul responds to this argument, though it was intrinsically very strong and, being supported on the authority of Scripture, seemed almost invincible: ”O man, who are you to challenge with God?” That is, since you do not agree with God, you rise up against Him, and consult the holy Scriptures to find authoritative evidence to condemn His conduct. But by acting on this sinful desire to accuse God, it is manifest that you have free will, and that you can do whatever you want, and it is in your power to keep silent or to talk when you please. If you are convinced that God has acted in the same way as a potter who makes a vase of clay, and you can not resist his will, reflect that a vase of clay does not tell the one who made it, ”’Why did you make me this way?’ because the potter has the power to make the same lump or mass of clay, into a clay vase for to honorable use, and another for uses vile and shameful.” But God made all men of the same nature and in the same condition: He gave them, via their training, the freedom to do what they please, and to freely take their stand for good or evil, and this freedom is so full and so complete that they are displaying their impiety by challenging their Creator and examining the reasons for His conduct.

”Who can complain,” continues the apostle, ”if God, desiring to show His wrath and to make known His power, tolerated with extreme patience vessels of wrath destined for destruction, in order to make known the riches of His glory on the vessels of mercy He has destined for His glory — on those whom He called, even us, not of Jews only but also of the Gentiles? As He Himself said through the mouth of the prophet Hosea, ’I will call them My people who were not My people, ”My beloved” one I had not loved, and the time shall come in the same place where I had once said, ”You are not My people,” they shall be called children of the living God,”’” and so on. Inasmuch as the patience of God, says Saint Paul, served only to harden the heart of Pharaoh, and since the Lord delayed so long to punish the Israelites, you thus have a sound justification to conclude that His toleration of those impious people was not infinite; He tolerated their impiety, and in His extreme patience did not condemn those who were so condemnable, so that even those who were lost He might make use of to display His anointed kindness and His mercies.

Consider that the sun’s heat is always the same, but it produces different effects depending on the nature of different subjects upon which it acts: some are softened, others besides these are firmed up, being tightened; the wax is melted and the mud is hardened, although the heat never changes its nature. The same is true of God, for by His goodness and mercy He hardens vases of wrath, that is, those who are lost among the people of Israel, but concerning vessels of mercy, He has called us to His glory, that is, us, whom He called not only of Jews but also from the Gentiles. He does not save without reason and without equitable discernment; His reasons for acting this way consist of what has happened; some have rejected the Son of God and others were willing to receive Him.

However, by ”these vessels of mercy” is meant not only the Gentiles but also those of Jews who wanted to believe in Jesus Christ, and being joined together with them, they are to be one faithful people, which shows that God does not choose nationalities, but according to the wills of men. And this was the essence of the performance of what the prophet Hosea said: ”I will call them My people who were not My people,” namely, the Gentiles, ”and those to whom I once said, ’You are not My people,’ will now be called the children of the living God.” And we apprehend that this prediction does not apply exclusively to the Gentiles, for Saint Paul also called ”vessels of election and mercy” those Jews who believed in Jesus Christ, because, ”When it comes to Israel,” says the apostle, ”Isaiah cries out, ’Although the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, there will be a small remnant saved,’” that is, although all the children of Israel do not believe in Jesus Christ, there are yet a few, very few, who believe in Him, ”For God in His justice will make an end and cut off His people,” having saved by the incarnation and humiliation of Jesus Christ those who wanted to believe in Him. That is why the prophet Isaiah says in another place: ”If the Lord of hosts had not preserved a few of our race, we would have become like Sodom and Gomorrah.”

Saint Paul, continuing in this passage of Scripture which describes what the prophets have predicted about the dual vocation of the Gentiles and Jews, goes on to say that Gentiles, who did not pursue righteousness, have nevertheless embraced it, because they believed in Jesus Christ without the vanity of their works, while, contrary to this, most Israelites were lost because they ”stumbled at that stumbling-stone,” and, ”Not knowing the righteousness that comes from God, and seeking to establish their own justice, they have not submitted to the righteousness of God,” that is, Jesus Christ, who has been given to us by God to be our righteousness.

I have read the comments of a certain author who was claiming that he was rather embarrassed by Saint Paul’s response, because this issue was not explained, where, after having proposed the objection, ”What shall we say then? Is there injustice in God?”, and after having said, ”It does not depend on any who desire or upon those running, but of God who shows mercy,” and ”God will have mercy upon him whom He favors, and He hardens whom he pleases,” and again, ”Who can resist his will?”, ”Here,” says the author, is what the apostle says: ”O man, who are only earth and ash, how dare you question God? Do you want to rebel against that which you did, you who are also a fragile clay vase? Can a vase of earth say to those who made it, ’Why did you do me this way?’ Does not the potter have the power to make of one part of the same mass of clay a vessel intended for honorable use, and another for uses vile and shameful?” Therefore remain in eternal silence; acknowledge your own weakness, and put an end to asking God to account for His actions, because by dealing mercifully with one and in severity with others, He did what He wanted to do.

QUESTION #11

What is the meaning of these words of the Apostle Paul, in his second epistle to the faithful of Corinth: ”We are to the one, the smell of death that causes them to die, and to the other, the smell of life, which leads to life. And who is capable of these things”? The full passage from which these words are taken should be cited here, so that by considering their context, and their relationship with what precedes and what follows, we can better understand what is the true meaning. ”Being come to Troas,” says the Apostle, ”to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ, although the Lord had given me great opportunities to successfully fulfill my ministry, I had no peace of mind, because I had not found my brother Titus, but having taken leave of them, I went into Macedonia. But I thank God that we always triumph in Christ, who through us spreads everywhere the aroma of the knowledge of His name. For we are before God the aroma of Jesus Christ, among those who are being saved, or to those who are lost: to some, the smell of death that causes them to die, and to the other, the smells of life that gives life. And who is capable of such things? For we are not as many which corrupt the word of God, but we preach with complete sincerity, as from God, in God’s presence, and in the name of Jesus Christ.”

Saint Paul instructed the faithful of Corinth about everything he did and everything he has suffered, and how he always gave thanks to God in any situation he found himself in, leading them by his ample resolve to contend for the interests of faith. ”I came,” he says, ”to Troas,” which previously was called Troy, ”to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ in Asia, but although the Lord had given me great openings to fulfill my ministry successfully,” — that is, although many people were believing in miracles and wonders that God works by my administration, and had believed in Jesus Christ, and I had every reason to hope to see the faith of these people rise and increase by the grace of the Lord, nevertheless ”I had no rest in my spirit,” that is, I could not enjoy the consolation that I hoped to find, because I did not meet my brother Titus, as I was expecting, having heard that he was there, or that he himself had promised to go and rendezvous there.

But what great consolation and rest of mind could Saint Paul receive from the presence of Titus, and why did his absence force him to depart from the inhabitants

of Troas to go into Macedonia? I have noted on occasion that the apostle Paul was very wise, having been educated ”at the feet of Gamaliel,” who, according to the Acts of the Apostles, said in the council of the Jews, ”Why not keep away from these people? For if what they preach is the work of God, you cannot destroy it, and if it is the work of man, it will fall by itself.” Now, Saint Paul had a perfect knowledge of the holy Scriptures, he was naturally eloquent, and he possessed the gift of speaking in tongues, as he prides himself in the Lord, saying, ”I praise my God that I speak through the gift of tongues more than all of you.” Nevertheless he could not speak Greek in a manner worthy of the majesty and grandeur of our mysteries. Therefore Titus served as an interpreter, as Saint Mark used to serve Saint Peter, with whom he wrote his Gospel. Also we see that the two epistles attributed to Saint Peter have different styles and turn phrases differently, by which it is discerned that it was sometimes necessary for him to use different interpreters.

Saint Paul, therefore, sorry that he had not met at Troas the one by whose mouth he was to preach the gospel, took the party to go to Macedonia, the place from which a Macedonian had appeared during the night, inviting him to go, saying, ”Go to Macedonia and help us successfully.” He also hoped to find Titus, and indeed he had planned to visit the brethren or face the persecution of unbelievers, for that is what he means by these words: ”But I thank God that we always triumph in Christ, who spreads by us everywhere the odor of the knowledge of His name.” ”We always triumph,” that is, ”He triumphs in us,” or, ”He triumphs by us,” as the apostle says in another place, ”God made us a spectacle to the world, to angels and men.” This is why he says the following: ”Coming from Macedonia, we had no relief for our bodies, but we were constantly suffering, with conflicts on the outside and fears within. But God, who consoles the humble and the afflicted, consoled us by the arrival of Titus, and not only by his arrival, but by the consolation that he himself received from you.”

Having thus taken leave of the inhabitants of Troy or Troas, he went to Macedonia in the hope of finding Titus, and to use him in the functions of his ministry, but it is easy to discern that they did not meet there, and that Titus arrived there only after Saint Paul had suffered many punishments and persecution. And because he suffered so much before the arrival of Titus, he gives thanks to God in the name of Jesus Christ that he preached to the nations, because He desired to use him for the triumph of His Son. Indeed, the martyrs’ endurance of torments, the blood that is spilt for the name of Jesus Christ, the joy that they display in the midst of the cruelest tortures — all this is a triumph for God. When the martyrs’ strength and consistency are seen, as they undergo the horror and cruelty of the most horrific torment, and express all their joy in light of the fact that that they are suffering under torment, the smell of the knowledge of God is spreading among the Gentiles, who feel persuaded by the testimony of their own conscience that if the gospel was not true, no one would desire to shed his blood for his defense. For it is not in the

midst of the delights and pleasures of the world — including the concern to amass wealth — or in the midst of a soft and undisturbed life, that we confess the name of Jesus Christ; it is in prisons, in wounds, in persecutions, in nakedness, in hunger and thirst. That is the triumph of God and the victory of the apostles.

But one might post this objection to Saint Paul: How, with all that he had done, can there still be those who did not believe in Jesus Christ? The apostle, according to his custom, prevents disputes about this matter. It is true that we are, to God, the aroma of the name of Jesus Christ, and the gospel that we preach, like a pleasant scent, is spreading on all sides. But God has allowed men to use their free will so that, doing good voluntarily and not by necessity, He may reward the faithful and punish the unbelieving. Therefore sometimes the smell that we spread, though intrinsically good, provides either life or death, depending on the good or bad dispositions of those who receive or reject the gospel. Thus those who believe in Jesus Christ, He saves, and those who do not believe in Him will not ever come into contact with Him. Moreover it is not surprising that the preaching of the apostle Paul produced such diverse effects among the people, since the gospel says about Jesus Christ Himself, ”This child shall be for the fall and resurrection of many in Israel, and shall be spoken against by men.”

Every location, whether clean or dirty, receives direct sunlight, and this star, without concern for the purity of its light, shines indiscriminately upon flowers and manure alike. The same is true of the aroma of Jesus Christ: it is not likely to change or to cease to be what it is; however, it becomes for the faithful a principle of life, and for the unbelievers a principle of death. This is not referring to the death of this physical body, which is common with the animals, but to spiritual death, about which it is written: ”The soul who sins, it will die.” And when the faithful, who benefit from the aroma of Jesus Christ, hear this, they must not think of this physical breath that animates us, and which is the force behind all our actions and movements, but instead think of the life referred to by the prophet-king when he says, ”I firmly believe that I shall behold the Lord in the land of the living,” (because God is the God of the living and not dead) and about which Saint Paul said, ”Our life is hidden with God in Jesus Christ, but when Christ, who is our life, appears, then we will be partakers with Him in glory.”

The apostle instructs the Corinthians not to let it bother them — for it is not our main concern — that some receive the truth that we preach and others reject it; the many die a real death, and a few experience the life of which it is said, ”I am the life.” For if we did not announce the gospel, the unbelievers would still die, and none would have the life of the faithful. It is not easy to find a man worthy to proclaim the wonders of Jesus Christ; yet, the minister’s glory does not emanate from the minister, but from what he preaches. When Saint Paul said he does not conduct himself like so many who peddle the word of God, it shows that there are many

who imagine that their godliness serves as a way to get gain; these individuals have a shameful agenda in everything they do; they are those ”who devour widows’ houses.” But the one who preaches the gospel ”with full sincerity, as from God,” and in the presence of Him who sent him, not preaching this Jesus Christ and that Jesus Christ, will exercise his ministry in order to overcome through Jesus Christ, and to obtain his glory. It should be noted that here we bring this chapter in the Apostle to a close, mentioning the mystery of the Holy Trinity and saying, ”We preach the gospel from God, in the Holy Spirit, in the presence of God the Father, and in the name of Jesus Christ.”

We said that Saint Paul went to Macedonia from Troas; here is the evidence from the Acts of the Apostles: ”Having passed by Mysia, they went down to Troas, where during the night Paul had this vision: a man of Macedonia appeared to him and told him this request: ’Go to Macedonia and succeed in helping us.’ As soon as he had this vision, we sought to go to Macedonia, persuaded that God had indeed called us to preach the gospel.”

QUESTION #12

How should we understand these words of the apostle Paul in his first epistle to the Thessalonians: ”May the God of peace Himself sanctify you in all ways, so that everything that is in you, the spirit, the soul and body, may be kept spotless for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ”? Although this question is very famous, it must be explained in few words. Saint Paul said a little earlier: ”Do not quench the spirit.” If we understand the true meaning of these words, we understand together the nature of the spirit that we must keep unsullied with the soul and body for the day of the Lord’s coming. For who would imagine that the Holy Spirit may be extinguished like a flame, which when extinguished ceases to be what it was? Who could imagine that someone would destroy the Holy Spirit — who in the old law, speaking by the mouth of Isaiah, Jeremiah and other prophets, ”Here is what the Lord says,” and who said, in the new, by the prophet Agabus, ”These things says the Holy Spirit.”

”There are many kinds of spiritual gifts, but there is only one Spirit; there are numerous kinds of ministries, but there is only one Lord; there are several kinds of supernatural acts, but there is only one God who works all in all. But the gifts which make the Holy Spirit manifest are distributed to everyone for the good of the Church: one receives the gift of speaking wisdom by the Holy Spirit, while another received, through the same Spirit, a gift of speaking with knowledge; another, by the same Spirit, receives faith; another, the gift of working miracles; another received, through the same Spirit, the gift of healing disease; another the gift of prophecy; another the discernment of spirits. Yet one and the same Spirit is producing all these things, distributing gifts to these people as He pleases.” In regard to this Spirit, David, when he realized his isolation, said to God, ”Do not remove from me Your Holy Spirit.” When God withdraws the Spirit, He does not diminish His substance, but extinguishes Him for the souls that deprive themselves of His light. For me, I believe that by these words, ”Do not quench the spirit,” the apostle means the same thing by these, ”Keep yourselves in the fervor of the spirit” because the Spirit is never extinguished, except in a soul whose fervor has slowed to a stop by indulgence in crime, or in a love, once warm, which has grown cold and languid.

Now to this phrase, ”May the God of peace sanctify you in all ways,” or ”in all things,” or, if we flex the Greek text, ”give you a full and perfect holiness;” He is called ”God of peace,” because we were reconciled to him through Jesus Christ, ”who is our peace, who has made the two peoples one,” and, as the apostle said in another place, is ”the peace of God which surpasses all comprehension, that keeps the hearts and minds of the saints.” But he who was sanctified and is perfect in all things, ”keeps his spirit, his soul, and his body without blemish for the day of the coming of the Lord,” and uses his bodily members for the purposes for which they exist: his hands to work, his feet to walk, his eyes to see, his ears to hear, his teeth to eat, his stomach to digest meat, his bowels to order to avoid what is naturally leftover. Thus it is when all members of one’s body are whole and perfect.

But is it credible that Paul, in making this blessing-vow to heaven, expects Jesus Christ, on judgment day, to find the faithful individual’s body entirely intact? Does not death reduce everything to dust? Or if there are still a few, as some authors claim, that are still alive and kicking, do they not invariably have some defect? Consider especially the bodies of martyrs, even those whose eyes, or nose, or hands have been torn or cut off, for the sake of Christ. Therefore what the apostle meant by a ”whole body” is, as I have said elsewhere, that which remains attached to the head, verily, the leader from whom all parts of the body are united and bound together, according to the effective increase of the body of Jesus Christ. But this body is none other than the Church, and anyone who has a close union with the head of this body must also assist in the maintenance of all other members in the whole body, as far as human frailty can afford. And to do that, they must maintain the integrity of the soul, so as to say, ”Bless the Lord, O my soul, who heals all your infirmities,” and it is written, ”He sent his word and He healed.” We also maintain the integrity of the mind when we live according to spiritual things; we live by the Spirit, and thus we follow with docility the guidance and impressions from the Spirit, so that we may mortify by the mind the works of the flesh, and so that we produce the fruits of the Spirit, by which I mean love, joy, peace, and so forth.

Here is another explanation that we can give to the words of the Apostle Paul. As Solomon set forth a proverb by describing things in three ways, so our teachings and applications, conducted thoughtfully and carefully, may be set forth to expound the truth for those who question us. We can describe the three ways by which the instructions and regulations of Scripture are set forth in our hearts. First there is the literal and historical sense. Second, there is the moral sense. And, finally, it may be taken in the spiritual sense. In the literal sense, we are dealing simply with the facts of the story as we follow a sequence of events being narrated. In the moral sense, we leave the literal meaning and consider larger and nobler ideas that are expressed for the regulation of our morals, and for our edification, though grounded in physical matters pertaining to the Jewish people. In the spiritual sense our objective is something even more sublime; we abandon all the earthly things,

and simply look for what is said about the heavenly things, and the joy that is prepared for us; looking at all the good things in life is like a shadow in comparison to the adamantine happiness that is ours in that day. Jesus Christ, by His peace, will sanctify and perfect those who are happy in this situation, that is, those whose sole occupation is to take care to preserve the integrity of their body, their soul and their spirit, and to acquire a perfect knowledge of truth, and the triple-knowledge of which Solomon speaks.

Many, focusing simply on the letter, understand as pertaining to the resurrection what the Apostle Paul says, that we must keep our mind, our soul, and our body spotless for the day of the coming of the Lord. Some of them have claimed that this passage proves that man is composed of three kinds of substances: a spirit, which is the principle of their feelings and their thoughts, a soul, which is the source of his life, and of a body, which serves as an instrument for all external actions. There are others who claim that man is composed of a core and a body, and that the ”spirit” that we add is not a substance but a principle which, according the different effects it produces, is sometimes called spirit, or feeling, or thought, because there is no man in so many different substances that give them different names. And when they encounter the passage of Scripture, ”Spirits and souls of the righteous, bless the Lord,” they reject it by saying that these words are not found in the Hebrew text. For me, as I said earlier, I think that the ”spirit” which remains blameless with soul and body, must not be interpreted by us to mean the Holy Spirit, whose substance is imperishable, bur rather His gifts and graces, which lights are capable of being extinguished in us, if we make a poor, rather than good, use of them.

Letter 122. To Rusticus.

Rusticus and Artemia his wife having made a vow of continence broke it. Artemia proceeded to Palestine to do penance for her sin and Rusticus promised to follow her. However he failed to do so, and Jerome was asked to write this letter in the hope that it might induce him to fulfil his promise. The date is about 408 a.d.

I. I am induced to write to you, a stranger to a stranger, by the entreaties of that holy servant of Christ Hedibia and of my daughter in the faith Artemia, once your wife but now no longer your wife but your sister and fellow-servant. Not content with assuring her own salvation she has sought yours also, in former days at home and now in the holy places. She is anxious to emulate the thoughtfulness of the apostles Andrew and Philip; who after Christ had found them, desired in their turn to find, the one his brother Simon and the other his friend Nathanael. [Joh. 1:41, Joh. 1:45] To the former of these it was said "Thou art Simon, the son of Jona: thou shall be called Cephas which is by interpretation a stone; [Joh. 1:42] while the latter, whose name Nathanael means the gift of God, was comforted by Christ's witness to him: "behold an Israelite indeed in whom is no guile. [Joh. 1:47] So of old Lot [Gen. 19:15-26] desired to rescue his wife as well as his two daughters, and refusing to leave blazing Sodom and Gomorrah until he was himself half-on-fire, tried to lead forth one who was tied and bound by her past sins. But in her despair she lost her composure, and looking back became a monument of an unbelieving soul. [Cf. Wisdom, 10:7] Yet, as if to make up for the loss of a single woman, Lot's glowing faith set free the whole city of Zoar.

In fact when he left the dark valleys in which Sodom lay and came to the mountains, the sun rose upon him as he entered Zoar or the little City; so-called because the little faith that Lot possessed, though unable to save greater places, was at least able to preserve smaller ones. For one who had gone so far astray as to live in Gomorrah could not all at once reach the noonland where Abraham, the friend of God, [Jas. 2:23] entertained God and His angels. [Gen. 18:1] (For it was in Egypt that Joseph fed his brothers, and when the bride speaks to the Bridegroom her cry is: "tell me where thou feedest, where thou makest thy flock to rest at noon. [Cant. 1:7]) Good men have always sorrowed for the sins of others. Samuel of

old lamented for Saul [1 Sam. 15:35] because he neglected to treat the ulcers of pride with the balm of penitence. And Paul wept for the Corinthians [2 Cor. 2:4] who refused to wash out with their tears the stains of fornication. For the same reason Ezekiel swallowed the book where were written within and without song, and lamentation and woe; [Ezek. 2:10, LXX] the song in praise of the righteous, the lamentation over the penitent, and the woe for those of whom it is written, "When the wicked man falleth into the depths of evil, then is he filled with scorn. [Prov. 18:3, LXX] It is to these that Isaiah alludes when he says:

"in that day did the Lord God of hosts call to weeping and to mourning and to baldness and to girding with sackcloth: and behold joy and gladness, slaying oxen; and killing sheep, eating flesh" and saying, "let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die. [Isa. 22:12, Isa. 22:13] Yet of such persons Ezekiel is bidden to speak thus: "O thou son of man, speak unto the house of Israel; Thus ye speak, saying, If our transgressions and our sins be upon us, and we pine away in them, how should we then live? Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live," and again, "turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel? [Ezek. 33:10, Ezek. 33:11] Nothing makes God so angry as when men from despair of better things cleave to those which are worse; and indeed this despair in itself is a sign of unbelief. One who despairs of salvation can have no expectation of a judgment to come. For if he dreaded such, he would by doing good works prepare to meet his Judge. Let us hear what God says through Jeremiah, "withhold thy foot from a rough way and thy throat from thirst" [Jer. 2:25, LXX] and again "shall they fall, and not arise? Shall he turn away, and not return? [Jer. 8:4] Let us hear also what God says by Isaiah:

"When thou shalt turn and bewail thyself, then shall thou be saved, and then shalt thou know where thou hast hitherto been. [Isa. 30:15, LXX] We do not realize the miseries of sickness till returning health reveals them to us. So sins serve as a foil to the blessedness of virtue; and light shines more brightly when it is relieved against darkness. Ezekiel uses language like that of the other prophets because he is animated by a similar spirit. "Repent," he cries, "and turn yourselves from all your transgressions; so iniquity shall not be your ruin. Cast away from you all your transgressions whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord. [Ezek. 18:30-32] Wherefore in a subsequent passage he says: "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked: but that the wicked turn from his way and live. [Ezek. 33:11] These words shew us that the mind must not through disbelief in the promised blessings give way to despair; and that the soul once marked out for perdition must not refuse to apply remedies on the ground that its wounds are past curing. Ezekiel

describes God as swearing, that if we refuse to believe His promise in regard to our salvation we may at least believe His oath.

It is with full confidence that the righteous man prays and says, ”Turn us, O God of our salvation, and cause thine anger toward us to cease,” [Ps. 85:4] and again, ”Lord, by thy favour thou hast made my mountain to stand strong: thou didst hide thy face and I was troubled. [Ps. 30:7] He means to say, ”when I forsook the foulness of my faults for the beauty of virtue, God strengthened my weakness with His grace. Lo, I hear. His promise: ”I will pursue mine enemies and overtake them: neither will I turn again till they are consumed,” [Ps. 18:37, R.V] so that I who was once thine enemy and a fugitive from thee, shall be laid hold of by thine hand. Cease not from pursuing me till my wickedness is consumed, and I return to my old husband who will give me my wool and my flax, my oil and my fine flour and will feed me with the richest foods. [Hos. 2:7-9] He it was who hedged up and enclosed my evil ways [Hos. 2:6] that I might find Him the true way who says in the gospel, ”I am the way, the truth, and the life. [Joh. 14:6] Hear the words of the prophet: ”they that sow in tears shall reap in joy. He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him. [Ps. 126:5, Ps. 126:6] Say also with him: ”All the night make I my bed to swim;

I water my couch with my tears” [Ps. 6:6] : and again, ”As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God. My soul thirsteth for God, for the living God: when shall I come and appear before God? My tears have been my meat day and night,” [Ps. 42:1-3] and in another place, ”O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee: my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and weary land where no water is. So have I looked upon thee in the sanctuary. [Ps. 63:1-3 R.V] For although my soul has thirsted after thee, yet much more have I sought thee by the labour of my flesh and have not been able to look upon thee in thy sanctuary; not at any rate till I have first dwelt in a land barren of sin, where the weary wayfarer is no more assailed by the adversary, and where there are no pools or rivers of lust.

The Saviour also wept over the city of Jerusalem because its inhabitants had not repented; [Luke 19:41] and Peter washed out his triple denial with bitter tears, [Luke 22:62] thus fulfilling the words of the prophet: ”rivers of waters run down mine eyes. [Ps. 119:136] Jeremiah too laments over his impenitent people, saying: ”Oh that my head were waters and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for ...my people! [Jer. 9:1] And farther on he gives a reason for his lamentation: ”weep ye not for the dead,” he writes, ”neither bemoan him: but weep sore for him that goeth away: for he shall return no more. [Jer. 22:10] The Jew and the Gentile therefore are not to be bemoaned, for they have never been in the Church and have died once for all (it is of these that the Saviour says: ”let the dead bury their dead” [Matt. 8:22]); weep rather for those who by reason of

their crimes and sins go away from the Church, and who suffering condemnation for their faults shall no more return to it. It is in this sense that the prophet speaks to ministers of the Church, calling them its walls and towers, and saying to each in turn, ”O wall, let tears run down. [Lam. 2:18] In this way, it is prophetically implied, you will fulfil the apostolic precept:

”rejoice with them that do rejoice and weep with them that weep,” [Rom. 12:15] and by your tears you will melt the hard hearts of sinners till they too weep; whereas, if they persist in evil doing they will find these words applied to them, ”I ...planted thee a noble vine, wholly a right seed: how then art thou turned into the degenerate plant of a strange vine unto me? [Jer. 2:21] and again ”saying to a stock, Thou art my father; and to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth: for they have turned their back unto me, and not their face. [Jer. 2:27] He means, they would not turn towards God in penitence; but in the hardness of their hearts turned their backs upon Him to insult Him. Wherefore also the Lord says to Jeremiah: ”hast thou seen that which backsliding Israel hath done? She is gone up upon every high mountain and under every green tree, and there hath played the harlot. And I said after she” had played the harlot and ”had done all these things, Turn thou unto me. But she returned not. [Jer. 3:6, Jer. 3:7]

2. How hard hearted we are and how merciful God is! who even after our many sins urges us to seek salvation. Yet not even so are we willing to turn to better things. Hear the words of the Lord: ”If a man put away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man’s and shall afterwards desire to return to him, will he at all receive her? Will he not loathe her rather? But thou hast played the harlot with many lovers: yet return again to me, saith the Lord. In place of the last clause the true Hebrew text (which is not preserved in the Greek and Latin versions) gives the following: ”thou hast forsaken me, yet return, and I will receive thee, saith the Lord. Isaiah also speaking in tim same sense uses almost the same words: ”Return,” he cries, ”O children of Israel, ye who think deep counsel and wicked. [Isa. 31:6, LXX] Return thou unto me and I will redeem thee. I am God, and there is no God else beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me. Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth. [Isa. 45:21, Isa. 45:22] Remember this and shew yourselves men: bring it again to mind, O ye transgressors. Return in heart and remember the former things of old: for I am God and there is none else. [Isa. 46:8, 9, LXX] Joel also writes:

”turn ye even to me with all your heart, and with fasting and with weeping and with mourning: and rend your heart and not your garments and turn unto the Lord your God; for he is gracious and merciful...and repenteth him of the evil. [Joel 2:12, Joel 2:13] How great His mercy is and how excessive-if I may so say-and unspeakable is His pitifulness, the prophet Hosea tells us when he speaks in the Lord’s name: ”how shall I give thee up, Ephraim? how shall I deliver thee, Israel? how shall I

make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zeboim? Mine heart is turned within me, my repentings are kindled together. I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger.' [Hos. 11:8, Hos. 11:9] David also says in a psalm: "in death there is no remembrance of thee; in the grave who shall give thee thanks? [Ps. 6:5] and in another place: "I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin. For this shall every one that is godly pray unto thee in a time when thou mayest be found: surely in the floods of great waters they shall not come nigh unto him. [Ps. 32:5, Ps. 32:6]

3. Think how great that weeping must be which deserves to be compared to a flood of waters. Whosoever so weeps and says with the prophet Jeremiah "let not the apple of mine eye cease" [Lam. 2:18] shall straightway find the words fulfilled of him: "mercy and truth are met together: righteousness and peace have kissed each other;" [Ps. 85:10] so that, if righteousness and truth terrify him, mercy and peace may encourage him to seek salvation.

The whole repentance of a sinner is exhibited to us in the fifty-first psalm written by David after he had gone in unto Bathsheba the wife of Uriah the Hittite, and when, to the rebuke of the prophet Nathan he had replied, "I have sinned." Immediately that he confessed his fault he was comforted by the words: "the Lord also hath put away thy sin." [2 Sam. 12:13] He had added murder to adultery; yet bursting into tears he says: "Have mercy upon me, O God, according to thy loving kindness: according unto the multitude of thy tender mercies blot out my transgressions." [Ps. 51:1] A sin so great needed to find great mercy. Accordingly he goes on to say: "Wash me throughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin. For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me. Against thee, thee only have I sinned"-as a king he had no one to fear but Gods-"and done this evil in thy sight; that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest and be clear when thou judgest." [Ps. 51:2-4] For "God hath concluded all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all." [Rom. 11:32] And such was the progress that David made that he who had once been a sinner and a penitent afterwards became a master able to say: "I will teach transgressors thy ways; and sinners shall be converted unto thee." [Ps. 51:13] For as "confession and beauty are before God," [Ps. 96:6, Vulg] so a sinner who confesses his sins and says: "my wounds stink and are corrupt because of my foolishness" [Ps. 38:5] loses his foul wounds and is made whole and clean. But "he that covereth his sins shall not prosper." [Prov. 28:13]

The ungodly king Ahab, who shed the blood of Naboth to gain his vineyard, was with Jezebel, the partner less of his bed than of his cruelty, severely rebuked by Elijah. "Thus saith the Lord, hast thou killed and also taken possession?" and again, "in the place where dogs licked the blood of Naboth, shall dogs lick thy blood, even thine;" and "the dogs shall eat Jezebel by the wall of Jezreel." [1 Kings 21:19, 1 Kings

21:23] ”And it came to pass”-the passage goes on-”when Ahab heard those words that he rent his clothes, and put sackcloth upon his flesh,and fasted, and lay in sackcloth…andthe word of the Lord came to Elijah saying, Because Ahab humbleth himself before me, I will not bring the evil in his days.” [1 Kings 21:27-29] Ahab’s sin and Jezebel’s were the same; yet because Ahab repented, his punishment was postponed so as to fall upon his sons, while Jezebel persisting in her wickedness met her doom then and there.

Moreover the Lord tells us in the gospel, ”the men of Nineveh shall rise in judgment with this generation and shall condemn it: because they repented at the preaching of Jonas;” [Matt. 12:41] and again He says ”I am not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance.” [Matt. 9:13] The lost piece of silver is sought for until it is found in the mire. [Luke 15:8-10] So also the ninety and nine sheep are left in the wilderness, while the shepherd carries home on his shoulders the one sheep which has gone astray. [Luke 15:4, Luke 15:5] Wherefore also ”there is joy in the presence of the angels over one sinner that repenteth.” [Luke 15:10] What a blessed thought it is that heavenly beings rejoice in our salvation! For it is of us that the words are said: ”Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” [Matt. 3:2] Death and life are contrary the one to the other; there is no middle term. Yet penitence can knit death to life. The prodigal son, we are told, wasted all his substance, and in the far country away from his father ”would fain have filled his belly with the husks that the swine did eat.” Yet, when he comes back to his father, the fatted calf is killed, a robe and a ring are given to him. [Luke 15:11-24] That is to say, he receives again Christ’s robe which he had before defiled, and hears to his comfort the injunction: ”let thy garments be always white.” [Eccles. 9:8] He receives the signet of God and cries to the Lord: ”Father, I have sinned against heaven and before thee;” and receiving the kiss of reconciliation, he says to Him: ”Now is the light of thy countenance sealed upon us, O Lord.”

Hear the words of Ezekiel: ”as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness; neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth.” [Ezek. 33:12] The Lord judges every man according as he finds him. It is not the past that He looks upon but the present. Bygone sins there may be, but renewal and conversion remove them. ”A just man,” we read ”falleth seven times and riseth up again.” [Prov. 24:16] If he falls, how is he just? and if he is just, how does he fall? The answer is that a sinner does not lose the name of just if he always repents of his sins and rises again. If a sinner repents, his sins are forgiven him not only till seven times but till seventy times seven. [Cf. Matt. 18:21, Matt. 18:22] To whom much is forgiven, the same loveth much. [Cf. Luke 7:47] The harlot washed with her tears the Saviour’s feet and wiped them with her hair; and to her, as a type of the Church gathered from the nations, was the declaration made: ”Thy sins are

forgiven." [Luke 7:48] The self-righteous Pharisee perished in his pride, white the humble publican was saved by his confession. [Cf. Luke 18:14]

God makes asseveration by the mouth of the prophet Jeremiah: "At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up to pull down and to destroy it: if that nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them. And at what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom to build and to plant it; if it do evil in my sight, that it obey not my voice, then I will repent of the good wherewith I said I would benefit them." And immediately he adds: "Behold, I frame evil against you, and devise a device against you: return ye now every one from his evil way, and make your ways and your doings good. And they said, there is no hope: but we will walk after our own devices, and we will every one do the imagination of his evil heart." [Jer. 18:7-12] The righteous Simeon says in the gospel: "Behold, this child is set for the fall and rising again of many," [Luke 2:34] for the fall, that is, of sinners and for the rising again of the penitent. So the apostle writes to the Corinthians: "it is reported commonly that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not so much as named among the Gentiles, that one should have his father's wife. And ye are puffed up and have not rather mourned that he that hath done this deed might be taken away from among you." [1 Cor. 5:1, 1 Cor. 5:2] And in his second epistle to the same, "lest such a one should be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow," [2 Cor. 2:7] he calls him back, and begs them to confirm their love towards him, so that he who had been destroyed by incest might be saved by penitence.

"There is no man clean from sin; even though he has lived but for one day. [Job 14:4, 5, LXX] And the years of man's life are many in number. "The stars are not pure in his sight, [Job 25:5] and his angels he charged with folly. [Job 4:18] If there is sin in heaven, how much more must there be sin on earth? If they are stained with guilt who have no bodily temptations, how much more must we be, enveloped as we are in frail flesh and forced to cry each one of us with the apostle: "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? [Rom. 7:24] For in my flesh there dwelleth no good thing. [Rom. 7:18] For we do not what we would but what we would not; the soul desires to do one thing, the flesh is compelled to do another. If any persons are called righteous in scripture, and not only righteous but righteous in the sight of God, they are called righteous according to that righteousness mentioned in the passage I have quoted: "A just man falleth seven times and riseth up again," [Prov. 24:16] and on the principle laid down that the wickedness of the wicked shall not hurt him in the day that he turns to repentance. [Cf. Ezek. 33:12] In fact Zachariah the father of John who is described as a righteous man sinned in disbelieving the message sent to him and was at once punished with dumbness.

[Luke 1:20-22] Even Job, who at the outset of his history is spoken of as perfect and upright and uncomplaining, is afterwards proved to be a sinner both by God's words and by his own confession. If Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the prophets also and the apostles were by no means free from sin and if the finest wheat had chaff mixed with it, what can be said of us of whom it is written: "What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord? [Jer. 23:28] Yet the chaff is reserved for future burning; as also are the tares which at present are mingled with the growing corn. For one shall come whose fan is in His hand, and shall purge His floor, and shall gather His wheat into the garner, and shall burn the chaff in the fire of hell. [Matt. 3:12]

4. Roaming thus through the fairest fields of scripture I have culled its loveliest flowers to weave for your brows a garland of penitence; for my aim is that, flying on the wings of a dove, you may find rest [Ps. 55:6] and make your peace with the Father of mercy. Your former wife, who is now your sister and fellow-servant, has told me that, acting on the apostolic precept, [1 Cor. 7:5] you and she lived apart by consent that you might give yourselves to prayer; but that after a time your feet sank beneath you as if resting on water and indeed-to speak plainly-gave way altogether. For her part she heard the Lord saying to her as to Moses: "as for thee stand thou here by me; [Deut. 5:31] and with the psalmist she said of Him: "He hath set my feet upon a rock. [Ps. 40:2] But your house-she went on-having no sure foundation of faith fell before a whirlwind of the devil. [Cf. Matt. 7:24-27] Hers however still stands in the Lord, and does not refuse its shelter to you; you can still be joined in spirit to her to whom you were once joined in body. For, as the apostle says, "he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit" with him.

[1 Cor. 6:17] Moreover, when the fury of the barbarians and the risk of captivity separated you again, you promised with a solemn oath that, if she made her way to the holy places, you would follow her either immediately or later, and that you would try to save your soul now that by your carelessness you had seemed to lose it. Perform, now, the vow which you then made in the presence of God. Human life is uncertain. Therefore, lest you may be snatched away before you have fulfilled your promise, imitate her whose teacher you ought to have been. For shame! the weaker vessel overcomes the world, and yet the stronger is overcome by it!

"A woman leadeth in the high emprise; and yet you will not follow her when her salvation leads you to the threshold of the faith! Perhaps, however, you desire to save the remnants of your property and to see the last of your friends and fellow-citizens and of their cities and villas. If so, amid the horrors of captivity, in the presence of exulting foes. and in the shipwreck of the province, at least hold fast to the plank of penitence; and remember your fellow-servant who daily sighs for your salvation and never despairs of it. While you are wandering about your own country (though, indeed, you no longer have a country; that which you once had, you have lost) she is interceding for you in the venerable spots which witnessed

the nativity, crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord and Saviour, and in the first of which He uttered His infant-cry. She draws you to her by her prayers that you may be saved, if not by your own exertions, at any rate by her faith. Of old one lay upon his bed sick of the palsy, so powerless in all his joints that he could neither move his feet to walk nor his hands to pray; yet when he was carried to our Lord by others, he was by Him so completely restored to health as to carry the bed which a little before had carried him. [Matt. 9:1-7] You too-absent in the body but present to her faith-your fellow-servant offers to her Lord and Saviour;

and with the Canaanite woman she says of you: ”my daughter is grievously vexed with a devil. [Matt. 15:22] Souls are of no sex; therefore I may fairly call your soul the daughter of hers. For as a mother coaxes her unweaned child which is as yet unable to take solid food; so does she call you to the milk suitable for babes and offer to you the sustenance that a nursing mother gives. Thus shall you be able to say with the prophet: ”I have gone astray like a lost sheep; seek thy servant; for I do not forget thy commandments. [Ps. 119:176]

Letter 123. To Ageruchia.

An appeal to the widow Ageruchia, highborn lady of Gaul, not to marry again. It should be compared with the letters to Furia (LIV.) and to Salvina (LXXIX.) The allusion to Stilicho's treaty with Alaric fixes the date to 409 a.d. 1. I must look for a new track on the old road and devise a natural treatment, the same yet not the same, for a hackneyed and well-worn theme. It is true that there is but one road; yet one can often reach one's goal by striking across country. I have several times written letters to widows in which for their instruction I have sought out examples from scripture, weaving its varied flowers into a single garland of chastity. On the present occasion I address myself to Ageruchia; whose very name (allotted to her by the divine guidance) has proved a prophecy of her after-life. Around her stand her grandmother, her mother, and her aunt; a noble band of tried Christian women. Her grandmother, Metronia, now a widow for forty years, reminds us of Anna the daughter of Phanuel in the gospel. [Luke 2:36, Luke 2:37] Her mother, Benigna, now in the fourteenth year of her widowhood, is surrounded by virgins whose chastity bears fruit a hundredfold. The sister of Celerinus, Ageruchia's father, has nursed her niece from infancy and indeed took her into her lap the moment that she was born. Deprived of the solace of her husband she has for twenty years trained her brother's child, teaching her the lessons which she has learned from her own mother.

2. I make these brief remarks to shew my young friend that in resolving not to marry again she does but perform a duty to her family; and that, while she will deserve no praise for fulfilling it, she will be justly blamed if she fails to do so. The more so that she has a posthumous son named after his father Simplicius and thus cannot plead loneliness or the want of an heir. For the lust of many shelters itself under such excuses as though the promptings of incontinence were only a desire for offspring. But why do I speak as to one who wavers when I hear that Ageruchia seeks the church's protection against the many suitors whom she meets in the palace? For the devil inflames men to vie with one another in proving the chastity of our beloved widow; and rank and beauty, youth and riches cause her to be sought after by all. But the greater the assaults that are made upon her continence, the greater will be the rewards that will follow her victory.

3. But no sooner do I clear the harbour than I find my way to the sea barred by a rock. I am confronted with the authority of the apostle Paul who in writing to Timothy thus speaks concerning widows: ”I will therefore that the younger women marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully. For some are already turned aside after Satan.” [1 Tim. 5:14, 1 Tim. 5:15] I must accordingly begin by considering the meaning of this pronouncement and examining the context of the whole passage. I must then plant my feet in the steps of the apostle and, as the saying goes, not deviate a hair’s breadth from them either to this side or to that. He had previously described his idea widow as one who had been the wife of one man, who had brought up children, who was well reported of for good works, who had relieved the afflicted with her substance, [1 Tim. 5:9, 1 Tim. 5:10] whose trust had been in God, and who had continued in prayer day and night. [1 Tim. 5:5] With her he contrasted her opposite, saying: ”She that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth.” And that he might warn his disciple Timothy with all needful admonition, he immediately added these words: ”the younger widows refuse: for when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ they will marry; having damnation because they have cast off their first faith.” [1 Tim. 5:11, 1 Tim. 5:12] It is then for these who have outraged Christ their Spouse by committing fornication against Him (for this is the sense of the Greek word ”καταστρηνιάσωσι”)-it is for these that the apostle wishes a second marriage, thinking digamy preferable to fornication; but this second marriage is a concession and not a command.

4. We must also take the passage clause by clause. ”I will,” he says, ”that the younger women marry.” Why, pray? because I would not have young women commit fornication. ”That they bear children;” [1 Tim. 5:14, 1 Tim. 5:15] for what reason? That they may not be induced by fear of the consequences to kill children whom they have conceived in adultery. ”That they be the heads of households.” Wherefore, pray? Because it is much more tolerable that a woman should marry again than that she should be a prostitute, and better that she should have a second husband than several paramours. The first alternative brings relief in a miserable plight, but the second involves a sin and its punishment. He continues: ”that they give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully,” a brief and comprehensive precept in which many admonitions are summed up. As for instance these: that a woman must not bring discredit upon her profession of widowhood by too great attention to her dress, that she must not draw troops of young men after her by gay smiles or expressive glances, that she must not profess one thing by her words and another by her behaviour, that she must give no ground for the application to herself of the well known line:

She gave a meaning look and slyly smiled. [Ovid, Am. 3:2, 83] Lastly, that Paul may compress into a few words all the reasons for such marriages, he shews the motive of his command by saying: ”for some are already turned aside after Satan.”Thus he

allows to the incontinent a second marriage, or in case of need a third, simply that he may rescue them from Satan, preferring that a woman should be joined to the worst of husbands rather than to the devil.To the Corinthians he uses somewhat similar language: ”I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn.” [1 Cor. 7:8, 1 Cor. 7:9] Why, O apostle, is it better to marry? He answers immediately: because it is worse to burn.

5. Apart from these considerations, that which is absolutely good and not merely relatively so is to be as the apostle, that is loose, not bound; free, not enslaved; caring for the things of God, not for the things of a wife. Immediately afterwards he adds: ”The wife is bound by the law to her husband as long as her husband liveth, but if her husband be fallen asleep, she is at liberty to be married to whom she will; only in the Lord. But she is happier if she so abide, after my judgment: and I think also that I have the spirit of God. [1 Cor. 7:39, 1 Cor. 7:40, cf. Rom. 7:2] This passage corresponds with the former in meaning, because the spirit of the two is the same. For though the epistles are different, they are the work of one author. While her husband lives the woman is bound, and when he is dead, she is loosed. Marriage then is a bond, and widowhood is the loosing of it. The wife is bound to the husband and the husband to the wife; and so close is the tie that they have no power over their own bodies, but each stands indebted to the other. They who are under the yoke of wedlock have not the option of choosing continence. When the apostle adds the words ”only in the Lord,” he excludes heathen marriages of which he had spoken in another place thus: ”be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers:

for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? and what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel? and what agreement hath the temple of God with idols? [2 Cor. 6:14-16] We must not plough with an ox and an ass together; [Dt. 22:10] nor weave our wedding garment of different colours. He at once takes back the concession he made, and, as if repenting of his opinion, withdraws it by saying: ”She is happier if she so abide,” that is, unmarried; and declares that in his judgment this course is preferable. And that this may not be made light of as a merely human utterance, he claims for it the authority of the Holy Spirit, so that we are listening not to a fellowman making concessions to the weakness of the flesh but to the Holy Spirit using the apostle for his mouthpiece.

6. Again, no widow of youthful age must quiet her qualms of conscience by the plea that he gives commandment that no widow is to be taken into the number under three-score years old. [1 Tim. 5:9] He does not by this arrangement urge unmarried girls or youthful widows to marry, seeing that even of the married he says: ”the time is short: it remaineth that they that have wives be as though they had

none. [1 Cor. 7:29] No, he is speaking of widows who have relations able to support them, who have sons and grandsons to be responsible for their maintenance. The apostle commands these latter to shew piety at home, and to requite their parents and to relieve them adequately; that the church may not be charged, but may be free to relieve those that are widows indeed. ”Honour widows,” he writes, ”that are widows indeed,” that is, such as are desolate and have no relations to help them, who cannot labour with their hands, who are weakened by poverty and overcome by years, whose trust is in God and their only work prayer. [1 Tim. 5:3-5, 1 Tim. 5:16] From which it is easy to infer that the younger widows, unless they are excused by ill health, are either left to their own exertions or else are consigned to the care of their children or relations. The word ’honour’ in this passage implies either alms or a gift, as also in the verse immediately following:

”Let the elders ...be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine. [1 Tim. 5:17] So also in the gospel when the Lord discusses that commandment of the Law which says: ”Honour thy father and thy mother,” [Ex. 20:12] He declares that it is to be interpreted not of mere words which while offering an empty shew of regard may still leave a parent’s wants unrelieved, but of the actual provision of the necessaries of life. The Lord commanded that poor parents should be supported by their children and that these should pay them back when old those benefits which they had themselves received in their childhood. The scribes and pharisees on the other hand taught the children to answer their parents by saying: ”It is Corban, that is to say, a gift [Mark 7:11] which I have promised to the altar and engaged to present to the temple: it will relieve you as much there, as if I were to give it you directly to buy food. So it frequently happened that while father and mother were destitute their children were offering sacrifices for the priests and scribes to consume.

If then the apostle compels poor widows-yet only those who are young and not broken down by sickness-to labour with their hands that the church, not charged with their maintenance, may be able to support such widows as are old, what plea can be urged by one who has abundance of this world’s goods, both for her own wants and those of others, and who can make to herself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness able to receive her into everlasting habitations? [Cf. Luke 16:9]

Consider too that no one is to be elected a widow, except she has been the wife of one husband. We sometimes fancy it to be the distinctive mark of the priesthood that none but monogamists shall be admitted to the altar. But not only are the twice-married excluded from the priestly office, they are debarred from receiving the alms of the church. A woman who has resorted to a second marriage is held unworthy to be supported by the faithful. And even the layman is bound by the law of the priest, for his conduct must be such as to admit of his election to the priesthood. If he has been twice married, he cannot be so elected. Therefore, as priests are

chosen from the ranks of laymen, the layman also is bound by the commandment, fulfilment of which is indispensable for the attainment of the priesthood.

7. We must distinguish between what the apostle himself desires and what he is compelled to acquiesce in. If he allows me to marry again, this is due to my own incontinence and not to his wish. For he wishes all men to be as he is, and to think the things of God, and when once they are loosed no more to seek to be bound. But when he sees unstable men in danger through their incontinence of falling into the abyss of lust, he extends to them the offer of a second marriage; that, if they must wallow in the mire, it may be with one and not with many. The husband of a second wife must not consider this a harsh saying or one that conflicts with the rule laid down by the apostle. The apostle is of two minds: first, he proclaims a command, "I say therefore to the unmarried and widows, It is good for them if they abide even as I. Next. he makes a concession, "But if they cannot contain, let them marry: for it is better to marry than to burn. [1 Cor. 7:8, 1 Cor. 7:9] He first shews what he himself desires, then that in which he is forced to acquiesce. He wishes us-after one marriage-to abide even as he, that is, unmarried, and sets before us in his own apostolic example an instance of the blessedness of which he speaks.

If however he finds that we are unwilling to do as he wishes, he makes a concession to our incontinence. Which then of the two alternatives do we choose for ourselves? The one which he prefers and which is in itself good? Or the one which in comparison with evil is tolerable, yet as it is only a substitute for evil is not altogether good? Suppose that we choose that course which the apostle does not wish but to which he only consents against his will, allowing those who seek lower ends to have their own way; in this case we carry out not the apostle's wish but our own. We read in the old testament that the daughters of the priests who have been married once and have become widows are to eat of the priests' food and that when they die they are to be buried with the same ceremonies as their father and mother. If on the other hand they take other husbands they are to be kept apart both from their father and from the sacrifices and are to be counted as strangers. [Lev. 22:12, Lev. 22:13]

8. These restraints on marriage are observed even among the heathen; and it is our condemnation if the true faith cannot do for Christ what false ones do for the devil, who has substituted for the saving chastity of the gospel a damning chastity of his own. The Athenian hierophant disowns his manhood and weakens his passions by a perpetual restraint. The holy office of the flamen is limited to those who have been once married, and the attendants of the flamens' wives must also have had but one husband. Only monogamists are allowed to share in the sacred rites connected with the Egyptian bull. I need say nothing of the vestal virgins and those of Apollo, the Achivan Juno, Diana, and Minerva, all of whom waste away in the perpetual virginity required by their vocation. I will just glance at the queen of Carthage who

was willing to burn herself rather than marry king Iarbas; at the wife of Hasdrubal who taking her two children one in each hand cast, herself into the flames beneath her rather than surrender her honour; and at Lucretia [See Livy, I. 200:57, 58] who having lost the prize of her chastity refused to survive the defilement of her soul. I will not lengthen my letter by quoting the many instances of the like virtue which you can read to your profit in my first book against Jovinian.

[Against Jov. 1:20] I will merely relate one which took place in your own country and which will shew you that chastity is held in high honour even among wild and barbarous and cruel peoples. Once the Teutons who came from the remote shores of the German Ocean overran all parts of Gaul, and it was only when they had cut to pieces several Roman armies that Marius at last defeated them in an encounter at Aquae Sextiae. By the conditions of the surrender three hundred of their married women were to be handed over to the Romans. When the Teuton matrons heard of this stipulation they first begged the consul that they might be set apart to minister in the temples of Ceres and Venus; and then when they failed to obtain their request and were removed by the lictors, they slew their little children and next morning were all found dead in each other's arms having strangled themselves in the night. [Val. Max. 6:1]

9. Shall then a highborn lady do what these barbarian women refused to do even as prisoners of war? After losing a first husband, good or bad as the case may be, shall she make trial of a second, and thus run counter to the judgment of God? And in case that she immediately loses this second, shall she take a third? And if he too is called to his rest, shall she go on to a fourth and a fifth, and by so doing identify herself with the harlots? No, a widow must take every precaution not to overstep by an inch the bounds of chastity. For if she once oversteps them and breaks through the modesty which becomes a matron, she will soon riot in every kind of excess; so much so that the prophet's words shall be true of her "Thou hast a whore's forehead, thou refusest to be ashamed." [Jer. 3:3]

What then? do I condemn second marriages? not at all; but I commend first ones. Do I expel twice-married persons from the church? Far from it; but I urge those who have been once married to lives of continence. The Ark of Noah contained unclean animals as well as clean. It contained both creeping things and human beings, In a great house there are vessels of different kinds, some to honour and some to dishonour. [2 Tim. 2:20] In the gospel parable the seed sown in the good ground brings forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold. The hundredfold which comes first betokens the crown of virginity; the sixtyfold which comes next refers to the work of widows; while the thirtyfold-indicated by joining together the points of the thumb and forefinger -denotes the marriage-tie. What room is left for double marriages? None. They are not counted. Such weeds do not grow in good ground but among briers and thorns, the favourite haunts of

those foxes to whom the Lord compares the impious Herod. [Luke 13:32] A woman who marries more than once fancies herself worthy of praise because she is not so bad as the prostitutes, because she compares favourably with these victims of indiscriminate lust by surrendering herself to one alone and not to a number.

10. The story which I am about to relate is an incredible one; yet it is vouched for by many witnesses. A great many years ago when I was helping Damasus bishop of Rome with his ecclesiastical correspondence, and writing his answers to the questions referred to him by the councils of the east and west, I saw a married couple, both of whom were sprung from the very dregs of the people. The man had already buried twenty wives, and the woman had had twenty-two husbands. Now they were united to each other as each believed for the last time. The greatest curiosity prevailed both among men and women to see which of these two veterans would live to bury the other. The husband triumphed and walked before the bier of his often-married wife, amid a great concourse of people from all quarters, with garland and palm-branch, scattering spelt as he went along among an approving crowd. What shall we say to such a woman as that? Surely just what the Lord said to the woman of Samaria: "Thou hast had twenty-two husbands, and he by whom you are now buried is not your husband." [Cf. Joh. 4:18]

11. I beseech you therefore, my devout daughter in Christ, not to dwell on those passages which offer succour to the incontinent and the unhappy but rather to read those in which chastity is crowned. It is enough for you that you have lost the first and highest kind, that of virginity, and that you have passed through the third to the second; that is to say, having formerly fulfilled the obligations of a wife, that you now live in continence as a widow. Think not of the lowest grade, nay of that which does not count at all, I mean, second marriage; and do not seek for far fetched precedents to justify you in marrying again. You cannot too closely imitate your grandmother, your mother, and your aunt; whose teaching and advice as to life will form for you a rule of virtue. For if many wives in the lifetime of their husbands come to realize the truth of the apostle's words: "all things are lawful unto me but all things are not expedient," [1 Cor. 6:12] and make eunuchs of themselves for the kingdom of heaven's sake [Matt. 19:12] either by consent after their regeneration through the baptismal laver, or else in the ardour of their faith immediately after their marriage; why should not a widow, who by God's decree has ceased to have a husband, joyfully cry again and again with Job:

"the Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away," [Job 1:21] and seize the opportunity offered to her of having power over her own body instead of again becoming the servant of a man. Assuredly it is much harder to abstain from enjoying what you have than it is to regret what you have lost. Virginity is the easier because virgins know nothing of the promptings of the flesh, and widowhood is the harder because widows cannot help thinking of the license they have enjoyed in the past. And it is

harder still if they suppose their husbands to be lost and not gone before; for while the former alternative brings pain, the latter causes joy.

12. The creation of the first man should teach us to reject more marriages than one. There was but one Adam and but one Eve; in fact the woman was fashioned from a rib of Adam. [Gen. 2:21, Gen. 2:22] Thus divided they were subsequently joined together in marriage; in the words of scripture ”the twain shall be one flesh,” not two or three. ”Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife. [Gen. 2:24, LXX] Certainly it is not said ”to his wives. Paul in explaining the passage refers it to Christ and the church; [Eph. 5:31, Eph. 5:32] making the first Adam a monogamist in the flesh and the second a monogamist in the spirit As there is one Eve who is ”the mother of all living,” [Gen. 3:20] so is there one church which is the parent of all Christians. And as the accursed Lamech made of the first Eve two separate wives, [Gen. 4:19] so also the heretics sever the second into several churches which, according to the apocalypse of John, ought rather to be called synagogues of the devil than congregations of Christ. [Rev. 2:9] In the Book of Songs we read as follows:-”there are threescore queens, and fourscore concubines, and virgins without number. My dove, my undefiled is but one; she is the only one of her mother, she is the choice one of her that bare her.

[Cant. 6:8, Cant. 6:9] It is to this choice one that the same John addresses an epistle in these words, ”the elder unto the elect lady and her children. So too in the case of the ark which the apostle Peter interprets as a type of the church, [1 Pet. 3:20, 1 Pet. 3:21] Noah brings in for his three sons one wife apiece and not two. [Gen. 7:13] Likewise of the unclean animals pairs only are taken, male and female, to shew that digamy has no place even among brutes, creeping things, crocodiles and lizards. And if of the clean animals there are seven taken of each kind, [Gen. 7:2] that is, an uneven number; this points to the palm which awaits virginal chastity. For on leaving the ark Noah sacrificed victims to God [Gen. 8:20] not of course of the animals taken by twos for these were kept to multiply their species, but of those taken by sevens some of which had been set apart for sacrifice.

13. It is true that the patriarchs had each of them more wives than one and that they had numerous concubines besides. And as if their example was not enough, David had many wives and Solomon a countless number. Judah went in to Tamar thinking her to be a harlot; [Gen. 38:12-18] and according to the letter that killeth the prophet Hosea married not only a whore but an adulteress. [Hos. 1:2, Hos. 1:3] If these instances are to justify us let us neigh after every woman that we meet; [Cf Jer. 5:8] like the people of Sodom and Gomorrah let us be found by the last day buying and selling, marrying and giving in marriage; [Luke 17:27-29] and let us only end our marrying with the close of our lives. And if both before and after the deluge the maxim held good: ”be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth: [Gen. 1:28, Gen. 9:7] what has that to do with us upon whom the ends of

the ages are come, unto whom it is said, ”the time is short,” [1 Cor. 7:29] and ”now the axe is laid unto the root of the trees; [Matt. 3:10] that is to say, the forests of marriage and of the law must be cut down by the chastity of the gospel. There is ”a time to embrace, and a time to refrain from embracin. [Eccles. 3:5] Owing to the near approach of the captivity Jeremiah is forbidden to take a wife. [Jer. 16:2] In Babylon Ezekiel says:

”my wife is dead and my mouth is opened. Neither he who wished to marry nor he who had married could in wedlock prophesy freely. In days gone by men rejoiced to hear it said of them: ”thy children shall be like olive plants round about thy table,” and ”thou shalt seethy children’s children. [Ps. 128:3, Ps. 128:6] But now it is said of those who live in continence: ”he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit; [1 Cor. 6:17] and ”my soul followeth hard after thee: thy right hand upholdeth me. [Ps. 63:8] Then it was said ”an eye for an eye; now the commandment is ”whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. [Matt. 5:38, Matt. 5:39] In those days men said to the warrior: ”gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O most mighty; [Ps. 45:3] now it is said to Peter: ”put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword. [Matt. 26:52]

In speaking thus I do not mean to sever the law from the gospel, as Marcion falsely does. No, I receive one and the same God in both who, as the time and the object vary, is both the Beginning and the End, who sows that He may reap, who plants that He may have somewhat to cut down, and who lays the foundation that in the fulness of time He may crown the edifice. Besides, if we are to deal with symbols and types of things to come, we must judge of them not by our own opinions but in the light of the apostle’s explanations. Hagar and Sarah, or Sinai and Zion, are typical of the two testaments. [Gal. 4:22-26] Leah who was tender-eyed and Rachel whom Jacob loved [Gen. 29:17, Gen. 29:18] signify the synagogue and the church. So likewise do Hannah and Peninnah of whom the former, at first barren, afterwards exceeded the latter in fruitfulness. In Isaac and Rebekah we see an early example of monogamy: it was only to Rebekah that the Lord revealed Himself in the hour of childbirth and she alone went of herself to enquire of the Lord. [Gen. 25:22, Gen. 25:23] What shall I say of Tamar who bore twin sons, Pharez and Zarah? [Gen. 38:27-30] At their birth was broken down that middle wall of partition which typified the division existing between the two peoples;

[Eph. 2:14] while the binding of Zarah’s hand with the scarlet thread even then marked the conscience of the Jews with the stain of Christ’s blood. And how shall I speak of the whore married by the prophet who is a figure either of the church as gathered in from the Gentiles or-an interpretation which better suits the passage- of the synagogue? First adopted from among the idolaters by Abraham and Moses, this has now denied the Saviour and proved unfaithful to Him. Therefore it has

long been deprived of its altar, priests, and prophets and has to abide many days for its first husband. [Hos. 2:7, Hos. 3:3] For when the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in, all Israel shall be saved. [Rom. 11:25, Rom. 11:26]

14. I have tried to compress a great deal into a limited space as a draughtsman does when he delineates a large country in a small map. For I wish to deal with other questions, the first of which I shall give in Anna's words to her sister Dido: "Why waste your youth alone in ceaseless grief Unblest with offspring, sweetest gift of love? Think you the buried dead require this?" To whom the sufferer thus briefly replies: "Twas you, my sister, you, who were the first To plunge my frenzied soul into this woe. Why could I not have lived a virgin life Like some wild creature innocent of care? Alas! I pledged my soul unto the dead:"

I vowed a vow and I have broken it. You set before me the joys of wedlock. I for my part will remind you of Dido's sword and pyre and funeral flames. In marriage there is not so much good to be hoped for as there is evil which may happen and must be feared. Passion when indulged always brings repentance with it; it is never satisfied, and once quenched it is soon kindled anew. Its growth or decay is a matter of habit; led like a captive by impulse it refuses to obey reason. But you will argue, 'the management of wealth and property requires the superintendence of a husband.' Do you mean to say that the affairs of those who live single are ruined; and that, unless you make yourself as much a slave as your own servants, you will not be able to govern your household? Do not your grandmother, your mother and your aunt enjoy even more than their old influence and respect, looked up to as they are by the whole province and by the leaders of the churches? Do not soldiers and travellers manage their domestic affairs and give entertainments to one another with no wives to help them? Why can you not have grave and elderly servants or freed-men, such as those who have nursed you inyour childhood, to preside over your house, to answer public calls, to pay taxes;

men who will look up to you as a patroness, who will love you as a nursling, who will revere you as a saint? "Seek first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added unto you. [Matt. 6:33] If you are careful for raiment the gospel bids you "consider the lilies; and, if for food, to go back to the fowls which "sow not neither do they reap; yet your heavenly father feedeth them. [Matt. 6:26, Matt. 6:28. How many virgins and widows there are who have looked after their property for themselves without thereby incurring any stain of scandal!

15. Do not associate with young women or cleave to them, for it is on account of such that the apostle makes his concession of second marriage, and so you may be shipwrecked in what appears to be calm water. If Paul can say to Timothy, "the younger widows refuse," [1 Tim. 5:11] and again "love the elder women as mothers; the younger as sisters, with all purity," what plea can you urge for refusing to hear my admonitions? Avoid all persons to whom a suspicion of evil living may attach

itself, and do not content yourself with the trite answer. 'my own conscience is enough for me; I do not care what people say of me.' That was not the principle on which the apostle acted. He provided things honest not only in the sight of God but in the sight of all men; [Rom. 12:17, cf. Letter cxvii] that the name of God might not be blasphemed among the Gentiles. [Rom. 2:24] Though he had power to lead about a sister, a wife, [1 Cor. 9:5] he would not do so, for he did not wish to be judged by an unbeliever's conscience. [1 Cor. 10:29] And, though he might have lived by the gospel, [1 Cor. 9:14] he laboured day and night with his own hands, that he might not be burdensome to the believers. [1 Cor. 4:12, 1 Thess. 2:9, 2 Cor. 12:14] "If meat," he says, "make my brother to offend. I will eat no flesh while the world standeth.

[1 Cor. 8:13] Let us then say, if a sister or a brother causes not one or two but the whole church to offend, 'I will not see that sister or that brother.' It is better to lose a portion of one's substance than to imperil the salvation of one's soul. It is better to lose that which some day, whether we like it or not, must be lost to us and to give it up freely, than to lose that for which we should sacrifice all that we have. Which of us can add-I will not say a cubit for that would be an immense addition-but the tenth part of a single inch to his stature? Why are we careful what we shall eat or what we shall drink? Let us "take no thought for the morrow: sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. [Matt. 6:25, Matt. 6:27, Matt. 6:34]

Jacob in his flight from his brother left behind in his father's house great riches and made his way with nothing into Mesopotamia. Moreover, to prove to us his powers of endurance, he took a stone for his pillow. Yet as he lay there he beheld ladder set up on the earth reaching to heaven and behold the Lord stood above it, and the angels ascended and descended on it; [Gen. 28:11-13] the lesson being thus taught that the sinner must not despair of salvation nor the righteous man rest secure in his virtue. To pass over much of the story (for there is no time to explain all the points in the narrative) after twenty years he who before had passed over Jordan with his staff returned into his native land with three droves of cattle, rich in flocks and herds and richer still in children. [Gen. 32:7, Gen. 32:10] The apostles likewise travelled throughout the world without either money in their purses, or staves in their hands, or shoes on their feet; [Matt. 10:9, Matt. 10:10] and yet they could speak of themselves as "having nothing and yet possessing all things." [2 Cor. 6:10] "Silver and gold," say they, "have we none, but such as we have give we thee: in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk." [Acts 3:6] For they were not weighed down with the burthen of riches. Therefore they could stand, as Elijah, in the crevice of the rock, they could pass through the needle's eye, and behold the back parts of the Lord.

But as for us we burn with covetousness and, even while we declaim against the love of money, we hold out our skirts to catch gold and never have enough. [Cf. Juv.

1:88] There is a common saying about the Megarians which may rightly be applied to all who suffer from this passion: ”They build as if they are to live forever; they live as if they are to die to-morrow.” We do the same, for we do not believe the Lord’s words. When we attain the age which all desire we forget the nearness of that death which as human beings we owe to nature and with futile hope promise to ourselves a long length of years. No old man is so weak and decrepit as to suppose that he will not live for one year more. A forgetfulness of his true condition gradually creeps upon him; so that-earthly creature that he is and close to dissolution as he stands-he is lifted up into pride, and in imagination seats himself in heaven.

16. But what am I doing? Whilst I talk about the cargo, the vessel itself founders. He that letteth is taken out of the way, and yet we do not realize that Antichrist is near. Yes, Antichrist is near whom the Lord Jesus Christ ”shall consume with the spirit of his mouth.” [2 Thess. 2:7, 2 Thess. 2:8] ”Woe unto them,” he cries, ”that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days.” [Matt. 24:19] Now these things are both the fruits of marriage.

I shall now say a few words of our present miseries. A few of us have hitherto survived them, but this is due not to anything we have done ourselves but to the mercy of the Lord. Savage tribes in countless numbers have overrun all parts of Gaul. The whole country between the Alps and the Pyrenees, between the Rhine and the Ocean, has been laid waste by hordes of Quadi, Vandals, Sarmatians, Alans, Gepids, Herules, Saxons, Burgundians, Allemanni and-alas! for the commonweal!-even Pannonians. For ”Assur also is joined with them.” [Ps. 83:8] The once noble city of Moguntiacum has been captured and destroyed. In its church many thousands have been massacred. The people of Vangium after standing a long siege have been extirpated. The powerful city of Rheims, the Ambiani, the Altrebatae, the Belgians on the skirts of the world, Tournay, Spires, and Strasburg have fallen to Germany: while the provinces of Aquitaine and of the Nine Nations, of Lyons and of Narbonne are with the exception of a few cities one universal scene of desolation. And those which the sword spares without, famine ravages within. I cannot speak without tears of Toulouse which has been kept from failing hitherto by the merits of its reverend bishop Exuperius. Even the Spains are on the brink of ruin and tremble daily as they recall the invasion of the Cymry; and, while others suffer misfortunes once in actual fact, they suffer them continually in anticipation.

17. I say nothing of other places that I may not seem to despair of God’s mercy. All that is ours now from the Pontic Sea to the Julian Alps in days gone by once ceased to be ours. For thirty years the barbarians burst the barrier of the Danube and fought in the heart of the Roman Empire. Long use dried our tears. For all but a few old people had been born either in captivity or during a blockade, and consequently they did not miss a liberty which they had never known. Yet who will hereafter credit the fact or what histories will seriously discuss it, that Rome

has to fight within her own borders not for glory but for bare life; and that she does not even fight but buys the right to exist by giving gold and sacrificing all her substance? This humiliation has been brought upon her not by the fault of her Emperors who are both most religious men, but by the crime of a half-barbarian traitor who with our money has armed our foes against us. Of old the Roman Empire was branded with eternal shame because after ravaging the country and routing the Romans at the Allia, Brennus with his Gauls entered, Rome itself. Nor could this ancient stain be wiped out until Gaul, the birth-place of the Gauls, and Gaulish Greece, wherein they had settled after triumphing over East and West, were subjugated to her sway.

Even Hannibal who swept like a devastating storm from Spain into Italy, although he came within sight of the city, did not dare to lay siege to it. Even Pyrrhus was so completely bound by the spell of the Roman name that destroying everything that came in his way, he yet withdrew from its vicinity and, victor though he was, did not presume to gaze upon what he had learned to be a city of kings. Yet in return for such insults-not to say such haughty pride-as theirs which ended thus happily for Rome, one banished from all the world found death at last by poison in Bithynia; while the other returning to his native land was slain in his own dominions. The countries of both became tributary to the Roman people. But now, even if complete success attends our arms, we can wrest nothing from our vanquished foes but what we have already lost to them. The poet Lucan describing the power of the city in a glowing passage says:

”If Rome be weak, where shall we look for strength?” we may vary his words and say: ”If Rome be lost, where shall we look for help” or quote the language of Virgil: ”Had I a hundred tongues and throat of bronze The woes of captives I could not relate” Or ev’n recount the names of all the slain. [Virg. A. 6:625-627] Even what I have said is fraught with danger both to me who say it and to all who hear it; for we are no longer free even to lament our fate. and are unwilling, nay, I may even say, afraid to weep for our sufferings.

Dearest daughter in Christ, answer me this question: will you marry amid such scenes as these? Tell me, what kind of husband will you take? One that will run or one that will fight? In either case you know what the result will be. Instead of the Fescennine song, the hoarse blare of the terrible trumpet will deafen your ears and your very brideswomen may be turned into mourners. In what pleasures can you hope to revel now that you have lost the proceeds of all your possessions, now that you see your small retinue under close blockade and a prey to the inroads of pestilence and famine? But far be it from me to think so meanly of you or to harbour any suspicions of one who has dedicated her soul to the Lord. Though nominally addressed to you my words are really meant for others such as are idle, inquisitive and given to gossip. These wander from house to house and from one

married lady to another, [1 Tim. 5:13] their god is their belly and their glory is in their shame, [Phil. 3:19] of the scriptures they know nothing except the texts which favour second marriages, but they love to quote the example of others to justify their own self-indulgence, and flatter themselves that they are no worse than their fellow-sinners. When you have confounded the shameless proposals of such women by explaining the true drift of the apostle's meaning; then to show you by what mode of life you can best preserve your widowhood, you may read with advantage what I have written. I mean my treatise on the preservation of virginity addressed to Eustochium and my two letters to Furia and Salvina. Of these two latter you may like to know that the first is daughter-in-law to Probus some time consul, and the second daughter to Gildo formerly governour of Africa. This tract on monogamy I shall call by your name.

Letter 124. To Avitus.

Avitus to whom this letter is addressed is probably the same person who induced Jerome to write to Salvina (see Letter 79., §I, ante). The occasion of writing is as follows. Ten years previously (that is to say in a.d. 399 or 400) Pammachius had asked Jerome to supply him with a correct version of Origen's First Principles to enable him to detect the variations introduced by Rufinus into his rendering. This Jerome willingly did (see Letters LXXXIII. and LXXXIV.) but when the work in its integrity was perused by Pammachius he thought it so erroneous in doctrine that he determined not to circulate it. However, "a certain brother" induced him to lend the ms. to him for a short time; and then, when he had got it into his hands, had a hasty and incorrect transcript made, which he forthwith published much to the chagrin of Pammachius. Falling into the hands of Avitus a copy of this much perplexed him and he seems to have appealed to Jerome for an explanation. This the latter now gives forwarding at the same time an authentic edition of his version of the First Principles. The date of the letter is a.d. 409 or 410.

1. About ten years ago that saintly man Pammachius sent me a copy of a certain person's rendering, or rather misrendering, of Origen's First Principles; with a request that in a Latin version I should give the true sense of the Greek and should set down the writer's words for good or for evil without bias in either direction. When I did as he wished and sent him the book, he was shocked to read it and locked it up in his desk lest being circulated it might wound the souls of many. However, a certain brother, who had "a zeal for God but not according to knowledge," [Rom. 10:2, R.V] asked for a loan of the manuscript that he might read it; and, as he promised to return it without delay, Pammachius, thinking no harm could happen in so short a time, unsuspectingly consented. Hereupon he who had borrowed the book to read, with the aid of scribes copied the whole of it and gave it back much sooner than he had promised. Then with the same rashness or-to use a less severe term-thoughtlessness he made bad worse by confiding to others what he had thus stolen. Moreover, since a bulky treatise on an abstruse subject is difficult to reproduce with accuracy, especially if it has to be taken down surreptitiously and in a hurry, order and sense were sacrificed in several passages. Whence it comes, my dear Avitus, that you ask me to send you a copy of my version as made for

Pammachius and not for the public, a garbled edition of which has. been published by the aforesaid brother.

2. Take then what you have asked for; but know that there are countless things in the book to be abhorred, and that, as the Lord says, you will have to walk among scorpions and serpents. [Cf. Luke 10:19, Ezek. 2:6] It begins by saying that Christ was made God's son not born; that God the Father, as He is by nature invisible, is invisible even to the Son; that the Son, who is the likeness of the invisible Father, compared with the Father is not the truth but compared with us who cannot receive the truth of the almighty Father seems a figure of the truth so that we perceive the majesty and magnitude of tire greater in the less, the Father's glory limited in the Son; that God the Father is a light incomprehensible and that Christ compared with him is but a minute brightness, although by reason of our incapacity to us he appears a great one. The Father and the Son are compared to two statues, a larger one and a small; the first filling the world and being somehow invisible through its size, the second cognisable by the eyes of men. God the Father omnipotent the writer terms good and of perfect goodness; but of the Son he says: "He is not good but an emanation and likeness of goodness; not good absolutely but only with a qualification, as 'the good shepherd' and the like. The Holy Spirit he places after the Father and the Son as third in dignity and honour.

And while he declares that he does not know whether the Holy Spirit is created or uncreated, he has later on given his own opinion that except God the Father alone there is nothing uncreated. "The Son," he states, "is inferior to the Father, inasmuch as He is second and the Father first; and the Holy Spirit which dwells in all the saints is inferior to the Son. In the same way the power of the Father is greater than that of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Likewise the power of the Son is greater than that of the Holy Spirit, and as a consequence the Holy Spirit in its turn has greater virtue than other things called holy."

3. Then, when he comes to deal with rational creatures and to describe their lapse into earthly bodies as due to their own negligence, he goes on to say: "Surely it argues great negligence and sloth for a soul so far to empty itself as to fall into sin and allow itself to be tied to the material body of an unreasoning brute; and in a subsequent passage: "These reasonings induce me to suppose that it is by their own free act that some are numbered with God's saints and servants, and that it was through their own fault that others fell from holiness into such negligence that they were changed into forces of an opposite kind. He maintains that after every end a fresh beginning springs forth and an end from each beginning, and that wholesale variation is possible; so that one who is now a human being may in another world become a demon, while one who by reason of his negligence is now a demon may hereafter be placed in a more material body and thus become a human being. So far does he carry this transforming process that on his theory

an archangel may become the devil and the devil in turn be changed back into an archangel. ”Such as have wavered or faltered but have not altogether fallen shall be made subject, for rule and government and guidance, to better things-to principalities and powers, to thrones and dominations”;

and of these perhaps another human race will be formed, when in the words of Isaiah there shall be ”new heavens and a new earth.’ [Isa. 65:17] But such as have not deserved to return through humanity to their former estate shall become the devil and his angels, demons of the worst sort; and according to what they have done shall havespecial duties assigned to them in particular worlds. Moreover, the very demons and rulers of darkness in any world or worlds, if they are willing to turn to better things, may become human beings and so come back to their first beginning. That is to say, after they have borne the discipline of punishment and torture for a longer or a shorter time in human bodies, they may again reach the angelic pinnacles from which they have fallen. Hence it may be shewn that we men may change into any other reasonable beings, and that not once only or on emergency but time after time; we and angels shall become demons if we neglect our duty; and demons, if they will take to themselves virtues, may attain to the rank of angels.

4. Bodily substances too are to pass away utterly or else at the end of all things will become highly rarified like the sky and aether and other subtle bodies. It is clear that these principles must affect the writer’s view of the resurrection. The sun also and the moon and the rest of the constellations are alive. Nay more; as we men by reason of our sins are enveloped in bodies material and sluggish; so the lights of heaven have for like reasons received bodies more or less luminous, and demons have been for more serious faults clothed with starry frames. This, he argues, is the view of the apostle who writes:-”the creation has been subjected to vanity and shall be delivered for the revealing of the sons of God. [Rom. 8:19-21, R.V] That it may not be supposed that I am imputing to him ideas of my own I shall give his actual words. ”At the end and consummation of the world,” he writes, ”when souls and beings endowed with reason shall be released from prison by the Lord, they will move slowly or fly quickly according as they have previously been slothful or energetic. And as all of them have free will and are freeto choose virtue or vice, those who choose the latter will be much worse off than they now are. But those who choose the former will improve their condition. Their movements and decisions in this direction or in that will determine their various futures;

whether, that is, angels are to become men or demons, and whether demons are to become men or angels. Then after adducing various arguments in support of his thesis and maintaining that while not incapable of virtue the devil has yet not chosen to be virtuous, he has Finally reasoned with much diffuseness that an angel, a human soul, and a demon-all according tohim of one nature but of different

wills-may in punishment for great negligence or folly be transformed into brutes. Moreover, to avoid the agony of punishment and the burning flame the more sensitive may choose to become loworganisms, to dwell in water, to assume the shape of this or that animal; so that we have reason to fear a metamorphosis not only into four-footed things but even into fishes. Then, lest he should be held guilty of maintaining with Pythagoras the transmigration of souls, he winds up the wicked reasoning with which he has wounded his reader by saying: ”I must not be taken to make dogmas of these things; they are only thrown out as conjectures to shew that they are not altogether overlooked.”

5. In his second book he maintains a plurality of worlds; not, however, as Epicurus taught, many like ones existing at once, but a new one beginning each time that the old comes to an end. There was a world before this world of ours, and after it there will be first one and then another and so on in regular succession. He is in doubt whether one world shall be so completely similar to another as to leave no room for any difference between them, or whether one world shall never wholly be indistinguishable from another. And again a little farther on he writes: ”if, as the course of the discussion makes necessary, all things can live without body, all bodily existence shall be swallowed up and that which once has been made out of nothing shall again be reduced to nothing. And yet a time will come when its use will be once more necessary. And in the same context: ”but if, as reason and the authority of scripture shew, this corruptible shall put on incorruption and this mortal shall put on immortality, death shall be swallowed up in victory and corruption in incorruption. [1 Cor. 15:53, 1 Cor. 15:54] And it may be that all bodily existence shall be removed, for it is only in this that death can operate. And a little farther on: ”if these things are not contrary to the faith, it may be that we shall some day live in a disembodied state.

Moreover, if only he is fully subject to Christ who is disembodied, and if all must be made subject to Him, we too shall lose our bodies when we become fully subject to Him. And in the same passage: ”if all are to be made subject to God, all shall lay aside their bodies; and then all bodily existence shall be brought to nought. But if through the fall of reasonable beings it is a second time required it will reappear. For God has left souls to strive and struggle, to teach them that full and complete victory is to be attained not by their own efforts but by His grace. And so to my mind worlds vary with the sins which cause them, and those are exploded theories which maintain that all worlds are alike. And again: ”three conjectures occur to me with regard to the end; it is for the reader to determine which is nearest to the truth. For either we shall be bodiless when being made subject to Christ we shall be made subject to God and He shall be all in all; or as things made subject to Christ shall be with Christ Himself made subject to God and brought under one law, so all substance shall be refined into its most perfect form and rarified into aether which is a pure and uncompounded essence;

or else the sphere which I have called motionless and all that it contains will be dissolved into nothing, and the sphere in which the antizone itself is contained shall be called 'good ground,' [Matt. 13:8] and that other sphere which in its revolution surrounds the earth and goes by the name of heaven shall be reserved for the abode of the saints."

6. In speaking thus does he not most clearly follow the error of the heathen and foist upon the simple faith of Christians the ravings of philosophy? In the same book he writes: "it remains that God is invisible. But if He is by nature invisible, He must beso even to the Saviour. And lower down: "no soul which has descended into a human body has borne upon it so true an impress of its previous character as Christ's soul of which He says: 'no man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself.'" [Joh. 10:18] And in another place: "we must carefully consider whether souls, when they have won salvation and have attained to the blessed life, may not cease to be souls. For as the Lord and Saviour came to seek and to save that which was lost [Luke 19:10] that it might cease to be lost; so the lost soul which the Lord came to save, when saved, will cease to be a soul. We must ask ourselves whether, as the lost was not lost once and again will not be, the soul likewise may have been and again may be not a soul. And after a good many remarks upon the soul he brings in the following, "νοῦς or" intelligence by falling becomes a soul; and by acquiring virtue this will become intelligence again. This at least is a fair inference from the case of Esau who for his old sins is condemned to lead a lower life.

And concerning the heavenly bodies we must make a similar acknowledgment. The soul of the sun-or whatever else you like to call it-does not date its existence from the creation of the world; it already existed before it entered its shining and glowing body. So also with the moon and stars. From antecedent causes they have been made subject to vanity not willingly but for future reward, [Rom. 8:20] and are forced to do not their own will but the creator's who has assigned to them their several spheres."

7. Hellfire, moreover, and the torments with which holy scripture threatens sinners he explains not as external punishments but as the pangs of guilty consciences when by God's power the memory of our transgressions is set before our eyes. "The whole crop of our sins grows up afresh from seeds which remain in the soul, and all our dishonourable and undutiful acts are again pictured before our gaze. Thus it is the fire of conscience and the stings of remorse which torture the mind as it looks back on former self-indulgence." And again: "but perhaps this coarse and earthly body ought to be described as mist and darkness; for at the end of this world and when it becomes necessary to pass into another, the like darkness will lead to the like physical birth." In speaking thus he clearly pleads for the transmigration of souls as taught by Pythagoras and Plato. . And at the end of the second

book in dealing with our perfection he has said: ”when we shall have made such progress as not only to cease to be flesh or body but perhaps also to cease to be souls our perfect intelligence and perception, undimmed with any mist of passion, will discern reasonable and intelligible substances face to face.

8. In the third book the following faulty statements are contained. ”If we once admit that, when one vessel is made to honour and another to dishonour, [2 Tim. 2:20] this is due to antecedent causes; why may we not revert to the mystery of the soul and allow that it is loved in one and hated in another because of its past actions, before in Jacob it becomes a supplanter and before in Esau it is supplanted? [Mal. 1:2, Mal. 1:3] And again: ”the fact that souls are made some to honour and some to dishonour is to be explained by their previous history. And in the same place: ”on this hypothesis of mine a vessel made to honour which fails to fulfil its object will in another world become a vessel made to dishonour; and contrariwise a vessel which has from a previous fault been condemned to dishonour will, if it accepts correction in this present life, become in the new creation a vessel ’sanctified and meet for the Master’s use and prepared unto every good work. [2 Tim. 2:21] And he immediately goes on to say: ”I believe that men who begin with small faults may become so hardened in wickedness that, if they do not repent and turn to better things, they must become inhuman energies; and contrariwise that hostile and demonic beings may in course of time so far heal their wounds and cheek the current of their former sins that they may attain to the abode of the perfect.

As I have often said, in those countless and unceasing worlds in which the soul lives and has its being some grow worse and worse until they reach the lowest depths of degradation; while others in those lowest depths grow better and better until they reach the perfection of virtue. Thus he tries to shew that men, or rather their souls, may become demons; and that demons in turn may be restored to the rank of angels. In the same book he writes: ”this too must be considered; why the human soul is diversely acted upon now by influences of one kind and now by influences of another. And he surmises that this is due to conduct which has preceded birth. It is for this, he argues, that John leaps in his mother’s womb when at Mary’s salutation Elizabeth declares herself unworthy of her notice. [Luke 1:41] And he immediately subjoins: ”on the other hand infants that are hardly weaned are possessed with evil spirits and become diviners and soothsayers; [Cf. Acts 16:16, A.V. margin] indeed, some are indwelt from their earliest years with the spirit of a python. Now as they have done nothing to bring upon themselves these visitations, one who holds that nothing happens without God’s permission, and that all things are governed by His justice, cannot suppose that God’s providence has abandoned them without good reason.

9. Again, of the world he writes thus: ”The belief commends itself to me that there was a world before this world and that after it there will be another. Do you wish to

know that after the decay of this world there will be a new one? Hear the words of Isaiah: 'the new heavens and the new earth which I will make shall remain before me.' [Isa. 66:22] Do you wish to know that before the making of this world there have previously been others? Listen to the Preacher who says: 'the thing which hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun. Is there anything whereof it may be said, See, this is new? it hath been already of old time, which was before us.' [Eccles. 1:9, Eccles. 1:10] A passage which proves not only that other worlds have been but that other worlds shall be; not, however, simultaneously and side by side but one after another. And he immediately adds: "I hold that heaven is the abode of the deity, the true place of rest; and that it was there that reasonable creatures enjoyed their ancient bliss, before coming down to a lower plane and exchanging the invisible for the visible, they fell to the earth and came to need material bodies. Now that they have fallen, God the creator has made for them bodies suitable to their surroundings;

and has fashioned this visible world, and has sent into it ministers to ensure the salvation and correction of the fallen. Of these ministers some have held assigned positions and have been subject to the world's necessary laws; while others have intelligently performed duties laid upon them in times and seasons determined by God's plan. To the former class belong the sun, moon, and stars called by the apostle 'the creation;' and these have had allotted to them the heights of heaven. Now the creation is subjected to vanity [Rom. 8:20, R.V] because it is encased in material bodies and visible to the eye. And yet it is 'made subject to vanity not willingly but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope.' Others again of the second class, at particular places and times known to their Maker only, we believe to be His angels sent to steer the world. A little farther on he says: "the affairs of the world are so ordered by Providence that while some angels fall from heaven others freely glide down to earth. The former are hurled down against their will; the latter descend from choice alone. The former are forced to continue in a distasteful service for a fixed period; the latter spontaneously embrace the task of lending a hand to those who fall. Again he writes: "whence it follows that these different movements result in the creation of different worlds; and that this world of ours will be succeeded by one quite unlike it.

Now, as regards this falling and rising, this rewarding of virtue and punishment of vice, whether they take place in the past, present, or future, God, the creator, can alone apportion desert and make all things converge to one end. For He only knows why He allows some to follow their own inclination and to descend from the higher planes to the lowest; and why He visits others and giving them His hand draws them back to their former state and places them once more in heaven."

10. In discussing the end of the world he has made use of the following language. ”Since, as I have often said, a new beginning springs from the end, it may be asked whether bodies will then continue to exist, or whether, when they have been annihilated, we shall live without bodies and be incorporeal as we know God to be. Now there can be no doubt but that, if bodies or, as the apostle calls them, visible things, belong only to our sensible world, the life of the disembodied will be incorporeal. And a little farther on: ”when the apostle writes, ’the creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God,’ [Rom. 8:21, R.V] I explain his words thus. Reasonable and incorporeal beings are the highest of God’s creatures, for not being clothed with bodies they are not the slaves of corruption. Since where there are bodies, there corruption is sure to be found. But hereafter ’the creation shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption,’ and then men shall receive the glory of the children of God and God shall be all in all. And in the same passage he writes:

”that the final state will be an incorporeal one is rendered credible by the words of our Saviour’s prayer: ’as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they also may be one in us.’ [Joh. 17:21] For we ought to realize what God is and what the Saviour will finally be, and how the likeness to the Father and the Son here promised to the Saints consists in this that as They are one in Themselves so we shall be one in Them. For if in the end the life of the Saints is to be assimilated to the life of God, we must either admit that the Lord of the universe is clothed with a body and that he is enveloped in matter as we are in flesh; or, if it is unbecoming to suppose this, especially in persons who have but small clues from which to infer God’s majesty and to guess at the glory of His innate and transcendent nature, we are reduced to the following dilemma. Either we shall always have bodies and in that case must despair of ever being like God; or, if the blessedness of the life of God is really promised to us, the conditions of His life must be the conditions of ours.”

11. These passages prove what his view is regarding the resurrection. For he evidently maintains that all bodies will perish and that we shall be incorporeal as according to him we were before we received our present bodies. Again when he comes to argue for a variety of worlds and to maintain that angels will become demons, demons either angels or men, and men in their turn demons; in a word that everything will be turned into something else, he thus sums up his own opinion: ”no doubt, after an interval matter will exist afresh and bodies will be formed and a different world will be created to meet the varying wills of reasonable beings who, having forfeited the perfect bliss which continues to the end, have gradually fallen into so great wickedness as to change their nature and refuse to keep their first estate of unalloyed blessedness. Many reasonable beings, it is right to say, keep it until a second, a third, and a fourth world, and give God no ground for changing their condition. Others deteriorate so little that they seem to have lost hardly anything, and others again have to be hurled headlong into the abyss. God

who orders all things alone knows how to use each class according to its deserts in a suitable sphere; for He only understands opportunities and motives and the course in which the world must be steered.

Thus one who has borne away the palm for wickedness and has sunk into the lowest degradation will in the world which is hereafter to be fashioned be made a devil, a kind of first fruits of the Lord's handiwork, to be a laughing stock to the angels who have lost their first virtue. What is this but to argue that the sinful men of this world may become a devil and demons in another; and contrariwise that those who are now demons may hereafter become either men or angels? And after a lengthy discussion in which he maintains that all corporeal creatures must exchange their material for subtle and spiritual bodies and that all substance must become one pure and inconceivably bright body, of which the human mind can at present form no conception, he winds up thus:-"'God shall be all in all;' that is to say, all bodily existence shall be made as perfect as possible; it shall be brought into the divine essence, than which there is none better."

12. In the fourth and last book of his work the following passages deserve the church's condemnation. "It may be that as, when men die in this world by the separation of soul and body, they are allotted different positions in hell according to the difference in their works; so when angels die, out of the system of the heavenly Jerusalem, they come down to this world as a hell and are placed on earth according to their deserts." And again: "as we have compared the souls which pass from this world to hell with those which as they come from heaven to us are in a manner dead; so we must carefully inquire whether this is true of all souls without exception. For in that case souls born on earth when they desire better things rise out of hell and assume human bodies or when they desire worse things come down to us from better worlds; and in the firmament above us likewise there are souls on their way from our world to higher ones, and others who, while they have fallen from heaven, have not sinned so grievously as to be thrust down to earth."He thus tries to prove that the firmament, that is the sky, is hell compared with heaven; and that this earth is hell compared with the firmament; and again that our world is heaven to hell. Or in other words what is hell to some is heaven to others. And not content with saying this he goes on: "at the end of all things when we shall return to the heavenly Jerusalem the hostile powers shall declare war against the people of God to breathe and exercise their valour and strengthen their resolve. For this they cannot have until they have faced and foiled their foes; of whom we read in the book of Numbers that they are overcome by reason, discipline, and tactical skill."

13. After saying that according to the apocalypse of John "the everlasting gospel" which shall be revealed in heaven [Rev. 14:6] as much surpasses our gospel as Christ's preaching does the sacraments of the ancient law, he has asserted what it is sacrilegious even to think; that Christ will once more suffer in the sky for the

salvation of demons. And although he has not expressly said it, it is yet implied in his words that as for men God became man to set men free, so for the salvation of demons when He comes to deliver them He will become a demon. To shew that this is no gloss of mine, I must give his own words: "As Christ," he writes, "has fulfilled the shadow of the law by the shadow of the gospel, and as all law is a pattern and shadow of things done in heaven, we must inquire whether we are justified in supposing that even the heavenly law and the rites of the celestial worship are still incomplete and need the true gospel which in the apocalypse of John is called everlasting to distinguish it from ours which is only temporal, set forth in a world that shall pass away. Now if we extend our inquiry to the passion of our Lord and Saviour, it may indeed be overbold to suppose that He will suffer in heaven; yet if there is spiritual wickedness in heavenly places [Eph. 6:12] and if we confess without a blush that the Lord has once been crucified to destroy those thing's which He has destroyed by His passion; why need we fear to imagine a like occurrence in the upper world? the fulness of time, so that the nations of all realms shall be saved by a passion of Christ?"

14. Here is another blasphemy which he has spoken of the Son. "Assuming that the Son knows the Father, it would seem that by this knowledge He can comprehend Him as much as a craftsman can comprehend the rules of his art. And, doubtless, if the Father is in the Son, He is also comprehended by Him in whom He is. But if we mean by comprehension not merely that the knower takes a thing in by perception and insight but that he contains it within himself by virtue of a special faculty; in this sense we cannot say that the Son comprehends the Father. For the Father comprehends all things, and of these the Son is one; therefore, He comprehends the Son." And to shew us reasons why, while the Father comprehends the Son, the Son cannot comprehend the Father, he adds: "the curious reader may inquire whether the Father knows Himself in the same way that the Son knows Him. But if he recalls the words: 'the Father who sent me is greater than I,' [Joh. 14:28] he will allow that they must be universally true and will admit that, in knowledge as in everything else, the Father is greater than the Son, and knows Himself more perfectly and immediately than the Son can do."

15. The following passage is a convincing proof that he holds the transmigration of souls and annihilation of bodies. "If it can be shewn that an incorporeal and reasonable being has life in itself independently of the body and that it is worse off in the body than out of it; then beyond a doubt bodies are only of secondary importance and arise from time to time to meet the varying conditions of reasonable creatures. Those who require bodies are clothed with them, and contrariwise, when fallen souls have lifted themselves up to better things, their bodies are once more annihilated. They are thus ever vanishing and ever reappearing." And to prevent us from minimizing the impiety of his previous utterances he ends his work by maintaining that all reasonable beings, that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, angels,

powers, dominations, and virtues, and even man by right of his soul's dignity, are of one and the same essence. "God," he writes, "and His only-begotten Son and the Holy Spirit are conscious of an intellectual and reasonable nature. But so also are the angels, the powers, and the virtues, as well as the inward man who is created in the image and after the likeness of God. [2 Cor. 4:16, Gen. 1:27] From which I conclude that God and they are in some sort of one essence." He adds "in some sort" to escape the charge of blasphemy; and while in another place he will not allow the Son and the Holy Spirit to be of one substance with the Father lest by so doing he should appear to make the divine essence divisible, he here bestows the nature of God almighty upon angels and men.

16. This being the nature of Origen's book. is it anything short of madness to change a few blasphemous passages regarding the Son and the Holy Spirit and then to publish the rest unchanged with an unprincipled eulogy when the parts unaltered as well as the parts altered flow from the same fountain head of gross impiety? This is not the time to confute all the statements made in detail; and indeed those who have written against Arius, Eunomius, Manichaeus, and various other heretics must be supposed to have answered these blasphemies as well. If anyone, therefore, wishes to read the work let him walk with his feet shod towards the land of promise; let him guard against the jaws of the serpent and the crooked jaws of the scorpion; let him read this treatise first and before he enters upon the path let him know the dangers which he wilt have to avoid.

Source. English translation: an older public-domain translation as collected in the Writings-Database (HistoricalChristianFaith), mostly from the Ante-Nicene, Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers and similar nineteenth-century editions. SermonIndex has only divided it into chapters and short sections; the wording is the translator's own. Square brackets, Greek or Latin words and footnote-free text are as the source file prints them, and a transcription error may remain. No Greek or Latin text is shown beside it yet, and no modern English version has been made.

Incomplete. 30 parts of this work in the source collection are a modern or machine translation, which we do not republish, so they are left out and this page has gaps.