

**THE PREFACE TO THE READER [OF THE RHEIMS NEW
TESTAMENT] TREATING OF THESE THREE POINTS: OF THE
TRANSLATION OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE INTO THE VULGAR
TONGUES, AND NAMELY INTO ENGLISH: OF THE CAUSES WHY
THIS NEW TESTAMENT IS TRANSLATED ACCORDING TO THE
ANCIENT VULGAR LATIN TEXT & OF THE MANNER OF
TRANSLATING THE SAME.**

JOHN FOGNY

The holy Bible long since translated by us into English, and the old Testament lying by us for lack of good means to publish the whole in such sort as a work of so great charge and importance requires, we have yet through God's goodness at length fully finished for thee (most Christian reader) all the New Testament; which is the principal, most profitable and comfortable piece of holy writ and, as well, for all other institution of life and doctrine (particularly for deciding the doubts of these days) is more proper and pregnant than the other part (Old Testament) which we have not yet printed.

For all that, we do not publish this translation upon any erroneous opinion of necessity, or that the holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongue, or that Scriptures ought or were ordained by God to be read indifferently of all, or could even be easily understood of everyone that reads or hears them in a known language: or that they were not often through man's malice or infirmity, pernicious and very harmful to many: or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's word and honor or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical learned languages. Not for these nor any similar causes do we translate this sacred book. Rather we do so upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, unto which a diversity of things are either necessary or profitable and therapeutic, now, rather than in a time of peace in the Church where such things were neither much required nor perhaps entirely tolerable.

In this matter, to mark only the wisdom and moderation of holy Church and the governors thereof on the one side, and the indiscreet zeal of the popular, and their factious leaders, on the other, is a high point of prudence. These latter, partly of simplicity, partly of curiosity, and specially of pride and disobedience, have claimed that this helps the common people; saying this with many plausible pretences but without any good reasons. But the other, The Church, is that to whom Christ has given charge of our souls, the dispensing of God's mysteries and treasures (among which holy Scripture is no small store) and the

Date: 1582.

feeding of his family in season with food fit for every sort. And The Church has neither of old nor of late ever entirely condemned all vulgar versions of Scripture, nor has at any time generally forbidden the faithful to read the same. Yet the same Church has never by public authority prescribed, commanded, or authentically ever recommended any such interpretation to be indifferently used by all men.

The Armenians say they have the Psalter and some other pieces translated by St. Chrysostom into their language, when he was banished among them. George the Patriarch, in writing his life, signified no less. The Slavonians affirm that they have the Scriptures in their vulgar tongue, turned by St. Jerome. And some would gather so much by his own words in his epistle to Sophronius. But it doesn't serve as proof. Vulpilas surely gave the Scriptures to the Goths in their own tongue, and that before he was an Arian. It is almost three hundred years since James, Archbishop of Genoa, is said to have translated the Bible into Italian. More than two hundred years ago, in the days of Charles the fifth (the French king) were Scriptures faithfully put forth in French, the sooner to shake out of the deceived peoples hands the false heretical translations of that sect called, Waldenses. In our own country, notwithstanding that the Latin tongue was always (to use Venerable Bedes words) common to all the provinces for meditation or study of Scriptures, and no vulgar translation was commonly used or occupied by the multitude, yet they were in existence, in English, even before the troubles that Wyclif and his followers raised in our Church. This is shown, as well as by some pieces yet remaining, by a provincial Constitution of Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canturbury, in a Council held at Oxford, where straight provision was made that no heretical version set forth by Wyclif, or his adherents, should be suffered, nor any other in or after his time be published or permitted to be read, being not first approved and allowed by the Diocesan. They did this citing St. Jerome for the difficulty and danger of interpreting the holy Scripture from one language into another, even though done by learned and Catholic men. So also it is there insinuated that neither the translations set forth before that heretic's time, nor other afterward being approved by the lawful Ordinaries, were ever in our country entirely forbidden, though they were not (to say the truth) in quiet and better times (much less when the people were prone to alteration, heresy, or novelty) either hastily admitted or ordinarily read of the vulgar, but used only, or specially, of some devout religious and contemplatives persons, in reverence, secrecy and silence for their spiritual comfort.

Now also since Luthers revolt many learned Catholics, in order to more quickly abolish a number of false and impious translations put forth by sundry sects, and for the better preservation or reclamation of many good souls endangered thereby, have published the Bible in the several languages of almost all the principal provinces of the Latin Church. For there are no other books in the world which are so pernicious as heretical translations of the Scriptures because these poison people under colour of divine authority. And there are not many other remedies which are more sovereign against false translations than the true, faithful and sincere interpretation (if used in order, discretion, and humility).

For such reasons the holy Church does not entirely forbid any Catholic translation, though she does not allow the publishing or reading of any absolutely, without any exception or limitation. She knows by her divine and most sincere wisdom, how, where,

when, and to whom these her Master's and Spouse's gifts are to be bestowed to the most good of the faithful. And therefore neither generally does The Church permit that which must necessarily harm the unworthy nor absolutely condemns that which may do much good to the worthy. Whereupon, the order which many a wise man wished for before was taken by the Deputies of the late famous Council of Trent in this behalf, and confirmed by supreme authority, that the holy Scriptures though truly and Catholicly translated into vulgar tongues, nevertheless may not be indifferently read by all men nor of any other than such as have express license thereunto of their lawful Bishop (Ordinary); and this requires good testimony from their Curates or Confessors that they be humble, discreet and devout persons, and likely to take much good and no harm thereby. This prescription, though in these days of ours it cannot be so precisely observed - as in other times and places where there is more due respect of the Church's authority, rule, and discipline—yet we trust all wise and godly persons will use the matter, in the meanwhile, with such moderation, meekness, and subjection of heart as the handling of so sacred a book, the sincere senses of God's truth therein, and the holy Canons, Councils, reason, and religion do require.

Wherein, though for due preservation of this divine work from abuse and profanation, and for the better bridling of the intolerable insolence of proud, curious, and contentious wits, the governors of the Church guided by God's Spirit as ever before, so also upon more experience than before, gained from the malady of this time, have taken more exact order both for the readers and translators in these later ages than of old. Yet we must not imagine that in the primitive Church either every one that understood the learned tongues wherein the Scriptures were written, or other languages into which they were translated, might without reprehension, read, reason, dispute, turn and toss the Scriptures, or that our forefathers suffered every schoolmaster, scholar, or grammarian that had a little Greek or Latin to take in hand the holy Testament, or that the translated Bibles into the vulgar tongues were in the hands of every husbandman, artificer, apprentice, boy, girl, mistress, maid, man, sung, played, alleged, of every tinker, taverner, rhymer, minstrel, for table talk, for alebenches, for boats and barges, and for every profane person and company. No, in those better times men were neither so ill, nor so curious of themselves, so to abuse the blessed book of Christ. Neither was there any such easy means before printing was invented to disperse the copies into the hands of every man, as now there is.

They were then in Libraries, Monasteries, Colleges, Churches, in Bishops, Priests, and some other devout principal lay mens houses and hands, who used them with fear and reverence, and specially such parts as pertained to good life and manners; not meddling, but in pulpit and schools (and that moderately, too) with the difficult and high mysteries and places of even greater difficulty. And the poor plowman could then, in laboring the ground, sing the hymns and psalms either in known or unknown languages, as they heard them in the holy Church, though they could neither read nor know the sense, meaning, and mysteries of the same. Such holy persons of both sexes, to whom St. Jerome in many Epistles to them commends the reading and meditation of holy Scriptures, were diligent to search all the godly histories and imitable examples of chastity, humility, obedience, clemency, poverty, penance, renouncing the world. They particularly noted the places that bred the hatred of sin, fear of God's judgment, delight in spiritual cogitations. They

referred themselves in all hard places to the judgment of the ancient fathers and their masters in religion, never presuming to contend, control, teach or talk of their own sense and fantasy in deep questions of divinity. Then the virgins did meditate upon the places and examples of chastity, modesty and demureness, the married on conjugal faith and continence, the parents how to bring up their children in faith and fear of God, the Prince how to rule, the subject how to obey, the Priest how to teach, and the people how to learn.

Then the scholar taught not his master. The sheep controlled not the Pastor. The young student did not send Doctor to school nor reprov'd their fathers of error and ignorance. Or if in those better days (as compared with all times of heresy such necessarily are) there were those who had itching ears, tickling tongues and wits, or were curious and contentious disputers, hearers and talkers rather than doers of God's word, then these the Fathers did always sharply reprehend, counting them unworthy and unprofitable readers of the holy Scriptures. St. Jerome in his Epistle to Paulinus, after declaration that no handy craft is so base, nor liberal science so easy, that can be had without a master (which St. Augustine also affirmed. *De utilitate cred. cap. 7.*) nor that men presume in any occupation to teach what they never learned, *Only (said he) the art of Scripture is that which every man challenges: this the chatting old wife, this the doting old man, this the brabbling sophister, this on every hand men presume to teach before they learn it.* Again, *some with poise of lofty words devise of Scripture matters among women: othersome (fy upon it) learn of women, what to teach men, and lest that be not enough, by facility of tongue, or rather audacity, teach that to others which they understand not at all themselves; to say nothing of such as be of my faculty, who stepping from secular learning to holy Scriptures, and able to tickle the ears of the multitude with a smooth tale, think all they speak to be the Law of God.* He wrote this when the malady of arrogance and presumption in divine matters was nothing so outrageous as it is now.

St. Gregory Nazianzene made an oration in which he spoke of the moderation that was to be used in these matters where he said that some in his time thought themselves to have all the wisdom in the world when they could once repeat two or three words, and these ill couched together, out of Scriptures. But he there divinely discourses of the orders and differences of degrees—how in Christ's mystical body some are ordained to learn, some to teach: that all are not Apostles, all Doctors, all interpreters, all of tongues and knowledge, not all learned in Scriptures and divinity. Not everyone went not up to talk with God in the mountain, but Moses, Aaron, and Eleazar, and they by the difference of their callings. Those that rebel against this ordinance are guilty of the conspiracy of Korah and his accomplices. In Scripture there is both milk for babies and meat for men, to be dispensed, not according to every ones greediness of appetite or wilfulness, but as is most appropriate for each ones necessity and capacity. Just as it is a shame for a Bishop or Priest to be unlearned in God's mysteries, so for the common people it is oftentimes profitable to salvation not to be curious but to follow their Pastors in sincerity and simplicity. So it was excellently said by St. Augustine, *Fidei simplicitate and sinceritate lactati, nutriamur in Christo: and cum parvi sumus, majorum cibos non appetamus.* that is, *Being fed with the simplicity and sincerity of faith, as it were with milk, so let us be nourished in Christ: and when we are little ones, let us not covet the meats of the elder sort.* In another place

he testified that the word of God cannot be preached nor certain mysteries uttered to all men alike, but are to be delivered according to the capacity of the hearers. This he proves both by St. Paul's example, who gave not to every sort strong meat, but milk to many (those who were not spiritual, but carnal and not capable), and by our Lord's also, who spoke to some plainly and to others in parables, and affirmed that he had many things to utter which the hearers were not able to bear.

How much more may we gather that all things that are written are not for the capacity and diet of every of the simple readers, but that very many mysteries of holy writ are very far above their reach, and may and ought to be (by as great reason) delivered to them in measure and mean as is most appropriate? This indeed can hardly be done when the whole book of the Bible lies before every man in his mother tongue to make choice of what he list. For which cause the said Gregory Nazianzen wished the Christians had as good a law as the Hebrews of old, who (as St. Jerome also witnessed) took order among themselves that none should read the *Song of Songs* nor certain other pieces of hardest Scriptures until they were thirty years old.

And truly there is no cause why men should be more loathe to be ordered and moderated in this point by God's Church and their Pastors than they are in the use of holy Sacraments. For this Christ has appointed Priests and ministers, at whose hands we must receive them, and not be our own carvers. And so he has given us doctors, prophets, expounders, interpreters, teachers and preachers to take the law and our faith at their mouths. Because our faith and religion come not to us properly or principally by reading of Scriptures but (as the Apostle said) by hearing of the preachers lawfully sent: though reading in order and humility much confirms and advances the same. Therefore this holy book of the Scriptures is called by St. Ambrose, *Liber sacerdotalis, the book of priests*, at whose hands and disposition we must take and use it. *Li. 2. ad Grat.*

The wise will not here regard what some willful people mutter, namely, that the Scriptures are made for all men and that it is from envy that the Priests keep the holy book from them. This suggestion comes from the same serpent that seduced our first parents, who persuaded them that God had forbidden them that tree of knowledge lest they should be as cunning as himself, and like unto the Highest. No, no, the Church does it to keep them from blind, ignorant presumption and from that which the Apostle calls *falsi nominis scientiam, knowledge falsely so-called*: and not to bar them from the true knowledge of Christ. She would have all wise, but *usque ad sobrietatem, unto sobriety*, as the Apostle speaks. She knows the Scriptures are ordained for every state, as meats, elements, fire, water, candle, knives, sword, and the like: which are as necessary (most of them) for children as old folks, for the simple as the wise: but yet would damage all if they were at the guiding of other than wise men, or were in the hands of every one, for whose preservation they are profitable. She forbids not the reading of them in any language, envies no man's commodity, but gives order how to do it to edification and not destruction: how to do it without casting *the holy to dogs*, or *pearls to hogs*: (See St. Chrysostom homily 24 in Matthew, declaring these hogs and dogs to be carnal men and Heretics, that take no good of the holy mysteries, but thereby do both hurt themselves and others :) how to do it agreeably to the sovereign sincerity, majesty, and depth of Mystery contained in the same.

She would have the presumptuous Heretic, notwithstanding he allege them never so fast, flying as it were through the whole Bible, and quoting the Psalms, Prophets, Gospels, Epistles, never so readily for his purpose, as Vincentius Lirinensis said such mens fashion is. Yet she would, according to Tertullian's rule, have such mere usurpers quite discharged of all occupying and possession of the holy Testament, which is her old and only right and inheritance, and belongs not to Heretics at all, whom Origen called *Scripturarum fures, thieves of the Scriptures*. She would have the unworthy repelled, the curious repressed, the simple measured, the learned humbled, and all sorts so to use them or abstain from them as is most convenient for every ones salvation. So it would be with this general admonition, that none can understand the meaning of God in the Scriptures except Christ open their sense and make them partakers of his holy Spirit in the unity of his mystical body. And for the rest, she commits it to the Pastor of every province and people, according to the difference of time, place, and persons, how and in what sort the reading of the Scriptures is more or less to be procured or permitted.

Wherein, the variety of circumstances causes them to deal differently: as we see by St. Chrysostom's people of Constantinople, who were so delicate, dull, worldly, and so much given to dice, cards, specially stage-plays or theaters (as St. Gregory Nazianzene witnessed) that the Scriptures and all holy lections of divine things were loathsome to them. Whereby their holy Bishop was forced in many of his sermons to cry out against their extreme negligence and contempt of God's word, declaring that not only hermits and religious (as they alleged for their excuse) but secular men of all sorts might read the Scriptures and often have more need thereof in respect of themselves then the other that live in more purity and contemplation. He further insinuated that though many things are high and hard therein, yet many godly histories, lives, examples, and precepts of life and doctrine are plain. And finally he said that when the Gentiles were so cunning and diligent to impugne their faith, it were not good for Christians to be too simple or negligent in the defense thereof as (in truth) it is more requisite for a Catholic man in these days when our Adversaries are industrious to impeach our belief, to be skillful in Scriptures, than at other times when the Church had no such enemies.

To this sense St. Chrysostom said many things, not as a teacher in school making exact and general rules to be observed in all places and times, but as a pulpit man, agreeably to that audience and his people's default. He was not making it therefore (as some perversely gather of his words) a thing absolutely needful for every poor artificer to read or study Scriptures. Nor did he in any way favor the presumptuous, curious, and contentious jangling and searching of God's secrets, reproved by the aforesaid fathers, much less approve the excessive pride and madness of these days, when every man and woman is become not only a reader, but a teacher, controller, and judge of Doctors, Church, Scriptures and all. They either contemn or easily pass over all the moral parts, good examples, and precepts of life (by which the simple learning these might be much edified). Only, after a fashion, do they occupy themselves in dogmatic, mystical, high, and hidden secrets of God's counsels, as of Predestination, reprobation, election, prescience, forsaking of the Jews, vocation of the gentiles, and other incomprehensible mysteries. *Languishing about questions* of only

faith, fitude, new phrases and figures, *ever learning*, but *never coming to knowledge*, reading and tossing in pride of wit, conceit of their own cunning, and upon presumption of I can tell what spirit, such books specially and Epistles, as St. Peter foretold that the unlearned and unstable would deprave to their own damnation.

They delight in none more than in the Epistle to the Romans, the *Song of Songs*, the Apocalypse, which have in them as many mysteries as words. They find no difficulty in the sacred book clasped with seven seals. They ask for no expositor with the holy Eunuch. They feel no such depth of God's science in the scriptures, as St. Augustine did when he cried out, *Mira profunditas eloquiorum tuorum, mira profunditas (Deus meus) mira profunditas: horror est intendere in eam, horror honoris, et tremor amoris.* That is, *O wonderful profoundness of thy words: wonderful profoundness, my God, wonderful profoundness: it makes a man quake to look on it: to quake for reverence, and to tremble for the love thereof.* They regard not that which the same Doctor affirmed, that the depth and profundity of wisdom, not only in the words of holy Scripture, but also in the matter and sense, is so wonderful, that, live a man never so long, be he of never so high a wit, never so studious, never so servent to attain the knowledge thereof, yet when he ends he shall confess he only begins. They feel not with St. Jerome, that the text has a hard shell to be broken before we come to the kernel. They will not stay themselves in only reading the sacred Scriptures thirteen years together, with St. Basil and St. Gregory Nazianzene, before they expound them, nor take the care (as they did) never otherwise to interpret them, than by the uniform consent of their forefathers and Apostolic tradition.

If our new Ministers had this cogitation and care that these and all other wise men have, and ever had, our country would have never fallen to this miserable state in religion, and that under pretence, colour, and countenance of God's word. Neither should virtue and good life have been so pitifully corrupted in time of such reading, toiling, tumbling and translating the book of our life and salvation. The more precious the right and reverent use is, the more pernicious is the abuse and profanation of the same: which every man of experience by these few years prove, and by comparing the former days and manners to these of ours may easily try.

Look whether your men be more virtuous, your women more chaste, your children more obedient, your servants more trusty, your maids more modest, your friends more faithful, your laity more just in dealing, your Clergy more devout in praying: whether there be more religion, fear of God, faith and conscience in all states now, than of old, when there was not so much reading, chatting, and jangling of God's word, but much more sincere dealing, doing, and keeping the same. Look whether through this disorder women teach not their husbands, children their parents, young fools their old and wise fathers, the scholars their masters, the sheep their pastor, and the people the Priest. Look whether the most chaste and sacred sentences of God's holy word are not turned of many into mirth, mockery, amorous ballets and detestable letters of love and lewdness: their delicate rhymes, tunes, and translations much increasing the same.

This fall of good life and profaning the divine mysteries, everybody sees. But the great corruption and decay of faith hereby, none see but wise men, who only know that, were the Scriptures never so truly translated, yet Heretics and ill men that follow their own

spirit and know nothing but their private fantasy and not the sense of the holy Church and Doctors, must necessarily abuse them to their damnation. And they know that the curious simpletons and sensual men which have no taste of the things that be of the Spirit of God, may of infinite places take occasion of pernicious errors. For though the letter or text have no error, yet (said St. Ambrose) the Arian, or (as we may now speak) the Calvinist interpretation has errors. *lib. 2 ad Gratianum ca. 1.* And Tertullian said, *The sense adulterated is as perilous as the style corrupted. De Praescript.* St. Hilary also speaks thus: *Heresy rises about the understanding, not about the writing: the fault is in the sense, not in the word. lib. 2 de Trinit. in principio.* and St. Augustine said that many hold the scriptures as they do the Sacraments, *ad speciem, and non ad salutem: to the outward show, and not to salvation. de Baptis. cont Donat lib 3 ca. 19.* Finally, all sect-masters and ravening wolves, even the devils themselves, pretend Scriptures, allege Scriptures, and entirely shroud themselves in Scriptures, as in the wool and fleece of the simple sheep. Whereby the vulgar, in these days of general disputes, cannot but be in extreme danger of error, though their books were truly translated and were truly in themselves God's own word indeed.

But the case now is more lamentable. The Protestants and such as St. Paul calls *ambulantes in aslutia, walking in deceitfulness*, have so abused the people and many others in the world, not unwise, that by false translations they have instead of God's Law and Testament, and for Christ's written will and word, given them their own wicked writing and fantasies, most shamefully in all their versions Latin, English, and other tongues, corrupting both the letter and sense by false translation, adding, detracting, altering, transposing, pointing, and all other guileful means: specially where it serves for the advantage of their private opinions. For which, they are bold also, partly to disauthorise quite, partly to make doubtful, many entire books allowed for Canonical Scripture by the universal Church of God this thousand years and upward: to alter all the authentic and Ecclesiastic words used since our Christianity into new profane novelties of speech agreeable to their doctrine: to change the titles of works, to put out the names of the authors, to charge the very Evangelist with following untrue translation, to add entire sentences proper to their sect, into their psalms in meter, even into the very Creed in rhyme; all which the poor deceived people say and sing as though they were God's own word, being indeed through such sacrilegious treachery, made the Devil's word.

To say nothing of their intolerable liberty and license to change the accustomed callings of God, Angel, men, places, and things used by the Apostles and all antiquity, in Greek, Latin, and all other languages of Christian Nations, into new names, sometimes falsely, and always ridiculously and for ostentation taken of the Hebrews: to frame and fine the phrases of holy Scriptures after the form of profane writers, sticking not for the same to supply, add, alter or diminish as freely as if they translated Livy, Virgil, or Terence. Having no religious respect to keep either the majesty or sincere simplicity of that venerable style of Christ's spirit, as St. Augustine spoke, in which kind the holy Ghost chose of infinite wisdom rather to have the divine mysteries uttered than any other more delicate, much less in that meretricious, manner of writing that sundry of these new translators use. Of this sort Calvin himself and his pew-fellows so much complain that they profess Satan to

have gained more by these new interpreters (their number, levity of spirit, and audacity increasing daily) than he did before by keeping the word from the people. And for a pattern of this mischief, they give Castalion, adjuring all their churches and scholars to beware of his translation, as one that has made a very sport and mockery of God's holy word. So they charge him. But they themselves (and the Zwinglians of Zuricke, whose translations Luther therefore abhorred) handle the matter with no more fidelity, gravity, or sincerity, but rather with much more falsification, or (to use the Apostles words) *cauponation* and *adulteration* of God's word, than those they criticize. They add many wicked glosses, prayers, confessions of faith, containing both blasphemous errors and plain contradictions to themselves and among themselves, all privileged and authorised to be joined to the Bible, and to be said and sung of the poor people, and to be believed as articles of faith and entirely consonant with God's word.

Whether having compassion to see our beloved countrymen, with extreme danger of their souls, to use only such profane translations, and erroneous mens mere fantasies, for the pure and blessed word of truth, much also moved thereunto by the desires of many devout persons, have set forth for you (benign readers) the new Testament to begin with, trusting that it may give occasion to you, after diligent perusing thereof, to lay away at lest such their impure versions as hitherto you have been forced to occupy. How well we have done it, we must not be judges, but refer all to God's Church and our superiors in the same. To them we submit our selves, and this, and all other our labours, to be in part or in the whole, reformed, corrected, altered, or quite abolished: most humbly desiring pardon if through our ignorance, temerity, or other humane infirmity, we have anywhere mistaken the sense of the holy Ghost; further promising that, if hereafter we espy any of our own errors, or if any other, either friend of good will or adversary for desire of reprehension, shall open unto us the same, we will not (as Protestants do) for defense of our estimation or of pride and contention, by wrangling words, wilfully persist in them but be most glad to hear of them and in the next edition or otherwise to correct them. For it is truth that we seek for, and Gods honour: which being had either by good intention, or by occasion, all is well. This we profess only, that we have done our endeavor with prayer, much fear and trembling, lest we should dangerously err in so sacred, high, and divine a work: that we have done it with all faith, diligence, and sincerity: that we have used no partiality for the disadvantage of our adversaries, nor no more license then is sufferable in translating of holy Scriptures: continually keeping ourselves as near as is possible to our text and to the very words and phrases which by long use are made venerable, though to some profane or delicate ears they may seem more hard or barbarous, as the whole style of Scripture does lightly to such at the beginning: acknowledging with St. Jerome that in other writings it is enough to give in translation sense for sense, but that in Scriptures, lest we miss the sense, we must keep the very words. *Ad Pammach. epistola 101 ca. 2 in princip.* We must, said St. Augustine, speak according to a set rule, lest license of words breed some wicked opinion concerning the things contained under the words. *De civitate lib. 10. cap. 12.* Whereof our holy forefathers and ancient Doctors had such a religious care that they would not change the very barbarisms or incongruities of speech which by long use had prevailed in the old readings or recitings of scriptures; as, *Neque nubent neque nubentur,*

in Tertullian li. 4. in Marcion. in St. Hilary in c. 22 Mat. and in all the fathers. *Qui me confusus fuerit, confundar and ego eum*, in St. Cyprian ep. 63 nu. 7. *Talis enim nobis decebat sacerdos* (which was an older translation than the vulgar Latin that now is) in St. Ambrose c. 3 *de fuga seculi*. and St. Jerome himself, who otherwise corrected the Latin translation that was used before his time, yet keeps religiously (as himself professes *Praefat. in 4 Evang. ad Damasum*) these and similar passages, *Nonne vos magis pluris estis illis? and, filius hominis non venit ministrari, sed ministrare:* and, *Neque nubent, neque nubentur:* in his commentaries upon these places: and *Non capit Prophetam perire extra Hierusalem*, in his commentaries in c. 2. *Joel. sub finem*. And St. Augustine, who is most religious in all these phrases, counts it a special pride and infirmity in those that have a little learning in tongues, and none in things, that they easily take offense of the simple speeches or solecisms in the scriptures, *de doctrina Christ. li. 2. cap. 13*. See also the same holy father *li. 3 de doct. Christ. c. 3.* and *tract. 2 in Evang. Joan*. But of the manner of our translation more later.

In the sight of the learned and all indifferent men, the text thus truly translated might sufficiently both control the adversary's corruptions and prove that the holy Scripture, whereof they have made so great boasts, make nothing for their new opinions but entirely for the Catholic Church's belief and doctrine in all the points of difference between us. But the good and simple may easily be seduced by some few obstinate persons of perdition whom we see given over to a reprobate sense, to whom the Gospel, which in itself is the odor of life to salvation, is made the odor of death to damnation, over whose eyes for sin and disobedience God suffers a veil or cover to lie, while they read the new Testament; even as the Apostle said the Jews have till this day in reading of the old that as the one sort cannot find Christ in the Scriptures, no matter how much they may read, so the other cannot find the Catholic Church nor her doctrine. And so the truth is again discovered, by such experience, in this saying of St. Augustine, *If the prejudice of any erroneous persuasion preoccupy the mind, whatsoever the Scripture has to the contrary, men take it for a figurative speech*. For these reasons, and somewhat to help the faithful reader in the difficulties of diverse places, we have also set forth reasonably large ANNOTATIONS, thereby to show the studious reader in most places pertaining to the controversies of this time, both the heretical corruptions and false deductions, and also the Apostolic tradition, the expositions of the holy fathers, the decrees of the Catholic Church and most ancient Councils. Whosoever trusts not the sense of holy Scriptures by these means, but had rather follow his private judgment or the arrogant spirit of these sectaries, shall worthily through his own wilfulness be deceived. So beseeching all men to look with diligence, sincerity, and indifference into the case that concerns no less than every ones eternal salvation or damnation.

Which if he do, we doubt not but he shall to his great contentment, find the holy Scriptures most clearly and invincibly to prove the articles of Catholic doctrine against our adversaries, which perhaps he had thought before this diligent search, either not to be consonant with God's word, or at least not contained in the same, and finally he shall prove this saying of S. Augustine to be most true. *Multi sensus, etc. Many senses of holy Scriptures lie hidden, and are known to some few of greater understanding: neither are*

they at any time avouched more commodiously and acceptably than at such times when the care to answer heretics does force men thereunto. For then, even they that are negligent in matters of study and learning, shaking of sluggishnes, are stirred up to diligent hearing that the Adversaries may be refelled. Again, how many senses of holy Scriptures, concerning Christ's Godhead, have been avouched against Photinus: how many, of his Manhood, against Manichaus: how many, of the Trinity, against Sabellius: how many, of the unity in Trinity, against the Arians, Eunomians, Macedonians: how many, of the Catholic Church dispersed throughout the whole world, and of the mixture of good and bad in the same until the end of the world, against the Donatists and Luciferians and other of the like error: how many against all other heretics, which it were to long to rehearse? Of which senses and expositions of holy Scripture the approved authors and avouchers, should otherwise either not be known at all, or not so well known, as the contradictions of proud heretics have made them.

Thus he said of such things as not seeming to be in holy Scriptures to the ignorant or heretics, yet indeed are there. But in other points doubted of, that indeed are not decided by Scripture, he gives us this goodly rule to be followed in all, as he exemplifies in one. *Then do we hold (said he) the verity of the Scriptures when we do that which now has seemed good to the Universal Church, which the authority of the Scriptures themselves do commend: so that, forasmuch as the holy Scripture cannot deceive, whosoever is afraid to be deceived with the obscurity of questions, let him therein ask counsel of the same CHURCH, which the holy Scripture most certainly and evidently shows and points unto.* Aug. li. I. Cont. Crescon. c. 13.

Now to give thee also intelligence in particular, most gentle reader, of such things as it behooves thee specially to know concerning our Translation: We translate the old vulgar Latin text, not the common Greek text, for these reasons:

- (1) It is so ancient that it was used in the Church of God over 1300 years ago, as appears by the fathers of those times.
- (2) It is that (by the common received opinion and by all probability) which St. Jerome afterward corrected according to the Greek, by the appointment of Damasus then Pope, as he makes mention in his preface before the four Evangelists, unto the said Damasus: and *in Catalogo in fine, and ep. 102.*
- (3) Consequently it is the same which St. Augustine so commends and allows in an Epistle to St. Jerome.
- (4) It is that, which for the most part ever since has been used in the Church's service, expounded in sermons, alleged and interpreted in the Commentaries and writings of the ancient fathers of the Latin Church.
- (5) The holy Council of Trent, for these and many other important considerations, has declared and defined this only of all other latin translations, to be authentic, and so only to be used and taken in public lessons, disputations, preachings, and expositions, and that no man presume upon any pretence to reject or refuse the same.

- (6) It is the gravest, sincerest, of greatest majesty, least partiality, as being without all respect of controversies and contentions, specially these of our time, as appears by those places which Erasmus and others at this day translate much more to the advantage of the Catholic cause.
- (7) It is so exact and precise according to the Greek, both the phrase and the word, that delicate Heretics therefore reprehend it of rudeness. And that it follows the Greek far more exactly than the Protestant's translations, beside infinite other places, we appeal to these. Tit. 3, 14. *Curent bonis operibus praesse.* [gk-proí9asq7-gk] (greek: proístasthai). Engl. bib. 1577, *to mainteine good workes.* and Hebr. 10, 20. *Viam nobis initinaust.* [gk-ènek㩭nisen-gk] (greek: ènekainisen). English Bib. *he prepared.* So in these words, *Justificationes, Traditiones, Idola &c.* In all which they come not near the Greek, but avoid it on purpose.
- (8) The Adversaries themselves, namely Beza, prefer it before all the rest. *In praefat. no. Test an. 1556.* And again he said that the old Interpreter translated very religiously. *Annot. in 1. Luc. v. 1.*
- (9) In the rest, there is such diversity and dissension, and no end of reprehending one another, and translating every man according to his fantasy, that Luther said, If the world should stand any long time we must receive again (which he thought absurd) the Decrees of Councils, for preserving the unity of faith, because of so diverse interpretations of the Scripture. And Beza (in the place above mentioned) notes the itching ambition of his fellow-translators, that had much rather disagree and dissent from the best, than seem themselves to have said or written nothing. And Bezas translation itself, being so esteemed in our country that the GenevaEnglish Testaments are translated according to the same, yet sometime goes so wide from the Greek, and from the meaning of the holy Ghost, that themselves which protest to translate it, dare not follow it. For example, *Luc. 3, 36.* They have put these words, *The sonne of Cainan,* which he wittingly and wilfully left out: and *Act. 1, 14.* they say, *With the women,* agreeably to the vulgar Latin: where he says, *Cum vxoribus, with their wives.*
- (10) It is not only better than all other Latin translations, but than the Greek text itself in those places where they disagree.

The proof hereof is evident, because most of the ancient Heretics were Grecians, and therefore the Scriptures in Greek were more corrupted by them, as the ancient fathers often complain. Tertullian notes the Greek text which is at this day (1 Cor. 15, 47) to be an old corruption of Marcion the Heretic, and the truth to be as in our vulgar latin, *Secundus homo de coelo coelestis, The second man from heauen heauenly.* So read other ancient fathers, and Erasmus thinks it must be so, and Calvin himself follows it *Instit. li. 2. c. 13. parag. 2.* Again St. Jerome notes that the Greek text (1 Cor. 7, 33) which is at this day, is not the *Apostolical veritie* or the true text of the Apostle: but that which is in the vulgar Latin, *Qui cum vxore est, sollicitus est qua sunt mundi quomodo placeat vxori, and diuisus est. He that is with a wife, is careful of worldly things, how he may please his*

wife, and is divided or distracted. The Ecclesiastical history called the, Tripartite, notes the Greek text that now is (1 John 4, 3) to be an old corruption of the ancient Greek copies, by the Nestorian Heretics, and the true reading to be as in our vulgar Latin, *Omnis spiritus qui solvit IESUM, ex Deo non est. Every spirit that dissolves JESUS, is not of God:* and Beza confesses that Socrates in his Ecclesiastical history reads so in the Greek, [gk-pn pn3=ma -gk] (greek: pan pnonma) [gk-l2-gk] (greek: lei) [gk- tn hso4 xri9n-gk] (greek: tn soun christn) &c.

But the proof is more pregnant out of the Adversaries themselves. They forsake the Greek text as corrupted, and translate according to the vulgar Latin, namely Beza and his scholars the English translators of the Bible, in these places. Hebr. chap. 9, vers. 1. saying, *The first covenant*, for that which is in the Greek. *The first tabernacle.* where they put, *covenant*, not as of the text, but in another letter, as to be understood, according to the vulgar Latin which most sincerely leaves it out altogether, saying, *Habuit quidem and prius iustificationes &c. The former also indeed had justifications &c.* Again, Ro. 11, vers. 21. They translate not according to the Greek text, *Tempori servientes, serving the time*, which Beza says must be a corruption, but according to the vulgar Latin, *Domino servientes, serving our Lord.* Again, *Apoc. 11, vers. 2.* they translate not the Greek text, *Atrium quod intra templum est, the court which is within the temple:* but clean contrary, according to the vulgar Latin, which Beza says is the true reading. *Atrium quod est foris templum, the court which is without the temple.* Only in this last place, one English Bible of the year 1562 follows the error of the Greek. Again, *2 Tim. 2. vers. 14.* they add, *but*, more than is in the Greek to make the sense more commodious and easy, according as it is in the vulgar Latin. Again, James 5, 12 they leave the Greek, and follow the Vulgar Latin, saying, *lest you fall into condemnation. I doubt not (says Beza) but this is the true and sincere reading, and I suspect the corruption in the Greek came thus &c.* It would take a long time to write down all such places where the Adversaries (specially Beza) follow the old vulgar Latin and the Greek copy agreeable thereunto, condemning any other Greek text as corrupt.

Again, Erasmus the best translator of all the later, by Beza's judgment, said that the Greek sometime had superfluities corruptly added to the text of holy Scripture; as Mat. 6 to the end of the Pater noster, these words—*Because thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glorie, for euer more.* Which he called, *nugas*, trifles rashly added to our Lords prayer, and reprehended Valla for blaming the old vulgar Latin because it did not have it. Likewise Ro. 11, 6, these words in the Greek are not in the vulgar latin: *But if of works, it is not now grace: otherwise the work is no more a work.* and *Mar 10, 29.* these words, or *wife*, and such like. Indeed, the Greek text in these superfluities condemns itself and justifies the vulgar Latin exceedingly, as being marked throughout in a number of places that such and such words or sentences are superfluous, and in which places our vulgar Latin has no such thing but is agreeable to the Greek which remains after the superfluities are taken away. For example, that before mentioned in the end of the *Pater noster*, has a mark of superfluity in the Greek text thus [gk-)-gk] (greek:). And *Marc. 6, 11* these words, *Amen I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrhé in the day of judgement, than for that city.* And *Mat. 20, 22.* these words, *And be baptized with the*

baptism that I am baptized with? Which is also superfluously repeated again vers. 23. and in many similar places: which being noted superfluous in the Greek, and being not in the vulgar Latin, proves the Latin in those places to be better, truer and more sincere than the Greek.

Whereupon we conclude of these premises that it is no derogation to the vulgar Latin text, which we translate, to disagree from the Greek text, whereas it may notwithstanding be not only as good, but also better. And this the Adversary himself, their greatest and latest translator of the Greek, avouches against Erasmus in behalf of the old vulgar Latin translation in these notorious words. *How unworthily and without cause* (he said) *does Erasmus blame the old Interpreter as dissenting from the Greek? he dissented, I grant, from those Greek copies which he had gotten, but we have found, not in one place, that the same interpretation which he blames is grounded upon the authority of other Greek copies, and those most ancient. And in some number of places we have observed that the reading or the Latin text of the old Interpreter, though it agree not sometime with our Greek copies, yet it is much more convenient for that it seems he followed some better and truer copy.* Thus far Beza. In which words he unwittingly, but most truly justifies and defends the old vulgar Translation against himself and all other cavillers, that accuse the same, because it is not always agreeable to the Greek text. Whereas it was translated out of other Greek copies (partly extant, partly not extant at this day) either as good and as ancient, or better and more ancient, of which S. Augustine spoke, calling them *doctiores and diligentiores, the more learned and diligent Greek copies*, to which the latin translations, that fail in any place, must necessarily yield. *Li. 2. de doct. Christ. c. 15.*

And if it were not to long to exemplify and prove this, which would require a treatise by itself, then we could show—by many, very clear examples throughout the new Testament—these sundry means of justifying the old translation.

- (1) First, if it agree with the Greek text (as it commonly does, and in the greatest places concerning the controversies of our time it most certainly does) so far the Adversaries have nothing about which to complain: unless they will complain of the Greek also, as they do *James 4. v 2.* and *1 Pet. 3. v. 21.* where the vulgar Latin follows exactly the Greek text, saying, *Occiditis:* and, *Quod vos similis forma, &c.* But Beza in both places also corrects the Greek text as being false.
- (2) If it disagree here and there with the Greek text, it agrees with another Greek copy written in the margin, where one can see examples in the aforesaid Greek Testaments of Robert Stevens and Crispin throughout, namely *2 Pet. 1, 10. Satagite ut per bona opera certam vestram vocationem faciatis.* [gk-di#224; t#163;n #224;gaq#163;n#233;rgwn-gk] (greek: dia t#244;n agath#244;n#233;rg#244;n) and *Marc. 8. v. 7. Et ipsos benedixit,* [gk-#232;ulog#186;sas#224;ut#224;-gk] (greek: #232;ulog#234;sas auta).
- (3) If these marginal Greek copies are thought to be less authentic than Greek text, the Adversaries themselves tell us the contrary, who in their translations often follow the marginal copies and forsake the Greek text, as in the examples above mentioned *Ro. 11. Apoc. 11. 2 Tim. 2. James 5. &c.* it is evident.

- (4) If all Erasmus Greek copies have not that which is in the vulgar Latin, Beza had copies which have it, and those most ancient (as he said) and better. And if all Beza's copies fail in this point and will not help us, Gagny the French king's preacher, and he that might command in all the king's libraries, he found Greek copies that have just according to the vulgar Latin: and that in such place as would seem otherwise less probable, as James 3. v. 5. *Ecce quantus ignis quam magnam filiam incendit! Behold how much fire what a great wood it kindles!* A man would think it must be rather as in the Greek text. *A little fire what a great wood it kindles!* But an approved ancient Greek copy, alleged by Gagny, has as it is in the vulgar Latin. And if Gagny's copies also fail sometime, there Beza and Crispin supply Greek copies fully agreeable to the vulgar Latin as *ep. Jude v. 5. Scientes femel omnia, quoniam IESVS &c. and v. 19. Segregant semetipsos.* likewise 2 Ephes 2. *Quod elegerit vos primitias:* [gk-parxs-gk] (greek: aparchas) in some Greek copies. Gagn. and 2 Cor. 9. *Vestra amulatio,* [gk-mn zg8-gk] (greek: mn zgos), so has one Greek copy—Beza.
- (5) If all their copies are not sufficient, the ancient Greek fathers had copies and expounded them, agreeable to our vulgar Latin; as 1 Tim. 6, 20. *Prophanas vocum novitates.* So reads St. Chrysostom and expounds it against Heretical and erroneous novelties. Yet now we know no Greek copy that reads so.
- (6) Likewise John 10, 29. *Pater meus quod mihi ded it maius omnibus est.* So reads St. Cyril and expounds it li. 7 in John c. 10. likewise 1 John 4, 3. *Omnis spiritus qui solvit IESVM, ex Deo non est.* So reads St. Irenaeus li. 3. c. 18. St. Augustine tract. 6. in John. St. Leo *epist.* 10. c. 5. beside Socrates in his Ecclesiastical history, li. 7. c. 22. and the Tripartite li. 12. c. 4, who say plainly that this was the old and the true reading of this place in the Greek.
- (7) And in what Greek copy extant at this day is there this text John 5, 2. *Est autem Hierosolymis probatica piscina?* and yet St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, and Theophylact read so in the Greek, and Beza said it is the better reading. And so is the Latin text of the Roman Mass book justified, and eight other Latin copies, that read so. For our vulgar Latin here is according to the Greek text, *Super probatica.*
- (8) And Ro. 5. v. 17. *Donationis and iustitia.* so reads Theodoret in Greek.
- (9) And Lu. 2. v. 14. Origen and St. Chrysostom read, *Hominibus bona voluntatis,* and Beza prefers it to the current Greek text.

Where there is no such sign or token of any ancient Greek copy in the fathers, yet these later Interpreters tell us that the old Interpreter followed some other Greek copy, as Marc. 7, 3. *Nisi crebro lauerint.* Erasmus thinks that he read in the Greek [gk-puknῇ-gk] (greek: puknê), "often". And Beza and others commend his conjecture, and the English Bibles are so translated. Whereas now it is [gk-pugmῇ-gk] (greek: pugmê), which signifies the length of the arm up to the elbow. And who would not think that the Evangelist should say, The Pharisees wash often, because otherwise they won't eat, rather than, *Unless they wash up to the elbow, they won't eat?*

If all such conjectures, and all the Greek fathers help us not, yet the Latin fathers with great consent will easily justify the old vulgar translation, which for the most part they follow and expound, as, John 7, 39. *Nondum erat spiritus datus.* so reads St. Augustine *li. 4 de Trinit. c. 20.* and *li. 83 Quaest. q. 62.* and *tract. 52 in Ioan.* Leo *ser. 2 de Pentecoste.* Whose authority were sufficient, but indeed Didymus also a Greek Doctor reads so *li. 2 de Sp. sancto,* translated by St. Jerome, and a Greek copy in the Vatican, and the Syriac new Testament. Likewise John 21, 22. *Sic eum volo manere.* so read St. Ambrose, *in Psal. 45. and Psal. 118. octonario Resh.* St. Augustine and Ven. Bede upon St. John's Gospel.

And lastly, if some other Latin fathers of ancient time, read otherwise, either here or in other places, not all agreeing with the text of our vulgar Latin, the cause is the great diversity and multitude that was then of Latin copies, (whereof St. Jerome complained) until this one vulgar Latin came solely into use. Neither does their diverse reading make more for the Greek, than for the vulgar Latin, differing oftentimes from both, as when St. Jerome in this last place reads, *Si sic eum volo manere, li. 1. adu. Iovin.* it is according to no Greek copy now extant. And if yet there be some doubt that the readings of some Greek or Latin fathers, differing from the vulgar Latin, are a check or condemnation to the same, let Beza, that is, let the Adversary himself, tell us his opinion in this case also. *Whosoever, he says, shall take upon him to correct these things* (speaking of the vulgar Latin translation) *out of the ancient fathers writings, either Greek or Latin, unless he do it very circumspectly and advisedly, he shall surely corrupt all rather than amend it, because it is not to be thought that as often as they cited any place they did always look into the book or number every word.* As if he should say, We may not by and by think that the vulgar Latin is faulty and to be corrected, when we read otherwise in the fathers either Greek or Latin, because they did not always exactly cite the words, but followed some commodious and godly sense thereof.

Thus then we see that by all means the old vulgar Latin translation is well approved and better than the Greek text itself, and that there is no reason why it should give way to any other text, copies, or readings. Mary if there are any faults which evidently crept in from those that up to now wrote or copied the Scriptures (as there are some) them we grant no less than we would grant faults nowadays committed by the Printer. And they are exactly noted of Catholic writers, namely in all Plantins Bibles set forth by the Divines of Louan: and the holy Council of Trent wills that the vulgar Latin text is in such points thoroughly mended, and so to be most authentic. Such faults are these, *In fide,* for, *in fine: Praescientiam,* for, *praesentiam: Suscipiens,* for, *Suspiciens:* and such like very rare, which are evident corruptions made by the copyists, or grown by the similitude of words. These being taken away, which are no part of those corruptions and differences before mentioned, we translate that text which is most sincere and in our opinion, and as we have proved, incorrupt. The Adversaries contrary, translate that text, which they themselves confess both by their writings and doings to be corrupt in a number of places, and more corrupt than our vulgar Latin, as is before declared.

And if we would here stand to recite the places in the Greek which Beza pronounces to be corrupted, we should make the Reader wonder how they can either so plead otherwise

for the Greeke text, as though there were no other truth of the new Testament but that: or how they translate only that (to deface, as they think, the old vulgar Latin) which they so shamefully disgrace, more than the vulgar Latin, inventing corruptions where none are, nor can be, in such universal consent of all both Greek and Latin copies. For example, Mat. 10. *The first Simon, Who is called Peter.* I think (says Beza) this word [gk-pr£tos-gk] (greek: prôtos), *first*, has been added to the text of some that would establish Peter's Primacy. Againe *Luc. 22.* The Chalice, *that is shed for you.* It is most likely (says he) that these words being sometime but a marginal note, came by corruption out of the margin into the text. Againe *Act. 7.* Figures which they made, *to adore them.* It may be suspected (says he) that these words, and many others, have crept by corruption into the text out of the margin. And 1 *Cor. 15.* He thinks the Apostle said not [gk-nîkos-gk] (greek: nîkos), *victorie*, as it is in al Greeke copies, but [gk-n2=kos-gk] (greek: neikos), *contention.* And *Act. 13.* he calls it a manifest error, that in the Greek it is, *400 years*, for, 300. And *Act. 7. v. 16.* he reckons up a whole catalogue of corruptions. namely *Marc. 12. v. 42.* [gk-Ó ê9i kodránths-gk] (greek: ó êsti kodrantês), *Which is a farthing*, and *Act, 8. v. 26.* [gk-åuth é9in êrhmos-gk] (greek: autê éstin êrêmos), *This is desert.* and *Act. 7. v. 14.* the name of Abraham, and so on; all which he thinks to have been added or altered into the Greek text by corruption.

But among other places, he labours exceedingly to prove a great corruption *Act. 7. v. 14.* where it is said (according to the *Septuagint*, that is, the Greek text of the old Testament) that Jacob went down into Egypt with 75 souls. And *Luc. 3. v. 36*, he thinks these words [gk-toûkainàn-gk] (greek: toûkainan), *Which was of Cainan*, to be so false that he leaves them clean out in both his editions of the new Testament. He says that he is bold to do so by the authority of Moses. That is, he will signify that as it is not in the Hebrew text of Moses nor of the old Testament, therefore it is false where found in the New Testament Greek. But if that were true, then as a consequence, they (for it is common among them and concerns all Scriptures) make all of the Greek text of the new Testament, cited out of the old according to the Septuagint, but not according to the Hebrew (which they know are very many) to be false. So by tying themselves only to the Hebrew in the old Testament, they are forced to forsake the Greek of the new: or if they will maintain the Greek of the new, they must forsake sometime the Hebrew in the old. But this argument shall be pressed against them elsewhere.

By this little, the Reader may see what gleeful patrons they are of the Greek text, and how little reason they have in their own judgments to translate it, or boast of it, as in derogation of the vulgar Latin translation, and how easily we might answer them in a word, why we do not translate the Greek: because it is so infinitely corrupted. But the truth is, we do by no means grant it so corrupted as they say, though in comparison we know it less sincere and incorrupt than the vulgar Latin, and for that reason and others previously alleged we prefer the Latin, and have translated it.

If there yet remains one thing which perhaps they will say when they cannot answer our reasons just mentioned—and namely, if they say that we prefer the vulgar Latin before the Greek text because the Greek makes more against us—then we protest that we prefer

the Latin for other reasons. So in this respect of making for us or against us we allow the Greek as much as the Latin; indeed in many places more than the Latin, being assured that they have not one, and that we have many advantages in the Greek more than in the Latin, as the Annotations of this new Testament shall evidently show. Namely, in all such places where they dare not translate the Greek because it is for us and against them;

- as when they translate, [gk-dik7¡mata-gk] (greek: dikaiômata), *ordinances*, and not, *justifications*, and that of purpose as Beza confesses *Luc. 1, 6*.

gk-paradós2s-gk (greek: paradóseis), *ordinances* or *instructions*, and not *traditions*, in the better part. *2 Thess. 2, 15*.

gk-presbutérous-gk (greek: presbutérous), *Elders*, and not *Priests*. [gk-èídwla-gk] (greek: èídôla), *images* rather than *idols*. And especially when St. Luke in the Greek so makes for us (the vulgar Latin being indifferent for them and us) that Beza says it is a corruption crept out of the margin into the text.

What resort to these absurd devices and false dealings with the Greek text, if it made for them more than for us, indeed if it made not for us against them? But the Greek makes more for us.

- See 1 Cor. 7. In the Latin, *Defraude not one another, but for a time, that you give yourselves to prayer*. In the Greek, *to fasting and prayer*.
- Act. 10, 30. in the Latin Cornelius said, *from the fourth day past until this hour I was praying in my house, and behold a man &c. in the Greek, was fasting, and praying*.
- 1 John 5, 18. in the Latin, *We know that every one which is born of God, sins not, but the generation of God preserves him &c. in the Greek, but he that is born of God preserves himself*.
- Apoc. 22, 14. in the Latin, *Blessed are they that wash their garments in the blood of the lamb &c. in the Greek, Blessed are they that do his commandments*.
- Rom. 8, 38. *Certus sum &c. I am sure that neither death nor life, nor other creature is able to separate us from the charity of God. as though he were assured, or we might and should assure ourselves of our predestination. In the Greek, [gk-pép2sm7-gk] (greek: pépeismai), I am probably persuaded that neither death nor life &c.*
- In the Evangelists about the Sacrifice and B. Sacrament, in the Latin thus: *This is my blood that shall be shed for you:* and in St. Paul, *This is my body which shall be betrayed or delivered for you:* both being referred to the time to come and to the sacrifice on the cross. In the Greek, *This is my blood which is shed for you:* and, *my body which is broken for you:* both being referred to that present time when Christ gave his body and blood at his supper, then shedding the one and breaking the other, that is, sacrificing it sacramentally and mystically.

All these and similar are to our advantages in the Greek, more than in the Latin.

But for all this, does that mean that the vulgar translation is Papistical? And is that why we follow it? (some of them call it that, and say it is the worst of them all.) If

so, the Greek (as you see) is more, and so both Greek and Latin and consequently the holy Scripture of the new Testament is Papistical. Again if the vulgar Latin is Papistical, Papistry is very ancient and the Church of God, for so many hundred years wherein it had used and allowed this translation, had been Papistical. But wherein is it Papistical? In these phrases and speeches, *Poenitentiam agite. Sacramentum hoc magnum est. AVE GRATIA PLENA. Talibus hostiis promeretur Deus.* and such like.

First, doesn't the Greek say the same? (see the Annotations upon these places)

Secondly, could he even translate these things Papistically or partially, or rather prophetically, so long before they were in controversy?

Thirdly, does he not say for, *poenitentiam agite*, in another place, *poenitemini*, and does he not translate other mysteries, by the word, *Sacramentum*, as *Apoc. 17, Sacramentum mulieris*, and as he translates one word, *Gratia plena*, so he does not translate the very like word, *plenus ulceribus*, which they do follow also?

Is this also Papistry?

- (1) When he said Heb. 10, 29. *Quanto deteriora merebitur supplicia* etc, which they like well enough, might he not have said according to the same Greek word, *Vigilate ut mereamini sugere ista omnia and stare ante filium hominis.* Luc. 21, 36.
- (2) and, *Qui merebuntur saeculum illud and resurrectionem ex mortuis* etc. Luc. 20, 35. and, *Tribulationes quas sustinetis, ut mereamini regnum Dei, pro quo et patimini.* 2 Thess. 1, 5.
- (3) Might he not (we say) if he had partially affected the word merit, have used it in all these places, according to his and your own translation of the same Greek word Hebr. 10, 29? Which he does not, but in all these places says simply, *Ut digni habeamini*, and, *Qui digni habebuntur.*
- (4) And how can it be judged Papistical or partial, when he says, *Talibus hostiis promeretur Deus*, Heb. 13? Was Primasius also St. Augustine's scholar, a Papist, for using this text, and all the rest, that have done the like? Was St. Cyprian a Papist, for using so often this speech, *promereri Dominum iustis operibus, poenitentia*, etc? or is there any difference but that St. Cyprian uses it as a deponent more latinly, the other as a passive less finely?
- (5) Was it Papistry, to say *Senior* for *Presbyter*, *Ministrantibus* for *sacrificantibus* or *liturgiam celebrantibus*, *simulachris* for *idolis*, *fides tua te saluum fecit* sometime for *sanum fecit*? Or shall we think he was a Calvinist for translating thus, as they think he was a Papist when any word is found for us?

Again, was he a Papist in these kinde of words only, and was he not in whole sentences? as, *Tibi dabo claves, etc. Quicquid solueris in terra, erit solutum and in coelis.* and, *Quorum remisieritis peccata, remittuntur eis.* and, *Tunc reddet unicuique secundum opera sua* and, *Nunquid poterit fides saluare eum? Ex operibus iustificatur homo and non ex fide tantum.* and, *Nubere volunt, damnationem habentes, quia primam fidem irritam fecerunt.* and, *Mandata eius graua non sunt.* and, *Aspexit in remunerationem.* Are all these and similar Papistical translations because they are most plain for the Catholic faith, which they call Papistry? Are they not word for word as in the Greek, and the very words

of the holy Ghost? And if in these there be no accusation of Papistical partiality, why in the other? Lastly, are the ancient fathers, General Councils, the Churches of all the western part, that use all these speeches and phrases now so many hundred years, are they all Papistical? Be it so, and let us in the name of God follow them, speak as they spoke, translate as they translated, interpret as they interpreted, because we believe as they believed. And thus far for defense of the old vulgar Latin translation, and why we translated it before all others. Now of the manner of translating the same.

In this translation, because we wish it to be most sincere, as becomes a Catholic translation, and have endeavoured to make it so, we are very precise and religious in following our copy, the old vulgar approved Latin: not only in sense, which we hope we always do, but sometime in the very words and phrases which may seem to the vulgar Reader and to common English ears not yet acquainted with these to be rude or ignorant. But to the discreet Reader that deeply weighs and considers the importance of sacred words and speeches, and how easily the voluntary Translator may miss the true sense of the Holy Ghost, we do not doubt that our consideration and doing it this way shall seem reasonable and necessary, and yes that all sorts of Catholic Readers will in short time think that familiar which at first may have seemed strange; and will esteeme it more when they shall otherwise be taught to understand it than if it were the commonly known English.

- For example, we translate often thus, *Amen, amen, I say unto you*. Which as yet seems strange. But after awhile it will be as familiar as, *Amen* in the end of all prayers and Psalms. and even as when we end with, *Amen*, it sounds far better than, *So be it*: so in the beginning, *Amen Amen*, must by use and custom sound far better than, *Verily verily*; which indeed does not express the asseveration and assurance signified in this Hebrew word. Besides that, it is the solemn and usual word of our Saviour to express a vehement asseveration, and therefore is not changed, neither in the Syriac nor Greek, nor vulgar Latin Testament, but is preserved and used of the Evangelists and Apostles themselves, even as Christ spoke it, *propter sanctiorem auctoritatem*, as St. Augustine said of this and of *Alleluia*, for the more holy and sacred authority thereof, li. 2. Doct. Christ. c. 11. And therefore do we keep the word *Alleluia*. Apoc. 19. as it is both in Greek and Latin, and in all the English translations, though in their books of common prayer they translate it, *Praise ye the Lord*.
- Againe, if *Hosanna, Raca, Belial*, and such are yet untranslated in the English Bibles, why may not we say, *Corbana*, and *Parascene*: specially when they Englishing this later thus, *the preparation of the Sabbath*, put three words more into the text than the Greek word signifies. *Mat. 27, 62*. And others saying thus, After the day of *preparing*, make a cold translation and short of the sense as if they should translate, *Sabbath, the resting*. For, *Parascene* is as solemn a word for the Sabbath eve, as *Sabbath* is for the Jews seventh day. And now among Christians much more solemn, taken for Good-Friday only. These words then we thought it far better to keep in the text and to tell their signification in the margin or in a table for that purpose, than to disgrace both the text and them with translating them.

- Such are also these words, *The Pasche. The feast of Azymes. The bread of Propositi-
tion.* Which they translate *The Passover, The feast of sweetbread, The shewbread.*
But if *Pentecost Act. 2* is yet untranslated in their bibles, and seems not strange:
why should not *Pasche* and *Azymes* remain also, being solemn feasts, as *Pentecost*
was? or why should they English one rather than the other? specially whereas
Passover at the first was as strange, as *Pasche* may seeme now, and perhaps as
many now understand *Pasche*, as *Passover.* and as for *Azymes*, when they English
it, *the feast of sweetbread*, it is a false interpretation of the word and nothing ex-
presses that which belongs to the feast concerning unleavened bread. And as for
their term of *shewbread*, it is very strange and ridiculous.
- Againe, if *Proselyte* be a received word in the English bibles *Mat. 23. Act. 2.* why
may we not be bold to say, *Neophyte.* 1 Tim. 3? specially when they translating
it into English, do falsely express the signifi-
- cation of the word thus, *a young scholar.* Whereas it is a peculiar word to signify
them that were lately baptized, as *Catechumenus*, signifies the newly instructed in
faith not yet baptized, who is also a young scholar rather than the other and many
that have been old scholars, maybe *Neophytes* by differring baptism.
- And if *Phylacteries* be allowed for English *Mat. 23*, we hope that *Didragmes* also,
Prepuce, Paraclete, and such like, will easily grow to be currant and familiar.
- And in good sooth there is in all these such necessity that they cannot conveniently
be translated, as when St. Paul says, *concisio, non circumcisio*: how can we but
follow his very words and allusion?
- And how is it possible to express *Evangelizo*, but as we do, *Evangelize?* for *Evan-
gelium* being the Gospel, what is, *Evangelizo* or *to Evangelize*, but to show the glad
tidings of the Gospel, of the time of grace, of all Christ's benefits? All which signifi-
cation is lost by translating as the English bibles do, *I bring you good tydings.* Luc.
2, 10. Therefore we say *Depositum*, 1 Tim. 6. and, He *exinanited* himself, Philip.
2. and, You have *reflorished*, Philip. 4. and, *to exhaust*, Hebr. 9, 28. because we
cannot possibly express these words fully in English, and we thinke much better
that the reader staying at the difficulty of them should take an occasion to look in
the table following, or otherwise to ask the full meaning of them, than by putting
some usual English words that do not express them, so to deceive the reader.
- Sometime also we do it for another reason, as when we say, *The advent of our Lord*,
and, *Imposing of hands.* because one is a solemn time, the other a solemn action
in the Catholic Church: to signify to the people that these and similar names come
from the very Latin text of the Scripture.
- So did *Penance, doing penance, Chalice, Priest, Deacon, Traditions altar, host*,
and the like (which we exactly keep as Catholic terms) proceed even from the very
words of Scripture.

Moreover, we presume not in hard places to mollify the speeches or phrases but to religiously keep them word for word and point for point, for fear of missing or restraining the sense of the holy Ghost to our fantasy,

- as Eph. 6. *Against the spirituals of wickedness in the celestials.* and, *What to me and thee woman?* whereof see the Annotation upon this place. and 1 Pet. 2.
- *As infants even now born, reasonable, milk without guile desire ye.* We do so place, *reasonable*, of purpose, that it may be indifferent both to infants going before, as in our Latin text, or to milk that follows after, as in other Latin copies and in the Greek.
- *John 3* we translate, *The spirit breathes where he will &c.* leaving it indifferent to signify either the holy Ghost, or wind: which the Protestants translating, *wind*, take away the other sense more common and usual in the ancient fathers.
- We translate Luc. 8, 23. *They were filled*, not adding of our own, *with water*, to mollify the sentence, as the Protestants do.
- And c. 22. *This is the chalice, the new Testament &c.* not, *This chalice is the new Testament.* likewise, Mar. 13.
- *Those days shall be such tribulation &c.* not as the Adversaries, *In those days*, both our text and theirs being otherwise. Likewise James 4, 6.
- *And gives greater grace*, leaving it indifferent to the *Scripture*, or to the *holy Ghost*, both going before. Whereas the Adversaries too boldly and presumptuously add, saying, *The Scripture giveth*, taking away the other sense, which is far more probable.
- Likewise *Hebr.* 12, 21 we translate, *So terrible was it which was seen, Moses said &c.* neither does Greek nor Latin permit us to add, *that Moses said*, as the Protestants presume to do. So we say, *Men brethren, A widow woman, A woman a sister, James of Alphaeus*, and the like.
- Sometime also we follow of purpose the Scriptures phrase, as, *The hell of fire*, according to Greek and
- Latin, which we might say perhaps, *the firey hell*, by the Hebrew phrase in such speeches, but not, *hell fire*, as commonly it is translated.
- Likewise *Luc. 4, 36.* What *word* is this, that in power and authority he commands the unclean spirits? as also, *Luc 2.* Let us pass over, and see the *word* that is done, Where we might say, *thing*, by the Hebrew phrase, but there is a certain majesty and more signification in these speeches, and therefore both Greek and Latin keep them, although it is no more the Greek or Latin phrase than it is the English. And why should we be squeamish at new words or phrases in the Scripture which are necessary, when we do easily admit and follow new words coined in court and in courtly or other secular writings?

We add the Greek in the margin for various reasons. Sometime when the sense is hard, that the learned reader may consider it and see if he can help him more than by our translation, as Luc 11 [sic]. *Nolite extolli.* [gk-m? metewrze5e-gk] (greek: m meterzesthe) [Lu 12:29], and againe. *Quod superest date eleemosynam.* [gk-t ennta-gk] (greek: ta ennta) [Lu 11:41]. And sometime to take away the ambiguity of the Latin or English, as Luc. 11. *Et domus supra domum cadet* [11:17]. And why we must use in English, *a house upon house, shall fall* by the Greek, the sense is not one house shall fall upon another, but if

one house rise upon itself, that is, against itself, it shall perish; according as he speaks of a kingdom divided against itself in the words before. And Acts 14. *Sacerdos louis qui erat.* In the Greeke, *qui*, is referred to Jupiter. And sometime to satisfy the reader, that might otherwise conceive the translation to be false, as *Philippians 4. v. 6. But in every thing by prayer, &c.* [gk-n pant proseux-gk] (greek: n pant proseuch), not, in all prayer, as it may seem in the Latin. And sometime when the Latin does not, nor can, reach to the signification of the Greek word, we add the Greek also as more significant, *Illi soli servies, him only shalt thou serve,* [gk-latres2s-gk] (greek: latreseis) [Lu 4:8]; and Act. 6. Nicolas a stranger of Antioch, [gk-proslutos-gk] (greek: proslutos); and, *Ro. 9. The service,* [gk-? latrea-gk] (greek: latrea) [Ro 9:4]. and *Eph. 1. to persite. instaurare omnia in Christo,* [gk-2akefal7sa57-gk] (greek: anakephalaisasthai) [Eph 1:10]; and, *Wherein he has gratified us* [gk-xaritwsen-gk] (greek: charitsen) [Eph 1:6]; and Eph. 6. *Put on the armour,* [gk-p2opl2-gk] (greek: panoplan) [Eph 6:11]; and many others like that. Sometime, when the Greeke has two senses, and the Latin but one, we add the Greeke; 2. Cor. 1. *By the exhortation wherewith we also are exhorted.* the Greeke signifies also *consolation &c.* and 2 Cor. 10. *But having hope of your faith increasing, to be &c.* where the Greeke may also signify, as or *when your faith increases;* sometime for advantage of the Catholic cause, when the Greek makes for us more then the Latin, as, *Seniores*—[gk-presbutrous-gk] (greek: presbutrous), *Vt digni habeamini*—[gk-na aciwqte-gk] (greek: na kataxithte) [e.g. Luc 21:36], *Qui effundetur*—[gk-t ekx4menon-gk] (greek: t ekchunmenon) [e.g. Luc 22:20], *Praecepta*—[gk-parads2s-gk] (greek: paradseis), and lo. 21. [gk-pom7ne-gk] (greek: pomaine) [21:16], *Pasce and rege;* and sometime to show the false translation of the Heretic. as when Beza says, *Hoc poculum in meo sanguine qui,* [gk-t 6otrion-gk] (greek: t potrion) [gk- n t em 7!mati t kxr40on-gk] (greek: n t em aimati t kchrunmenon) [22:20], *Luc. 22,* and, *Quen oportet coelo contineri,* [gk-#211;n d1= òuranon déxe57-gk] (greek: ón dei òuranon déchesthai) [3:21], *Act. 3.* Thus we use the Greek in manys ways and esteem of it as it is worthy, and take all commodities thereof for the better understanding of the Latin, which being a translation cannot always attain to the full sense of the principal tongue, as we see in all translations.

We add the Latin word sometime in the margin when either we can not fully express it, (as *Act. 8.* They took order for Stevens funeral, *Curaverunt Stephanum.* and, All take not this word, *Non omnes capiunt.*) or when the reader might think it cannot be as we translate, as *Luc. 8.* A storme of wind descended into the lake and *they were filled, and complebantur,* and John 5. when Jesus knew that he had now a long time, *quiaiam multum tempus haberet,* meaning, in his infirmity.

This precise following of our Latin text, in neither adding nor diminishing, is the reason we say not in the title of books, in the first page, S. Matthew, St. Paul: because it is not that in the Greek nor Latin, though in the tops of the leaves following, where we may be bolder, we add, St. Matthew &c to satisfy the reader; unlike the Protestants, our Adversaries, who make no scruple to leave out the name of Paul in the title of the Epistle to the Hebrews, though it is in every Greek book which they translate. And their most authorised English Bibles leave out, Catholic, in the title of St. James Epistle and the rest,

which were famously known in the primitive Church by the name of *Catholicae Epistolae*. Euseb. hist. Eccl, li. 2 c. 22.

We give the Reader in places of some importance another reading in the margin, specially when the Greek is agreeable to the same. as John 4. *tranfiet de morte ad vitam*. Other Latin copies have, *tranfuit*, and so it is in the Greek.

We do not bind ourselves to the points of any one copy, print, or edition of the vulgar Latin, in places of no controversy, but follow the pointing most agreeable to the Greek and to the fathers commentaries. As Col. 1, 10. *Ambulantes dignè Deo, per omnia placentes*. *Walking worthy of God, in all things pleasing*. [gk-#8217;acíws toûkuríou 2s 6âsan àrésk2an-gk] (greek: kataxíôs toûkuríou eis pasan aréskeian). *Eph. 1, 17*, we point thus, *Deus Domini nostri Iesu Christi, pater gloria*, as in the Greek, and St. Chrysostom, and St. Jerome both in text and commentaries. Of this the Catholic reader should take special note, lest he find fault when he sees our translation disagree in such places from the pointing of his Latin Testament.

We translate sometime the word that is in the Latin margin, and not that in the text, when by the Greek or the fathers we see it is a manifest fault of the writers heretofore that mistook one word for another. As, *In fine*, not, *in fide*, 1. Pet. 3. v. 8. *praesentiam*, not, *praescientiam*, 2 Pet. 1. v. 16. Heb. 13. *latuerunt*, not, *placuerunt*.

Thus we have endeavored by all means to satisfy the indifferent reader and to help his understanding in every way, both in the text and by Annotations: and in all ways to deal most sincerely before God and man in translating and expounding the most sacred text of the holy Testament. Fare well good Reader, and if we profit thee any whit by our poor pains let us for God's sake be partakers of thy devout prayers, and together with humble and contrite heart call upon our Saviour Christ to cease these troubles and storms of his dearest spouse: in the meantime comforting ourselves with this saying of St. Augustine. *That Heretics, when they receive power corporally to afflict the Church, do exercise her patience: but when they oppugne her only by their evil doctrine or opinions, then they exercise her wisdom*. De civit. Dei li. 18. ca. 51.

SOURCES & MORE INFORMATION

Transcription from: <http://one-holy-catholic-apostolic.org/bible/rheims/revised/intro/preface/index.html>

Compared to: <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k53352s>

What Bible Should You Read? A Short Comparison and Commentary on Modern Bible Traslations by Thomas A. Nelson

Newman, John Henry Cardinal. "§2. Dr. Challoner's Bible" from the *Rambler* of July, 1859.

Ward, Bernard. "Douay Bible." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 5. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1909. 8 Oct. 2009 (<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/05140a.htm>).