

Biblical Authority in the *Malleus maleficarum*: Sacred Text in Support of a Radical Agenda

By David Porreca

Abstract

The authors of the *Malleus maleficarum* rely extensively on earlier authorities in building their case for the uprooting and elimination of the ‘heresy of the sorceresses.’ In going about their task, they intentionally distort the established Dominican tradition of biblical commentary as it was embodied in the works of Thomas Aquinas. This distortion is apparent through a comparison of the use of biblical quotations in the *Malleus maleficarum* and the commentaries on those same passages found in Aquinas’ works.

Keywords

Malleus maleficarum, Johann Sprenger, Heinrich Kramer, Henricus Institoris, biblical commentaries, Dominican order, Thomas Aquinas



The *Malleus maleficarum* (i.e., *The Hammer of the Witches*) presents itself as a handbook for those entrusted with the elimination of a Satanic form of heresy called the ‘heresy of the sorceresses.’¹ It was written in 1486 and published the following year, with 28 editions following in the next two centuries.² Although it is far from unique in its focus on the elimination of witchcraft, it is widely recognized

An earlier version of this paper was presented on 12 May 2007 at the 42nd Annual International Congress for Medieval Studies, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI.

¹ Some activities commonly attributed to the mostly female adherents of this heresy were apostasy, murder (especially of babies), the use of malevolent magic, devil-worship, sexual relations with demons, and attending (through magical flight) ceremonies presided over by Satan himself. The concept of the ‘heresy of the sorceresses’ stemmed from the fictitious charges brought against the Waldensian and Cathar heresies in the 14th century, combined with the fertile imagination of later authors, principally those of the *Malleus maleficarum*. For more background information on this heresy, see Mackay in Institoris and Sprenger 1:46-52.

² See Mackay’s observations in Institoris and Sprenger 1:170-71.

as one of the most influential works of its time on this topic, helping to fuel the so-called 'witch craze' of succeeding centuries. Its authors, Johann Sprenger and Heinrich Kramer (a.k.a. Institoris, the Latinized version of his name), were members of the Dominican order which had been put in charge of the extirpation of heresy. They saw themselves as the staunchest defenders of the Church's authority and doctrine, a critical bulwark against the Devil himself who sought to overrun the world through this deadly and dangerous heresy. But not everyone shared their views. In fact, the authors spent a fair amount of effort in the *Malleus* to refute those who would question the existence of such a heresy or the methods the *Malleus* describes to exterminate it. Their refutations take on a number of forms, from practical examples of sorcery drawn from Institoris' inquisitorial experience to the more pedantic approach of the *quaestio disputata* used in Medieval scholastic higher education. And since the authors of the *Malleus* were both papally appointed inquisitors, their own orthodoxy was never questioned by their contemporaries. Since the majority of the material that makes up the *Malleus* is not original but rather 'borrowed' from previous works, the authors probably saw themselves as shining examples of orthodox rigor, adding but a few bricks of their own to the edifice of Church knowledge and practice when it came to the specific topic of Satanic sorcery. Their purpose was to convince the world of the imminent danger posed by this heresy to Christendom, and indeed to the world as a whole, while presenting themselves as uniquely qualified to deal with the problem.³ This paper proposes to examine the extent to which the authors of the *Malleus* were willing to alter, distort, or even contradict the established Dominican tradition of biblical interpretation in order to back up their claims.

Before getting to the use of the Bible in the *Malleus* itself, I should say a few words about the methodology of my study. In the initial phases of this paper, my intent was to compare how specific passages from the Bible were employed in the *Malleus* to the interpretation of those same passages in earlier biblical

³ How radical and ideologically driven their agenda truly was Mackay has pointed out in the introduction to his recent edition, and needs not be repeated here.

commentaries. Since the authors of the *Malleus* were both Dominican, it made sense to restrict the scope of the study to Dominican theologians. My plan was to look at the comprehensive commentaries of Hugh of St. Cher, Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and Meister Eckhart. These four figures, I thought, would provide a decent cross-section of Dominican biblical interpretation. The *Malleus* itself, however, relies heavily on material ultimately derived from Aquinas, although not always directly. Since Aquinas himself is probably the single most important theological thinker in the history of the Church, it seemed redundant to chase down material which Institoris and Sprenger themselves did not bother to examine. So, for the purposes of this paper, Aquinas' biblical interpretations have been chosen as a 'fair measure' of Dominican thinking. Choosing Aquinas also allows for inferences to be drawn from the changes the *Malleus* makes to the passages it borrows from his writings.

I have identified 295 biblical quotations or allusions in the *Malleus*, 109 of which are not tralatitious, or derived from an intermediary author. Aquinas never produced a systematic biblical commentary, but he did write commentaries on several isolated books of the Old Testament and on most of the New Testament books. Of the 109 'original' quotations from the Bible in the *Malleus*, 25 overlap with material Aquinas commented upon, 7 from the Old Testament and 18 from the New Testament. Although they represent less than 10% of the total number of references to the Bible in the *Malleus*, these 25 passages display a dynamic relationship between the agenda of the authors and the tradition upon which they drew. Indeed, there are numerous instances of parallel thinking and general agreement between the *Malleus* and Aquinas.

But one also finds examples of exaggeration, false inferences, and outright distortion of the Bible or what Aquinas had to say about it. Of the 25 passages selected for this study, 8 are in broad agreement with the corresponding passage from Thomas' biblical commentaries. One example from this category will suffice

to illustrate the sort of agreement I mean. While proving that humans can be begotten by demons in the first part of the work, the authors of the *Malleus* cite Job 41:24, "There is no power on earth that can be compared to the one who was created to fear no one,"⁴ to illustrate that demons are in fact more powerful than men. In his commentary on Job, Aquinas argues on the basis of this same passage that "there is no corporeal virtue that can be equated to the power of a demon, which is a power of its spiritual nature."⁵ He claims that demons were created by God to fear neither man nor any corporeal creature on account of the condition of their nature. The authors of the *Malleus* quote the verse from Job a total of six times, which strongly indicates that it provides a critical component of their argument in many different contexts. In fact, only one other biblical passage is cited as often as this one, and that is the famous story in Exodus where the pharaoh's mages turn sticks into snakes, certainly a relevant passage for the discussion of sorcery. Furthermore, only two of the six citations of Job 41:24 in the *Malleus* are tralatitious. The illustration of the power of demons over men was therefore a necessary component of the authors' argument regarding both the existence of the heresy of the sorceresses and the magnitude of its threat. The fact that it was consonant with Aquinas' view in this matter shows that there was substantial corroboration in the established Dominican tradition for the *Malleus'* principal thesis. Indeed, the passage was used not only in the context of whether a demon can beget a human, but also to show that although demons' power is puny next to God, it is still great with respect to "physical virtues"⁶; to show how sorceresses are transported from place to place⁷; and to show that it is lawful under certain circumstances to break sorcery with sorcery.⁸

⁴ Institoris and Sprenger 1:246. All translations in this article (from the *Malleus*, Aquinas, and Jerome's Bible) are my own.

⁵ Aquinas, *Expositio super Iob* 50.

⁶ Institoris and Sprenger 1:369.

⁷ Institoris and Sprenger 1:407.

⁸ Institoris and Sprenger 1:494. As a side note, there is no evidence that the authors of the *Malleus* used Aquinas' commentary on Job or any other of his biblical commentaries. Consequently, the parallels between the *Malleus'* use of certain biblical quotes and the Thomistic tradition of their interpretation are the result of an ideological harmony rather than direct dependence.

Sed contra. There are numerous instances where the authors of the *Malleus* deliberately alter the use or interpretation of a biblical quote so as to make a better case for their own point of view. Today, we call this technique *spin*. The first example of spin involves another passage from Job 41: 6-8. It occurs in a counter-argument to the proposition claiming that demons carry out their works “without order or distinction,”⁹ meaning without any hierarchical order among the demons. The *Malleus* draws its material from a passage in Book 2 of Aquinas’ *In quattuor libros sententiarum* and both are in essence arguing for the same position—that there *is* in fact a hierarchy among demons. It is instructive to compare the passages side-by-side with each other and also against Jerome’s Vulgate (Table 1).

Jerome	Aquinas	<i>Malleus</i>
Una uni ... adhaerebit, et tenentes se nequaquam separabuntur. ¹⁰ (Job 41:7-8)	Sed contra est quod dicitur Job 61 [sic], de squamis Leviathan, per quas membra Diaboli significantur, quod una uni adhaerebit, et tenentes se nequaquam separabuntur. Ergo videtur quod sit inter eos aliqua concordia, et ordo praelationis. ¹¹ (<i>In quattuor</i> 142, bolding mine)	Item Job xl dicitur de squamis leviathan per quas membra diaboli significantur, quod una uni adheret: ergo inter eos est diversitas et ordinis et actionis. ¹² (Institoris and Sprenger 1: 256, bolding mine)

(Table 1)

⁹ Institoris and Sprenger 1:256.

¹⁰ “One [scale of Leviathan or limb of the Devil] will stick to another, and by holding each other, they will never be separated.”

¹¹ “But on the contrary, there is what is said in Job 61 [sic] regarding the scales of Leviathan, by which the limbs of the Devil are meant, that one will stick to another, and by holding each other, they will never be separated. Therefore, it seems that there is some sort of harmony and order of preference among them.”

¹² “The same is said in Job 40 regarding the scales of Leviathan, by which the limbs of the Devil are meant, that one sticks to another, therefore there is a difference among them both of order and of action.”

The *Malleus* omits the final portion of Job 41:8 which, in Aquinas' rendition, reads "one [scale of Leviathan or limb of the Devil] will stick to another, and by holding each other, they will never be separated." This adaptation of Job by Aquinas flies in the face of the *Malleus*' agenda to show that the hierarchy of demons implies that demons are different from each other. The sentence following the quote from Job in the *Malleus* states that "there is a difference among them (i.e., the demons) both of order and of action," whereas Aquinas concludes that there seems to be some sort of harmony (*concordia*) and order of preference (*ordo praelationis*) among the demons. Thus, the *Malleus* introduces the concept of difference within a hierarchy at the expense of Aquinas' perception of the common purpose implied by the hierarchy's very existence, even among demons.

Another example of divergence between the *Malleus*' use of a biblical passage and Aquinas' interpretation of that passage concerns the quote from Galatians 3:1 where Paul asks "Who cast the Evil Eye on you?" The discussion in the *Malleus*¹³ focuses on three manifestations of the evil eye: the first and third of which are discussed at length in Aquinas, but not the second. In the second manifestation Institoris and Sprenger equate the evil eye with envy, an association which is absent from Aquinas' discussion of Galatians 3:1¹⁴ and from his discussion of the evil eye in the *Summa theologiae*.¹⁵ While it is not entirely clear why the *Malleus* includes this element (envy is not mentioned again in the rest of the passage), it nevertheless illustrates a willingness on the part of the authors to go beyond transmitted authority when this was deemed necessary.

A more obvious example of the *Malleus*' divergence from tradition for propagandistic purposes involves a citation from I Corinthians 11:10, where women in churches are enjoined to cover their heads "because of the angels" (Table 2).

¹³ Institoris and Sprenger 1:235-36.

¹⁴ Aquinas, *Super ad Galatas* 431.

¹⁵ Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* 351-52.

Jerome	<i>Malleus</i>
Ideo debet mulier potestatem habere supra caput propter angelos. ¹⁶ (1 Cor. 11:10)	Insuper illud apostoli (<i>i Corinthiorum xi</i>): “Mulier debet habere velamen super caput suum propter angelos” multi catholici exponunt quod sequitur: “Propter angelos, id est, incubos.” ¹⁷ (Institoris and Sprenger 1: 249, bolding mine)

(Table 2)

Commenting on this passage, Aquinas explains that it is out of reverence for the presence of the angels during the celebration of the sacred mysteries that the heads of both men and women should be covered.¹⁸ He points out that the “angels” in this passage could also refer to priests who are like angels to their congregation and who are therefore also owed their share of reverence. The *Malleus*, however, says that “many Catholics give the following interpretation” of this passage: “Because of angels, that is incubi.”¹⁹ The statement in the *Malleus* is followed by a list of authorities who are said to have made this claim: Bede; William of Auvergne; and Aquinas in the *Summa theologiae*, in his *In quattuor libros sententiarum*, in one of his *Quaestiones quodlibetales*, and twice in his commentary on Isaiah.²⁰ William discusses demons at length in his work, including an explicit connection between angels and incubi.²¹ Of the five references to Aquinas provided in the *Malleus*, only the passages from the *Quaestiones quodlibetales* and the *In quattuor libros sententiarum* are even remotely related to the topic at hand. Aquinas’ *Quaestiones quodlibetales* never

¹⁶ “So the woman ought to have a symbol of authority on her head because of the angels.”

¹⁷ “In addition to that statement of the apostle (I Corinthians 11): ‘The woman ought to have a covering on her head because of the angels’, which many Catholics give the following interpretation: ‘Because of the angels, that is incubi.’”

¹⁸ Aquinas, *Super I ad Corinthios* 376-77.

¹⁹ Institoris and Sprenger 1:249. Incubi were thought to be corporeal angels who sought out carnal relations with human women.

²⁰ The reference to Bede is wrong, as Mackay points out in his edition of the *Malleus* (see 2:79 in *Malleus*).

²¹ Guilielmus Parisiensis [William of Auvergne] 2, iii, 25: 1: 1070.

mentions incubi.²² A specific statement claiming that “to deny such things [the equation of biblical angels and incubi] is an act of imprudence” is falsely attributed to Aquinas in this passage of the *Malleus*, as it originates in Augustine’s *City of God*.²³ So we are left only with the discussion in William and the passage from Aquinas’ *In quattuor libros sententiarum*²⁴ to justify the *Malleus*’ link between the angels referred to in I Corinthians 11:10 and incubi demons. Moreover, none of these passages ever discusses the phrase from Corinthians at all, and this entire section of the *Malleus*, including the list of authorities, is actually borrowed from Johannes Nider’s work, the *Formicarius*.²⁵ The context of this material in the *Malleus* is the same as that discussed above regarding Job 41:24 and the begetting of humans by demons. Clearly, Institoris and Sprenger chose this passage from Nider because of the latter’s exploitation of authorities. Thanks to Nider, they manage to twist and exaggerate the implications of a simple exhortation from the Bible in order to fit their agenda of promoting the destruction of the demon-led heresy of the sorceresses. For without the equation of angels and incubi, there would be no reason to cite I Corinthians 11:10 as justification for their claims.

One can see further distortion and exaggeration surrounding an allusion to the Gospel according to Matthew (Table 3). The discussion in the *Malleus* queries whether the separate angelic substances or entities that move the planetary orbs are responsible for the *maleficia* of the sorceresses. The authors conclude that such creatures are not inclined by their intellectual natures to support the criminal activities of sorceresses. Relying implicitly on Matthew 7:20, the authors claim that the sorceresses are criminals because “they are known through their works.”²⁶ Aquinas’ comment on this verse from the Bible is silent about sorcery, but the passage in the *Malleus* is inspired by a section from the *Summa contra gentiles*.²⁷

²² See Busa’s editorial comments in his edition of Aquinas’ *Quaestiones quodlibetales* 491-92.

²³ Augustine 15.23; 2:108.

²⁴ Aquinas, *In quattuor* 147.

²⁵ For more on Nider, the *Formicarius* and its relationship with the *Malleus*, see Mackay’s introduction to Institoris and Sprenger 1:47, 154-5.

²⁶ Institoris and Sprenger 1:272.

²⁷ Aquinas, *Summa contra gentiles* 96.

Here, Aquinas speaks of moral disposition of those inclined to use sorcery but omits the allusion to Matthew entirely and makes no mention of separate substances. So once again we see a passage from the Bible being taken out of its context and used to support Institoris and Sprenger’s argument.

Jerome	Aquinas	Malleus
Igitur ex fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos. ²⁸ (Matt. 7:20)	Non est intellectus bene dispositi secundum virtutem familiarem esse et patrocinium exhibere sceleratis, et non quibuslibet optimis viris. Huiusmodi autem artibus utuntur plerumque homines scelerati. Non igitur intellectualis natura cuius auxilio hae artes efficaciam habent, est bene disposita secundum virtutem. ²⁹ <i>(Summa contra gentiles 96)</i>	[N]on est intellectus bene dispositi familiarem esse sceleratis et eis patrocinium exhibere et non quibusdam virtuosus. Huiusmodi autem operibus maleficorum utuntur homines scelerati quia a fructibus eorum cognoscuntur . Auxilio autem substantiarum orbis moventium in bonum quelibet creatura inclinatur a natura, licet corrumpatur per accidens sepe. Ergo ille substantie non possunt esse originalis causa maleficarum. ³⁰ (Institoris and Sprenger 1: 272, bolding mine)

(Table 3)

²⁸ “Therefore, you will know them from their works.”

²⁹ “It is not the property of an intellect well-disposed according to familiar virtue to furnish the courtroom defense for criminals and not to any distinguished gentlemen. But many criminals frequently make use of skills of this kind. Therefore, the intellectual nature which assists the effectiveness of these skills is not well-disposed according to virtue.”

³⁰ “It is not the property of a well-disposed intellect to be familiar with criminals and to furnish the courtroom defense for them and not to certain virtuous men. But many criminals use the works of sorcerers of this kind, because they are known through their works. Any creature is inclined by its nature toward the good thanks to the help of the orbs of moving substances, although it is often corrupted by circumstance. Therefore, those substances cannot be the original cause of the sorceresses.”

So far, most of the examples in this paper have been drawn from the first part of the *Malleus* which is devoted to a demonstration of “the theoretical reality of sorcery.”³¹ In the third part of the *Malleus*, which describes the methods to be used to exterminate sorcery, the authors also indulge their tendency to undermine traditional interpretations of biblical passages to suit their argument. In 2 Corinthians 12:16 (Table 4), Paul claims to have been clever since he caught the letter’s recipients by means of a trick. The *Malleus* offers a literal interpretation of this passage to justify the use of deceitful means by judges in determining the eligibility of a witness. This, incidentally, is a crucial step in the instructions prescribed by the *Malleus* for setting up an inquisitorial trial. In Aquinas’ commentary on 2 Corinthians, however, he treats the verse as a false hypothetical, along the lines of “I would have been clever if I had caught you in a trick.”³² He proves this by citing 1 Thessalonians 2:3, where Paul explicitly states that he does not use deceit.³³ By treating the statement in 2 Corinthians as an untrue statement, Aquinas avoids the moral awkwardness of St. Paul’s use of deceit. Yet this is precisely what the authors of the *Malleus* need in order to justify their methods: the use of deceit for a holy cause by a person considered holy, i.e., the inquisitor.

One final example, also drawn from the third part of the *Malleus*, sees the Bible being used to threaten inquisitorial judges who would ignore the instructions offered by Institoris and Sprenger (Table 5). In what may be seen as sacrilegious presumption, the authors of the *Malleus* create a parallel between their work and that of Jesus in spreading the Gospel. They cite John 15:22, where Jesus says “If I had not come and spoken to them, they would have no sin. But now, they have no excuse for their sin,” implying that those judges who are aware of their words and ignore them are just as guilty of sin as those who ignore the Gospel. Aquinas discusses inexcusable sin at length in his commentary on John, but nowhere does he presume to speak with equivalent authority to Jesus.

³¹ Mackay’s introduction to Institoris and Sprenger 1:143.

³² Aquinas, *Super II ad Corinthios* 423.

³³ I Thess. 2:3: “For our encouragement comes neither from error, nor from corruption, nor from a trick.”

Jerome	Aquinas	Malleus
Sed esto ego vos non gravavi, sed cum essem astutus dolo vos cepi. ³⁴ (2 Cor. 12:16)	Et ideo dicit, hoc ponens, <i>esto</i> , id est dato et concesso, quod <i>ego</i> , in persona mea et eorum qui mecum sunt, aliquid accipiendo <i>non gravavi vos, sed, sicut credidistis, cum essem astutus, dolo</i> , etc., id est per alios detraxi vobis bona vestra plurima: sed hoc est falsum, quia nihil ex dolo feci. I Thess. II, 3: <i>exhortatio nostra non de errore, neque de immunditia, neque in dolo.</i> ³⁵ (<i>Super II ad Corinthios</i> 423, bolding mine)	Attento quod a testimonio ferendo tantummodo inimici capitales repelluntur, ut supra quinta questione tactum fuit, inimiciciam autem talem declarare ex his que in capitulo precedenti tacta sunt iudici fortassis nimis obscurum et difficile videtur ... sunt alii modi quibus in noticiam talis inimicicie iudex deveniret. ... Et hi modi, licet sunt cauteliosi seu etiam dolosi , tamen iudex illos praticare potest in bonum fidei et reipublice, cum et apostolus dicat: “Cum essem astutus, dolo eos cepi.” ³⁶ (<i>Institoris and Sprenger</i> 1: 608, bolding mine)

(Table 4)

³⁴ “But so be it, I myself have not burdened you, but since I am clever, I have taken you by a trick.”

³⁵ “And so he says, stating this, ‘so be it’, that is, given and conceded, that ‘I’, in my own person and of those who are with me, by taking something, ‘have not burdened you, but’, just as you have believed, ‘since I am clever, by a trick’ etc., that is, I have taken away many good things from you through others. But this is false, because I did nothing from a trick. I Thess. 2:3: “Our encouragement comes not from error, nor from corruption, nor from a trick.”

³⁶ “I call into question that first-rate criminals are put off by sworn testimony, as was touched upon above in the fifth question, but it seems perhaps too obscure and difficult for the judge to declare such hostility from those things which were touched upon in the preceding chapter. [. . .] There are other ways by which a judge may arrive at an awareness of such enmity. [. . .] These ways, although they are cautious or even crafty, nevertheless the judge is able to practice them for the good of the faith and of the republic, since the apostle also says: ‘Since I am clever, I have taken them by a trick.’”

Jerome	<i>Malleus</i>
Si non venissem et locutus fuisset eis peccatum non haberent nunc autem excusationem non habent de peccato suo. ³⁷ (John 15:22)	Non pervipendant [sic; = parvipendant] iudices talia avisamenta et remedia, cum vilipensio talium post tanta avisamenta in eternam eis cedet damnationem iuxta salvatoris dictum: "Si non invenissem et locutus eis non fuisset, peccatum non haberent. Nunc autem excusationem non habent pro peccato." ³⁸ (Institoris and Sprenger 1: 621-2)

(Table 5)

There are other examples of intentional distortion of traditional biblical interpretation in the *Malleus*, but the above examples suffice for the purposes of this paper. On the surface, the *Malleus* is wholly orthodox, having been approved by the faculty of theology at the University of Cologne in 1487.³⁹ Indeed, the greater part of the book is assembled from very traditional sources, among them Thomas Aquinas. The zeal with which the authors of the *Malleus* undertook their task of uprooting heresy, however, required them to take certain liberties in their use of biblical authority. In many instances, the authors stick to orthodox interpretations of biblical passages, and use them to defend theses which can generally be considered within the mainstream of Late Medieval Dominican thought. In other cases, however, they move beyond traditional confines by distorting their sources, either through omission or commission. Their willingness to co-opt traditional sources for their rhetorical and ultimately inquisitorial purposes is an indication of the urgency with which they viewed their mission. In their minds, failure would mean victory for the 'capital-E' Enemy, the Devil

³⁷ "If I had not come and spoken to them, they would have no sin. But now they have no excuse for their sin."

³⁸ "Let the judges not scorn such warnings and remedies, since the contempt of such matters after these kinds of warnings results in eternal damnation for them according to the statement of the Savior: 'If I had not found and spoken to them, they would have no sin. But now, they have no excuse for sin.'"

³⁹ See Mackay's introduction to Institoris and Sprenger 1:127-35 for a discussion of the circumstances under which the approbation was obtained.

himself—a disaster which could not be countenanced and which apparently demanded going beyond accepted boundaries of interpretation and practice.



Works Cited

- Aquinas, Thomas. *Expositio super Iob ad litteram*. Ed Roberto Busa. Vol. 5 of *S. Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1980.
- . *In quattuor libros sententiarum*. Ed. Roberto Busa. Vol. 1 of *S. Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1980.
- . *Quaestiones quodlibetales*. Ed. Roberto Busa. Vol. 3 of *S. Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1980.
- . *Summa contra gentiles*. Ed. Roberto Busa. Vol. 2 of *S. Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1980.
- . *Summa theologiae*. Ed. Roberto Busa. Vol. 2 of *S. Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1980.
- . *Super I ad Corinthios*. Ed. Roberto Busa. Vol. 6 of *S. Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1980.
- . *Super II ad Corinthios*. Ed. Roberto Busa. Vol. 6 of *S. Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1980.
- . *Super ad Galatas*. Ed. Roberto Busa. Vol. 6 of *S. Thomae Aquinatis opera omnia*. Stuttgart: Frommann-Holzboog, 1980.
- Augustine, Aurelius. *De civitate Dei*. Eds. Bernhard Dombart and Alfonsus Kalb. 2 vols. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1981.
- Guilielmus Parisiensis [William of Auvergne]. *De universo*. Ed. Bartholomaeus Le Feron. Vol. 1 of *Guilielmi Alverni episcopi Parisiensis ... opera omnia*. Orléans: F. Hotot, 1674; repr. Frankfurt am Main: Minerva, 1963.
- Institoris, Henricus [Heinrich Kramer], and Johann Sprenger. 1486. Ed. and trans. Christopher S. Mackay. 2 vols. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Jerome, trans. *Biblia sacra*. London: S. Bagster, 1827.