The reason produced for condemning the opinion that the earth moves and the sun
stands still is that in many places in the Bible one may read that the sun moves and
the earth stands still. Since the Bible cannot err, it follows as a necessary
consequence that anyone takes an erroneous and heretical position who maintains
that the sun is inherently motionless and the earth movable.

With regard to this argument, I think in the first place that it is very pious to say
and prudent to affirm that the holy Bible can never speak untruth—whenever its
ture meaning is understood. But I believe nobody will deny that it is often very
abstruse, and may say things which are quite different from what its bare words
signify. Hence in expounding the Bible if one were always to confine oneself to the
unadorned grammatical meaning, one might fall into error. Not only contradictions
and propositions far from true might thus be made to appear in the Bible, but even
greave heresies and follies. Thus it would be necessary to assign to God feet, hands,
and eyes, as well as corporeal and human affections, such as anger, repentance,
hatred, and sometimes even the forgetting of things past and ignorance of those to
come. These propositions uttered by the Holy Ghost were set down in that manner
by the sacred scribes in order to accommodate them to the capacities of the
common people, who are rude and unlearned.

For the sake of those who deserve to be separated from the herd, it is necessary that wise expositors should produce the
true senses of such passages, together with the special reasons for which they were
set down in these words. This doctrine is so widespread and so definite with all
theologians that it would be superfluous to adduce evidence for it.

Hence I think that I may reasonably conclude that whenever the Bible has
occasion to speak of any physical conclusion (especially those which are very
abstruse and hard to understand), the rule has been observed of avoiding confusion
in the minds of the common people which would render them contumacious toward
the higher mysteries. Now the Bible, merely to condescend to popular capacity, has
not hesitated to obscure some very important pronouncements, attributing to God
himself some qualities extremely remote from (and even contrary to) His essence.
Who, then, would positively declare that this principle has been set aside, and the
Bible has confined itself rigorously to the bare and restricted sense of its words,
when speaking but casually of the earth, of water, of the sun, or of any other created
thing? Especially in view of the fact that these things in no way concern the primary
purpose of the sacred writings, which is the service of God and the salvation of
souls—matters infinitely beyond the comprehension of the common people.

This being granted, I think that in discussions of physical problems we ought to
begin not from the authority of scriptural passages, but from sense-experiences and
necessary demonstrations; for the holy Bible and the phenomena of nature proceed
alike from the divine Word, the former as the dictate of the Holy Ghost and the
latter as the observant executrix of God’s commands. It is necessary for the Bible, in
order to be accommodated to the understanding of every man, to speak many things which appear to differ from the absolute truth so far as the bare meaning of the words is concerned. But Nature, on the other hand, is inexorable and immutable; she never transgresses the laws imposed upon her, or cares a whit whether her abstruse reasons and methods of operation are understandable to men. For that reason it appears that nothing physical which sense-experience sets before our eyes, or which necessary demonstrations prove to us, ought to be called in question (much less condemned) upon the testimony of biblical passages which may have some different meaning beneath their words. For the Bible is not chained in every expression to conditions as strict as those which govern all physical effects; nor is God any less excellently revealed in Nature’s actions than in the sacred statements of the Bible. Perhaps this is what Tertullian meant by these words:

“We conclude that God is known first through Nature, and then again, more particularly, by doctrine; by Nature in His works, and by doctrine in His revealed word.”

From this I do not mean to infer that we need not have an extraordinary esteem for the passages of holy Scripture. On the contrary, having arrived at any certainties in physics, we ought to utilize these as the most appropriate aids in the true exposition of the Bible and in the investigation of those meanings which are necessarily contained therein, for these must be concordant with demonstrated truths. I should judge that the authority of the Bible was designed to persuade men of those articles and propositions which, surpassing all human reasoning, could not be made credible by science, or by any other means than through the very mouth of the Holy Spirit.

Yet even in those propositions which are not matters of faith, this authority ought to be preferred over that of all human writings which are supported only by bare assertions or probable arguments, and not set forth in a demonstrative way. This I hold to be necessary and proper to the same extent that divine wisdom surpasses all human judgment and conjecture.

But I do not feel obliged to believe that that same God who has endowed us with senses, reason, and intellect has intended to forgo their use and by some other means to give us knowledge which we can attain by them. He would not require us to deny sense and reason in physical matters which are set before our eyes and minds by direct experience or necessary demonstrations. This must be especially true in those sciences of which but the faintest trace (and that consisting of conclusions) is to be found in the Bible. Of astronomy, for instance, so little is found that none of the planets except Venus are so much as mentioned, and this only once or twice under the name of “Lucifer.” If the sacred scribes had had any intention of teaching people certain arrangements and motions of the heavenly bodies, or had they wished us to derive such knowledge from the Bible, then in my opinion they would not have spoken of these matters so sparingly in comparison with the infinite number of admirable conclusions which are demonstrated in that science. Far from pretending to teach us the constitution and motions of the heavens and the stars, with their shapes, magnitudes, and distances, the authors of the Bible intentionally forbore to speak of these things, though all were quite well known to them. ...

From these things it follows as a necessary consequence that, since the Holy Ghost did not intend to teach us whether heaven moves or stands still, whether its shape is spherical or like a discus or extended in a plane, nor whether the earth is located at its center or off to one side, then so much the less was it intended to settle for us any other conclusion of the same kind. And the motion or rest of the earth and the sun is so closely linked with the things just named, that without a determination of the one, neither side can be taken in the other matters. Now if the
Holy Spirit has purposely neglected to teach us propositions of this sort as irrelevant to the highest goal (that is, to our salvation), how can anyone affirm that it is obligatory to take sides on them, and that one belief is required by faith, while the other side is erroneous? Can an opinion be heretical and yet have no concern with the salvation of souls? Can the Holy Ghost be asserted not to have intended teaching us something that does concern our salvation? I would say here something that was heard from an ecclesiastic of the most eminent degree: “That the intention of the Holy Ghost is to teach us how one goes to heaven, not how heaven goes.” ...

***

Catholic Church, *Codex* of 1616

[In part a response to Galileo’s 1615 “Letter to the Grand Duchess Christina.”]

“Propositions to be forbidden: That the sun is immovable at the center of the heaven; that the earth is not at the center of the heaven, and is not immovable; but moves by a double motion.”

***