Nicolaus Serarius, S.J.

COMMENTARY ON JOSHUA

Volume II — His Wars, and What Followed Them

Caput VI–XII: the five Canaanite wars and the northern war · Caput XIII–XXIV: the dividing of the land, and Joshua's last days

Iosue, ab utero ad ipsum usque tumulum — tomus posterior — Paris, Edmund Martin, 1610

English translation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Front Matter

Index of Questions · 13
CAPUT VI. [*(col. 733)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-733) · 13
CAPVT VII. [*(col. 821)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/068-question-lx-how-great-was-joshua-s-glory-and-what-was-it/#col-821) · 18
CAPVT VIII. — The Second War, of Ai [*(col. 917)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/116-question-xlvii-how-are-masters-pastors-and-bishops-somet/#col-917) · 21
CAPVT IX — The Third War: The Gibeonite [*(col. 955)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/145-question-xxvii-what-is-the-allegory-of-this-ceremony/#col-955) · 24
CAPUT X [*(col. 985)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/170-question-xxiv-the-catholic-allegory-of-the-same-history/#col-985) · 26
CAPUT X (on Joshua, chapter 10) [*(col. 999)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/180-question-ix-whether-the-terror-cast-upon-the-enemies-was/#col-999) · 27
CAPUT XI — The Sixth War: The Jabinite [War], or the Northern [*(col. 1055)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/212-question-xl-on-the-allegory-of-this-war/#col-1055) · 29
CAPUT XII — [*(col. 1081)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/230-question-xvii-what-is-the-mystical-explanation-of-this-c/#col-1081) · 31
CAPUT XIII — [*(col. 1089)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/237-question-vi-whether-some-canaanites-hid-themselves-in-ca/#col-1089) · 31
CAPUT XIV — Concerning the division of the land, in detail [*(col. 1035)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1035) · 33
CAPUT XV — The portion and dominion of the tribe of Juda [*(col. 1153)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/264-question-viii-how-did-caleb-take-hebron/#col-1153) · 34
CAPUT XVI — Concerning the Portions of the two Josephine tribes, and specifically of the Ephraimite [portion] thereof [*(col. 1163)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/271-question-vi-did-any-cities-later-depart-from-or-accede-t/#col-1163) · 35
CAPUT XVII — Concerning the Portion of the tribe of Manasse [*(col. 1167)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/274-caput-xvi-concerning-the-portions-of-the-two-josephine-t/#col-1167) · 35
CAPUT XVIII — Concerning the second division of the land among the seven remaining tribes; and specifically of the Benjaminite portion [*(col. 1171)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/275-caput-xvii-concerning-the-portion-of-the-tribe-of-manass/#col-1171) · 35
CAPUT XIX — Concerning the portions of the remaining six tribes, and of Joshua himself [*(col. 1187)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/290-question-xiv-what-are-the-limits-borders-and-cities-of-t/#col-1187) · 36
CAPUT XX [*(col. 1207)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/304-question-xiii-what-did-the-leader-joshua-display-in-the-/#col-1207) · 37
CAPUT XXI [*(col. 1227)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/317-question-xii-what-is-the-mystical-explanation-of-the-cit/#col-1227) · 38
CAPUT XXII [*(col. 1249)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/328-question-x-whether-in-the-levitic-cities-besides-the-lev/#col-1249) · 39
CAPUT XXIII [*(col. 1263)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/332-question-iii-did-the-transjordanians-act-rightly-in-erec/#col-1263) · 39
CAPUT XXIV [*(col. 1267)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/333-caput-xxiii-opening/#col-1267) · 39
Title Page · 41
LATTER VOLUME [Tomus Posterior]. · 41
Dedication · 41

Of the Wars

The Wars (opening) · 43
Question I. How many were Joshua's wars against the Canaanites? · 43
Question II. Were these wars just? And first: Did the Israelites justly move arms against the Canaanites? · 43

Question III. Against the just arms of the Israelites, did the Canaanites too justly bear arms? · 47
Question IV. What do these wars of the Israelites against the Canaanites signify? · 51

Of the Wars: Caput VI

Caput VI (opening) · 57
Question I. What [was] the state of Jericho at [the time of] the war? · 58
Question II. By what plan was Jericho to be assaulted? · 59
Question III. What of the arrangement of those who go round Jericho in the first circuit? · 60
Question IV. Of what kind were the trumpets of the seven priests? · 60
Question V. What is Jobel [the Jubilee]? · 63
Question VI. Whether "Jubilaeus" is rightly derived from "iobel"? · 67
Question VII. Whether, at the time of the siege of Jericho, the Jubilee years had already begun? · 68
Question VIII. Why did the Lord will that, in the siege of Jericho, [the trumpets] be sounded with such Jubilee-buccinae? · 68
Question IX. How many, and which, priests carried the ark around Jericho? And whether their sides were bare of all protection? · 69
Question X. Whether, the warriors excepted, the rest of the multitude of the Israelites followed the ark? · 70
Question XI. Whether in that last column of those following the ark there were priests, Levites, and some Egyptians? · 71
Question XII. Whether in that same last column, besides the seven priests before the ark, there were any [other] horn-blowers? · 72
Question XIII. Whether Joshua enjoined this order of going round Jericho upon the people by himself, or through the priests? · 72
Question XIV. How was Jericho stormed? · 73
Question XV. What was the people's shout? · 73
Question XVI. To what end [was] this shout? · 74
Question XVII. When, and how, was this same shout commanded, and poured forth? · 75
Question XVIII. Concerning the anathematizing of the city and the preservation of Rahab: when [were they] commanded by Joshua? · 75
Question XIX. The circuits — how many were they? · 76
Question XX. Whether the walls of Jericho fell upon the surface of the ground? · 77
Question XXI. Whether the same walls collapsed of their own accord [spontaneously]? · 78
Question XXII. Whether the sound of the trumpets and the people's shout overthrew and cast down the same walls? · 79
Question XXIII. How did the Israelites enter the city, and what did they do there? · 82
Question XXIV. For what reason did the Lord will this war to be waged by the carrying-around of the ark? · 83
Question XXV. Why were the circuits made with the multitude, and in the order set out above? · 84
Question XXVI. Why did the Lord judge that many days, trumpets, and circuits should be employed here? · 85
Question XXVII. Why, along with the trumpet-clangor, was now silence, now a shout, enjoined upon the people? · 88
Question XXVIII. Why, definitely, were seven trumpets, seven days, and — on the seventh day — seven circuits employed? · 91
Question XXIX. Of these seven days, which was the first, and which the last? Was it the Passover? the Sabbath? or another day? · 94
Question XXX. At what hour of the seventh day was Jericho taken? · 96
Question XXXI. Whether Jericho was burned on the same seventh day? · 97
Question XXXII. But how does the Jericho week [septenary] fit Jesus [Joshua]? · 98
Question XXXIII. What is "anathema" and "cherem"? · 100
Question XXXIV. How manifold is the anathema? [How many kinds are there?] · 101
Question XXXV. Of what kind [was] the Jericho anathema? · 102
Question XXXVI. Could all the mothers, virgins, and girls of that city be rightly included in the Jericho anathema? · 103
Question XXXVII. Were infants, boys, and decrepit old men rightly included in the same anathema? · 104
Question XXXVIII. Were the beasts and cattle, the garments, and the other inanimate things rightly included in the same anathema? · 105

Question XXXIX. Why was so dire an anathema inflicted upon a city so beautiful and opulent? · 105
Question XL. Why were the metals excepted from this anathema, and what was done with them? · 106
Question XLI. Whether, besides those four kinds of metals brought into the Lord's treasury, there were also others; and whether whatever could be found of those four [was brought in]? · 108
Question XLII. Whether it is lawful for the houses of God, or the Christian Churches, to have treasuries? · 111
Question XLIII. Of the anathema of persons: who were excepted? and whether rightly? · 111
Question XLIV. Whether the household-goods of Rahab herself and of her kin, and all the other goods, were preserved? · 112
Question XLV. Who [were they that] preserved Rahab, and her kinsfolk and goods? · 113
Question XLVI. For what causes was Rahab preserved with all her people? · 114
Question XLVII. What manner was used in preserving Rahab and her kinsfolk? · 115
Question XLVIII. Whether, just as in body, so also in soul, Rahab and her kinsfolk were saved? · 116
Question XLIX. Rahab being preserved, did any of the Israelites take her to wife — and who? · 117
Question L. Whether Salmon rightly married this same Rahab? · 117
Question LI. What offspring [came] from this marriage of Rahab and Salmon? · 118
Question LII. What further did Joshua decree against Jericho, [now] emptied by slaughters and swallowed by fire? · 119
Question LIII. Did Joshua rightly imprecate [a curse] on the rebuilder of Jericho? · 120
Question LIV. Are the builders, the masons, and the workmen liable to the same imprecation? · 121
Question LV. Did the inhabitants of the now-rebuilt city fall under the same imprecation? · 121
Question LVI. Whether, if anyone should raise up on the same site another city under another name, he would be held by the same imprecation? · 121
Question LVII. What if the rebuilder of Jericho had had no children, or at least not so many? · 122
Question LVIII. Was any of the Jews so bold that, against this imprecation, he thought of the restoration of Jericho? · 122
Question LIX. Did Hiel do [it] against the same imprecation with impunity? · 123
Question LX. How great [was] Joshua's glory, and what [was] its cause? · 124

Of the Wars: Caput VII

Textvs · 127
Question I. Who [was] Achan? · 128
Question II. Why is Achan's genealogy indicated so carefully? · 129
Question III. What did Achan commit? · 130
Question IV. What, and of what kind, [was] the garment which Achan stole? · 130
Question V. What, and how much, silver did Achan steal? · 132
Question VI. What, and how much, of gold did Achan steal? · 138
Question VII. In what manner was Achan led to these thefts? · 139
Question VIII. In what manner did Achan cover his thefts? · 142
Question IX. Of what kind was Achan's sin? · 143
Question X. Achan's sacrilege being so hidden, how was it detected? · 144
Question XI. The description of the city of Ai, its reconnaissance, the beginning of the war against it, and the receiving of the loss and disaster? · 144
Question XII. What, having learned of the slaughter and flight of their own, did the Israelite people, and its Leader Joshua, and the elders, do? · 147
Question XIII. What [was] Joshua's prayer to God? · 148
Question XIV. To Joshua's petition, what [was] the response of God the Best and Greatest? · 151
Question XV. What method of inquiring out the guilty one was prescribed by God? · 152
Question XVI. Whether by lot, or by the oracle of Urim and Thummim, or by some other way, the guilty tribe, clan, house, [and] person were detected? · 153
Question XVII. How manifold [is] the lot? · 154
Question XVIII. Are lots fortuitous? · 156
Question XIX. Are lots evil by their own nature? · 158
Question XX. Of lots which of their own kind are not vicious, are some forbidden, some permitted? · 160
Question XXI. What [are] the conditions of the permitted lots? · 163
Question XXII. When and how was the lot conducted in [the case of] Achan? · 164

Question XXIII. How, with the occasion of a night intervening, did Achan not flee, but awaited the announced — and indeed the last — lot? · 165
Question XXIV. Achan, [once] betrayed by the lot, how did Joshua lead [him] to the confession of [his] sin? · 166
Question XXV. How, by the confession of his sin, could Achan give glory to God? · 167
Question XXVI. Why did Joshua strive to lead Achan to the confession of his sin? · 168
Question XXVII. Of what kind [was] Achan's confession? · 169
Question XXVIII. How, and why, was the eye-witness inspection of Achan's sacrilege made? · 171
Question XXIX. With what punishment was the sacrilegious Achan afflicted? · 173
Question XXX. What things, and what men, were burned and overwhelmed with stones together with Achan? · 176
Question XXXI. Why were inanimate things, and brute cattle, burned? · 177
Question XXXII. Why were Achan's sons and daughter burned? · 178
Question XXXIII. On what men, or things, is the punishment of cremation inflicted? · 179
Question XXXIV. Why were stones cast upon the ashes, or the half-burned bones, of all [these]? · 180
Question XXXV. Achan being now overwhelmed, why was a heap of stones raised [over him]? · 181
Question XXXVI. How, through Achan's punishment, was the Lord's fury turned away from the Israelites? · 182
Question XXXVII. For what causes does the Lord rightly punish some innocent [persons], with temporal punishments, on account of the guilt of others? · 184
Question XXXVIII. Whether human Judges can extend even the temporary punishments of the guilty to the innocent? · 191
Question XXXIX. Whether the Lord can inflict, even on the innocent, the punishments by which the souls of the guilty are tortured in this or the future age? · 191
Question XL. How do the scriptures agree — which say, and deny, [that] the punishments of the guilty are transferred to the guilty, and especially of parents to sons? · 192
Question XLI. Was Achan adjudged to the eternal fire, or rather to heavenly felicity? · 193
Question XLII. Whom can Achan's punishment terrify? · 194
Question XLIII. Concerning the sacrilegious Calvinians and Lutherans — what [do] the Lutherans and Luther [say]? · 196
Question XLIV. How, from the books of the Gentile and Heretic Poets, orators, and Philosophers, do some at times become Achans? · 198
Question XLV. How do Heretics and Apostate Monks become Achans? · 199
Question XLVI. How greatly must one beware, lest — after the manner of Achan — we harm the community by sinning? · 200
Question XLVII. How are masters, Pastors, [and] Bishops sometimes the cause that some Achans — who by their sins harm the community — arise? · 202
Question XLVIII. Why, and whence, [is it] called the valley of Achor? · 203

Of the Wars: Caput VIII — The Second War, of Ai [Bellum II. Haiense]

Caput VIII — The Second War, of Ai [Bellum II. Haiense] (opening) · 205
Question I. Are there, properly [speaking], ambushes in war? · 207
Question II. Whether it is lawful to use ambushes in war? · 207
Question III. Of how many kinds, how great, where, and when did Joshua place ambushes? · 215
Question IV. How did Joshua place the ambushes so secretly that they were neither perceived nor detected by the men of Ai? · 215
Question V. By what signal roused did the ambush take the city? · 216
Question VI. What, and to what end, was Joshua bidden by the Lord to raise? · 216
Question VII. When, and how, did the Lord command the extension of the hand and shield? · 218
Question VIII. Whether in this battle any of the Jews were slain? and of the enemy, who and how many? · 218
Question IX. Why was Ai destroyed by fire? (v. 28) · 219
Question X. The King of Ai — in what manner, and why, [was he] hung? (v. 29) · 219
Question XI. When was the King of Ai taken down from the cross, and why? · 220
Question XII. Where, and how, was the King of Ai buried? · 220
Question XIII. What [is] the allegory of the storming of Ai? · 221
Question XIV. Of what sort, and where, [are] Mounts Ebal and Gerizim? · 223
Question XV. On which mountain [was] the altar? and on this one or that, which tribe, and how [arranged]? · 225
Question XVI. Of what kind was the altar on Ebal? · 226

Question XVII. What sacrifices were made on Ebal? · 227
Question XVIII. Whether, besides the Altar's stones, some others [were] erected? · 228
Question XIX. How many, how great, and of what kind [were] these stones? · 228
Question XX. What, then, [was] inscribed [on] these stones? · 229
Question XXI. How was the inscription of Deuteronomy made upon these stones? · 230
Question XXII. How many, and of what kind, were the blessings [precations] and imprecations? · 230
Question XXIII. In what manner did the priests conduct themselves in pronouncing these blessings and imprecations? · 230
Question XXIV. When did the Israelites come to these mountains for the sake of this ceremony? · 231
Question XXV. How long was labor given to this ceremony? · 231
Question XXVI. Why was this whole ceremony undertaken? · 232
Question XXVII. What [is] the allegory of this ceremony? · 232

Of the Wars: Caput IX — The Third War: The Gibeonite [War]

Caput IX — The Third War: The Gibeonite [War] (opening) · 235
Question I. What city [is] Gabaon, and where? · 236
Question II. Which [were] the other cities of the Hevites, joined to Gabaon? · 237
Question III. What [was] the cunning of the Gabaonites for turning away from themselves the war of the Israelites? · 238
Question IV. What, how, and in what language, did the legates of the Gabaonites speak to the Israelites? · 239
Question V. Whether the Gabaonites rightly employed the fraud of things and words? · 240
Question VI. What [did] the Israelites [say and do] at the embassy of the Gabaonites? · 243
Question VII. Whether the Gabaonites embraced the true religion of the one God? · 243
Question VIII. Whether the Israelites could strike a covenant with the Gabaonites? · 245
Question IX. Whether the Israelites struck the covenant with the Gabaonites rightly — [in] the manner [in which] they struck [it]? · 245
Question X. When and how did the Israelites find out the fraud of the Gabaonites? [heading printed "IX"] · 246
Question XI. Whether the Israelites were bound by the oath given to the Gabaonites? · 247
Question XII. Since the Israelites were not bound by that oath, [did they] rightly keep it? · 247
Question XIII. In so great a readiness to believe the Gabaonites, could anything of virtue — either Joshua's or Israel's — be noted [marked]? · 248
Question XIV. Whether any penalty could be imposed on the Gabaonites for the fraud, and what? · 249
Question XV. What penalty was imposed on the Gabaonites for [their] lies and deceptions? · 250
Question XVI. Where was the domicile of the Gabaonites thereafter? · 251
Question XVII. Whether a wage was given to the Gabaonites [while] serving? · 252
Question XVIII. Whether, by the festival of the Xylophoria [wood-carrying], the wood-servitude of the Gabaonites was taken away? · 252
Question XIX. Whether, by the probatic [sheep-] pool and the fountain of the temple, the water-servitude of the same Gabaonites was taken away? · 253
Question XX. Whether the Gabaonites are the Nethinim? · 253
Question XXI. Whether many Gabaonites [were] slain by King Saul, and why? · 254
Question XXII. From these Gabaonite [matters], what [is there] for the reforming of morals? · 255
Question XXIII. How charming an allegory [is] the heretical Gabaonite history! · 258
Question XXIV. The Catholic allegory of the same history · 258

Of the Wars: Caput X

The Fourth War — namely the second Gabaonite [war], or the Adoni-zedekian [war] · 260
Question I. Who were the five Kings that besieged Gabaon? · 261
Question II. How, and from what, is Jerusalem named? · 262
Question III. Which [city] is Hebron? · 266
Question IV. Which are Jarmuth, Lachish, Eglon? · 266
Question V. Why the King of Jerusalem summoned to himself four other Kings · 267
Question VI. Why the King of Jerusalem [was] the first to summon those other four Kings to himself · 267
Question VII. How did Joshua raise the siege of Gabaon, and put the Kings to flight? · 268
Question VIII. How did the Lord trouble these Kings? · 269

Question IX. Whether the terror cast upon the enemies was a "Panic" [terror] · 270
Caput X (opening) · 270
Question X. By what route did the terrified enemies flee? · 270
Question XI. What, how many, and of what kind were the stones the Lord hurled upon the fleeing? · 271
Question XII. Whence were these stones sent, by whom were they made and cast, and were they obtained by Joshua's prayers? · 271
Question XIII. Whether in this battle the Sun and Moon stood still? · 272
Question XIV. Whether the Sun and Moon can stand still naturally? · 275
Question XV. Whether evil Angels can make the Sun and Moon stand still? · 277
Question XVI. Whether any one of the good Angels could stay these same heavenly bodies of the Sun and Moon? · 278
Question XVII. What were the efficient causes that, in the Gabaonite war, the Sun and Moon stood still? And what did the first [cause], namely Joshua, effect? · 279
Question XVIII. Whether Joshua rightly asked and commanded that the Sun and Moon should deflect from the constant and perpetual law of nature? · 280
Question XIX. What did the other efficient cause, namely God, effect? · 283
Question XX. What did the third efficient cause, namely the Angel, effect? · 285
Question XXI. Where did the Sun and Moon stand still? · 286
Question XXII. In what month, day, [and] hour did the Sun and Moon stand still? · 288
Question XXIII. How long did the Sun and Moon stand still? · 290
Question XXIV. Whether so long a day had never been before? · 292
Question XXV. Whether so long a day has [never] been afterward? · 293
Question XXVI. When the Sun and Moon stood still, did the [other] stars and the other orbs of the heavens stand still [too]? · 296
Question XXVII. From the rest of the Sun and Moon, did a rest of all things follow in the sublunary world? · 297
Question XXVIII. How could Joshua, and the whole people, bear the weight and heat of so long a day? · 298
Question XXIX. Whether it is a greater miracle for the Sun to stand still, or to go back? · 298
Question XXX. Whether on account of this miracle Joshua [is] greater than Moses? · 299
Question XXXI. Whether the ancient writers remembered so great a miracle? · 300
Question XXXII. Who [is] the "Book of the Just" cited in the text? · 301
Question XXXIII. Whether the [things] which our text adduces from the cited Book of the Just are poetic, and verses? · 301
Question XXXIV. Why is the same Book of the Just cited by the text? · 304
Question XXXV. Does the Book of the Just exist? Or, how did it perish? · 304
Question XXXVI. Whither, how, and when did the victorious Israelites return from the slaughter of the enemy? · 304
Question XXXVII. What did the conquered enemy, and the enemy Kings, do [and] suffer? · 305
Question XXXVIII. For this victory, did Joshua sing any song? · 306
Question XXXIX. On certain moral [lessons]? · 307
Question XL. On the allegory of this war · 311

Of the Wars: Caput XI — The Sixth War: The Jabinite [War], or the Northern [War]

Caput XI — The Sixth War: The Jabinite [War], or the Northern [War] (opening) · 319
Question I. What [is] Asor, and its King? · 320
Question II. Which Kings and peoples did King Jabin stir up against the Israelites? · 320
Question III. Of how great a number were these enemies against Israel? · 322
Question IV. Into what place did these enemies assemble? · 323
Question V. How, when, and why did the Lord confirm Joshua? (v. 6) · 324
Question VI. How, and how far, did Joshua put to flight and cut down this innumerable multitude of enemies? · 325
Question VII. What did Joshua do after so great a victory? · 327
Question VIII. In prosecuting his victory, what cities and kingdoms did Joshua occupy, and either lay waste or preserve? · 329
Question IX. Whether Joshua left no remnants of the Canaanites? · 331
Question X. Why did Joshua do all these things thus? · 331
Question XI. Why did God will all these things to be done thus by Joshua? · 333
Question XII. What is the hardening of the heart? · 334

Question XIII. What are the efficient causes of the hardening? · 335
Question XIV. How is God sometimes said to harden someone, or to be the cause of someone's hardening? · 336
Question XV. What is the effect of this hardening? · 338
Question XVI. How long a time did Joshua take to accomplish these wars, and destroy the Enakim? · 338
Question XVII. What [is] the mystical explanation of this chapter? · 338

Of the Wars: Caput XII — [The Kings Conquered on Both Sides of the Jordan]

Caput XII — [The Kings Conquered on Both Sides of the Jordan] (opening) · 340
Question I. How many, and which, Kings were subdued and destroyed by Joshua? · 341
Question II. Whence [came there] so many Kings? · 341
Question III. In how many years' space did Joshua reduce all these Canaanite kings, and their kingdoms, under the dominion of the Israelites? · 342
Question IV. Whether Joshua, at the beginning of these wars, invited the Canaanites to peace and surrender? · 342
Question V. Whether the Canaanites, refusing peace and surrender, blocked the wells and springs, lest the use of them be for the Israelites, and did other things of that kind? · 343
Question VI. Whether some Canaanites hid themselves in caves for fear of Joshua, and others fled into other regions — especially Libya and Germany? · 343

After the Wars: Caput XIII — [The Land Yet to Be Divided; the Inheritance of Reuben, Gad, and Half Manasseh]

Caput XIII — [The Land Yet to Be Divided; the Inheritance of Reuben, Gad, and Half Manasseh] (opening) · 345
Question I. What [is] this promised land to be divided? · 346
Question III. Of what sort [is] this land to be divided? [so numbered; the print skips Q II] · 346
Question III. Compared to other regions, of what sort [is] the same land? · 349
Question IIII. How great [is] that same land? · 354
Question V. Into what parts was the land divided? · 357
Question VI. Why was the Levitical tribe excluded from the inheritance, and from every portion of the land? · 358
Question VII. To what time is the interpretation to be assigned, [of the right] taken away from Levi himself? [the print: "Quando capiendae interpretationis ius ipsi Levi ademptum?" — i.e. to what point is Levi's loss of his right [to a land-portion] to be referred.] · 361
Question VIII. Did Ephraim and Manasseh succeed into the place of the Levites? · 362
Question IX. Whether the land ought to have been divided into twelve portions, and why? · 362
Question X. Who [were] the dividers of the promised land? · 364
Question XI. Where was the division of the land made? · 366
Question XII. In what manner was the division made? · 367
Question XIII. At what time was the division made? · 369
Question XIV. Were the Sabbatical and Jubilee years begun from that division of the land? · 370
Question XV. How did the Sabbatical and Jubilee years cease to be counted by the Jews? · 375
Question XVI. From the division of the land to CHRIST the Lord, how many Sabbaticals and Jubilees were there in sum? · 377
Question XVII. For what causes did the Lord will that land to be so divided? · 378

After the Wars: Caput XIV — Concerning the division of the land, in detail [De terrae divisione speciatim]

Caput XIV — Concerning the division of the land, in detail [De terrae divisione speciatim] (opening) · 381
Question I. Why did the Judaic and Josephine tribes cast lots first of all, and receive [their] portion [first]? · 381
Question II. When did Caleb approach Joshua, [as] about to seek the promised territory? · 382
Question III. Who, and of what sort, [was] the man Caleb? · 382
Question IV. What [is] the mountain which Caleb seeks from Joshua? · 386
Question V. What city [is] Hebron? and what [is] in it? · 388
Question VI. Whether Caleb obtained Hebron, which he was seeking from Joshua? · 392
Question VII. Whether Hebron [was] stormed by Joshua, or by Caleb? And how? · 393
Question VIII. How did Caleb take Hebron? · 394

After the Wars: Caput XV — The portion and dominion of the tribe of Juda [Iudae tribus portio ac ditio]

Caput XV — The portion and dominion of the tribe of Juda [Iudae tribus portio ac ditio] (opening) · 395
Question I. Whether the investigation of those cities and places be useful · 397
Question II. What [is] to be noted in the borders of Judaea? · 398
Question III. How many Southern cities of Juda were there? · 400
Question IV. How many cities [were there] in the plains of Judaea? · 400
Question V. In the mountains, the deserts, and in sum in the whole tribe of Judaea, how many cities? · 401
Question VI. Did any cities later depart from, or accede to, this tribe? · 401
Question VII. To what tribe did Jerusalem belong, and why could the Jebusites not be expelled from it? · 402
Question VIII. Why are the single or several places of the tribe of Juda not handled [in detail] here? · 402

After the Wars: Caput XVI — Concerning the Portions of the two Josephine tribes, and specifically of the Ephraimite [portion] thereof [De Iosephinarum tribuum duarum Portionibus, & singulatim de ipsius Ephraimica]

Caput XVI — Concerning the Portions of the two Josephine tribes, and specifically of the Ephraimite [portion] thereof [De Iosephinarum tribuum duarum Portionibus, & singulatim de ipsius Ephraimica] (opening) · 404

After the Wars: Caput XVII — Concerning the Portion of the tribe of Manasse [De Manassae tribus Portione]

Caput XVII — Concerning the Portion of the tribe of Manasse [De Manassae tribus Portione] (opening) · 407

After the Wars: Caput XVIII — Concerning the second division of the land among the seven remaining tribes; and specifically of the Benjaminite portion [De secunda terrae in septem residuas tribus divisione: ac speciatim de Beniaminia portione]

Caput XVIII — Concerning the second division of the land among the seven remaining tribes; and specifically of the Benjaminite portion [De secunda terrae in septem residuas tribus divisione: ac speciatim de Beniaminia portione] (opening) · 411
Question I. What, and where, [is] Shiloh? · 412
Question II. What assembly [was] held by Joshua at Shiloh, and what [was] decreed in it? · 412
Question III. What [is] "the tabernacle of testimony"? · 413
Question IV. Whether at Shiloh, first of all in the land of Canaan, Moses's tabernacle was fixed? · 413
Question V. Whether at Shiloh the tabernacle stood under the open sky, or in some house? · 414
Question VI. Why [was] the tabernacle taken away from Gilgal, and transferred to Shiloh? · 415
Question VII. At what time [was] the tabernacle transferred to Shiloh? · 416
Question VIII. How long did the tabernacle remain at Shiloh? · 416
Question IX. Why did the tabernacle afterward emigrate [depart] from Shiloh? · 417
Question X. Whether, together with the tabernacle, the camp of the Israelites [was] transferred to Shiloh from Gilgal? · 417
Question XI. Whether, the tabernacle being transferred to Shiloh and the camp being fixed in that same place, the observance of the Mosaic ceremonies and of the whole law began? · 418
Question XII. Why [was] the casting-of-lots of the land, begun at Gilgal, interrupted? · 418
Question XIII. How [was] the second division of the land undertaken and completed? · 420
Question XIV. What [are] the limits [borders] and cities of the Benjaminite tribe? · 421

After the Wars: Caput XIX — Concerning the portions of the remaining six tribes, and of Joshua himself [De reliquarum sex tribuum, ipsiusque Iosue portionibus]

Caput XIX — Concerning the portions of the remaining six tribes, and of Joshua himself [De reliquarum sex tribuum, ipsiusque Iosue portionibus] (opening) · 424
Question I. What [are] the limits [borders] and cities of the Simeonic tribe? · 425
Question II. By what right or manner [was] the Simeonic portion placed within the Judaean tribe? · 425
Question III. Why [was] the Simeonic [portion] placed within the bounds of the Judaic [tribe] rather than of any other tribe whatsoever? · 426

Question IV. Whether by an error of the lot, or in what other manner, [was] the Judaic tribe's portion greater than would suit [it]? · 426
Question V. Whether the Jews [Judahites] received the Simeonites into their lot unwillingly and grievingly? · 428
Question VI. Of what limits [borders] and cities does the tribe of Zabulon consist? · 429
Question VII. What limits [borders] and cities the Issacharite tribe had? · 431
Question VIII. For the Aserite tribe, what borders? what cities? · 431
Question IX. For the Nephtalite tribe, what borders, and what cities, were decreed? · 432
Question X. By what limits [was] the Danite portion contained? what cities did [it] contain? · 433
Question XI. Which [inheritance], and where, did the Commander Joshua receive? · 434
Question XII. When and how did Joshua receive that inheritance? · 435
Question XIII. What did the leader Joshua display in the love, the petition [requesting], the building, and the inhabiting of this his inheritance? · 436

After the Wars: Caput XX

Caput XX (opening) · 439
Question I. What [are] the cities of refuge? · 439
Question II. Whom, among the Israelites, did the cities of refuge protect, and why? · 440
Question III. How, and against whom, did the asylum-cities protect a refugee? · 441
Question IV. How long did the same cities of refuge protect a refugee? · 442
Question V. Why did the death of the high priest free the exiles from the cities of refuge, and from [their] exiles [banishments]? · 443
Question VI. How many cities of refuge, and of what kind? · 446
Question VII. Whether the City of the Sanctuary, or the Sanctuary itself, was an Asylum? · 448
Question VIII. Whether among Christians [there] are also any asylums? and which [are] they? · 449
Question IX. What [is] the difference between the asylums of the Old Testament and of the New? · 449
Question X. Whether among the Israelites, and [among] Christians, asylums of this kind [were] rightly instituted? · 450
Question XI. Whether, against the Asylums of the Christians, Masius spoke prudently enough in this place? · 452
Question XII. What [is] the mystical explanation of the cities of refuge? · 453

After the Wars: Caput XXI

Caput XXI (opening) · 456
Question I. Why [were] cities given to the Levites? · 457
Question II. How [were] cities given to the Levites? · 457
Question III. How many cities in all [were] given to all the Levites? · 459
Question IV. How many, and which, cities [were] given to the chief families of the Levites? · 460
Question V. Whether the Levites dwelt in other cities [too]? · 463
Question VI. How large, and of what kind, [were] those cities of the Levites? · 463
Question VII. What, and for what, [were] the spaces around those cities given to the Levites? · 465
Question VIII. How great [large were] the suburbs of the Levitic cities? · 466
Question IX. Whether, in the cities given to the Levites, [there] was any right left — after the giving — to the tribes, or to the tribesmen who had given them? · 469
Question X. Whether in the Levitic cities, besides the Levites, no one dwelt? · 470

After the Wars: Caput XXII

Caput XXII (opening) · 473
Question I. What, and how, did Joshua speak to the Transjordanian tribes [as they were] about to depart? · 474
Question II. How did [they] depart, and [how, as they] departed, did the Transjordanian tribes raise up an altar on the way? · 477
Question III. Did the Transjordanians act rightly in erecting that altar? · 478

After the Wars: Caput XXIII

Caput XXIII (opening) · 485

After the Wars: Caput XXIV

Caput XXIV (opening) · 489
Question I. Where [was it] that Joshua, [as] Commander, held this last gathering of the people, and [his] last words to it? · 490
Question II. Whether the ancestors of the Israelites, whom Joshua led into the land of promise, were idolaters in Mesopotamia and Egypt? · 491
Question III. Whether also, in Joshua's own time, [there] were still any Israelites [who were] idolaters? · 492
Question IV. Whether the Lord [truly] sent hornets, before the Israelites, upon their enemies? · 493
Question V. Whether Joshua made to the Israelites a true option [choice] of serving God or the [false] gods? · 495
Question VI. How did [Joshua] say (v. 19) to the Israelites [who were] choosing God: "You will not be able to serve the Lord"? · 496
Question VII. How did Joshua strike [make] a covenant with the Israelites? · 497
Question VIII. When did Joshua die? · 500
Question IX. Where, and with what mourning [planctu], was Joshua buried? · 501
Question X. What [kind of] sepulchre [had] the Leader Joshua? and were the stone knives buried with him in this [sepulchre]? · 502
Question XI. What [was] the epitaph of Joshua? · 503
Question XII. What other monuments [exist] to the perpetual memory of Joshua? · 504
Question XIII. Whether Joshua waged any war with the Kings of Armenia, Persia, and Media? · 504
Question XIV. Whether Joshua left children, or was celibate [coelebs]? · 508
Question XV. Whether Joshua escaped the teeth of heretics? · 510
Question XVI. When were Joseph's bones buried? · 510
Question XVII. Where were Joseph's bones buried? · 510
Question XVIII. Whether, with Joseph, more other Patriarchs [were] buried at Shechem? · 513
Question XIX. How, and why, were Joseph's bones transferred to Shechem? · 514
Question XX. How died, & where [was] buried, Eleazar the Pontiff? · 514
Question XXI. Who wrote the end of this book? and what [is] added to it by the 70 [LXX]? · 515

Front Matter

Index of Subjects · 516
A · 516
B · 519
C · 520
D · 523
E · 525
F · 526
G · 527
H · 528
I · 529
L · 534
M · 536
N · 538
O · 539
P · 539
Q · 543
R · 543
S · 545
T · 548
V · 549
X · 551

Front Matter

Index of Questions

This index is generated from the translated question- and chapter-headings of this volume (Tomus Posterior); each entry cites the original printed column number of the page on which the heading falls. It stands in place of the original's Latin Index Quaestionum, *a tabular list of the same questions.*

ON THE WARS [De Bellis]. [*(col. 717)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/003-the-wars-opening/#col-717)

- [**QVAESTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/004-question-i-how-many-were-joshua-s-wars-against-the-canaa/) — How many were Joshua's wars against the Canaanites? [*(col. 717)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/003-the-wars-opening/#col-717) - [**QVAESTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/) — Were these wars just? And first: Did the Israelites justly move arms against the Canaanites? [*(col. 717)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/003-the-wars-opening/#col-717) - [**QVAESTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/006-question-iii-against-the-just-arms-of-the-israelites-did/) — Against the just arms of the Israelites, did the Canaanites too justly bear arms? [*(col. 723)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-723) - [**QVAESTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/) — What do these wars of the Israelites against the Canaanites signify? [*(col. 727)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/006-question-iii-against-the-just-arms-of-the-israelites-did/#col-727)

2. ON JOSHUA'S FIVE WARS AGAINST THE CANAANITES, ONE BY ONE [singillatim]. [*(col. 733)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-733)

THE FIRST WAR: THE WAR OF JERICHO [Primum Bellum Hierichuntinum].

CAPUT VI. [*(col. 733)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-733)

- [**QVAESTIVNCVLA I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/009-question-i-what-was-the-state-of-jericho-at-the-time-of-/) — What [was] the state of Jericho at [the time of] the war? [*(col. 735)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/008-caput-vi-opening/#col-735) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/010-question-ii-by-what-plan-was-jericho-to-be-assaulted/) — By what plan was Jericho to be assaulted? [*(col. 737)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/009-question-i-what-was-the-state-of-jericho-at-the-time-of-/#col-737) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/011-question-iii-what-of-the-arrangement-of-those-who-go-rou/) — What of the arrangement of those who go round Jericho in the first circuit? [*(col. 739)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/010-question-ii-by-what-plan-was-jericho-to-be-assaulted/#col-739) - [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/012-question-iv-of-what-kind-were-the-trumpets-of-the-seven-/) — Of what kind were the trumpets of the seven priests? [*(col. 739)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/010-question-ii-by-what-plan-was-jericho-to-be-assaulted/#col-739) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/013-question-v-what-is-jobel-the-jubilee/) — What is Jobel [the Jubilee]? [*(col. 743)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/012-question-iv-of-what-kind-were-the-trumpets-of-the-seven-/#col-743) -

[**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/014-question-vi-whether-jubilaeus-is-rightly-derived-from-io/) — Whether "Jubilaeus" is rightly derived from "iobel"? [*(col. 747)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/013-question-v-what-is-jobel-the-jubilee/#col-747) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/015-question-vii-whether-at-the-time-of-the-siege-of-jericho/) — Whether, at the time of the siege of Jericho, the Jubilee years had already begun? [*(col. 747)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/013-question-v-what-is-jobel-the-jubilee/#col-747) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/016-question-viii-why-did-the-lord-will-that-in-the-siege-of/) — Why did the Lord will that, in the siege of Jericho, [the trumpets] be sounded with such Jubilee-buccinae? [*(col. 747)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/013-question-v-what-is-jobel-the-jubilee/#col-747) - [**QVÆSTIO IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/017-question-ix-how-many-and-which-priests-carried-the-ark-a/) — How many, and which, priests carried the ark around Jericho? And whether their sides were bare of all protection? [*(col. 749)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/016-question-viii-why-did-the-lord-will-that-in-the-siege-of/#col-749) - [**QVÆSTIO X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/018-question-x-whether-the-warriors-excepted-the-rest-of-the/) — Whether, the warriors excepted, the rest of the multitude of the Israelites followed the ark? [*(col. 749)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/016-question-viii-why-did-the-lord-will-that-in-the-siege-of/#col-749) - [**QVÆSTIO XI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/019-question-xi-whether-in-that-last-column-of-those-followi/) — Whether in that last column of those following the ark there were priests, Levites, and some Egyptians? [*(col. 751)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/018-question-x-whether-the-warriors-excepted-the-rest-of-the/#col-751) - [**QVÆSTIO XII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/020-question-xii-whether-in-that-same-last-column-besides-th/) — Whether in that same last column, besides the seven priests before the ark, there were any [other] horn-blowers? [*(col. 753)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/019-question-xi-whether-in-that-last-column-of-those-followi/#col-753) - [**QVÆSTIO XIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/021-question-xiii-whether-joshua-enjoined-this-order-of-goin/) — Whether Joshua enjoined this order of going round Jericho upon the people by himself, or through the priests? [*(col. 753)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/019-question-xi-whether-in-that-last-column-of-those-followi/#col-753) - [**QVÆSTIO XIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/022-question-xiv-how-was-jericho-stormed/) — How was Jericho stormed? [*(col. 755)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/021-question-xiii-whether-joshua-enjoined-this-order-of-goin/#col-755) - [**QVÆSTIO XV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/023-question-xv-what-was-the-people-s-shout/) — What was the people's shout? [*(col. 755)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/021-question-xiii-whether-joshua-enjoined-this-order-of-goin/#col-755) - [**QVÆSTIO XVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/024-question-xvi-to-what-end-was-this-shout/) — To what end [was] this shout? [*(col. 755)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/021-question-xiii-whether-joshua-enjoined-this-order-of-goin/#col-755) - [**QVÆSTIO XVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/025-question-xvii-when-and-how-was-this-same-shout-commanded/) — When, and how, was this same shout commanded, and poured forth? [*(col. 757)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/024-question-xvi-to-what-end-was-this-shout/#col-757) - [**QVÆSTIO XVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/026-question-xviii-concerning-the-anathematizing-of-the-city/) — Concerning the anathematizing of the city and the preservation of Rahab: when [were they] commanded by Joshua? [*(col. 757)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/024-question-xvi-to-what-end-was-this-shout/#col-757) - [**QVÆSTIO XIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/027-question-xix-the-circuits-how-many-were-they/) — The circuits — how many were they? [*(col. 759)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/026-question-xviii-concerning-the-anathematizing-of-the-city/#col-759) - [**QVÆSTIO XX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/028-question-xx-whether-the-walls-of-jericho-fell-upon-the-s/) — Whether the walls of Jericho fell upon the surface of the ground? [*(col.*

759)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/026-question-xviii-concerning-the-anathematizing-of-the-city/#col-759) - [**QVÆSTIO XXI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/029-question-xxi-whether-the-same-walls-collapsed-of-their-o/) — Whether the same walls collapsed of their own accord [spontaneously]? [*(col. 761)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/028-question-xx-whether-the-walls-of-jericho-fell-upon-the-s/#col-761) - [**QVÆSTIO XXII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/030-question-xxii-whether-the-sound-of-the-trumpets-and-the-/) — Whether the sound of the trumpets and the people's shout overthrew and cast down the same walls? [*(col. 763)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/029-question-xxi-whether-the-same-walls-collapsed-of-their-o/#col-763) - [**QVÆSTIO XXIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/031-question-xxiii-how-did-the-israelites-enter-the-city-and/) — How did the Israelites enter the city, and what did they do there? [*(col. 765)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/030-question-xxii-whether-the-sound-of-the-trumpets-and-the-/#col-765) - [**QVÆSTIO XXIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/) — For what reason did the Lord will this war to be waged by the carrying-around of the ark? [*(col. 767)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/031-question-xxiii-how-did-the-israelites-enter-the-city-and/#col-767) - [**QVÆSTIO XXV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/033-question-xxv-why-were-the-circuits-made-with-the-multitu/) — Why were the circuits made with the multitude, and in the order set out above? [*(col. 769)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-769) - [**QVÆSTIO XXVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/034-question-xxvi-why-did-the-lord-judge-that-many-days-trum/) — Why did the Lord judge that many days, trumpets, and circuits should be employed here? [*(col. 769)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-769) - [**QVÆSTIO XXVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/035-question-xxvii-why-along-with-the-trumpet-clangor-was-no/) — Why, along with the trumpet-clangor, was now silence, now a shout, enjoined upon the people? [*(col. 773)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/034-question-xxvi-why-did-the-lord-judge-that-many-days-trum/#col-773) - [**QVÆSTIO XXVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/) — Why, definitely, were seven trumpets, seven days, and — on the seventh day — seven circuits employed? [*(col. 775)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/035-question-xxvii-why-along-with-the-trumpet-clangor-was-no/#col-775) - [**QVÆSTIO XXIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/037-question-xxix-of-these-seven-days-which-was-the-first-an/) — Of these seven days, which was the first, and which the last? Was it the Passover? the Sabbath? or another day? [*(col. 779)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/#col-779) - [**QVÆSTIO XXX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/038-question-xxx-at-what-hour-of-the-seventh-day-was-jericho/) — At what hour of the seventh day was Jericho taken? [*(col. 783)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/037-question-xxix-of-these-seven-days-which-was-the-first-an/#col-783) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/039-question-xxxi-whether-jericho-was-burned-on-the-same-sev/) — Whether Jericho was burned on the same seventh day? [*(col. 785)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/038-question-xxx-at-what-hour-of-the-seventh-day-was-jericho/#col-785) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/040-question-xxxii-but-how-does-the-jericho-week-septenary-f/) — But

how does the Jericho week [septenary] fit Jesus [Joshua]? [*(col. 785)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/038-question-xxx-at-what-hour-of-the-seventh-day-was-jericho/#col-785) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/041-question-xxxiii-what-is-anathema-and-cherem/) — What is "anathema" and "cherem"? [*(col. 789)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/040-question-xxxii-but-how-does-the-jericho-week-septenary-f/#col-789) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/042-question-xxxiv-how-manifold-is-the-anathema-how-many-kin/) — How manifold is the anathema? [*(col. 791)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/041-question-xxxiii-what-is-anathema-and-cherem/#col-791) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/043-question-xxxv-of-what-kind-was-the-jericho-anathema/) — Of what kind [was] the Jericho anathema? [*(col. 791)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/041-question-xxxiii-what-is-anathema-and-cherem/#col-791) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/044-question-xxxvi-could-all-the-mothers-virgins-and-girls-o/) — Could all the mothers, virgins, and girls of that city be rightly included in the Jericho anathema? [*(col. 791)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/041-question-xxxiii-what-is-anathema-and-cherem/#col-791) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/045-question-xxxvii-were-infants-boys-and-decrepit-old-men-r/) — Were infants, boys, and decrepit old men rightly included in the same anathema? [*(col. 793)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/044-question-xxxvi-could-all-the-mothers-virgins-and-girls-o/#col-793) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/046-question-xxxviii-were-the-beasts-and-cattle-the-garments/) — Were the beasts and cattle, the garments, and the other inanimate things rightly included in the same anathema? [*(col. 795)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/045-question-xxxvii-were-infants-boys-and-decrepit-old-men-r/#col-795) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/047-question-xxxix-why-was-so-dire-an-anathema-inflicted-upo/) — Why was so dire an anathema inflicted upon a city so beautiful and opulent? [*(col. 795)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/045-question-xxxvii-were-infants-boys-and-decrepit-old-men-r/#col-795) - [**QVÆSTIO XL**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/048-question-xl-why-were-the-metals-excepted-from-this-anath/) — Why were the metals excepted from this anathema, and what was done with them? [*(col. 797)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/047-question-xxxix-why-was-so-dire-an-anathema-inflicted-upo/#col-797) - [**QVÆSTIO XLI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/049-question-xli-whether-besides-those-four-kinds-of-metals-/) — Whether, besides those four kinds of metals brought into the Lord's treasury, there were also others; and whether whatever could be found of those four [was brought in]? [*(col. 799)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/048-question-xl-why-were-the-metals-excepted-from-this-anath/#col-799) - [**QVÆSTIO XLII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/050-question-xlii-whether-it-is-lawful-for-the-houses-of-god/) — Whether it is lawful for the houses of God, or the Christian Churches, to have treasuries? [*(col. 801)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/049-question-xli-whether-besides-those-four-kinds-of-metals-/#col-801) - [**QVÆSTIO XLIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/051-question-xliii-of-the-anathema-of-persons-who-were-excep/) — Of the anathema of persons: who were excepted? and whether rightly? [*(col. 801)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/049-question-xli-whether-besides-those-four-kinds-of-metals-/#col-801) - [**QVÆSTIO XLIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/052-question-xliv-whether-the-household-goods-of-rahab-herse/) — Whether the household-goods of Rahab herself and of her kin, and all the other goods, were preserved? [*(col. 803)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/051-question-xliii-of-the-anathema-of-persons-who-were-excep/#col-803) - [**QVÆSTIO XLV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/053-question-xlv-who-were-they-that-preserved-rahab-and-her-/) — Who

[were they that] preserved Rahab, and her kinsfolk and goods? [*(col. 805)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/052-question-xliv-whether-the-household-goods-of-rahab-herse/#col-805) - [**QVÆSTIO XLVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/054-question-xlvi-for-what-causes-was-rahab-preserved-with-a/) — For what causes was Rahab preserved with all her people? [*(col. 805)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/052-question-xliv-whether-the-household-goods-of-rahab-herse/#col-805) - [**QVÆSTIO XLVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/055-question-xlvii-what-manner-was-used-in-preserving-rahab-/) — What manner was used in preserving Rahab and her kinsfolk? [*(col. 807)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/054-question-xlvi-for-what-causes-was-rahab-preserved-with-a/#col-807) - [**QVÆSTIO XLVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/056-question-xlviii-whether-just-as-in-body-so-also-in-soul-/) — Whether, just as in body, so also in soul, Rahab and her kinsfolk were saved? [*(col. 809)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/055-question-xlvii-what-manner-was-used-in-preserving-rahab-/#col-809) - [**QVÆSTIO XLIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/057-question-xlix-rahab-being-preserved-did-any-of-the-israe/) — Rahab being preserved, did any of the Israelites take her to wife — and who? [*(col. 809)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/055-question-xlvii-what-manner-was-used-in-preserving-rahab-/#col-809) - [**QVÆSTIO L**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/058-question-l-whether-salmon-rightly-married-this-same-raha/) — Whether Salmon rightly married this same Rahab? [*(col. 809)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/055-question-xlvii-what-manner-was-used-in-preserving-rahab-/#col-809) - [**QVÆSTIO LI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/059-question-li-what-offspring-came-from-this-marriage-of-ra/) — What offspring [came] from this marriage of Rahab and Salmon? [*(col. 811)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/058-question-l-whether-salmon-rightly-married-this-same-raha/#col-811) - [**QVÆSTIO LII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/060-question-lii-what-further-did-joshua-decree-against-jeri/) — What further did Joshua decree against Jericho, [now] emptied by slaughters and swallowed by fire? [*(col. 811)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/058-question-l-whether-salmon-rightly-married-this-same-raha/#col-811) - [**QVÆSTIO LIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/061-question-liii-did-joshua-rightly-imprecate-a-curse-on-th/) — Did Joshua rightly imprecate [a curse] on the rebuilder of Jericho? [*(col. 813)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/060-question-lii-what-further-did-joshua-decree-against-jeri/#col-813) - [**QVÆSTIO LIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/062-question-liv-are-the-builders-the-masons-and-the-workmen/) — Are the builders, the masons, and the workmen liable to the same imprecation? [*(col. 813)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/060-question-lii-what-further-did-joshua-decree-against-jeri/#col-813) - [**QVÆSTIO LV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/063-question-lv-did-the-inhabitants-of-the-now-rebuilt-city-/) — Did the inhabitants of the now-rebuilt city fall under the same imprecation? [*(col. 815)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/062-question-liv-are-the-builders-the-masons-and-the-workmen/#col-815) - [**QVÆSTIO LVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/064-question-lvi-whether-if-anyone-should-raise-up-on-the-sa/) — Whether, if anyone should raise up on the same site another city under another name, he would be held by the same imprecation? [*(col. 815)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/062-question-liv-are-the-builders-the-masons-and-the-workmen/#col-815) - [**QVÆSTIO LVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/065-question-lvii-what-if-the-rebuilder-of-jericho-had-had-n/) — What if the rebuilder of Jericho had had no children, or at least not so many? [*(col. 815)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/062-question-liv-are-the-builders-the-masons-and-the-workmen/#col-815) - [**QVÆSTIO LVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/066-question-lviii-was-any-of-the-jews-so-bold-that-against-/) — Was any of the Jews so bold that, against this imprecation, he thought of the restoration of Jericho? [*(col. 815)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/062-question-liv-are-the-builders-the-masons-and-the-workmen/#col-815) -

[**QVÆSTIO LIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/067-question-lix-did-hiel-do-it-against-the-same-imprecation/) — Did Hiel do [it] against the same imprecation with impunity? [*(col. 817)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/066-question-lviii-was-any-of-the-jews-so-bold-that-against-/#col-817) - [**QVÆSTIO LX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/068-question-lx-how-great-was-joshua-s-glory-and-what-was-it/) — How great [was] Joshua's glory, and what [was] its cause? [*(col. 819)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/067-question-lix-did-hiel-do-it-against-the-same-imprecation/#col-819)

CAPVT VII. [*(col. 821)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/068-question-lx-how-great-was-joshua-s-glory-and-what-was-it/#col-821)

TEXTVS. - [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/070-question-i-who-was-achan/) — Who [was] Achan? [*(col. 823)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/069-textvs/#col-823) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/071-question-ii-why-is-achan-s-genealogy-indicated-so-carefu/) — Why is Achan's genealogy indicated so carefully? [*(col. 825)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/070-question-i-who-was-achan/#col-825) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/072-question-iii-what-did-achan-commit/) — What did Achan commit? [*(col. 825)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/070-question-i-who-was-achan/#col-825) - [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/073-question-iv-what-and-of-what-kind-was-the-garment-which-/) — What, and of what kind, [was] the garment which Achan stole? [*(col. 827)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/072-question-iii-what-did-achan-commit/#col-827) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/074-question-v-what-and-how-much-silver-did-achan-steal/) — What, and how much, silver did Achan steal? [*(col. 829)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/073-question-iv-what-and-of-what-kind-was-the-garment-which-/#col-829) - [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/075-question-vi-what-and-how-much-of-gold-did-achan-steal/) — What, and how much, of gold did Achan steal? [*(col. 835)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/074-question-v-what-and-how-much-silver-did-achan-steal/#col-835) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/076-question-vii-in-what-manner-was-achan-led-to-these-theft/) — In what manner was Achan led to these thefts? [*(col. 837)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/075-question-vi-what-and-how-much-of-gold-did-achan-steal/#col-837) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/077-question-viii-in-what-manner-did-achan-cover-his-thefts/) — In what manner did Achan cover his thefts? [*(col. 841)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/076-question-vii-in-what-manner-was-achan-led-to-these-theft/#col-841) - [**QVÆSTIO IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/078-question-ix-of-what-kind-was-achan-s-sin/) — Of what kind was Achan's sin? [*(col. 843)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/077-question-viii-in-what-manner-did-achan-cover-his-thefts/#col-843) - [**QVÆSTIO X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/079-question-x-achan-s-sacrilege-being-so-hidden-how-was-it-/) — Achan's sacrilege being so hidden, how was it detected? [*(col. 843)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/077-question-viii-in-what-manner-did-achan-cover-his-thefts/#col-843) - [**QVÆSTIO XI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/080-question-xi-the-description-of-the-city-of-ai-its-reconn/) — The description of the city of Ai, its reconnaissance, the beginning of the war against it, and the receiving of the loss and disaster? [*(col. 843)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/077-question-viii-in-what-manner-did-achan-cover-his-thefts/#col-843) - [**QVÆSTIO XII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/081-question-xii-what-having-learned-of-the-slaughter-and-fl/) — What, having learned of the slaughter and flight of their own, did the Israelite people, and its Leader Joshua, and the elders, do? [*(col. 847)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/080-question-xi-the-description-of-the-city-of-ai-its-reconn/#col-847) - [**QVÆSTIO XIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/082-question-xiii-what-was-joshua-s-prayer-to-god/) — What

[was] Joshua's prayer to God? [*(col. 849)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/081-question-xii-what-having-learned-of-the-slaughter-and-fl/#col-849) - [**QVÆSTIO XIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/083-question-xiv-to-joshua-s-petition-what-was-the-response-/) — To Joshua's petition, what [was] the response of God the Best and Greatest? [*(col. 853)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/082-question-xiii-what-was-joshua-s-prayer-to-god/#col-853) - [**QVÆSTIO XV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/084-question-xv-what-method-of-inquiring-out-the-guilty-one-/) — What method of inquiring out the guilty one was prescribed by God? [*(col. 855)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/083-question-xiv-to-joshua-s-petition-what-was-the-response-/#col-855) - [**QVÆSTIO XVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/085-question-xvi-whether-by-lot-or-by-the-oracle-of-urim-and/) — Whether by lot, or by the oracle of Urim and Thummim, or by some other way, the guilty tribe, clan, house, [and] person were detected? [*(col. 855)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/083-question-xiv-to-joshua-s-petition-what-was-the-response-/#col-855) - [**QVÆSTIO XVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/086-question-xvii-how-manifold-is-the-lot/) — How manifold [is] the lot? [*(col. 857)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/085-question-xvi-whether-by-lot-or-by-the-oracle-of-urim-and/#col-857) - [**QVÆSTIO XVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/087-question-xviii-are-lots-fortuitous/) — Are lots fortuitous? [*(col. 859)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/086-question-xvii-how-manifold-is-the-lot/#col-859) - [**QVÆSTIO XIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/088-question-xix-are-lots-evil-by-their-own-nature/) — Are lots evil by their own nature? [*(col. 861)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/087-question-xviii-are-lots-fortuitous/#col-861) - [**QVÆSTIO XX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/089-question-xx-of-lots-which-of-their-own-kind-are-not-vici/) — Of lots which of their own kind are not vicious, are some forbidden, some permitted? [*(col. 863)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/088-question-xix-are-lots-evil-by-their-own-nature/#col-863) - [**QVÆSTIO XXI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/090-question-xxi-what-are-the-conditions-of-the-permitted-lo/) — What [are] the conditions of the permitted lots? [*(col. 867)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/089-question-xx-of-lots-which-of-their-own-kind-are-not-vici/#col-867) - [**QVÆSTIO XXII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/091-question-xxii-when-and-how-was-the-lot-conducted-in-the-/) — When and how was the lot conducted in [the case of] Achan? [*(col. 869)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/090-question-xxi-what-are-the-conditions-of-the-permitted-lo/#col-869) - [**QVÆSTIO XXIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/092-question-xxiii-how-with-the-occasion-of-a-night-interven/) — How, with the occasion of a night intervening, did Achan not flee, but awaited the announced — and indeed the last — lot? [*(col. 869)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/090-question-xxi-what-are-the-conditions-of-the-permitted-lo/#col-869) - [**QVÆSTIO XXIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/093-question-xxiv-achan-once-betrayed-by-the-lot-how-did-jos/) — Achan, [once] betrayed by the lot, how did Joshua lead [him] to the confession of [his] sin? [*(col. 871)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/092-question-xxiii-how-with-the-occasion-of-a-night-interven/#col-871) - [**QVÆSTIO XXV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/094-question-xxv-how-by-the-confession-of-his-sin-could-acha/) — How, by the confession of his sin, could Achan give glory to God? [*(col. 873)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/093-question-xxiv-achan-once-betrayed-by-the-lot-how-did-jos/#col-873) - [**QVÆSTIO XXVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/095-question-xxvi-why-did-joshua-strive-to-lead-achan-to-the/) — Why did Joshua strive to lead Achan to the confession of his sin? [*(col. 875)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/094-question-xxv-how-by-the-confession-of-his-sin-could-acha/#col-875) -

[**QVÆSTIO XXVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/096-question-xxvii-of-what-kind-was-achan-s-confession/) — Of what kind [was] Achan's confession? [*(col. 875)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/094-question-xxv-how-by-the-confession-of-his-sin-could-acha/#col-875) - [**QVÆSTIO XXVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/097-question-xxviii-how-and-why-was-the-eye-witness-inspecti/) — How, and why, was the eye-witness inspection of Achan's sacrilege made? [*(col. 879)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/096-question-xxvii-of-what-kind-was-achan-s-confession/#col-879) - [**QVÆSTIO XXIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/098-question-xxix-with-what-punishment-was-the-sacrilegious-/) — With what punishment was the sacrilegious Achan afflicted? [*(col. 879)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/096-question-xxvii-of-what-kind-was-achan-s-confession/#col-879) - [**QVÆSTIO XXX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/099-question-xxx-what-things-and-what-men-were-burned-and-ov/) — What things, and what men, were burned and overwhelmed with stones together with Achan? [*(col. 883)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/098-question-xxix-with-what-punishment-was-the-sacrilegious-/#col-883) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/100-question-xxxi-why-were-inanimate-things-and-brute-cattle/) — Why were inanimate things, and brute cattle, burned? [*(col. 885)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/099-question-xxx-what-things-and-what-men-were-burned-and-ov/#col-885) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/101-question-xxxii-why-were-achan-s-sons-and-daughter-burned/) — Why were Achan's sons and daughter burned? [*(col. 885)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/099-question-xxx-what-things-and-what-men-were-burned-and-ov/#col-885) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/102-question-xxxiii-on-what-men-or-things-is-the-punishment-/) — On what men, or things, is the punishment of cremation inflicted? [*(col. 887)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/101-question-xxxii-why-were-achan-s-sons-and-daughter-burned/#col-887) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/103-question-xxxiv-why-were-stones-cast-upon-the-ashes-or-th/) — Why were stones cast upon the ashes, or the half-burned bones, of all [these]? [*(col. 889)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/102-question-xxxiii-on-what-men-or-things-is-the-punishment-/#col-889) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/104-question-xxxv-achan-being-now-overwhelmed-why-was-a-heap/) — Achan being now overwhelmed, why was a heap of stones raised [over him]? [*(col. 891)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/103-question-xxxiv-why-were-stones-cast-upon-the-ashes-or-th/#col-891) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/105-question-xxxvi-how-through-achan-s-punishment-was-the-lo/) — How, through Achan's punishment, was the Lord's fury turned away from the Israelites? [*(col. 891)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/103-question-xxxiv-why-were-stones-cast-upon-the-ashes-or-th/#col-891) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/106-question-xxxvii-for-what-causes-does-the-lord-rightly-pu/) — For what causes does the Lord rightly punish some innocent [persons], with temporal punishments, on account of the guilt of others? [*(col. 893)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/105-question-xxxvi-how-through-achan-s-punishment-was-the-lo/#col-893) - [**QVÆSTIO XXXVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/107-question-xxxviii-whether-human-judges-can-extend-even-th/) — Whether human Judges can extend even the temporary punishments of the guilty to the innocent? [*(col. 901)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/106-question-xxxvii-for-what-causes-does-the-lord-rightly-pu/#col-901) -

[**QVÆSTIO XXXIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/108-question-xxxix-whether-the-lord-can-inflict-even-on-the-/) — Whether the Lord can inflict, even on the innocent, the punishments by which the souls of the guilty are tortured in this or the future age? [*(col. 903)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/107-question-xxxviii-whether-human-judges-can-extend-even-th/#col-903) - [**QVÆSTIO XL**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/109-question-xl-how-do-the-scriptures-agree-which-say-and-de/) — How do the scriptures agree — which say, and deny, [that] the punishments of the guilty are transferred to the guilty, and especially of parents to sons? [*(col. 903)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/107-question-xxxviii-whether-human-judges-can-extend-even-th/#col-903) - [**QVÆSTIO XLI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/110-question-xli-was-achan-adjudged-to-the-eternal-fire-or-r/) — Was Achan adjudged to the eternal fire, or rather to heavenly felicity? [*(col. 905)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/109-question-xl-how-do-the-scriptures-agree-which-say-and-de/#col-905) - [**QVÆSTIO XLII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/111-question-xlii-whom-can-achan-s-punishment-terrify/) — Whom can Achan's punishment terrify? [*(col. 905)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/109-question-xl-how-do-the-scriptures-agree-which-say-and-de/#col-905) - [**QVÆSTIO XLIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/112-question-xliii-concerning-the-sacrilegious-calvinians-an/) — Concerning the sacrilegious Calvinians and Lutherans — what [do] the Lutherans and Luther [say]? [*(col. 909)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/111-question-xlii-whom-can-achan-s-punishment-terrify/#col-909) - [**QVÆSTIO XLIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/113-question-xliv-how-from-the-books-of-the-gentile-and-here/) — How, from the books of the Gentile and Heretic Poets, orators, and Philosophers, do some at times become Achans? [*(col. 909)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/111-question-xlii-whom-can-achan-s-punishment-terrify/#col-909) - [**QVÆSTIO XLV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/114-question-xlv-how-do-heretics-and-apostate-monks-become-a/) — How do Heretics and Apostate Monks become Achans? [*(col. 911)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/113-question-xliv-how-from-the-books-of-the-gentile-and-here/#col-911) - [**QVÆSTIO XLVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/115-question-xlvi-how-greatly-must-one-beware-lest-after-the/) — How greatly must one beware, lest — after the manner of Achan — we harm the community by sinning? [*(col. 913)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/114-question-xlv-how-do-heretics-and-apostate-monks-become-a/#col-913) - [**QVÆSTIO XLVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/116-question-xlvii-how-are-masters-pastors-and-bishops-somet/) — How are masters, Pastors, [and] Bishops sometimes the cause that some Achans — who by their sins harm the community — arise? [*(col. 915)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/115-question-xlvi-how-greatly-must-one-beware-lest-after-the/#col-915) - [**QVÆSTIO XLVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/117-question-xlviii-why-and-whence-is-it-called-the-valley-o/) — Why, and whence, [is it] called the valley of Achor? [*(col. 917)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/116-question-xlvii-how-are-masters-pastors-and-bishops-somet/#col-917)

CAPVT VIII. — The Second War, of Ai [*(col. 917)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/116-question-xlvii-how-are-masters-pastors-and-bishops-somet/#col-917)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/118-caput-viii-the-second-war-of-ai-bellum-ii-haiense-openin/#col-921) — Are

there, properly [speaking], ambushes in war? [*(col. 921)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/118-caput-viii-the-second-war-of-ai-bellum-ii-haiense-openin/#col-921) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/118-caput-viii-the-second-war-of-ai-bellum-ii-haiense-openin/#col-921) — Whether it is lawful to use ambushes in war? [*(col. 921)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/118-caput-viii-the-second-war-of-ai-bellum-ii-haiense-openin/#col-921) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-931) — Of how many kinds, how great, where, and when did Joshua place ambushes? [*(col. 931)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-931) - [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-931) — How did Joshua place the ambushes so secretly that they were neither perceived nor detected by the men of Ai? [*(col. 931)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-931) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-931) — By what signal roused did the ambush take the city? [*(col. 931)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-931) - [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/123-question-v-by-what-signal-roused-did-the-ambush-take-the/#col-933) — What, and to what end, was Joshua bidden by the Lord to raise? [*(col. 933)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/123-question-v-by-what-signal-roused-did-the-ambush-take-the/#col-933) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-935) — When, and how, did the Lord command the extension of the hand and shield? [*(col. 935)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-935) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-935) — Whether in this battle any of the Jews were slain? and of the enemy, who and how many? [*(col. 935)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-935) - [**QVÆSTIO IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-935) — Why was Ai destroyed by fire? (v. 28) [*(col. 935)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-935) - [**QVÆSTIO X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-935) — The King of Ai — in what manner, and why, [was he] hung? (v. 29) [*(col. 935)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-935) - [**QVÆSTIO XI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/128-question-x-the-king-of-ai-in-what-manner-and-why-was-he-/#col-937) — When was the King of Ai taken down from the cross, and why? [*(col. 937)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/128-question-x-the-king-of-ai-in-what-manner-and-why-was-he-/#col-937) - [**QVÆSTIO XII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/128-question-x-the-king-of-ai-in-what-manner-and-why-was-he-/#col-937) — Where, and how, was the King of Ai buried? [*(col. 937)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/128-question-x-the-king-of-ai-in-what-manner-and-why-was-he-/#col-937) - [**QVÆSTIO**

XIII](/works/serarius-joshua-2/128-question-x-the-king-of-ai-in-what-manner-and-why-was-he-/#col-937) — What [is] the allegory of the storming of Ai? [*(col. 937)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/128-question-x-the-king-of-ai-in-what-manner-and-why-was-he-/#col-937)

Second Part of Chapter 8 — On the Ceremony on Mounts Ebal and Gerizim [*(col. 939)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/131-question-xiii-what-is-the-allegory-of-the-storming-of-ai/#col-939)

- [**QVÆSTIO XIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/131-question-xiii-what-is-the-allegory-of-the-storming-of-ai/#col-941) — Of what sort, and where, [are] Mounts Ebal and Gerizim? [*(col. 941)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/131-question-xiii-what-is-the-allegory-of-the-storming-of-ai/#col-941)

- [**QVÆSTIO XV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/132-question-xiv-of-what-sort-and-where-are-mounts-ebal-and-/#col-943) — On which mountain [was] the altar? and on this one or that, which tribe, and how [arranged]? [*(col. 943)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/132-question-xiv-of-what-sort-and-where-are-mounts-ebal-and-/#col-943)

- [**QVÆSTIO XVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/133-question-xv-on-which-mountain-was-the-altar-and-on-this-/#col-945) — Of what kind was the altar on Ebal? [*(col. 945)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/133-question-xv-on-which-mountain-was-the-altar-and-on-this-/#col-945)

- [**QVÆSTIO XVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/133-question-xv-on-which-mountain-was-the-altar-and-on-this-/#col-945) — What sacrifices were made on Ebal? [*(col. 945)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/133-question-xv-on-which-mountain-was-the-altar-and-on-this-/#col-945)

- [**QVÆSTIO XVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/135-question-xvii-what-sacrifices-were-made-on-ebal/#col-947) — Whether, besides the Altar's stones, some others [were] erected? [*(col. 947)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/135-question-xvii-what-sacrifices-were-made-on-ebal/#col-947)

- [**QVÆSTIO XIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/135-question-xvii-what-sacrifices-were-made-on-ebal/#col-947) — How many, how great, and of what kind [were] these stones? [*(col. 947)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/135-question-xvii-what-sacrifices-were-made-on-ebal/#col-947)

- [**QVÆSTIO XX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/135-question-xvii-what-sacrifices-were-made-on-ebal/#col-947) — What, then, [was] inscribed [on] these stones? [*(col. 947)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/135-question-xvii-what-sacrifices-were-made-on-ebal/#col-947)

- [**QVÆSTIO XXI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/138-question-xx-what-then-was-inscribed-on-these-stones/#col-949) — How was the inscription of Deuteronomy made upon these stones? [*(col. 949)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/138-question-xx-what-then-was-inscribed-on-these-stones/#col-949)

- [**QVÆSTIO XXII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/138-question-xx-what-then-was-inscribed-on-these-stones/#col-949) — How many, and of what kind, were the blessings [precations] and imprecations? [*(col. 949)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/138-question-xx-what-then-was-inscribed-on-these-stones/#col-949)

- [**QVÆSTIO XXIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/138-question-xx-what-then-was-inscribed-on-these-stones/#col-949) — In what manner did the priests conduct themselves in pronouncing these blessings and imprecations? [*(col. 949)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/138-question-xx-what-then-was-inscribed-on-these-stones/#col-949)

- [**QVÆSTIO XXIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-951) —

When did the Israelites come to these mountains for the sake of this ceremony? [*(col. 951)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-951) - [**QVÆSTIO XXV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-951) — How long was labor given to this ceremony? [*(col. 951)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-951) - [**QVÆSTIO XXVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-951) — Why was this whole ceremony undertaken? [*(col. 951)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-951) - [**QVÆSTIO XXVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-951) — What [is] the allegory of this ceremony? [*(col. 951)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-951)

CAPVT IX — The Third War: The Gibeonite [*(col. 955)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/145-question-xxvii-what-is-the-allegory-of-this-ceremony/#col-955)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/146-caput-ix-the-third-war-the-gibeonite-war-opening/#col-957) — What city [is] Gabaon, and where? [*(col. 957)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/146-caput-ix-the-third-war-the-gibeonite-war-opening/#col-957) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/147-question-i-what-city-is-gabaon-and-where/#col-959) — Which [were] the other cities of the Hevites, joined to Gabaon? [*(col. 959)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/147-question-i-what-city-is-gabaon-and-where/#col-959) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/147-question-i-what-city-is-gabaon-and-where/#col-959) — What [was] the cunning of the Gabaonites for turning away from themselves the war of the Israelites? [*(col. 959)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/147-question-i-what-city-is-gabaon-and-where/#col-959) - [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/149-question-iii-what-was-the-cunning-of-the-gabaonites-for-/#col-961) — What, how, and in what language, did the legates of the Gabaonites speak to the Israelites? [*(col. 961)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/149-question-iii-what-was-the-cunning-of-the-gabaonites-for-/#col-961) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/149-question-iii-what-was-the-cunning-of-the-gabaonites-for-/#col-961) — Whether the Gabaonites rightly employed the fraud of things and words? [*(col. 961)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/149-question-iii-what-was-the-cunning-of-the-gabaonites-for-/#col-961) - [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-965) — What [did] the Israelites [say and do] at the embassy of the Gabaonites? [*(col. 965)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-965) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-965) — Whether the Gabaonites embraced the true religion of the one God? [*(col. 965)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-965) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/153-question-vii-whether-the-gabaonites-embraced-the-true-re/#col-967) — Whether the Israelites could strike a covenant with the Gabaonites? [*(col. 967)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/153-question-vii-whether-the-gabaonites-embraced-the-true-re/#col-967) - [**QVÆSTIO IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/153-question-vii-whether-the-gabaonites-embraced-the-true-re/#col-967) —

Whether the Israelites struck the covenant with the Gabaonites rightly — [in] the manner [in which] they struck [it]? [*(col. 967)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/153-question-vii-whether-the-gabaonites-embraced-the-true-re/#col-967) - [**QVÆSTIO X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/155-question-ix-whether-the-israelites-struck-the-covenant-w/#col-969) — When and how did the Israelites find out the fraud of the Gabaonites? [*(col. 969)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/155-question-ix-whether-the-israelites-struck-the-covenant-w/#col-969) - [**QVÆSTIO XI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/155-question-ix-whether-the-israelites-struck-the-covenant-w/#col-969) — Whether the Israelites were bound by the oath given to the Gabaonites? [*(col. 969)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/155-question-ix-whether-the-israelites-struck-the-covenant-w/#col-969) - [**QVÆSTIO XII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/157-question-xi-whether-the-israelites-were-bound-by-the-oat/#col-971) — Since the Israelites were not bound by that oath, [did they] rightly keep it? [*(col. 971)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/157-question-xi-whether-the-israelites-were-bound-by-the-oat/#col-971) - [**QVÆSTIO XIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/157-question-xi-whether-the-israelites-were-bound-by-the-oat/#col-971) — In so great a readiness to believe the Gabaonites, could anything of virtue — either Joshua's or Israel's — be noted [marked]? [*(col. 971)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/157-question-xi-whether-the-israelites-were-bound-by-the-oat/#col-971) - [**QVÆSTIO XIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/159-question-xiii-in-so-great-a-readiness-to-believe-the-gab/#col-973) — Whether any penalty could be imposed on the Gabaonites for the fraud, and what? [*(col. 973)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/159-question-xiii-in-so-great-a-readiness-to-believe-the-gab/#col-973) - [**QVÆSTIO XV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/159-question-xiii-in-so-great-a-readiness-to-believe-the-gab/#col-973) — What penalty was imposed on the Gabaonites for [their] lies and deceptions? [*(col. 973)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/159-question-xiii-in-so-great-a-readiness-to-believe-the-gab/#col-973) - [**QVÆSTIO XVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/161-question-xv-what-penalty-was-imposed-on-the-gabaonites-f/#col-975) — Where was the domicile of the Gabaonites thereafter? [*(col. 975)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/161-question-xv-what-penalty-was-imposed-on-the-gabaonites-f/#col-975) - [**QVÆSTIO XVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/161-question-xv-what-penalty-was-imposed-on-the-gabaonites-f/#col-975) — Whether a wage was given to the Gabaonites [while] serving? [*(col. 975)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/161-question-xv-what-penalty-was-imposed-on-the-gabaonites-f/#col-975) - [**QVÆSTIO XVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-977) — Whether, by the festival of the Xylophoria [wood-carrying], the wood-servitude of the Gabaonites was taken away? [*(col. 977)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-977) - [**QVÆSTIO XIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-977) — Whether, by the probatic [sheep-] pool and the fountain of the temple, the water-servitude of the same Gabaonites was taken away? [*(col. 977)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-977) - [**QVÆSTIO XX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-977) —

Whether the Gabaonites are the Nethinim? [*(col. 977)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-977) - [**QVÆSTIO XXI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/166-question-xx-whether-the-gabaonites-are-the-nethinim/#col-979) — Whether many Gabaonites [were] slain by King Saul, and why? [*(col. 979)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/166-question-xx-whether-the-gabaonites-are-the-nethinim/#col-979) - [**QVÆSTIO XXII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/167-question-xxi-whether-many-gabaonites-were-slain-by-king-/#col-981) — From these Gabaonite [matters], what [is there] for the reforming of morals? [*(col. 981)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/167-question-xxi-whether-many-gabaonites-were-slain-by-king-/#col-981) - [**QVÆSTIO XXIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/168-question-xxii-from-these-gabaonite-matters-what-is-there/#col-983) — How charming an allegory [is] the heretical Gabaonite history! [*(col. 983)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/168-question-xxii-from-these-gabaonite-matters-what-is-there/#col-983) - [**QVÆSTIO XXIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/168-question-xxii-from-these-gabaonite-matters-what-is-there/#col-983) — The Catholic allegory of the same history. [*(col. 983)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/168-question-xxii-from-these-gabaonite-matters-what-is-there/#col-983)

CAPUT X [*(col. 985)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/170-question-xxiv-the-catholic-allegory-of-the-same-history/#col-985)

The Fourth War — namely the second Gabaonite [war], or the Adoni-zedekian - [**QUESTION I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/172-question-i-who-were-the-five-kings-that-besieged-gabaon/) — Who were the five Kings that besieged Gabaon? [*(col. 987)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/171-the-fourth-war-namely-the-second-gabaonite-war-or-the-ad/#col-987) - [**QUESTION II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/173-question-ii-how-and-from-what-is-jerusalem-named/) — How, and from what, is Jerusalem named? [*(col. 989)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/172-question-i-who-were-the-five-kings-that-besieged-gabaon/#col-989) - [**QUESTION III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/174-question-iii-which-city-is-hebron/) — Which [city] is Hebron? [*(col. 993)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/173-question-ii-how-and-from-what-is-jerusalem-named/#col-993) - [**QUESTION IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/175-question-iv-which-are-jarmuth-lachish-eglon/) — Which are Jarmuth, Lachish, Eglon? [*(col. 993)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/173-question-ii-how-and-from-what-is-jerusalem-named/#col-993) - [**QUESTION V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/176-question-v-why-the-king-of-jerusalem-summoned-to-himself/) — Why the King of Jerusalem summoned to himself four other Kings [*(col. 995)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/175-question-iv-which-are-jarmuth-lachish-eglon/#col-995) - [**QUESTION VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/177-question-vi-why-the-king-of-jerusalem-was-the-first-to-s/) — Why the King of Jerusalem [was] the first to summon those other four Kings to himself [*(col. 995)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/175-question-iv-which-are-jarmuth-lachish-eglon/#col-995) - [**QUESTION VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/178-question-vii-how-did-joshua-raise-the-siege-of-gabaon-an/) — How did Joshua raise the siege of Gabaon, and put the Kings to flight? [*(col. 995)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/175-question-iv-which-are-jarmuth-lachish-eglon/#col-995) - [**QUESTION VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/179-question-viii-how-did-the-lord-trouble-these-kings/) — How did the Lord *trouble* these Kings? [*(col. 997)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/178-question-vii-how-did-joshua-raise-the-siege-of-gabaon-an/#col-997) -

[**QUESTION IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/180-question-ix-whether-the-terror-cast-upon-the-enemies-was/) — Whether the terror cast upon the enemies was a "Panic" [terror] [*(col. 997)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/178-question-vii-how-did-joshua-raise-the-siege-of-gabaon-an/#col-997)

CAPUT X (on Joshua, chapter 10) [*(col. 999)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/180-question-ix-whether-the-terror-cast-upon-the-enemies-was/#col-999)

- [**QUESTION X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/182-question-x-by-what-route-did-the-terrified-enemies-flee/) — By what route did the terrified enemies flee? [*(col. 999)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/180-question-ix-whether-the-terror-cast-upon-the-enemies-was/#col-999) - [**QUESTION XI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/183-question-xi-what-how-many-and-of-what-kind-were-the-ston/) — What, how many, and of what kind were the stones the Lord hurled upon the fleeing? [*(col. 999)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/180-question-ix-whether-the-terror-cast-upon-the-enemies-was/#col-999) - [**QUESTION XII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/184-question-xii-whence-were-these-stones-sent-by-whom-were-/) — Whence were these stones sent, by whom were they made and cast, and were they obtained by Joshua's prayers? [*(col. 999)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/180-question-ix-whether-the-terror-cast-upon-the-enemies-was/#col-999) - [**QUESTION XIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/185-question-xiii-whether-in-this-battle-the-sun-and-moon-st/) — Whether in this battle the Sun and Moon stood still? [*(col. 1001)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/184-question-xii-whence-were-these-stones-sent-by-whom-were-/#col-1001) - [**QUESTION XIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/186-question-xiv-whether-the-sun-and-moon-can-stand-still-na/) — Whether the Sun and Moon can stand still *naturally*? [*(col. 1003)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/185-question-xiii-whether-in-this-battle-the-sun-and-moon-st/#col-1003) - [**QUESTION XV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/187-question-xv-whether-evil-angels-can-make-the-sun-and-moo/) — Whether evil Angels can make the Sun and Moon stand still? [*(col. 1005)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/186-question-xiv-whether-the-sun-and-moon-can-stand-still-na/#col-1005) - [**QUESTION XVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/188-question-xvi-whether-any-one-of-the-good-angels-could-st/) — Whether any one of the good Angels could stay these same heavenly bodies of the Sun and Moon? [*(col. 1007)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/187-question-xv-whether-evil-angels-can-make-the-sun-and-moo/#col-1007) - [**QUESTION XVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/189-question-xvii-what-were-the-efficient-causes-that-in-the/) — What were the efficient causes that, in the Gabaonite war, the Sun and Moon stood still? And what did the first [cause], namely Joshua, effect? [*(col. 1009)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/188-question-xvi-whether-any-one-of-the-good-angels-could-st/#col-1009) - [**QUESTION XVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/190-question-xviii-whether-joshua-rightly-asked-and-commande/) — Whether Joshua rightly asked and commanded that the Sun and Moon should deflect from the constant and perpetual law of nature? [*(col. 1009)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/188-question-xvi-whether-any-one-of-the-good-angels-could-st/#col-1009) - [**QUESTION XIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/191-question-xix-what-did-the-other-efficient-cause-namely-g/) — What did the other efficient cause, namely God, effect? [*(col. 1013)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/190-question-xviii-whe

ther-joshua-rightly-asked-and-commande/#col-1013) - [**QUESTION XX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/192-question-xx-what-did-the-third-efficient-cause-namely-th/) — What did the third efficient cause, namely the Angel, effect? [*(col. 1015)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/191-question-xix-what-did-the-other-efficient-cause-namely-g/#col-1015) - [**QUESTION XXI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/193-question-xxi-where-did-the-sun-and-moon-stand-still/) — Where did the Sun and Moon stand still? [*(col. 1017)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/192-question-xx-what-did-the-third-efficient-cause-namely-th/#col-1017) - [**QUESTION XXII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/194-question-xxii-in-what-month-day-and-hour-did-the-sun-and/) — In what month, day, [and] hour did the Sun and Moon stand still? [*(col. 1019)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/193-question-xxi-where-did-the-sun-and-moon-stand-still/#col-1019) - [**QUESTION XXIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/195-question-xxiii-how-long-did-the-sun-and-moon-stand-still/) — How long did the Sun and Moon stand still? [*(col. 1021)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/194-question-xxii-in-what-month-day-and-hour-did-the-sun-and/#col-1021) - [**QUESTION XXIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/196-question-xxiv-whether-so-long-a-day-had-never-been-befor/) — Whether so long a day had never been before? [*(col. 1023)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/195-question-xxiii-how-long-did-the-sun-and-moon-stand-still/#col-1023) - [**QUESTION XXV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/197-question-xxv-whether-so-long-a-day-has-never-been-afterw/) — Whether so long a day has [never] been afterward? [*(col. 1025)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/196-question-xxiv-whether-so-long-a-day-had-never-been-befor/#col-1025) - [**QUESTION XXVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/198-question-xxvi-when-the-sun-and-moon-stood-still-did-the-/) — When the Sun and Moon stood still, did the [other] stars and the other orbs of the heavens stand still [too]? [*(col. 1029)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/197-question-xxv-whether-so-long-a-day-has-never-been-afterw/#col-1029) - [**QUESTION XXVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/199-question-xxvii-from-the-rest-of-the-sun-and-moon-did-a-r/) — From the rest of the Sun and Moon, did a rest of all things follow in the sublunary world? [*(col. 1029)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/197-question-xxv-whether-so-long-a-day-has-never-been-afterw/#col-1029) - [**QUESTION XXVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/200-question-xxviii-how-could-joshua-and-the-whole-people-be/) — How could Joshua, and the whole people, bear the weight and heat of so long a day? [*(col. 1031)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/199-question-xxvii-from-the-rest-of-the-sun-and-moon-did-a-r/#col-1031) - [**QUESTION XXIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/201-question-xxix-whether-it-is-a-greater-miracle-for-the-su/) — Whether it is a greater miracle for the Sun to stand still, or to go back? [*(col. 1031)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/199-question-xxvii-from-the-rest-of-the-sun-and-moon-did-a-r/#col-1031) - [**QUESTION XXX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/) — Whether on account of this miracle Joshua [is] greater than Moses? [*(col. 1033)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/201-question-xxix-whether-it-is-a-greater-miracle-for-the-su/#col-1033) - [**QUESTION XXXI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/203-question-xxxi-whether-the-ancient-writers-remembered-so-/) — Whether the ancient writers remembered so great a miracle? [*(col. 1035)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1035) - [**QUESTION**

XXXII](/works/serarius-joshua-2/204-question-xxxii-who-is-the-book-of-the-just-cited-in-the-/) — Who [is] the "Book of the Just" cited in the text? [*(col. 1035)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1035) - [**QUESTION XXXIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/205-question-xxxiii-whether-the-things-which-our-text-adduce/) — Whether the [things] which our text adduces from the cited Book of the Just are poetic, and verses? [*(col. 1035)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1035) - [**QUESTION XXXIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/206-question-xxxiv-why-is-the-same-book-of-the-just-cited-by/) — Why is the same Book of the Just cited by the text? [*(col. 1039)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/205-question-xxxiii-whether-the-things-which-our-text-adduce/#col-1039) - [**QUESTION XXXV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/207-question-xxxv-does-the-book-of-the-just-exist-or-how-did/) — Does the Book of the Just exist? Or, how did it perish? [*(col. 1039)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/205-question-xxxiii-whether-the-things-which-our-text-adduce/#col-1039) - [**QUESTION XXXVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/208-question-xxxvi-whither-how-and-when-did-the-victorious-i/) — Whither, how, and when did the victorious Israelites return from the slaughter of the enemy? [*(col. 1039)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/205-question-xxxiii-whether-the-things-which-our-text-adduce/#col-1039) - [**QUESTION XXXVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/209-question-xxxvii-what-did-the-conquered-enemy-and-the-ene/) — What did the conquered enemy, and the enemy Kings, do [and] suffer? [*(col. 1041)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/208-question-xxxvi-whither-how-and-when-did-the-victorious-i/#col-1041) - [**QUESTION XXXVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/) — For this victory, did Joshua sing any song? [*(col. 1042)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/209-question-xxxvii-what-did-the-conquered-enemy-and-the-ene/#col-1042) - [**QUESTION XXXIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/) — On certain moral [lessons]? [*(col. 1043)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1043) - [**QUESTION XL**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/212-question-xl-on-the-allegory-of-this-war/) — On the allegory of this war [*(col. 1047)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/#col-1047) *THE FIFTH WAR, THE SOUTHERN [WAR]; and the second part of the tenth chapter.*

CAPUT XI — The Sixth War: The Jabinite [War], or the Northern [*(col. 1055)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/212-question-xl-on-the-allegory-of-this-war/#col-1055)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/213-caput-xi-the-sixth-war-the-jabinite-war-or-the-northern-/#col-1057) — What [is] Asor, and its King? [*(col. 1057)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/213-caput-xi-the-sixth-war-the-jabinite-war-or-the-northern-/#col-1057) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/213-caput-xi-the-sixth-war-the-jabinite-war-or-the-northern-/#col-1057) — Which Kings and peoples did King Jabin stir up against the Israelites? [*(col. 1057)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/213-caput-xi-the-sixth-war-the-jabinite-war-or-the-northern-/#col-1057) - [**QVÆSTIO**

III](/works/serarius-joshua-2/215-question-ii-which-kings-and-peoples-did-king-jabin-stir-/#col-1059) — Of how great a number were these enemies against Israel? [*(col. 1059)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/215-question-ii-which-kings-and-peoples-did-king-jabin-stir-/#col-1059) - [**QVÆSTIO**
IV](/works/serarius-joshua-2/216-question-iii-of-how-great-a-number-were-these-enemies-ag/#col-1061) — Into what place did these enemies assemble? [*(col. 1061)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/216-question-iii-of-how-great-a-number-were-these-enemies-ag/#col-1061) - [**QVÆSTIO**
V](/works/serarius-joshua-2/217-question-iv-into-what-place-did-these-enemies-assemble/#col-1063) — How, when, and why did the Lord confirm Joshua? (v. 6) [*(col. 1063)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/217-question-iv-into-what-place-did-these-enemies-assemble/#col-1063) - [**QVÆSTIO**
VI](/works/serarius-joshua-2/217-question-iv-into-what-place-did-these-enemies-assemble/#col-1063) — How, and how far, did Joshua put to flight and cut down this innumerable multitude of enemies? [*(col. 1063)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/217-question-iv-into-what-place-did-these-enemies-assemble/#col-1063) - [**QVÆSTIO**
VII](/works/serarius-joshua-2/219-question-vi-how-and-how-far-did-joshua-put-to-flight-and/#col-1065) — What did Joshua do after so great a victory? [*(col. 1065)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/219-question-vi-how-and-how-far-did-joshua-put-to-flight-and/#col-1065) - [**QVÆSTIO**
VIII](/works/serarius-joshua-2/220-question-vii-what-did-joshua-do-after-so-great-a-victory/#col-1067) — In prosecuting his victory, what cities and kingdoms did Joshua occupy, and either lay waste or preserve? [*(col. 1067)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/220-question-vii-what-did-joshua-do-after-so-great-a-victory/#col-1067) - [**QVÆSTIO**
IX](/works/serarius-joshua-2/221-question-viii-in-prosecuting-his-victory-what-cities-and/#col-1069) — Whether Joshua left no remnants of the Canaanites? [*(col. 1069)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/221-question-viii-in-prosecuting-his-victory-what-cities-and/#col-1069) - [**QVÆSTIO**
X](/works/serarius-joshua-2/221-question-viii-in-prosecuting-his-victory-what-cities-and/#col-1069) — Why did Joshua do all these things thus? [*(col. 1069)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/221-question-viii-in-prosecuting-his-victory-what-cities-and/#col-1069) - [**QVÆSTIO**
XI](/works/serarius-joshua-2/223-question-x-why-did-joshua-do-all-these-things-thus/#col-1073) — Why did God will all these things to be done thus by Joshua? [*(col. 1073)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/223-question-x-why-did-joshua-do-all-these-things-thus/#col-1073) - [**QVÆSTIO**
XII](/works/serarius-joshua-2/224-question-xi-why-did-god-will-all-these-things-to-be-done/#col-1075) — What is the hardening of the heart? [*(col. 1075)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/224-question-xi-why-did-god-will-all-these-things-to-be-done/#col-1075) - [**QVÆSTIO**
XIII](/works/serarius-joshua-2/224-question-xi-why-did-god-will-all-these-things-to-be-done/#col-1075) — What are the efficient causes of the hardening? [*(col. 1075)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/224-question-xi-why-did-god-will-all-these-things-to-be-done/#col-1075) - [**QVÆSTIO**
XIV](/works/serarius-joshua-2/226-question-xiii-what-are-the-efficient-causes-of-the-harde/#col-1077) — How is God sometimes said to harden someone, or to be the cause of someone's hardening? [*(col. 1077)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/226-question-xiii-what-are-the-efficient-causes-of-the-harde/#col-1077) -

[**QVÆSTIO XV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/227-question-xiv-how-is-god-sometimes-said-to-harden-someone/#col-1079) — What is the effect of this hardening? [*(col. 1079)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/227-question-xiv-how-is-god-sometimes-said-to-harden-someone/#col-1079) - [**QVÆSTIO XVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/227-question-xiv-how-is-god-sometimes-said-to-harden-someone/#col-1079) — How long a time did Joshua take to accomplish these wars, and destroy the Enakim? [*(col. 1079)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/227-question-xiv-how-is-god-sometimes-said-to-harden-someone/#col-1079) - [**QVÆSTIO XVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/227-question-xiv-how-is-god-sometimes-said-to-harden-someone/#col-1079) — What [is] the mystical explanation of this chapter? [*(col. 1079)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/227-question-xiv-how-is-god-sometimes-said-to-harden-someone/#col-1079)

CAPUT XII — [*(col. 1081)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/230-question-xvii-what-is-the-mystical-explanation-of-this-c/#col-1081)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/230-question-xvii-what-is-the-mystical-explanation-of-this-c/#col-1081) — How many, and which, Kings were subdued and destroyed by Joshua? [*(col. 1081)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/230-question-xvii-what-is-the-mystical-explanation-of-this-c/#col-1081) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/232-question-i-how-many-and-which-kings-were-subdued-and-des/#col-1083) — Whence [came there] so many Kings? [*(col. 1083)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/232-question-i-how-many-and-which-kings-were-subdued-and-des/#col-1083) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/232-question-i-how-many-and-which-kings-were-subdued-and-des/#col-1083) — In how many years' space did Joshua reduce all these Canaanite kings, and their kingdoms, under the dominion of the Israelites? [*(col. 1083)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/232-question-i-how-many-and-which-kings-were-subdued-and-des/#col-1083) - [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/234-question-iii-in-how-many-years-space-did-joshua-reduce-a/#col-1085) — Whether Joshua, at the beginning of these wars, invited the Canaanites to peace and surrender? [*(col. 1085)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/234-question-iii-in-how-many-years-space-did-joshua-reduce-a/#col-1085) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/234-question-iii-in-how-many-years-space-did-joshua-reduce-a/#col-1085) — Whether the Canaanites, refusing peace and surrender, blocked the wells and springs, lest the use of them be for the Israelites, and did other things of that kind? [*(col. 1085)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/234-question-iii-in-how-many-years-space-did-joshua-reduce-a/#col-1085) - [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/234-question-iii-in-how-many-years-space-did-joshua-reduce-a/#col-1085) — Whether some Canaanites hid themselves in caves for fear of Joshua, and others fled into other regions — especially Libya and Germany? [*(col. 1085)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/234-question-iii-in-how-many-years-space-did-joshua-reduce-a/#col-1085)

There follow the ΤΑ ΜΕΤΑΠΟΛΕΜΙΚΑ [Ta Metapolemika] — that is, those [things] which happened after the Joshuan wars [*(col. 1089)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/237-question-vi-whether-some-canaanites-hid-themselves-in-ca/#col-1089)

BOOK OF JOSHUA, SECOND PART: PART THREE — Of those [things] which [come] after the wars

CAPUT XIII — [*(col. 1089)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/237-question-vi-whether-some-canaanites-hid-themselves-in-ca/#col-1089)

FIRST — The division of the sacred land, or of the holy promised land - [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/238-caput-xiii-the-land-yet-to-be-divided-the-inheritance-of/#col-1091) — What [is] this promised land to be divided? [*(col. 1091)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/238-caput-xiii-the-land-yet-to-be-divided-the-inheritance-of/#col-1091) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/238-caput-xiii-the-land-yet-to-be-divided-the-inheritance-of/#col-1091) — Of what sort [is] this land to be divided? [*(col. 1091)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/238-caput-xiii-the-land-yet-to-be-divided-the-inheritance-of/#col-1091) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/240-question-iii-of-what-sort-is-this-land-to-be-divided-so-/#col-1095) — Compared to other regions, of what sort [is] the same land? [*(col. 1095)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/240-question-iii-of-what-sort-is-this-land-to-be-divided-so-/#col-1095) - [**QVÆSTIO IIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/241-question-iii-compared-to-other-regions-of-what-sort-is-t/#col-1101) — How great [is] that same land? [*(col. 1101)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/241-question-iii-compared-to-other-regions-of-what-sort-is-t/#col-1101) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/242-question-iiii-how-great-is-that-same-land/#col-1105) — Into what parts was the land divided? [*(col. 1105)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/242-question-iiii-how-great-is-that-same-land/#col-1105) - [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/243-question-v-into-what-parts-was-the-land-divided/#col-1107) — Why was the Levitical tribe excluded from the inheritance, and from every portion of the land? [*(col. 1107)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/243-question-v-into-what-parts-was-the-land-divided/#col-1107) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/244-question-vi-why-was-the-levitical-tribe-excluded-from-th/#col-1109) — To what time is the interpretation to be assigned, [of the right] taken away from Levi himself? *[the print: "Quando capiendae interpretationis ius ipsi Levi ademptum?" — i.e. to what point is Levi's loss of his right [to a land-portion] to be referred.]* [(col. 1109)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/244-question-vi-why-was-the-levitical-tribe-excluded-from-th/#col-1109)* - *[QVÆSTIO VIII](/works/serarius-joshua-2/245-question-vii-to-what-time-is-the-interpretation-to-be-as/#col-1111)* — *Did Ephraim and Manasseh succeed into the place of the Levites?* [(col. 1111)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/245-question-vii-to-what-time-is-the-interpretation-to-be-as/#col-1111)* - *[QVÆSTIO IX](/works/serarius-joshua-2/245-question-vii-to-what-time-is-the-interpretation-to-be-as/#col-1111)* — *Whether the land ought to have been divided into twelve portions, and why?* [(col. 1111)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/245-question-vii-to-what-time-is-the-interpretation-to-be-as/#col-1111)* - *[QVÆSTIO X](/works/serarius-joshua-2/247-question-ix-whether-the-land-ought-to-have-been-divided-/#col-1113)* — *Who [were] the dividers of the promised land?* [(col. 1113)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/247-question-ix-whether-the-land-ought-to-have-been-divided-/#col-1113)* - *[QVÆSTIO XI](/works/serarius-joshua-2/248-question-x-who-were-the-dividers-of-the-promised-land/#col-1115)* — *Where was the division of the land made?* [(col. 1115)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/248-question-x-who-were-the-dividers-of-the-promised-land/#col-1115)* - *[QVÆSTIO XII](/works/serarius-joshua-2/249-question-xi-where-was-the-division-of-the-land-made/#col-1117)* — *In what manner was the division made?* [(col. 1117)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/249-question-xi-where-was-the-division-of-the-land-made/#col-1117)* -

*[**QVÆSTIO XIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/250-question-xii-in-what-manner-was-the-division-made/#col-1119) — At what time was the division made? [*(col. 1119)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/250-question-xii-in-what-manner-was-the-division-made/#col-1119)*

- *[**QVÆSTIO XIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/251-question-xiii-at-what-time-was-the-division-made/#col-1121) — Were the Sabbatical and Jubilee years begun from that division of the land? [*(col. 1121)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/251-question-xiii-at-what-time-was-the-division-made/#col-1121)*

- *[**QVÆSTIO XV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/252-question-xiv-were-the-sabbatical-and-jubilee-years-begun/#col-1127) — How did the Sabbatical and Jubilee years cease to be counted by the Jews? [*(col. 1127)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/252-question-xiv-were-the-sabbatical-and-jubilee-years-begun/#col-1127)*

- *[**QVÆSTIO XVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/253-question-xv-how-did-the-sabbatical-and-jubilee-years-cea/#col-1129) — From the division of the land to CHRIST the Lord, how many Sabbaticals and Jubilees were there in sum? [*(col. 1129)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/253-question-xv-how-did-the-sabbatical-and-jubilee-years-cea/#col-1129)*

- *[**QVÆSTIO XVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/254-question-xvi-from-the-division-of-the-land-to-christ-the/#col-1131) — For what causes did the Lord will that land to be so divided? [*(col. 1131)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/254-question-xvi-from-the-division-of-the-land-to-christ-the/#col-1131)

CAPUT XIV — Concerning the division of the land, in detail [*(col. 1035)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1035)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1035) — Why did the Judaic and Josephine tribes cast lots first of all, and receive [their] portion [first]? [*(col. 1035)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1035)

- [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1035) — When did Caleb approach Joshua, [as] about to seek the promised territory? [*(col. 1035)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1035)

- [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/258-question-ii-when-did-caleb-approach-joshua-as-about-to-s/#col-1137) — Who, and of what sort, [was] the man Caleb? [*(col. 1137)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/258-question-ii-when-did-caleb-approach-joshua-as-about-to-s/#col-1137)

- [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/259-question-iii-who-and-of-what-sort-was-the-man-caleb/#col-1141) — What [is] the mountain which Caleb seeks from Joshua? [*(col. 1141)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/259-question-iii-who-and-of-what-sort-was-the-man-caleb/#col-1141)

- [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/260-question-iv-what-is-the-mountain-which-caleb-seeks-from-/#col-1143) — What city [is] Hebron? and what [is] in it? [*(col. 1143)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/260-question-iv-what-is-the-mountain-which-caleb-seeks-from-/#col-1143)

- [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/261-question-v-what-city-is-hebron-and-what-is-in-it/#col-1149) — Whether

Caleb obtained Hebron, which he was seeking from Joshua? [*(col. 1149)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/261-question-v-what-city-is-hebron-and-what-is-in-it/#col-1149) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/261-question-v-what-city-is-hebron-and-what-is-in-it/#col-1149) — Whether Hebron [was] stormed by Joshua, or by Caleb? And how? [*(col. 1149)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/261-question-v-what-city-is-hebron-and-what-is-in-it/#col-1149) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/263-question-vii-whether-hebron-was-stormed-by-joshua-or-by-/#col-1151) — How did Caleb take Hebron? [*(col. 1151)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/263-question-vii-whether-hebron-was-stormed-by-joshua-or-by-/#col-1151)

CAPUT XV — The portion and dominion of the tribe of Juda [*(col. 1153)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/264-question-viii-how-did-caleb-take-hebron/#col-1153)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/265-caput-xv-the-portion-and-dominion-of-the-tribe-of-juda-i/#col-1155) — Whether the investigation of those cities and places be useful. [*(col. 1155)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/265-caput-xv-the-portion-and-dominion-of-the-tribe-of-juda-i/#col-1155) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/266-question-i-whether-the-investigation-of-those-cities-and/#col-1157) — What [is] to be noted in the borders of Judaea? [*(col. 1157)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/266-question-i-whether-the-investigation-of-those-cities-and/#col-1157) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/267-question-ii-what-is-to-be-noted-in-the-borders-of-judaea/#col-1159) — How many Southern cities of Juda were there? [*(col. 1159)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/267-question-ii-what-is-to-be-noted-in-the-borders-of-judaea/#col-1159) - [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/267-question-ii-what-is-to-be-noted-in-the-borders-of-judaea/#col-1159) — How many cities [were there] in the plains of Judaea? [*(col. 1159)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/267-question-ii-what-is-to-be-noted-in-the-borders-of-judaea/#col-1159) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/269-question-iv-how-many-cities-were-there-in-the-plains-of-/#col-1161) — In the mountains, the deserts, and in sum in the whole tribe of Judaea, how many cities? [*(col. 1161)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/269-question-iv-how-many-cities-were-there-in-the-plains-of-/#col-1161) - [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/269-question-iv-how-many-cities-were-there-in-the-plains-of-/#col-1161) — Did any cities later depart from, or accede to, this tribe? [*(col. 1161)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/269-question-iv-how-many-cities-were-there-in-the-plains-of-/#col-1161) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/271-question-vi-did-any-cities-later-depart-from-or-accede-t/#col-1163) — To what tribe did Jerusalem belong, and why could the Jebusites not be expelled from it? [*(col. 1163)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/271-question-vi-did-any-cities-later-depart-from-or-accede-t/#col-1163) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/271-question-vi-did-any-cities-later-depart-from-or-accede-t/#col-1163) — Why are the single or several places of the tribe of Juda not handled [in detail] here? [*(col. 1163)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/271-question-vi-did-any-cities-later-depart-from-or-accede-t/#col-1163)

CAPUT XVI — Concerning the Portions of the two Josephine tribes, and specifically of the Ephraimite [portion] thereof [*(col. 1163)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/271-question-vi-did-any-cities-later-depart-from-or-accede-t/#col-1163)

CAPUT XVII — Concerning the Portion of the tribe of Manasse [*(col. 1167)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/274-caput-xvi-concerning-the-portions-of-the-two-josephine-t/#col-1167)

CAPUT XVIII — Concerning the second division of the land among the seven remaining tribes; and specifically of the Benjaminite portion [*(col. 1171)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/275-caput-xvii-concerning-the-portion-of-the-tribe-of-manass/#col-1171)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/276-caput-xviii-concerning-the-second-division-of-the-land-a/#col-1173) — What, and where, [is] Shiloh? [*(col. 1173)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/276-caput-xviii-concerning-the-second-division-of-the-land-a/#col-1173)
- [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/276-caput-xviii-concerning-the-second-division-of-the-land-a/#col-1173) — What assembly [was] held by Joshua at Shiloh, and what [was] decreed in it? [*(col. 1173)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/276-caput-xviii-concerning-the-second-division-of-the-land-a/#col-1173)
- [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/278-question-ii-what-assembly-was-held-by-joshua-at-shiloh-a/#col-1175) — What [is] "the tabernacle of testimony"? [*(col. 1175)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/278-question-ii-what-assembly-was-held-by-joshua-at-shiloh-a/#col-1175)
- [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/278-question-ii-what-assembly-was-held-by-joshua-at-shiloh-a/#col-1175) — Whether at Shiloh, first of all in the land of Canaan, Moses's tabernacle was fixed? [*(col. 1175)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/278-question-ii-what-assembly-was-held-by-joshua-at-shiloh-a/#col-1175)
- [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/278-question-ii-what-assembly-was-held-by-joshua-at-shiloh-a/#col-1175) — Whether at Shiloh the tabernacle stood under the open sky, or in some house? [*(col. 1175)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/278-question-ii-what-assembly-was-held-by-joshua-at-shiloh-a/#col-1175)
- [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/281-question-v-whether-at-shiloh-the-tabernacle-stood-under-/#col-1177) — Why [was] the tabernacle taken away from Gilgal, and transferred to Shiloh? [*(col. 1177)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/281-question-v-whether-at-shiloh-the-tabernacle-stood-under-/#col-1177)
- [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/282-question-vi-why-was-the-tabernacle-taken-away-from-gilga/#col-1179) — At what time [was] the tabernacle transferred to Shiloh? [*(col. 1179)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/282-question-vi-why-was-the-tabernacle-taken-away-from-gilga/#col-1179)
- [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/282-question-vi-why-was-the-tabernacle-taken-away-from-gilga/#col-1179) — How long did the tabernacle remain at Shiloh? [*(col. 1179)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/282-question-vi-why-was-the-tabernacle-taken-away-from-gilga/#col-1179)
- [**QVÆSTIO IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/282-question-vi-why-was-the-tabernacle-taken-away-from-gilga/#col-1179) —

Why did the tabernacle afterward emigrate [depart] from Shiloh? [*(col. 1179)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/282-question-vi-why-was-the-tabernacle-taken-away-from-gilga/#col-1179) - [**QVÆSTIO X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/285-question-ix-why-did-the-tabernacle-afterward-emigrate-de/#col-1181) — Whether, together with the tabernacle, the camp of the Israelites [was] transferred to Shiloh from Gilgal? [*(col. 1181)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/285-question-ix-why-did-the-tabernacle-afterward-emigrate-de/#col-1181) - [**QVÆSTIO XI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/285-question-ix-why-did-the-tabernacle-afterward-emigrate-de/#col-1181) — Whether, the tabernacle being transferred to Shiloh and the camp being fixed in that same place, the observance of the Mosaic ceremonies and of the whole law began? [*(col. 1181)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/285-question-ix-why-did-the-tabernacle-afterward-emigrate-de/#col-1181) - [**QVÆSTIO XII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/285-question-ix-why-did-the-tabernacle-afterward-emigrate-de/#col-1181) — Why [was] the casting-of-lots of the land, begun at Gilgal, interrupted? [*(col. 1181)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/285-question-ix-why-did-the-tabernacle-afterward-emigrate-de/#col-1181) - [**QVÆSTIO XIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/288-question-xii-why-was-the-casting-of-lots-of-the-land-beg/#col-1183) — How [was] the second division of the land undertaken and completed? [*(col. 1183)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/288-question-xii-why-was-the-casting-of-lots-of-the-land-beg/#col-1183) - [**QVÆSTIO XIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/289-question-xiii-how-was-the-second-division-of-the-land-un/#col-1185) — What [are] the limits [borders] and cities of the Benjaminite tribe? [*(col. 1185)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/289-question-xiii-how-was-the-second-division-of-the-land-un/#col-1185)

CAPUT XIX — Concerning the portions of the remaining six tribes, and of Joshua himself [*(col. 1187)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/290-question-xiv-what-are-the-limits-borders-and-cities-of-t/#col-1187)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/291-caput-xix-concerning-the-portions-of-the-remaining-six-t/#col-1189) — What [are] the limits [borders] and cities of the Simeonic tribe? [*(col. 1189)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/291-caput-xix-concerning-the-portions-of-the-remaining-six-t/#col-1189) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/291-caput-xix-concerning-the-portions-of-the-remaining-six-t/#col-1189) — By what right or manner [was] the Simeonic portion placed within the Judaean tribe? [*(col. 1189)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/291-caput-xix-concerning-the-portions-of-the-remaining-six-t/#col-1189) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/293-question-ii-by-what-right-or-manner-was-the-simeonic-por/#col-1191) — Why [was] the Simeonic [portion] placed within the bounds of the Judaic [tribe] rather than of any other tribe whatsoever? [*(col. 1191)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/293-question-ii-by-what-right-or-manner-was-the-simeonic-por/#col-1191) - [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/293-question-ii-by-what-right-or-manner-was-the-simeonic-por/#col-1191) — Whether by an error of the lot, or in what other manner, [was] the Judaic tribe's portion greater than would suit [it]? [*(col. 1191)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/293-question-ii-by-what-right-or-manner-was-the-simeonic-por/#col-1191) - [**QVÆSTIO**

V](/works/serarius-joshua-2/295-question-iv-whether-by-an-error-of-the-lot-or-in-what-ot/#col-1193) — Whether the Jews [Judahites] received the Simeonites into their lot unwillingly and grievingly? [*(col. 1193)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/295-question-iv-whether-by-an-error-of-the-lot-or-in-what-ot/#col-1193) - [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/296-question-v-whether-the-jews-judahites-received-the-simeo/#col-1195) — Of what limits [borders] and cities does the tribe of Zabulon consist? [*(col. 1195)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/296-question-v-whether-the-jews-judahites-received-the-simeo/#col-1195) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/297-question-vi-of-what-limits-borders-and-cities-does-the-t/#col-1197) — What limits [borders] and cities the Issacharite tribe had? [*(col. 1197)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/297-question-vi-of-what-limits-borders-and-cities-does-the-t/#col-1197) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/297-question-vi-of-what-limits-borders-and-cities-does-the-t/#col-1197) — For the Aserite tribe, what borders? what cities? [*(col. 1197)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/297-question-vi-of-what-limits-borders-and-cities-does-the-t/#col-1197) - [**QVÆSTIO IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/299-question-viii-for-the-aserite-tribe-what-borders-what-ci/#col-1199) — For the Nephtalite tribe, what borders, and what cities, were decreed? [*(col. 1199)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/299-question-viii-for-the-aserite-tribe-what-borders-what-ci/#col-1199) - [**QVÆSTIO X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/300-question-ix-for-the-nephtalite-tribe-what-borders-and-wh/#col-1201) — By what limits [was] the Danite portion contained? what cities did [it] contain? [*(col. 1201)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/300-question-ix-for-the-nephtalite-tribe-what-borders-and-wh/#col-1201) - [**QVÆSTIO XI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/300-question-ix-for-the-nephtalite-tribe-what-borders-and-wh/#col-1201) — Which [inheritance], and where, did the Commander Joshua receive? [*(col. 1201)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/300-question-ix-for-the-nephtalite-tribe-what-borders-and-wh/#col-1201) - [**QVÆSTIO XII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/302-question-xi-which-inheritance-and-where-did-the-commande/#col-1203) — When and how did Joshua receive that inheritance? [*(col. 1203)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/302-question-xi-which-inheritance-and-where-did-the-commande/#col-1203) - [**QVÆSTIO XIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/302-question-xi-which-inheritance-and-where-did-the-commande/#col-1203) — What did the leader Joshua display in the love, the petition [requesting], the building, and the inhabiting of this his inheritance? [*(col. 1203)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/302-question-xi-which-inheritance-and-where-did-the-commande/#col-1203)

CAPUT XX [*(col. 1207)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/304-question-xiii-what-did-the-leader-joshua-display-in-the-/#col-1207)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/306-question-i-what-are-the-cities-of-refuge/) — What [are] the cities of refuge? [*(col. 1207)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/304-question-xiii-what-did-the-leader-joshua-display-in-the-/#col-1207) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/307-question-ii-whom-among-the-israelites-did-the-cities-of-/) — Whom, among the Israelites, did the cities of refuge protect, and why? [*(col. 1207)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/304-question-xiii-what-did-the-leader-joshua-display-in-the-/#col-1207) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/308-question-iii-how-and-against-whom-did-the-asylum-cities-/) — How, and against whom, did the asylum-cities protect a refugee? [*(col. 1209)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/307-question-ii-whom-among-the-israelites-did-the-cities-of-/#col-1209) -

[**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/309-question-iv-how-long-did-the-same-cities-of-refuge-prote/) — How long did the same cities of refuge protect a refugee? [*(col. 1211)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/308-question-iii-how-and-against-whom-did-the-asylum-cities-/#col-1211) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/310-question-v-why-did-the-death-of-the-high-priest-free-the/) — Why did the death of the high priest free the exiles from the cities of refuge, and from [their] exiles [banishments]? [*(col. 1211)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/308-question-iii-how-and-against-whom-did-the-asylum-cities-/#col-1211) - [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/311-question-vi-how-many-cities-of-refuge-and-of-what-kind/) — How many cities of refuge, and of what kind? [*(col. 1215)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/310-question-v-why-did-the-death-of-the-high-priest-free-the/#col-1215) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/312-question-vii-whether-the-city-of-the-sanctuary-or-the-sa/) — Whether the City of the Sanctuary, or the Sanctuary itself, was an Asylum? [*(col. 1217)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/311-question-vi-how-many-cities-of-refuge-and-of-what-kind/#col-1217) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/313-question-viii-whether-among-christians-there-are-also-an/) — Whether among Christians [there] are also any asylums? and which [are] they? [*(col. 1219)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/312-question-vii-whether-the-city-of-the-sanctuary-or-the-sa/#col-1219) - [**QVÆSTIO IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/314-question-ix-what-is-the-difference-between-the-asylums-o/) — What [is] the difference between the asylums of the Old Testament and of the New? [*(col. 1219)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/312-question-vii-whether-the-city-of-the-sanctuary-or-the-sa/#col-1219) - [**QVÆSTIO X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/315-question-x-whether-among-the-israelites-and-among-christ/) — Whether among the Israelites, and [among] Christians, asylums of this kind [were] rightly instituted? [*(col. 1221)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/314-question-ix-what-is-the-difference-between-the-asylums-o/#col-1221) - [**QVÆSTIO XI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/316-question-xi-whether-against-the-asylums-of-the-christian/) — Whether, against the Asylums of the Christians, Masius spoke prudently enough in this place? [*(col. 1223)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/315-question-x-whether-among-the-israelites-and-among-christ/#col-1223) - [**QVÆSTIO XII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/317-question-xii-what-is-the-mystical-explanation-of-the-cit/) — What [is] the mystical explanation of the cities of refuge? [*(col. 1225)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/316-question-xi-whether-against-the-asylums-of-the-christian/#col-1225)

CAPUT XXI [*(col. 1227)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/317-question-xii-what-is-the-mystical-explanation-of-the-cit/#col-1227)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/319-question-i-why-were-cities-given-to-the-levites/) — Why [were] cities given to the Levites? [*(col. 1229)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/318-caput-xxi-opening/#col-1229) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/320-question-ii-how-were-cities-given-to-the-levites/) — How [were] cities given to the Levites? [*(col. 1229)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/318-caput-xxi-opening/#col-1229) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/321-question-iii-how-many-cities-in-all-were-given-to-all-th/) — How many cities in all [were] given to all the Levites? [*(col. 1231)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/320-question-ii-how-were-cities-given-to-the-levites/#col-1231) - [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/322-question-iv-how-many-and-which-cities-were-given-to-the-/) — How many, and which, cities [were] given to the chief families of the Levites? [*(col. 1233)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/321-question-iii-how-many-cities-in-all-were-given-to-all-th/#col-1233) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/323-question-v-whether-the-levites-dwelt-in-other-cities-too/) — Whether the Levites dwelt in other cities [too]? [*(col. 1235)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/322-question-iv-how-many-and-which-cities-were-given-to-the-/#col-1235) - [**QVÆSTIO**

VI](/works/serarius-joshua-2/324-question-vi-how-large-and-of-what-kind-were-those-cities/) — How large, and of what kind, [were] those cities of the Levites? [*(col. 1237)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/323-question-v-whether-the-levites-dwelt-in-other-cities-too/#col-1237) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/325-question-vii-what-and-for-what-were-the-spaces-around-th/) — What, and for what, [were] the spaces around those cities given to the Levites? [*(col. 1239)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/324-question-vi-how-large-and-of-what-kind-were-those-cities/#col-1239) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/326-question-viii-how-great-large-were-the-suburbs-of-the-le/) — How great [large were] the suburbs of the Levitic cities? [*(col. 1239)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/324-question-vi-how-large-and-of-what-kind-were-those-cities/#col-1239) - [**QVÆSTIO IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/327-question-ix-whether-in-the-cities-given-to-the-levites-t/) — Whether, in the cities given to the Levites, [there] was any right left — after the giving — to the tribes, or to the tribesmen who had given them? [*(col. 1243)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/326-question-viii-how-great-large-were-the-suburbs-of-the-le/#col-1243) - [**QVÆSTIO X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/328-question-x-whether-in-the-levitic-cities-besides-the-lev/) — Whether in the Levitic cities, besides the Levites, no one dwelt? [*(col. 1245)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/327-question-ix-whether-in-the-cities-given-to-the-levites-t/#col-1245)

CAPUT XXII [*(col. 1249)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/328-question-x-whether-in-the-levitic-cities-besides-the-lev/#col-1249)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/) — What, and how, did Joshua speak to the Transjordanian tribes [as they were] about to depart? [*(col. 1251)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/329-caput-xxii-opening/#col-1251) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/331-question-ii-how-did-they-depart-and-how-as-they-departed/) — How did [they] depart, and [how, as they] departed, did the Transjordanian tribes raise up an altar on the way? [*(col. 1253)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1253) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/332-question-iii-did-the-transjordanians-act-rightly-in-erec/) — Did the Transjordanians act rightly in erecting that altar? [*(col. 1255)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/331-question-ii-how-did-they-depart-and-how-as-they-departed/#col-1255)

CAPUT XXIII [*(col. 1263)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/332-question-iii-did-the-transjordanians-act-rightly-in-erec/#col-1263)

CAPUT XXIV [*(col. 1267)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/333-caput-xxiii-opening/#col-1267)

- [**QVÆSTIO I**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/335-question-i-where-was-it-that-joshua-as-commander-held-th/) — Where [was it] that Joshua, [as] Commander, held this last gathering of the people, and [his] last words to it? [*(col. 1269)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/334-caput-xxiv-opening/#col-1269) - [**QVÆSTIO II**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/336-question-ii-whether-the-ancestors-of-the-israelites-whom/) — Whether the ancestors of the Israelites, whom Joshua led into the land of promise, were idolaters in Mesopotamia and Egypt? [*(col. 1271)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/335-question-i-where-was-it-that-joshua-as-commander-held-th/#col-1271) - [**QVÆSTIO III**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/337-question-iii-whether-also-in-joshua-s-own-time-there-wer/) — Whether also, in Joshua's own time, [there] were still any Israelites [who were] idolaters? [*(col. 1271)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/335-question-i-where-was-it-that-joshua-as-commander-held-th/#col-1271) - [**QVÆSTIO IV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/338-question-iv-whether-the-lord-truly-sent-hornets-before-t/)

— Whether the Lord [truly] sent hornets, before the Israelites, upon their enemies? [*(col. 1273)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/337-question-iii-whether-also-in-joshua-s-own-time-there-wer/#col-1273) - [**QVÆSTIO V**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/339-question-v-whether-joshua-made-to-the-israelites-a-true-/) — Whether Joshua made to the Israelites a true option [choice] of serving God or the [false] gods? [*(col. 1275)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/338-question-iv-whether-the-lord-truly-sent-hornets-before-t/#col-1275) - [**QVÆSTIO VI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/340-question-vi-how-did-joshua-say-v-19-to-the-israelites-wh/) — How did [Joshua] say (v. 19) to the Israelites [who were] choosing God: "You will not be able to serve the Lord"? [*(col. 1277)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/339-question-v-whether-joshua-made-to-the-israelites-a-true-/#col-1277) - [**QVÆSTIO VII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/341-question-vii-how-did-joshua-strike-make-a-covenant-with-/) — How did Joshua strike [make] a covenant with the Israelites? [*(col. 1277)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/339-question-v-whether-joshua-made-to-the-israelites-a-true-/#col-1277) - [**QVÆSTIO VIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/342-question-viii-when-did-joshua-die/) — When did Joshua die? [*(col. 1281)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/341-question-vii-how-did-joshua-strike-make-a-covenant-with-/#col-1281) - [**QVÆSTIO IX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/343-question-ix-where-and-with-what-mourning-planctu-was-jos/) — Where, and with what mourning [planctu], was Joshua buried? [*(col. 1283)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/342-question-viii-when-did-joshua-die/#col-1283) - [**QVÆSTIO X**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/344-question-x-what-kind-of-sepulchre-had-the-leader-joshua-/) — What [kind of] sepulchre [had] the Leader Joshua? and were the stone knives buried with him in this [sepulchre]? [*(col. 1283)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/342-question-viii-when-did-joshua-die/#col-1283) - [**QVÆSTIO XI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/345-question-xi-what-was-the-epitaph-of-joshua/) — What [was] the epitaph of Joshua? [*(col. 1283)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/342-question-viii-when-did-joshua-die/#col-1283) - [**QVÆSTIO XII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/346-question-xii-what-other-monuments-exist-to-the-perpetual/) — What other monuments [exist] to the perpetual memory of Joshua? [*(col. 1285)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/345-question-xi-what-was-the-epitaph-of-joshua/#col-1285) - [**QVÆSTIO XIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/347-question-xiii-whether-joshua-waged-any-war-with-the-king/) — Whether Joshua waged any war with the Kings of Armenia, Persia, and Media? [*(col. 1285)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/345-question-xi-what-was-the-epitaph-of-joshua/#col-1285) - [**QVÆSTIO XIV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/348-question-xiv-whether-joshua-left-children-or-was-celibat/) — Whether Joshua left children, or was celibate [coelebs]? [*(col. 1289)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/347-question-xiii-whether-joshua-waged-any-war-with-the-king/#col-1289) - [**QVÆSTIO XV**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/349-question-xv-whether-joshua-escaped-the-teeth-of-heretics/) — Whether Joshua escaped the teeth of heretics? [*(col. 1291)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/348-question-xiv-whether-joshua-left-children-or-was-celibat/#col-1291) - [**QVÆSTIO XVI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/350-question-xvi-when-were-joseph-s-bones-buried/) — When were Joseph's bones buried? [*(col. 1291)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/348-question-xiv-whether-joshua-left-children-or-was-celibat/#col-1291) - [**QVÆSTIO XVII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/351-question-xvii-where-were-joseph-s-bones-buried/) — Where were Joseph's bones buried? [*(col. 1293)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/350-question-xvi-when-were-joseph-s-bones-buried/#col-1293) - [**QVÆSTIO XVIII**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/352-question-xviii-whether-with-joseph-more-other-patriarchs/) — Whether, with Joseph, more other Patriarchs [were] buried at Shechem? [*(col. 1295)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/351-question-xvii-where-were-joseph-s-bones-buried/#col-1295) -

[**QVÆSTIO XIX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/353-question-xix-how-and-why-were-joseph-s-bones-transferred/) — How, and why, were Joseph's bones transferred to Shechem? [*(col. 1295)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/351-question-xvii-where-were-joseph-s-bones-buried/#col-1295) - [**QVÆSTIO XX**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/354-question-xx-how-died-where-was-buried-eleazar-the-pontif/) — How died, & where [was] buried, Eleazar the Pontiff? [*(col. 1297)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/353-question-xix-how-and-why-were-joseph-s-bones-transferred/#col-1297) - [**QVÆSTIO XXI**](/works/serarius-joshua-2/355-question-xxi-who-wrote-the-end-of-this-book-and-what-is-/) — Who wrote the end of this book? and what [is] added to it by the 70 [LXX]? [*(col. 1297)*](/works/serarius-joshua-2/353-question-xix-how-and-why-were-joseph-s-bones-transferred/#col-1297)

Title Page

OF NICOLAUS SERARIUS,

of the SOCIETY OF JESUS,

Theologian, and Professor of Sacred Letters in the Academy of Mainz [Moguntina Academia] — [the] commentaries on the Book of Joshua.

LATTER VOLUME [Tomus Posterior].

COMPRISING ALL THE WARS waged by him [Joshua], and the [deeds] which, after the wars, up to the death of that same Leader, were done by him.

> *[Original: "NICOLAI SERARII SOCIETATIS IESV THEOLOGI, ET SACRARVM LITERARVM IN MOGVNTINA ACADEMIA Professoris, commentariorum in Librum Iosue, TOMVS POSTERIOR. COMPLECTENS BELLA OMNIA AB eo gesta, & ea quæ post bella, vsq; ad eiusdem Ducis mortem, ab eo sunt acta."]*

Dedication

To the Most Reverend and Most Illustrious Prince and Lord, Lord JOHANN SCHWEIKARD [Ioanni Svicardio], Archbishop of the Holy See of Mainz, Arch-Chancellor of the Holy Roman Empire throughout Germany, and Prince-Elector, his most clement Lord —

the College of the Society of Jesus at Mainz [prays for him] everlasting Felicity.

Although, Most Reverend and Most Illustrious Prince, such is Thy graciousness that Thou hast readily allowed the *prior* part of the Joshuan history to be adorned with Thy most ample name, nevertheless it will perhaps seem to someone that the *latter* [part], which we now offer, agrees less with that grade of dignity which Thou holdest in the Church — in that it recounts those wars most happily accomplished, under God's auspices, by the most valiant Joshua against his enemies. For who does not see [these things] to differ greatly from the office of an Ecclesiastical Prince, whose mind ought to be set apart from all the din of arms and placed in a certain blessed quiet — so that he who among mortals is nearest to God may emulate the state of that better world which is above the Moon, [marked] by a certain freedom from all motions and disturbances? This, indeed, might seem rightly said, if here the arms were impious and severed from all religion, if the battle-lines were devoid of piety, if any standards other than God's ark were being followed. But whoever shall have seen a Commander [Imperator] outstanding in holiness, girt with a most powerful army — one who stamped upon [conquered] almost all Palestine with as many victories as footsteps; who encircled cities with a crown of Priests; who shook [their] walls with the blast of the priestly trumpets; who

undertook and crushed all his wars from the oracle of the High Priest; who prevailed, in the end, more by the Priests' ceremony than by the strength of arms — he, assuredly, will understand that the glory of the priests is contained within the praises of the supreme Commander. And shall we doubt whether a book is less fittingly dedicated to Thee, the Supreme Prelate of the Priests in Germany — [Thee] who dost establish the felicity of Emperors in obedience to the Priests, by God's own arbitration? Especially since, after — by God's will — the Principate of the Roman Empire was transferred to the Germans from the East, we recognize in Thee and in Thy predecessors almost the same authority of the Priesthood before the Emperors. For what else does the office of Arch-Chancellor [Maximi Cancellarii munus], joined with this Pontifical office, intend, except that we should understand thee to be a certain Father of the Caesars, the mind of the Empire, the president of the best counsels? Which dignity I judge our most wise forefathers to have granted to the Prelate of Mainz for this reason: that he might consider that from that most excellent City [Mainz], always — in war and peace, God favoring — counsels would flow forth into all Germany, whence true religion toward her, and the fear of God (without which the counsels of men are empty), had once emanated. Thou knowest, as we suppose, Most Illustrious Prince, what a harvest there is in this book for adorning Thy dignity. And whence the zeal for amplifying it was born in us, Thou canst not be ignorant — Thou who art conscious both of very many other merits [of Thine], and of that [benefit] which lately proceeded from Thy beneficence to this College, in a difficult time though it was. Wherefore Thou easily understandest that a great occasion has been offered to this our least Society for venerating Thy Most Illustrious name, and for assiduously making vows for Thy safety. And that the endeavors of this Society confer something toward the honor of God the Best and Greatest — to whom alone these Thy bounties are devoted — Thou dost not only deign to reckon, but also, not so long ago, hast declared by an illustrious testimony among Princes estranged from the Catholic religion. May God preserve this Thy Highness as long as possible for his Church.

At Mainz, on the Kalends [1st] of April, in the year 1610.

Of the Wars

The Wars (opening)

THE SECOND PART OF THE BOOK OF JOSHUA — the OTHER Portion, which comprises τὰ πολεμικὰ [ta polemika, "the matters of war"].

(col. 717)

ON THE WARS [De Bellis].

Of the wars we must treat in two ways. First, in general, by inquiring how many and of what kind they were, and what they signified; afterward, of the individual [wars].

Question I. How many were Joshua's wars against the Canaanites?

It could be said that there was ONE war, which however consisted of various sieges, assaults, and battles, and was waged over a long time. For so today we call [it] the "Hungarian" and the "Belgian" [war], which for so many years now — alas! — and with so many and so deadly contests, in so many and so scattered places, endures. Yet for the sake of a greater distinction, [these wars] can be numbered as several, in respect of the cities or the enemies against whom the fighting was done — and these chiefly FIVE: that of Jericho [Hierichuntinum], that of Ai [Haiense], that of Gibeon [Gabaonicum], that of Adoni-zedek [Adonisedechianum], [and] that of Jabin [Iabinicum], or the "Northern" [war] [seu Aquilonare].

Question II. Were these wars just? And first: Did the Israelites justly move arms against the Canaanites?

I do not ask universally, "Whether wars [in general] are just?" — for that is both foreign to this my design, and has been sufficiently disputed by St Bernard (ch. 3 of the sermon to the Knights of the Temple) and by Bellarmine (controversy 5, bk. 3, ch. 14) — but [I ask] whether THESE wars [were] just. Now the justice of these wars can be weighed in two ways. First, by considering the part of Joshua and of the Israelites themselves: whether they justly brought these wars upon the Canaanites. Secondly, [the part] of the Canaanites themselves: whether the Canaanites defended themselves by a just war. And each [question] can again be disputed in two ways. First, as to all the modes and circumstances which either preserve or violate the justice of wars. Secondly, as to the very cause only of waging or of repelling the war — or, as some call it, the "title" [titulus]. The former mode contains both this latter [one] and several others — for example,

whether it is lawful to slay all the enemies utterly, even weak women and innocent little ones? whether it is just to circumvent the enemy by ambushes? and other similar [questions], which can befall a war otherwise undertaken on a just principle and cause, and can bring some fault upon it. But these [matters] will be explained more conveniently in the individual wars, as they present themselves. And so this only is now to be inquired: WHETHER the Israelites justly bore arms against the Canaanites? — or, whether the reason and cause of warring against them was just? [It was] UNJUST, the Canaanites first said — in Procopius (the book on the Vandal War) [and] Evagrius (bk. 4, ch. 18), as will be said below in another place. Namely, [because] it is a vice in all mortals to assign a just cause to themselves and an unjust one to their enemies. SECONDLY, the Egyptians [said so], in Origen (bk. 3 Against Celsus); and by name the Alexandrian Apion, as Josephus relates (bk. 1 Against Apion). But no wonder [it comes] from these, since the Israelites had afflicted Egypt with such great disasters as they departed. THIRDLY, certain Gentile writers — Alexander Polyhistor (in Suidas), Tacitus (bk. 5 of the Histories), Justinus (bk. 36), Strabo (bk. 16), and the Epicurean Celsus (in Origen, at the cited place). For these, as I have already said in [the commentary on] Exodus, relate that the Israelites — either cast out of Egypt on account of the monstrous foulness of leprosy, or fugitives of

their own accord on account of sedition — set up a brigandage [latrocinium] and sought new abodes for themselves. But the lies of these [writers] were long ago refuted by Josephus and Origen at the places already cited, and also by Cyril (bks. 1 & 7 Against Julian) [and] Orosius (bk. 1, ch. 10). FOURTHLY, the Manichaean heretics — in St Epiphanius (heresy 66), St Jerome (on Isaiah, ch. 16), [and] St Augustine (bk. 22 Against Faustus, ch. 12 and following). And although these [objectors] bring forward nothing of arguments, nevertheless these [considerations] can come into someone's mind. FIRST: The Canaanites were in their own fatherland; they inhabited their own lands and homes peaceably. What right, then, [had] the Israelites to invade them, to seize their cities and fields, [and] to exterminate them? SECOND: Nay rather, the Sowers [progenitors] and first parents of the Israelites — Abraham, Isaac, [and] Jacob — [when] coming into Canaan from elsewhere, [as] unknown [strangers],

(col. 719)

[running head: Iosuæ.]

as strangers and guests — these same Canaanites not only tolerated [them] with great kindness, but received [them] even into their own sepulchres, marriages, and kinships, into leagues and friendships — into the very bowels, in short, of the region, and into the bosom of its most excellent sky and soil. What equity, then, [is it] that the natives, so well deserving of the newcomers, should have this thanks returned to them by the [newcomers'] posterity — that they be assailed by a most unworthy war, overthrown in their fortunes, [and] cast out of [their] homes, fatherland, and life? THIRD: If the Israelites were oppressed in Egypt by the heavy yoke of servitude, why did they not shake it off there, so as to remain in that very [land]? What need was there to attack the harmless Canaanites, so far removed by [such] an interval, [and] suspecting nothing of the kind? Was not the soil of Egypt most fertile? Was not [its] air most healthful? If they had the right to despoil the Egyptians of gold, silver, and precious clothing, to vex [them] with the cruelty of so great, so many, and so manifold most bitter plagues, and to drown the King himself with so many thousands — could the cause for seizing Egypt [itself] have been lacking? But if nevertheless it pleased [them] to desert the unlucky lands in which they had first served [as slaves], was there too little of land between Canaan and Egypt for this people to settle in? Why did they not begin — [why] did they not strive — to cultivate the vast solitudes in which they had continued for 40 years, to dig wells in them, to sow fields, to plant vineyards and trees, to raise villages and cities? But if [land] already cultivated and inhabited pleased [them] more, why did they not go eastward into most delightful Susiana, into most fertile Mesopotamia, or the other provinces of those parts abounding in all delights? Why did they not betake themselves into Arabia Felix [the Happy]? What need was there to come to Canaan through so many trackless places, by so great a journey, [through] so many bends and windings? What reason, what right [is it], that a friendly nation — certainly not hostile, [but] once so benevolent and beneficent toward their forefathers, tranquil, secure in its own home, minding its own affairs, having no disagreement or business whatever with the Israelites — should by them be attacked, laid waste, and, as far as could be done, utterly destroyed, by so unexpected, so grievous, and [so] intestine a war?

Nevertheless it must be said that these wars were MOST JUST, [and that] this region was most justly entered and possessed by the Israelites. And there are indeed THREE causes of this matter given at ch. 1, quest. 5 — but concerning which, with the order however a little changed, [there is] still something to be said. The FIRST is the iniquity and impiety of the Canaanites themselves. For they were most defiled with idolatry, and with the filth of various other sins, Gen. 15 & Lev. 18. This cause, however, if it were the only [one], could not justly enough arm the Israelites for their devastation and slaughter. For, FIRST, it is not lawful for just anyone to rush upon just any wicked person, [even one] otherwise most worthy of death: but it is the charge of magistrates, and of those to whom this business is delegated by them. For [what], otherwise, [of] human society? What [place would] not [be] everywhere [full of] slaughters and deaths? SECONDLY: The Canaanites [were] not the only sinners. The crime of very many other nations was equal; equal [was their] perversity in the worship of God and in the manner of life — and indeed [of] those nations which [the

Israelites] could have reached eastward and southward as conveniently as the Canaanites. Why, then, should the Israelites spare the others, and

[running head: Iosuæ.]

demand for punishment and destruction the Canaanites alone? THIRDLY: But be it so — [suppose] the Canaanites were to be punished before others: [was it to be done] in that manner [Israel's war]? For the Lord could have taken vengeance on them by sending a contagious plague, or by some sharp famine, or by some other torment. And if indeed a war too had to be applied, other nations were not lacking, by whom this very [war] could have been stirred up and waged. FOURTHLY: And do the Israelites themselves reckon [themselves] free from sin? Were not all the elders taken away from the midst [i.e., died in the wilderness] on account of the crimes and offenses committed in the Egyptian exodus? Was there not always some wickedness in their [own] camp too, and — as [clung] to most [of them] (about which, however, elsewhere) — the one [sin of] idolatry clinging [to them]? Therefore the wickedness of the Canaanites alone — which brought no injury to the Israelites — did not hand a just sword into their hands.

The SECOND cause [is] the reclaiming of an ancient possession and inheritance. For the Canaanites had once, by force, cast out the posterity of Shem — that is, the forefathers of the Israelites — from this very region, as is shown copiously by St Epiphanius (heresy 66, against the Manichaeans who slander the Old Testament), and as already said above at ch. 1, quest. 5; in which [place] Serapion, in Cassian (Conference 5, ch. 24), says: *and the most righteous judgment of God is approved, who both expelled those [Canaanites] from the alien places which they had wrongly seized, and restored to these [Israelites] the ancient possession of the fathers, which had been assigned to their stock in the division of the world.* But neither does this seem, perhaps, a sufficiently suitable ground for a just war. FIRST: because it would have happened at least 500 years before, as is gathered from Gen. 15, Exodus 12, and from the 40 years which were passed in the desert. But to possess some region for so long a time, without anyone's disturbance, in peace and tranquility — does it not give a just title of possession, and therefore [make] it unjust for all others to snatch it away and lay claim [to it]? For this is a prescription [præscriptio] of more than the longest time, and utterly beyond memory. And the force of this in law is such that it makes [them] true Lords of the property who otherwise were not [so] in the beginning. For although those who first seized an alien dominion were not possessors of the good faith which is required for prescription, and although their generations did not receive a just title from them, nevertheless, after so many centuries, the descendants of these began to have good faith, and to transmit a good and just title to [their] posterity. SECONDLY: If this ground of prescription, continued for so many years, did not make the Canaanites just possessors of that land, many kingdoms of Christians today would be unjust. For by what right did the Germans of old seize Germany, the Franks France? By what [right did] the Saxons [seize] England? By what [right did] some remaining families of the Goths and Suevi [seize] a certain part of the Spains? But of this prescription in wars [there will be] more [at] Judges 11. THIRDLY: There were many other descendants of Shem in the East; to them, therefore, Canaan would have belonged by the same right [equally].

The THIRD cause, finally, is the AUTHORITY OF GOD, which alone contains all the measure of justice, and alone suffices. FIRST: because he willed to punish the abominable impiety of the Canaanites at this time, in this manner, and through these [the Israelites]. SECONDLY: because he himself permitted arms [to be borne] against the Canaanites by the Israelites only [so far as…]

(col. 721)

[running head: ad caput VI.]

arms to be turned [against the Canaanites], and their lands to be seized — nay, [God] even commanded and enjoined [it]. THIRDLY: because he himself frequently made his own will manifest to the Israelites, and affirmed [it] by various signs and portents before the war, in [it], and after it. And who would doubt that God,

as the supreme Judge, most justly inflicted these penalties on them [the Canaanites] through these [the Israelites]? If some King justly drives [men] guilty of treason [perduellio] or of other crimes out of all [their] possessions and [their] life, and gives those [possessions] to whom he pleases — why not also the King of kings, the Lord of lords? FOURTHLY: Nay rather, even if there were no fault in the Canaanites, [if] no offense clung to that nation, [God] can nevertheless most justly snatch away life, wealth, possessions, and regions from whom he pleases, and bestow [them] on whom he pleases — because he is the supreme and independent Lord of all. For so he did when he made man himself, and assigned Paradise to him; and when afterward he dispersed the sons of Noah into various parts, and circumscribed their own boundaries for each. Since, however, he always has the best reasons of his divine will, and

[running head: ad caput VI.]

[Augustine, Contra Faustum, bk. 22:] "…but the order of serving shows [him] an innocent soldier: how much more innocently is he engaged in the conduct of wars who wages war at God's command — since no one who serves him is ignorant that he [God] cannot command anything wrongly." And [at] chapter 78: "By a slanderous ignorance is Moses (and likewise Joshua) blamed for having waged wars — [Moses], who ought to have been blamed less if he waged them of his own accord than if he did not wage them at God's command. But to dare to blame God himself for having commanded such things, or not to believe that God, [being] just and good, could command such things, is [the mark] of a man who — to speak more gently — is not able to consider [this]: that to the divine providence, which reaches through all things highest and lowest, it is neither new that [anything] arises, nor [a real] perishing that [anything] dies, but that each single thing, in its own order — whether of natures or of merits — either gives way, or succeeds, or remains; and that the right will of men is joined to the divine law, while inordinate desire is restrained by the order of the divine law: so that neither does the good [man] will anything other than what is commanded, nor can the evil [man do] more than what is permitted — so, indeed, that he cannot [do] with impunity what he has willed unjustly; and thereby, in all the things which human weakness dreads or fears, only iniquity is justly condemned: the rest are either the tributes of natures, or the deserts of faults." And, a few [words] being interposed: "But what the distribution of the judging and pitying God may be — why one [is dealt with] thus, another thus — comes about by hidden causes, yet just [ones]. Not for that reason, however, do we [fail to] know that all these things happen by the judgment or the mercy of God — though by measures and numbers and weights set in secret, by which all things are disposed by God, the creator of all things that naturally exist, [who is] not the author, yet nevertheless the orderer, even of sins: so that those things which would not be sins unless they were against nature are so judged and ordered [that], assigned to the places and conditions of their own deserts, they are not permitted to disturb or defile the nature of the universe. Since these things are so — and since, through this secret of God's judgments and [through] the motions of human wills, some are corrupted by the same prosperities [while] others use [them] temperately, and by the same adversities some fail [while] others advance; and since human and mortal life itself is a trial upon the earth — who among men knows what profits or harms [him]: in peace, to reign, or to serve, or to be at leisure, or to die; but in war, to command, or to fight, or to conquer, or to be slain? — since nevertheless this is established, that [it profits] the one whom it profits only by a divine benefit, and [it harms] the one whom it harms only by a divine judgment. Why, therefore, do we leap into rash reproaches — and would that [they were reproaches] of men, and not of God?" And, onto this book [in his Questions on Joshua], question 10: "Those wars are wont to be defined [as] just which avenge injuries — if some nation or state, which is to be attacked by war, has neglected either to punish what has been wickedly done by its own [people], or to restore what has been taken away by injuries. But even this kind of war is, without doubt, just, which God commands — in whom there is no iniquity, and who knows what ought to be done to each. In which war the army, or the people itself, is to be judged not so much the author of the war as the minister [servant]." And hence, using this one right as the weightiest and most certain of all, the Israelites always gladly [warred], Judges 11, Isaiah 15, [and] elsewhere. And indeed it is implanted by nature in all nations, that [the war] which they undertook with

a deity as its author [numine auctore], they reckoned that a most just expedition. So in Herodotus (bk. 2), the Ethiopians would at once take up the arms which Jupiter had commanded by oracle; in Xenophon (bk. 4), the Spartans [did likewise]; and [Aeneas] himself in Virgil, who [reckons] himself sufficiently [justified], and — by the admonitions of I-know-not-what gods — into [war]

(col. 723)

[running head: Iosuæ.]

[Aeneas himself in Virgil, by the admonitions of I-know-not-what gods,] was saying [that he] made for Latium:

> *— [there] where the fates show quiet abodes, there [it is] right that the kingdom of Troy should rise again. [Aeneid 3.393–4, adapted]*

Whence [comes] that Ausonian [verse]:

> *If Gradivus [Mars] bid the Leader take up arms, to trust [him] is as much a right [fas] as to doubt [is] a wrong [nefas].*
>
> *— Mortal [things] seek counsel; [but the man] sure [of his course hastens] to lay hold of the commands of God.*

So blind, insane, and mad, however, is the mind of our Calvinists, that they reckon this most firm conclusion — [furnished] by nature itself — [to be] infirm: "God commanded this, therefore it is just" — because, by their tenets, he [God] commands even sins. O the madness! — which not only have Catholics always execrated, but, out of that very heresy, now in England almost all the Academics [university men] too [execrate it], as an English heretic (or heresiarch, about whom [I shall speak] elsewhere) has often affirmed to me; who related that by that [doctrine] he had un-taught a certain Count of Hanau, our neighbor — [a Count] worthy indeed of saner masters. And, conveniently, there came into my hands these [past] days, from England, a disputation "On War" [De iure belli] of the Italian heretic Gentili [Alberico Gentili], printed at Hanau, in whose book 1, chapter 8, he pronounces the Canaanite wars just, by God's command. And to those [arguments] which have been disputed for the Canaanites against the martial justice of the Jews, there is no obscure answer [to be found] from what has been said. For the one will and command of God is equivalent to all causes and rights.

Question III. Against the just arms of the Israelites, did the Canaanites too justly bear arms?

The determination of this question is connected and bound to other general questions. One is: Can it happen that a war be just on both sides? Piccolomini touched on [this] question in [book] 6, ch. 1, Philosophy 21 — but in such a way that, as if it were not clear [to him], he settled nothing. Not a few of old denied [it], to whom it seemed that, if someone justly wages war, the other resists unjustly; and even if someone justly resists, the other attacks unjustly. Nevertheless [these] affirm [it can be just on both sides]: Abulensis (on ch. 9 of this book, q. 15; ch. 11, qq. 11 & 12); Dominicus Soto (bk. 5 On Justice, q. 1, a. 7); the jurisconsults too — Fulgosius (law "Ex hoc iure," Digest, "de iustitia [et iure]") and Alciatus (bk. 2 Paradoxa, last chapter, & law 5 "de iustificatione") — because what is truly just is either evident and clear to both parties, or obscure and unknown to both, or known to one [and] unknown to the other. In the first mode and the third, only one party wars justly, since it is settled to the other party that justice is being assailed by it. But in the second mode, justice is sought on both sides, and therefore the war [is] just on both sides. For just as in forensic [legal] affairs, when what is just lies hidden, the litigation is just on both sides, and the disputation before the Judge is just: so also the disputation of arms is not unjust, when each party judges that justice stands on its own side. "It happens," says St Augustine (Exposition [Enarratio] 2 on Psalm 25), "that two men have a case before the servant of God. No one calls any cause just but his own. For if he thought his cause unjust, thou wouldst not seek a judge. And this one thinks he has a just cause, and that one [too]. They come to the judge;

before the sentence is pronounced, both say: We embrace thy judgment, whatever thou shalt adjudge — far be it that we should reject [it]. What sayest thou too? Judge

[running head: Iosuæ.]

whatever [thou wilt], only judge. Utterly, if we resist in anything, may we be anathema. Both love the Judge before he judges." And so, when the Hungarian legates were speaking rather vehemently against the Emperor, Pius II said to them that, in the dissension and controversy of the kingdom, neither the King of Hungary nor the Emperor was acting against [his] duty — since indeed each reckoned his cause just for himself. So [Cicero], in the oration Pro Marcello: "There was," he says, "a certain obscurity; there was a contest among most illustrious Leaders. Many doubted what was best; many, what was fitting; some even, what was lawful." So, in [book] 3 of the Rhetoric, Aristotle said that in almost all the states [types] of controversies it happens that neither party of the litigants is dishonest — except in the question "Whether the deed was done?" — the deed, I say, [done] by one of the litigants. For he who is conscious to himself of his own deed cannot cover this with the cloak of ignorance. Well, therefore — and in accordance with the judgment and mind of Abulensis, cited before — Covarruvias, on the Rule "Peccatum," part 2, §10, at the last number [says]: "A war can truly be just [only] on one side, but in opinion just on both." The former part is evident also from this, that in fact either this one or that one always has the true right, [but] never both. For since the foundation of the right, and, as it were, the sole [thing], is the matter about which the contest is: that [matter] is really owed either to this one or to that one, and there is in it a certain contradiction, so that if it really belongs to this one, it really does not belong to the other. But the latter part too is evident from what has been said, because what is true and just in the matter itself is obscure to the litigants; and each claims it for himself, not amiss — provided, however, that each has applied, in the search for truth, the diligence that is fitting. For it is not enough, for a thing to be just even in opinion, [merely] to think [it] just: but it is necessary to think [it just] with right reason. And that will never be [the case] unless each has explored the truth by [all] the ways and reasons he can. Otherwise the savagery and cruelty of those who — as [it is in] John [ch.] 16, verse 2 — would kill them [the saints] and think they were rendering service to God, would be just against His saints.

The OTHER question is — not, indeed, in general, whether it is just to repel force with force (for this [principle] Cicero in the Pro Milone, and reason for the learned, and necessity for the barbarians, and custom for the nations, and nature itself for the wild beasts, has prescribed — that they should always repel every force, by whatever means they could, from [their] body, from [their] head, [and] from their life) — but specifically: Whether one may justly defend by force a force justly brought [upon him]? There are good and useful [things] which Abulensis hands down at the cited question 11 — but perhaps too many for [our] purpose, since, besides objections and various arguments, Alphonsus à Polo noted 42 conclusions in them. In a few [words], therefore, I say: FIRST, if the force that is brought [to bear] pertains to taking away only the goods of fortune and wealth, and it is settled for us that the force is just, [then] it cannot be warded off by force. For example, if a Judge, by himself or through his ministers, wished justly to coerce us by taking away pledges [pignora], or by some other loss of [our] property — the reason is: he who thus attempts to take away those goods by force does a lawful, good, and just work; and this our reason dictates to us. To hinder him, therefore, and to wish to kill or wound him, is a wickedness [nefas]. SECOND: If a just force likewise rages even to [the taking of] our life, or the wounding of the body, and we know it to be just — [then] no force which is opposed to it is just. The reason

(col. 725)

[running head: ad caput VI.]

[The reason is] the same. THIRDLY: If some force be brought [to bear] upon [our] fortunes or [our] life, and it be not known [to be] just — although otherwise it might be just — [then] to repel it by force is just, in that

manner which was already set forth in the preceding little question: namely, as to an opinion in no way rash or imprudent. For such a person is convinced within himself that force is being applied to him through wickedness and injury, [and] that it is just to check it by [counter-]force.

As to the Canaanites, however, the common opinion is — which Abulensis taught in the same place — that, against the just arms of the Israelites, they justly bore arms; and that for one just cause: namely, because they were ignorant of the justice of the Israelite cause. For they did not know that the Israelites were sent by the supreme Judge as avengers of [their] crimes; that the whole region had been given to them by the supreme God; [and] that the manner and method had been commanded, by which these [Canaanites], on account of their own crimes, were to be punished, [while] these [Israelites] were to seize all their fortunes and wealth. To me, however, it seems [otherwise]:

FIRST: that the Canaanites either knew, or at least could and ought to have known, that the Israelites had been brought into their [land of] Canaan by the supreme and true God. For far and wide, certainly and constantly, there had reached those peoples the most illustrious report of the miracles which God had done in Egypt, at the Red Sea, and in the wilderness. They had also lately seen the admirable crossing of the same Israelites through the waves of the Jordan. Ought not so many and so great prodigies to have sufficed for them to acknowledge the true and supreme God, [and] to confess him [to be] the Leader, helper, and favorer of the Israelites? Recall to mind the confession of Rahab's faith, which we heard above at chapter 2, verse 9: *"I know,"* she says, *"that the Lord has delivered the land to you: for the terror of you has fallen upon us, and all the inhabitants of the land have grown faint. We have heard that the Lord dried up the waters of the Red Sea at your entrance, when you went out of Egypt; and what you did to the two Kings of the Amorites who were beyond the Jordan, Sihon and Og, whom you slew. And hearing this, we were greatly afraid, and our heart grew faint, nor did there remain in us spirit for [i.e., to withstand] your entrance: for the Lord your God, he himself is God, in heaven above, and on earth below."* Did she not pronounce this sentence against her own countrymen? Did she not show that they ought — and, had they willed, could — to believe and venerate the all-powerful one God, who governs and protects heaven and earth, the whole world, and above all the Israelites themselves? If they could be shaken by so great a fear and dread, why were they not bent toward some somewhat saner reflection? What of the things which might urge [them] to the true faith was present to Rahab, that was not present to the other Canaanites? The external [things] which invited [them] to faith were the same for all; and God's grace, sufficient, was present to everyone. A nearly equal confession of the Gibeonites will meet [us] below at chapter 9. If Pharaoh, [being] obstinate, was held bound [to believe] — if any who either saw, or certainly and undoubtedly heard, some works of CHRIST God [were bound] — why not the Canaanites too? Wherefore these words of Abulensis, at the cited question 11, please [me] little: *"Granted that the Canaanites should concede the Jews to have been sent by their God to the destruction of the Canaanites, nevertheless they were not compelled to confess them [the Israelites] to be their [rightful] judges: because they would say that the God of the Hebrews had not the power to [commit] any such destruction*

[running head: ad caput VI.]

to be delegated to the Jews, since he himself had not power over the Canaanites. And that was a legitimate excuse. But if thou sayest that all were obligated to know the one God, whose knowledge is naturally implanted, as is plain [in the Epistle] to the Romans, chapter 1: it must be answered that, although they were obligated to know and to believe that there is one true God, nevertheless they were not obligated to believe that this [God] was the God of the Hebrews, or of the Sidonians, or of the Canaanites — because it was not implanted in the nature of things that God should be more in that people than in others. Therefore, just as the Canaanites could legitimately reckon that Chemosh, the god of the Moabites, or Astarte, the goddess of the Sidonians, were not gods having power over them, so they could reckon concerning the God of the Jews — since nothing more was established from the nature of things — until, through the operations of miracles,

something should be made known." But assuredly so many and so great operations of miracles had already gone before, that there ought to be no doubt about the supreme excellence and truth of the God of the Jews above all other gods. For if before the crossing of the Jordan Rahab spoke thus, what ought all [the Canaanites] to have said after it?

SECONDLY: The Canaanites were ignorant of the divine will as to many [things] which in no way forbade them to prepare force and defense against the Israelites. For, first, they did not know whether the Lord had brought them [the Israelites] so wonderfully across the Jordan in order that they might press on to yet other lands and merely pass through Canaan, or in order that they might fix [their] seat in it and make an end of the journey undertaken. For this [passing through] both could have been done by them, and indeed had been done among several other nations through which they passed. Secondly: [even] granted that the Canaanites knew that the Israelites wished to remain in Canaan, they nevertheless did not know how, or on what condition — namely, whether they [the Canaanites] ought to yield the whole region to them and depart into other lands, or to remain and dwell together with them in it. If they had to depart, they did not sufficiently see whether the Lord would give other dominions in compensation for the fatherland they would forsake, and what those [dominions] would be, or where; whether they ought to be scattered and dispersed into various places, and in what manner; whether into [places] which each might choose at his own discretion, or which would be assigned [to them]; and again, whether to set out like colonies [colonists], or to rush headlong away in precipitate flight and hide wherever [they could]. But if they had to remain and dwell in the same Canaan together with the Israelites, they did not see whether [it would be] by equal right with them — namely, that they should remain free alongside the free, and that either mixed together with them, or gathered into certain parts of the land and still kept separate from them — or by another right, namely, that they should be made either slaves or tributaries to them. But most of all of everything, they were ignorant that, by the just judgment of God, they were to perish utterly, and to be stripped of fatherland and life at once. For neither had this divine sentence been proclaimed to them, nor was there anything from which they could certainly gather it. For what if perchance the Israelites should sin, and — ungrateful after so many and so great benefits of God — should themselves be [the ones] to be chastised by the sword of the Canaanites? What if God should only permit, and not also command, that they [the Israelites] assail the Canaanites with war and cut [them] down? What if these [Israelites], comparing their own depravity with the impiety of the other nations, should [not] find themselves more worthy of punishment and death? What if these same [Canaanites] should do penance, [and] destroy their idols,

(col. 727)

[running head: Iosuæ.]

[destroy their idols,] correct [their] wicked ways? What if they should indeed believe themselves guilty, and not undeserving of death — but yet [death] in such a way that they ought to die in the field and battle-line, and not basely give up [their] spoils and lay down [their] life without blood and sweat? For truly, before the will and sentence of the Judge is clearly manifest, many [things] of this kind — especially when [the matter] concerns life, than which no one has a greater or dearer temporal good in this world — can come into mind, which can rightly be done, and sometimes ought [to be]. So that, from ignorance — not that former [ignorance, of Israel's mission], but this latter [ignorance, of the manner of God's will] — I think the Canaanites could, not unjustly, defend and protect themselves by arms against the invasion of the Israelites. For no one is bound to cast away and squander his goods and life, or to fail to defend and preserve [them], unless he clearly knows the will and command of him who has right over what is ours and over us ourselves — [namely] that we be thus stripped even now of our goods and life. But when this is clearly established (namely, by that clarity which morally suffices for a prudent judgment), then indeed it is most just to endure patiently and bravely all despoilings, torments, and deaths — as so many holy confessors and martyrs did, when in the profession of faith and justice they knew the divine will from a divine precept; likewise that thief

on the cross, and thereafter innumerable other malefactors, when by their Magistrates they were cast out of [their] goods, bound in fetters, shut in prisons, punished with exile, [and] put to death on gibbets, wheels, and flames. But a question still remains.

Whether the Canaanites not only COULD resist the invading Israelites, as has been said, but also OUGHT to have? As to [their] goods, Abulensis affirms that they only could [resist]; as to life, that they even ought [to have]. For those [goods], since they are goods of a lower grade, we are not so [strictly] obliged to retain and protect; but it is otherwise with life, since, as has been said, it is in the highest grade of temporal goods. When, however, it would not be altogether manifest that [life] was being unjustly snatched from us, and some probable reasons should teach [us] that — God willing and commanding (although in truth he only permitted [it]) — swords were being brought against us: I should believe that we are not indeed bound to refrain from resisting; but that we can also refrain from resisting, and endure the inflicted death with an even and patient mind. Because [in that case] we would then establish no injustice in the strikers, nor would we rashly expose [our] life, or basely desert [it]; but, from the supreme right which is ours, we would remit a little, out of reverence for the divine will and command — [known] not indeed certainly, but probably. Wherefore I conclude that the Canaanites could [choose] not to defend both their lands and their life against the justly-invading Israelites; yet [that] they could justly, for the causes set forth before, have defended [them]. Hence, further, it appears how detestable Luther was, when in his article 4 he wrote that *"war is not to be waged by Christians against the Turks."* For if against the justly-invading Jews the Canaanites could rightly and justly defend themselves, why should not Christians resist the Turks — who wage most unjust wars — by a most just war? If against the people of God — hedged about by his protection, renowned by miracles — the arms of an impious and profane nation could be just, how [could] the war of Christians against the Turks,

[running head: Iosuæ.]

of the faithful against the infidels, of defenders against invaders, of dogs against wolves, be a wicked assault [i.e., how could it be criminal]? See Bellarmine, book On the Laity, ch. 16. It is well, however, that he [Luther] sang a palinode [recantation] in the Saxon Visitation — except that certain Calvinist Ministers, mad with a more-than-Vatinian hatred of Catholics, seem not to disapprove that former opinion. For [in] controversy 5, book 2, ch. 16, Franciscus Junius so explains it (κατά τι, "in a certain respect") that he still grants there are no [just] causes for waging war against the Turks. He rejects Cochlaeus in [his] history as hostile to Luther; on the contrary he praises Sleidan; he accuses the Popes of being "more Turkish than the Turks"; nay, even in the rank of a public council pertaining to the public administration of the kingdom, he calls most Christians "worse than those same Turks," and exclaims in these words: *"Would that — and again would that — this thing were not so utterly true!"* Whence even at this present time, when most of the Lutherans offer money and bodies against those same enemies [the Turks] not a little more eagerly than of old, we see it come about that the Calvinists more willingly betake themselves to the Dutch rebellions and brigandages. But of the many [things] which pertain to this [subject], my *Anti-Turkish* [writings] treat: read them, judge [them], and — if thou canst do nothing else — groan with me, and for our Germany pray to God, the Best and Greatest. For what more useful [thing] can we, private and poor [men], do?

Question IV. What do these wars of the Israelites against the Canaanites signify?

Gratian (causa 23, question 1, chapter 2) answers that [they] signify spiritual [wars], by which we must fight against spiritual enemies. But he wrongly puts forth Gregory as the author of this most true response, since he cites not Gregory's words, but Origen's, from homily 15 on this book: *"Unless,"* he says, *"these carnal wars bore a figure of spiritual wars, never, I think, would the books of the Jewish histories have been handed down by the Apostles to be read in the Churches by the disciples of Christ — who came to teach peace. For*

to what profit would that description of wars be, to those to whom it is said by Jesus, 'My peace I give to you, my peace I leave with you'? And to those to whom it is commanded and said through the Apostle: 'not avenging ourselves,' and 'rather receive [ye] the injury,' and 'rather suffer [ye] the fraud'? Whence, finally, the Apostle, knowing that no wars are any longer to be waged by us carnally, but that the contests of the soul are to be sweated out against spiritual adversaries, gives — like a drill-master — a precept to the soldiers of Christ, saying: 'Put on the armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil.' And that we might have examples of these spiritual wars from the deeds of the ancients, he willed these narrations of things done to be recited to us in the Church, so that we — if we are spiritual, hearing that the law is spiritual — might, in the [things] which we hear, compare spiritual with spiritual, and contemplate, from those nations which visibly assailed the carnal Israel, how great are the nations of the contrary powers — from among the spiritual [beings] which are called 'spiritual wickednesses in the heavenly places' [Eph 6:12] — which stir up wars against the Church of the Lord, which is the true Israel." In these words it is to be noted, first, that by them every just cause of warring seems to be taken away from Christians, and that it is lawful for them to undertake war only against the enemies of the soul. But this [was treated] above, at question 1.

(col. 729)

[running head: ad caput VI.]

was already exploded [refuted] above [at q. 1], and in that same causa 23 [of Gratian] it is copiously exploded, even from St Gregory's own mind, at question 8. Whence — that I may briefly point this out — he collects [it] badly, who wishes very much to seem sharp-eyed: the Gentile Calvinist [i.e., Alberico Gentili], On War, book 1, ch. 5, [says] that the Father [Gregory] is not sufficiently consistent with himself. For, having followed the erring Gratian, he attributes to Gregory the words which we have heard [which are really Origen's]. SECONDLY: it seems, by those same words, that the reason why these wars are read is a single one — namely, the figure of the interior [spiritual] wars. But surely there are several reasons: FIRST: that from this [reading] the supreme benevolence of God toward his people — in leading them — and [his] wisdom in governing, [his] power in protecting and enlarging [them], and other such things, may be seen. SECOND: that the progress of the ancient Church, and its whole state, from the beginning of the world, through the unfoldings of all the ages, may be known. THIRD: that precepts and examples of the military art may also be taken from it — especially those which, even if they are sometimes suggested by the natural light of reason and by profane [pagan] writers, are nevertheless proposed less efficaciously than they ought [to be], and are held of less [account] in war by the common soldiers, and even by some of the [leaders]. Of which kind are these: that all victories and triumphs be seriously believed to be from God, and in God alone; that he be often and ardently besought by prayers [for them]; that something from the spoils be consecrated to his honor and worship; that all impiety be banished from the camp, [that] sacrileges be absent, and whatever sins provoke the divine wrath; [that] obedience and innocence flourish among them; and, if there be any sin, [that there be] penance and expiation. Concerning which [things] let there usefully be read Ferrandus, to Duke Reginus, and St Bernard, in the sermon to the Knights of the Temple. FOURTH: Finally, to these military narrations that [saying] of the Apostle also applies, 2 Timothy 3, verse 16: *"All Scripture, divinely inspired, is useful for teaching, for arguing, for correcting, for instructing in justice: that the man of God may be perfect, furnished for every good work"* — for every, I say, good work, even a military one, whether the war be undertaken for invasion or for defense. Since indeed each [kind], when it is a work of justice, is necessarily good. It is to be noted, thirdly, that it is an Apostolic tradition [which decides] that these or those books [are] to be read in the Church before the people. FOURTHLY: as to the cause which he [Origen] brings, [note] that Origen speaks modestly, since he does not affirm [it], but only says, "I think" [opinor]. FIFTHLY: that first cause is proposed by him as if [it were] the only one — either because he reckoned [it] the chief [cause], or even the only [cause] — not simply, but in respect of the common crowd of

Christians: so that, when the people hear [these things] recited in the Church (for he clearly names such a recitation "Ecclesiastical"), they may straightway have at hand [something] which they may usefully ponder for every state of life, and for every place and time — namely, that they may learn to do battle spiritually against the spiritual [powers of] wickedness. For these battles are to be fought by all, and everywhere, and always, as long as one lives. From diabolical temptation none of us is exempt. No place is so splendid or so holy where the demon and the flesh will not either openly assail or lie in wait; no festal or laborious day, no youth or old age, no hour of health or of sickness, is safe from those dangers. This, therefore, is the greatest, and in a way the sole, reason why, to every kind of men,

[running head: ad caput VI.]

however rude and simple, the history of these wars can be as useful as possible. And therefore these [things] too must now be explained a little.

FOUR [things], therefore, are to be noted in general, which are to be transferred to the likeness of the wars of the soul: namely, WHO the enemies are, with whom one must war; WHAT the cause of the wars [is]; WHO the Leader [is]; and WHAT the manner [is].

FIRST: The enemies are many; universally, however, they are called Canaanites [Chananæi]. Now "Canaan" means, first, a merchant [mercator] — Hosea 12, verse 7; Zechariah 14:21; Proverbs 31:24; Job 40:24; Isaiah 23:8; and, according to the Targum and Rabbi David [Kimhi] in the [Book of] Roots, Genesis 38, verse 2, where our [Vulgate] retains the Hebrew "Canaanite." SECONDLY, it can mean "afflicting and humbling." For כנע [kana] is "to humble." Whence the German word *fnien* [i.e. to bow down] and the Greek χύνω. THIRDLY, according to some, from ענה [ana] it can mean "thus" — that is, "fittingly responding," or "afflicting." The Demon is a merchant, who, for a scrap of one apple, bought for himself the whole human race in paradise; and today, at a price, he buys up [those men] who take delight in a certain flattering [enticement] of pleasures — [those] either coveting the things which [please] the soul with immoderate lust, or shuddering with excessive fear and trembling, or boiling over with a more atrocious wrath. For hence [come] the words of "buying" and "redeeming" so often attributed to Christ the Lord in the Scriptures. He [the Demon] can be said "thus" — that is, to "respond fittingly" — when, at a man's [mere] wish, he gives all his goods as freely granted. The lust of man says: "Is it lawful, by right and wrong [per fas & nefas], to heap up wealth?" He answers: "It is lawful." "I should wish, above all, to be made great, to be honored, to be graced with praises, to be made illustrious with glory." "And this [is] splendid." "I should wish to eat of the forbidden tree, were it not that one must die." "Ah, eat! be of good cheer — thou shalt by no means die." "I should wish to excel in the knowledge of various things, and so to be admirable to all." "Indeed — if thou hearkenest to me, I will bring [it about] that thou be as God, knowing good and evil." So [it is] in all the other depraved vices of souls. So also — that is, fittingly and "well" — he "afflicts," sometimes indeed by the sending of calamities: for example, of poverty, hunger, worthlessness, sickness, and the like, as was done in Job; but sometimes by wearing down souls with sadness and grief, ceaselessly lacerating [them] with anxious thoughts, and soliciting [them] to impatience, murmuring, and utmost despair. What I have said in the singular [of the one Demon] is to be transferred to the whole multitude of the flesh, the world, and all the demons. For these are the "Canaanites," with whom we have perpetual, truceless [ἄσπονδα, asponda], and more-than-deadly wars. These are the nations which, to us who seek the inheritance provided for us by God, most of all and always resist with the most hostile arms and minds — [the nations] which, in Canaan, were long ago, through the true Noah (that is, the bestower of true rest [Noah = "rest"]), given over to execration and cursed, Genesis 9, verse 25 ["Cursed be Canaan"]. These peoples are also sometimes called "Amorites" [Amorrhæi], as [in] Genesis 15, verse 16 — but more rarely. And what does the name of those "Amorites" signify, but either "talkative" (from אמר [amar, "to say"]), or "rebels and apostates" (from מרה [marah, "to rebel"])? By which name — for that same nation of demons, which so basely fell away from God, ceaselessly works perpetual rebellion and apostasy in men, and everywhere clamors with immense

talkativeness — what [could be] more fitting?

(col. 731)

[running head: Iosuæ.]

SECONDLY: The cause of this war [is] threefold, as was indicated before. FIRST: that the sins which those Canaanites and Amorites committed be punished. But no sharper punishment can now be inflicted by us upon the demons than if we never obey their will, [but] perpetually confute, despise, trample, and spit upon them. So also nothing can be more troublesome to this world than if it be held cheap and deserted. Nothing is more hateful and harsh to the flesh than if fetters and bonds be cast upon it by right reason, its lust be bridled, its wantonness be checked, and its wildness be tamed. SECOND: that the ancestral possession of [our] forefathers be recovered. In paradise [our first parents] were in that most fertile, most healthful, most delightful place. Thence the Canaanites, by force and injury, expelled and dislodged them. Let us return thither, and reclaim what has been lost or snatched away. *"This figure in us,"* says Serapion in Cassian (chapter 24, conference 5), *"is known by a most certain reasoning. For the will of the Lord naturally assigned the possession of our heart not to vices but to virtues. Which [heart], after Adam's transgression — [with] the vices growing insolent, that is, the Canaanite peoples — [was] driven from its own region; and when these [virtues], again through the grace of God, by our diligence and labor, shall have been restored, [we] are to be believed not so much to have occupied alien lands, as to have recovered [our] own."* THIRD, and the greatest, and the chief of all the other causes: because God commands [it]. Run through all the [sacred] writers — they always exhort to that sacred war: Job 7, verse 1; 2 Timothy 2, verse 3; 1 Peter 5, verse 9. That great Trumpeter, St Peter, sounds the battle-call; St Paul opens the armory and hands over the full panoply: 2 Corinthians 10, verse 4; Ephesians 6, verses 11 and 13. *"To me,"* says Origen in the cited homily, *"there seems to be a countless number of contrary powers, inasmuch as through almost every individual man there are some spirits contriving diverse kinds of sins in them. For example, there is a certain spirit of fornication; there is another, of wrath; there is a spirit of avarice, and another of pride. And if it happen that there is some man who is driven by all these evils, or even by more, he is to be thought to have all these, or even more, [as] enemy spirits in himself. Whence also [we] are to believe [there are] several through each individual, because individual men do not have single vices, but commit sins — and several seem to be admitted by each one. And again, it is not to be thought that one spirit of fornication seduces him who (for example) fornicates in Britain, and him who [fornicates] in India and in other places; nor is there one spirit of wrath which drives diverse men in diverse places: but I think rather that there is one chief spirit of fornication, and countless [others] who obey him in this office; and, through each individual man, diverse spirits soldiering under that chief solicit them to sins of this kind. Similarly I judge that there is one chief spirit of wrath, and countless [others] acting under him, who kindle the sins of that vice through each individual man. Similarly, that there is one chief of avarice, so also of pride, and of the other evils. And therefore not one principality is spoken of by the Apostle among the contrary powers, but several, against whom he writes that there is a battle for himself and for all of us. Nevertheless, I think that there is one chief of all — more eminent, as it were, in wickedness, and loftier in crime — who alone, as the Leader of all the chiefs and the master of the whole nefarious militia, harasses the whole world (which those [demons] each solicit to sins, part by part, through the [various] kinds of sins)."* The same [Origen] also [says] many [things] on

[running head: Iosuæ.]

this book, homilies 12 and 14; and Cassian, Conference 5, from chapter 16 — concerning which [see] elsewhere.

THIRDLY: A Leader and Commander is most necessary in every war. For [the war is] military — as Curtius (book 10) and Quintilian (book 5) said: *"Without a Leader, [what is] a crowd, but a body without a spirit; or*

oarsmen without any helmsman?" And that [Leader], indeed, ought not to be just anyone, but an outstanding and warlike man — because, as Florus judged (book 2, chapter 18), *"an army is worth as much as its Commander"*; and, from the mind of a great warrior: *"an army of stags is better with a Lion as Leader, than [an army] of Lions with a Stag as leader."* And that he be outstanding and warlike, the masters of the military art require these FIVE [things] in him. FIRST: experience and skill in [the art of] war itself, as to all doubtful and favorable circumstances. SECONDLY: virtue of body and mind — but of this [latter] more — [such] that he can declare of himself, among his own men, that [saying] from Livy, book 7: *"My deeds, not my words, [do] I wish you to follow, soldiers; nor to seek from me discipline only, but also example." "A Leader,"* says Ferrandus (rule 2), *"is [so called] because he leads"* — so that, as in a mirror, the soldiers may see in him what faith, abstinence, continence, probity, innocence, and endurance of labors they may follow. *"How great in innocence,"* says the Manilian [oration] of Tully [Cicero], *"ought Commanders to be? with how great humility?"* Utterly false, and unworthy of a Philosopher, [is] that saying of Seneca (book 4 On Benefits, chapter 37): *"No one can at the same time play both a good man and a good leader."* THIRDLY: foresight, that he do nothing overhastily or fiercely, [and] rashly cast neither himself nor his own men into any danger. For truly, in Plutarch, someone said: *"In war it is not [permitted] to err twice."* FOURTHLY: felicity [good fortune] — which is generally the companion of counsel and reason, but so [understood] that it be firmly held to depend on God, and be sought from him in every assault or defense. For that [felicity], as Tully says in the same place, no one can furnish from himself. FIFTHLY: authority. For, as the same Orator says, it greatly pertains to the waging of wars, what the enemies, and what the allies, think of the Commanders. Now all these [qualities] — in whom were they ever more compactly, more fully, and more perfectly [gathered] than in him whom Joshua signified: our Lord and Savior JESUS CHRIST? Who is more knowing than he of all the things which pertain to his soldiers, to the enemies, and finally to that whole [war]? Was not he too engaged in the camp from boyhood? [did he not] frequently join battle in the line with the enemies? [Is he] not master of the full measures of all the virtues in himself, and — without any hyperbole — most absolutely [master] of the most absolute? [Is he] not so provident of all circumstances, and did he not always hate, condemn, and cut away — in himself and in his own — all rashness, audacity, and the desire of vain glory (which most frequently drives puffed-up and reckless minds into the uncertainties of dangers)? And in his hand — [is] not felicity itself? [Is he] not always victor, never vanquished? And hence, as from a fountain, [comes] his glory and authority — as great as all nations and tongues confess. At his name the enemies dread and tremble; but by it the soldiers are raised up, and inspired with an unknown vigor — as was shown in book 1, chapter 2. This one, therefore, [is] our Leader and Commander against all the nations [that come] from the depth of Acheron [hell]: upon him we must gaze assiduously; him we must always follow, energetically and diligently.

(col. 733)

[running head: caput VI.]

"When, bearing his javelin in his hand, [the Leader] goes panting before [his men]" — bearing [it], I say, and carrying the wood of his own cross, *"— and shows [them] how to endure labors."* He does not [merely] command. So below, chapter 8, verse 10: *"Joshua went up with the elders, in the front of the army." "Arm yourselves also,"* says St Peter (1st Epistle, chapter 4, verse 1) — [Christ] having suffered in the flesh — *"with the same thought."* And St Paul, Hebrews 12, verse 1: *"Laying aside every weight, and the sin that surrounds us, let us run to the contest set before us, looking upon the author and consummator of faith, JESUS, who, for the joy set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame."* Concerning which St Chrysostom, homily 13 on Philippians: *"Nothing,"* he says, *"is so contrary and alien to a Christian as to seek rest and leisure; nothing so alien to our perfection, and to the militia to which we have given our name, as to be fixed upon the present life. Thy Lord was driven to the cross, and dost thou seek rest? Thy Lord was fastened with nails, and dost thou take thy delights? Is this [the mark] of noble soldiers?"* And St Augustine,

on Psalm 26 and 29, and in the first sermon on Psalm 30. Origen, in [his] twelfth homily on this book — where there is, as it were, a summary of the [things] which I have said concerning our Leader, the causes of the war, and the enemies: *"If,"* he says, *"the [things] which through Moses were shadowed forth concerning the tabernacle, or the sacrifices, and all that worship, are said to be a type and shadow of heavenly [things], without doubt the wars too which are waged through Jesus [Joshua], and the slaughters of Kings and enemies, are to be said to be a shadow and type of heavenly [things] — [namely] of those wars which our Lord Jesus, with his army, and [his] magistrates, and the peoples of believers, and their*

[running head: caput VI.]

leaders, wages against the devil and his angels. For it is he [Jesus] who, in Paul and in the Ephesians, fights against the principalities and powers, and the rulers of these darknesses, against the spiritual [powers] of wickedness in the heavenly places. And see, O ungrateful heretic, how entirely the new [things] agree with the old. To the ancients was promised the kingdom of the holy land, a land flowing with milk and honey — which land was then held by sinners, and by most wicked inhabitants and kings. Jesus [Joshua] came into that land with the army of the Lord and the Israelite leaders; he stormed all; he slew; he took possession; and, for the merit of victory, he received the kingdoms of those whom he conquered. To thee, through the Gospels, are promised not the kingdoms of earth, but the kingdoms of heaven. But these kingdoms are not empty or void: they have their own inhabitants — sinners, and wicked spirits, apostate Angels. There dwell those against whom the Apostolic trumpet, sounding through Paul, exhorts thee to battle. And just as there Jesus [Joshua] said, 'there will be war for you against the Amorites, and Perizzites, and Hivites, and Jebusites,' so here too Paul announces to thee, saying: 'Our battle will not be against flesh and blood' — that is, we will not fight thus, as the Ancients fought; nor are battles to be waged by us on earth against men, but against the principalities, and against the powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world. Now indeed thou understandest in what places such contests are to be waged by thee."

The fourth manner, in the various wars, is various; and therefore [it is] rather to be observed henceforth in the individual [wars] — to which the pen now hastens.

2. ON JOSHUA'S FIVE WARS AGAINST THE CANAANITES, ONE BY ONE [singillatim].

THE FIRST WAR: THE WAR OF JERICHO [Primum Bellum Hierichuntinum].

Of the Wars: Caput VI

Caput VI (opening)

1. Now Jericho was close shut up and fenced, for fear of the children of Israel, and no man durst go out or come in. **2.** And the Lord said to Joshua: Behold I have given into thy hands Jericho, and the king thereof, and all the valiant men. **3.** Go round about the city, all ye men of war, once a day: so shall ye do for six days. **4.** And on the seventh day the priests shall take the seven trumpets, whose use is in the jubilee, and shall go before the ark of the covenant: and you shall go about the city seven times, and the priests shall sound the trumpets. **5.** And when the voice of the trumpet shall give a longer and broken tune, and shall sound in your ears, all the people shall shout together with a very great shout, and the walls of the city shall fall to the ground, and they shall enter in every one at the place against which they shall stand. **6.** Then Joshua the son of Nun called the priests, and said to them: Take the ark of the covenant: and let seven other priests take the seven trumpets of the jubilee, and march before the ark of the Lord. **7.** And he said to the people: Go, and compass the city, armed, marching before the ark of the Lord. **8.** And when Joshua had ended his words, and

(col. 735)

…the seven priests sounded the seven trumpets before the ark of the covenant of the Lord, **9.** And all the armed men went before, and the rest of the common people followed the ark, and the sound of the trumpets was heard on all sides. **10.** But Joshua had commanded the people, saying: You shall not shout, nor shall your voice be heard, nor any word go out of your mouth: until the day come wherein I shall say to you: Cry out, and shout. **11.** So the ark of the Lord went about the city once a day, and returning into the camp, abode there. **12.** And Joshua rising before day, the priests took the ark of the Lord, **13.** And seven of them the seven trumpets, whose use is in the jubilee: and they went before the ark of the Lord, walking and sounding the trumpets: and the armed men went before them, and the rest of the common people followed the ark, and they blew the trumpets. **14.** And they went round about the city the second day once, and returned into the camp. So they did six days. **15.** But the seventh day, rising up early, they went about the city, as it was ordered, seven times. **16.** And when in the seventh going about the priests sounded with the trumpets, Joshua said to all Israel: Shout: for the Lord hath delivered the city to you: **17.** And let this city be an anathema, and all things that are in it, to the Lord. Let only Rahab the harlot live, with all that are with her in the house: for she hid the messengers whom we sent. **18.** But beware ye lest you touch ought of those things that are forbidden, and you be guilty of transgression, and all the camp of Israel be under sin, and be troubled. **19.** But whatsoever gold or silver there shall be, or vessels of brass and iron, let it be consecrated to the Lord, laid up in his treasures. **20.** So all the people making a shout, and the trumpets sounding, when the voice and the sound thundered in the ears of the multitude, the walls forthwith fell down: and every man went up by the place that was over against him: and they took the city, **21.** And killed all that were in it, man and woman, young and old. The oxen also and the sheep and the asses they slew with the edge of the sword. **22.** But Joshua said to the two men that had been sent for spies: Go into the harlot's house, and bring her out, and all things that are hers, as you assured her by oath. **23.** And the young men went in and brought out Rahab, and her parents, her brethren also, and all her goods and her kindred, and made them to stay without the camp. **24.** But they burned the city, and all things that were therein; except the gold and silver, and vessels of brass and iron, which they consecrated into the treasury of the Lord. **25.** But Joshua saved Rahab the harlot, and her father's house, and all she had, and they dwelt in the midst of Israel until this present day: because she hid the messengers whom he had sent to spy out Jericho. **26.** At that time Joshua made an imprecation, saying: Cursed be the man before the Lord, that shall raise up and build the city of Jericho. In his firstborn may he lay the foundation thereof, and in the last of his children set up its gates. **27.** And the Lord was with Joshua, and his name was noised throughout all the land.

COMMENTARY.

This first war, of Jericho, is described in two ways [bifariam]. For, first, its outcome and manner is foretold to Joshua himself by the Angel, from verse 2 up to [verse] 6. Then, from that same verse 6, this first war is waged. And because in this chapter — as I said in the last question of the preceding chapter — that whole prediction is seen more clearly, I shall join it with this [chapter] in the exposition. Now there are chiefly four [things] to be considered in it. FIRST: the City, which [was] to be assaulted. SECOND: the assault itself. THIRD: the storming, as [the] victory. FOURTH: the two events either joined to this [war] or following it. And concerning the first, indeed, many [things] have already been sufficiently said at chapter 2, question 4; nevertheless one [point] is here handed down which pertains to the present state of the war — from which the first question is now to be begun.

Question I. What [was] the state of Jericho at [the time of] the war?

"Jericho," says the text, *"was shut up and fenced, for fear of the children of Israel; and no one durst go out or come in."* In which words three [things] are to be noted. FIRST: that for "shut up and fenced" [clausa & munita], there are in the Hebrew two participles, of which one [is] active, the other passive, thus: "Jericho was shutting [claudens] and shut [clausa]." But what [of] this? Some say [it] is a metonymy, in this sense: the citizens of Jericho had shut up the city, and held [it] shut. But surely the latter would differ little — or rather nothing — from the former in that manner;

and both would become active, and a figure [trope] is established in vain where the proper meaning of the words can conveniently be preserved. Finally, that the exposition might be probable, [it] nevertheless ought not to be foisted upon the text by the Interpreters Junius and Tremellius. Masius, however, interprets [it thus]: that [the city] had so shut in its own citizens and defenders that no one could go out at all; and had so been shut against the enemies that likewise no one could go in. The exposition agrees not inelegantly with the last clause of the text [v. 1], and rightly explains the force of the Hebrew words. Someone also thought that ["Jericho"] is called "shutting" [claudens] because it had fenced itself in with gates and sharp watches and guards; but "shut" [clausa] because it was besieged by the Israelites. For, as was said above,

(col. 737)

…is, [the Israelites'] camp was distant from it by only ten stadia; and those who are besieged are wont to be called "shut in" [*clausi*], as in Vegetius, book 4, ch. 12: *"If,"* he says, *"the first encounter is repelled by confident or by soldierly men, at once the boldness of the besieged [clausis] grows."* And in our own text, 2 Kings [4 Reg.] 25:2, *"the city was shut up,"* where the Hebrew has, *"it came into siege."* But properly the city had not been shut in by the Israelites, since it had not been surrounded on all sides; and for the men of Jericho, had they wished, an exit lay open toward the West and the South; and their camp was still far enough off. And therefore it rather seems that a description is given of what the city was doing of itself against the enemy, and in what state it held itself — such that the first participle, "shutting" [*claudens*], signifies what it was now doing. For we saw, in its chapter 2, that its gates lay open until evening. But now it keeps them shut always, by night and by day. Then it was itself both long since, and much most of all now, "shut" [*clausa*] — namely by the great strength of its walls, by the variety of its bulwarks, by the depth of its ditches, by the multitude and might of its soldiers and defenders, since the King kept himself within it, and the whole people of the neighboring countryside had withdrawn into it as into a most secure citadel. And this most firm manner of "shutting" is indicated by the Hebrew participle, which is in the *Piel* conjugation — the one called "strong" [*fortis*]. And therefore our translator [the Vulgate] rendered it "fortified" [*munitam*], following of course the Seventy [LXX], in whom it is Ἰεριχὼ συγκεκλεισμένη ἦν, καὶ ὠχυρωμένη [*Ierich■ synkekleismen■ ■n, kai ■chyr■men■*, "Jericho was shut up and fortified"]. For the fortifications [*munitiones*] and ὀχυρώματα [*ochyr■mata*, "strongholds"] of cities are walls, towers, ditches, ramparts, and many — or at least vigorous — defenders, as Vegetius pursues in the cited book from ch. 1. And the Chaldee

Thargum says: *Jericho was closed with iron doors, and barred with bronze bars.* Nor indeed is it to be doubted that all the other things which pertain to defense besides were present in fullest abundance — grain, water, salt, vinegar, pitch, incendiary oil, and arms of every kind. For Jericho was situated in the most excellent farmland, as was set out at ch. 2, q. 4; and that it abounded in gold and iron we shall hear afterward. What, moreover, that it was a royal city too? Some have handed down that it was so fortified that St. Ephrem believed it to have been surrounded by a sevenfold wall. For in vol. 3, in the oration on the sinful woman, he says: *I adjure thee by that holy power which, in the twinkling of an eye, broke down the seven walls of the city of Jericho.* But the context hands down nothing of the kind, nor Josephus, nor any others whom I know, none at all. And although Josephus, and the Seventy at verses 5 and 20, and our translator use the plural number "walls," yet they do not on that account mean that there were several — as is plain from the most common everyday speech, when we call cities "girded with walls" [*muris cinctas*] which have only a single one, and that sometimes not very thick or strong. And the Hebrew here always set down the singular noun "wall." We read of the very broad and vast ramparts of Babylon in Herodotus book 1, Diodorus book 2, Propertius book 3; of the double walls of Saguntum too in Livy book 30; of Tyre in Diodorus book 17; of Jerusalem, 2 Kings [4 Reg.] 25:4; of other cities, in whose wall there is now ruin and calamity, in Vegetius book 4, ch. 14. But who has heard of a sevenfold wall of any city or citadel? When the Poet [Virgil] wished, in *Aeneid* 6, to signify the most tightly shut Stygian prison, yet he said no more than: *Broad ramparts thou seest, girt with a threefold wall.* [*Moenia lata vides triplici circumdata muro,* Aen. 6.549.] To me it seems that the whole slight conjecture was drawn from this — that the Israelites went round for seven days, and on the seventh day seven times, as is said afterward — or that he said "seven walls" for "most firm ones," in that manner in which the number seven is sometimes taken for "much" in the Scriptures, as I noted at 1 Samuel [1 Reg.] ch. 2.

A second thing is to be noted: that "the fear of the children of Israel" is omitted in the Seventy — either because it dropped out of the text, or because it is easily understood from the present danger. This is also the cause that moved the [Vulgate] Interpreter so to render what is in the Hebrew, *"from before the face of the children of Israel."* And the Innovators [*Novatores*] Junius and Tremellius, imitating this, translate: *"for fear of the children of Israel."*

A third thing: when it is said that *"no one could go out or come in,"* it is not merely signified that the city's gates were shut, but also that keen guards and watches were everywhere posted, so that it was permitted to no one, neither openly nor secretly, neither for battle nor for flight, nor for parley or for making peace, to enter or go out. Whence the Chaldee Thargum: *there was none who might go out of it to fight, nor who might come in to make terms of peace, or to sue for peace.* And because all these things were done on account of the children of Israel, our Interpreter used the verb "to dare": *No one dared to go out or come in.*

Question II. By what plan was Jericho to be assaulted?

[so corrected; the 1610 original misprints the number as "VII"]

[*"VII" so printed, but a misprint for "II"* — this is the second of the Jericho little-questions (the first being QVAESTIVNCVLA I above, col. 735; the next, QVÆSTIO III, follows correctly on col. 739). Serarius himself back-refers to the present question as "q. 2" on col. 739.]

Wholly unheard-of was the assault of this city. But it was prescribed by that very One, through His Angel, at verses 2, 3, 4, and 5 — who alone does wondrous things. **First:** the camp was not moved nearer to the city from Gilgal, although some have supposed otherwise, since there is neither trace nor cause of any such advance. **Then:** for seven days the approach to the city had to be made daily, close up from the camp — namely up to the point where they would be safe from the darts and missiles which the enemy could hurl from the walls. **Third:** on those same seven days the Israelites went all round about the whole city, and returned into their own camp, verse 11. **Fourth:** this order was kept — that in the first place the column of

armed men should march; in the second, seven priests sounding seven trumpets; in the third, the ark itself, borne on the shoulders of other priests; **fourth**, the rest of the multitude, verses 9 and 13. **Fifth:** this method was employed. **First**, that on the six former days they should go round the city only once, but on the seventh day seven times. **Then**, that on those same six former days the utmost silence should be kept by all, except by those seven priests who had to blow the blast of the trumpets, verse 10. The same had to be observed most carefully in all the circuits of the seventh day too; but when these were completed, at once and by all a most vehement shout was raised, verses 5 and 16. **Third**, that this halt and shout was not to be made at once at the will of any individual, but when a fixed signal was given by the Commander, verses 5, 10, 16. **Sixth:** the time of all the circuits was before noon, that is, in the morning, verse 12. Who ever saw, read, or heard of such an assault upon any city, or even upon the smallest fort? *"Jericho,"* says St. Chrysostom, homily 23 on the Ephesians, *"the Israelites overthrew rather in the manner of those performing dances than of those waging war."* Or, as it is more elegantly in the Greek: τῶν χορευόντων μᾶλλον, ἢ τῶν πολεμούντων τὸ ὄμμα ἔχοντες ἐτροπώσαντο [*t■n choreuont■n mallon, ■ t■n polemount■n to omma echontes etrop■santo*, "having the bearing rather of dancers than of warriors, they routed it"].

(col. 739)

But some of these [points] must still be discussed a little.

Question III. What of the arrangement of those who go round Jericho in the first circuit?

Some of the Jewish Rabbis — Rashi — and, of ours, following him, Lyra and Vatablus, say that in the first rank there were warriors from only three tribes, Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, who had crossed the Jordan with Joshua, of whom it was spoken in ch. 1. But whence he hammers this out appears nowhere in the text; nay, clearly at v. 3 the Angel says: *"Go round the city, all ye men of war."* Were there warriors in those tribes alone? Were there not indeed far more in the others? From all the tribes, therefore, I judge that all who were fit to bear arms were present, and held the first place in the order — unless perhaps some had to be absent for guarding the camp and the baggage. For thus all could be said to have been present as warriors — not indeed as individuals, but the classes of individuals, that is, some from all the tribes; or rather it must be said that all and each from all the tribes were here. **First:** because the Lord willed this city to be assaulted not in the usual manner of wars, but, as we have already heard in q. 2, miraculously and almost in play, and by neglecting all military art — so that it ought to seem less wondrous if the camp was ordered to be left bare and undefended, and from it all the warriors flowed together to those "processions round the city" [*amburbalia*]. **Secondly:** God could easily do what he promised to those same Israelites in Exodus 34:24, when they should betake themselves for religion's sake to Jerusalem three times each year. *"No one,"* he says, *"shall lie in wait for thy land, when thou goest up and appearest in the sight of the Lord thy God thrice in the year."* **Thirdly:** thus the proper meaning of the words is not violated at all; and so Abulensis too pronounced before, at q. 3. But St. Ephrem, in the oration on the Forty Martyrs, makes mention of forty thousand. But what these things mean will be asked afterward. And among these [warriors], immediately before the seven priests sounding the trumpets, I place the Leader himself, Joshua.

Question IV. Of what kind were the trumpets of the seven priests?

The kinds of trumpets are wont to be variously distinguished. **First, by reason of form.** For they are either straight, or curved and bent. And so, *"the lituus,"* says Festus, *"is a kind of curved trumpet [buccina], with which whoever has sounded is called a liticen."* Ovid: *"Not the straight trumpet, not the curved horns of bronze."* [*Non tuba directi, non aeris cornua flexi*, Met. 1.98.] And Juvenal: *"the horn-blower [cornicen], whether here he had sounded upon the straight bronze."* **Secondly, by reason of material.** For [they are made] either of horn, or of some metal — for instance, silver or bronze — or of both. Of the first kind there

were formerly very many, whether they were the horns of oxen — as in Diodorus, κέρασι βοείοις ἐνσαλπίζειν [*kerasi boeiois ensalpizein*, "to sound the trumpet with ox-horns"] — or of rams, as Josephus (book 5, ch. 8) says Gideon's soldiers had in their hands κριῶν κέρα[τα] [*kri■n kerata*, "rams' horns"], or of other animals, as I shall say from Vegetius a little later. And these are most often called simply "horns" [*cornua*] — whence also "horn-blowers" [*cornicines*] are named — and "buccina," whence "to sound the buccina" and "buccinator." *"Horns,"* says Varro, *"which are now made of bronze, then were made of ox-horn." "Now within the walls the shepherd's buccina sings softly,"* says Propertius. And of these the use is not only in calling the cattle, but also in the night-watches among most of the cities and citadels of Germany, and for marking the hours. **To the second kind** belong those which in the Scriptures are called "beaten" [*ductiles*], Numbers 10:2, Psalm 97 — on which there are beautiful things, on that same Psalm, in D. Augustine, and on Psalm 32. To the same belong "the brazen and silver buccinae," which Josephus (book 3, ch. 11) says were invented by Moses, and are called in Hebrew ἀσώσρα [*as■sra* — Josephus's Graecized form], that is חצוצרה [*chatsotserah*, "trumpet"], Numbers 10, where the same matter is handed down at verses 2, 6, 9, and following. But the description of these, from their form and material, is read in the same Josephus in the same place; it runs thus: *"In length it is a little short of a cubit; the tube is narrow, a little thicker than a flute [aulos], providing a width sufficient at the mouth for the reception of breath, ending in a bell [k■d■n] much like the [war-]trumpets."* [Βυκάνη μῆκος μὲν ἔχει πηχυαῖον ὀλίγῳ λεῖπον, στενὴ δὲ σῦριγξ αὐλοῦ βραχὺ παχυτέρα, παρέχουσα δὲ εὖρος ἀρκοῦν ἐπὶ τῷ στόματι πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν πνεύματος, εἰς κώδωνα ταῖς σάλπιγξι παραπλησίως τελῶν.] **To the third** [kind] pertains that verse of Propertius: *"And he fashioned the querulous trumpets, hoarse through bones."* For in Artemidorus (book 1, ch. 58) a trumpet is composed of bronze and bone; and in Vegetius (book 3, ch. 5) a horn from wild oxen [*uri*] is bound with silver. **Thirdly, by reason of use:** some are of gathering [τῆς συλλογῆς] or of calling-together [ἀνακλήσεως] or of summoning [παρακλήσεως], others of breaking-camp [τῆς ἀναζεύξεως] — that is, some summoning, or sounding the call-to-arms [*classicum*], others signifying departure. For *"the buccina compelled the men of old, the Quirites, to the assembly,"* in Propertius; and *"the call-to-arms sounded with the curved horn,"* in Seneca's *Oedipus*. And both uses you have in writing in Numbers 10, and in Josephus at the place cited. For when it was sounded with two trumpets, the whole multitude was summoned to the door of the tabernacle; when with one only, the princes alone. And thus it must be taken from the Hebrew and the Seventy, and likewise from Josephus (book 3, ch. 11), what our Interpreter there says at v. 3, *"to sound the trumpets,"* and at v. 4, *"to sound once."* Again, some are warlike [*bellicae*], concerning which Numbers 10:9, 1 Corinthians 14:8; others funereal [*funebres*], concerning which Hyginus (fable 274), Propertius, Persius, Tertullian *On the Soldier's Crown*. Others of ostentation and hypocrisy [the compressed Latin: *ostent[atoriae], abundae & hypocritae*], concerning which CHRIST the Lord [speaks], Matthew 6:2. And again, some profane, others sacred, among the Gentiles — concerning which Varro thus: *"It is called Tubilustrum because on that day the trumpets of the sacred rites are purified [lustrantur]";* Festus: *"the Armilustrum, a festival, in which armed men performed divine rites, and while they sacrificed, sounded the trumpets."* Calpurnius, in the *Eclogues: "to sound the trumpets amid sacred rites, not amid wars."* So too, at the place cited, Artemidorus. But among the Jews, while burnt-offerings and sacrifices were offered — especially the Eucharistic [thank-offering], Numbers 10:10 — either ordinarily, as at the solemnities, Deuteronomy 16, verses 11 and 14; at the New Moons, Nehemiah 8:10, Isaiah 66:23; or extraordinarily, Psalms 47, 117; 1 Maccabees 4:59; at the dedication of Solomon's temple, 2 Chronicles [Paralip.] 5, verses 12 and 13, ch. 7, verse 6; in the restoration of divine worship under Hezekiah [*Ezechiana*], the same book, ch. 29, verse 27; in the bringing-up of the ark, in this very Joshua ch. 6, and 1 Chronicles [Paralip.] 13, verse 8, ch. 15, verse 14. Nay, that the New Moons [*Neomeniae*] were wont to be announced by the blast of trumpets, Philo teaches in the book *On the Ten Words* [On the Decalogue], thus: *"They signal the sacred new-moon festival with a trumpet."* [Τὴν ἱερομηνίαν σάλπιγγι ὑποσημαίνουσι.] Which is also wont to be handed down of the first day of the month Tishri — which in Leviticus 23 is called in the Hebrew "a memorial of the shout" [*memoriale vociferationis*], in the Seventy "a memorial," or "the

feast of trumpets"; and concerning the Jubilee year a clear precept is given, Leviticus 25, verse 9, where in Hebrew it is said once: *"You shall cause the trumpet of the shout [jubilee-blast] to pass through in the [seventh] mon-…"*

(col. 741)

…in the seventh [month]; and again [Leviticus 25:9]: *"In the tenth of the month, on the day of ha[k]kippurim* [the Atonement] *or of propitiation, you shall cause the trumpet to pass through all your land."*

Fourthly, by reason of the men who blow the trumpets themselves. And thus they are either of slaves or of freemen, as in Artemidorus at the place cited and in Dio, book 57; and again, of either profane or sacred men — for instance, of priests. And thus by Suidas it is called σάλπιγξ ἱερατικὸν ὄργανον [*salpinx hieratikon organon*, "the trumpet, a priestly instrument"]. So by Eustathius (Iliad 10), by reason of those who either invented or used them, the trumpet is called Minervan, Egyptian, Gallic, Paphlagonian, Median, Tyrrhenian; and to these such kinds could be added — as the Mosaic trumpet, if Josephus is to be trusted (book 3, ch. 11), as seen above; and the Roman, Greek, German, and others.

Fifthly, by reason of sound, which is either glad or mournful — even, or else varied, broken, and clipped. And that [broken sound] is called among the Hebrews simply *theka* [תקע], as if you should say a fixed and least-varied sound; for תקע [*taqa*■] means "to fix." But that broken sound is *therouah* [תרועה] — in Oleaster on Leviticus 25, and in Masius f. 104, "a crash." For רוע [*rua*■], as in voice so in signification, has a certain affinity with the verb רעע [*ra*■*a*■], which is "to break," most common in the Chaldee tongue, as at Deuteronomy 28:33 — which makes it from the Hebrew רעע, substituting, in its usual manner, [one letter for another]. This same varied and broken sound the Seventy call (Numbers 10) a σημασία [*s*■*masia*, "signal-blast"]; but the other, steady one, οὐ σημασίαν ["not a signal-blast"]. But our Interpreter renders the former, in the same place, "prolonged" and "clipped" at verse 5, and "howling" [*ululatum*] at verse 6; but the latter, at verse 1, a "simple blast" and "not brokenly howling." I say, therefore:

1. That these seven priests' trumpets were of the kind whose use was in the proclamation of the jubilee years, as was said above from Leviticus 25:9. For here in the Hebrew (vv. 4–5, ch. 13) they are called *tuba haiobelim* [היובלים]; and in the same v. 4, *cornu haiobel* [היובל] — concerning which again later, q. 5.

2. That they were sacred: first, because they were blown in a sacred matter — namely in the Jubilee year — and by the priests; then, because, although in this chapter the Seventy several times omit that [word] "of the Jubilee," yet once they rendered it σάλπιγγας ἱερὰς [*salpingas hieras*, "sacred trumpets"] at v. 8.

3. That their blast on the several days and circuits is not expressly explained; but that after the last circuit the sound was longer and more clipped. For thus our translator renders v. 5, which in the Hebrew is v. 4: *"And it shall be, in the prolonging on the horn of jubilee."* But what was that protraction and length of the blast? To some it seems to have consisted in a certain slowness of the notes. For thus they render: *"when it shall sound drawn-out."* To others — as to Abulensis, after qq. 8, 10, 11 — in a length of time, namely that it should be sounded without interruption; and then, in the other circuits, it appears an interruption was frequently made, and almost one rule was observed, as the same Abulensis says. Others, in Masius f. 104, [make it] a middle and as it were mixed, tempered sound, from *thecouah* [תקועה] and *therouah* [תרועה]. The middle opinion pleases, especially since the Seventy said ἐντόνως σημαίνειν [*enton*■*s s*■*mainein*, "to signal with a sustained tone"].

[4. On the material.] But concerning the material of these same trumpets there is a small controversy. Isidore judges them to have been of bronze; Abulensis (qq. 7 and 8) of silver; Masius, Augustine Steuchus (on Numbers, last [chapter]), Ribera (book 5, *On the Temple*, ch. 24), and Cajetan, of horn. But whether of ram's or of ox's horn? Ox-horn is preferred by Masius, Ribera, Rutilius, Benzonius (book 1, *On the Jubilee*, ch. 4); ram's-horn by the others cited, with whom I hold the same view. **First:** because expressly at v. 4, in

Hebrew, it is קרן חיובל [*keren ha-yobel*], that is, "the horn of jubilee." **Secondly:** because in some Greek [versions] — for example in Symmachus and in the Royal [Bibles] — the seven priests take up τὰς κερατίνας [*tas keratinas*, "the horn-trumpets"]. It is well enough known that from that Hebrew, and the Greek κέρας, and the Latin *cornu*, come the modern French *corne*, the ancient form in Eustathius (at the place cited) *carnix* [κάρνιξ], the Syriac קרנא [*karna*] (1 Thessalonians 4), and the German *horn*. Josephus (book 3, ch. 1) says the priests, having gone before the ark, [were] ἐπὶ τὰ κέρασιν αὐτῶν σαλπίζοντας [*epi ta kerasin aut■n salpizontas*, "sounding upon their horns"]. **Thirdly:** because the Chaldee Paraphrast here (v. 6) renders it "trumpets of ram's horn." For [the Chaldee] makes it [so] from the Hebrew — at Exodus 29, Leviticus 15 — and here the noun דכר [*dikra*] and דיצא [Aramaic ram-words] stand for איל [*ayil*], i.e. "ram." **Fourthly:** thus think nearly all the Rabbis. **[Fifthly]:** in the same way, Psalm 97, "with the voice of the horn-trumpet [*tuba cornea*]." **Sixthly:** because Abulensis's two reasons are weak. (1) If these trumpets had been of horn, they would not have carried them with them from the wilderness, since there was nothing precious in them and they could have been made anywhere. (2) Because the war-trumpets of Numbers 10:9 are of silver — but these too are war-trumpets, since the city of Jericho was being assaulted. **To the first:** they could be carried from the wilderness, not because precious, but because once dedicated to sacred use; and they could also not be carried, but be prepared suddenly at Gilgal. **To the second:** it was indeed a war, but one waged rather in the manner of peace, as was said above, q. 2. **Seventhly:** against Masius there also avails the annual custom of ram's-horn [trumpets] at the beginning of the month Tishri, of which it was also said before; for if they can be used every year, why not also in the Jubilees? **Eighthly:** there is no reason why the Talmudists should not be thought to have learned from the ancient Jews in what manner, and with what trumpets, the Jubilee years were wont to be announced. **Ninthly:** it is added that the same Talmudists hand down the causes of these horns — in the tractate *On the Beginning of the Year* [Rosh Hashanah], ch. 11, and more copiously in *Bereshith Rabbah* — [causes] which strengthen and increase Christian piety. For, first, since Isaac was freed by a ram from most imminent death (Genesis 22), they say the memory of this benefit is rightly repeated, not only every year, but especially in that year in which liberty is restored to men bound and fettered by servitude, and to lands and houses — in the year, I say, of Jubilee. Secondly, they teach that by the ram's horns liberty was once to be given to the Israelites, and that the same is signified in the Jubilees. But what are these ram's horns, but [the horns] of that Ram who was silent before the shearer (Isaiah 53), who took away the sin of the world (John 1), who with the two horns of the cross butted and laid Satan low? **Tenthly:** Ribera and Benzonius seem also to use this reasoning — that those horns would be too cheap for what ought to be employed in so great a solemnity of the Jubilee. But in sacred things it is not the excellence of the material but of the use that commends a thing, as Tully [Cicero] also noted in book 2 *On the Laws*. Finally, in Masius's argument there is no force. *"Ram's horns,"* he says, *"are wholly solid; but a trumpet must be hollow, so that it can be blown."* Both these are true. But can things which are solid not be made hollow? Nay, they are made [so] daily; and that they were made [so] in Gideon's time Josephus told us before, and the feast of trumpets confirms it. Let it stand, then, that these trumpets were of horn, from ram's horns.

5. And this is the reason why our Interpreter calls them, in this chapter, "trumpets" [*tubae*] only twice, but "buccinae" very often — for although "buccina" seems to be the Greek βυκάνη [*bykan■*], yet this, as we saw above, is also of metal; and "tuba," "lituus," "buccina," and "cornu" are not…

(col. 743)

…the names are rarely confused; yet more properly they [the "cornua"] are from the horn of a buccina, as Saint Jerome teaches on Hosea ch. 5, [and] Lipsius, book 4 *On the [Roman] Militia*, dialogue 10, and book 5, dialogue 9.

Question V. What is Jobel [the Jubilee]?

First, indeed, the Seventy, as I said above, disguised this word *Iobel* in this chapter [Josh 6]; but in Leviticus 25 they usually translate it ἄφεσις [*aphesis*, "release, remission"]; and to them Aquila and Abenezra [Ibn Ezra] subscribe, and the Greek fathers Theodoret (q. 35 on Leviticus), Nazianzen (oration *On Pentecost*), and the Latin Rupert also (on Ezekiel, book 2, ch. 11; on Leviticus, book 2, ch. 41). "And this," says Benzonius at the place cited, "seems to me the true derivation." **Secondly.** Josephus (book 3, ch. 10): τῷ ἰωβήλῳ ἐλευθερίαν σημαίνει τοὔνομα [*t■ i■b■l■ eleutherian s■mainei tounoma*] — that is, "the name *Iobel* signifies liberty." **Thirdly,** of the Rabbis, Moses Gerundensis [Nachmanides] and Bahaia [Bachya] expound it as "approach" or "access," because in the Jubilee year a return to liberty and to the ancestral possessions lay open to everyone. **Fourthly.** The Chaldee Paraphrast, as was already noted in the previous question, turns it into "ram"; and to this opinion, as to a Rock, cleave the rest of the Jewish Rabbis, especially the Talmudists (at the place indicated in the previous question), where they hand down that the same notion of this same word exists among the Arabs too. **Fifthly.** Abulensis (q. 6 here): "*Iobel* in Hebrew," he says, "signifies horn or trumpet" (Leviticus 25 and on Ruth, q. 10); and so, on the same Leviticus passage, Rashi, Lyra, and — in his *Thesaurus* — Pagninus, where thus: "*Iobel*, that is, Jubilee, and a buccina of ram's horn; and it is of feminine gender among the Hebrews, as Leviticus 25:10, 'This *Iobel* shall be to you.'" **Sixthly.** Masius here says it is an ancient word, derived from the first inventor of music, who is called *Iubal* (Genesis 4:21); and that it signifies those tuneful sounds, great indeed, but rustic, hard, and rural, and as it were howling. **Seventhly.** The Venerable Bede (book *On the Tabernacle*) [says] it is "beginning" [*initium*], because liberty began at the beginning and threshold of the year. **Eighthly.** The same Bede (homily *On Pentecost*): "*Jubilaeus*," he says, "was ordered to be called 'changed' [*mutatus*], because slaves were changed from captivity into liberty," etc. **Ninthly.** Cajetan (on Leviticus 25): "*Iobel* is the land's sprout, and the year *Iobel* is interpreted 'the year of germination,' as being fruitful of the liberties of men and of lands." **Tenthly.** Benzonius, at the place cited, brings forward other derivations or significations, but which are either too inept in the Hebrew tongue, or are not according to the mind of the authors he cites. For what is more ridiculous than what John Baptist Paulianus handed down in his books to Pope Julius — that *Iobel* is interpreted "great God"? What more foreign to the mind of Eusebius in the *Chronicle* than that *Iobel* signifies "fiftieth"? What less thought-out by Gregory (book 1 on Job, ch. 9) and Bede (in the homily *On Pentecost*) than that by the word *Iobel* is signified "rest"? I say, therefore:

I. Among the Hebrews there is the verb *iobal* [יבל], which is read only in the *hiphil* conjugation; and the Rabbis say it signifies "to lead, to bring, to bring in"; and from it they derive four nouns. **(1)** *Iebul* [יבול], that is, "sprout and fruit" — Judges 6:4, Habakkuk 3:16, Job 20:28, Leviticus 26:4, Ezekiel 34:27, Psalm 66:6, Psalm 77:45, Psalm 85:13, Exodus 32:22. **(2)** *iubal* [יובל], that is, "a stream" — Isaiah 30:25, ch. 44:4. **(3)** *Iabbeleth* [יבלת], "a wart" or "pustule," as our [Vulgate] renders it, Leviticus 22:22. **(4)** *Iobel* [יובל], on account of which this whole disputation has now been undertaken. Concerning these, Oleaster (on Leviticus 25) thus: "These nouns, derived from that verb, seem to have no agreement with that [proposed] signification of it." And a little after: "I could have no conjecture toward hunting out the proper signification."

Secondly. Yet if we consider the use of this verb in the Scriptures, we shall see that it signifies, as was said, "to lead, to bring," but with a certain emphasis of joy and gladness, which is either in the one who leads, or in the one who is led, or in both. Jeremiah 31:9, where the Lord promises his people a happy and glad return from captivity: when he had said, "Rejoice in gladness, O Jacob," he added, "In weeping (which is wont to flow for joy) they shall come, and in mercy I will lead them back," or "in supplications." Psalm 44[45]:15, "They shall be led in gladness." Psalm 59[60], when David had said, "I will rejoice, and I will divide Shechem," and was singing his victories: "Who," he says, "will lead me (gladly, that is, and happily) into the fortified city?" Psalm 67[68]:29, "To thee the kings shall bring gifts" — with a glad and cheerful mind, of course, which makes all gifts much greater and more welcome, 2 Corinthians 9:7, [drawn] from the Greek [of] Proverbs ch. 22. So Psalm 75[76]:12, Psalm 107[108]:11, Zephaniah 3:10, Isaiah 18:7; but ch. 23:7, "They themselves shall lead" — namely the enemies, glad with victory and spoils — "Tyre (borne now not

by horses and chariot, but) walking on her own feet, far off, to go into exile." For in such [passages] the preposition is easily understood — "into" — especially since among the Hebrews "feet" are feminine, but the verb "they shall lead" masculine; for which the same sense our [Vulgate has]: "her own feet shall lead her far off, to go into exile," ch. 25. And "In peace you shall be led back." Hosea 10:6, "And he himself shall be led to Assur, that he may be a *minchah* [מנחה] or gift to the avenging king" — with that gladness of those leading, of which was said a little before, and which is wont to be in those who trust they will win some great favor with the king by a gift. And these are indeed all clear enough. But in some [passages], in which one might suppose there is no indication of any joy, four occur. **I.** Job 10:19, "Would that I had been consumed, that I had been as though I were not, carried from the womb to the tomb" — in Hebrew, "let me be led to the grave." **II.** Job 20[21]:30 and 32, "The wicked man is kept for the day of destruction, and shall be led to the day of wrath. He himself shall be led to the graves." **III.** Isaiah 53:7, "As a sheep he shall be led to the slaughter." **IV.** Jeremiah 11:19, "I am as a gentle lamb, that is borne to be the victim" — in Hebrew, "that shall be led." But truly joy is not absent even from these. For as to **I:** those who are in great evils long for death as a kind of good and glad thing. "Many," says Pliny in the proem of book 7, "have existed who judged it best not to be born, or to be destroyed as quickly as possible." As to **II:** those who shall lead these wicked, impious men to death and butchery will do it with great exultation — whether they be [the powers] who will drag them off to hell, [namely] the Demons, or the men themselves, or the enemies, or any others oppressed by them and stricken by some wrong; for not a few are wont to exult at the destruction of tyrants and of wicked men. As to **III:** CHRIST the Lord was led to the slaughter not simply, but with the monstrous joy of the Jews, while, [him] whom they pursued with such bitter hatred, and whom they had so often demanded for death, they now rejoiced to have seized…

(col. 745)

…they [the Jews] rejoiced [to have seized him], and triumphed over him by the cross granted by Pilate. Equal is the reason in [case] IV. For although the sheep that is to be slaughtered, while it is led to the shambles, may seem not to rejoice, yet the Butcher who is about to slaughter it does rejoice. It appears, therefore, that together with the "leading" there is in this word a notable and beautiful co-signification of joy.

Thirdly. But in the very nouns that flow from this verb, the same two can also be found — a "leading," namely, and a certain adjoined joy. For **first**, the sprouts and fruits are led forth from the earth itself, and they gladden men, and (whatever exists for men's sake) the beasts and cattle; whence someone once called the crops "glad" [*laetas segetes*]. **Secondly**, streams likewise are led from their mountains, springs, and gushings, and bring to the same no unequal joy — especially in Judaea, a dry and thirsty land. See with what longing and labor Isaac seeks wells (Genesis 26), and how he calls the name of one "Breadth" [*Latitudo*, Rehoboth], saying (v. 22): "Now the Lord has enlarged us, and made us grow upon the earth." See what Achsah, Caleb's daughter, asks of Caleb (Judges 1:15). **Thirdly**, in "warts" [*verrucae*] too there seems to be a metaphor, whence the likeness was drawn — that, as a sprout [is led] from the earth, so those [warts] are led out from the human body, so that they stand out on the outermost surface; just as in the Greek name too another likeness is regarded, when they are called *achrocordones*, *thymia*, and *myrmeciae* (whence, in the cited Leviticus passage, in the 70, μυρμηκῶντα [*myrm■k■nta*]), concerning which [see] Paul of Aegina (book 4, ch. 15), Celsus (book 5, last ch.). And perhaps at first there is some itching, which is indeed scratched pleasantly, but ends in warts — as there is a Jewish proverb about the itch: "widely and pleasantly are five dogs set upon a hare, which, however, once caught, is wretchedly handled." For here the hare is the itch of the scab; and the five [things] — the fingers of the hand with which one scratches oneself — are those hunting dogs. Concerning *Iobel*, it follows.

Fourthly. It seems *Iobel* can be taken in two ways. **First**, as the participle of the verb *iobal*, and then it would be "leading with joy"; yet no one asserts this. **Secondly**, as a substantive — and this all teach with one mouth — and it seems to signify a word indicative of joy, which leads to glad persons or to glad things, or is

led forth from a glad heart, whether that sound be vocal [*assa vox*] or instrumental. For [firstly] in this signification is preserved the analogy that has been set out thus far. **Secondly**, hence seems to have arisen the Latin *iubilum*, of which Silius Italicus: "And on the broad rocks the Cyclops heard the jubilations"; also the verb "to jubilate," which Varro (book 5) and Festus say is a word of country folk — just as *quiritatus* is of townsfolk, because *quiritare* is "to call the Quirites." Beautifully the divine Augustine, on Psalm 65[66]: "What is 'Jubilate'? Break forth into a voice of joys, if you cannot [into a voice] of words. For one does not jubilate with words, but only the sound of those rejoicing is rendered — as if the joy of a heart in travail and giving birth [is poured out] into the voice of a thing conceived, which cannot be explained in words." And on Psalm 94[95]: "What is to jubilate? That joy cannot be explained in words, and yet is testified by the voice — [that joy] which is conceived in the heart and cannot be explained in words. This is to jubilate." **Thirdly**, in the Septuagint (Leviticus 25) it is often σημασία τῆς ἀφέσεως [*s■masia t■s aphese■s*, "a signal of release"], or τὸ ἔτος τῆς ἀφέσεως σημασίας ["the year of the signal of release"]. **Fourthly**, the affinity of the name with *iobab*, and its antithesis with *obal* [אבל, "mourning"]. **Fifthly**, this signification rightly explains all the Scriptures. For *iobel* in those [passages] is read in two ways: either so that it is openly governed by another substantive, or so that it appears placed absolutely. In the former way it is said at Leviticus 25:12, 13, 28, 53, 54, "the year of *iobel*," and in this ch. 6, those [phrases] cited in the previous question — namely "the trumpet of *iobel*" or "*iobelim*." In the latter way, here at vv. 10 and 11 it is *iobel*; likewise at v. 15, "after *iobel*"; at v. 28, "he shall go out in *iobel*"; and likewise at vv. 30, 31, 33. But what do those [passages] signify, other than "the year of jubilation," "the trumpets of the jubilee or of the jubilees"? For that year led to liberty and the recovery of possessions — things indeed most desired and most joyful — and it was announced by the glad sound of buccinae throughout the whole land of the Israelites. The same is the reason of the Jericho buccinae, as will be said below. But when it seems to be placed absolutely, "year" is always understood — as seems to appear well enough at v. 10, where must be repeated what was placed a little before, *schanoth* [שנת, "the year of"]; and because this [word] is of feminine gender, Pagninus was deluded about the gender of *Iobel*, as was said above. It appears from this too, that "to go out in *iobel*" is expressed at v. 54 by "to go out in the year of *iobel*"; and [because] it would be ridiculous to say that someone "goes out in a ram's horn," or in some similar thing which *iobel* is said to signify. Or else, certainly, by metonymy, the very year is called *iobel* or *iubilum*, because it is announced to those jubilating with buccinae — since with glad blasts it leads to those good things which have been mentioned; in that manner, namely, in which it is said in the old Greek proverb, "the year fructifies, not the field." And so, at the place cited, Josephus says: καλεῖ δ' ὑπὸ Ἑβραίων ὁ πεντηκοστός· ἐνιαυτὸς ἰώβηλος [*"by the Hebrews the fiftieth is called… the year iobel"*]. **Sixthly.** By this name too the said signification can be admitted, because it indicates the course and, as it were, the manner by which, through some trope, *iobel* can signify almost all the more famous things which, at the beginning of the question, so many interpretations were saying [it meant]. For — to run briefly through them one by one — ἄφεσις [*aphesis*], that is, "remission and liberty," is that to which this year gladly leads, [and] which the jubilation of the trumpets announces. Why, then, could not *iobel* be said to signify these things too?

Hence Josephus too seems to have drawn his [ἐλευθερίαν, "liberty"], because in Leviticus 25 in Hebrew *deror* [דרור] is written at v. 10, and our Interpreter says, "thou shalt call remission to all the inhabitants of thy land," just as the 70 [have] διαβοήσετε ἄφεσιν ["you shall proclaim release"]. So the very return to liberty after the post-liminium is a *iubilum*. So the ram — by reason of that old deed by which it freed Isaac (Genesis 22), and by reason of the horns by which one jubilates — the very horns and trumpets [are called *iobel*]. Nor did Masius conjecture badly about the signification of this word from *Iubal*, the author of musical instruments. For since Cain's offspring, wholly poured out into this world's joys and pleasures (Genesis 5:19 and ch. 6:2), gladly imposed on their children names that would be, as it were, auguries and omens of future gladness — the Lord sweetly ordering these their wishes, and sometimes fittingly [matching them] to future events — since therefore *iabal* had the signification that was mentioned, Lamech called one of his sons by

Adah [Hadama] his wife *Iabal* (or, as our [Vulgate] and the 70 write, *Iabel*); and he was the inventor of tents and of cattle-keeping, and therefore also [the father] of the songs and jubilations of country folk, of which was said before from Varro. But the other [son], who [was master] of the mirth and jubilation of harps and organs, ma-… [*The Lamech/Jabal/Jubal narrative is Genesis 4:19–21.*]

(col. 747)

…[the other son, who] was the first master [of harps and organs], that same *Iubal* named. So that, although *iobel* is not [derived] from *iubal*, yet all these nouns are shown to have proceeded from the ancient signification of this word. Bede I pass over; and Cajetan I praise, because he saw the affinity of this year and of the earth's fruits — although he less [fully] set out the cause whence this affinity in the thing and in the word arose; which [affinity], unless something deceives me, is clear enough from what has just been said.

Question VI. Whether "Jubilaeus" is rightly derived from "iobel"?

The Theologian who performs his office well is a debtor to Greeks and Barbarians, to the wise and the foolish, to Philosophers and Grammarians. And therefore various [matters] must be handled by him from time to time, even with his own labor and trouble — especially at this time, when the heretics catch at every handle for carping at and plucking at either the ancient fathers or the Church, and some Catholics too easily lend their ears to the words of certain word-artificers [*Logodaedali*]. There are, then, two [reasons] on account of which some think that *iubilaeum* is not rightly said from *iobel*. For, first, from "o" an "u" is not rightly made in the first syllable; then, in the second, an "i" is not rightly made from "e"; and therefore one should rather say *iobelaeum*, or, with at least one error, *iobilaeum*. So argue and write Eugubinus (on Leviticus 25 and Numbers 37), John Baptist Paulianus (in the book *On the Jubilee*), Sabellicus (*Ennead* 3), Polydore [Vergil] (book 8, *On Invention*), Cajetan (on Leviticus 25), Antonius Cordubensis (book 5, *On Indulgences*, q. 11), Victorius (in the Hieronymian Index), and finally Navarrus (in the commentary *On the Jubilee*, and on the Canon *"Siquis aliquando,"* § *"in Leviticum," On Penance*, first distinction) — although it is strange to want to fetch this Latin word from the Hebrews, yet to deny the thing itself; for he [Navarrus] denies that our Jubilee year has anything in common with the Israelite one. I say briefly: **first**, that *iubilaeus* is rightly derived and said from *iobel*. **1.** because it is most well known to all who have tasted the Greek and Hebrew tongue even with the tips of their lips, that the two vowels about whose permutation the quarrel here is — "e" & "i", "u" & "o" — are very frequently interchanged among themselves, both when they are transferred to another language, and in the same language too. The examples are six hundredfold; but, that I may not wander far afield: in the passage about Lamech cited in the previous question (Genesis 4:19), "Sella" [Zillah] stands in our text and the Greek, but in the Hebrew "Silla" (v. 22); her son, in the Hebrew and our [Vulgate], is "Tubalcain," but in the 70, in Greek, "Θόβελ" [*Thobel*]. And what is more usual today among them, even in Greece itself, [than] for the Greeks — as I have very often heard from them — to pronounce the Greek "u" [upsilon] as "i"? So that hence Josephus's ἰώβηλος [*i■b■los*] is pronounced "iobilos." What in the German tongue? Is not "e" pronounced for "i," and the reverse, by very many, according to the variety of dialects? In the Ripuarian Law, Count Nuenarius (I, *On the Franks*) notes that *fredum* is read for "peace," which today is *frid*, whence also "Frederici" [Frederick]. **2.** because our elders — among whom this word began to be used in the Church — so judged. For in the author of the book *On the Sacrament* in [pseudo-]Cyprian, and in our [Vulgate] interpreter, it is always *Iubilaeus*; whence in D. Jerome it seems, by the mere arbitrary choice of copyists, that today *iobilaeum* is read (Galatians 1; Epistle 125 to Damasus, q. 1; Epistle 127). **3.** So all expositors and Popes hitherto — as St. Gregory (book 1 on Job, ch. 6) and others — wherever they name or announce the jubilee years. **4.** So *iubilum*, as I said above, the Latins said. **5.** So too some of the more recent [scholars] — most fond of novelties, and most zealous for the Latin tongue and for correct pronunciation — as Scaliger (*On the Emendation of the Times*, book 7, f. 737) often; and at last he says: "The rest of the Jubilee-matters are fabrications." I would add Beza too (2 Thessalonians 2:4), had he

not, with sycophantic slanders, added "in that jubilee-year, as they call it." **6.** the Christian German peoples approve the same word in their vernacular tongues, when they say *iubeliar*, and the French *iubilet*.

Secondly. I say, however, that those who say *iobel*, or *iobelaeum*, or *iobilaeum* do not seem to be blamed either; because thus, perhaps, it was their purpose to point the finger at the origin of this word, lest it perish. And so I too sometimes do. **Thirdly.** Yet it is more convenient to follow the common usage of the Church — meanwhile by no means denying or spurning the etymology — as Cicero advises in his *Orator*; and, on [the preface to] Galatians, the divine Jerome: "If those," he says, "who are accustomed to read the eloquent [authors] of the age begin to mock us for the novelty and cheapness of [our] speech, let us send them to Cicero's books which are prefaced *'On the Questions of Philosophy,'* and let them see by how great a necessity he was compelled to bring forth such portents of words as the ear of no Latin man ever heard — and this, when he was translating from the Greek, which is a neighboring tongue, into ours. What, [then,] do those suffer who try to express the properties [of things] out of the Hebrew difficulties? And yet far fewer [words] that sound of novelty are in such great volumes of the Scriptures than those which he [Cicero] heaped up in a small work."

Question VII. Whether, at the time of the siege of Jericho, the Jubilee years had already begun?

Because the Lord here commands that [the trumpets] be sounded with "the buccinae of the Jubilees," someone might suppose, not without reason, that the jubilee years had already been received into use and custom. But it is not so: because, from the precept given about them, XL [forty] years had not yet elapsed, much less L [fifty], as appeared above (chs. 3 & 4). The "trumpets of the Jubilees," therefore, are here to be understood — not [trumpets] of which there had already been any use in their [the Jubilees'] proclamation, but such as ought to be [used] when the longed-for time of that kind should have come — whether some [Jubilees] had already been held, or were only now being held; and again, whether the same in number were afterward employed, or not, but others quite like these. But concerning the time when the first Jubilee began, more in its place afterward, where the division of the land will have been treated in general (qq. 14 & 15).

Question VIII. Why did the Lord will that, in the siege of Jericho, [the trumpets] be sounded with such Jubilee-buccinae?

The Lord did not will that the jubilee-buccinae then be sounded because it was the beginning of a jubilee year. But: **First**, that he might show that the Jericho…

(col. 749)

…[the Jericho] war would bring the Israelites no sadness, but very much joy and gladness. **Secondly**, that they might understand they were now being restored into the inheritance once promised, and into the land held by unjust invaders. **Thirdly**, just as in the jubilee year the fruits which the untilled earth yields are common to all — and the rich man plucks no more of them for himself than the poor man and the beggar — so in the Jericho victory the powerful, the strong, and the wealthy claims for himself no greater share than any poor wretch, weak and needy. The whole victory is to be ascribed to God: there was no human labor, no battle, no blood, and no sweat. **Fourthly**, the jubilee-buccinae were cheap, if we regard the material — of ram's horn, namely, as was said above (q. 4); horns, in which [is there] anything splendid or rare? Yet these God chose above all the silver and splendid trumpets — willing that by their sounding the men of Jericho be brought into admiration and stupor, and the whole city at last be shaken; [willing that it] be stormed and taken, not without great mysteries indeed. "For see," says the Apostle (1 Corinthians 1:26), "your calling, brethren: that [there are] not many wise according to the flesh, not many powerful, not many noble; but the foolish things of the world God has chosen, that he may confound the wise; and the weak things of the world

God has chosen, that he may confound the strong; and the base things of the world, and the contemptible, God has chosen, and the things that are not, that he might bring to nought the things that are: that no flesh should glory in his sight."

Who [but the Apostles] utterly stupefied, struck down, and overturned the whole globe of lands — one Jericho, as it were, most full of idols, of pleasures, and of all crimes — by their voice and their clangor? Were they not little men, commended by no nation, no number, no praise of garments, wealth, or pedigrees? — but in appearance most abject and most contemptible, worn out with labors, hunger, thirst, heat, cold, and the utmost want of all things, and most wretched? They were horns — and ram's horns at that — which a small animal yields, a cheap shepherd supplies, [and] a lowly craftsman hollows and bores. O the counsels of God! O the power, which exerts itself through the most despicable instruments, and works such great and wondrous things! But of the mystical sound of these trumpets there will again be another place.

Question IX. How many, and which, priests carried the ark around Jericho? And whether their sides were bare of all protection?

On the first and second [points] that are asked, it must be said: that as many, and the same, priests carried the Lord's ark around Jericho as [those who] had carried it in the crossing of the Jordan. For no reason occurs for imagining bearers fewer, or more, or even other [than those]. It was said (ch. 3, part 2, q. 1) that those bearers were two, Eleazar and Ithamar. Let them, then, now be the same. But on the third [point] that is asked, Josephus's opinion (book 5, ch. 1) is that the sides of these priests were not bare of all protection. For, he says, τὴν κιβωτὸν οἱ ἱερεῖς φέροντες, περὶ αὐτὴν ἐν κύκλῳ μέρος τι τῶν ὁπλιτῶν φυ- -λάττον ἦν [*"the priests carrying the ark, around it in a circle a part of the armed men was guarding"*] — that is: the priests were carrying the ark, and around it in a circle was a part of the armed men, to guard it. And this indeed seems to have had to be done both from military discipline and from a certain pious religion. For so great a treasure, so great an honor and ornament of the Israelite people — ought it to have been left uncovered and unguarded in the enemy's sight? And God's priests — and they, indeed, the chief of all — around a hostile city, before the eyes and weapons of a hostile nation, ought they to have been hedged about and walled round by no guard? And did not religious devotion toward this sacred litter of the ark demand — if not for guarding, at least for honor's sake — a bodyguard to press close about it? These things seem to win some probability from Josephus's testimony, or at least to be such as would have persuaded him that it was so done. Yet because the text hands down that the warriors only went *before* the ark, and that none walked at its sides, I would not readily dare to side with Josephus. For at verse 7: "Go round the city, [ye] armed men, going before the ark of the Lord." And at verse 9 the whole army is said to have gone before. And at verse 13 the armed people [are said] to have gone before the priests. For although that word "all" is not in the Hebrew and the Greek, yet the very course of the narrative shows that all the armed [men] went before; and the 70 say τοὺς μαχίμους παραπορεύεσθε ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου [*"let the armed men march past before the Lord"*], or ἔμπροσθεν ["in front"]. You will object: in the 70, at verse 12, it is said καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσεπορεύοντο οἱ μάχιμοι [*"and after these the armed men went in"*]. I reply, first, that from this it is not gathered that the soldiers were at the ark's side, but rather behind it. Secondly, that not even this is rightly gathered; for that μετὰ ταῦτα here means "besides, moreover," so that the sense is: the priests took up the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and those seven priests who carried the seven trumpets went before the Lord, and, besides them, the warriors went in. For what is added, ὄπισθεν τῆς κιβωτοῦ ["behind the ark"], refers to the people, of whom [we shall speak] afterward. And therefore the Lord seems to have willed that the ark not be surrounded by a military guard, so that he might show the enemies could do nothing against him; or at least [he willed] that it was sufficiently covered and protected by those very warriors who went before it, if perchance any inroad or tumult should arise from the enemy. And great honor accrued to the ark by this very [fact] — that no one from the people dared approach it, not even at its side — especially since there was no necessity.

Question X. Whether, the warriors excepted, the rest of the multitude of the Israelites followed the ark?

Our text affirms it — as we saw above (q. 2) — at verses 9 and 13. But, first, certain of the Innovators press a dispute from the Hebrew *measseph* [מאסף], which some translate "the one gathering" [*congregantem*]. But Calvin: "who closed the column [rearguard]." "Thus," he says, "the marches were arranged, so that the greater part preceded the ark — which is understood [to mean] the armed men — but there should follow [those] who were wont to accompany the baggage; for it was their [task] to see that the rearmost column was not scattered." Because the term "gatherer" was obscure, I rendered what was more usual among the Latins. Junius and Tremellius always translate [it] "the rearmost line." Secondly, the Chaldee Paraphrast, at verses 9 and 13, and most of the Jews — as Rabbi Solomon [Rashi] — understand by *measseph*…

(col. 751)

…[understand by *measseph*] only the Danites, with the Asherites and Naphtalites; because by that very name they are called in the marching of the Israelite camp (Numbers 10:25). And Lyra agrees with these, and Masius (fol. 106). Josephus (book 5, ch. 1) seems only to say ἐπομένην χερσαίαν [*"the following land-column"*]. **Fourth**: if by that word the rest of the multitude were understood, it would have to be asked whether the whole crowd is to be understood — of all men, older or younger, who could bear arms, and of all women, boys, and girls. I, with Abulensis (q. 9), judge that the good interpretation of our text is to be adopted and retained. For, **first**, the 70 themselves also interpreted [it] twice similarly, ὁ λοιπὸς ὄχλος [*"the rest of the throng"*] — which manner of speaking of camps [Cassius] Dio also uses (book 47). **Secondly**, the Hebrew *measseph*, since [it is] a participle in *piel*, means "gathering, adding," and so it must necessarily be seen what it gathers, or to what it adds. And indeed, if we well consider the marching of the Israelite camps, they [the *measseph*] are not either baggage, or deserters, runaways, [or] laggards. For each tribe carried and led its own baggage; nor [was there] danger from runaways or deserters on that march; but if any were slower, they were urged on by the rear of their own tribe, and made to remain with it and to advance with it. For there was no weakling [among them], Psalm 104[105]:37. Those, therefore, who are called *meassephim* [מאספים], joined and gathered themselves to others — the following [to] the preceding, the rear [to] the front. And therefore in that [passage of] Numbers ch. 10 it is not simply said "Dan [is] *measseph*," but "*measseph lecol machenoth*" [מאסף לכל המחנות], that is, "adding to all the camps," or "gathering to all the camps" — which the 70 rendered ἔσχατοι πασῶν παρεμβολῶν [*eschatoi pas■n parembol■n*, "last of all the camps"], that is, "the rearmost of all the camps." And so there the camp of the Danites is compared with the camps of the other tribes. But here *measseph* is placed absolutely, to signify those Israelites who joined themselves to those [who], it was said, went before. Now those who went before were all the warriors of all the tribes (by the earlier question). The priests had gone before, some sounding trumpets, some carrying the ark. That, therefore, which was the remainder of the Israelites, and joined itself to these behind the ark, is here called *measseph* — but not the tribe of Dan alone, with the Asherites and Naphtalites; nay, not even any warriors of these (by the same q. 3), but, from these tribes and from all the others, the remaining multitude of the Israelite army — which in German we call *den übrigen Hauffen* [the rest of the crowd]. And it is confirmed **thirdly**, because in the march to the Jordan, through the Jordan, and after, that old order of the tribes and camps of proceeding was changed — [see] the second question, on the preparation of a certain part of the people, of chapter one.

But to the question that was put in the fourth place, the answer is not of one kind. Abulensis (in q. 9, and a little before) thinks that by the name of that "crowd" or "multitude following the ark" are understood those who by age and strength could indeed bear arms, but yet lacked them. Masius (fol. 105): the Danite, Asherite, and Naphtalite soldiers, as was said — but in such a way that, as regards the rest of the common people, it was left to anyone's will whether to follow the ark or remain in the camp. But all who were entered in the muster-rolls of the militia by age [are understood] here under the name of "the light-armed and

warriors," [and] I said (q. 3) that they were in the first rank. And therefore in the fourth rank I think there were boys and youths, girls, mothers and mothers-in-law, and every kind of crowd, which was not reckoned among the warriors — yet in such a way that, as Masius says, it was free to anyone of that crowd to be present at the circuits, or absent. For there is no precept about them here; but that it was done spontaneously by them is narrated at verses 9 and 13. You will say: at verse 7 it seems [to be] a precept: "Go, and go round the city." And in the Hebrew more clearly: "Pass over and surround the city; and let every light-armed man pass before the ark of the Lord." But it can be said that these words are explained by what follows, as the Latin signifies, when it adds "the armed going before."

Question XI. Whether in that last column of those following the ark there were priests, Levites, and some Egyptians?

It can be said in general that after the ark went the rest of the priests, the Levites, and the Egyptians who had gone out from Egypt with the Israelites (as was said, Exodus 12:38). For neither — as was already set out in the previous question — was it commanded or predetermined who ought to be in the last column, but it was placed in each one's choice. And who would doubt that from every rank, sex, and age of men very many flowed together? For a new thing was being done, unheard-of, and never seen since the founding of the world. To see it with one's own eyes, to be present at it in person — who [was] so stupid, or so removed from the human desire of knowing, as would not have wished [it]? The wondrous power of God, the wondrous manner of destroying the enemy and the enemy's cities, was to be displayed; deservedly the honor of God invited everyone to watch, and to go around the hostile walls — and [so did] each one's own advantage and pleasure. God's honor, indeed, in that his work is beheld openly, and he himself, both now and hereafter, should ever be praised by the remembrance of so great a marvel. One's own advantage, in that the mind was inflamed to the love and praise of God, and, at the very entrance upon the wars against the Canaanites, was strengthened against all dangers and fears. And pleasure, indeed, most sweet, was born from the knowledge of so admirable a thing and from a most delightful spectacle — which the frequent conversation among fellow-tribesmen and friends, before children and household, would nourish and wondrously increase, and the handing-down [of it] to posterity itself.

But specifically there is, first, some difficulty about the priests, from the 70, who say: καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ οὐραγοῦντες ὀπίσω τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῆς διαθήκης κυρίου σαλπίζοντες [*"and the priests bringing up the rear behind the ark of the covenant of the Lord, sounding [the trumpets]"*]. That the sense of which words might be grasped, one must know that οὐραγεῖν means either ὑστερίζειν [*hysterizein*, "to be in the rear"], as Hesychius explains — that is, "to be in the last [ranks]" — or τὴν οὐρὰν ἄγειν [*t■n ouran agein*, "to lead the tail"], as Eustathius and Suidas [say] from Xenophon, that is, "to bring up the last column." Whence he who so leads [it] is called οὐραγός [*ouragos*]: in Latin, by Lipsius (book 4, *On the [Roman] Militia*, ch. 10), *Vragus*; [and] (book 5, ch. 9) *Tergiductor* [rear-leader]. In the former way, it would be signified by the 70 that certain priests went in the last column behind the ark, and sounded the trumpets — which is now a confirmation of what I said at the beginning:

(col. 753)

…that [matter] of the trumpets will have its own question later. In the latter way [taking the priests as rear-guard] a double sense can be made. One, indeed: that the seven priests who went before the ark were themselves, as it were, the leaders of the rear column, before which their seven horns went sounding. And this sense would be easiest, without any question about the trumpets; but it would have to be understood as if it were τοὺς ὀπίσω [*tous opis■*, "those behind"], or as elsewhere sometimes happens — that from the verb itself a substantive be drawn out, which is as it were included in it — as οὐραγοῦντες [τὴν] οὐραγίαν τὴν ὀπίσω [*"rear-guarding the rear-part which is behind"*] etc.; that is, "leading those who [are] behind the ark," or "leading the last tail or column," which was at the rear of the ark. The other [sense]: that the priests indeed

were in the last part of those going round, but in such a way that in it they were the leaders of all the others whom that same part contained. And this sense seems quite consonant with the words, and therefore to be preferred to the rest; but that difficulty returns — indicated a little before, and to be explained a little later — about their trumpet-sounding. Perhaps also a distinction could be placed after "priests," thus: "and the priests" — namely, they went before the ark; afterward: οἱ οὐραγοῦντες [those bringing up the rear], i.e. the Israelites who were in the last column, were the ones sounding the trumpets. Secondly: that the Levites accompanied close behind these priests, at their back, is not difficultly understood from this — that, since they were not in the first column, and in the pitching of the camp the priests were always in the middle, between them [the Levites] and the ark, they now followed the ark only with priests interposed. Thirdly: after these followed the Israelites, whether elder or younger; then whatever there was of women, whether older or younger. Fourthly: I do not think the Egyptians had a proper and separate place from all the tribes, but that, by a certain fixed arrangement, they had long since been joined to them by Moses, and, as regards marches, military duties, and tents, were mingled [with them]; and so their boys, girls, and wives too were mixed in with the boys, girls, and wives of the Israelites.

Question XII. Whether in that same last column, besides the seven priests before the ark, there were any [other] horn-blowers?

If we consult the 70 interpreters, behold the priests οἱ οὐραγοῦντες ὀπίσω τῆς κιβωτοῦ σαλπίζοντες [*"bringing up the rear behind the ark, sounding [trumpets]"*], as I touched once and again in the previous question. If we take up our Latin, behold v. 9: "The rest of the common people followed the ark, and made everything resound with the buccinae." And v. 13: "The rest of the common people followed the ark, and sounded with the buccinae." But if we examine the Hebrew text in each cited verse word for word, it is thus: that when it had been said [that] in the first place the armed go, in the second the seven priests sound with trumpets, in the third others carry the ark, in the fourth the last column go — it is always added [that they went] "going, and sounding with trumpets." Does not, then, this last band seem to have gone in such a way that it too sounded trumpets? It seems it can be answered in two ways. **First**: that from the common people and the last column there were certain trumpeters, but with trumpets other than those which had been commanded to the seven priests. These [priests'] were the Jubilee-[trumpets]; but the people's trumpets, of whatever [kind they were]. For "iobel" [the jubilee-blast] was added to the priests' trumpets twice or thrice [in the text], as appeared (q. 4), [but] never to the [common] people's. **Then** [secondly], that we may grant the trumpets to the priests alone: and then the Hebrew text is expounded in two ways. First, by the Chaldee, and by those following him, thus: "the priests going on, and sounding those buccinae." Secondly, by Masius thus: "during the marching it was sounded with the buccinae." And this sense pleases altogether. For, first, in the Hebrew tongue this repetition of infinitives — like the Latin gerunds — is not infrequent, [made] for greater force of speech. Secondly, that it was proper to the priests to sound the trumpets, several Hebrews and Latins teach — Theodoret too, the Greek (q. 15 on Numbers). Thirdly, to the same view the 70 and the Latin can be recalled; for the priests of the rear column were sounding, and the [common] crowd made the sound not of itself, but through the seven priests going before. For "what we do through others, we are said to do [ourselves]," as a certain rule of Law says; and the whole army sounds the clarions and trumpets, not through individual soldiers, but through a few clarion-players and trumpeters. And so the Latin rightly said, "all things resounded with the buccinae." Fourthly, silence was commanded to the people at v. 10, so that they might receive the priestly trumpets as a voice sent by God (Numbers 10:9).

Question XIII. Whether Joshua enjoined this order of going round Jericho upon the people by himself, or through the priests?

Our text says Joshua enjoined this order upon the people by himself, at v. 7. For when he had spoken to the priests about their order and duty, it is added: "To the people also he said: Go, and go round the city, [ye] armed men, going before the ark of the Lord." But the Greek 70 version does not have this, but through the priests makes this same [thing] — both the work and the order — to be enjoined by Joshua upon the people, thus at v. 6: Εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Ναυῆ πρὸς τοὺς ἱερεῖς, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· παραγγείλατε τῷ λαῷ παρελθεῖν, καὶ κυκλῶσαι τὴν πόλιν, καὶ οἱ μάχιμοι παραπορευέσθωσαν ἐνωπλισμένοι ἐναντίον κυρίου. That is: "Jesus [Joshua] the son of Nave went in to the priests, and said to them, saying: Command the people to go round and surround the city; and let the warriors march armed before the Lord." It must be said:

First, that the Latin text, as it is now read, is more consonant with the Hebrew text, in which at v. 7 is written *vaiomer el ha'am* [ויאמר אל העם] — *vaiomer*, that is, "and he (Joshua) said to the people." For the "vau" which is added to that Hebrew verb has, noted above it, a little circle, by which some other reading is signified, and a note of the Masoretes, who write in the margin *yatir vav* [יתיר ו], that is, "the letter vau is redundant" — just as, on the contrary, it is noted by the same [Masoretes] to be lacking in the same verb at 1 Samuel [1 Reg.] ch. 13, v. 19. **Secondly**, that the Greek 70 [text] agrees more with the Hebrew text which — by the Masoretes' annotation — has now been indicated to have been in certain codices. For somewhere it was read with that "vau," thus: *vaiomeru* [ויאמרו] — "and they said to the people," namely the priests, to whom Joshua had spoken at v. 6. **Thirdly**, that the same Greek [70] translated this passage not word for word, but as it were paraphrastically…

(col. 755)

…transposing verses 6 and 7, and rendering the sense itself rather than the single words; since, from what is said — according to the other Hebrew reading, that "the priests said to the people" — they gather and express that Joshua had commanded it to them [the priests]. **Fourth**: that in fact the [two] texts do not disagree, and can be reconciled thus — that, according to the Latin, Joshua said those things to the people, but through the priests, his go-betweens to the people in the matter, on account of the ark, [which is] as it were sacred.

Question XIV. How was Jericho stormed?

At the first assault of Jericho, and at the seventh circuit, at last "came the highest day, and the ineluctable fate" — truly a "fate": that terrible judgment which the Lord had pronounced against the wicked nation of the Canaanites and the city of Jericho (Genesis 15, and above, v. 2). And since, as was also said above (q. 2), on that seventh day — the seventh circuit of that day, but of all the days [together] the thirteenth circuit — was completed, Joshua gave threefold commands. **First**: that the people should shout (v. 16). **Secondly**: that the city should be an anathema (v. 17). **Thirdly**: that, according to the pacts and agreements above (ch. 2), Rahab the harlot, with her own, should be safe (ibid., and v. 22). At once the commanded shout and clamor followed (v. 20). The walls of the city fell; and it was taken (ibid.); and what had been commanded concerning the anathema was carried into execution (vv. 21, 24). Rahab was saved (vv. 23 & 25). But whether those precepts were given here [for the first time], and indeed now for the first time — it will be disputed below (q. 13 & 14).

Question XV. What was the people's shout?

It was a huge shout — plainly [such] as [that] of which the poet [says]: "The immense clamor, rising, strikes the golden stars." For there was a huge multitude of men; and in the Hebrew and Latin text it is described not simply as "clamor," but now with the epithet "great"; but in the 70, ἀλαλαγμὸς μέγας καὶ ἰσχυρός [*alalagmos megas kai ischyros*, "a great and mighty war-cry"]. "Ἀλαλαγμὸς," says Origen (homily 7), "signifies properly neither jubilation nor howling, but rather displays that shout by which, in time of war, an army raising a harmonious clamor is wont unanimously to exhort itself to battle." And this *alalagmus* seems

at first to have been a confused sound, signifying nothing at all, repeating one or another syllable rather than a word; yet afterward it was somewhere made articulate and modulated. For from *alal* seems to have been made ἀλαλάζειν [*alalazein*, "to raise the war-cry"], which in Suidas is written more thinly ἐλελεῦ, for the grander ἀλαλεῦ, when he says: οἱ προσιόντες εἰς πόλεμον τὸ ἐλελεῦ ἐφώνουν [*"those going to war used to cry the 'eleleu'"*]. Those who went to war cried out that "Elelelu," or rather "Alalau"; and it was very frequent of old at the beginnings of battles and at the first clash of the lines: among the Persians and Macedonians, on Curtius's testimony (book 3); among the Greeks, [on] Thucydides['s]; among the Romans, on the testimony of Polybius (books 1 & 12), Livy (books 1 & 9), Josephus (book 3 of the *War*, ch. 18), Dio (book 47), Ammianus (book 31); among the Germans, whose that warlike shout was called *baritus*, as the same Ammianus reports (book 21, and book 16, where you will treat of them). "Eager," he says, "to raise the *baritus*" — or "the greatest [shout]" — "which clamor, by the very heat of the contests, arising from a thin murmur and gradually growing, is raised up in the manner of waves dashed against rocks." And the same *baritus* is called by Festus "barbaricum," when he says: "Barbaricum is called the shout of the army, because barbarians use that kind" — as if "barbaricum," because the Germans were wont to cry "bar bar." Which even sometimes today they employ in fights and exhortations, just as the Irish [use] their "pharropharno." "The Germans have," says Tacitus (in the book on their customs [*Germania*]), "songs, by the recitation of which — which they call *baritus* — they inflame their spirits." And that this *baritus* was transferred from the Germans to the Romans in his own age, Vegetius shows (book 3, ch. 18). But whence that name comes, Lipsius investigates (book 4, *On the [Roman] Militia*, dialogue 11). In Suidas this kind of clamor is also called λυκηθμὸς [*lyk■thmos*], that is, "a wolf-like sound" or "howling" — which the Gauls too used, as these words of Livy (book 20 [21]) show: "The Gauls run to the bank with various howlings, and with the singing of their custom." Among the Spaniards too there is even today sometimes a certain clamor, but articulate and meaningful, invoking God and the saints, especially St. James; but how monstrous and terrible the shoutings of the Turks are, they know and report who, last year, 1601, were present at the recovery of Alba Regalis [Székesfehérvár], and this year (alas) at its loss again. In sum: for many nations it was, and is, the custom to raise shouts before battles; and this [is] either confused or articulate, signifying something or not, of one kind or modulated, at the joining of the lines or before — as Gellius proves from Homer concerning the Trojans (book 1, ch. 11).

Question XVI. To what end [was] this shout?

Two ends of this shout Caesar indicated (book 3 of the *Civil War*): "Nor," he says, "was it instituted of old in vain, that the signals should sound together on every side, and that all should raise a shout — by which things they judged both that the enemy is terrified and that their own men are incited." Whence Gellius (book 1, ch. 11): "that spirits may be roused and whetted, horns and clarions are set in motion." And a physical cause can be given from those things which the Philosopher [Aristotle] disputes about the voice (*Problems*, section 11); just as [there is a reason] why skilled leaders would sometimes make a conjecture about the battle's outcome from that shout — "the shout," says Livy (book 4), "was the first indication of which way the matter would incline: more excited and more frequent, raised by the enemy (the Volscian), [it foretold victory]; but by the Romans, dissonant, uneven, sluggish, often repeated, it betrayed the panic of their spirits." Nor unlike[ly does] Plutarch [treat it] in the Crassus disaster. But God and Joshua seem to have had the same ends in the Israelites' shout — yet not these alone. **First**, because the enemies were to be utterly terrified and stunned with fear, so that thus they would not even draw a single sword against the Israelites, and not even one of these [Israelites] should be even most lightly hurt. **Secondly**, the spirit of the Israelites was to be incited, that they might rush most eagerly into the collapsing city, fear nothing at all, and put to slaughter whatever they met. **Thirdly**, that shouting was, as it were, a certain public prayer to God, that he might now in very deed fulfill what he had deigned to promise. **Fourthly**, it was a testimony of their utmost faith and confidence in God, while they professed themselves…

(col. 757)

…[while they professed themselves] to doubt nothing about this city's destruction, while they did even these light and easy things which he had commanded. **Fifth**: it was an index of a spirit prepared and exulting, as if they were already gaining a most certain victory; and so they sang thanks to God, and the enemy's "penalty," now most joyful. **Sixth**: it was a Symbol of other things, concerning which below.

Question XVII. When, and how, was this same shout commanded, and poured forth?

When this shout was commanded [it] seems — as regards the first day of the assault — sufficiently manifest from vv. 5 & 10. But as regards the last day, Josephus (book 5, ch. 1) indicates it was commanded in the camp itself, before they advanced to the last circuits; Masius (fol. 109) [says] immediately before the seventh circuit; but it is more likely that Joshua commanded — when the seventh circuit was wholly or nearly completed — that all should now shout. For the text signifies this at v. 16, with the reason especially added: that, the shout being raised, the city immediately fell; and, this falling, the Israelites immediately rushed in; and nonetheless they completed seven circuits. Otherwise the seventh would not have been complete; therefore Josephus said, in the aorist, περιελθόντων ἑπτάκις [*perielthont■n heptakis*], that is, "when they had circled seven times." And Abulensis (q. 3): "the circuit being finished, when they halted, the walls fell." But as to how Joshua could give this command to so great a multitude, that it might be heard — Lyra not badly said, with the Hebrews, that this was done, not by Joshua's voice carried to all ears, but by some other signal, of which kind Abulensis (q. 10) sets down three. Masius (at the cited fol.) will have it that the very clangor of the priests' trumpets in the seventh circuit — [being] not new or unusual, but the customary [thing] — served as a signal. But it is most true and most ready [to hold] that those who were nearest Joshua heard his command and at once began to raise the shout; and these being heard, immediately all the others [did too]; or even, the change of the customary trumpet-clangor being heard, as is added at vv. 5, 16, 20, as will be touched again a little later. But how this same shout was "poured forth" is understood from two or three [things]. For **first**, the Israelites stood still — because it was the end of the circuits, and because a greater straining of the voice is in those quiet and standing than in those walking. And this too Josephus touched, saying πρὸς ὀλίγον ἠρεμησάντων [*pros oligon ■rem■sant■n*], "when they had kept still a little." **Secondly**, they turned their faces toward the walls of Jericho; for this is gathered from vv. 20 & 5: "They shall enter, each one, by the place over against which he shall have stood." For it was fitting that they themselves should see, with their own eyes, [even] as they stood [there], the enemy city's walls suddenly collapsing. **Thirdly**, the priestly trumpets sounded all together, most vehemently, continuously, without any interruption (vv. 5, 16, 20, and above, q. 4).

Question XVIII. Concerning the anathematizing of the city and the preservation of Rahab: when [were they] commanded by Joshua?

The text seems to signify (vv. 17 & 18) that both the anathema of the city of Jericho, and the preservation of Rahab the harlot, were then commanded by Joshua, when he commanded the shout. But since he commanded that [shout], as was handed down in the previous question, after — or at least toward the end of — the seventh circuit, and indeed in such a way that there was no other signal for beginning the shout than the clamor of the voices of those who were near Joshua himself, or the changed clangor of the trumpets: these somewhat longer commands about the anathema and about Rahab could not then be given [at that moment]. There are, therefore, two opinions. The prior [is] Abulensis's (q. 12): that these commands were given on the seventh day, before all the circuits of that same seventh [day]; or at least on the very first day, before all the circuits of all the days. The latter is Masius's (fol. 109): on the seventh day, before the seventh circuit. "From that," he says, "compass of words — 'For the Lord has given you the city' — and from those commands

which are now for the first time set out in the nearest verses, it seems it can be taken by good conjecture that the Commander [Joshua] had led the people around the city while still, indeed, in hope, but in uncertain [hope]; nor [does it seem] that he himself made public what the army of GOD had received as most certain through that its leader — except now at last."

The things that seem [right] to me are these. **I.** The anathema of this city, and the imprecation against its restorer (of which afterward), was prescribed by the Angel together with the prediction of victory, and [along] with the very manner of the assault. For if God prescribed the things that seem of lesser moment — about the trumpets, the circuits, the shout — how much more these, the greatest of all: about the slaughter of all the men of Jericho, about the destruction of the women and infants, and other like things? Then, the imprecation here attributed to Joshua is ascribed to God as its author (3 Kings [1 Kings] 16). Thirdly, the same [view], against some Talmudists (tractate *On the Sabbath*, ch. 1), is the opinion of Radak [R. David Kim■i], and of Masius (fol. 110). **II.** The preservation of Rahab arose from the promise and faith given (ch. 2), of which afterward. **III.** On the first day, before the beginning of the circuits, all these things were set out by Joshua to the people; but on the seventh day, in the camp, before the beginning of the last circuits, [they were] briefly brought back to everyone's memory; perhaps also, before the seventh and last circuit of all, most briefly. For that anathema, and its whole rationale, had to be accurately set forth to all and each, since its violation was to be punished with so grave a penalty (as will be said afterward). But how could it be set forth more accurately than if it were set forth on the very first day? — than if there were given to them space for repeating this precept, and for employing it in frequent conversations among themselves, and indeed [over] the whole six-day period [hexaemeron]? Now when, concerning grave matters of this kind, precepts have been given some days before, it is customary — on the very day, and at the very moment when they are to be carried out — to signify [them] again, so that all may be mindful of what had been prescribed. **IV.** The order of the narrative, then, is changed; and those longer precepts [were] therefore deferred, so that their execution might at once be set forth together [with them]. **V.** It seems too insulting to Joshua, what is handed down by Masius — that he led the people around in uncertain hope, and did not make public what he had received from God. For concerning great and divine men, nothing depraved is to be thought, or to be uttered…

(col. 759)

…[nothing depraved is to be thought or] uttered. But whence does Masius gather so great a despair in Joshua? How would so great a man — instructed and confirmed by the recent memory of so many benefits of God, of the so admirable crossing of the Jordan, and by so many and so illustrious words and promises of the same God — hesitate so childishly? [How] would he so stupidly lead the people around so many times? and so impiously distrust the things which he had received from the Lord? Moses was punished for a certain slight fault in the leading of water from the rock: how would Joshua bear with impunity so great, so many-days-long, so obstinate a distrust? Therefore the things now said here [are] the more likely.

Question XIX. The circuits — how many were they?

Summarily, that they were all fourteen, is the opinion of Radak, of the Rabbis. For on the seventh day he posits one, which was at first light [dawn], then seven others — so that on that day all the circuits were eight. His reason is that v. 15, in the Hebrew, word for word, is thus: "And it was on the seventh day, and they rose early when the dawn ascended, and they went round the city, according to this ordinance, seven times." For he thinks that, when it is said "according to this ordinance," the morning circuit is referred to, so that the [other] seven should be made according to its manner and, as it were, [its] exemplar. But [rather] the custom and manner of circling is referred to, which had been observed in the circuits of the previous six days. For of these it had been treated in the preceding v. 14 — as if he said, "they circled seven times in the same manner and mode"; or rather (which comes to the same) the ordinance, or custom, is referred to, which the Lord had

prescribed, and which had been kept up to that day. And our interpreter [the Vulgate] signified this when he translated: "they went round the city, as it had been arranged, seven times." And because that was clear enough, we see [it] omitted by the 70. It is confirmed: **first**, because it is immediately added in the Hebrew, "On that day alone they went round the city seven times" — but it would have had to say "eight times" [were Radak right]. **Secondly**, this is the opinion of the Latins, the Greeks, and all other Hebrews. **Thirdly**, even today, in their synagogues, the Jews, on the seventh day of Tabernacles [Scenopegia], in memory of this sevenfold circuit, seven times go round the "ambo" [bimah] — which they have in the middle of them — in the manner of a procession; as is noted by Paul of Burgos in the additions to Matthew ch. 26, and by the Latin interpreter of the Hebrew calendar, and likewise recently by Ernst Ferdinand [Hess] (book 2 of the *Scourge of the Jews*, ch. 8). Summarily, therefore, the circuits [were] thirteen.

Question XX. Whether the walls of Jericho fell upon the surface of the ground?

So says our text (v. 20). But the Rabbis of today have another mind. For they think that the walls of Jericho were not collapsed and dissolved, but, whole and cemented together, sank down as the earth gaped open — so that both their whole breadth, and [their] height, was only buried under the earth, yet safe and constant [intact]. This they take: **first**, from the Hebrew phrase, which at v. 4 is "And the wall of the city shall fall under it," that is, "under itself"; and at v. 20, "the wall fell under it," that is, "under itself." **Secondly**, the Chaldee Thargum translates at v. 4: "and the wall of the city shall fall, and be swallowed up under it[self]"; [and at] v. 19: "the wall of the city fell, and was swallowed up." **Thirdly**, the Talmudists, in the tractate *Berachot*, ch. 9, say thus: "Whoever sees the swallowed-up wall of the city of Jericho ought to use a favorable prayer [say a blessing]." And the same [Talmudists] go on, objecting to themselves: "But it is written [that it] was not swallowed up, but collapsed" — and they at once reply: "That is indeed written; but since its breadth and height still then stood firm together, it is concluded that it was swallowed up, not collapsed." It is confirmed, **fourthly**, because after the mention of the walls it is immediately added, "And each one went up by the place which was over against him." But how could anyone conveniently "go up," if the walls were cast down and prostrate on the ground? For one would have had to go over rough and jagged heaps of stones and rubble. **Fifthly**: [given] such walls, so suddenly cast down and scattered — how great clouds of raised dust, how great a gloom, how great a blindness of all, would there have been? **Sixthly**: to this sense too the Latin Interpreter can easily be expounded. For he says only that "the walls collapsed" [*corruisse*]. But they could "collapse" in two ways: (1) if they were thrown apart and lay strewn on the ground in heaps of stones and lime; (2) if they were, as it were, dug down beneath themselves and wholly swallowed up. The Latin expressed neither mode, but asserted generally that they "collapsed," not defining this or that mode of collapsing. **Seventhly**: this mode [sinking] was as easy for God as that the walls should fall forward and occupy the surface of the ground. **Eighthly**: to which side do we think they fell — inward, or outward? If inward, it is likely that all, or nearly all, of the men of Jericho were overwhelmed by their ruin. For it is quite probable that they were wont to run to the walls each day, while the Israelites circled — partly to defend them, if force were applied, partly to view with their own eyes that new and unusual circuit of the strangers and enemies. How much more on that seventh day, when, contrary to custom, the Israelites repeated those circuits of theirs so many times? And [when] there was added the new clangor of the trumpets, the new and most intense shout and shouting of all? But if all, or nearly all, had been crushed by that ruin, who then, at last, were those whom the Israelites are said to have slain with the sword? If the walls leaned and fell outward, nearly the same things would have happened — but this besides: that it would have thrown more obstacles and impediments in the Israelites' way. But indeed the received opinion of all others is that those walls fell upon the very surface of the ground; and this is proved: (1) from the Hebrew text, where expressly, as we saw above, the wall is asserted [to be] "about to fall" and "to have fallen." But what falls does not stand [remain]; and it is one thing to be dug down, and swallowed up whole by the jaws of the earth, and preserved [while] swallowed — [and] another to fall. The Hebrew *naphal* [נפל] agrees with the German

verb *fallen*; nay, that [German word] is derived from this. Certainly no one would say in German: "*wo ein Maur unter sich gesunken were, das ist gefallen*" ["where a wall had sunk down under itself — [to say] that is 'fallen'"]. As for what is added in the same Hebrew, "under it[self]," it does not have that force, that the wall be understood [to be] swallowed up beneath the earth, but…

(col. 761)

…but [it collapsed] onto the same [spot]. For at 1 Kings [1 Sam.] 14:9 it is also said in Hebrew, "and we will stand under us [= in our place]." How can anyone stand "under himself"? Did [Jonathan], when he said this, think that he and his armor-bearer, standing on the ground, would be swallowed up out of the earth? Ridiculous. But the sense is the one which our own interpreter best expressed: "let us stand in our place"; or, "let us not advance further." The Hebrew, therefore, meant nothing else than that the walls of Jericho were not so taken away that they were carried off elsewhere I-know-not-whither, or that, springing apart this way and that, the stones were flung far off, but that they fell down in the same place in which they stood. Yet because this could be sufficiently gathered from the verb "to fall," it was put in the [completed] past by the 70 and by the Latin — indeed also by St. Paul, Heb. 11:30. For they [render] thus: ἔπεσεν ἅπαν τὸ τεῖχος κύκλῳ [*epesen hapan to teichos kykl■i*, "the whole wall fell down round about"]; our [Latin]: "the walls fell down forthwith." St. Paul: τὰ τείχη ἔπεσε [*ta teich■ epese*, "the walls fell"]; and Josephus, book 5, ch. 1: κατέπεσε τὸ τεῖχος [*katepese to teichos*, "the wall fell down"]. **3.** The same can be confirmed by replying to the things which were being objected.

And of the *first* [objection] it has already been spoken. To the *second*, indeed, it could be said that "the walls are swallowed up" when they fall, and fall into certain trench-like ditches, which perhaps the Chaldee Targum supposed to have been around Jericho. Whence — *which was the third* [point] — those later Talmudists who followed it [the Targum] are to be understood. To the *fourth*: if the walls collapsed into the city's ditches after the manner of a bridge, or rather of a level road, they would have been [a way] for the Israelites about to enter the city; but if there were no ditches, how dainty are these soldiers whom they set before us, who would seem either unable or unwilling to rush into the city over the cast-down heaps of walls? The reply to [the point about] the dust, which is cast at our eyes in the fifth place, is the same. These are the soldiers' daily banquets: "Dust, thirst, heat, sand — [things] sweet to valor." Yet of this [I shall say] something again in the following question. To the *sixth*: it is better that the Chaldee Jonathan, and with it its Talmudic followers, be brought over into the common sense [of the passage], than that our interpreter be dragged into a foreign and absurd one. To the *seventh*: that mode [the sinking] is denied not as if difficult for God, but because Scripture does not assert it — indeed rejects it. To the *eighth*: if Jericho was surrounded by ditches, I should think the walls fell outward, to fill those up, as has been said; if otherwise, inward. That not all the men of Jericho were on the walls is nearer the truth — though without doubt there were very many; but that there were not a few in the marketplace, in towers or houses or other places [is also likely]; especially since there was now not so great a novelty [in the sight], after the circuits had already been watched several other times. But whichever opinion we follow, one difficulty always remains, concerning the house of *Rahab*. For since, in ch. 2, q. 21, it was taught that it was fixed in and built into the city's wall, how, when that [wall] fell, did that [house] not collapse at the same time? It is answered that this part of the wall does not seem to have fallen; nor yet, on that account, is it badly said by the 70 that "the whole wall round about fell." For how tiny is this little scrap of wall? And [there is] that moral note: "A little [thing] is reckoned as nothing." Hither can be recalled the things which, at the cited q. of ch. 2, were brought forward from the most illustrious Duke of Olyka [Radziwi■■], a recent eyewitness of Jericho.

Question XXI. Whether the same walls collapsed of their own accord [spontaneously]?

The Greek 70 Interpreters asserted this at verse 5, when they render, πεσεῖται αὐτόματα τὰ τείχη τῆς πόλεως [*peseitai automata ta teich■ t■s pole■s*, "the walls of the city shall fall of their own accord"]. Now in inanimate things that is said to happen "automatically" [αὐτομάτως] and "spontaneously" which comes about from them with no force or externally-applied operation: just as, in Demosthenes, αὐτόματος θάνατος, *a natural death*, which no external force but the interior corruption of the humors produces; in Hesiod, *Works [and Days]*: "diseases come of their own accord" [αὐτόματοι φοιτῶσι]; in others, αὐτόμαται μηχαναί, *machines which are moved by themselves*. How, then, without any force — at least any applied externally — was the overthrow of those walls brought about? Were they decrepit through weak foundations, ruinous with age, of faulty material, rotten in structure, sapped by the injury of rains and storms? None of these. And therefore it is to be said that they "collapsed of their own accord," if indeed [only] the force which is applied by men, and which falls under sight, be considered; but if the Angelic force and impulse, which is not perceived by the eyes, be looked at, [it is to be said] they "did not collapse of their own accord." For these [Angels] either undermined the foundations of those [walls], or by some hidden manner dissolved their bonding with their most efficacious efficacy, and overthrew them entirely; but of the Israelites there were, against those walls, absolutely no battering-rams, catapults, mines, or assaults. And this Josephus indicated not obscurely, when he wrote, in the place often cited: κατέπεσε τὸ τεῖχος μήτε μηχανῆς μήτε ἄλλης βίας αὐτῷ προσενεχθείσης ὑπὸ τῶν ἑβραίων [*"the wall fell, though neither engine nor any other force had been applied to it by the Hebrews"*] — that is, "the wall fell, though neither engine nor any other force had been brought against it by the Hebrews."

But it could again be asked, *of what kind were they who produced this ruin — [were they] Angels? evil or good?* For those [evil ones], indeed, employed as executioners upon the crimes of the Canaanites, could well have thrown these walls into disorder, and either crushed those [men] by their ruin, or cast them forth to be slaughtered by the swords of the Israelites. Yet I should rather believe that this whole thing was done *by good* Angels — and indeed either by that very one who introduced this assault to Joshua and predicted the victory, or by others, but at his command and bidding. For it seems [fitting] that, of a victory so great and so admirable, whose author and giver [was] the Lord, the ministers were good rather than evil Angels — [Angels] who, after the Israelites had so many times, and so piously, and so obediently and humbly undertaken the circuits, the carryings of the sacred ark, the sounds of the trumpets, paved a road into the city, and visited the impious with punishment and disaster, the pious with victory and reward. For the same holy Angels destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah with heavenly flames, [and] led out pious Lot safe and unharmed; the same — as the more probable opinion, which I set forth in [my work] on Exodus, holds — smote Egypt with all the plagues, divided the Red Sea, led the Israelites through it, [and] submerged Pharaoh in it with his chariots and horses. Why, then, should not the Angels — happy [themselves] — open a happy road for Joshua in Jericho? And these could most easily have turned away all the dust and the roughness of the wall-fragments, if there were need. Certainly, when *Robert, King of the Franks*, was besieging Avallon, and meanwhile was free for prayers and was chanting psalms together with the priests, the walls of that [town] suddenly collapsed — as Espencæus notes in his treatise *On the Eucharist*, and Lipsius, book [1] of *Political Examples*, ch. 2. And because these same Angels are ministers of God, the principal cause is to be referred to Him — as S. Macarius rightly does (homily 50), and Rupert on Joshua, ch. 20: "The walls," he says, "by God's mere nod, and without the hand of man, had utterly collapsed."

(col. 763)

Question XXII. Whether the sound of the trumpets and the people's shout overthrew and cast down the same walls?

That the walls of Jericho were shaken and cast down by the sound of the trumpets and the shout of the people, Ralbag seems, of the Rabbis, to teach. "Because," he says, "a great voice strikes the air with a great

impulse"; and this impulse struck and threw down the standing walls. "Which," says Masius (fol. 112), "certainly seems ridiculous to me." But of our own [writers], behold for you one than whom scarcely any is graver, subtler, and more cautious in asserting — St. Augustine, sermon 106 *On the Season*. "After these things," he says, "they came to the city of Jericho, and its walls, at the shout of the peoples and the sound of the trumpets, were cast down to the foundations." And afterward more plainly: "At the priests' trumpets, the walls of Jericho, which contained within themselves the people of sinners, collapsed. No ram struck them, no engine stormed them; but — what is marvelous — the priestly sound, or the terror of the trumpet, overthrew [them]. The walls which had stood unconquerable against iron were shattered by the sacred voice of the trumpets. For who would not be stupefied at that deed — rocks broken apart by sound, foundations shaken by the clangor, and thus the whole [wall] collapsed, so that, while the victors hurt nothing with the hand, among the adversaries nothing remained stable? Yet they were stormed from without by the sound of the just, [and] within [were] the dwellings of sinners. For thus, by the just judgment of God, they both opened a way for the just and denied a defense to the faithless." And St. Jerome, in his letter to Abigaus, briefly: "The walls of Jericho collapsed, overthrown by the clangors of the priestly trumpets." St. Ambrose, *On Duties* [*De officiis*], book 3, ch. 10: "The walls of Jericho, struck by the sacred sound of the trumpets, and battered by the howling of the people." And *On the Faith, to Gratian*, book 1, ch. 1: "Jesus [Joshua] the son of Nun conquered the enemies — whom the hand of the whole army could not powerfully overcome — by the sound of the seven priestly trumpets, inasmuch as he recognized the captain of the heavenly host." Origen, hom. 6: "Jericho is surrounded; it must be stormed. How, then, is Jericho stormed? No sword is drawn against it; no ram is aimed, nor darts brandished: only the priestly trumpets are applied, and by these the walls of Jericho are undermined." And at the beginning of hom. 7: "Jericho is undermined by the priests' trumpets. For as soon as the trumpets' clangor sounded out, the circuit of the walls was cast down."

Next, that there is in great sounds a force for shaking and prostrating some things can be shown by manifold experience. For when the greater bells are rung, when cannons hurl the larger balls, how great [is] the movement of the air, of houses, of windows, and of towers? What, when "the poles thunder, [and] the aether flashes with frequent fires"? Is it not [true], as Seneca says in book 2 of the *Natural Questions*, that "men fall down and are struck lifeless"? Do not certain men stand stupefied, and utterly go out of themselves — [the state] which we call "thunderstruck" [*attoniti*] — whose minds that heavenly sound has driven from their place? Hence, in the Poet [Virgil], that Cyclops:

> *"He raises an immense shout, at which the sea and all*
>
> *the waves trembled." [Aen. 3.672–673]*

And another:

> *"He sings the pastoral signal, and on the curved horn*
>
> *strains a Tartarean voice, at which straightway the whole*
>
> *grove trembled, and the deep woods thundered." [Aen. 7.513–515]*

Similar things [are] in Homer and others. But lest these be despised as merely poetic, the divine books too attribute to sounds and voices a power of shaking even great masses. Ps. 45[46]:7: "The Lord gave [uttered] his voice, the earth was moved." And more manifestly, Ezek. 36:10 [the noise-of-chariots, walls-shaking text is Ezek. 26:10]: "With the overflow of his horses their dust shall cover you; at the noise of the horsemen, and of the wheels, and of the chariots, your walls shall be moved." I say, *first*: No sound of men — however huge, intense, and multiplied — nor of our trumpets, can naturally, by itself alone, cast down or [even] shake any wall, or any mass even moderately firm. This is proved. *First*: three things concur to make a sound. 1. the collision of two bodies, [either] solid or quasi-solid. *Secondly*: the breaking and grinding of air, or of a similar body, intercepted between those two. *Thirdly*: the diffusion of this broken and ground body, and, as it were, its flight and recession. And this is that by which anything can be moved and impelled. For while it

thus flees and recedes, if any bodies meet it, it strikes them, and, if it can in any way, drives them forward. And indeed it always moves and drives forward the *neighboring* and first-met air — because otherwise there would be an interpenetration of bodies; and air, to receive motion, is of itself as it were spontaneously very ready: but the *remote* [air], not always. Because the impetus of that fleeing [air] is gradually weakened, and so it ceases to advance further and to impel. But in that its advance, and its driving of foreign bodies, it must be considered that, for it to be able to advance far and forcibly and to impel, it is necessary, *first*, that it be broken and thrust out by a great force; *secondly*, that it be not something slight and thin, but have a greater quantity [bulk]. For if the former be lacking, it will at once be stopped from its flight, nor will it, even at the very outset, vehemently move the nearest air. If the latter be lacking, it will soon be checked by the surrounding air, diffused far and wide, and will be able neither to advance nor to drive anything.

Now consider for me: when our trumpets blare, when we shout, how scanty [is] the breath poured forth from individuals — which is broken up in the trumpets, or in the [wind]pipes and our throats, and thrust outside the trumpet and ourselves? And when it has been thrust out, how languid and feeble it is, scarcely rolling itself forward a little? how easily it is dissolved and dissipated into the vast air that surrounds us? — so much so that most of the philosophers teach, with great approval, that to ears somewhat more remote it is not the true and direct sound [that arrives], but only its "species," or images, that reach [them]. How, then, could this sound loosen ordinary bodies, walls, and any masses moderately firm? And to this [effect] there is no weight in the multitude of the trumpets and shouts themselves. For the breath of all is at once scattered into all the parts of this most vast airy space, and, cooled, grows dull, and comes to rest. *Secondly*: Aristotle is in doubt whether, if very many sound and shout together, they are heard farther than if individuals were to sound and shout singly. For he affirms it in the *Problems*, sect. 19, problem 2, but denies it in sect. 11, problem 52. Therefore the movement of air is not more vehement and stronger, even if there be very many sounds of very many [people]. *Thirdly*: If they could [do] that…

(col. 765)

…[if they could do] that — the most intense and, in number, most abundant sounds of men [could] cast down standing solid bodies — they would surely *first* cast down those which are nearest, and into which they run more quickly: namely, in the camps, the neighboring trees, their own standards, lances, tents; nay, those who shouted would lay themselves low, and one another. *Fourthly*: this way of destroying cities would be easy, and quite charming, and pretty. For [then] only Homeric Stentors would have to be chosen for sieges — the Egyptians of Herodotus [used] for summoning Histiaeus, and others of that clamorous kind; then to these must be joined a great force of horn-blowers, clarion-players, trumpeters, and drummers; boys too, perhaps, and girls, must be gathered with as many bells and rattles as possible. *Fifthly*: If motion from sound helped so much toward the ruin of things, [it would help] much more if great and whole armies ran round about with the greatest force and speed, threw their arms about, or by any other more vehement manner stirred the air.

Neither Ralbag nor St. Augustine either said or supposed that the walls of Jericho were torn down by the natural force of the trumpets and shouts *alone*. For that Rabbi too adjoins a divine efficiency, and this holy Father [does] here [as well]: but he considered those sounds as an instrument fit for shaking the walls, because through them the air would be moved and impelled, and through this [air] the walls. Yet this is nothing. For in supernatural [works] God needs not the natural faculty of the instruments themselves; nor, if ever for some fitting cause he employs such [an instrument], does that reasoning hold in trumpet-blasts and human voices. For their power to move solid and fixed things is very small, or almost none; he would rather have prescribed [an instrument of] running and charging — the various composition of bodies and the swift motion of any [heavy] things.

III. Nevertheless it is not to be denied that God could, if he had willed, use these clangors and shouts as an instrument to demolish those walls. For [God] can use any creature, however unfit, for whatever effects he pleases: and there are those who grant that the voice of Christ the Lord (John 5), and [the voice] of the

Archangel (1 Thess. 4), and the clangor of the last trumpet (1 Cor. 15; Matt. 24) effect the resurrection of the dead physically, in this instrumental manner — as Euthymius, ch. 7 on John; Toletus on the same St. John, ch. 5; Suárez, vol. 2, disp. 50, sect. 4; Thyraeus, *On the glorious apparition of Christ*, ch. 4, no. 214. But that the Lord willed to use these sounds as an instrument — whence [could] any conjecture [of that] be made?

IV. Those same sounds demolished those walls and laid them level with the ground by no physical effecting, natural or supernatural, but by a *moral* one alone. For, this [sound] being as it were a signal given, the Angels did [it] — which was said in the previous question. The *former* part has thus far been proved by the 1st and 3rd propositions; the *latter* is gathered, first, from the text, which at vv. 5 and 20 indicates that the concordant trumpets and the shouting Israelites concurred in some manner toward the ruin of those walls: but there can be no other mode than the moral one. Therefore [it was so]. *Secondly*: Of this mode St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and perhaps Ralbag also speak. *Thirdly*: this same mode — of the voice and trumpet rousing the dead from their tombs — S. Chrysostom attributes [to sound] (1 Thess., hom. 8), [as do] Scotus (bk. 4, dist. 43) and several others, among whom also Suárez in the cited place.

From these, moreover, it is understood what is to be said *to the objected experiences* [the bells, cannon, thunder]. For when bells sound, when the greater cannons bellow, *first* the neighboring beams, and the mountings to which they are fastened, are moved; *then* the air itself too, a little more remote — because that which is shattered and flees is shattered by a somewhat greater force. *Thirdly*: other things, which are solid and stand firmly fixed and are a little distant, are moved not at all or very little. *Fourthly*: if they are moved, yet not so as to fall — they are moved, but tremble a little, like windows; so also in thunder, but much more, because there is much greater force in air shattered and broken by the collision of [air] thrust from a cloud, and the air itself [is] much more copious and more densely massed. Moreover, the shouts *of the Poets* are hyperbolic, yet with decorum, so that they say [only] that the sea and the grove trembled so much — not that ships were overturned in the one, [or] trees torn up in the other. But *in the Scriptures*: 1. his divine voice is his command. 2. whatever voice, at his bidding, can move the earth as much morally as physically, as was said [in] propositions 3 and 4. 3. by "earth" are also called the men who are roused by the shouts, in that manner which was expounded in q. 12; and so Ezekiel is to be taken. Or it must be said that not rarely, in descriptions of the affections, the Poetic and Oratorical grandiloquence is employed by the Prophets — as Ps. 113[114]:4: "the mountains skipped like rams."

Question XXIII. How did the Israelites enter the city, and what did they do there?

To all [these questions] the context replies. For, *first, each one went up by the place which was over against him* (v. 20). The discourse is of the warriors, as appears from what follows. For these had a sword for killing; and there was no reason why others should wish to enter, especially in that first fury of the storming. For perhaps some of the men of Jericho, unarmed, might have hurt them; and nothing of the booty was owed to be taken by anyone into his own private property. But the things which were to be received for the Lord, the warriors themselves could receive and keep. Yet afterward, when all had already been killed, it could come about that, for the sake of seeing so noble a city, those who wished — men and women, boys and old men — should enter it from the whole army of the Israelites, before the devouring flame should lay waste all things. *Secondly, they took the city. Thirdly, they killed all that were in it.* To the things themselves our interpreter [the Vulgate] applies a fitting word, which the Hebrews render "effected" [carried out]. And that is, *iacherim* [יַחֲרִימוּ, from ■*erem*, "they put under the ban"], that is, *they made an anathema* of all that was in the city — namely, by that command which was above prescribed [in] qq. 14 and 18. And therefore the 70 also render [it] ἀνεθεμάτισαν [*anethematisan*, "they devoted to destruction"]. Now there is subjoined a certain particular enumeration of all those [things] at v. 21: *"From man to woman, from infant to old man. The oxen also, and sheep, and asses, they smote with the edge of the sword."* And at v. 24…

(col. 767)

…[And at v. 24] "the city, and all that was in it, they burned." There was a twofold exception from that anathema. *One*, as to persons: namely Rahab, and all who [were] of her kindred, [saved] together with her, at v. 23. *The other*, as to things, twofold: some, namely, common to the whole city; others proper to Rahab herself. The former were metal objects — gold, silver, vessels of bronze [and] iron (v. 24). The latter, namely, Rahab's own house and all that [was] in it — but see below, qq. 33/35.

Question XXIV. For what reason did the Lord will this war to be waged by the carrying-around of the ark?

First indeed, and chiefly, that the Lord might show himself present to his people, and himself the giver of victory. For the ark [is] the symbol of the divine presence, and victory is from the Lord (Macc. 3:11). *[Secondly]*, that the faith and obedience of that same people might be exercised, while those things were done which seemed of little or no fitness for waging war. For to what purpose the ark? why are not rather battering-rams brought up to the walls? why are not rock-breaking engines rather brought up? Namely, [because] this city was to be stormed not by the force of arms, but by the force and power of God alone. *III.* That the idols of Jericho and its wicked gods might be terrified by the new [unheard-of] presence of the true and living God, by his new mysteries and shrines, and cast themselves into flight. It is known from Macrobius, *Saturnalia*, book 3, ch. 7, how the Romans, when they besieged some city, would call out its tutelary gods by a certain incantation, and would promise them at Rome more august temples and rites. But here [there is] no calling-out of those demons, no promise of a better worship — but their execration, extermination, [and] annihilation. For what heart had they [the idol-gods], when they saw the God who forbade all their worship? when they beheld his ark — [the God] who would snatch away from them all altars and images? when they looked upon his priests — [the God] who would grant them no flamens, male or female? *IV.* That in the whole world idolatry, and the whole sink of crimes joined to it, was signified [as destined] to be encircled and demolished by the ark of God — which is the sacrosanct Church of God — by [the ark's] most holy laws and words, whose books [are] stored in it [the Church], and by its priests and ministers. *V.* That there might stand [as] a figure and example of the sacred processions which were one day to be in the Catholic Church. For if the Gentiles celebrated the *amburbalia* and *ambaruualia* [lustral processions] in honor of empty gods, it is not therefore evil for the Israelites to go in procession with his ark for the glory of their true God. *VI.* That in these processions we might understand [it] not unfittingly [prefigured] to carry around, three and four times, the venerable Sacrament of the EUCHARIST, the sacred standards and crosses of Christ the Lord, the relics of the saints, and other things of that kind, which among Christians are instruments of divine worship. For what the ark of the covenant was in the Synagogue of the Jews, this — the sacred furniture which I have touched on — is in the Church of the Christians. Whence [comes] that illustrious [practice] instituted against the Constantinopolitan Arians by St. Chrysostom: that through the city's streets the Catholics should proceed *"with silver crosses and many lamps,"* and should celebrate the one holy Trinity with hymns and praises — as they re- late [it]: Socrates, book 6, ch. 8; Sozomen, book 8, ch. 8.

When Jerusalem was besieged by our [men], under Godfrey Duke of Lorraine [de Bouillon], in the year of the Lord 1099, "by public decree" (says William of Tyre, [*History of*] *the Sacred War*, book 8, ch. 11) in the very camp of the Christians, *"litanies were proclaimed to the whole people; and, having taken up the crosses and the patronages [relics] of the saints, the Bishops and the whole Clergy, clad in priestly and Levitical vestments, with bare feet, and with much devotion, went before the following people all the way to the Mount of Olives. There the noble man Peter the Hermit, and Arnulf, a familiar of the Norman Counts, a lettered man, giving a sermon of exhortation to the people, so far as they could, kindled [them] to long-suffering."* But what [was] the outcome of a procession of this kind? Hear what [is related] in the same book, ch. 21

cited: *"The city being now taken, and their arms laid aside, in a spirit of humility and in a contrite mind, with bare feet, with joined hands, and having put on cleaner garments, with groaning and tears, they began now, with all devotion, to go around the venerable places which the Saviour willed to make illustrious and to sanctify by his own presence, and to kiss them with inmost sighs; but especially the Church of the Lord's Passion and Resurrection, where the Clergy and the faithful people — who for so many years had borne the too-hard and undue yoke of servitude — rendering thanks to the Redeemer for their restored liberty, with crosses and the patronages of the saints, meeting the Princes, led them into the aforesaid Church with hymns and spiritual canticles. For it was most delightful to behold, and full of spiritual gladness, with how great devotion, with how great fervor of pious desire the people approached the holy places; with how great exultation of mind and spiritual joy they kissed the memory of the Lord's dispensation. Everywhere tears, everywhere sighs — not such as grief and anxiety are wont to wring out, but such as fervent devotion and the consummated gladness of the inner man is wont to kindle as a whole-burnt-offering to the Lord. Moreover there was, both in the Church and throughout the whole city, so great a shout of the people rendering thanks to the Lord, that now the sound seemed to be raised almost up to the stars — so that of them it might deservedly be believed [what was] said: 'The voice of gladness and exultation [is] in the tabernacles of the just' [Ps. 117(118):15]. Indeed, kindled with pious desire, throughout the whole city they glowed [fervently] in works of mercy. These confessed to the Lord the things they had committed that were to be bewailed, binding themselves by vow not thenceforth to commit [things] to be bewailed; those [others], with lavish liberality, distributed all their substance to old men, the sick, and the needy, reckoning [it] the highest and sufficient riches that to have seen this day had been divinely granted to them. Those [others], with bent and bared knees, with sobs and heartfelt sighs, went around the venerable places, filling everything with a sprinkling of tears — whose discourse, indeed, was directed to the Lord: 'My eyes have sent down streams of waters' [Ps. 118(119):136]. What more? It is difficult that there be comprehended in our speech how great, in the faithful people, was the immensity of holy devotion. For, desiring to outdo one another in rivalry, they sweated unanimously in works of piety, mindful of the heavenly benefit, and having before their eyes the divine grace by which [God] deigned to reward their so great labors. For who [would be] of so iron a breast, of so adamantine a mind, whose inward parts would not melt, when it was permitted to take the most worthy fruit of so great a pilgrimage, and to number the wages of the service performed? Yet [for] whatever mind was loftier, into the ark of future retribution — by which the Lord promised he would reward his saints — that gift seemed [already] rendered, so that by the comparison of the present [things]…"*

(col. 769)

…[so that by the comparison of present things] there might be a firm expectation of future [rewards], and that through her [the earthly Jerusalem] the one who here goes on pilgrimage to Jerusalem might attain to that [heavenly] one, participation in which is [gathered] into the selfsame [unity]. Moreover the Bishops and priests, completing the sacrifices in the Churches, prayed for the people, rendering thanks for the benefit conferred." These things have with the Jericho carrying of the sacred ark, and the victory won, no small similarity. And all these [things] I recently applied to our processions, in book 1, *On Processions*, ch. 3 — where also is set out the Jews' sixfold yearly circuit in memory of this [event], p. 27. But of the carrying of the ark [there will be] more [at] 1 Kings [1 Sam.], ch. 4; where also, from Justin, book 7, will be adduced the King carried as an infant in a cradle to the battle — no author, indeed, of victory, yet a great helper and inciter. But greater [is] the power in the Lord's ark than in that little boy.

Question XXV. Why were the circuits made with the multitude, and in the order set out above?

There is not one cause of the multitude. *I.* For it was fitting that, of its own nature, most deservedly, honor be paid to the Lord's ark, so that it might advance with as large an escort of the people as possible. For if to

Kings, Princes, and Lords there is honor if very many attend and accompany them, is it becoming that the divine mysteries, and God himself, be deserted unaccompanied? *II.* When what pertains to religion and the worship of God is publicly performed, it is fair that men of every rank and age should come together: that men and women be present; priests and laity; boys and old men; soldiers and citizens; the helmeted and the togaed. *III.* The ark of God was a kind of, as it were, law-repository [*nomophylacium*]. Because, therefore, the laws of God ought to be observed by all, it is consonant that all, so far as it can be done, accompany the sacred ark. *IV.* Jericho — a most opulent, most charming city, most fruitful of all delights and pleasures — is this world. Against this [world] the zeal of all ought to glow: to follow God, to cleave to his sacred laws and mysteries, and to enter among themselves into a sacred fellowship, so as to go around the vain and fleeting goods of this world: all ought [to do so]. *V.* If [only] a few, or [some] warriors, or priests, or others, had gone around Jericho by themselves, they would have created less terror for the enemy, and more danger for themselves, since a sally of the townsmen against them would have been readier. But now, while there are so many and so great [in number], they hold the enemy within the walls trembling and stupefied; while they themselves, hedged and covered by the company of others, are free from all danger, go securely, come from the camp, [and] return to the camp. Always *united force [is] stronger*; and *the things which do not avail singly, help [when] many* [together]. *VI.* All the warriors and laity need the help of the priests; the priests [need] the aid of the warriors and laity. All the ranks conspire together amicably in this world, and in the holy Church of God. The soldier protects the priests with arms; the ark of God [protects] the soldier, and the priest [protects him] with the sacred trumpets — that is, by the administration of the divine mysteries and words. O fellowship of the holy Church! O holy communion of the saints! O holy framework, bond, and charity of all the members of Christ!

Moreover the *first cause of the order* is expediency. For the unarmed advance more safely, before whom the mass of the arm- ed goes [ahead]. *II.* The middle place [was given] to the priests; and it was so assigned because from them, into every kind of men — into the first [ranks] and the last — as, so to speak, from the heart into the other members, the spiritual life [flows]: they, as [being] virtue in the midst of the extremes, ought to excel before all the rest in holiness and justice. *III.* Here there is a certain figure of all who, from the founding of the world, fight against the crimes of this world. The warriors set before us the state of nature; the priests, the ceremonies of the Mosaic law; the following column of unarmed men of every kind, [that of] the Gospel — and peace, and a multitude of every sort. For in the Catholic Church, Jews and Egyptians, Greeks and Scythians, slaves and free, men and women, boys and disciples — all, in short, of whatever region and nation they be, of whatever religion and superstition they may have been — can have a place. *IV.* For the altars and the sacred things, for the priests and before them, it befits the Christian battle-lines to stand and fight bravely. After these are to be set the things which otherwise are the dearest pledges of all: wives, children, dependents, anything else. Nothing to Christian princes ought to be so hedged, and so walled around with every defense, as religion. "To you" (St. Symmachus addresses the Emperor) "it ought to be a greater concern for the sake of the faith than of the kingdom; and your clemency ought to be more solicitous for the peace of the Churches than for the security of all lands." *V.* Here too [is] a certain type of our processions — especially where there is some danger from enemies. You have an example in the litany of the Jerusalem siege, indicated above [in] q. 24.

Question XXVI. Why did the Lord judge that many days, trumpets, and circuits should be employed here?

The *first reason* of the many days is rightly drawn from the supreme benignity of God toward the men of Jericho. For he could, first, if he had willed, in one day — nay, in the first hour and moment — have scattered their walls; but the Lord is long-suffering, merciful; he always awaits and invites us to penitence; he defers his wrath; he postpones, so far as he can, the destruction that must be sent upon sinners. A most true example of him [is] that which is praised by a certain one of the poets: "A prince slow to punishment, swift to

rewards." *II.* [The second reason] is from the same [God's] wisdom and goodness toward the Israelites. He willed that an opportunity be given for exercising their faith and obedience longer. "By faith," says the Apostle (Heb. 11:30), "the walls of Jericho collapsed, by the circuit of seven days." That faith was both Joshua's own and the whole people's, while they kept coming, so many times, on so many days, to go around that city. Some faithless and refractory [men] might say: "To what purpose so many days, and circuits of the city? Cannot our God overthrow those walls in a single day, at once?" *III.* That the desire of the Israelites might be the more kindled, [and] a greater ardor be stirred up in [their] prayers. For desires which are put off a little while grow. *IV.* That they might learn, in the things which they desire, always to keep a measure. For while the famished are borne with too great an onrush upon food, they do not refresh their nature, but overwhelm it. If Esau had bridled his craving, [he would] so [not have lost] his birthright…

(col. 771)

…[If Esau had bridled his craving,] he would not have reckoned his birthright as nothing (Gen. 25:32, 34). In all these cravings: "Put it off! — small delays have great advantages." *V.* That, in the expectation of God's promises, and in the observance of his commands, in prayers, and in the handling of all religious [duties], constancy and perseverance might be commended to us — partly by the decree of God himself who prescribed those [seven] days, partly by the example of the Israelites obeying him. *VI.* That it might be made clearly manifest to all that this ruin was made not by any chance or fortuitous cause — of the kind that sometimes happens in earthquakes — but by the predetermined and destined counsel and will of the superior agent-cause [God], as Abulensis declares at length, q. 3.

The trumpets were *many*, *first*: that the sound might be greater, which could be heard both by the Israelites, [being] so many, and by all the men of Jericho. For I do not at all doubt, with Aristotle (of whom above, q. 22), that a sound is carried farther if it be the shout of many. Now that sound, as has been said, incited and refreshed the Israelites; but the men of Jericho, if they were wise, it invited to penitence, and terrified. *Secondly*: that the multitude of the heralds of the Gospel might be signified. *Thirdly*: that the office, efficacy, and force of the same [heralds] in demolishing the worldly Jericho might be demonstrated. All these [things] the renowned and ancient trumpeters set forth beautifully — St. Augustine and Origen. The former, indeed, [in] sermon 106 *On the Season*, with these words: "Jericho, brothers, was a type of this world. For just as then, at the sounding of the trumpets, those walls fell, so now too it behooves that the city of the world — that is, pride with its towers, namely avarice, envy, and luxury, together with its peoples, that is, with all evil concupiscences — be destroyed and perish utterly by the constant preaching of the priests. It behooves not, therefore, that the priests be silent in the Church, but let them hear the Lord saying: 'Cry, cease not, lift up your voice like a trumpet, and announce to my people their crimes' [Isa. 58:1]. We are commanded, therefore, to cry, and to cry vehemently. 'Spare not,' he says — that is, [spare not] the sinner's iniquity, lest by keeping silent it perish; and while you consult his shame, you do not consult his health, lest, by keeping silent, you nourish for the worse the wounds which by crying out you could have cut away. We are commanded, therefore, to cry; and, lest anyone say he did not hear, or the priest's voice be hidden from any, to cry vehemently." And, lest perhaps this itself should not suffice, he adds, saying: "'Lift up your voice like a trumpet.' You know that the trumpet is wont to be [an instrument] not so much of delight as of terror; not so much to hold forth pleasure as to inspire dread. The trumpet, therefore, is necessary for sinners — [a trumpet] which not only penetrates their ears, but also shakes the heart; which delights not by [its] song, but chastises by [its] hearing; and which exhorts all the strenuous in good [works], and terrifies the slack for [their] faults. For just as in battle the trumpet casts down the mind of the fearful soldier, and kindles the courage of the brave, so also the priestly trumpet humbles the mind of the sinner, [and] strengthens the courage of the holy man. Nor does it spare the voice, as it spares [seeks] health; and by one and the same sound it gives to the one [the holy man] exhortation, that he may be stronger for conquering, [and] on the other [the sinner] it strikes terror, that he may be slower to sin. For this is the trumpet's custom: that it may

scatter the works of transgressors, and confirm the deeds of the saints." That all these [things] were done in a figure, there is no doubt. For what else do we believe the priestly trumpets of that time to have prefigured, than the preachings of the priests of this time — through which they cease not to announce to sinners, with a terrible sound, the stern judgment; to preach the sad destruction of Gehenna; and, with a certain crash of threatening, [to] the ears of transgressors beat? "For just as then the clangor of the trumpets, once evil thoughts were destroyed, passed through to the bare [depths] of the soul; and just as the sound of the sacred voice destroyed and took captive the stubborn people, so also now the priestly preaching subjugates the sinful people."

Origen, hom. 7: "Jericho is the form of the present age, whose strength and defenses we see to have been destroyed by the priestly trumpets. For the firmness and the defenses by which, as by walls, that world relied — [these were] the worship of idols, ministered by the deceptive art of the demons' divinations, [and] the fabrications of augurs and haruspices and magicians, by all which, as by most strong walls, this world was ringed about. Moreover, it was also strengthened by the diverse dogmas of the philosophers, and by [their] most eminent assertions and disputations — as by certain tall and robust towers. But our Lord JESUS CHRIST, coming — whose advent that former son of Nun [Joshua] designated — sends his priests, his Apostles, bearing ductile [beaten-metal] trumpets; and the magnificent and heavenly doctrine of [his] preaching, Matthew first sounded forth with the priestly trumpet in his Gospel; Mark too, [and] Luke, and John, sounded [it] with their several priestly trumpets. Peter too resounds with the two trumpets of his epistles; James too, and Jude. And John still adds, moreover, to sound the trumpet through his epistles and the Apocalypse; and Luke, describing the deeds of the Apostles. But last of all comes that one who said: 'I think that God has set forth us, the Apostles, last of all' [1 Cor. 4:9] — and, fulminating with the trumpets of his fourteen epistles, he cast down to the very foundations the walls of Jericho, and all the engines of idolatry, and the dogmas of the philosophers." And this last [point], about St. Paul, [Origen puts] excellently, as is his wont. The golden trumpet of St. Chrysostom resounds [likewise], hom. 25 on 2 Corinthians: "Just as," he says, "one man, assailed in war by the whole world, might move among the very wedges [ranks] of the enemy, and suffer nothing adverse, so also Paul, alone among Barbarians, among Gentiles, everywhere on earth, and appearing in all the parts of the sea, remained unconquered. And just as some spark, falling into stubble and hay, turns into its own nature the things that are burned, so here too, invading in the same manner, he was leading all over to the truth, [sweeping] all things like a torrent." St. Ambrose, in the prologue to book 1 *On the Faith, to Gratian*: "Jesus [Joshua] too, the son of Nun, conquered the enemies — whom the strong hand of the whole army could not overcome — by the sound of the seven priestly trumpets, when he recognized the captain of the heavenly host. Therefore you too now prepare to conquer, you who adore Christ; you prepare to conquer, you who champion the faith." And in the same work, book 5: "Joshua led forth into the wars no bronze-clad battle-lines, nor [conquered] by the ram and the other engines of artillery, but by the sound of the seven priestly trumpets he laid low the enclosures of the enemy walls. Thus the trumpet's clangor, and the priest's fillet [mitre], accomplished a monstrous war."

But the causes of the *many circuits* [are] the same as [those] of the days. But because our heretics accuse the various rites and ceremonies of the Catholics of a certain fatuous inanity and folly, it will not be beside the point to recall to their memory this very example of God, of Joshua, and of the Israelites — and indeed (that it may have more authority with them) in the words of a rabbi great among them, namely Calvin, who writes thus on this passage: "God commands [them] to go around the city with one circuit daily, up to the seventh day, on which he commands them to go around seven times, to sound the trumpets, and to shout; which whole [thing] was nothing else than to play childishly. But by this test it was worth the while that their faith be proved: so that, discerning in the matter itself nothing but mere frustration [futility], they should nevertheless acquiesce in GOD's miracle — with which counsel too [God] often hides his power for a time under weakness,…"

(col. 773)

…"[with which counsel too God often hides his power under weakness for a time,] and seems to play with empty trifles, so that his weakness may at last appear stronger than all power, and his folly shine out above all wisdom. So, while they are bidden to give way to his reasoning, the Israelites hang upon his mouth; by acting foolishly they profit far more than if they had made an assault by violent effort, and had shaken the walls with the mightiest and countless engines. It behooved that they be foolish only for a short time, and not eagerly, anxiously, and subtly inquire about the outcome — because that would in some manner have blocked the way to God's power. Meanwhile, although their circular walking could be a laughingstock, at last, by the prosperous outcome, it became known that God commands nothing in vain."

Question XXVII. Why, along with the trumpet-clangor, was now silence, now a shout, enjoined upon the people?

"All things," says Ecclesiastes (ch. 3, v. 1), "have their time. A time to be silent, a time to speak" (v. 7). But Joshua does not permit each of these two times, in the common business of all, to the discretion of anyone; rather, as one to whom the care of the common and public good [belongs], he accurately dispenses that [matter], and enjoins [it] upon the people (v. 10): "You shall not cry, nor shall your voice be heard, nor shall any word go forth from your mouth, until the day comes on which I shall say to you: shout and cry aloud." Now that day was the seventh day, and indeed then, when the seventh circuit had been completed, as was expounded above, q. 17. But the *causes of the silence* were not those which Ralbag has devised — namely, lest the men of Jericho, roused by the shouts of the Israelites, should defend their walls, defend the city, and, as those [Israelites] walked around, attack them with darts and stones. What? Were the men of Jericho so deaf that they did not hear the noise and clangors of the trumpets? So heedless and mad that they had not, even in the higher towers, any watchman to announce the enemies' plans and approaches? These [are] rather the causes. *First*: Before a battle, and while the enemy is still at a distance, the masters of military affairs judge that one must abstain from all shouting. "On the march," says Gellius (book 1, ch. 11), "there is need of calm and silence, when one goes toward an enemy standing far off, at a long distance in view. But when it has come near, to close quarters, then now, from nearby, the enemy is both to be driven back by the charge and to be terrified by the shout." Now although there was here no [actual] battle, yet the appearance of a battle was on the seventh day, when the Israelites were borne with great force into the city and to the slaughter: it would have been a battle in either case, had not a loftier force struck both their [the enemies'] courage and their walls. But on the earlier days there was no nearer approach to the enemy. *II.* The clangor of the trumpets manifested the presence of God; and the same [was], as it were, a certain voice and exhortation of God himself, as is had [in] Num. 10:9. Therefore, with ears and minds attentive and alert, it was fitting to receive it, and to hear [it] in a reverent silence — [so] that not even the least little word should chatter in among it. *III.* While mouth and tongue were silent, [it was fitting] to ponder in the mind the goodness, benefits, and majesty of God; to give him thanks; to offer vows and prayers, [asking] that he would now deign to bestow the good things he had promised: so that this silence was by no means stupid and idle, but joined with a great stirring of mind, with religion, and with prayer. He [Homer] censures — as is noted by Eustathius — in the Iliad, the Trojans, because in battle "they went like birds, with clamor and clangor"; but on the contrary he praises the Achaeans going to the fight not shouting, chattering, [and] making a din, but with a keen silence, [full of] modesty and a silent concord, [and] meditative:

> *"But the Achaeans went in silence, breathing might,*
>
> *eager in their heart to defend one another." [Iliad 3.8–9]*

IV. It is indicated generally what is to be done in sacred [rites], what in Christian processions. The Gentiles used to say in their sacrifices, "Favor [us] with tongues and minds" [keep a holy silence]: how much more ought we Christians [do] this very thing? Here was a war, and yet, though very many myriads of men [were]

together, there was the utmost silence. What [ought to be done] in the temples, at the time of that sacrifice by which peace is established between us and God; what in the public prayers and litanies, in which we all beg the same Lord for pardon and peace to be made? A few things which I once set down in [my] *On the Joshuan Priests* I shall add on this matter: "Processions — whether *amburbales*, or *ambaruales*, or any others whatsoever — we rightly fetch not from the institutions of the Gentiles (as I-know-not-who objects), but from the pomps of the men of Jericho, so often and so seriously repeated — that we may learn not only their most ancient origin, but also the best manner and reason [of them]. In them one must not walk for the sake of [idle] spirits or curiosity, nor spend time in silly chatterings. 'Your voice shall not be heard,' he says, 'nor shall any word go forth from your mouth'; but one must proceed gravely, modestly, and religiously: something pious must be meditated, prayed, and sung together. For to this end also are carried [in procession] the sacred relics of the saints, the labara [banners] of the Lord's cross, and the ark itself of the most holy Sacrament — which, under a certain appearance and covering, yet a propitiatory one, contains CHRIST the Lord and Savior." See, if it please [you], [my work] on processions, book 1, ch. 7, p. 75. And weigh, I pray, how gravely, how seriously our Jesus [Joshua] enjoins this silence. It was not enough for him to say "You shall not cry out": but he added, "nor shall your voice be heard"; or, as it is word-for-word in the Hebrew, "You shall not make your voice to be heard." And, not content with this, he still subjoins: "nor shall any word go forth from your mouth." What if something new and unusual had happened? Was it not [then] permitted to ask what the matter was, [or] to answer one asking? What if someone did not keep his rank, or advanced too slowly, or went on too swiftly — would there be no means of warning [him]? What if, in contempt of the Israelites — as was done in the siege of Jerusalem — the men of Jericho should do something: [was it not] right to murmur a word and point it out to another? What too, if the same [men] should sally out from the city — [was it not permitted] to shout "to arms, to arms"? Truly, "no word," says our Jesus, "shall go forth from your mouth" — [no word], that is, which may make a sound. Is coughing, then, and clearing the throat, also forbidden? Rambam [Maimonides] disputes (book 1, Halacha 3, ch. 4) whether, if someone sneezes in a house of *Midrash* [study], it is permitted to wish him *Rephuah* — that is, to pray a blessing of health for him. And he answers that it is not necessary, because the sanctity of this house is greater than [that of] the house of *Kenisuth* [the synagogue] (fol. 20, at the end of the chapter). Moreover, our [interpreter, the Vulgate] rendered "speech," because the Hebrew *dabar* denotes not only a thing but a word — nay, a thing, because it is wont to be denoted by a word; and this whole clause the 70 omitted, content with the prior two — because by it nothing new is prescribed, although, without doubt, [it serves] to inculcate the prior [clauses] the more; in the Hebrew and Latin…

(col. 775)

…[in the Hebrew and Latin] let it be [repeated]. For the things we most of all, and most accurately, wish to be done, these very [things] we repeat again and again. *V.* While the trumpets of the divine word resound, [while] the Gospels are preached, [while] sermons are made, the lips are utterly to be restrained with the fingers. *VI.* Silence, indeed, seems a sign of timidity — nay, it is even wont to bring fear itself; as, on the cited passage of Homer, the Archbishop of Thessalonica [Eustathius] notes, and perhaps some of the men of Jericho suspected thus of the Israelites. But the Israelites despised suspicions and talk of this kind; and [chose] to obey Joshua in silence, rather than to make a vain show of boldness, and of minds loosed from all fear, either by disordered shouts or by [too-]careless words and chatterings. After the six-day silence, the *shout* was *commanded*. *First*, indeed, on account of the things said above, q. 16. *Secondly*, that there might be an approbation of the things which had hitherto been signaled by the priests with the clangor of the trumpets. *Thirdly*, that it might be signified that, after the priestly trumpets and exhortations, God is to be praised by us, and the hand at once to be set to the work. *Fourthly*: In sacred rites and processions, when the priests have discharged their parts, [it is fitting] that the Laity also perform their own parts, by communicating [taking part], praying together, [and] singing together. *Fifthly*: one must not always be silent, but, when the matter and need demands, one must cry out most gravely and most intently against the enemies

of the faith, the sowers of crimes, [and] the imitators of the impiety and wickedness of Jericho. *Sixthly*: one must always be silent both first and longer than one speaks. For here [there was] shouting on one day, and [only] once; but silence [was kept] all six days, and in the thirteen circuits. *Seventhly*: that the notable agreement and consonance of the peoples with the priests, and of both among themselves — which is [found] in the Catholic Church — might be foreshown and commended. When he discusses that concordant joint-shout of the people with the priests' trumpets, in hom. 7, Origen wonders why it was said in Ps. 88[89]:16, "Blessed [is] the people that knows jubilation." "It moves [me]," he says, "this saying — what so great a work [it is] that makes a people blessed. He did not say, 'Blessed the people that works justice,' or 'Blessed the people that knows the mysteries,' or 'that knows the reckoning of heaven and earth and the stars'; but 'Blessed,' he says, 'the people that knows jubilation.' In others [i.e., other texts] the fear of God makes [one] blessed, yet makes only a single man blessed. For so he says, 'Blessed the man that fears the Lord.' Elsewhere too many are made blessed — as the poor in spirit, or the meek, or the peacemakers, or the clean of heart. Hither [belongs] the Beatitude [that] is poured out lavishly, and here I-know-not-what so great a cause of blessedness is indicated, that it makes the whole people alike blessed — [any people] that shall [only] have known jubilation." But at last the same Origen answers: "It seems to me that jubilation indicates a certain disposition of concord and unanimity. If it fall upon two or three disciples of Christ, [then] all things whatsoever they shall have asked in the name of the Savior, the heavenly Father grants them. But if the blessedness be so great that the whole people remains concordant and unanimous, so that all say the same things, abiding in the same sense and in the same judgment — then, when such a people lifts its voice unanimously, that will come to pass which is written in the Acts of the Apostles: that a great earthquake was made, where then they were praying with one mind — the Apostles with the women, and Mary the mother of JESUS — and, an earthquake being made, [the walls] will be destroyed, and all things that are earthly will fall, and the world itself will be overthrown. Hear, finally, our Lord and Savior [saying], to this very [end] exhorting his soldiers — how he says, 'Be of good cheer, I have conquered the world.' Under him, therefore, as leader, the world is now conquered for us, and its walls, on which the men of the [worldly] age relied, have collapsed." Moreover the same author adduces yet two other causes. The one — to me the eighth — that there might be signified the joy and exultation with which the Angels were affected at the Lord's Nativity, when, as with one voice, they cried out together, "Glory to God in the highest." The other — to me the ninth — that there might be signified the clangor and shout of the same Angels and of the saints at the world's end, or the Lord's second coming. The former [Origen] pursues [in] homily 7, thus: "At the coming of JESUS [Joshua] the walls of Jericho were overthrown; at the coming of my Lord JESUS the world is conquered. Yet how the world is conquered, I should wish to know, [and] to understand more manifestly and clearly the things that are said. I myself, who teach, wish to learn together with you. Let us take Paul in common as our Master. For he is the minister of Christ, who can show us how Christ conquered the world. Hear him, then, saying: 'What was contrary to us, he took away from the midst, fixing it to his cross; and, despoiling the principalities and powers, he led [them] across, freely triumphing over them on the wood of the cross' [Col. 2:14–15]. From these words, therefore, I understand this: that the heavenly Virtues, seeing the battle of Jesus — [seeing] the contrary principalities and powers stripped of their powers, the strong one bound, and his vessels plundered — sounded out with their heavenly trumpets, because, the prince of this world being bound, the world was conquered; and the heavenly host gave the voice of jubilation in the triumph of Christ. Truly, therefore, blessed is the people of the Gentiles, that has known this jubilation of the heavenly host, and that acknowledges and believes the mysteries." But in the sixth homily [Origen] explains the latter cause thus: "We frequently find in the Scriptures that Jericho is set as a figure of the world. For also in the Gospel, where it is said that a man went down from Jerusalem to Jericho, and fell among robbers, [that man] was without doubt a form of that Adam who was thrust out from Paradise into the exile of this world. And also the blind men who were in Jericho, to whom Jesus came to make them see, bore the form of those who in this world were oppressed by the blindness of ignorance, [and] to whom the Son of God came. This Jericho, therefore — that is, this world — is [destined] to fall. For the consummation of the age has long

since been published abroad in the holy volumes. How, then, will the consummation be given to it? by what instruments? By the voices," he says, "of the trumpets. Of which trumpets? Let Paul betray to you the secret of this mystery. Hear what he himself says: 'The trumpet,' he says, 'shall sound, and the dead who are in Christ shall rise incorruptible; and the Lord himself, at the command, at the voice of the Archangel, and at the trumpet of God, shall descend from heaven' [1 Thess. 4:16]. Then, therefore, our Lord Jesus, with the trumpets, will conquer Jericho, and cast it down."

Question XXVIII. Why, definitely, were seven trumpets, seven days, and — on the seventh day — seven circuits employed?

Abulensis's answer (q. 4) is ready and easy: this number was definitely employed because it so pleased God. "For what has pleased the prince has the force of law" [Digest, *On the constitutions of princes*, law "Quod principi"]. And, as readily and easily as this is said, so too that it is true cannot be denied. But that cause [is], in all things, a general [one]…

(col. 777)

…[But that cause, in all things, is a general one]; and, though the mind is not ignorant of it — especially [a mind] steeped in true piety — yet it advances, and still inquires whether some fitting reason can be adduced, why the Lord should seem to have willed it. Others, therefore, answer that the number seven is sacred, and pleasing to God in many things. "See," says St. Bernard (sermon 15 on the Canticle, near the end), "seven is a sacred number; it is not idle." St. Jerome, on Galatians ch. 5: "To the faith," he says, "is given the seventh, and more sacred, place." And again: "the seventh place," he says, "the striving holds — [seven being] as it were a consecrated and eminent number among the vices." [St.] Bede, on Acts ch. 6, says the deacons were seven "not without the mystery of the sevenfold number." Similar [things say] St. Nazianzen, oration 44 on Pentecost, and the oration on the Maccabees; St. Augustine, in the book *On the Spirit and the Soul*, ch. 62, [and] book 11 of the *City [of God]*, ch. 31; Philo, *On the Contemplative Life*; and, among the profane [authors], Cicero, in the *[Dream of Scipio]*, when he calls [seven] "the knot of all things"; the most ancient of the Greek poets, Linus, "the origin of all things"; Censorinus, in the book *On the Birthday*, ch. 5: "The seventh number," he says, "among the Jews is [foremost] in the reckoning of all times." For [Scripture] regards the seven days of the week, the seven weeks of Pentecost, the seven years of the land's sabbath, the seven weeks of years of the Jubilee. Tacitus (book 5 of the *Histories*): "Most of the heavenly [bodies] accomplish their force and course by sevenfold numbers." See Nicomachus of Gerasa in [his] *Arithmetic*; Rhodiginus, book 4, ch. 24, [and] book 22, ch. 12; Cassanaeus, *On the Glory of the World*; Gerard Vossius on the Dream of Scipio; our own Salmerón, in the prologue to the Gospels, 20; and several others, whom I have cited [in my commentary] on Tobit, ch. 12, q. 7. And by these [authorities] enough is indeed done for the proposed question; yet the human mind does not yet rest — it presses, insists, ponders: why, and whence, [comes] to this number so great a sanctity, or grace, and authority? Masius, on this very passage (fol. 107 and following), with great and diligent zeal and effort, strove to settle this question. For he says that there are *seven kinds of all things*, of which this whole universe consists, and outside which nothing at all anywhere either is, or can be; and therefore the sevenfold [number] deservedly, among all [peoples], has so [great] a name, mystery, and veneration. The *first* kind of things is spiritual creation — namely, the Angels themselves. The *second*, simple bodies — the heavens and the elements. The *third*, mixed inanimate bodies. The *fourth*, mixed bodies animated with that soul only which gives life alone — as trees, plants. The *fifth*, [bodies] animated with that soul which, together with life, bestows sense — as are the brutes. The *sixth*, [bodies] animated with a soul which, together with life and sense, furnishes intellect — as [is] man. The *seventh* — which can also be called the first — is God, the author and creator of all these: the beginning and end of all, from whom all things began, and into whom all things end. Hence, therefore, in the very creation of things [there is] a week of days, whose six former days correspond to the six kinds of created things; but

the Sabbath [corresponds] to the seventh kind of things, [being] dedicated and consecrated to God the Creator — so much so that the Cabalists say that "whoever does not keep the Sabbath thinks rightly neither about the creation of the world nor about the future life." Hence thereafter, in sacred [rites], and in the rites and institutions of various [kinds], the sevenfold [number] was employed, and the number held in esteem, for the perpetual memory and signification of so great a mystery. All [this is] fitting enough. Yet someone could still inquire, why the kinds of ani- mate [things] are here divided more minutely than [the kinds] of other things? why those six kinds of creatures were not created distinctly on six days, each on its own? For — to say nothing of other [difficulties] — *when* the Angels were created is still undecided [sub iudice]. Finally, why were not more or fewer kinds of things created? Namely, in that kind [of question] we cannot cut everything to the quick by the reasons of the divine counsel and will. Yet a reply can be made to all these [questions]. But because the reply would have to be fetched from the various, multiform opinions which are [held] in the debates of Philosophers and Theologians, the Reader will be content with the things hitherto adduced; but [I add this], so that I may indicate some proper causes of this question. And these will be twofold. For, first, because the sevenfold number not rarely signifies not a definite [number], but the more frequent repetition of some thing — as will be said [at] Kings, ch. 2 — we can here generally reckon that there were seven priests for this reason: that there might be signified all that multitude of them, whether of Angels or of men, who, from duty, from charity, and by the inspiration or command of God, use — with their prayers before Him, and with their voices and admonitions before their neighbor, as certain trumpets — [these instruments], so that the vanity and perversity of this world may be overthrown in the minds of all, [and] that the walls and all the impediments, by which the approach to their hearts is blocked against the feet of the holy Israelites who evangelize peace, may be cut down. For to each of these it is said, "Cry, cease not, lift up your voice like a trumpet, and announce to my people their crimes" (Isa. 58:1, and ch. 40:9). Trumpeters of this kind were the Prophets, the Apostles, and all Apostolic men — so that, in the life of St. Bernard, it is written that, against the schism of Peter Leonis [Anacletus II], "as [one summoned] to demolish Jericho, the priestly trumpeter was called out" (book 2, ch. 7), and elsewhere. Thus, by the *seven trumpets* of them, we understand all [those things] which they use as instruments toward the aforesaid end — whether they be supernatural or natural — such as eloquence, erudition, [and] the charisms of the Holy Spirit. Through all these, the voice of them, most clear for moving the minds of men — whose hearts, ensnared by the pleasures of this world, are touched by no care or thought of heavenly things — is wont, in breaking through [those hearts], to be poured forth quite wonderfully. All these [things], if they be regarded in themselves, are small, and of no great moment, and cheap — like rams' horns; yet when they are handled at God's nod, and serve his will and praise, they are the trumpets of the Jubilee: they arouse true peace, true liberty, and true jubilation and joy — [and] to them no power of the world, no obstacles of impious men, no engines of the hellish enemies can resist. By the *seven days* — of all the ages, in which the Jericho-like beauty and pleasantness of this world seems to flourish and endure — we understand the whole span. For this consists of the constant weeks of rolling and re-rolling days; and though it seem very long, it is very short, [being only] like seven days. By the *seven circuits* on the seventh day — are there not denoted the pilgrimages, the courses, and all the labors of all the pious and true Israelites, by which they are wearied in this world? Jericho standing and flourishing they never en- …

(col. 779)

…[Jericho standing and flourishing they never] enter, but only go around — that is, they never give themselves wholly to the pleasures and empty joys of this world; but, sober, chaste, and holy, they walk around them only, seeing them, yet despising them, and desiring [them] overthrown.

Secondly, specifically: the *sevenfold number of priests* not unfitly designates those seven Princes of the Angels, of whom I have said much [on] Tobit 12. Nay, it can also signify the seven lower orders of Angels; to which, if there be joined — as *Cherubim and Seraphim* — the two others [priests], who carried the ark on

their shoulders, we shall see all the choirs of Angels, with their various offices, venerate, worship, and proclaim the humanity of CHRIST the Lord; be present to the multitude of pious Israelites; with their jubilating trumpets, arouse it to all piety, religion, and the hatred and storming of the vices, and console and refresh it; but to the wicked metropolis of the worldly, announce and threaten ruin and destruction, and at last — while they [the worldly] do not repent — inflict [it], just as [do] the seven Angels, with the seven trumpets, in the Apocalypse. There are signified also the seven orders of the Church, to which those carrying the ark come up — [namely] the Episcopate, and the Supreme Pontificate. There are signified men marked with the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit: the seven heralds of the sacraments, and the trumpeters against the heretical Jericho of our time — the stormers of the seven capital vices, as of the strongest walls.

The *seven trumpets* are those very [things] which I have already called the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, the seven sacraments, and also the seven liberal arts — by whose force, and right and holy use, as I said before, the Jericho-walls of the vices, of infidelity, and of all heresies can be shaken, cast down to the foundations, and prostrated.

The *seven days* are [the days] of this world, of which I have spoken in Genesis: six ages, together with the eternity adjoined — which the Apostle teaches (Heb. ch. 4) is signified by the seventh day, or Sabbath. There are also the seven days of the week, on which the pious constantly worship God — whence, the Gentile [names] having been rejected (of the Sun, Moon, Mars, and other like names), they are better called *feriæ* by the Church. What too [of] the seven grades of age in men — infancy, boyhood, adolescence, youth, settled age, old age, and decrepit senility? But let the opinion of Rupert too be heard (ch. 9): "Why," he says, "must one go around the city six days once per day, but on the seventh day seven times? Namely, because the city of the devil is to be judged both for the creature of the world — whence it could have known the Creator — and for the coming of the Son of God, whom it does not receive. The circuit of six days signifies the judgment of the sixfold creature [creation]. For in six days all these [things] were created. And the Apostle, when he had said that 'what is known of God is manifest in them, for God manifests [it] to them,' immediately subjoined: 'For his invisible [attributes], from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood through the things that are made — his eternal power also and divinity — so that they are inexcusable, because, when they had known God, they did not glorify [him] as God, nor gave thanks,' etc. [Rom. 1:19–21]. Therefore, for six days, once on each single day, the enemy city is encircled, because through the understood creature of the world the impiety of men — who did not approve of holding God in [their] knowledge — is to be judged. But sevenfold — that is, most greatly — [they are to be judged], and [they are] to be judged more in every way through the coming of the Son of God, because they did not receive him. For did they not indeed hear? 'And indeed, into all the earth their sound went out,' etc. [Rom. 10:18]. They heard, the heavens narrating; and they saw 'his tabernacle set in the sun, nor is there any that hides himself from his heat' [Ps. 18:6–7]. This [is] said as marvelously as truly — [namely], that the coming of the Son of God was no more hidden from them than that sun which is seen by all. For this [reason], I say, they are to be judged more, and by this they will be most greatly inexcusable. Therefore this too was rightly said or done, that — with each of the other days once — on the seventh day the city should be circled seven times. For the seventh [is] the day on which God rested from all work. The seven *circuits* on the seventh day are the seven actions by which the blessed in heaven clearly see God, sincerely love [him], constantly praise [him], clearly enjoy [him], are delighted without any interruption, bless their own bodies, and all exult among themselves in a most joyful fellowship — and that unto all eternity thereafter, as the circuits made around [the city] suggest. For what would you call first, what last, in a circle? But also in this [present] life, the same seven circuits admonish [us] to use well the seven gifts of the Holy Spirit, well the seven sacraments of the Church, well the seven liberal disciplines, well our seven ages, well the seven days of the week: and with these to fight against Jericho, and to storm all its gates, ramparts, and walls." It also seems to me to be signified that, with a more earnest care, the holy Angels — [beings] loving our salvation — admonish and urge us when the last time of life is at hand. For what at other times they do as it were once,

this they then do sevenfold; just as, on the contrary, the demons then too solicit us to [our] fall much more vehemently, cunningly, and frequently. It is given, finally, to understand what fervor of piety, at that same extreme term of our life, and what care and assiduity in the service of God — what diligence, solicitude, and effort — ought to be [expended] in the hearing of the divine trumpets, in the escort of the ark of the covenant, and in the plucking-out and casting-down of the walls of Jericho, that is, of all the vices.

Question XXIX. Of these seven days, which was the first, and which the last? Was it the Passover? the Sabbath? or another day?

Of the seven days on which the Israelites circled Jericho, there is, as to the *first*, a twofold opinion. *One*, of Josephus (book 5, ch. 1): that it was the *paschal* [day], or the first [day] of the feast of unleavened bread — which, as was expounded above (ch. 5, q. 28, ch. 31), was the 15th day of the month Nisan itself. *The other*, of the Hebrew Chronicles which are called *Seder Olam Rabbah* (ch. 11): that it was the day after the last day of unleavened bread, the 22nd day of the same month. But as to the *last* of those same seven days, there is one concordant opinion of all the Rabbis: that it was the *Sabbath*, as R. Joses and Radak assert on this passage, the *Seder Olam* in the cited chapter, and the Jerusalem Talmud in the tractate *On the Sabbath*, ch. 1. And it is certain that, however and from wherever we reckon these seven days, one of them was a Sabbath. For if we wish the first day to have been, say, the Lord's Day [Sunday], the seventh was the Sabbath; if the first day [was]…

(col. 781)

…[if the first day was that] of the Moon [Monday], the sixth was the Sabbath, and so on. But as to the *first day*, the *latter opinion* [the 22nd of Nisan] *seems the more to be embraced* — not only because it is [the opinion] of many Rabbis against Josephus alone, but also because it is more consonant with reason. For since the Hebrews had recovered from the circumcision they had undergone, they had business enough on the 15th day of Nisan to carry out their Passover, and on the following day likewise to gather the manna [the omer] and offer the sheaf. How, then, could they on those days have gone in the morning to Jericho, and circled it with the ark? Then, this first Passover celebrated after a long interval, these first days of unleavened bread, this first festival of the Lord in the land of promise, seems to have demanded a religious ceremony and rest, and a remaining, each in his own tabernacle, by no means occupied [with other business] — so that all might the better recall God's benefits and mighty works, and the parents themselves might the more aptly teach these same [things] to their children; especially since the new occupation of the new business — however pious and divine — would [otherwise] have called away [their] minds from the consideration of the Lord's ancient works, and would have drawn to itself alone the minds and tongues of all. For what, during those *amburbal* days [of solemn circling], could the Israelites either say or think, other than what this new manner of fighting meant for them? to what end so many periods [circuits], prescribed in such a manner and reason, were going to come out? When, therefore, the seven days of unleavened bread had been completed, it is nearer the truth that these periods were [only then] begun.

But *as to the last* day of those same periods, whether it was a *Sabbath*, Abulensis (ch. 7, q. 65) says [is] uncertain, and calls [it] a *divination* [guess]. But I have no cause to wish to dissent from all [the Rabbis]. For the rest, from that so great consensus of the Rabbis concerning the Sabbath, [some things are] to be learned. *First*, generally: Radak rightly writes, in this passage, "He who commanded the Sabbath, also commanded that they should profane it." *Secondly*, specifically, [there are] several [things]. *First*: on a Sabbath it is permitted to walk over some space of ground. For from the camp, which was 10 stadia distant from Jericho (as was shown, ch. 4, q. 4), they came up to the city; and, besides, they surrounded the city in a circle. And the larger the city was, and the farther they [kept] from it, beyond a dart's throw, the larger were the circles. Then they returned into the camp by the same length of journey. *Secondly*: it is likewise permitted, on a Sabbath, to perform, for the honor of God, certain ceremonies, even laborious and toilsome ones. For these

seven circuits — besides the others of the previous days, and the daily going-out from the camp — had something of work and labor. *Thirdly*: it is permitted, on a Sabbath, to wage war with enemies, to invade, ravage, and slaughter them. For all these [things] were done here. Whence, in the book against the Jews, ch. 4, Tertullian [says]: "The Jews will say that, from [the time] this precept (concerning the Sabbath) was given through Moses, it was thenceforth to be observed. It is manifest, therefore, that the precept was not eternal nor spiritual, but temporal, and [was] such as would at some time cease — since, finally, so [far is it] that this solemnity [was] to be celebrated in the rest of the Sabbath, that is, of the seventh day, [that rather] Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun, in his time, when he was subduing the city of Jericho, said that a precept [was given] to him by God, that he should command the people that the priests should carry around the ark of the testament of God for seven days in the circuit of the city; and that thus, when the circuit of the seventh day was completed, the walls of the city should fall of their own accord. Which was so done, and, the space of the seventh day being finished, as had been foretold, the walls of the city fell. From which it is manifestly shown that in the number of those seven days there fell the Sabbath day. For seven days, from wherever they take [their] beginning, necessarily include the Sabbath day with them — on which day not only did the priests labor, but the city was made a spoil, by the edge of the sword, by all the people of Israel. Nor is there doubt that they did servile work, since they carried off the spoils of war by God's precept. For also in the times of the Maccabees they did valiantly by fighting on the Sabbaths, and stormed the foreign [Philistine] enemies, and, by fighting on Sabbaths, recalled the ancestral law to its former state of life. Nor would I think they defended any other law than that in which they remembered [it] to have been prescribed concerning the Sabbath day. Whence it is manifest that [the law] had force for a time and for the necessity of the present cause, [and] that God had not given a law of this kind to them for the observance of perpetual time." But when the impious Marcion objected that the God of the Old Testament had contradicted himself, in that he had introduced a cessation from all works on the Sabbaths, and yet the same [God], in this passage, had commanded the carrying-around of the ark, [Tertullian] answers him (book 2 against him, ch. 21): "So also, among the rest, you reproach him with contrarieties of precepts, as [being] fickle and unstable — [the God] who forbids [them] to work on Sabbaths, and [yet] commands the ark to be carried around for eight days [across a week], that is, on the Sabbath too, in the storming of the city of Jericho. For you do not look into the Sabbaths' law, [which] forbids human, not divine, works. Since he says: 'Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy works; but the seventh day [is] the sabbath of the Lord thy God: thou shalt not do in it any work' — which of course [is] thine own. For it follows that he should take away, on the Sabbath, those works which, over the six days, he had above enjoined — namely, thine own, that is, human and daily works. But to carry around the ark can be seen neither as a daily work, nor a human one, but both a rare and sacrosanct [one], and — from that precept of God then [given] — certainly a divine one. And what this signified, I would explain, were it not long to unfold the figures of all the arguments of an orator — which perhaps you do not even admit. But it is more, if you are refuted from things plain, by the simplicity of truth, not [by] curiosity: as also now there is a certain distinction, of the Sabbath forbidding human, not divine works. And therefore he who had gone to gather wood on the Sabbaths was put to death. For he had done his own work, forbidden by the law. But those who had carried the ark around on the Sabbaths did [it] with impunity — for they had administered not their own work, but God's, namely by his own precept." And when the same heretic, with the same audacity of impiety, charged CHRIST the Lord with having violated the Sabbath against the precepts of the God of the Old Testament, the same Tertullian meets [him] excellently (book 4, ch. 12): "If CHRIST set aside the Sabbath, he did [so] according to the example of the Creator. Since, in the siege of the city of Jericho, the ark of the testament, carried around the walls for seven days — on the Sabbath too — by the Creator's precept, 'destroyed' the Sabbath by [that] operation — as those think who so judge of Christ too, ignorant that neither did Christ destroy the Sabbath, nor the Creator, as we shall soon teach. And yet through Jesus [Joshua] the Sabbath was then too shaken, so that from this [the charge might be] proclaimed against Christ — [namely] that, even if he pursued the most solemn day of the Jews with hatred, [it was] as Christ [belonging] not to the Jews. Having professed the Creator's hatred also of the Sabbath — as Christ, being his,

followed him — crying out through the mouth of Isaiah: 'Your new moons and sabbaths my soul hates' [Isa. 1:13–14]." Again afterward: "Even if [Christ] had destroyed [the Sabbath], [he did so] deservedly, because he [is] rather that Lord who instituted [it]; but he did not destroy [it] altogether, inasmuch as [he is] Lord — so that from this it can now appear that not even then, in the carrying-around of the ark at Jericho, was the Sabbath destroyed by the Creator. For that too was a work of God, which he himself had commanded, and which he had arranged for the sake of the souls of his men, set in the crisis of war." St. Epiphanius, heresy 66, against the Manichaeans: "When," he says, "not for the sake of good…"

(col. 783)

…"[When, he says, not] for the sake of a good [cause], was the Sabbath loosed? But when [was it] not bound (or forbidden), by [the standard of] malice — not only the Sabbath, but every day? For Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun, the successor of Moses — who is numbered among the Prophets, who was chosen by God, who by [his] prayer held back the Sun and the Moon, when he said, 'Let the Sun stand near Gibeon, and the Moon near the valley of Aijalon' [Josh. 10:12] — is at once found to loose the Sabbath, on account of a good action. For for seven days JESUS [Joshua] himself goes around the walls of Jericho; and it was not permitted to go, on Sabbaths, beyond the defined measure of six stadia. But the measure of the circuit of Jericho exceeds 20 stadia. And since for seven days they surrounded the city, the Sabbath altogether fell on one of these days. But this was God's precept, that he might show the will of his production of miracles. For there were no frauds, nor engines, no rams, no military instruments for laying cities waste — but one voice of the horned trumpet, and the prayer of the just man; and they prostrated the collapsed walls of the adversaries. For it behooved them to be punished, since the sins of the Amorites had been filled up. For the law was a judge against injustice, and rendered to each according to his works; and since the Amorites were established in sins, in transgression, and [in that] they had denied the oath which they had sworn." And not long after: "In the times of Nahshon, the prince of Judah, and in the times of Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun, the sons of Shem received their own land, no injury being [done] in the midst, but by a just judgment. The walls of Jericho, therefore, fell of their own accord. For justice avenges injustice. For seven days they surrounded the walls, and the Sabbath was loosed, that justice might be fulfilled." But, if it please [you], see what I have noted [in] book 1 of Maccabees, ch. 2, fol. 631, and following. *Fourthly*: that the same is permitted on other feasts can be gathered even from Josephus's opinion. For if the first [day] of unleavened bread was also the first of the circuits, the last of unleavened bread would also have to have been the last of the circuits. But these were feast-days, as was shown, ch. 5, q. 31, Num. 4. *Fifthly*: the same, if we consider [it], it will be permitted to say of the seventh day of this month *Nisan*. For since on it Joshua ordered the provisions to be prepared, who would doubt that all [the circuits] began on that day? [see] above, ch. 2, q. 5, and below, this ch., q. 31.

Question XXX. At what hour of the seventh day was Jericho taken?

It seems that, when the walls of Jericho fell, and the open and passable city was taken,

[Figure — two concentric circles about a central point, divided by a vertical diameter. ***Center (small circle):*** *"HIERICHO INSTAR PVNCTI" — "Jericho, [the size] of a point."* ***Middle ring:*** *"HIERICHO IN LATITVDINE ET LONGITVDINE [SVA]" — "Jericho in its breadth and length."* ***Outer circle:*** *"PERIPHERIA CIRCVLATIONVM" — "the perimeter of the circlings" (the Israelites' circuit-path).]*

…the hour was midday — not taking [the noon] itself most accurately, but in the common way, so that it be understood [as] around the time of midday. And this can be gathered from these [considerations]. Jericho was distant — as was said in the previous question — from the camp of the Israelites, by ten stadia; and when these [Israelites] approached from here to it, so as to be beyond the range of all missiles, they were distant [from the wall] by some space. But let us make [suppose] this space to have been half a stadium. For what less could be assumed? Let there now be adjoined the rule of the Geometers concerning the comparison of the diameter and the periphery, which our Clavius set forth in these verses, on the 1st chapter of the

Sphere:

> *"Let the circumference of the circle be multiplied by seven;*
>
> *then, the product being divided by twenty-two,*
>
> *hence the number, [as] quotient, that is named, is the diameter.*
>
> *If you multiply the diameter by twenty-two,*
>
> *and divide the number by seven, the number which comes forth from there*
>
> *gives you, as quotient, the circumference of the circle."*

Hence, therefore, I reason thus. From the periphery, which the Israelites trace by going around Jericho, [it is] half a stadium up to the city itself. Therefore, from one part of that same periphery up to the other, opposite [part], it is [one] stadium — as it were the diameter of the circle. Therefore the whole periphery is more than three stadia. Therefore, around the city, the daily circuit of the six days was of three stadia and more. Therefore the seven circuits of the seventh day were more than 21 stadia. And these [things] are still said thus, as if the city were like a point, and had no length or breadth at all. But if we grant it some [extent] — as it certainly had no very small [amount] — there will here too be no small addition of stadia. Nay, plainly St. Epiphanius (heresy 66): "The measure," he says, "of the circuit of Jericho exceeds twenty stadia." And since, in the circuits, not running and haste, but [a solemn] pace and gravity was used, it appears that, from the morning time, when they went out of the camp, to the end of all the circuits, many hours flowed between; and that [the city] was circumambulated up to midday itself, or even beyond. See [the figure].

(col. 785)

Question XXXI. Whether Jericho was burned on the same seventh day?

Fire was thrown into Jericho [when it was] captured, yet not on the same day. For the part of that [day] which remained from midday on, and the whole ensuing night, and perhaps some part of the following day, the Israelites assigned to the slaughter of the townsmen, [and] to the killing of the flocks, herds, and beasts of burden; then, indeed, to the gathering of the gold, silver, and other metals, and to the carrying [of them] out into the camp. There was also, for whoever pleased, the opportunity of viewing the soon-to-perish city, and a little leisure was given. And so, on the following day, after a few hours of the day, [the city was] set afire on all sides and burned up. If anything by chance withstood the fire, this — by Joshua's order — was dug out and demolished, says Josephus (book 5, ch. 1); and by the same Joshua was then pronounced that execration [curse] concerning it, of which [more] later. But because in various places hitherto the whole of this first month, Nisan, of the entry into the promised land has been [treated], it will be neither useless nor unpleasant, I think, to set out here a brief synopsis:

NISAN — the Month *(full-width synopsis; ■ = each week's first day; "Sabb." = the Sabbath; "azym." = day of unleavened bread; "Cir./Circui." = circuit)*

Day	Event (with cross-reference)
1	■ New Moon [Neomenia].
2	The spies sent by Joshua (ch. 2, q. 5) — the first day of their hiding.
3	2nd day of the spies' hiding.
4	3rd day of the spies' hiding, and the same [as] the day of their return (ch. 2, q. 5, & pt. 2, q. 25); or at least their return was deferred to the following day, the 5th.
5	—
6	—
7	*Sabbath.* The promulgation of the precept concerning preparation for the crossing (ch. 2, q. 5).
8	■
9	Departure to the bank of the Jordan (ch. 2, q. 5, & ch. 3, q. 2).
10	Crossing over the Jordan (ch. 2, q. 5; ch. 4, pt. 2, q. 2); the laying-out of the camp at Gilgal; the setting up of the 12 stones (ch. 4, pt. 3, q. 6).
11	Circumcision commanded and at once performed (ch. 5, q. 8).
12	—
13	—
14	*Sabbath.* The Passover, at evening (ch. 5, q. 28).
15	■ The beginning of the 41st year from the exodus out of Egypt — which year [is] the first of the entry into the promised land (ch. 4, pt. 2, q. 2); and likewise the 1st day of unleavened bread.
16	2nd [day] of

unleavened bread, & the Sheaf [Omer] offered (ch. 5, q. 22). | | 17 | 3rd of unleavened bread; the cessation of the manna (ibid.). | | 18 | 4th of unleavened bread. | | 19 | 5th of unleavened bread. | | 20 | 6th of unleavened bread. | | 21 | *Sabbath.* 7th of unleavened bread. | | 22 | ■ The Jericho circuit [1st] (ch. 6, q. 29). | | 23 | Circuit 2. | | 24 | Circuit 3. | | 25 | Circuit 4. | | 26 | Circuit 5. | | 27 | Circuit 6. | | 28 | *Sabbath.* Circuit 7, & the storming of Jericho (q. 29 here). | | 29 | ■ The burning of Jericho (here, q. 31). | | 30 | — |

Question XXXII. But how does the Jericho week [septenary] fit Jesus [Joshua]?

To bring destruction upon the unclean world and its King, the Devil, CHRIST JESUS came into these lands. "Do not think," he says (Matt. 10:34), "that I have come to send peace on the earth. I came not to send peace, but a sword." And John 16:33: "Be of good cheer: I have conquered the world." We can, therefore, either consider Christ's whole life as [one] week, or, properly, only the last week of that same life. In the former mode, these seven days can again be taken in two ways. For either we shall divide his whole life into seven equal parts, or we shall think about the same life without any such minute partition. The Lord lived on earth about 34 years — therefore about seven quinquennia [five-year periods]. And *in the first quinquennium* he circled that Jericho — to root it out at last, with all its walls and bulwarks — when he was born; and born in such humility, poverty, sharpness of cold, darkness of night, and other like [things], which are altogether opposed to the pride, splendor, pleasures, and delights of Jericho — as St. Bernard beautifully teaches, sermon 3 on the Nativity of the Lord; likewise when, a tender infant, he was circumcised on the 8th day; when he was offered to the heavenly Father [and] brought to Jerusalem, into the Temple, on the very day of the Blessed Virgin's purification; when, to escape the raging sword of Herod, he sought Egypt, and there hid. *In the second quinquennium* [is] his return from the Egyptian hiding-place into Judea, and his coming to the town of Nazareth — from which [he has] the surname *Nazarene*. For these [things] happened in the ninth year of his tender age, as Baronius teaches in volume 1 of his *Annals*. *In the third quinquennium* [is] his going up, at the age of 12, with his parents, to the Temple at Jerusalem, and his disputation with the Jewish doctors, when he spoke that illustrious word: "Did you not know that I must be in [the things] which are my Father's?" [Luke 2:49]. *In the fourth quinquennium, the fifth, and the sixth* [is] that supreme and incredible obedience and submission, by which — obscure and poor — he lay hidden with his parents, up to the 30th year of [his] age; and in these same [years], as [one] from the common crowd of the other boys and youths…

(col. 787)

…[as] someone [ordinary from the common crowd], he was subject, obeyed them, and most readily undertook all their commands. For this is what St. Luke briefly said, from that twelfth year up to the thirtieth (ch. 2, v. 51): "And he went down with them (his parents), and came to Nazareth; and he was subject to them." O how marvelous were those circuits of the true Joshua! How Jericho, and its King, were stupefied — [if] it could see this! In the *seventh and last quinquennium* [is] the most sacred baptism of the same CHRIST the Lord, and his whole most active preaching: "JESUS went about the whole of Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom" (Matt. 4:23). And again (ch. 9, v. 35): "JESUS went about all the cities and towns, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the Gospel of the kingdom." And Mark 6:6: "he went about the towns in a circuit, teaching." For because this part of the life of CHRIST the Lord is like the seventh day, in it he circled not only once, but seven times — that is, he undertook journeys, labors, troubles, and very many and most grievous difficulties; among which [was] also his whole passion, cross, and most bitter death.

But if it is not permitted to partition [his] life so minutely, we can set the *first* [thing], as it were the *circuit* of the first day, [as] his descent from the highest of the heavens to the lowest of the lands; the *second*, [his] Nativity; the *third*, [his] Circumcision; the *fourth*, [his] flight into Egypt, and return thence; the *fifth*, [his] going up to Jerusalem when he was 12 years old; the *sixth*, that whole subjection and obedience rendered to his parents up to the thirtieth year; the *seventh and last*, the same [manner] that was said above — of going

about the whole of Judea and Galilee, teaching all everywhere, and enduring very many grievous [things]; and together [with it], the whole bitterness of all his torments and of [his] death.

But if we look only at the last week of his life itself, behold — from the things which I noted in [my] book *On the Apostles*, at [ch.] 21 — [this] table *(the planetary sign marks the weekday:* ■ *Saturday*, ■ *Sunday*, ■ *Monday*, ■ *Tuesday*, ■ *Wednesday*, ■ *Thursday*, ■ *Friday)*:

| Day | Event | |----|----| | 1. ■ | The Lord returns from Jerusalem to Bethany (John 12); he suffers slander from Judas concerning the ointment. | | 2. ■ | He returns to Jerusalem, carried on an ass; and "Hosanna" is cried out to him (John 12; Matt. 21; Luke 19). | | 3. ■ | He returns to Bethany, and on the withered fig tree seeks fruit in vain, and therefore curses it (ibid.). | | 4. ■ | He returns to Jerusalem, and exhorts [them] to render obedience even to those who, [though] living badly, sit upon the seat of Moses (Matt. 23); and he foretells the destruction of the Temple and of Jerusalem (Matt. 24). | | 5. ■ | When he had returned from Jerusalem to Bethany, he perseveres in prayer with the Apostles. | | 6. ■ | He comes to Jerusalem; washes the disciples' feet; eats the Passover (Matt. 26; John 12); withdraws into the garden; is seized. | | 7. ■ | He is crucified — yet in such a way that, on that very day, one may behold seven of his circuits: the *first*, from the house of Annas to Caiaphas; the *second*, from this [one] to Pilate; the *third*, from this to Herod; the *fourth*, from this to Pilate; the *fifth*, from this to the Jews standing before the praetorium and crying "*Crucify!*", when it was said, "*Behold the Man*"; the *sixth*, to Pilate's tribunal, in the place which is called *lithostrotos* [the Pavement], and in Hebrew *Gabbatha*; the *seventh*, to that [place] which is called *the place of Calvary*, in Hebrew *Golgotha*, where they crucified him, and with him two other robbers, one on this side and one on that, but JESUS in the middle (John 19:17–18). |

Whence, in pious remembrance of these journeys [of Christ], the accustomed piety of our forefathers — which still flourishes somewhere, as at Rome, Cologne, and elsewhere — [is wont] to go around seven churches, or seven altars, on the very day of the Parasceve [Good Friday], with prayers and meditations on the Lord's passion; as [Johann] Feucht, suffragan of Bamberg, noted concerning these [things] in a certain little book. These circuits of our JESUS have assuredly ruined the diabolical Jericho — have broken through its walls, and overthrown all its towers and ramparts; and even now, in this time, they go on ever to overthrow [it]. These [circuits] indeed seem — since both of old they were made by Jesus himself with great silence, great modesty, and an utterly unusual manner, and now are set forth — [to be], in the eyes of this world, ridiculous, and almost histrionic, and to be despised. But how great their force was, and ever is, the outcome teaches. For 1 Cor. 1:27: "the foolish things of the world God has chosen, that he may confound the wise; and the weak things of the world God has chosen, that he may confound the strong; and the base and contemptible things of the world God has chosen, and the things that are not, that he might destroy the things that are." But observe that Joshua [Jesus] not only went around, but had very many companions of every rank and sex — that we all might learn what is to be done by us, as was expounded above (qq. 9, 10, 11, & 25). Our Joshua himself invites us, and says (Luke 9:23): "If anyone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me." His voice the Apostles at once heard; and, with most closely-joined and most silent minds — while they were mocked, despised, [and] oppressed — they went around this Jericho-world with [their] tongues and throats. To these, thereafter, throughout all the ages, were joined the Martyrs, Confessors, and as many as loved God and diligently sought their eternal salvation — pious and holy men of every rank, sex, age, and estate. "For all who wish to live piously in CHRIST JESUS shall suffer persecution" (2 Tim. 3:12). "Let us go out to him outside the camp, bearing his reproach. For we have not here a permanent city, but we seek the [city] to come" (Heb. 13:13[–14]). Let us cry out to God; let us cry out in prayers and groanings; let us cry out to men, and call them away from their heresies and vices; let us cry out in sermons, exhortations, and disputations — that the walls of the errors of the men of Jericho may collapse; that all the bulwarks of [their] crimes may be laid low; that all the towers of every pride, avarice, luxury, and other crimes may fall and lie utterly on the ground. Then a most happy Sabbath will

receive us. Then we shall rejoice and exult, like one who finds much spoil. The first and best-fortified barrier to entering the promised inheritance — the land flowing with milk and honey — will be taken away. By our [feet] the substructures of the mad palaces of the worldly, and the proud roof-tops of [their] houses, will be trodden underfoot. But grief, disgrace, ruin, and the devouring and eternal flame will forever torment the most wretched men-of-Jericho of this world. But let us now treat of the anathema upon this city.

(col. 789)

Question XXXIII. What is "anathema" and "cherem"?

What to the Hebrews is *cherem* [חֵרֶם, "a ban, a devoted thing"], this to the Greeks and Latins is *anathema* [ἀνάθεμα]. But that *cherem* means a thing which is snatched away from the use of men, and utterly taken away and removed from human and common usage. And this happens in two ways, and for a twofold cause. For either it is consecrated to God and preserved, so that it may be a holy thing, dedicated to his ministry, worship, and honor; or it is abolished [and] exterminated from the nature of things, because it is impure, nefarious, and unworthy of all use. *An example of the former* is illustriously set forth in Lev. 27:28. For what our interpreter renders — "everything that is consecrated to the Lord, whether it be a man, or an animal, or a field, shall not be sold, nor can it be redeemed" — is in Hebrew: "every *cherem* which a man shall *iacherim* [יַחֲרִים, devote as a ban] to the Lord, out of everything that is his — of men, and of cattle, and of the field of his possession — shall not be sold, nor redeemed." Again, what follows in our text — "Whatever has once been consecrated shall be most holy to the Lord" — is in Hebrew, "every *cherem* is a holiness of holinesses [most holy]." Finally, what our [interpreter] says at v. 9 — "every consecration which is offered by a man shall not be redeemed, but shall die by death" — is in Hebrew, "every *cherem* which he shall *iacheram* [devote], or shall devote of man, shall not be freed, [but] shall die by death." But wherever that [word] is *cherem*, and in the Latin "consecrated" or "consecration," there in the Greek it is always ἀνάθεμα [anathema]. Similarly Num. 18:14: what is rendered by our [interpreter] — "everything which the sons of Israel render by vow shall be yours" — is in Hebrew, "every *cherem* in Israel shall be yours," [and] in Greek, πᾶν ἀνάθεμα υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ σοὶ ἔσται ["every anathema of the sons of Israel shall be yours"]. *Examples of the latter kind* are Judg. 7[:1] & 12; 3 Kings [1 Kings] 20:39; here in the following chapter, v. 1; and in this very chapter, vv. 17 & 18. Where the Hebrew, word for word, [is] thus: "And only keep yourselves from the *cherem* [the accursed thing], lest perchance you *tacherimou* [make yourselves accursed], and take of the *cherem*, and make the camp of Israel [into] a *cherem*, and trouble it." Now Radak holds that those [phrases], "lest perchance you *tacherimu*" and "and take of the *cherem*," mean one and the same [thing]; and the moderns generally embrace this. For so Pagninus [renders]: "lest perchance you take of the anathema, and carry off from the anathema"; Masius: "lest perchance you anathematize, that is, take of the anathema." And in [his] Commentary he says: "the word *tacherimu* here signifies to take a thing dedicated to God, and to take [it] for oneself, as the particle which is subjoined explains." But indeed that word here signifies to anathematize — that is, to make [someone] guilty of the anathema, to subject [him] to the anathema, and to destroy [him] — or, as the text adds, "to put into *cherem*," that is, into execration, into sin, or into the penalty of sin; and at v. 21 likewise. And again the particle "and" which is subjoined has a causal force, thus: lest you make yourselves guilty of the anathema, because you have taken of the anathema — just as in Isa. 64:5, "You are angry, and we have sinned," that is, because we have sinned. And that whole reading those words of Deut. 7:26 wholly confirm: "You shall not bring anything from an idol into your house, lest you become an anathema, like it also is." And therefore our interpreter well rendered — not indeed word for word, but the sense — and said: "But beware lest you touch any of those things which are forbidden, and be guilty of transgression, and all the camp of Israel be under sin, and be troubled." And the same [meaning] the 70 regarded, when they translated μήποτε ἐνθυμηθέντες ὑμεῖς αὐτὸ λαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναθέματος ["lest, being provoked, you take it from the anathema"]. For since θυμός [thumos] not rarely signifies *anger* — whence [come] θυμαίνειν, θυμιᾶσθαι, and, in Aristophanes, ὀξυθυμεῖν, "to blaze up in headlong anger," in

Plutarch (in [the life of] Marius) ἐπιθυμεῖν, "to be greatly kindled with anger," in Suidas συνθυμεῖν, "to be angry together" — the 70 took ἐνθυμεῖν not only for "to think" and "to turn over in the mind," but also for "to be angry," or "to be in anger" (actively), and ἐνθυμεῖσθαι for "to be [one] with whom another is angry," or "to be [an object] of anger" (passively). And therefore this is their meaning: "lest perchance you be in [God's] anger," or "lest perchance you be those with whom, on account of [their] transgression, God is angry, because you have taken of the anathema." Since this had not come into Masius's mind, he fastened onto the 70 here [conjectures] like games [absurdities]. For *first* he wants them to have read *daleth* for *resh* in the Hebrew; *then*, to have transposed the letters of the Hebrew word, and so, for *tacherimu*, to have made *tachmedu*; *thirdly*, to have put ἐνθυμηθέντες for [the anathematizing word]. But although Achan is thus called ἐνθυμηθείς in the 70 at the following chapter (7), yet none of these [conjectures] is here either necessary or opportune. It is clear, in the manner I have handed down, [that there is] the fullest concord of their text, and ours, and the Hebrew, and the true sense — which too, for the evidence of the matter (and rather [preferring] that other [reading]), Junius and Tremellius have followed, [men] who otherwise most gladly depart from our interpreter to the Rabbinic and new interpretations. For this is their version: "But only keep yourselves from the anathema, lest you make yourselves an anathema, taking of that anathema; and, subjecting the camp of Israel to the anathema, you trouble it." And from these [things] it is clear that, just as the noun *Cherem* is taken in two ways — namely, for a good and for a bad thing — so also [is] the verb *hecherim*. For above, twice, from Lev. 27:28 & 29, it is put for "to vow, and to consecrate something to God"; and very often elsewhere it is read for "to subject to the anathema, to destroy, to slay, to root out" — as above (ch. 2, v. 9); below (ch. 10, v. 1; vv. 28, 35, 37; ch. 11, vv. 11, 12); Judg. 20:17; [1] Kings 15:9 & 18; Isaiah (ch. 11:15; 50[:2]; 51[:3]); Deut. 1:34; ch. 22:28; etc. And this the 70 render sometimes ἀναθεματίζειν [to anathematize] — as here, v. 21, where they attribute to Joshua, as author, what in the Hebrew and Latin, and in some Greek [copies], is attributed to all; sometimes ἐξολοθρεύειν [to destroy utterly] — as above (ch. 2, v. 10), where the Chaldee used the verb *gamar* [גמר, "to make an end of"]; sometimes otherwise. Whence to the Latins too [the word] is *anathematizare*, and, in St. Augustine, *anathemare*. But when some thing is consecrated to God, and yet is not taken away from the midst, but is preserved, it is wont almost always to be called — by the Jewish Rabbis of the later times — *Corban* [קׇרְבָּן, "offering"], and more softly *Coban*, from *Corab* [the root "to draw near, to offer"], which means "to offer": as is clear in the Talmud, tractate *On Oaths and Vows*; but by the Greeks, ἀνάθημα [anath■ma, "votive offering"] — yet sometimes also ἀνάθεμα, as question 121 in St. Justin shows, and the promiscuous use of these names in Andreas of Caesarea (on Apocalypse 22, fol. 108), St. Chrysostom (homily 6 on Ephesians, fol. 1070), [and] Prudentius (in the *Psychomachia*, on avarice) — just as ἀνάθημα and ἐπίθεμα ["a lid, covering"] are used for the covering of some thing. Yet that confusion [of the two forms] is rarer; and where ἀνάθημα is taken in the bad sense, I do not remember reading [it]. But of this I have said something on Judith 16 (fol. 406). But [as to the fact] that thus…

(col. 791)

…[But as to the fact that thus something] is abolished and destroyed, it is also said "to be given to God": whence here, at v. 17, when it had been said "let this city be an anathema," at once is added, "and let all that is in it be the Lord's." For thus it seems it must be read, so that what is in the Hebrew be more clearly expressed; or at least that word "be" [*sint*] must be understood, since it would have to be said fully, "let all the things that are in it be the Lord's." But those [things] are said "to be given to God," because, in his honor and reverence, they are removed as nefarious and wicked, and are reduced to nothing. But others, as was said above, are preserved, and so are applied to the divine worship as pure, chaste, and holy.

Question XXXIV. How manifold is the anathema? [How many kinds are there?]

The anathema, as was said in the previous question, is either salutary or destructive; and because [the discussion] is now about this destructive [one], its causes are here to be run through. And *first*, indeed, [its] *end*. For although, as was said above, all anathemas are made for the honor of God, yet this kind is referred chiefly to punishing sins, to showing detestation of them, and to persuading men [thereof], as will appear below. *Secondly*, [its] *efficient* cause: the commander, indeed, [is] God, or man; the executor, [is] man. *Thirdly*, [its] *form* is the separation of the things themselves from human use, and [their] abolition; and to it can be referred the *mode* of the separation and abolition itself, which is various according to the variety of things. For some are burned, some are slaughtered, some are affected only with a civil death — so that, although they are allowed to live and to be, yet [they are] as if already dead, [and] are set apart from all [normal] intercourse. *Fourthly*, [its] *matter* is twofold. One [is the] proper and *proximate* [matter] — namely, the impure man, who commits the sin worthy of that penalty. The less proper and, as it were, *remote* [matter] is whatever properly pertains to men of this kind among these lower creatures — such as clothes, resources, furniture, house, fields, cities, wife, and children. All these are gathered from the scriptures cited [in] q. 23; and, as to the manner of that civil death, from various writers. For *first*, Elias Levita testifies, in [his] *Thisbi*, under the word *Schamattha*, that among the Jews a man is struck with the anathema in a threefold [way] — namely, so that there is *Nidui* [נידוי], *Cherem* [חרם], and *Schamattha* [שמתא] — as I have expounded in [my commentary on] the last [chapter] of Ezra. Josephus, in book 2 of the *[Jewish] War*, chapter 7 [says]: "The Essenes expel from their congregation those caught in sins; and whoever has been so condemned is generally consumed by a miserable death: for, bound by their oaths and rites, he can neither take food offered by others, but, plucking herbs after the manner of cattle, and eaten away by hunger, is corrupted through [his] limbs; on which account [the Essenes], very often pitying most of them at [their] last gasp, have taken [them] back, judging that they had paid a penalty for their sins sufficient [even] to what had led them to death." Among the Romans, whoever had been publicly devoted to the [avenging] deities for some unspeakable crime could be slain by anyone with impunity, as Diodorus says in book 2. Of the Druids, Caesar relates these [things] in book 6 of the *Gallic War*: "Concerning all controversies, public and private, they decide; and if any crime has been committed, if a murder has been done, if there is a controversy about inheritance [or] about boundaries, the same [Druids] adjudge [it], and appoint rewards and penalties. If anyone, whether a private [person] or a people, did not stand by their decree, they interdict [him] from the sacrifices. This penalty, among them, is the gravest: those to whom it is thus interdicted are reckoned in the number of the impious and the criminal; all depart from them, flee their approach and conversation, lest they receive some harm from the contagion; nor is justice rendered to them when they seek it, nor is any honor shared [with them]." "Not to show the way to one erring" — at Athens it was sanctioned by public execrations, says Cicero, book 3 *On Duties*. And after the imprecations, glowing masses of iron were wont to be cast into the sea, as Plutarch relates in [the life of] Aristides. In what manner, among the Christians, and how manifold, *excommunication* is, what it effects, and how it is imposed, I have said in [my] treatise on Ecclesiastical Censures; and the most Reverend Baronius may be seen, in volume 1 of the *Annals*, at the year of the Lord 57. But, with respect to the matter [at hand], this division is to be gathered: that one [kind] is a *general* anathema, by which both the man and all his [goods] are utterly destroyed; another [is] *particular*, by which either the man is not destroyed, or not all his [goods].

Question XXXV. Of what kind [was] the Jericho anathema?

It would have to be reckoned *general*, were it not that, first, from the anathema of persons, *Rahab* was excepted, with all [her] kinsfolk and household whom her house contained; and, from the anathema of things, the metals and all metal objects [were excepted]. Otherwise, all the men of the whole city — women too, old men, boys, and young men — were all slain; likewise all the cattle; the buildings, and whatever of the city still stood, were burned — so that, in the same fire, all the corpses both of the slain men and of the cattle were burned up, and likewise all the garments, and the furnishings which were devoid of metal. See above, q.

23.

Question XXXVI. Could all the mothers, virgins, and girls of that city be rightly included in the Jericho anathema?

Rightly does Plutarch [say], in [the life of] Camillus: "War is a savage thing, and drags with it a heap of injuries and violence." Yet there are, for good men, certain laws of war. For one must not so press toward victory that one [fail to] decline the name of wicked and impious deeds. And therefore, that I may answer more distinctly, I set up two propositions. *The first. Speaking generally, the lives of all women in war — especially when some city has been stormed, and the victory is now in [one's] hands — ought to be spared.* I. Because war, if indeed [it is] just, is undertaken either to punish the guilty, or to ward off and repel their violence and injuries from the innocent. But, speaking generally and commonly, women are not guilty, nor do they bring violence and injury. *Secondly*: War is waged — or, [when] waged [by others], is resisted — by the authority of those who preside over Commonwealths, and who, by office, administer the common affairs, whether by counsel or by hand. But commonly women are excluded from the government of Commonwealths, from the courts, and from the dignities. In the Digest, book 3, *On Public Duties and Honors*, the Emperor says: "The sex itself denies bodily duties to women." Whence they are wont also to be excluded from fiefs, as Alexander shows…

(col. 793)

…[as Alexander shows] in [his] consilium 30, [and] Decius in consilium 139. *Thirdly*: the sex is of itself unwarlike, weak, and worthy rather of mercy than of force and the sword. *Fourthly*: thus the interpreters of law teach — as you will see in Covarrubias, on the rule *Peccatum* [Sin], part 2; [in] the *Relectio "On the Law of War and of the Indies"* [of Vitoria]; [and in] Bellarmine, book 3 *On the Laity*, ch. 15. Nay, even among the Gentiles, Seneca (book 4, ch. 8): "a woman," he says, "does not take [the name] of enemy"; Statius (*Silvae*): "the sex stands rude and ignorant of the sword." Diodorus relates, in book 4, that among the Troglodytes battles are broken off by the women, and it is held a sacrilege to hurt them by any pact. Alexander the Great, in Curtius, book 5: "I am not wont," he says, "to wage war with captives and women. Let him be armed, whom I am to hate." *Fifthly*: behold too the divine law, Deut. 20:13: "When the Lord your God shall have delivered the city into your hand, you shall smite everything of the male sex that is in it with the edge of the sword — except the women."

II. There are some causes for which, in war, even after victory, it is permitted to slay women. *The first is*: if the women themselves are accessory to the crime and injury on account of which the war is [waged]. Num. 25: the Moabite women had enticed the Israelites to foul lust and idolatry. On this account war was brought upon the Midianites, Num. 31. But since the Israelites had used the common rule about not slaying women (laid down a little before), Moses, angered, said to the leaders of the army, the tribunes and centurions who had come from the war (v. 15): "Why have you spared the women? Are not these they who deceived the sons of Israel at the suggestion of Balaam, and made you transgress against the Lord over the sin of Peor, whence also the people was struck?" And Moses goes on, in this just and healthy anger, and imposes punishment on the women who had bent them to the crime (v. 17): "Therefore kill all that is of the male sex, even among the little ones; and slay the women who have known men carnally. But the girls, and all the virgin women, keep for yourselves." Hence too the Poet [Virgil] wisely, when in *Aeneid* 2 he brings in Aeneas, [amid] Troy burning, disputing whether to take away Helen — the torch and cause of the whole evil — from the midst, says it would be granted to [his] praise if he removed not only the wicked one, but that very wickedness:

> *"—although no memorable name / [lies] in a woman's punishment, nor has [such] a victory praise: / yet I shall be praised for having extinguished a wickedness, / and exacted the penalties of one deserving [them]." [Aen. 2.583–586]*

As [the poet] weighs this very thing not lightly; and, against Tucca, Varus, and Servius, [it is defended by] Casertanus — moved by their authority — (5, *On the Meaning [of Words]*, ch. 14), by Julius Caesar Scaliger (book 3, chs. 12 & 24), and by Modicius (ch. 4). *The second cause is*, if, contrary to custom, women should attempt hostile [acts] by hand and arms — as the raging Penthesilea, and the whole [tale] of the Amazons (whatever Berthus, Gentilis, and I-know-not-who-else may say) [is] a fable. And so, in Vopiscus, Aurelian not badly cut down many of the women who fought in male attire, and even led some in [his] triumph. *The third [cause]*: if the crimes of the Commonwealth and of the hostile parties should be so great, and the injuries so grave, that the death of the men alone would not suffice to expiate them. For women too are a certain portion of the Commonwealth, a certain good of the men themselves; so that, even on account of the crimes of those [men] alone, these [women] can be cut down, for the punishment of those [men]. And this has often been done. Whence, when Germanicus had attacked the German enemies [who were] joyful, and passing a festal night in play with solemn feasts, "Neither sex," says Tacitus (book 1 of the *Annals*), "nor age brought [any] pity." *The fourth [cause]*: if afterward some danger might rightly be feared from them by the victors. The same [Germanicus], in the same Tacitus (*Annals*, book 2): Germanicus begged his soldiers to "press on with the slaughter: [there was] no need of captives; only the extermination of the nation would be an end to the war." *The fifth [cause]*: if the Lord commands. For to him [belongs] the supreme power — against which nothing can be excepted — of the life and death of all mortals; and indeed the most benign Lord never commands slaughter of this kind without some most grave cause. Thus Deut. 2:34; ch. 3:6; 1 Kings 15. And this cause [at Jericho] is either one of those which have already been set out, or some other similar [one], obscure though it be to the blindness of our minds. For rightly [says] St. Augustine, in [his] *Questions* 36 & 49 on Judges, and likewise q. 56 on Leviticus: "God's command is always in place of a law," even if the reason of the command is hidden from us. But the Lord commanded the Jericho anathema, as was shown above (q. 18); and the older women [were] not free from idolatry and the other crimes which the Lord willed to be punished (Gen. 15); but the younger [women] were a portion of the whole city, and a certain good of their parents; and on that account all were rightly included in that anathema.

Question XXXVII. Were infants, boys, and decrepit old men rightly included in the same anathema?

Here [it is] to be answered in almost the same manner as to the previous question. *First*: Commonly, in war, when victory is already won, death is not to be brought upon infants, boys, and the decrepit. For *first*, infants and boys are utterly innocent. *Secondly*, in the administration of the Commonwealth they hold no part. *Thirdly*, the weakness of [their] age is worthier of pity than of slaughter. But it belongs to the old, generally, to govern the Commonwealth — by them, and from them, [comes] the *Senate* [the council of elders]; by [their] counsel they sometimes harm the enemy very much, nay, even by [their] exhortation and example. Yet because their bodily strength is worn out, [their] hands feeble, [their] limbs unwarlike, so that of themselves they can do no great harm to the adversaries; because they are already near to death; because that age is [worthy] of veneration, and, if it be full of hardship, has not a little [claim] to pity — it is commonly wont, by moderate commanders, that that little which remains to them of life be spared to them. And from the slaughter of infants all are restrained by God's command, Deut. 20:14. But the illustrious oration of Camillus about them [the children] — which filled the enemy first with admiration, then with love of the [Roman] command and name — is read in Livy, book 5 of the first decade; when, to him [Camillus] besieging the Faliscans, a traitor schoolmaster had led the boys, whose parents were the chief men there. "Between us and the Faliscans," he says, "there is no fellowship established by human compact; but that [fellowship] which nature has engendered in both, is, and will be. There are laws both of war and of peace; and we have learned to wage them justly no less than bravely. We have arms not against that age which is spared even when cities are captured, but against the armed." See also Valerius [Maximus], book 6, chapter [7]…

(col. 795)

…[See also Valerius Maximus, book 6, chapter] 2, [and] Florus, book 1. Alphenus says (in [Digest] book 3), and reason dictates, that "those [things] which are granted to children not by the father, but by their birth, by the state, [and] by the nature of things, remain inviolate." It was held a reproach to do otherwise. Tacitus, book 3 of the *Histories*: "[the soldiers] dragged the aged old men and the women worn out with age — worthless as booty — into [their] mockery," namely in the destruction of Cremona. *Secondly*, [there] can, however, be causes which make the slaying of all these [infants, boys, old men] just; and they are exactly the same [causes] which were in the previous question: but, as to the old, the first and second; as to the same old age, and infancy and boyhood, the third, fourth, and fifth. And so Ps. 136[137]: "Blessed [is he] who shall hold, and dash your little ones against the rock." So Deut. 2:34; ch. 3:6.

Question XXXVIII. Were the beasts and cattle, the garments, and the other inanimate things rightly included in the same anathema?

> *"What did the oxen deserve — an animal without fraud and guile? / And what the sheep and birds? what the bees? what the horses? what the little asses? / What the garments, the doorposts? what the spices, balsams, [and] palms?"*

These things — whether animals, or inanimate — all [deserved] nothing of punishment, since they committed no fault. Yet they are slaughtered, burned, and destroyed — because the impious had abused those creatures to the injury of the Creator; because by this abuse of the impious they had been made impure, as it were by a contagion; [because] these [were the things] in which, [God] being forsaken and despised, those same [impious] had set their happiness; and because, finally, these were their goods, wealth, and resources. It is added that, by the destruction of those things, the immense anger of God against the impious is set the more before the eyes of all mortals, and a greater terror is cast in, for shuddering at and fleeing all crimes. And this too has appeared from almost all the places cited before. Otherwise the Israelites would more gladly have carried off the rich booty from these [things], [and] would more gladly have spared the buildings, as [being] now as it were their own — as Croesus warned Cyrus, when Sardis was captured (in Herodotus, book 1): "For no one lays waste his own," says Seneca (*Thebais* 4). And in Livy, book 32, Quinctius earnestly warns his soldiers to have regard, as [for a place] now of their own dominion, for that which they held: the Lacedaemonians, indeed, did not demolish the villas of the Messenians, nor cut down [their] trees, since they now reckoned it [as] their own field. And in these buildings it is easily understood that there were magnificent palaces of the King, magnificent shrines and groves of the gods. All things, sacred and profane, sank down in the fire. Whence it seems to me that God willed also all these things to be laid waste, destroyed, and burned, in order to accustom the Israelites to cast a bridle upon their desires, to set a measure to avarice, to keep their hands abstinent [from plunder], and to establish their obedience, abstinence, and virtue as an example to all posterity.

Question XXXIX. Why was so dire an anathema inflicted upon a city so beautiful and opulent?

Certain heretics have conjectured the cause [to lie] in the bloodthirsty temper of Joshua. But these [heretics] have both already been refuted from the things said, and [will be] much more [refuted] from those which will be said below. Certain of the Talmudists, [in the] tractate *On the Sabbath*, chapter 1, have handed down three other causes. *The first*: that Joshua reckoned that, with those nefarious cities — for which, at Deut. 13:15, 16, 17, the utter destruction [πανωλεθρία] is prescribed — the case of impious Jericho was equal. *The second*: that, the city being captured on the Sabbath day (as was said above, q. 29), he judged it right that it be dedicated to Him to whom the Sabbath is dedicated, so that, for that [God's] sake and honor, it might be utterly exterminated. *The third*: that the law about firstfruits to be offered to God, sanctioned in Numbers 15,

he thought was to be observed also in captured cities; and therefore, since Jericho was the first of all the cities captured in cisjordanian Canaan, he offered it to the Lord as a kind of firstfruits. But by those [Talmudists] these things are said as if Joshua condemned that city to the anathema of his own accord, not by another's command — which was denied above (q. 18). And therefore it must be said that Joshua did this: *first*, because the Lord commanded [it]. And the Lord commanded [it]: *first*, on account of the Canaanite impiety and wickedness of this city; *secondly*, that the other Canaanites thereafter might be struck by so great a destruction and disaster, and yield to the sons of Israel the possession decreed [to them] by God; *thirdly*, that those of the same Canaanites who were willing might repent, and beg the mercy of God and the right hand of Joshua, take up the true religion, and serve the true God piously and chastely; *fourthly*, that it might be understood how detestable are the sins which the Lord — otherwise most benign — afflicts with so great penalties even in this world; *fifthly*, that the storming of this city might be ascribed not to human arts, swords, and strength, but to the power of God alone; *sixthly*: the Lord could also have willed all the causes — both those touched in this very question and in the previous questions — to concur; as indeed Josephus (book [5], ch. 1), Theodoret (q. 6), and others hand down that [cause] about the firstfruits. Nay, although one command of God could have sufficed for Joshua for those slaughters and burnings, yet nothing prevents [that] a man both prudent and religious toward the Deity could have looked also to other causes — for instance, that these firstfruits might be devoted to God, [and] that there might be one established example for [dealing with] the impious cities, if any should afterward arise. Whence Theodoret, q. 6: "This city," he says, "they took first after the river was crossed. As, therefore, he commands them to offer the firstfruits of the fruits, so he commanded [them] to offer the firstfruits of the spoils. Moreover, he wishes them to be exercised, by these laws, in observing the necessary laws. And he lays open to them his power in [their] taking the first city without arms or engines — [the city] which was dissolved by the mere sound of the trumpets: so that, when they should be conquered in battle, they might recognize that they had given the occasions of [their own] succumbing — namely, by despising the divine laws." But that general reason, which is patent to the previous questions [as well], is not to be scorned: that the Lord willed to demonstrate what would come to pass in this world. For of this Jericho is a type. There will be, therefore, most fearful earthquakes, most bloody wars, most destructive plagues, by which, in the last days, this fabric of the world and its mortal inhabitants will be destroyed; there will then follow the horrendous conflagration, which will lay waste and swallow up all that remains. For [the case] of Jericho holds [applies to] what St. Peter said (2 [Peter], ch. 2, v. 6): "reducing the cities of the Sodomites and Gomorrhaeans to ashes, [God] condemned [them] by overthrow, setting [them as] an example of those who would act impiously." See Origen, q. 6, near the end.

(col. 797)

Question XL. Why were the metals excepted from this anathema, and what was done with them?

Why is it that the garments of Jericho, its crops, its furniture, and all the other inanimate goods were reduced to ashes — the causes have been stated at q. 38 — [and] the same [causes] cling to the metals, gold, silver, bronze, and iron? Why then were they excepted? This question moved Masius, so that (fol. 110) he denied that those other things were consumed by the fire for a detestation of the Jerichoite religion and an expiation of [its] contagion. But here two things are to be answered.

First. Why gold, silver, and the other metals were preserved is indicated by one cause from the text, v. 19 and 24: namely, *that they might be brought into the treasury of the House of God.* For it is to be known, *first*, that before the building of Solomon's temple, the very tabernacle of the Lord — wherever in the end its place might be — was called *the house of the Lord.* It is to be known, *secondly*, that there was a certain treasury of this divine house, in which things were laid up and kept that were consecrated to God himself, as is plain from Num. 31:54 [and] 2 Kings [= 2 Sam.] 8:11. But the question is not yet fully settled. For that doubt still

troubles the mind: why were there not brought into this treasury of God the crops (from which [comes] the bread either for sacrifices or for the sustenance of the Levites and Priests)? not oil and wine (from which would be the libations and the Levites' drink)? not scarlet, purple, and the like (from which the coverings of the tabernacle would be made, as at Exod. 25 and 35)? but the metals, and those only? Abulensis answers (q. 25) that the things which the Gentiles had contaminated by their use, or rather abuse, could not be brought to God's worship and consecrated unless they had been expiated by the greatest and most efficacious mode of purging. And this [mode] is, that they be cast into the fire and licked by it. For so Num. 31:22: *Gold and silver, bronze and iron, and lead and tin, and everything that can pass through the flame, shall be purged by fire.* But the things which had to come into the use of the Israelites — whether of the Levitical or of the lay order — from the enemy's plunder: for these it was enough to be expiated by a lighter atonement, namely by the water of purification. For it is added in the same place: *Whatever cannot endure the fire shall be sanctified by the water of expiation.* And both modes of expiation had generally been prescribed before, at v. 20: *Of all plunder, whether it be a garment, or a vessel, or anything prepared for utensils, of goats' skins, and hair, and wood, it shall be expiated.* Since, therefore, the metals could bear the force of the fire — and they alone could — therefore they were brought into the treasures of the Lord: but, as has been said, only after they had been expiated and thoroughly purged.

Other causes can be brought [forward]. *First.* Metals are preserved the longest of all things, and are kept without loss or the fault of corruption. *Secondly.* A temple was one day to be built: many vessels in it were to be cast from various metals. This material, then, the Lord willed to be prepared beforehand, so that it might be ready to hand at that time — just as we read that David also did, 2 Kings [= 2 Sam.] 8, vv. 8, 10, 11; 1 Chron. 22, vv. 2 and 14; ch. 29, vv. 2 and 3. *A third cause.* In this way the Lord had regard for the resources of the Israelites, lest, when that so-great work [of the Temple] should be raised, they be too far drained by the sheer enormity of the costs. *A fourth.* Lest, at the very outset of the wars, the Israelites, too laden and heavy with the plunder of gold and silver, should either swell up [with pride] or grow slack for the wars to come. *A fifth.* What could have turned to the Israelites' advantage, this the Lord willed to receive from them as a kind of gift and firstfruits of the spoils — foreseeing, perhaps, that they would not of their own accord be so munificent toward his sanctuary in time to come as they once had been (Num. 31, vv. 49 and 50), had not an occasion and a new spur — of command or of exhortation — been added. *A sixth.* By this deed the same Lord also willed to teach many things.

First. That mercy is always to be joined with justice, and some leniency with punishment (Ps. 100). Where Jericho was destroyed, and a just ruin was to be brought upon its roofs and wealth: yet in the deliverance of certain ones the goodness and clemency of God shone forth. *Secondly.* That out of every anathema there can arise something that may serve God and be pleasing [to him]. How many things there are in this world most despicable, out of which nevertheless God has chosen for himself the best hearts, the holiest men, the aptest ministers! Run through the crafts, states, and sexes of all: you will find that out of those who, like an anathema, are despised and spat upon, great men have sometimes arisen. And indeed, what is viler and more detestable than sins? Yet hence [came] St. Matthew [the publican]; the vessel of election, St. Paul; St. Magdalene; the good thief; and so many others. *Thirdly.* That rightly some things which had served impiety are turned into piety and the worship of God, both in men and in other things. So the Apostle, Rom. 6:19: *I speak humanly, on account of the weakness of your flesh. For as you presented your members to serve uncleanness and iniquity, unto iniquity: so now present your members to serve justice, unto sanctification.* So Philosophy, and the whole [body] of the arts that are called liberal — the *encyclopedia* — do service to the honor and glory of CHRIST, to be celebrated, defended, and championed. So the shrines of idols [are turned] into the Churches of CHRIST, [and] some rites and ceremonies of the gods are turned to the honor of CHRIST. How I rejoice at times, and gladly praise the triumph of CHRIST over the idols and over all the superstitions of the Gentiles, when in the neighboring village of Bretzenheim, before the temple doors, I see in an old stone Jupiter, Juno, Hercules, and I know not what other gods, holding up water blessed by the

Christian rite, and offering that very [water] to those going in and coming out! *Fourthly.* By us too, gold, bronze, iron — our [gold] — and silver are to be offered to God. What is gold, but the most excellent goods of men: talent, learning, and virtue? What silver, but men's fame, praise, and glory? What bronze, but bodily soundness, health, and strength? What iron, but the lowest goods of all, which are outside us — moneys, farms, and estates? The distinctions of the ages the Poets of old marked off by these four forms of metals, when they spoke of a golden and a silver, and a bronze and an iron age: why should it not likewise be allowed to distinguish all the kinds of goods [in the same way]? St. Augustine, Epist. 41, to his one-time disciple Licentius: he says, "[If] you had found a golden cup in the earth, you would give it to the Church of

(col. 799)

…of God. You received from God a talent spiritually golden, and do you minister from it to your lusts, and in it toast yourself to Satan?" St. Gregory, book four, epistle 84: "Toward the most sweet mind of my most glorious son the lord Theodore I have a certain complaint: that, though he has received the gift of talent, the gift of estate, [and] the gift of mercy and of charity from the Holy Trinity, yet he is ceaselessly bound by secular affairs, taken up with continual comings-and-goings, and daily neglects to read the words of his Redeemer. And what is Sacred Scripture, but a certain letter of Almighty God to his creature? And surely, if your Grace were established elsewhere, and were receiving the writings of an earthly emperor, you would not rest, you would not be quiet, you would give no sleep to your eyes, until first you had come to know what the earthly emperor had written to you. The Emperor of heaven, the Lord of men and of Angels, has for your life transmitted to you your own letters. And yet, glorious son, you neglect to read those same letters ardently. Study, therefore, I beg, and meditate daily upon the words of your Creator. Learn the heart of God in the words of God, that you may sigh the more ardently for things eternal, that your mind may be kindled with greater longings for the heavenly realms. For so much the greater will his rest then be, when now no rest has been [taken] from the love of his Maker. But that these things may be done, may Almighty God pour into you the Comforter Spirit. May he himself fill your mind with his presence, and by filling relieve it." But it must be well observed that these gifts should be brought into the House of God, which is the Church (1 Tim. ch. 3) — and especially at this time, when the enemies of it are on every side so many and so hostile. *Fifthly.* But when we have given these things, there ought to be no elation, no pride, on that account. For truly they had been given to us beforehand by the same Lord (1 Cor. 4); nor did we receive that grace from him by any merits of our own. What? Did gold, silver, bronze, iron deserve — by any excellence or dignity of their own — to be snatched from devastation, fire, and the spoils of the conquerors? To be laid up in the sacred treasury of God? To do service to his honor and worship? Yet than lifeless metals of this kind more excellent were living creatures endowed with soul and life, and so many and so great men, whom either the sword or the flame destroyed. *Sixthly.* Yet from the filth and dross of our former life we must be purged before we enter into the treasures of the Lord. We must undergo the fire of penance; all our daily words and deeds must be borne into the flame of examination; the furnace also of vexations and of endurance must be entered, by which all our ancient contagion may be boiled away.

Question XLI. Whether, besides those four kinds of metals brought into the Lord's treasury, there were also others; and whether whatever could be found of those four [was brought in]?

There are two parts to this question. And as to the former, indeed, there is a question about lead, tin, orichalc [aurichalcum, "brass"], and steel [chalybs]. These too seem to have been laid up in the Lord's treasury, because for these the same cause seems [to hold] as for the other metals — whether we consider use and opportunity, or God's own honor and worship. Whence also Num. 31, vv. 22, 23, [names] by name lead and tin; but under the general name of those "which can bear fire," orichalc and steel [are reckoned] among those things which can be repurged and expiated of their former filth for the worship of God, — [and thus can

serve the worship] of God, they are reckoned [in]. But they are not numbered here. Perhaps this was done because, [by naming] the chief and the extreme kinds of metals, the rest also were indicated. For the highest and chief is gold; the lowest and vilest of all, iron — concerning which there exists a fine *Dialogue* of Nicolaus Manardus. And of old they denoted the kinds of metals by these three letters, *a. a. a.* [= aurum, argentum, æs: gold, silver, bronze — all beginning with "a"], which, as [pertaining] to Egyptian matters, Ammianus relates (book 17): [namely,] gold, silver, and bronze were current. Indeed, in this very matter Josephus (book 5, ch. 1) sometimes names only gold and silver, sometimes adds bronze alone, never iron. Or truly, because — as I have said — the reasoning was equal for all, the consecration also was the same. Yet I would not rush here. For since these [others] could as easily have been named as the rest, the silence of the Holy Spirit in this place is for me a matter of reverence. For perhaps the Lord willed in this matter to exercise the obedience and abstinence of the Israelites, so that [only] the things which had been named should be brought into the Lord's treasury [gazophylacium], and nothing besides, however useful, good, and excellent. For thus, for the virtue of our first parents, the distinction of the trees in paradise was, as it were, a kind of material — that they should eat of some, [and] abstain from others. Otherwise we could even say that gems too were brought into the Lord's treasury, [gems] which the Kings of the East are not wont to be without. Perhaps also in the omitted metals there is something by which the Lord willed to signify certain useful things not yet perceived by me. *Lead* is the heaviest, and yet the easiest to melt. *Tin* is like silver, yet is not silver. *Orichalc* likewise is like gold, yet is not gold. *Steel* is a certain whetstone [cos] for the iron itself, for cutting and wounding. Who would not see them [worldly men] to be leaden — [those] who, fixed with their whole soul upon the desires of earthly and fleeting things, and weighed down with excessive cares, at the least fire of calamities straightway melt away, forsake God, cast off the Catholic faith and every duty? Are not all hypocrites tin and orichalc? — especially since orichalc, too, is a factitious [artificial] thing. Are they not steel who delight in slaughters, who stir up quarrels and wraths, who sharpen daggers and swords? These things do not pertain to the treasures of the Lord; these do not enter the kingdom of heaven. Nay, they deserve to be driven even from this earthly Church too, by excommunication and anathematizing.

In the other part of the question two things beget difficulty. *One* is that most grave prohibition of the Lord, Deut. 7:25: *Their graven images you shall burn with fire: you shall not covet the gold and silver of which they are made, neither shall you take anything of it for yourself, lest you be offended [ensnared], because it is an abomination to the Lord your God. Nor shall you bring anything of the idol into your house, lest you become an anathema, as it also is. As filth shall you detest it, and as uncleanness and dregs shall you hold it in abomination, because it is an anathema.* Yet we see that David did this (1 Chron. 14:25 [Paralip. 14]), although he elsewhere gathered gold, silver, bronze, and iron from every side for the building of the future temple, and heaped it up from the spoils of enemies, as was said above at question 40. It can be answered, *First*: that in that precept of the Lord [the Israelite] is only forbidden — that none of them should take anything of them for himself, and bring it into his own

(col. 801)

house — not, however, that he take [it] for the Lord, and consign it to his treasury. *Secondly*, it can be granted that it was generally forbidden that anything of golden or silver images and the like should be received by the Israelites in that manner — neither for private, nor for public and divine use. *First*, because that [reading] is more in keeping with the aim of that precept: namely, that the Israelites should above all detest and abhor them. Whence also in the same Deut. ch. 7, in the last verse, the Lord uses a heap of many words which signify the utmost abomination. *Secondly*, because through the appearance [of turning them into] the Lord's treasures there would be left a certain ordinary occasion for detestable sacrileges of this kind; and thus those who (2 Macc. 12) were slain on account of the anathema-spoils they had taken could have been excused, on the ground that they had wished to confer them into the Lord's treasures. But this general prohibition being laid down, it would have to be said here either that from it, at this time and on this

occasion, the Lawgiver himself willed an exception to be made — which, had he not himself commanded it, no man would have dared to make; or that, even now, the precept holding good, and gold and silver having been brought into the Lord's treasures, [it was] not just any [gold and silver], but that, namely, which the Lord's law did not forbid: of which sort was everything that had not gone into the foul construction of the images.

The other thing which begets some difficulty is a diversity in the manner of speaking. For whereas at v. 19 [and] ch. 24 [it is said], in the general way I have already stated, that gold and silver are claimed for the Lord, bronze and iron are not so claimed; but, in the Hebrew and the Latin, *vessels of bronze and of iron.* So that it seems to be signified that, if there were bronze or iron which had not been expended and shaped into vessels, that ought by no means to be received. It must be said that vessels are called "of bronze and of iron" for this reason: because commonly these two metals are not wont to be kept unworked, but are straightway cast into vessels; and therefore, for all bronze and iron, this state of bronze and iron — which is the more usual — has been put. And this the interpreter seems to hint, when here at verse 24 he renders *without the vessels of bronze, and the iron*: unless perhaps, as it is in the Hebrew, he had rendered *without the vessels of bronze and of iron.* Yet, as I have already said, this is strongly confirmed by the Seventy [LXX], who never make mention of vessels, but render v. 19: πᾶν ἀργύριον ἢ χρυσίον, ἢ χαλκὸς ἢ σίδηρος ἅγιον ἔσται τῷ κυρίῳ [*pan argyrion* ■ *chrysion,* ■ *chalkos* ■ *sid*■*ros hagion estai t*■ *kyri*■, "all silver or gold, or bronze or iron, shall be holy to the Lord"]. And afterward, πλὴν ἀργυρίου, καὶ χρυσίου, καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου ἔδωκαν εἰς θησαυρὸν κυρίου εἰσενεχθῆναι [*pl*■*n argyriou, kai chrysiou, kai chalkou kai sid*■*rou ed*■*kan eis th*■*sauron kyriou eisenechth*■*nai,* "except the silver, and the gold, and the bronze and the iron, [which] they gave to be brought into the treasury of the Lord"]. And so Josephus, in the place cited, just as [he reckons in] ἄργυρον καὶ χρυσὸν [*argyron kai chryson,* "silver and gold"], so also he counts in χαλκὸν [*chalkon,* "bronze"]. And indeed, just as all gold and silver is received — whether it were worked or unworked, whether it were cast into dishes and bowls — so bronze and iron are understood [to be received], whether it were already wrought into columns, plates, swords, spears, axes, pots and cauldrons, or not. Now weigh this, O my soul: that by these various kinds of metals are signified various kinds of talents and gifts, with which the Lord deigns to adorn whom he will. Gold, indeed, and silver can both be built into vessels and also, by themselves — even if they have no form or use of a vessel — bring honor and adornment to the House of God. But bronze and iron, unless they be vessels, what grace can they confer? You, therefore, since you are iron, and indeed the vilest [iron] — of the sort that nearly that [iron] is from which among us today, by a rather new invention, hypocaust-furnaces are made — you must resolve: *first,* that you are to be signally purged of your former filth; *then,* that you ought — after the manner of an axe, a pot, a pan, and other vessels of that kind — to be always ready for cutting, cooking, frying, or performing some other service of this sort, which is neither great, nor splendid, nor honorable; and likewise that you must suffer yourself to be handled by woodcutters, smiths, cooks, and the like, who are commonly reckoned the more abject and sordid — so that your fellowship and habitual company, that is, may be with the humble and the truly poor in spirit, whom the world holds *for a mockery and for a byword of reproach* [Wisd. 5:3–4; printed "in similitudinem imperij," apparently for *improperii,* "reproach"] — and that you may gladly obey the commands and counsels of such men, [and] apply yourself to the ministries and actions which the Lord wills. Only be you in the treasures of the House of the Lord, and let nothing be a care to you. Nay rather, labor, and strive as much as you can, that you never allow yourself to cease, but, after the manner of a vessel of bronze and iron, be applied frequently to use.

> *"Bronzes shine with use; a good garment asks to be worn: / iron laid aside is gnawed and rough with rust." [Ovid, Amores 1.8.51–52]*

Finally, hear the Apostle, 2 Tim. 2, v. 20: *In a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and of earthenware: and some indeed unto honor, but some unto dishonor. If anyone shall have cleansed himself from these, he shall be a vessel sanctified unto honor, and useful to the Lord, prepared for*

every good work. Of myself [I am] a vessel unto dishonor: make me, O God, by thy grace a vessel unto honor, and useful.

Question XLII. Whether it is lawful for the houses of God, or the Christian Churches, to have treasuries?

Hence surely a splendid example is drawn, by which this is proved lawful. But since many things can be objected, and by many [examples] this same thing can — and ought — to be proved, I refer the reader back to Bellarmine, book three *On the Worship of the Saints*, ch. 6; and at the same time I join to him [the matter of] the treasuries of that kind of the Christians' temples, concerning which I have treated in my [work] on Mainz [*Moguntiacarum rerum*], book 1, ch. 32. There are treasuries of temples of another sort, into which — of old among the Gentiles too, as Seneca (*Epist.* 116) and Varro (*On the Latin Language*) attest, and among us — an alms-offering [*stips*] is wont to be cast; concerning which our [confrère Martín] de Roa [treats], book 1, ch. 1, *On the Birthday.*

Question XLIII. Of the anathema of persons: who were excepted? and whether rightly?

In so great and so general a destruction of the city of Jericho, there remained safe: first, indeed, Rahab; then her father and mother (v. 26 [v. 23]); thirdly, her brothers, in the same place. That she had some sisters can be seen above, ch. 2, v. 13; but either these are understood here among the "brothers," or in the following general name of "families [households]." This latter [reading] pleases Abulensis; both please Masius — who adds that perhaps they [the sisters] had set their own salvation after their pleasures. Fourthly, all her kindred, as

(col. 803)

with the Seventy [LXX] our [translator] renders — what in Hebrew we read [as] *all her families* [*mispahoth*, מִשְׁפָּחוֹת, "clans, kindreds"]. And so perhaps, as I said, [her] sisters [are included]; but certainly there were preserved all who were near to Rahab herself by blood, all joined by affinity, all their sons and daughters, all, finally, the men-servants and maid-servants who could be in the houses and households of all these. Where it must be considered how great is the usefulness of virtue and of all good deeds: because it embraces not only him who does the good deed, but so many others besides — as was done also at Gen. 18 and 19. "In most ancient commentaries" (says Masius, fol. 116), "which, written upon the history of Ruth, are entitled *Midrash Ruth*, it is handed down that R. Simeon son of Yohai said, when he was treating that combination of words, [that] 'all their thoughts had drawn [it] forth' — [namely,] that Rahab, by that faith of hers, had obtained so great a grace with God that, even if she had had two hundred men joined to her by kindred, and they had contracted affinity with two hundred foreign families, all those families would have been about to be saved for her sake." And indeed that not a few of her fellow-townsmen, who for the sake of safety had betaken themselves to her, [were saved] — a very probable conjecture can be drawn from the plural number of the noun *mispahoth*, COGNATIONES [KINDREDS], or lineages. Now that all that saved multitude was rightly preserved is plain: because it is just to stand by compacts rightly made and agreed. And that Rahab, and all who touched her by any close relation and bond of family, were to be preserved, was rightly compacted and agreed — above, ch. 2, vv. 2, 13, 14, 18, 19. For it cannot be doubted that power to make terms in those things which would aid that reconnaissance of so great moment was granted to the spies by Joshua — although not [power] to make terms universally in any way whatever, as is to be understood [from] Masius, fol. 115. And a threefold [cause], just for those same spies, drawn from the very fountains of nature, had been the cause of entering upon this [compact]. *The first* was the public benefit of his own people, to whom — as it approached, and as it was expedient to wage a just war upon this well-fortified city — it was of profit not to be ignorant of the state of the [place] first met. But if the spies had not promised this

safety, they would have been killed, and could have reported nothing of the state [of the city]. *The second* [was] their own safety, in a most present danger of life. *The third* [was] the showing of a grateful mind toward Rahab. For what less do we owe to him who snatches us from death, than to guard his life while we can? Nor did those general laws of God concerning the utter destruction of the Canaanites (Exod. 23, v. 24; Num. 33; Deut. 7, v. 20) stand in the way — as will be said elsewhere against the Gentile [i.e. Alberico Gentili]. And rightly, in this place, Masius (fol. 113), and likewise Tostatus (q. 54), warns that it is by no means to be thought that God, the Best and Greatest, willed by his laws to abolish that natural obligation, by which the Israelites should do good to those who did good [to them]. And the same reasons demonstrate that Joshua rightly approved these things promised, when the spies had returned to him (ch. 2, v. 23) — as Josephus (bk. 5) asserts against Masius (fol. 115) — and commanded [them] to be preserved (this ch., v. 22). Then, [says] Alberico Gentili (bk. 3 *On War*, ch. 19), "the whole of that matter was done by the Spirit of God, who put that most holy confession into the mouth of the poor little woman — '*Jehovah* [*Iehoua*, יהוה] is your God' — and who willed that woman to be preserved, from whom the Saviour was to have his birth." These reasons, indeed, are not unfitting; but in them the Gentile first contradicts himself. For since, in the same chapter, he would not that those Canaanites be granted life, if any should give themselves up of their own accord to the Jews, and embrace their religion — how was Rahab to be spared, because God had put that confession into her? For can either the Gibeonites, or any other Canaanites at all, embrace the faith and the sacred things of the Israelites, apart from the Spirit of God? Is not faith, in all [men], the gift of God (Eph. 2)? Either, therefore, on account of that gift of God, Rahab ought not to be preserved; or, on account of the same gift, others of the Canaanites could have been preserved. *Secondly*, he does not explain the general cause of the whole benefit conferred on Rahab, but only [the cause] of her life alone. Could not Christ the Lord have been born, unless Rahab had lived? *Thirdly*, the Gentile adds: "And yet it is true, none of these things seems to have been considered by Joshua, who wishes Rahab's compact to be kept: but only the oath of the spies, and the merit of the woman." But whence does the Gentile know that none of those things was considered by Joshua? Was he not a prophet? Could he not know divinely beforehand, that from the chosen posterity of Rahab the Saviour of all would be brought forth? In the heretic, meanwhile, the word "MERIT" is to be noted.

Question XLIV. Whether the household-goods of Rahab herself and of her kin, and all the other goods, were preserved?

That all Rahab's furniture [*supellex*] was preserved, our text plainly indicates at v. 23; but in the Hebrew and the Greek there is no such word. This our Interpreter [the Vulgate translator] used, as a word which might reach most widely, [so as] to embrace all that was Rahab's. For under "furniture" these things are contained — as Paulus says (bk. 4 *To Sabinus*), and from him Justinian (*Digest*, bk. 33, tit. 10, law 2): a table, table-stands [*trapezophora*], a Delphic table [*delphica*], benches, stools, beds also that are silver-plated, mattresses, couch-coverlets, *imperia* [coverings], water-vessels, basins, ewers, candelabra, lamps, ladles, likewise common bronze vessels — that is [reckoned furniture], because they are not properly assigned to a [fixed] place. Besides, chests, cupboards. But there are those who rightly think that chests and cupboards, if they are prepared for the sake of books, or clothes, or armaments, are not among the furniture: because not even those very things, to which they would be assigned, fall under the equipment of furniture. Glass eating- and drinking-ware are among the furniture, just as earthenware: and not only the common, but also those which are of great price; for that silver basins, and silver ewers, and tables, and beds silver-plated, or gilded, or set with gems, are among the furniture is not doubted — so far, indeed, that the same law holds even if they be wholly of silver or of gold. Of murrhine and crystalline [vessels] it can be doubted whether they ought to be counted among the furniture, on account of their exceptional use and price; but of these too the same is to be said. Nor does it matter of what material are the things which are among the furniture. But [some say] that a silver mixing-bowl [*crater*] is not among the furniture, but is a silver vessel — according to

the severity of the age, which did not yet admit silver furniture; [whereas] today, on account of the use of the emperors, if a silver candelabrum be reckoned among silver, it seems to be [mere] silver — and error makes law. Many other things are added; and finally Celsus, in the same place. Labeo says that still more can be signified by the same name; because, by the customs of the state and the use of things, its appellation is changed — though before, in law 1, Pomponius had said, "furniture is the domestic equipment of the head of a household, which is counted neither among silver, nor wrought gold, nor clothing." Rightly, therefore, did the Interpreter render the sense by the word "furniture" [*supellectilis*]. For in the Hebrew and the Greek we here read,

(col. 805)

all that is hers. And therefore rightly Abulensis: "*Furniture* is said," he says, "[to be] all that Rahab possessed: and not only what she herself possessed, but also what her kindred possessed: because Rahab had expressed this, saying to the spies, *That you save my father and my mother, my brothers and sisters, and all that is theirs*, as is plain above, ch. 2." But this was done, not as though Rahab could not have greater [goods] among the Israelites than [those] they would leave in the city of Jericho — since she was joined in marriage to a prince of the tribe of Judah, namely Salmon — but because she loved her own things, which she had always possessed, and would grieve too much if she saw them burn together with the whole city: therefore they were led out. Chiefly, because Rahab was a woman, and [women] have tenderer affections, and are more richly moved toward the things they love, and are more deeply distressed over them when lost. All the goods, therefore, which are called *movable*, were preserved, both Rahab's and her kinsfolk's. But it is not treated here of *immovables*, of which sort are fields, gardens, vineyards, pools, and any others of that kind they had. For it is said (v. 22) *lead out*, and (v. 13) *they led out*: which verb suits only things that can be moved. Yet that her house — in which, and out of which, so many men and so many women escaped destruction — stood immune from the fire, I said above, ch. 2, q. 21. But that fields were given her by Joshua, Josephus relates (bk. 5, ch. 1): δωρεῖται αὐτὴν εὐθὺς ἀγροῖς, καὶ διὰ τιμῆς εἶχε τῆς ἁπάσης [*d■reitai aut■n euthys agrois, kai dia tim■s eiche t■s hapas■s*, "he straightway presents her with fields, and held her in all honor"].

Question XLV. Who [were they that] preserved Rahab, and her kinsfolk and goods?

Threefold [were they] who preserved her and her kinsfolk, her connections, and household, and all the furniture and whatever other unfixed resources. *First*, all the victorious Israelites, in that they held their hands off from them. *Secondly*, the spies, those young men, of whom so much [was said] in ch. 2, especially q. 3; for these led out of the city — now on the very point of perishing — both them and their goods (vv. 22 and 23). *Thirdly*, Joshua, and indeed most of all, as is signified in this chapter. For, *first*, when he promulgated the law of the anathema to all the people, he expressly provided for Rahab herself, and her kinsfolk and goods — and indeed with a signal remembrance and praise of her benefit toward the people (v. 17). *Then*, when Jericho was falling from its high summit, and it was now to be rushed upon by all, and raged against with sword and flame, he most earnestly admonished the spies themselves to preserve Rahab, with all her people, whole and roofed — and that by casting upon them the sacrosanct religion of the oath (v. 22). *Thirdly*, at last, at v. 25, it is said, *But Rahab the harlot, and the house of her father, and all that she had, Joshua made to live.* And this Radak [R. David Kimhi] thinks Joshua did by supplying Rahab with food and all necessaries; other Rabbis (of whom also below, q. 49) [think it was done] by taking her to wife — because [they hold] the Hebrew word *becheiah* [i.e. הִחְיִה, hiphil of חָיָה "to live"], pertaining to the propagation of seed, is an argument that the first mother of all, [she] who was named from that word, [was] Eve [*Heua*, חַוָּה]. But this latter [view] is most false, as will become clear below, in [the treatment of] Rahab's marriage. The former, indeed, [is] true, as is clear from Josephus's words adduced at the end of the

previous question. Yet Joshua is more truly and simply to be understood [thus]: "life" — properly, *chavah* [חָיָה, *chayah*] is "to live," and in the hiphil, *bechuah* [הֶחֱיָה, *hecheyah*] is "to make live." *Secondly*, the Seventy [LXX] render [it] ἐζώγρησεν [*ez■gr■sen*, "he took/saved alive"], of which word I spoke in chapter two, question eight. *Thirdly*: then here, on account of the anathema, all are said to be slain and slaughtered — one [company] alone excepted, namely Rahab with her people, *because Joshua made her to live.* And he did this not only in that common way, of which above — that he did not kill them by his own hand — but in another far greater [way]: namely, that by his imperial command and authority he warded off the swords of all from their bodies, [and] held back the hands of all. And in that he then made them to live in this way, he seems deservedly to have given life likewise to all their posterity — which proved most long-lasting and most splendid: in which [posterity], since CHRIST also, our Lord and Saviour, is [numbered], JESUS assuredly made JESUS to live — as to the flesh, namely, which he here deigned to take from Rahab, of this stock (Matt. 1). And here [is] a most beautiful type of our true Joshua [Jesus], who gives life both bodily and spiritual (as to his divinity) to Rahab herself, and to all — corporeal life; not only by not snatching away that [life] which they already have from elsewhere, but by bestowing [it] and effecting that those who never lived may live, and, living, be preserved. He, as to his sacred humanity also, gives spiritual life to all who believe in him and live in accord with his laws — here indeed grace, afterward glory and felicity; and he gives [it] in that way I already said, namely by effecting that those who never lived such a life, and could not live apart from him, may live — and live everlastingly. O great Joshua, O truest and most powerful giver and preserver of life, in the number of those to whom thou grantest such and so blessed a life, set me, I beseech thee. I am a sinner. And Rahab [was] a sinner. I have lived hitherto dissolutely, slothfully, wickedly. Had not Rahab's father, mother, brothers, and those other Jerichoites and her kin also lived so? Yet Joshua made them all to live; wilt thou deliver me to death? Far be it, my Lord, my Saviour! That is contrary to thy mercy, alien from thy goodness. Nay rather, come with me, all sinners: let us enter Rahab's house — the holy, Catholic Church, I mean. They will rage, they will slay and slaughter — all the swords that are outside and around it; streams of blood will run down, [and] no pardon for anyone: no salvation. But all of us, as many as shall have willed to be in this house, Joshua will make to live — so that now [it may be said]: Eve [*Eua*] [is] *Maveth* [מָוֶת, "death"], and Joshua is *Machieh* [מְחַיֶּה, *mechayeh*, "the giver of life"]: that is, "Though there be death, JESUS [is] the giver of life."

Question XLVI. For what causes was Rahab preserved with all her people?

Two causes are indicated in the text. *One* is, the oath given her by the spies (v. 22). *The other* is, because she had hidden those very spies, and was [thus] safe (vv. 17 and 25). From the former a distinguished example is drawn, that we may understand how great ought to be our religious regard for an oath. Certainly, says Masius, "a most upright Commander recalls to them

(col. 807)

their oath to their memory. For although in that which they [the spies] had given privately, they had not bound the Commander [Joshua] or the army: yet, since they at least were held bound by the sacred bond, the religious scruple of that best Commander was solicitous even for the pledged faith of two of his common soldiers. But if the leaders of our age, and the commanders of armies, would set such examples before themselves to imitate, surely less deadly wars would be waged — which now the rest wage after every appearance of the savagery of all barbarians, sparing themselves in nothing, not only against enemies, but (what is most unworthy) against allies and friends." See Seneca, book four *On Benefits*, chs. 25, 26. From the latter [cause] we are taught how deeply received benefits ought to be fixed in our minds, and, when it is lawful and fitting, recompensed. Two Israelites were guarded and preserved by Rahab: but now not two only, but by the Israelites very many of Rahab's people are guarded and preserved. Rahab bestowed one benefit only: now that benefit is repaid both by those same two Israelites who received it, and, for their sake, by the

whole army, and by the Commander. The life of two was covertly and skillfully protected: now the safety of Rahab herself, and of [her] father, and mother, and brothers, and of all [her] kinsfolk and household is defended and preserved publicly and openly, in the utmost peril of all the others, and in [their] final destruction. So benefits are to be returned — not equal for equal, but, since you can, even by the least, in due time and place, to be repaid. One thing is *justice*, which is called commutative; and another is *gratitude*: gratitude does not call these [benefits] back to niggling reckonings because it received [them]. Where occasion and power is, it pours itself wholly out: for a cup of water, gallons of wine; for a morsel, measures of grain; for an ounce, the whole As [coin] — and whatever there is beyond that? — it gladly gives. Rahab covered the spies: by those same [men] she is now made illustrious; she is set, in the eyes and speech of all, with great praise; under the flax those [spies] were hidden by her; by them she is now borne and celebrated above the roofs of this whole world; through the window and the cords they were let down by her secretly; by them she is now led out through the open gates of the city, by most friendly hands, away from slaughter and flames. But if reason bids us [be] so grateful in bodily benefits, what is to be done in those which regard, and preserve, and adorn the soul? But see the same [author, Seneca] in those same most beautiful books, and Valerius Maximus (bk. 5, ch. 2), where he relates how, when Capua was taken, freedom was given to Cluvia, a servant-harlot, because she had furnished provisions to the Roman soldiers.

Question XLVII. What manner was used in preserving Rahab and her kinsfolk?

A twofold manner is shown in the text. *One* (v. 23): *They made Israel to remain outside the camp* — namely her, that is, Rahab, and her kindred. *The other* (v. 25): into the camp of Israel, into the midst of the holy people, they led her, where she dwelt with her people *even unto the present day.* Of the former, Abulensis indicates two causes: namely, that she was led out of the Jerichoite city not into the Israelites' camp, but into a place situated outside the camp — either that she might wait there for a while, until, the destruction and burning of the city being complete[d], a suitable tent in the camp, and the other necessaries, might be prepared for her; or that she, together with all her people, might be expiated from the former rite and contagion of Gentilism. And these reasons are the more approved by the Jewish Rabbis, and by our [Christian] teachers, from Num. 6, v. 9; ch. 12, v. 14; ch. 31, v. 19. And I could not express it better than in the language of Masius — and the matter is then as pleasant to know as it is useful. "Moreover," he says, "that Rahab is placed outside the camp with her people, this pertains to religion, as the Hebrews say. For although she had long since worshipped the faith of the Israelites in her mind, as we heard above, yet she had not yet given in her name by solemn profession. And this, when it shall have been done, she will dwell among the Israelites." This [is], roughly, Kimhi [Radak]. No Israelite, certainly, was ignorant that Rahab, with her kindreds, was a foreigner. But whether they had ceased to worship strange gods, and had received the law of Moses, this was not widely known. For this, it was needful to be initiated not by faith alone, but also by sacred rites, before one should be reckoned in the number of the people of God. For although women were not circumcised, yet it is certain that by other ceremonies they were wont, as it were, to be dedicated to God, when names were imposed upon them. And God willed the camp to be esteemed holy — as [a place] in which he himself moved in their midst, since in the ark he dwelt as in a kind of headquarters [*prætorium*]. For the opinion of his presence brought religion likewise to the whole people, since each thought himself to be perpetually in the sight of the divine Majesty. And for the sake of confirming and increasing this opinion in the minds of the people, those laws especially were instituted concerning segregating and removing from the camp whoever were affected by certain diseases, and polluted by certain uncleannesses — [things] which are written in [the book of] Numbers. For [the reason] which is subjoined openly shows this — namely, because the Lord himself dwelt in the camp. To the same [purpose] looks also this, that a soldier returning from the slaughter of the Midianites — although [it was] accomplished by God's own command — must remain seven full days outside the camp, and is not admitted within, unless in the meantime he be twice

expiated. It is no wonder, then, if men now coming fresh from the impious worship of the gods are removed from the camp. And another reason too comes in here, why these should be prohibited for a while from the sacred assembly. Namely, by that very thing the dignity of true religion was preserved to them; and, on the contrary, the unworthiness — or rather the baseness — of superstitions was declared: since [those] foreign to the Israelite rites and sacred things were kept off, as profane, from the camp, as [from] a sacred assembly. Nor indeed is there doubt that this fired their souls not a little, and kindled [them] with a greater longing to take up the worship of the true God, and pure religion. Just as also that better discipline of the ancient Church did indeed admit the lapsed, as they called them — yet neither quickly nor rashly — to its communion: of which matter the most learned epistles of the divine Cyprian are full. But you will say: was not that crowd of the Egyptians, which followed the Israelites as they departed, [also] removed from the camp — [the camp] in which, nevertheless, GOD even then declared his presence: by day, indeed, through the pillar of cloud; but by night, of fire? But it is answered: only after the ark was at length built and consecrated, and a fixed plan for making the camp designated, did God will himself to be esteemed peculiarly present in the camp. And therefore, before[hand], nothing was established concerning the holiness of the camp. Nor indeed is there doubt that those Egyptian companions, at Mount Sinai, were partly initiated into the Hebrew sacred rites by circumcision, and gave in their name to God; [while] others were thereafter wholly excluded from the communion of the camp, and cast back into Egypt. But indeed, from these things anyone can clearly understand how greatly God abhors the camps of our armies: from which not only are the profane not removed — for [otherwise] they would remain deserted

(col. 809)

deserted and empty — but it is even held a reproach to display any piety and religion, whether in words or in deeds; and not to defile oneself, with great zeal, with every kind of crime. But what outcomes of things follow [from this], no pious [man] fails to see, with the utmost grief of soul.

Question XLVIII. Whether, just as in body, so also in soul, Rahab and her kinsfolk were saved?

Twofold is the salvation of souls: inchoate and perfect. The inchoate comes about through true faith, and its sacraments, and sanctifying grace. The perfect [comes] through the attainment of eternal glory and felicity. As for that inchoate salvation, it is most certain that Rahab was saved, as was proved above, ch. 2, q. 16. St. Ambrose, book 5 *On the Faith*, ch. 4: "The harlot," he says, "saw this — [that] marvelous destruction of the walls of the Jerichoites; and she who, in the destruction of the city, would despair of the remedies of salvation, because faith had conquered, raising up the standards and banners of the Lord's Passion, bound the scarlet in the window, so that the appearance of the mystic blood — which was to redeem the world — might come into bloom. Thus outside, the name of JESUS was for the warriors unto victory; within, the appearance of the Lord's Passion was, for those in peril, unto salvation. Whence, because Rahab understood the heavenly mystery, the Lord says in the psalm: *I will be mindful of Rahab and of Babylon, of those that know me.*" [Ps. 87:4 (Vulg. 86:4)] But of this place of Psalm 89 [so printed; the verse is Ps. 86:4 Vulg. / 87:4 Heb.] I spoke in that same ch. 2, before, when I was treating of Rahab's own name. It is also most probable that all her kinsfolk, connections, and household — who had obtained bodily safety together with her — were likewise saved. So Abulensis holds, before, at q. 56: and indeed with good reason. For they had seen the marvelous and divine ruin of the walls of the Jerichoites, the storming and destruction of the city. They had heard from Rahab of the one and greatest God, as was seen above in the same ch. 2, q. 26. Joshua's kindness, the spies' good faith, the people's felicity invited them; and in the whole seven-day period, during which they had to stay outside the Israelites' camp, who would doubt that they were excellently instructed by the priests and Levites in the Jewish religion? And the text brought forward in the previous question clearly says this same thing, when it says (v. 25) that these remained in the midst of Israel, in their very camp. For how could the

Jews — now victors, and so many, roused and inflamed by regard for such and so recent divine works — suffer a few conquered, profane, and polluted [persons] to dwell in the midst of their camps? How would they not reckon the whole camp to be polluted and profaned by their contagion, as of impure ones? Therefore all took up the Israelite sacred rites; and those of them who were men were initiated by circumcision; but the women were sprinkled and washed with water, as by a kind of baptism, as Rambam [Maimonides] teaches concerning women of that kind (part 2, fol. 137). As for *perfect* salvation, the opinion about Rahab is beyond doubt. For the Apostle reckons her in the Catalogue of those whom true faith in God has blessed (Heb. 11:31): *by faith Rahab the harlot did not perish with the unbelievers, receiving the spies with peace.* And of all who were reckoned in that Catalogue, it is subjoined (vv. 39 and 40) that they, approved by the testimony of faith, were at length, at some time, to be consummated [made perfect]. But concerning the father and mother of Rahab herself, and the other kinsfolk, and household, [good] is deservedly to be hoped — since there is no crime by which we might condemn them: so that those whom one house saved in body, one Church received, one initiation consecrated to God, one heaven also might receive, and make blessed forever.

Question XLIX. Rahab being preserved, did any of the Israelites take her to wife — and who?

Rahab had no husband, because, as was said in ch. 2, she was a harlot. But when she betook herself to the true worship of God — by the great benefit of that same God — she cast off that nefarious habit of life, and gave herself wholly to chastity and modesty, which she cultivated her whole subsequent life — not, indeed, by abstaining altogether from marriage, but by entering upon a chaste and immaculate wedlock. For the state of that time, and love and honor of offspring, and the divine law, and sacred religion, required chaste and holy [marriages]. Now certain Talmudic Rabbis say that she was made wife to Joshua himself — in Tractate *Zevachim*, ch. 14; *Megillah*, ch. 1; and thence R. Gedaliah in *Shalsheleth* [ha-Kabbalah], fol. 14; and R. Moses [Maimonides], in the negative precept 112, fol. 39b, col. 2. But there is no argument in them, as was set forth above, q. 45. And indeed, since no children of Joshua, no posterity, are ever read of in the sacred letters, it would be false even by their own exposition of the word — about which the same *becheiah* [i.e. הִחְיָה, *hecheyah*, hiphil of חָיָה "to make live"]. For since they say this means "to make a wife fruitful, and to make her, in a way, live in her offspring," Rahab would not have "made [them] live" [i.e. married Joshua], who left neither son nor daughter from her. But it is most certain that she married the son of Nahshon, who is called *Salmon* and *Salma* in the Hebrew, in the last chapter of Ruth (vv. 20 and 21). For so the Evangelist Matthew testifies (ch. 1, v. 5): *Nahshon begot Salmon; but Salmon begot Booz of Rahab.* And Nahshon was prince of the tribe of Judah (Num. 1:4 and 7). Theophylact, indeed, and the author of the *Opus Imperfectum*, doubted, at that place of St. Matthew, whether that Rahab was the same as this our [Rahab]. But there is no cause — not even the least — for doubting. For since the legitimate and ordinary wives of the Jews are passed over in silence in that whole genealogy of CHRIST the Lord, and only the foreign ones, or those [marked] with some notable stain, are named — Thamar, Ruth, Bathsheba — what other, besides this our [Rahab], is set down by name, [as] Rahab [is]? And in this [matter] there is the highest agreement of all Christians, even of the heretics: so that it is a wonder that, against the consensus of all the Latin, Greek, and Syrian books, Santes Pagninus removed from that text of Matthew this "*of Rahab*" — as our [Salmerón] notes (tract. 26, on ch. 1 of Matthew).

Question L. Whether Salmon rightly married this same Rahab?

These [reasons] seem to prove that he did not rightly marry [her]. *First*: it was not lawful to take a Canaanite wife (Deut. 7; Exod. 34). *Secondly*: likewise [not] any foreigner (Num. 36). *Thirdly*: but to marry a harlot

(col. 811)

to marry seems, from Deut. 23:17 [Vulg. 23:18], a nefarious thing. *Fourthly*: and certainly [is it right] to take such a one, whose modesty was defiled and prostituted — [is that] to take an honorable [wife]? *Fifthly*: and [even] if [it be] honorable for others, [is it fitting] for such and so great a youth — for [him], a prince of so great a tribe?

It is to be noted that she whom an Israelite would wish to join to himself in matrimony can be considered [as] twofold: Israelite, namely, and foreign. The Israelite [woman] is either of the same tribe as he, or of another. If of another, either some inheritance and patrimony is owed to her, or not. If she is foreign, she is either also a believer, and initiated in the divine rites, or unbelieving and not yet initiated; and these, again, are either of the Canaanite nation, or of another. Of the Israelite [woman] nothing is now to be said here: ch. 36 of Numbers can be consulted. But of the foreign [woman] it is thus to be determined. When she is a believer, and initiated in the divine ceremonies — of whatever nation she may in the end be — she can be married by any Israelite. For then the cause is absent on account of which a marriage of that kind [is] forbidden: which [cause] is a just fear either of apostasy to be urged upon the men, or of a corrupt superstition to be brought into the tender ears of the children. This is plain, *first*, from the cited Exod. ch. 34, since, after marriages of foreign women of that kind — and indeed of Canaanite women — are forbidden, it is subjoined: *Lest, after they have played the harlot, they make thy sons also to play the harlot. Secondly*, from Deut. 21, where [a woman] who had been captured in war from other nations is permitted to be married by a Jew — provided she forswear all the things of her fatherland, among which error and superstition, which concern the true worship of God, hold the first place. *Thirdly*, from many examples, in two ways. First, from those which are narrated in Scripture and are not disapproved. Secondly, from those which are disapproved. For [such marriage] is disapproved only for this cause: that foreign women were married [while] obstinate in superstition, from whom there was cause and danger of the husbands themselves, or the children, lapsing (1 Kings 11:1; Ezra 10:11). *Fourthly*: there are also good authors of this opinion — Abulensis in this place, qq. 57, 58; certain other Rabbis, as R. Moses of Coucy [Makotsius], cited before, in the negative precept 112, and R. Abraham Zacuto (fol. 10), hold that of the seven nations forbidden by God none could marry any Israelite, but that Rahab was of some other nation, and was made a proselyte. See on ch. 2 of Esther, part 1, p. 6, q. 2, fol. 474.

I say, therefore, that Salmon did excellently when he joined Rahab to himself in wedlock. *First*: because this was the highest recompense of the benefit received. *Secondly*: an invitation to others to deserve well of the same people. *Thirdly*: an exhortation of other peoples toward the Jewish sacred things and religion. *Fourthly*: a certain singular motion and instinct of God, that out of diverse nations and rites they should coalesce into one and the same marriage — that is, into a fellowship of things divine and human — from whom the Saviour of all nations, the Consummator of all sacred things, might be born. *Fifthly*: because all the objections are most easily overthrown. For to [objections] 1, 2, and 3 the answer is already [given]. To [obj.] 4 I say that it is honorable to take such a one who has already repented — nay, so much the more honorable, since there are more, weightier, and more honorable causes for doing this same thing. What [shows] God's goodness so much as the reception into grace of those who repent of their past crimes? To [obj.] 5: by how much he who acts well in things which are commonly deemed vile and abject is the greater, by so much is his deed the more honorable, the more admirable, the more commendable. And to this sense could be accommodated those verses of Horace (from book 2, ode 4) — which are otherwise deservedly hissed off [i.e. usually quoted to the contrary purpose]: *Let not the love of a serving-maid be a shame to thee*, etc. And the honor conferred on Rahab by Joshua, and by so great a people, could also — not amiss — have spurred Salmon himself to this marriage; [as could] the ample possession given [her], her own good beauty, suitable character, the approval of all [her] kinsfolk, and the applause of all the fellow-tribesmen Israelites.

Question LI. What offspring [came] from this marriage of Rahab and Salmon?

Boaz (or Booz) was born of the marriage of Rahab and Salmon; then others, in the tribe of Judah; at last CHRIST JESUS, our Lord and Saviour. But concerning that first [Boaz] there are some difficulties, which I point out at the end of Ruth, where this genealogy is handed down, ch. 4, qq. 17 and 18. Now that [saying] of Hecuba concerning Troy fits Jericho:

> *"Whoever trusts in a kingdom, and, mighty, reigns in a great hall, and fears not the fickle gods, and has given his credulous mind to glad affairs — let him look on me, and on thee, O Troy. Never did Fortune bring greater proofs [of] on how frail a ground the proud stand: the prop [of empire], overthrown, has fallen." [Seneca, Troades 1–6]*

Question LII. What further did Joshua decree against Jericho, [now] emptied by slaughters and swallowed by fire?

Torn down and prostrate were the walls of Jericho; men, women, boys, and infants all slain; the gates, roofs, and all the houses consumed by flames. Nothing seemed able to be added further, unless something more should be decreed for the time to come. And indeed it was decreed by Joshua, with a grave curse, that no one should dare to rebuild it. For so [says] v. 26: *At that time Joshua adjured [them], saying: Cursed [be] the man before the Lord who shall raise up and build the city of Jericho. In his firstborn may he lay its foundations, and in the youngest of his children may he set up its gates.* That is: whoever should ever attempt to rebuild this destroyed city, let God punish him — and with this penalty, indeed: that all his children die, and no posterity survive to him. Let the first, or greatest, of the children perish in the first work of rebuilding — in the very foundation, I say; in the several subsequent parts, the others; but in the last [part], that is, in the setting up of the gates, the last, or youngest-born. And in these words of the text, it is to be noted, *first*, that what our [Vulgate] renders *imprecari* [to imprecate a curse], the Septuagint renders ὁρκίζειν [*horkizein*, "to put under oath, to adjure"], as it were "to adjure"; and the force of both is the same. And the Hebrew word means "to swear, to adjure, and to imprecate curses," as at Num. ch. 5, vv. 19 and 21, and, according to some, Ps. 10, v. 9 [so printed; the verse quoted, "they that praised me swore against me," is Ps. 101:9 Vulg. / 102:8 Heb.]. For where our [Vulgate] says, *Those who praised me swore against me*, those [others] say, "Those who praised me — they imprecated curses upon me,

(col. 813)

and detested [me] as one hateful to God," as Masius notes. And by these [things] Abulensis is disproved, when after q. 60 he says these [words] are uttered in the manner of a pronouncing [i.e. merely a prediction], and repeats [it] at qq. 68, 69. *Secondly*: "Cursed before the Lord" — that is, exceedingly and truly detestable; since what is such *before God* is truly always such. For He cannot be deceived, nor mistaken, after the manner of a man, to whom sometimes that seems evil which is good, and the contrary. *Thirdly*: for "who shall raise up," in the Hebrew of today it is "who shall arise"; and so Masius renders and expounds it, "Who shall be born," or "who shall one day be." But although, as to the sense, it matters little in which way we read [it], yet our reading is the better. *First*: because the Seventy [LXX] omitted that word for this reason — that the same seemed to be sufficiently expressed by the following word, and they rendered only οἰκοδομήσει [*oikodom■sei*, "he will build"]. *Secondly*: because Josephus looks to that verb of "raising up," as if it had been also in the Hebrew, when (bk. 5, ch. 1) he uses ἐγείρειν [*egeirein*, "to raise up"], saying εἴ τις πορθηθεῖσαν ἐγείρειν ἐθελήσειεν [*ei tis porth■theisan egeirein ethel■seien*, "if anyone should wish to raise up [the city] that had been sacked"]. *Thirdly*: because it is not infrequent in the Hebrew text that the letter *vau* [ו] is put for *iod* [י], whose likeness is very great — as St. Jerome long since noted, on Isaiah ch. 10; and all know [it] who have touched these things even with the tips of their lips. And in this very history there is read *Segib* in the Hebrew for *Segub* (1 Kings 16:34); [and] 1 Sam. 18:6, *Iaschir* for *Iaschur* — so that there is no doubt that in this place it ought to be read בְּיָקִים [*iakim*], not בְּיָקוֹם [*iakoum*]. Finally, it is to be noted that after that imprecation the Seventy [LXX] appended its outcome — taken, namely, from that

sixteenth chapter of 1 Kings, of which afterward. For sometimes the Seventy themselves do this, for the sake of explanation, [so] that they insert some things — as at Exod. 2:22, concerning Eliezer, Moses's son, from ch. 18:4.

Question LIII. Did Joshua rightly imprecate [a curse] on the rebuilder of Jericho?

That Joshua had by now given Jericho penalties enough, someone perhaps would believe — since its walls [were] torn down, its citizens slain, its houses burnt — and [that] therefore Joshua acted too cruelly, in that he imprecates so many evils on anyone who should ever exist and try to restore it. And to this [effect] many things can be brought from Cicero's first [book] *On Duties*, from Alexander [of Hales?] bk. 5, *consilium* 132, and others. But I say briefly [that] Joshua did rightly and in due order when he detested the [would-be] rebuilder of Jericho, and devoted his children to destruction. *First*: because he did it by the command and authority of the Lord. For (1 Kings 16:34) this very detestation and devoting is called "the word of the Lord, which he had spoken by the hand of Joshua the son of Nun." *Secondly*: because the Lord assented to the imprecation, as will be said below. Whence Rupert (ch. 20, on Joshua): "He said two [things]: first, 'Let this city be anathema, and all that is in it.' Then, 'Cursed [be] the man before the Lord who shall raise up and build the city of Jericho.' He said two [things], I say, and neither in bitterness of fury, nor from a motion of his own mind, but by the contemplation of the divine judgment: he condemned a city [that was] sinful and hateful to God. Finally, his sentence in both [cases] was immediately followed by the divine testimony." *Thirdly*: because the causes were just and grave, on account of which Joshua took care that Jericho should not come to life again. *First*: that it might be a perpetual monument of the divine power and venge ance before the eyes of all, as Rambam [Maimonides] says. *Secondly*: that idolatry and impiety might be the more detestable to all, [when] they saw [it] so gravely punished in the first Canaanite city. *Thirdly*: lest, on account of the neighboring Jordan and the convenience of the place, some seed of war or of impiety should again arise thence. *Fourthly*: Abulensis (q. 60) adds — because the city had been condemned to the anathema, as [at] Deut. 13:16. But it is not to be thought that this [curse] was comprehended in the anathema simply [in the ban itself]. For otherwise it would have been enough to say beforehand, "the anathema was brought on this city." But now, as if the sentence of the anathema being fulfilled and completed, something new, as it were, is subjoined: "At that time Joshua imprecated [a curse]." For this cause, then, I suppose a mystical [reason]: namely, that it might be signified that it is not enough to have once uprooted all wickedness from the soul, root and branch, through penance and confession; but that one must persevere in this, and diligently take care, lest anyone build for us a new Jericho — lay new foundations of wickedness and dissolution, raise new walls, set up new gates. *Fifthly*: we see also that, for various causes, other peoples have in the same way either destroyed, or willed not to be rebuilt, certain enemy cities. Zonaras (tome 2, on the destruction of Carthage): Πᾶσα, inquit, ἀνάστατος γέγονε, καὶ ἐπάρατον ἐψηφίσθη τὸ ἐπ' αὐτὴν κατοικῆσαί τινα [*"The whole [city],*" he says, *"was made desolate, and it was voted accursed that anyone should dwell upon it [the site]."*]. And this Plutarch had handed down before, in the *Gracchi*; Appian, in the *Punic [Wars]*; and Orosius. [Velleius] Paterculus (bk. 2): "Carthage and Numantia being destroyed, Scipio delivered us from the fear of the one, [and] avenged us of the insults of the other." Cicero, first [book] *On Duties*: "Our forefathers utterly destroyed Carthage and Numantia. I could wish [they had] not [destroyed] Corinth; but I believe they especially followed the convenience of the place, lest the place itself should at some time be able to invite [men] to make war." And in [the speech] *On his House*: "…[so that] we are wont to destroy the cities of enemies — and not of all enemies, but of those with whom we have undertaken a bitter and internal war — drawn not by plunder, but by hatred: because, against those toward whom our minds have been inflamed on account of their cruelty, some [continuing] war always seems to reside even in their roofs and dwellings." In the Lyric [poet, Horace], bk. 3, Ode 3, Juno [speaks] thus:

"But to the warlike Romans I foretell [their] fates on this condition: that not, too dutiful and trusting in their fortunes, they should wish to rebuild the ancestral roofs of Troy. Troy, rising again under a mournful omen, shall be repeated in a sad disaster…" [Horace, Odes 3.3.57–62]

Moreover, we read a public decree [*psephisma*] of the Ionians, by which they cursed those who should rebuild the temples and shrines of the gods that had been set aflame by the fires of the Persians — that the sight, to the eyes, the recollection, to the minds, and the sense of grief, of so great an injury might never be absent — as [it is] in Isocrates, in the *Panegyric*. But see Pierre Faber, bk. 1 of the *Semestria*, ch. 8.

Question LIV. Are the builders, the masons, and the workmen liable to the same imprecation?

They were not. For here that rule of law must hold good, which bids that privileges be extended, but penalties

(col. 815)

restricted. But this penalty was aimed only at him who, as the principal cause, should rebuild Jericho: not at those who sought a living by craft and the labor of their hands. Whence [Scripture] hands down that only his children [the principal rebuilder's] suffered those curses (1 Kings, ch. 16, as we shall see a little later); and this is also Abulensis's opinion (q. 67).

Question LV. Did the inhabitants of the now-rebuilt city fall under the same imprecation?

They did not fall [under it], as is plain by the same argument I used in the previous question. To which this is also to be joined: that most holy men afterward inhabited that same city — such as Elisha, and very many sons of the prophets, of whom [we read] at 2 Kings ch. 2; and that CHRIST too honored [it] with miracles (Matt. 20:29; Luke 19:1). But if, as Zonaras above spoke concerning Carthage, Joshua had said, ἐπάρατος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς κατοικήσει [*eparatos ho anthr■pos hos katoik■sei*, "accursed [be] the man who shall dwell (there)"], there would have been no excuse for its inhabitants. But now he said, as it is in the Seventy [LXX], ἐπικατάρατος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὃς οἰκοδομήσει [*epikataratos ho anthr■pos hos oikodom■sei*, "accursed [be] the man who shall build"]. See St. Jerome, Epist. 17, to Marcella, against those who said Jerusalem was cursed, because it had drunk the blood of the Lord. And the reasoning is equal concerning those who, without walls and gates, should build some houses in the same place where Jericho once was, but not found a city. For in the formula of the devoting it is "this city," as Abulensis not incuriously observes (qq. 62, 63, 65).

Question LVI. Whether, if anyone should raise up on the same site another city under another name, he would be held by the same imprecation?

He would be held. Because this same thing would in fact be to rebuild Jericho. For Joshua — or rather God — is concerned not so much about the name as about the reality. And even if another name were imposed on the city by the builder, there would nevertheless not be lacking those who would use that ancient appellation of Jericho. See Boethius's *Geometry*, fol. 1229. The Rabbis cite another reason in their Talmud, tractate *Sanhedrin*, ch. 11, because the Hebrew text speaks thus, with several [definite] articles, "Whoever shall build this city, this Jericho" — [taking] the sense to be: "Neither let anyone restore this city under another name imposed on it, nor build another city under this very name." But to me this seems more ingenious than true. For that multiplication of the articles (if indeed they are so to be called in Hebrew) seems to signify only that sense which the Greek and the Latin express: as if it were, "Whoever shall build this city — this, I say, Jericho," or "this [city] which is called Jericho." For also in the ancient formulas of the Romans — by which they either declared war on certain enemies, or called forth the gods from their cities [*evocatio*], or made treaties with them, or did something similar — we see all things wonderfully defined and precisely

circumscribed.

Question LVII. What if the rebuilder of Jericho had had no children, or at least not so many?

Since — as the rule of Law said above — penalties are not to be extended, someone perhaps would judge that he who had no children, or certainly had only one or two, and yet should rebuild Jericho, would be either wholly, or at least in part, free and safe from this imprecation. But it is not so. Because this imprecation included two [things]. *First*: the prohibition of rebuilding Jericho. *Then*: a certain temporal penalty. In this way: "Let no one rebuild the destroyed Jericho. But if anyone should do the contrary, let the Lord punish him even in this age." By reason of the *prohibition*, the rebuilder commits a deadly sin, whose companion is eternal punishment; by reason of the *imprecation*, he will incur some penalty in this life. And if he be childless, or certainly not blessed with several children, the Lord will afflict him with some other evil, which shall not yield to [i.e. be no less than] the loss of children. For this taking-away of children seems to have been expressed for this reason only: that there might be a certain congruity of the sin and the punishment. For that "cities are born, live, die, and come to life again," Barnabé Brisson teaches, in his *Observations on Divine and Human Law*, bk. 1, on the law *Omnes* [in the Codex] *On Festivals*; and his friend Pierre Faber, bk. 1 of the *Semestria*, ch. 9. Whoever, therefore, should undertake to restore life and posterity to prostrate and dead Jericho, was worthy to be despoiled himself of life and posterity — at least as to his children. Yet meanwhile the Lord was not ignorant that he who would one day dare this would have several children born [to him].

Question LVIII. Was any of the Jews so bold that, against this imprecation, he thought of the restoration of Jericho?

That [there] was [such a one], this very chapter attests [through the LXX], as was noted above at q. 32, and the book of 1 Kings, ch. 16, v. 34, thus: *In his days* (namely, of King Ahab) *Hiel of Bethel built Jericho.* But he who is there called *Hiel* is called in the same place by the Seventy [LXX] ἀχιὴλ [*Achi■l*], but here ἐζὰν [*Ezan*]; in other Greek copies — as the Masian [that of Masius] — ἀζωζὰν [*Az■zan*]. "Whence that dissonance of the names is not yet sufficiently clear to me," says Masius. But this is certain: that many in sacred history are recorded as having two names. And this happens either because two truly different names were imposed on them, or because one of the names is a synonym of the other — as I said concerning St. Jude Lebbaeus and St. Simon the Canaanite, in my little book *On the Apostles*. And so in this very place *Hiel* and ἐζὰϊ [*Ezai*] seem to agree in signification. For *hotz* [עֹז, ■*oz*] in Hebrew is "strength and might"; but *Hiel* — or, as it is written in Hebrew, חיאל — means exactly the same, if (as not rarely happens in the paragogic letters of the Hebrews) the *aleph* [א] be reckoned not necessary; or, if we think it necessary, it will be, with one *lamed* [ל] subtracted (as I said elsewhere in [the case of] *corban* and *cob■*), "the power and strength of God" — that is, "great." For *Chail* [חיל] is "strength," [and] *el* [אל] is "God"; but that it might be signified that the *aleph* could be absent, our [Vulgate] Interpreter omitted it;

(col. 817)

Interpreter [omitted the *aleph*]; but the Seventy [LXX], in that chapter of Kings, moved it from its [proper] place, and set it at the beginning of the word [→ *Achiel*]. But that others say ἀζωζὰν [*Az■zan*] is either corrupt, or [is so framed] that that great force and power (of which I have spoken) might be signified — [being] a repetition of the same former syllable, as if it were said "*hotz hotz*," "strength [upon] strength" — by which manner of speaking the meaning is known to be intensified among the Hebrews. Nor will he wonder at ἀζ and ὠζ [*az* and ■*z*] who is not ignorant that the vowels sound variously among various [peoples], as I noted in [my work on] Mainz (bk. 1, ch. 3); and again in the following question an example will occur. But this I hold a thing to wonder at: how it could come to pass that an Israelite, in the midst of

Israelites, could be so bold as to count for nothing this imprecation of so great a leader, and of a man so dear to God. But indeed — *We always strive after the forbidden, and desire what is denied* [Ovid, *Amores* 3.4.17]. How is it that so many robbers today do not fear the gibbets and wheels set fixed before the eyes of all? How is it that so many neglecters and violators of testaments fear nothing at all from the imprecations of the dead? How is it that so many perjurers and treaty-breakers do not dread the curses which they had imprecated upon themselves? How did Adam and Eve not dread that terrible *Thou shalt die the death* [Gen. 2:17]? How do we ourselves not dread [it] daily? How, [with] hell threatened and most certainly foretold by the Apostles, by CHRIST the Lord, and eternal Gehenna — do we not shudder, [we] so many, daily [being] greedy, ambitious, greedy of vainglory, puffed up, drunken, lustful? Doubtless we close our eyes: we do not look upon these things; we do not turn [them] over in our mind; we shut [them] out from our ears, if ever they are brought in through the voices of the preachers; and we feign for ourselves causes — flattering to our disposition, pleasant to our desires — which not only do not restrain us from crimes, but incite [us], and drive [us] headlong. So indeed Hiel — whether from the rebuilding of Jericho [he coveted] certain profitable revenues, or palaces most full of pleasantness, or the celebrity of [his] name and its propagation to late descendants (which Rupert asserts, ch. 20), or [whether] he coveted all these at once, and many other like things — counted Joshua's devoting for a trifle. Perhaps too he silently reasoned within himself that Joshua had been too severe, and too hostile to this city; that his detestation proceeded from fury and excessive cruelty, not from the Spirit of God, who is gentle and meek; and was neither approved nor heard by God himself; or certainly that, since it had been conceived in the year of the world's creation 2490, and King Ahab (in whose time, as was said, he set about this restoration) began to reign [in the year] 3222, it had by now grown obsolete through age, and, after more than 700 years, the force of that detestation had vanished. Nay, perhaps the wretch had even advanced to such a [degree] of madness that he despised not only Joshua, but even the God of Israel, and counted His books, [His] Prophets, and [His] servants as nothing. For this seems to me to be signified by that book of Kings, when Hiel is so expressly noted as having undertaken this building "in the days of King Ahab." For Ahab was an impious king, and a most wicked author and sower of impiety, as he is described in the same place (v. 29 and following). This King, then, Hiel wished to please; and that he might please [him], he willed to profess his contempt of the highest King [God] by some signal crime; and the wealth in which he abounded (for none but a very powerful [man] could have undertaken so great a thing) he conferred toward the rebuilding of Jericho, against the vow and imprecation of God's servant and Prophet. And so we discern an illustrious example of certain Courtiers, and of those who today are called Politiques [*Politici*]; we see the course of this world — namely, what studies most [men] pursue, on which they pour out their wealth; how they accommodate themselves to the wills of wicked Princes; how, under these [princes'] reigns, those things are wont to be rebuilt which Joshua had torn down and reduced to ashes — [things] which he had forbidden to be restored unto all posterity, which he had willed [to be] anathema and devoted to curses: that is, [things] which CHRIST JESUS, our Lord and Saviour, hates and detests; which He blots out and disturbs by His life and doctrine; which He pursues through His Church with anathematizings and execrations — crimes, heresies, and impieties and vanities of every kind. And these too are sometimes restored by those who are "of Bethel," that is, "of the house of God," by Ecclesiastics and Monks — as [happens] almost in this our time through Luther, Zwingli, Beza, Calvin, and the like — even if they were not the supreme ones — [these] Monk-nuns [*Monachæ*, a barb at apostate monks] of Ahab.

Question LIX. Did Hiel do [it] against the same imprecation with impunity?

By no means. For thus it is added in the same ch. 16 of 1 Kings: *In Abiram his firstborn he* (Hiel of Jericho) *laid its foundation, and in Segub his youngest he set up its gates, according to the word of the Lord which he had spoken by the hand of Joshua the son of Nun.* For "Abiram" the Seventy [LXX] write ἀβειρὼν [*Abeir■n*]; and since in Hebrew the name is the same as his who perished with Korah and Dathan, [as well as] the name of this our [Abiram], the same [LXX] write it at Num. 16 [as] ἀβειρὼν; and our [Vulgate]

Interpreter imitates them there, and at ch. 26:8, Deut. 11:6, Ps. 105 and 107, Sir. [Ecclus.] 45:22. But for "Segub" the same Seventy wrote, in this place of Joshua, διασωθέντα [*dias■thenta*], that is, "saved." For they rendered the signification of the proper name, since it is from *sagab* [גבׇש], which is "to exalt, to raise up, to deliver, and to rescue." Indeed, God himself is called *misgab* [בׇגׇשׇמ] — Ps. 9:10; Ps. 45:8, 12; [Ps.] 59; Ps. 58:14; Ps. 94:22; Isa. 25:12 — that is, "a refuge and a deliverance." Yet not only these two children were taken away by Hiel's doing, but the others also, as many as had been placed between these two. For thus Rupert (ch. 20, on Joshua): "When he laid the foundations of Jericho, immediately his firstborn son died; and then, during the building, [his sons] gradually departing according to the order of [their] birth, [and] when — which was the last [act] — he set up its gates, his youngest son died: a marvelous ambition upholding [his] obstinacy, so that, by ambitiously [pursuing] the founder's name, he lost, with [full] feeling, the whole honor of a parent." And this death of the children could come about in two ways. *First*: on account of the parent's fault alone. For since this death is temporal, and the Lord has the right over the life and death of all, He can, without any fault of the children — [a fault] which would be their own — take them out of the midst, only so that the sad bereavement to the parents, and the bitter grief (of which [the children] are, as it were, certain parts), may be seared in

(col. 819)

be seared in. *Secondly*: on account of some fault of the children's own also. And perhaps both modes had a place here. For the firstborn could by [his] age be now more grown, and [could be] one of the [more culpable] others; but the youngest-born was still, by his tender age, a stranger to the faculty of sinning. Those [elder ones], then, seem to have taken after their father, and to have followed his impiety and pride — and perhaps so much the more, by how much greater [are] the torches of boldness, of wickedness, and of empty glory that blaze in the young and in youths. For if the sons of Heroes are sometimes harmful [/guilty], how much more the offspring of impious parents? Too true, alas the shame, [is] that complaint of the Lyric [poet, Horace], bk. 3, Ode 6:

> *"The age of [our] parents, worse than [our] grandsires', brought forth us [who are] more worthless, soon to give a still more vicious progeny." [Horace, Odes 3.6.46–48]*

But that youngest one — since indeed [his] parent worshipped Baal along with King Ahab, as was said in the previous question — was held still bound by original stain, because he had not been expiated from it by circumcision. Now "Abiram" is "strong," and as it were "the excellent one" of them — namely, of the parents, or of the brothers. Yet this strength and excellence, this primogeniture and prerogative, could not defend him from death; and [the name] proved false in Segub — his name. For he was neither διασωθεὶς [*dias■theis*] or "saved," nor, as [was] the parent's hope while he bestowed this name, did he prove "exalted" and "celebrated"; but, while the gates of Jericho are being raised, the unhappy boy is cast down. O how vain, often, [are] the auguries of parents concerning [their] children! how empty the hope! But how great [is] the obstinacy of men, who cannot be recalled from their undertakings even by the funerals of their own so-dear [children] — [warned] by a sure word of God, [even] when they see and feel [it]?

Question LX. How great [was] Joshua's glory, and what [was] its cause?

"His name," says our Interpreter (v. 27), "was noised abroad in all the land." Masius says the sentence is here ambiguous, because that "his" can be referred either to God or to Joshua. But it is certain [it is] referred to Joshua, since, from the fact that "God was with him," Scripture wishes to indicate how much good befell him. And so all understand [it], both Hebrews and Greeks and Latins. But our [Interpreter] renders "name" [for] what in Hebrew is "a hearing," or "a report," which is heard concerning him; and that too is in the Seventy [LXX], but without "noised abroad," thus: ἦν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν [■*n to onoma aut■s kata pasan t■n g■n*, "his name was throughout all the land"]. But how could Joshua's glory be spread and scattered through all the earth? Some, in Abulensis (q. 70), answer that it was done because the

standing-still of the sun made by him was seen in the whole world. But of that [we] treat not now; and afterward, in its own place below (ch. 10), it will be proved that it was not seen in the whole world. It is more truly said that here "all the land" is called that very [land] of which Jericho seemed, as it were, the Metropolis: namely Canaan, and its neighborhood. For in the same way it is said [in] Genesis 41: *All the provinces came into Egypt, to buy food.* [Were] all the provinces from the whole world? [Were they] from Spain, Gaul, India, and Mexico? No. But "all the provinces" [means those] which [were] nearer to Egypt — such as Arabia, [and] Palestine. And if anywhere this [phrase] must have a modification of the "whole earth" phrases applied to it, then certainly it must above all be applied when there is question of a name propagated far and wide — as, in the most beautiful [passage] in Cicero, in the *Dream [of Scipio]*, that most renowned Africanus [Scipio] instructs his [grandson] Scipio: "Look ever," he says, "upon the heavenly things; despise the human. For what celebrity of men's speech, or what glory to be sought, can you attain? You see that [the earth] is inhabited in few and narrow places, and that, in those very [places], as it were spots where [men] dwell, vast solitudes lie between; and that those who inhabit the earth are not only so cut off that nothing can flow among them from some to others, but stand partly aslant, partly athwart, partly even opposite to us: from whom you certainly can hope for no glory. But you discern that same earth as if girt and surrounded by certain belts [zones]: of which you see [that] two, most diverse from each other, and propped from either side upon the very poles of heaven, have stiffened with frost; but that middle and greatest [zone] is scorched with the sun's heat. Two are habitable: of which that Southern one, in which they who stand press footprints opposite to us, [is] nothing to your race; but this other, subject to the North wind [Aquilo], which you inhabit — [see] certainly with how thin a part it touches you. For all the earth which is inhabited by you, narrow at the poles, broader at the sides, is a certain small island, surrounded by that sea which on earth you call the Atlantic, the Great [sea], the Ocean: which, [though] with so great a name, you see how small it is. From these very cultivated and known lands, could your name, or that of any of us, cross this Caucasus which you behold, or swim across that Ganges? Who in the remaining [parts] of the East, or the utmost [West] of the setting sun, or of the North, or the Southern regions, shall hear your name? These being cut off, you see indeed within what narrow bounds your glory would spread itself." [Cicero, *Dream of Scipio = De Re Publica* 6] Which passage I have copied out the more gladly, because Boethius both praised it and imitated it (bk. 2 *On Consolation*, prose 7): "How slight," he says, "(is glory), and void of all weight, thus consider. The whole compass of the earth (as you have learned from astronomical demonstrations) is known to hold the ratio of a point to the space of the heavens; that is, so that, if you compare it to the magnitude of the celestial globe, you would judge it to have no extent at all. And of this so tiny a region of the world, scarcely a fourth part (as you have learned, with Ptolemy proving it) is inhabited by living beings known to us. If from this fourth part you subtract in thought as much as the seas and marshes press upon, and as much as the vast desert region stretches itself out, scarcely the narrowest area for men to dwell in will be left. In this smallest [point], then, of a point, fenced round and shut in, do you think of publishing [your] fame, of spreading [your] name? But what has glory ample and magnificent, cramped within such narrow and scanty limits? Add that this very enclosure of a brief dwelling-place many nations inhabit, differing in language, in customs, in the whole manner of life — to whom, both by the difficulty of journeys, and the diversity of speech, and the rarity of commerce, not only the fame of individual men, but not even [that] of cities, can reach. In the age, finally, of Marcus Tullius [Cicero] (as he himself signifies in a certain place), the fame of the Roman Republic had not yet crossed the Caucasus mountain; and it was then grown up, formidable even to the Parthians and the other nations of those parts. Do you see, then, how narrow, how compressed [is] the glory which you labor to spread and propagate? Or where the fame of the Roman name cannot pass, shall the glory of a Roman man advance? [And] what of [the fact] that the customs and institutions of diverse nations disagree among themselves — so that what among some is judged worthy of praise, among others is judged worthy of punishment? Whence it comes about that, if the proclamation of fame delight

(col. 821)

it is in no way expedient to spread [his] name among very many peoples.

But this celebrity of the Joshuan name was begotten, not — at this time — by the standing-still Sun (as was said by some a little before), nor by a coinage stamped with the emblems of Joshua (as the Jewish Rabbis fable, in *Bereshith Rabbah* [the midrash on Genesis]), but by two other causes. *One*, particular and less principal: namely, the destruction of Jericho, so sudden, so marvelous, and the recent crossing of the river Jordan, so unheard-of. *The other*, general and principal — which alone is expressed here — [is] *because the Lord was with Joshua*. This, indeed, [is] the fount of true glory: this the soil and foundation of solid fame. "All [men]," says Ennius, "wish to be praised": and St. Augustine indeed reproves this very [wish] (bk. 13 *On the Trinity*, ch. 3); yet in all [men there is] a certain inborn desire of glory. But some pursue that [glory] in vain; some employ vain modes of attaining it. They think that they will be glorious and of excellent fame, if there be at hand for them wealth, beauty, learning, a throng of clients, the favor of peoples, the grace and familiarity of Princes. But vain, vain [are] all these things. A name — even if [a man] neither works for it nor looks to it — that one most ample and most constant [name] will he attain, who will be with God. But what it is "to be with someone [i.e. God]" was said above, ch. 1, q. 12. Truly, God is with him who believes in Him, fears Him, worships Him, [and] prefers Him to all things. In 1 Sam. ch. 18, v. 30, "David's deed made his name exceedingly [great]," or "very [great]." Why so? Twice before it is said, in the same place (vv. 12 and 28), "The Lord was with David." There exists a witty poem of some more recent poet — I know not whose — which truly paints Virtue [as] the mother of true glory, and teaches that, without her, it [glory] cleaves to no one:

> *ON PAINTED GLORY.*
>
> *"What goddess [art thou]? — I am Glory, the daughter of Virtue. — What [is] that throng [about thee]? — Those [are] suitors, a wicked crowd, wooers. — Whom, about to wed, dost thou favor? — [I hold] all in disdain. — Why? — Secretly, because I will not give my mother [Virtue] in marriage to a man. — Whom worthy will she give [thee] to embrace, as a welcome husband? — [One] of perpetual faith — though he flee me."*

Indeed, one of the ancients said: "No renown is lacking, if prudence be with thee." But I [say]: "No renown is lacking, if the presence of the Godhead be with thee."

"Thou," says King and Prophet David (Ps. 3[:4]), "O LORD, art my upholder: my glory, and the lifter-up of my head." So profuse and so overflowing toward the race of men [is] the goodness of GOD, that in this age too He bestows upon His own servants not only various endowments and ornaments of the soul — not only the most divine form and beauty of His heavenly grace — but a name also, and the light and dignity of fame and glory. "I," He says (2 Sam. 7:9), "took thee from the pastures, following the flocks, that thou shouldest be Leader over my people Israel: and I was with thee in all things, wheresoever thou didst walk; and I made thee a GREAT NAME, according to the name of the great ones who are on the earth." "I have," says the Apostle (Rom. 15:17 [printed "Romanæ c. 17. v. 16"]), "glory in CHRIST JESUS toward God." And ch. 2[:10]: "Glory, and honor, and peace to everyone that worketh good." Yet because this celebrity of name and glory is of that kind of goods which we can abuse, and by which the less attentive and less wary are most easily puffed up, the Lord gives it to whom and when He wills. To me, O LORD, grant that [glory] which is looked for in the age to come. Now be Thou ever with me, by grace and help; but then, indeed, [be with me] also by glory and charity. AMEN.

Of the Wars: Caput VII

Textvs

1. But the children of Israel transgressed the commandment, and usurped [something] of the anathema. For Achan the son of Charmi, the son of Zabdi, the son of Zare, of the tribe of Judah, took something of the anathema: and the Lord was angry against the children of Israel. **2.** And when Joshua sent men from Jericho against Hai, which is beside Bethaven, on the east side of the town of Bethel, he said to them: Go up, and view the Land. And they, fulfilling [his] commands, viewed Hai. **3.** And returning, they said to him: Let not all the people go up, but let two or three thousand men go, and destroy the city: why shall all the people be vexed in vain against very few enemies? **4.** There went up therefore three thousand fighting men. Who straightway turning their backs, **5.** were smitten by the men of the city of Hai, and there fell of them thirty-six men: and the adversaries pursued them from the gate as far as Sabarim, and slew [them], fleeing down the slopes: and the heart of the people was afraid, and was melted like water. **6.** But Joshua rent his garments, and fell prostrate on the earth before the ark of the Lord until evening, both he and all the elders of Israel: and they cast dust upon their heads. **7.** And Joshua said: Alas, O Lord God, why wouldst Thou bring this people over the river Jordan, to deliver us into the hand of the Amorite, and to destroy [us]? Would that, as we had begun, we had remained beyond the Jordan. **8.** My Lord God, what shall I say, seeing Israel turning their backs to their enemies? **9.** The Canaanites and all the inhabitants of the Land will hear [it], and being gathered together will surround us, and will blot out our name from the earth: and what wilt Thou do to Thy great name? **10.** And the Lord said to Joshua: Arise, why liest thou prostrate on the earth? **11.** Israel hath sinned, and hath transgressed my covenant: and they have taken of the anathema, and have stolen and lied, and have hidden [it] among their own vessels.

(col. 823)

(full width — Joshua 7 lemma continues, vv. 12–26)

12. Neither will Israel be able to stand before their enemies, but will flee from them: because it [Israel] is polluted with the anathema. I will be no more with you, until you destroy him who is guilty of this crime. **13.** Arise, sanctify the people, and say to them: Be sanctified for the morrow: for thus saith the Lord God of Israel: The anathema is in the midst of thee, O Israel: thou shalt not be able to stand before thy enemies, until he who is defiled with this crime be blotted out from among thee. **14.** And you shall come near in the morning, each one by your tribes: and whatsoever tribe the lot shall find, it shall come near by its kindreds, and the kindred by its houses, and the house by its men. **15.** And whosoever he be that shall be caught in this crime, he shall be burnt with fire with all his substance: because he hath transgressed the covenant of the Lord, and hath done a wicked thing in Israel. **16.** Joshua therefore, rising in the morning, brought Israel near by their tribes, and the tribe of Judah was found. **17.** Which, when it was offered by its families, the family of Zare was found. Offering that also by houses, he found Zabdi: **18.** whose house, dividing into the several men, he found Achan the son of Charmi, the son of Zabdi, the son of Zare, of the tribe of Judah. **19.** And Joshua said to Achan: My son, give glory to the Lord God of Israel, and confess, and tell me what thou hast done, hide it not. **20.** And Achan answered Joshua, and said to him: Indeed I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel, and thus and thus have I done. **21.** For I saw among the spoils a scarlet garment exceeding good, and two hundred sicles of silver, and a golden rule of fifty sicles: and coveting [them] I took [them] away, and hid [them] in the earth against the middle of my tent, and covered the silver with the earth [I] dug up. **22.** Joshua therefore sent ministers: who running to his tent, found all [the things] hidden in the same place, and the silver together. **23.** And taking them away from the tent, they brought them to Joshua, and to all the children of Israel, and cast them down before the Lord. **24.** Joshua therefore, taking Achan the son of Zare, and the silver and the garment, and the golden rule, his sons also and daughters, oxen and asses and sheep, and the tent itself, and all the household goods — (and all Israel with him) — brought them to the

Valley of Achor: **25.** where Joshua said: Because thou hast troubled us, may the Lord trouble [/drive] thee out on this day. And all Israel stoned him: and all things that were his were consumed with fire. **26.** And they gathered together upon him a great heap of stones, which remaineth unto the present day. And the fury of the Lord was turned away from them. And the name of that place was called, the Valley of Achor, unto this day.

COMMENTARY.

Two events accompanied the storming of Jericho: namely, the detestation [curse] of him who should rebuild that destroyed [city], and the detection in crime, and the punishment, of the one Israelite who had stolen [something] of the city's anathema. And that former event was set forth toward the end of the previous chapter; of the other [event] this seventh chapter now treats — and indeed in three ways. For, *First*, the sin is generally recounted. *Secondly*, the sinner is sought out. *Thirdly*, he is punished.

Question I. Who [was] Achan?

He is described in the text in three ways: namely, as to name, tribe, and house. **1.** His name was threefold: *Achan*, *Achar*, *Achor* — of which the first is here always [used] in the Hebrew; the second [at] 1 Chron. 2:3; the third is here intimated (vv. 25 and 27). The Greek, on the contrary, uses rather the middle name. For it here always writes ἄχαρ [*Achar*] for Achan — which those generally do who follow the Seventy [LXX], as (bk. 7) Salvian, [and] Prudentius in the *Psychomachia*, [and] Rupert (ch. 21); and it twice keeps the other, ἄχωρ [*Ach■r*], and Josephus follows it in his own way, as does St. Jerome in ch. 4 of Micah. Whence is sufficiently refuted what Abulensis says (after questions 54 and 77, at the end of this chapter): that "Achor" is not the name of a man, but the name of a valley. But the origin of all the names is the same, which Joshua indicates (v. 26). For what there the Latin renders "to trouble" and "to drive out," and the Greek renders ὀλοθρεύειν and ἐξολοθρεύειν [*olothreuein* & *exolothreuein*, "to destroy" & "to destroy utterly"], in Hebrew is always one word, עכר *hacar* [■*akhar*, "to trouble"]. So that "Achan" signifies not "a lurking serpent" (as in the book of *[Hebrew] Questions on Chronicles* [ps.-Jerome] — for so it would be *nachas* [נחש]) — but "a troubler, a disturber," and "a destroyer," as will be said below from *Sanhedrin* ch. 6, fol. 44b, and others (q. 40). And so, alluding to this name, Joshua says: "Because thou hast troubled us, may the Lord drive thee out." As if he said what is commonly wont to be said: "Names often fit their things." And 1 Chron. 2:7 [reads] *hachar*, *hocher*, that is, "Achar the troubler," in Greek ὁ ἐμποδοστάτης Ἰσραήλ [*ho empodostat■s Isra■l*, "the hinderer of Israel"]. For — "to compose a name that comes true is to divine," says Ausonius (Epist. 21) — [it is] "a token of one's fortune and character, or of one's death." But on account of that root, from which this name springs up, [the name] is written by some with an aspiration, *Hacan*. **II.** His tribe was Judah — that tribe, I say, from which [came] the Saviour, who has His name also from "salvation," as was set forth [in] bk. 1, ch. 2. [But] no one is to glory in a lineage, however lofty and noble — since [that lineage] sometimes produces [men] unworthy of that stock; and no one should swell greatly over any lineage, since from it [too] some degenerate [offspring] arise. These are human [things]. The same garden brings forth both wholesome herbs and poisonous aconites. **III.** His father was *Charmi*; his [grandfather] *Zabdi*, who was grandfather to him; his [forefather] *Zara*, who by some is called *Zare*, [and] from the Hebrew is called *Zarach* [זרח]. And he [Zerah] was a son of the patriarch Judah (Genesis 38). But here there are difficulties. *First*: [there] are enumerated (1 Chron. 2:6)

(col. 825)

five sons of Zerah himself, and among them no Zabdi. *Secondly*: in the same place, at verse seven, "Achar the son of Charmi" is indeed said, but in such a way that Charmi seems [to be] one of Zerah's nearest sons. For the manner of writing there is such, that when someone's sons are recounted, the sons of these [sons] also, if there be anything notable in them for the memory, are recounted. But neither is Charmi placed there among the sons of Zerah, nor is it indicated of which of Zerah's sons he is the son. *Thirdly*: [is it not strange]

that from the patriarch Judah — that is, from the time before the descent into Egypt down to this arrival in the promised Land — only four generations are enumerated, [a span] of more than 260 years indeed? For the Israelites came into the promised Land in the year of the world 2490, as was said above (ch. 5); into Egypt they had gone in the year 2238. — As for the *first* [difficulty]: he who is here called *Zabdi* is there [1 Chron. 2:6] *Zamri*, or, as the Hebrew points prefer today, *Zimri*. For the Seventy [LXX] also read here, for *Zabdi*, Ζαμβεί [*Zambei*], with a *b* interposed for euphony's sake — as also [in the book] of Numbers, ch. 25, v. 14. And so either this [man] had two names (as pleases Abulensis), or, from the likeness of the letters *resh* [ר] and *mem* [מ] — as the Masorah notes was done elsewhere, and [as with] *Bethamara* for *Bethabara* (Epiphanius, *Against Heresy* 51 [of the *Anoetorum*], fol. 189) — the two [letters] *resh* and *mem* were here [confused]; and so from *Zamri* was made *Zabdi*, called by Josephus "Zebedias," [and] by his translator Rufinus "Zebedaeus." As for the *second*, that text [1 Chron. 2:6–7] seems, if not to be read, at least to be understood, thus: "the sons of *Zimri*: *Charmi*; the sons of *Charmi*: *Achar*." As for the *third*, those generations are four; but a fifth is also signified here, since mention is made of Achan's children (v. 24) — although it is not established how grown-up they were. But you will note that Achan is sometimes called by his father's name, *Charmi*, as in St. Chrysostom (homily 6 on Ephesians).

Question II. Why is Achan's genealogy indicated so carefully?

The Jew Rashi says it was done to signify that that had at last come to pass which had been shown at Zerah's birth, when — as he was just about to be born, and was putting out his hand from his mother's womb — the midwife bound a scarlet [thread] on him (Gen. 38:28): namely, because from his descendants there was to be one who would steal a scarlet garment, and give much [occasion of] public mourning. But this, says Abulensis (q. 4), "is ridiculous, since it is established that the scarlet was placed on the hand of that [child] about to be born for another cause." But of the same effect there are sometimes not one only, but many causes. And what forbids [that] this too was one of the secondary, as it were, and more hidden causes? The midwife did not indeed look to this, nor purpose in her mind, that Achan should [one day] be made famous by any scarlet theft; but how many things does the Lord do and show through men who know [it] not? [He] who (John 11:50 [printed "Ioann. 27"]) said, "It is expedient for us that one man die for the people, that not the whole nation perish" — did not say [it] of himself (v. 51, in the same place). This [reason], then, can be maintained. Yet there are others more principal and more certain. *First*: that this Achan might be distinguished from others, if any perchance bore this name, whether in the same tribe or in others. For the community of name, of crime, and of disgrace ought to bring [a community of shame]. There was indeed afterward one *Hacan*, who wrote a book on the laws and rites of the Karaites and the Sadducees; and of him one of the commentators on *Avoth* [Pirkei Avot] says: "Let his name be blotted out, like Achan's." *Secondly*: in that inquiry for the guilty one which had afterward to be made, one had to proceed by tribe, by family, and by house; and so Achan was detected. Rightly, therefore, are his tribe, family, and house at once described. *Thirdly*: that a certain contagion, as it were, of disgrace might be transmitted to the parents and forefathers — [now] long dead, it may be — and be carried, as it were, up or back. And this, *first*, because sometimes it is partly their fault, in that they too negligently educated [their] sons and grandsons. *Secondly*: the fear of a common stain and mark of this kind rouses [them], so that all labor in this — that no one in the whole house, stock, tribe, and nation may ever be impious, sacrilegious, [or] criminal. For hence [come] those exhortations, or complaints: "Beware lest you brand any disgrace upon our stock." "And do you dare to defile such parents, so noble and illustrious a house, so great and ancestral ornaments of the family, with those crimes of yours?" So it is: "A wise son makes a father glad; but a foolish son is the sorrow of his mother" (Prov. 10:1 [printed "10, v. 4"]). *Fourthly*: that the infamy of the sinner may be increased — [him] whom so good a stock, so honorable a family, so illustrious parents did not recall from the crime. "They dishonor," says the Lyric [poet, Horace] (bk. 4, Ode 4), "their good birth by [their] fault." *Fifthly*: that there may be a kind of solace, as it were, to the most honorable families, when they see that it has always been so from of

old — that in a great and excellent house there sometimes exists someone degenerate and infamous. Only care must be taken that not more [such] exist — nay, that not even that one such should have come forth through sloth, indulgence, and the depravity of [his] upbringing. Otherwise [there is] that well-known [saying]: ἡρώων ἀνδρῶν τέκνα, πήματα [*h■r■■n andr■n tekna, p■mata*, "the children of heroic men [are] calamities"]. And [that] which Demosthenes complained of: ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν φαύλους ἀποβαίνειν τοὺς υἱούς [*andr■n agath■n phaulous apobainein tous huious*, "that the sons of good men turn out worthless"].

Question III. What did Achan commit?

Generally (v. 1) it is said, "He took something of the anathema." And [so] v. 11. But Achan himself confesses all (vv. 20 and 21). If, then, those words be explained, all will be clear — since the law about the forbidden anathema was already sufficiently expounded in the previous chapter. "Truly," says Achan, "I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel, and thus and thus have I done. For I saw among the spoils a scarlet garment exceeding good, and two hundred sicles of silver, and a golden rule of fifty sicles: and coveting [them] I took [them] away, and hid [them] in the earth against the middle of my tent, and covered the silver with the earth [I] dug up." First, indeed, he confesses generally; and indeed with a great sense of grief and agitation of soul, as the particles "truly," "I," declare; and, not content to say "I have sinned," he adds "against the Lord God of Israel." Now "to sin against God" is taken in two ways. For it is either to sin with God knowing [it], or to sin against Him [directly]. In the former mode, Radak says, that [text] of Ps. 50[:6, Vulg.]/51:4 [Heb.] is to be understood, "To Thee only have I sinned" — that is, "Thee only knowing, Thee only seeing and beholding [it]." For although [David] had sinned against Uriah, yet [Uriah] was conscious of nothing of the stain and injury done to him, but God alone [was]. But in the latter

(col. 827)

mode, one sins against God in two ways: *first*, against Him as He is Lawgiver, commanding good, forbidding all evil. And thus every kind of sin is against God. *Secondly*, against Him as He is this-or-that Person — for example, "God the possessor, and such a Lord." And thus not every sin is against Him, but only those in which something is either attributed to Him, as He is such a Person, or taken from Him, which ought not to be attributed or taken away — for example, because He is God, the highest [worship], and to Him alone indeed, worship is due. If, therefore, you either render Him a lesser worship, or ascribe the highest [worship] to some other, it is a sin against God, both as He is Lawgiver and as He is God. If anything be given, dedicated, [or] consecrated to Him, of this He alone is the possessor and Lord. If that be taken away, [or] turned aside from the end of [its] consecration, and applied to a profane use, [that too] is likewise a sin against God in both those modes. And thus Achan sinned. For of those things which, by the anathema, were sacred and devoted to God, he took some away, and so committed [an offense] against God, and the Lawgiver, and the possessor and Lord — as Abulensis rightly warns (q. 48).

Then, specifically, what and how he sinned, Achan himself indicates. By that word, "I did," the sin is noted; by the particles "thus and thus," the *mode* of the sin, not the number — as Rashi fancies, saying that hence it is held that Achan had already four other times stolen something of the anathemata, and now at last a fifth [time]. Abulensis refutes him (q. 49), because neither were there so many anathematizings hitherto, nor, if Achan had violated any of them by theft, would he then have been more unpunished than now. But a distinct exposition of each [what and how] follows. For he confesses that he stole three things of the anathema: *a garment, silver, and gold*. As for the mode, he says not only that he took these, but how he was at first led to take them, and how, when he had taken them, he hid [them]. In the following questions all [these] will be explained.

Question IV. What, and of what kind, [was] the garment which Achan stole?

The garment is called by our interpreter [the Vulgate] "a scarlet garment [*pallium*] exceeding good"; by the Seventy [LXX] ψιλὴ ποικίλη [*psil■ poikil■*, "a smooth-woven, variegated [cloak]"]; by Aquila and the Targum στολὴ βαβυλωνικὴ [*stol■ babyl■nik■*, "a Babylonian robe"]; by Symmachus ἔνδυμα Σενναάρ [*enduma Sennaar*, "a garment of Shinar"; the Greek printed indistinctly]; by Josephus χλαμὺς βασίλειος [*chlamys basileios*, "a royal cloak"], not χλανὶς [*chlanis*], as Masius says, and Theodoret (q. 9), and from him the note in the Greek Bible. These interpretations indeed explain the thing itself well, but from various attributes and, as it were, circumstances of the same thing. For it is to be known that in Hebrew it is called אדרת [*adereth*]. And if the origin of this *adereth* be considered, it seems to signify a garment not just any [one], but a strong, splendid, and magnificent [one]. For that word *adar* [אדר], and the noun *eder* — that is, "magnificence" (whence some think the German *edel* [noble] flowed) — imports [this]. Yet in Scripture I see a twofold use of it. For either that name alone is put absolutely, and is rendered indeed "a mantle" or "garment," and "toga"; but yet, according to the reason of the place and circumstances, by the Seventy [as] στολὴ [*stol■*, "robe," at] Jonah 3:6; [as] μηλωτὴ [*m■l■t■*, "sheepskin mantle," at] 1 Kings 19:13, [and] 2 Kings 2, often: or else another name is joined to it, as *se'ar* [שער, "hair," at] Gen. 25:25, [and] Zech. 13:4 — here, [joined with] *se'ar*; but the Seventy [render it] δορὰ δασύ [*dora dasy*, "a shaggy hide"]; or, if Esau himself be considered, they rendered [it] δασύς [*dasys*, "hairy"] in Genesis; in Zechariah [13:4], δέῤῥιν τριχίνην [*derrhin trichin■n*, "a hairy skin"] — that is, "a shaggy and hairy pelt," perhaps through some allusion of that [word] δορὰ and δέῤῥις [*dora* & *derrhis*] to *adereth*; and at the same time showing [that] by this name is signified a garment which would have something of excellence and of admirableness, by reason of [its] material or form. For sometimes they were very precious; but sometimes indeed cheap and mean, yet notable by use and novelty — since they were worn only by prophets and by those doing penance, [being] woven in a certain manner, and of a certain cheap and rough material: [garments] Philosophical, which, though combed [rough] and worn, were nevertheless [held] in admiration, far surpassing [ordinary] mantles. And such was Elijah's better [mantle], of which above, and Heb. ch. 11; [and] Esau's hairy skin; and the shaggy skin[-mantle] in Zechariah — or, as our [Vulgate] there renders [it], "a sackcloth mantle." For all these had a certain sacred excellence in the garb of the prophets, and, so to speak, magnificence — just as also [do] the garments, customary among Christians, of the various religious [orders]: of the Capuchins, the Carthusians, the Hermits, and the like. But those which have excellence and price of material and of form are understood [to be] such either from the persons [who wore them] — as that [garment] of the King of Nineveh (Jonah 3) — or from this addition "Shinar," or, as the Seventy and our [Vulgate] write (Gen. 10:10; ch. 11:2), "Senaar," where Mesopotamia and Babylonia are signified. Whence also, in those parts, in Ptolemy and other Geographers, [there] is Mount Singaras, and the town Singara, near which [was] that huge battle of the Emperor Constantius with Sapor king of the Persians, of which Eutropius, Ammianus, and Sextus Rufus [write] — from which also a part of Mesopotamia is called Singarena. For out of the Hebrews' [guttural *cheth*] a G often comes among the Greeks and Latins, as is plain in "Gomorrah" and "Gaza," when the guttural is pronounced too thickly. And therefore, by some — as was said above — the garment which Achan stole is called "a garment of Shinar" [*indumentum Synar*]; by others, "a Babylonian robe" [*stola Babylonica*]: not that the Babylonian King had his dwelling in Jericho — as the Jew Rashi fables that all the Kings of the whole world had [dwellings there] — but that it was either brought thence, or made in the same manner, just as among us there are Italian silks and "Angelic" cloths, as Abulensis rightly observes (q. 50). Now at Babylon various colors used to be interwoven and painted into garments. "Babylon," says Pliny (bk. 8, ch. 48), "taught [men] to interweave diverse colors by [the art of] embroidery." Apuleius (bk. 1 of the *Florida*): "He had a belt girded on, of the kind that Babylonian embroidery variegates with wondrous colors." Martial (bk. 8, Epig. 28):

> *"I would not prefer the proudly-painted Babylonian [webs], the Semiramian [tapestries], which are varied with the needle."*

Silius [Italicus] (bk. 14):

"…[a garment] that would vie with tawny gold — a garment reproducing breathing faces beneath its covering, which Babylon weaves with the shuttle."

Lucretius (bk. 4): "When [the couches] are drenched with the magnificent splendor of Babylonian [coverlets]." Plutarch, in [the Life of] Cato, says that he [Cato] straightway sold off an ἐπίβλημα τῶν βαβυλωνίων ποικίλων [*epibl■ma t■n babyl■ni■n poikil■n*, "a coverlet of Babylonian embroideries"], when it had come to him by inheritance. Josephus (bk. 7, ch. 17): τὰ ἐκ πορφύρας ὑφάσματα τῆς σπανιωτάτης, τὰ δ' εἰς ἀκριβῆ ζωγραφίαν πεποικιλμένα τῇ βαβυλωνίων τέχνῃ [*ta ek porphyras hyphasmata t■s spani■tat■s, ta d' eis akrib■ z■graphian pepoikilmena t■ babyl■ni■n techn■*, "(some were) webs of the rarest purple; (others) embroidered into exact picturing by the art of the Babylonians"] — which Rufinus renders thus (ch. 24): "Some garments of purple from the rarest nations; others

(col. 829)

…in the Latin-Greek Paris [Lexicon], in Brissonius, at the beginning of bk. 2 *On the Signification of Words*, ψιλὴ πολύμιτος [*psil■ polymitos*, "a smooth-woven [cloak] of many threads / damask"]. But why our [Vulgate] rendered [it] "a scarlet mantle" — since many things about scarlet were said in ch. 2 — we now rest in Masius's answer alone. "The Latin," he says, "for 'Shinar,' that is, 'Babylonian,' said 'scarlet.' For that the luxury of the Persians and the neighboring nations was wont to show itself off in that color is plain even from this — that, when Susa was taken by Alexander, there were found there, as Plutarch relates, fifty thousand [talents by] weight, or talents, of Hermionian purple." Nay, some of the ancient Hebrews too — as is handed down in [the] בְּרֵאשִׁית רַבָּה [*Bereshith Rabbah*, the "Great Genesis" midrash] — interpreted that אדרת שנער [*addereth Shinar*] as "a Babylonian purple [robe]," and some as "a red robe." For the dyes of scarlet and of purple produce nearly the same red color; whence we see the one used for the other in the Evangelists, when they describe the garment with which the impious executioners mocked CHRIST as a King. But that this garment was some small thing — like a napkin [*sudarium*] — as Abulensis thinks (q. 50), I do not believe. For that is contrary both to the Hebrew name *addereth*, and to so many Greek interpretations already adduced, and indeed to the Latin itself. For who would call a mantle, a garment, a robe, and a cloak a "napkin"? "But Achan," says Abulensis, "could not, returning from the city into the camp, have hidden a garment of this kind." Nay rather, he easily could. For he could put it under [his own] garments, and roll it up tightly so that it took little room. For we see, on account of the thinness of silk and of fine linen [*byssus*], that very many ells [of it] can be carried, and hidden away, without difficulty. But since I said that the Seventy sometimes interpret the Hebrew word *adereth* by the name "skin" [*pellis*], I will not pass over in silence that mention is made of "Babylonian [cloths]" which were spread on horses, and of "Babylonian skins," [in the Digest] bk. 25, §1, ff. *On gold [and] silver bequeathed*, and at the last law ff. *On publicans*.

Question V. What, and how much, silver did Achan steal?

Achan's second theft was silver, and that 200 shekels; concerning which — since various things are asked — I will briefly run through a few. **1. On the name.** All agree that the name "shekel" [*siclus*] is entirely from the Hebrew שקל; and this [is] from the verb שקל [*shakal*], which is "to weigh out and to weigh" — partly because, as in many places even today, silver money used also to be weighed; partly because among the Hebrews this kind of coin was, as it were, the form and pattern by which they weighed [valued] all the other coins. But if the modern Hebrews' system of [vowel-]points were to be held, it would rather be said *seqel* than *shekel* [*siclus*] — against all the Greek and Latin interpreters, and Josephus and Philo themselves. **2. On the figure.** Since today great study is put into the investigation and understanding of ancient coins, many shekels are now everywhere to be seen; of which [shekels], of genuine silver, I have seen one or two — with several others of lead — with the most Reverend and Illustrious Julius, Bishop of Würzburg [Herbipolensis], a most great lover of learning and of all the learned; and another likewise of silver with the Noble and Distinguished Lord Bernhard von Rosenbach. And the figure of the former [shekel] was described by

Antonio Agustín (dialogue 2), and depicted at the beginning; likewise by Arias Montanus in the *Apparatus*, and by Bellarmine at the end of [his] Hebrew Grammar; [and by] Villalpando on Ezekiel (*Apparatus*, bk. 2, *On Weights*, disp. 4, ch. 21 and following); R. Azariah [de' Rossi] (bk. 3, ch. 56, fol. 171b); and, of all, as I think, first by Guillaume Postel (in the book *On the Twelve Languages*), in the Samaritan tongue and alphabet. But whether the form of the latter [shekel] has been rendered by anyone, I know not. I will set both before the reader's eyes, giving two images for each — as it were, the two faces which each has.

[Figure: a row of four coin-engravings — two shekels, each shown obverse and reverse.]

The former shekel (in Samaritan / paleo-Hebrew letters):

— Obverse: a chalice-like cup (the Urn of the manna), a mark at its mouth, encircled by the legend שקל ישראל *("Sheqel Yisrael," "Shekel of Israel").*

— Reverse: a triple-branched flowering rod (the budded rod of Aaron), encircled by the legend ירושלם קדשה *("Yerushalem Qedoshah," "Jerusalem the Holy").*

The latter shekel (in ordinary square-Hebrew letters):

— Obverse: a cup / censer with smoke rising from it (the daily incense), encircled by the legend שקל ישראל *("Shekel of Israel").*

— Reverse: a flowering branch, encircled by the legend ירושלים הקדושה *("Yerushalayim ha-Qedoshah," "Jerusalem the Holy").*

On the first face of the former [shekel] there is [an image], like a chalice — [the image] of that Urn in which the manna is said to have been stored (Exod. 16) — with "Lebanese" [Phoenician] or Samaritan letters, *Seqel Israel*, that is, "Shekel of Israel"; with an א [*aleph*] added, as it were, in the mouth of the chalice — of which afterward; but according to Beza and Masius, ש and מ [*shin* and *mem*, standing for] "Salomon Rex" [King Solomon]. On the other face of the same former coin there is a flower, which is said to signify the flowering rod of Aaron (Num. 17; Heb. 9); and, with the same letters, *Ierusalem Kedoschah*, that is, "Jerusalem the Holy." On the latter [shekel], on one face there is the same [urn] — or rather a censer [*acerra*] of the daily incense, as the ascending smoke indicates; on the other face, the same flower. But on both, the inscriptions [are] the same — yet in the usual Hebrew letters. But before there was a tabernacle and ark, [that] the shekel had another figure cannot be doubted;

(col. 831)

can be doubted; nay, that among other peoples [it had] yet another. For the shekels which Achan took — the Jerichoite [ones] — did they not have other images?

3. On [its] antiquity. The antiquity of this coin is most clear from Gen. 2 [recte 23]:15, when Abraham bought, for Sarah's burial, a field for four hundred shekels. But of those [shekels] which are shown today, the age I know not whether it can be traced back to those times in which Jerusalem either stood or was overthrown. For it is certain that some were struck in this very age, in imitation of older ones; but the older ones I almost suspect began first to be struck in these European shores about 400 years ago, [in imitation of] those which R. Moses of Gerona [Nachmanides] saw at Ptolemais, or Acre, and describes — [their] exemplar and pattern — at the end of his commentaries on the Pentateuch. For Arias Montanus interspersed in his book *On the Shekel* a little history — not unfitting for illustrating these [matters] — in these words: "R. Moses son of Nachman, of Gerona, relates that, in that year in which he was writing those [words] in Palestine, [having come thither] from Spain to visit the holy places — for having been brought to Acon, which they now call Iacham — there was shown to him by the inhabitants a most ancient silver coin, conspicuous with stamped signs and letters, on one side of which was the form of that little vessel which, full of Manna, had been placed in the sacred ark for a monument of the ages, by God's command and Moses's management; and on the other, that admirable branch which — [Aaron's rod,] brought in among a bundle of

very many rods under Aaron's name (when his priestly dignity was being carried at by certain rivals) — on the following day all the people saw flowering and unfolding almonds. [And] that there were also inscriptions on the same coin in Samaritan characters, which of old had been the common letters of all Israel, before the secession of the ten tribes from the two, in plainly Hebrew language: the sample of which, on the one side, was *Sekel Israel*, which in Latin sounds 'shekel of Israel'; on the other, *Ierusalaim Kedessah*, that is, 'Jerusalem the Holy.' Which coin proved a very great antiquity, as being struck in the name of Israel at that time when all twelve tribes by common concord held the name of Israel; and when Jerusalem was to them all the royal and holy city, and the same [system] was common to all — of religion, and of the commonwealth, and of the coinage, and of the letters — which afterward, the secession being made, was different for each part. For the Jews, as almost all writers assert, that they might have no communion in any use of sacred things with the schismatic Israelites, devised that form of letters which now too is in use — that is, the square [character] — the shapes of the former character being greatly changed." Yet if from Ptolemais, or from any other part of Palestine, shekels have flown hither, the more ancient they are, the more genuine, and the more welcome to the students of these things.

4. On [its] weight. Rashi had written, on Exod. 39, that the shekel's weight was half an ounce [semuncial]; or that the shekel is half an ounce. But R. [Moses] of Gerona, already cited, was reluctant to assent to him, writing on the same place. Yet, returned from Palestine, he corrected his opinion, and, in a certain special disputation at the end of his commentaries, subscribed to that former Rabbi [Rashi]. For he says that he put a shekel on the scales and carefully weighed [it], and found [it] altogether half an ounce. And this is the opinion received by all today, which from what follows will be still more explained and confirmed.

5. On [its] valuation, or price and value. Josephus (bk. 3, ch. 9): ὁ σίκλος νόμισμα Ἑβραίων ὢν, Ἀττικὰς δέχεται δραχμὰς τέσσαρας [*ho siklos nomisma Hebrai■n ■n, Attikas dechetai drachmas tessaras*] — "the shekel," he says, "being a coin of the Hebrews, contains four Attic drachmas." And he repeats the same in bk. 7 of the [Jewish War]. St. Jerome, on Ezekiel ch. 4, bk. 1: "the shekel," he says, "that is, the stater, has four drachmas. And eight drachmas make a Latin ounce." Hence indeed a comparison of the shekel to the coinage of the Romans and other peoples can be made however [one likes]. But [for] what is enough for this place, I say the shekel is worth 8 German batzen; 14 Belgic kreuzer; 4 Spanish reals; 4 Roman giulii; 2 Venetian mocenighi; French sous, according to Lyra, two — that is, 24 [petty Tours pennies]; small Tours [coins], according to the same Lyra on Exodus (who is refuted by all); according to Budé (bk. *On the As*), 14 sous — but this [was] true in his own time, says Maldonatus in the place cited, and Masius; twenty modern French sous, says Maldonatus (on Matt. 17, num. 24); [or] one franc, says the same Maldonatus in the same place. But against these [reckonings] there is one and another very weighty objection: that the Seventy [LXX], here and elsewhere, call the shekel διδράχμον [*didrachmon*, "a double-drachma"], and likewise St. Epiphanius (in the book *On Weights and Measures*). Then St. Jerome (on Gen. 24) and Isidore (bk. 16, ch. 24) say the shekel is an ounce. It will be answered more opportunely a little later.

6. On other names. We have already heard, from St. Jerome on Ezekiel, that it is also called "stater"; and it is clearly plain from Matthew ch. 17. Where, when the collectors of Capernaum were exacting from CHRIST the Lord and St. Peter two didrachmas — that is, 4 drachmas, or a shekel — the stater given [was found] in the fish caught; and therefore for the shekels of this Joshua-passage (ch. 7) Symmachus put "staters." Again it is called ἀργύριον [*argyrion*, "a silver-piece"], "a silver [coin]," by our interpreter (Gen. 20:14; 2 [Sam.] ch. 18) — for which Josephus (bk. 7 of the *Antiquities*) puts "shekel," and likewise the Chaldee [Targum]. Of the Xenophontic shekel, [more] afterward.

7. On [its] parts. 1. The smallest part of the shekel is called *gerah* [גרה], and of these there were 20 in it, as is had [at] Exod. 30:13; Lev. 27; Num. 3:47; Ezek. 45:12 and 25 — where the Seventy and our [Vulgate] render "obols." But these are to be taken [as] Hebrew, not Greek, because 48 of these make an ounce, and therefore 24 [make] half an ounce, or a shekel. And the Hebrew [obol] was greater than the Attic obol by a

fifth part. From *gerah* Arias [Montanus], in the cited place, derives the Arabic *cerath* [qirat / carat] — which, however, can be from the Greek physicians, among whom [there is] κεράτιον [*keration*, "carob-seed, carat"] and κερμάτιον [*kermation*, "small coin"]. **2.** The second, larger part [is at] 1 Sam. 9:8, *Rebah shekel keseph* [רבע שקל כסף], that is, a quarter of a silver shekel: namely one drachma, two batzen, one real. **3.** The larger part [is at] Neh. 10:32, *schelischith hasshekel* [שלישית השקל], a third, or the third part, of a shekel: 2 batzen, 4 pfennigs, and a third of two pfennigs. **4.** The [fourth] part [is at] Exod. 30:13 and 15, *machatsith hasshekel* [מחצית השקל], that is, half a shekel — namely, a didrachm, two reals, 4 batzen. And it is to be noted that the Gerundensian Rabbi [Nachmanides] cited above teaches, in the place cited, that a coin of the same figure as the whole shekel, but of half-less weight, was shown to him at Acon — which was not [a] *shekel*, but *chatsi shekel* [חצי שקל], that is, a halved shekel.

8. On the division of the shekel. The shekel is wont to be divided in three ways. First, by material — so that one is silver, another

(col. 833)

another bronze. For some say that all metals had their shekels, to which they [the coins] were weighed out. Secondly, by use — so that one is civil or common, another sacred. Thirdly, by [the biblical] writers [i.e. context]. For if it be among the Prophets, it is of one *mina*; if among others, it is semuncial [half-ounce], as was said above. So Rashi, on 1 Sam. 17:7. Concerning the silver [shekel] enough has been said hitherto; and often in Scripture the name "of silver" is expressly added to it (Gen. 23:16; Lev. 27:3; Num. 18:16; Deut. 22 and 29; 2 Sam. 18:11; ch. 24; 1 Kings 10:29; and, to omit others, in this very chapter). But of a gold [shekel] there is mention [at] Num. 7:14, ch. [7]:86; Judges 8:26; 1 Kings 10; 1 Chron. 21:25. Of a bronze [shekel] there is [mention at] 2 Kings 17:5.

9. In the first division. Arias Montanus, in the book *On the Shekel*, contends that there was no [shekel] properly gold or bronze, as to material; but that they are only called "gold" or "bronze" when the material of another thing — either of a coin, or of some object — was indeed gold or bronze, but it had only as much weight as so-many or so-many silver shekels made. But others think that there was indeed a golden shekel, which in size was equal to the silver [one], but double heavier in weight, tenfold better in value — so that it was worth 40 drachmas, [or] 80 batzen. But that former opinion seems rightly proved from this very [passage of] Joshua, ch. 7, v. 21. For the third theft of Achan was, as will be said afterward, [something] golden as to material, and yet in the Hebrew it is added that its weight was 50 shekels. But the very author of this opinion supplies the arguments for it. "We do not think," he says, "that there was any golden coin which was called a shekel, nor a bronze one either — although we will not deny that there were golden and bronze coins, [but] called by other names, as we shall explain of some afterward. [We think] that certain golden coins of twenty shekels, some of twenty-five, others of fifteen, were in use, which were called parts of a *mina*, as Cambius explains on Ezekiel 45:12. But a fixed gold or bronze shekel called by the same name we do not easily recognize in the books of the ancients; but when Scripture makes mention of a shekel of gold or of silver, we judge that the weight itself, not the value, is to be reckoned" — of which thing we subjoin some examples clear enough. In the book of Num. 7:87 [it is said] that the weight of the golden spoons was ten shekels each, which our interpreter [Vulgate] renders "little mortars." In which place it is indicated that not the value of the gold, but the whole weight, is to be known from that reckoning. "For if, as some will, it were a shekel of gold, and the golden shekel were worth as much as the silver — that is, [that] less weight of gold which would equal the value of a [silver] shekel — the golden shekel would be worth four silver drachmas, and would weigh at most two *gerah*, that is, two grains of a carob-seed. The whole spoon, therefore, would be [of] twenty grains of silver, that is, of the weight of four drachmas. But how large the spoon could be of this material, and how much incense a spoon of this kind could hold — since it is written 'a golden little-mortar weighing ten shekels, full of incense' — four, or even two, grains of incense could abundantly fill the half-ounce cup of the spoon. Wherefore we interpret [it] that the golden material of the individual spoons

weighed ten shekels each, that is, five ounces. But from five ounces of gold scarcely convenient enough spoons can be made — since the silver spoons which are in use among us are not large, [being] of two-and-a-half ounces, which corresponds to as much silver material as is set with five ounces of gold. And these things more openly the Scripture itself signifies — that in that place it treats not of the value of the spoons, but of the weight of the gold; for so we read verbatim, in the description of the individual spoons: 'And a golden spoon weighing ten shekels.' And at the end of the chapter, when the sum of all is reckoned up: 'Twelve golden spoons full of incense' — that is, together, 120 gold shekels, by the weight of the sanctuary — as was noted in the preceding verse in the same chapter. That total gold-weight also, which was gathered from the various numbered kinds [of items], [amounting] to sixteen thousand seven hundred and fifty shekels, is thus to be understood of weight, not of the value of the gold. For otherwise, if only the value of the gold were indicated in that place, [it] would not be a large enough spoil — 1,675 shekels — from the number of the warriors whom the tribunes and centurions had under their hand, none excepted, from whom all the golden ornaments had been received (that is, anklets, bracelets, rings, armlets, [and] chains), captured from so great a number of women and men, among whom were found thirty-two thousand virgins. The place is in the book Num. 31[:52]. That golden plate also, which Ghacham [Achan] confessed had been secretly taken by him from the anathema, [of] fifty shekels' weight, we interpret by reckonings of weight, not of valuation. For if we should expound [it] by the valuation of silver shekels, we can scarcely find [it] can be said that a plate which is equal in weight to five shekels — that is, two-and-a-half ounces [could be worth so much]; for a fairly small portion of gold weighs two-and-a-half ounces. And those earrings offered to Gideon from the spoils of the Israelites [i.e. Ishmaelites] are to be referred to this reckoning, so that the weight of all [the earrings] bound together was one thousand seven hundred shekels — that is, eight hundred ounces — and fifty of gold; which sum is nearly of six thousand eight hundred common gold [coins] which in our time they call 'crowns' [*coronati*] (Judges 8:25 [recte 8:26]). The gold also, of which the candlesticks were made, is written [as] weighed out by weight (1 Chron. 28:15). And in this way all weights of gold and silver seem to be expounded by the reckoning of shekels — that is, of half-ounces — unless it be otherwise expressly indicated. In the same way, too, we understand that the hooks of gold made for holding the doors [leaves] of the temple were of fifty shekels each. For smaller [ones] could not bear the weight of the doors to be turned. The place is in [2 Chron.] 3:[9]. Moreover, those [things] which are sometimes read in the sacred Scriptures concerning weights of iron, of steel, and of bronze, where they are signified by the name of shekels, are to be referred by us entirely to this reckoning too."

10. In the second division. That every shekel is sacred, or "of the sanctuary," Arias will have, in the same book; and this can be proved. *First*: from the cited inscriptions. *Secondly*: because the value of the sacred and the common [shekel] would have to be different; but no such difference can be found from the Scriptures or from the ancients. For as to what some say — that the sacred [shekel] is of 4 drachmas, the other of two — that is refuted from the Seventy [LXX] themselves, who do not recognize this distinction, but even where the sacred [shekel] is treated, render [it] διδράχμον [*didrachmon*], as at Exod. 30. *Thirdly*: because before there was a sanctuary the shekel was already most common, as appeared above from Gen. 23. *Fourthly*: because wherever in Scripture it is treated of the shekel "according to the measure of the sanctuary" — as Exod. 30:13, Lev. 27:25 — it means as much as if it were said "a good measure, and of just weight." For in Hebrew it is *besechel haccodesch* [בְּשֶׁקֶל הַקֹּדֶשׁ, "in the shekel of holiness"], that is, [a shekel] which suits holiness, or the sanctuary, and is therefore whole and approved. *Fifthly*: because neither St. Jerome nor Josephus make any distinction, but universally say the shekel is of 4 drachmas — as, namely, we have seen.

(col. 835)

On the contrary, however, many will have [it] that the sacred [shekel] was [that] which weighed 4 drachmas, and the civil [that] which [weighed] two; and that the one is called "sacred" because its use was in sacred things — as when someone's name was entered on the sacred registers (Exod. 30), when the redemption of

certain things owed to God was made. So, among Catholics: Pagninus (on the word שקל [*shekel*]); Masius (in this place); Pererius (on Gen. 20:14); Ribera (on Amos 8); Covarrubias (in the book *On the Comparison of Ancient Coins*, ch. 2, n. 9); but among the Innovators [Protestants]: Junius (on Gen. 23 and Exod. 30); Beza (on Matt. 17); Georgius Agricola (bk. 2 *On the Weight of Coins*); Molinaeus (treatise *On Contracts*, q. 100, num. 795). But they have no reason [for this], except that they say the phrase "shekel of the sanctuary" is added in some places so that it may be distinguished from the other. But this has already been expounded otherwise. And I add that some hand down that a single shekel was kept in the sanctuary or temple, to which — if any controversy should arise — all others were tested, as to a Lydian stone [touchstone]; just as at Rome a [standard] foot was kept.

11. In the third division. A *mina*, or *Mna*, is sometimes indeed used for *schekel* [shekel] by the Chaldee Paraphrast [Targum] (Ezra 2:69; Neh. 7:70; and Radak notes [it], 2 Chron. 9:16; the Talmud, tractate *Nezikin*, ch. 4). Sometimes for a pound [*libra*], which contains 12 ounces — that is, 24 shekels — and so among the Latins. Sometimes for a pound which, by Priscian, [contains] 75 drachmas. By Pliny (bk. 21) it comprises 100 drachmas, as Budé says (bk. 1); or 100 denarii; and so "pound" is [used] in the Chaldee (1 Kings 10:17; Jer. 32:9; and Elias the Tishbite [Levita]). *Fourthly*: finally, in Ezekiel ch. 45, a *Mna* has 60 shekels, which make 1200 obols, as St. Jerome says there. If, therefore, the "prophetic shekel" is taken for a *Mna*, for which of those now mentioned [is it taken]? Baronius indeed, the most Reverend, when he discusses (tome 1) the selling of CHRIST the Lord, which was made for 30 pieces of silver, embraces this exposition; and I have expounded it according to the second of the four proposed significations of *Mna*, in [my treatise on] Judas, no. 6. Yet Arias (in the cited book) and Suárez (tome 2, fol. 406) disapprove [it]; and certainly nothing firm can be brought [forward] for it.

12. How did the Seventy [LXX], here and at Exod. 30 and elsewhere, render *schekel* by διδράχμον [*didrachmon*, "two-drachma"]? Those who distinguish the gold and civil shekel from the silver and sacred think they have untied this knot, if they say the gold and sacred [shekel] is of 4 drachmas. But they ought to have noticed [that], where the sacred and silver [shekels] too are treated, [they] are rendered by those [same LXX] διδράχμον; and why not even once τετράδραχμον [*tetradrachmon*, "four-drachma"]? Arias Montanus (in the cited book), and almost Masius in this place (fol. 135), seem to think the Seventy slipped through some ignorance. But far be it! I confess the greatest ignorance rather in us, than the least in them. Yet two things now seem [right] to me. **I.** That there was prefixed to the drachma itself the letter *delta* [δ], which signifies four; and that in the Seventy it was written δ. δραχμῶν [*d. drachm■n*] or δ. δραχμὸν — that is, τετράδραχμον — and that from these, by the addition of the little letter *iota*, was made by the copyists διδράχμον. For, *first*, according to the customary alphabetic manner of numbering, δ. δραχμαὶ [*d. drachmai*] are a τετράδραχμον, or 4 drachmas; and this occasion of error is very easy. *Secondly*: Josephus is wont to follow the Seventy, and yet he never says διδράχμον for the shekel. *Thirdly*, the same Josephus, at the end of bk. 3, says that in a time of famine an *assaron* [■omer-measure] of grain sold ὡς τεττάρων δραχμῶν [*h■s tettar■n drachm■n*, "for about four drachmas"]; where, if it had been written more briefly, δ. δραχμῶν, someone rather unskilled would have thought διδράχμον was meant. **II.** In [reading] the Seventy, the circumstance of place and time — where and when they wrote — must be considered. For there and then one drachma was equal to two Attic [drachmas]; and so διδράχμον among them [meant] the same as afterward was τετράδραχμον. For of coins of this kind we see the greatest variety, according to the variety of places and times, both in modern and in ancient [coins]. In [the case of] the *Mina* it has already appeared, and of the pound: what in the Latins' *as*? in the Hebrews' *selach* [*sela*]? Is it not sometimes a shekel, as in the Chaldee at Gen. 23, Exod. 31 and 38 — sometimes a double shekel, in the Talmud, tractate *On Vows* [Nedarim], ch. 4; and *On the Corner* [Peah], ch. 8; and *On the Second Tithe* [Maaser Sheni], ch. 2? Those who considered not the error, not of the Seventy, but of the manual copyists, nor the difference of place and time — they thought of the shekel otherwise than the matter itself has [it], as in the cited place Epiphanius, and others. But in St. Jerome and Isidore, in the cited places, the shekel is not an ounce, but a

half-ounce, as Antonio Agustín noted (bk. 2 of the *Emendations*, ch. 8).

13. Is the *siclus* [shekel] the same as the *siglus* in Xenophon (bk. 1 of the *Anabasis*)? There is some similarity of the names; and the latter perhaps [is derived] from the former; but the valuation [is] different. For, by the same Xenophon's authority, the *siglus* is worth 7½ Attic obols; by Hesychius, 8 — who adds that it is a Persian and Sardian coin. But the shekel has 24 Attic obols, as was said above.

14. What, finally, [is] the sum of the silver which Achan stole from the anathema? "Two hundred shekels," says Masius, "make one hundred just German thalers." "Just" I say — not such as are commonly struck of so diluted an alloy that the goldsmith's art cannot subsist apart [from adulteration] — but such as in a former age used to be stamped with the image of Lord Joachim [the *Joachimsthaler*]. But if it be treated of our florins, or [those] of Frankfurt, each of which is valued at 15 batzen, Achan's [silver] theft would be [worth] 106 florins and 10 batzen.

Question VI. What, and how much, of gold did Achan steal?

Achan's third theft was of gold — namely, a *regula* [rule / rod / wedge], as our text has [it], "golden, [of] 50 shekels." But what this *regula* is, there is not one [single] opinion. For in Hebrew it is called *laschon* [לָשׁוֹן, *lashon*], that is, "tongue," and in Greek similarly γλῶσσα [*gl■ssa*, "tongue"]. And St. Ambrose keeps "tongue" (bk. 2 of the *Offices*, ch. 26). And Abulensis indeed, simply following the Latin text, thinks it was a *regula* [ruler] for directing [straightening] something. But what likeness of a rule [is there] with a "tongue"? And what were those things so precious, which a golden rule would direct? *Secondly*: Radak, in Pagninus, on the word *Laschon*, interprets [it as] a golden rod in the likeness of a tongue. But of what kind, and of what thing, is a rod of this sort? *Thirdly*: Rabbi Eliezer (ch. 38) says that it was the golden tongue of a certain idol, before whose feet there had also been offered, for honor's sake, both that precious garment and the 200 shekels of which [we have] spoken hitherto. This indeed is uncertain; yet it could have happened that there was some idol of this kind, to which a tongue was for that reason given

(col. 837)

as golden — or because it was a president of eloquence, as [is fabled] concerning Mercury and the Gallic Hercules, from whose mouth so many golden chains proceed (in Lucian), as the Gentiles have fabled; or because it uttered prosperous and happy oracles, as some [do] in Herodotus. *Fourthly*: Masius supposes it was a golden little-sword [*gladiolus*], with which the Jerichoites had armed some god of theirs — because the most ancient Poet Naevius also called a little-sword a "little-tongue" [*lingula*], as Gellius attests. But since Masius calls Rabbi Eliezer's former exposition a "Jewish dream," I do not see how he does not say that he himself also dreams. For granted that a *gladiolus* is sometimes a *lingula*, shall we therefore at once bind this to some idol? Could it not be the little-sword of some opulent, noble, and royal boy? Or even a man's dagger [*pugio*]? or even a shorter sword, of which [we read] in Judges ch. 3 [Ehud's dagger]? For since the Hebrew name truly signifies a "tongue," this [view of Masius] can, in the Rabbis' exposition, only be charged as [part] of the dream — namely, that they fasten it to an idol. *Fifthly*: Josephus renders [it] μάζαν [*mazan*] in bk. 5, ch. 1. But since among the Greeks μάζα [*maza*] is a "lump" [*offa*], or flour mixed with oil and water, or polenta, and as it were porridge, or a certain barley lump viler than bread itself — as is plain from Hesychius, Athenaeus, Xenophon, and others — how can it be golden? I will explain this place of Josephus, which was sometimes not easy for me. It was the custom in the East to call certain lumps of gold and silver by those names by which a fixed weight and shape of *bread* was named. For what our Interpreter [Vulgate] renders "a twist [loaf] of bread" (1 Sam. 2:3, 6; and ch. 10:4; 1 Chron. 16:3; Jer. 37:20) is in Hebrew *cicar* [כִּכַּר, *kikkar*]; and (Judges 8:5) "loaves" in Hebrew [is] *ciceroth* [*kikkeroth*]. And who does not know that *cicar* is also a "talent," and a lump of gold, silver, or bronze similar to some bread (Exod. 25:[39]; ch. 37:24; 2 Sam. 9:14 [and] ch. 20:39; 2 Kings 5:21, 22; ch. 15:19; ch. 18:14; ch. 23:33; and elsewhere)? And in this way, too, cakes, dried-figs, or figs were called "*cicar* of figs" or "of dried-figs," as it is in the Talmudic

Mishnayot, tractate *On the Mixtures* [Kilaim], ch. 2. So also from the Latins the name *massa* [lump] is received; and by the Spaniards today [it is] *cera* [wax] — and, when the honeycombs are pressed out, shaped and hardened, it is called "bread-wax" [*panis cera*]. The golden *maza*, therefore, in Josephus, is a piece and lump of gold, shaped like bread or a harder porridge and polenta, and heavy — as it is also rendered by Theodoret's translator. And perhaps Josephus used this word *maza* the more willingly, the more nearly it approaches the Hebrew *massa* [מַשָּׂא, *masa*], which is "a burden and weight" (Num. 4:14, 19, and 23, 26; ch. 11:11; Deut. 1:12; Isa. 46:1, 2; 2 Sam. 15:32; Ps. 37[38]:5; and Isa. 30:27; Zeph. 3:18). For Josephus is wont not rarely to give Hebrew names a Greek cloak. But is the error to be forgiven him, by which he says the weight of this lump was 200 shekels? For he confounds the third theft with the second, and manifestly deserts both the Hebrew and the Greek text, which accurately distinguish these three [thefts]. But much less is it to be forgiven to his old translator Rufinus, who — not having grasped even this [Josephus's] meaning, since he mixes even the third with the first, as if all were one thing — very ineptly renders thus: "When Achar had found a royal cloak all woven of gold, having a *maza* of gold, that is, of two hundred shekels in weight."

Sixthly: Vatablus in this place interprets [it] "a plate of gold" [*auri laminam*]. And [this] pleases: first, because it agrees with Josephus, for "a *maza* of gold" is like some plate [*lamina*]. Secondly: because it seems the Latin Interpreter [Vulgate] had the same mind, so that he rendered not *regula* [rule], but *tegula* [tile]. Thirdly: because thus is best signified [that] this gold stolen by Achan was still raw, not stamped and reduced to coins, but a piece and lump — like a *maza*, a plate, and a tile in weight and shape. Fourthly: because there is some likeness of such plates and tiles with the shape of a tongue; on account of which we see also that rocks and crags are sometimes in the Scriptures called "tongues" [*Leschonim*, לְשׁוֹנִים] (Isa. 11:15; and ch. 15:2 and 5); and likewise a flame [is called a "tongue," Isa. 5:24]. Fifthly: because the Innovators [Protestants] cannot fault this interpretation. For among them Calvin is entirely silent, and does not explain this word in his commentary; but Chytraeus says it is a "plate" [*lamina*]; Junius, in [his] annotations, [renders] "a brick" [*laterem*], which agrees entirely with our Interpreter's "tile" [*tegula*]. Sixthly: what of [the fact] that we read that certain houses and temples were sometimes roofed with golden tiles?

But as to what is added in our text — that this tile was of 50 shekels — in the Hebrew it is expressed thus: "fifty shekels [was] its weight," or "[a tile] which weighed 50 shekels." And this, says Masius, can be understood in a twofold sense: either that this golden tongue was of such weight that it was worth fifty silver shekels; or that it weighed fifty staters. If we follow the former sense, its price would be twenty-five thalers [*daleri*]; if this [latter], three hundred. To me the latter seems the more credible. Rightly — according to what he had said a little before, from Plato in the *Hipparchus*: namely, that the proportion of gold to silver is twelvefold, so that (for example) as much weight of gold as one shekel is, is worth as much as 12 [silver] shekels. And hence he establishes a concord between two places of Scripture which seem very discordant. For in the last [chapter] of 2 Samuel it is said that David bought the threshing-floor from Araunah the Jebusite for 50 shekels; but at 1 Chron. 21:25, for 600 shekels. "Fifty golden shekels," he says, "were equal in price to six hundred silver shekels." Therefore, since this lump was golden, and is said to be equal in weight to silver [shekels]: [if] 50 shekels, its price would have to be said to have been 600 shekels — or, as appears from what was said above, 300 simple thalers, or, as Chytraeus prefers to speak, "Joachim-[thalers]." But the common and now-received opinion is that the weight of gold, [compared] to an equal weight of silver, is tenfold in value, as Covarrubias, Arias, and others explain in the cited books. This tile, therefore — [being] uncoined, since it was golden, and had the weight of 50 silver shekels — its price is to be estimated [at] 500 silver shekels, that is, 250 simple thalers.

Question VII. In what manner was Achan led to these thefts?

In the Hebrew three words are read, which, if you regard the [verbal] form, are indeed future [tense]. But if [you regard] the Hebrew

(col. 839)

phrase and particle — "*Primò, Ve*" [the waw-consecutive], which is called transitive — [it has] the force of the past [tense], and they can be rendered thus: "I saw, I coveted, I took away." And of these three, the first two demonstrate what is sought — the manner by which Achan was driven headlong to these thefts. For the *sight* of the things toward which our concupiscence is prone is the first step to the fall. For by it [concupiscence], as if asleep, is roused, kindled, [and] enticed; and it seeks every manner and way by which it may obtain that which it has coveted by sight. "Of a thing unknown there is no desire"; and, as the Greeks say, ἐκ τοῦ ὁρᾶν τὸ ἐρᾶν [*ek tou horan to eran*] — "from the very seeing is loving." And this example of Achan is discerned in avarice, and in the excessive desire of having the fleeting riches of this world; but in other kinds of sins too, how great [is] the allurement of sight? — yet most of all in the concupiscence and lust of the flesh:

> *"…and a woman burns [the beholder] by being seen," [Virgil, Georgics 3.215]*

said a certain [poet]; and again:

> *"How I saw, how I perished, how an evil error carried me away!" [Virgil, Eclogues 8.41]*

Poetry is almost wholly full of ruins of this kind, and not rarely [is] history, both old and recent. But, omitting all others, that we may become cautious by another's peril, let us recount our own [examples]. Whence [was] the first destruction, as it were, of the human race? whence, as it were, the first fount and origin of the evils by which we wretches are continually afflicted? Genesis answers (ch. 3:6): "*The woman saw that the tree was good to eat, and fair to the eyes, and delightful to behold: and she took of its fruit, and ate.*" But whence [came] that most sorrowful inundation of the waters above the peaks of all mountains, and the pitiable submersion of the whole world, eight men excepted? "*The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men, that they were fair,*" says the same book (ch. 6:2), "*took to themselves wives from all whom they had chosen.*" Whence [came] the slaughter of the Shechemites, and the most deadly destruction of all together? "*When Shechem, son of Hamor the Hivite, prince of that land, had seen Dinah the daughter of Jacob,*" says the same book (ch. 34:2), "*he loved her, and seized her, and lay with her, oppressing the virgin by force.*" What was the cause that the Egyptian wife of Potiphar the Prince most lyingly calumniated the most chaste and most innocent Joseph — [and] took care that he be cast out of the house with disgrace and infamy, [and] most wickedly thrust into a most foul prison with great torment? It was — as the same book relates (ch. 39:6) — [that] "*Joseph [was] of a fair face, and comely in aspect. After many days, therefore, the Mistress cast her eyes upon Joseph: [saying,] Lie with me.*" But David the King and Prophet — what thing impelled him, [down] from so great a summit of sanctity and of the divine charisms, to [his] fall? What most unworthily and most foully cast down his virtue, constancy, [and] gravity? "*It happened,*" says the 2nd book of Kings [2 Sam.] (ch. 11:2), "*that he arose from his bed after midday, and walked on the roof of the royal house, and saw a woman washing herself opposite, upon her roof; and the woman was very beautiful. The King therefore sent, and inquired who the woman was. And it was told him that it was Bathsheba, the daughter of Eliam, the wife of Uriah the Hittite. David therefore, sending messengers, took her; and when she had come in to him, he lay with her.*" But how many and how great other sins thereafter? how many and how great disasters? how great an Iliad of the greatest calamities! Hence afterward he watered his bed with tears. Hence he cried to the Lord: "*Turn away my eyes, that they may not see vanity*" (Ps. 118:37 [Heb. 119]). "*And my eyes [are] ever toward the Lord*" (Ps. 24[25]:15). Hence his most wise son [Solomon] admonished [it] (Prov. 4:25): "*Let thine eyes look straight, and let thine eyelids go before thy steps.*" And afterward (ch. 23:31): "*Look not on the wine, when it grows yellow, when its color shines in the glass. Why so? Thine eyes shall see strange women, and thy heart shall speak perverse things.*" And the eternal Wisdom [Christ] (Matt. 5:28): "*You have heard that it was said to the ancients, Thou shalt not commit adultery. But I say to you, that*

everyone who shall look upon a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart. But if thy right eye scandalize thee, pluck it out, and cast it from thee. For it is expedient for thee that one of thy members perish, rather than that thy whole body be cast into Gehenna." Whoever, therefore, wishes to have a breast fortified and closed against the darts of lusts and the flames of earthly things — to stand firm and unmoved in the step of virtue, [and] to set all things before the precepts of God the Best and Greatest — let him, first of all, take care of his own eyes: let him keep them closed; let him never apply them to any [beautiful] shapes. There is a proverb of the Hebrews: "The eye and the heart are the brokers [*proxeneta*] of sin" — as Elias Levita relates in Hebrew, in the *Tishbi*, under the word *Sarsour* [סרסור, "broker, pander"], and in Chaldee [Aramaic] on Psalm 100, Radak. Beautiful is the comparison of Socrates, in Xenophon (bk. 1 of the *Memorabilia*), of bodily and beautiful things with "phalangia" [venomous spiders]. These are little creatures, not even of half-an-obol's size; yet if it happen that they put their mouth to men, they afflict them with incredible pain, cast them from their state of mind, [and] make them die — as Alexander ab Alexandro [notes] (bk. 2, ch. 17), and Muretus notes in [his] *Various Readings* (bk. 14, ch. 6). But the same — and much more perniciously, more covertly, and more quickly — do the beheld shapes of certain men, the glitter of gold and silver, the magnificence of garments and other such things. Take his [Socrates's] words: "Do you not know," he says, "that this very creature which they call 'beautiful and shapely' is, by this very name, more terrible than [ordinary] phalangia — because these [harm] only by touch, but that [beautiful thing], even if it does not touch, yet if anyone merely looks at it, sends forth from afar something of the kind that can stir up madness? Perhaps too the Cupids are for this reason called 'archers,' because the beautiful wound even from afar. Therefore I counsel you, O Xenophon, that when you see anyone beautiful, you flee as much as you can, so as not even to look back." Thus he [Socrates]. And from this same [Socrates] whom Socrates thus admonished, Plutarch (in the book *On Love*) cites these things: τὸ μὲν πῦρ τοὺς ἁψαμένους καίει μόνον, οἱ δὲ καλοὶ καὶ τοὺς μακρὰν ἐρῶντας ὑφάπτουσιν. Ἡ γὰρ ὄψις [λαβὴ τοῦ πάθους] [*to men pyr tous hapsamenous kaiei monon, hoi de kaloi kai tous makran er■ntas hyphaptousin. H■ gar opsis…*] — that is: "Fire indeed scorches only those who have touched it; but the beautiful set aflame even those who have stood far off." For the *sight* is the handle [*ansa*] of this perturbation — namely, of love. And it is commonly said by the Philosophers, "objects move the faculties"; and by others, "occasion makes the thief." Yet if by chance, or by some necessity, anyone has seen things of this kind, the next [best thing] is that he bridle concupiscence. "The root of all evils is cupidity" (1 Tim. 6[:10]) — where this very cupidity, which deceived Achan, is set [down as] ἡ φιλαργυρία [*h■ philargyria*, "the love of money"]. Cassiodorus (bk. 12, fol. 261): "Flee avarice, the queen of insolent vices." The sight itself indeed brings the greatest force to coveting; yet it cannot compel. How many behold many men and many women — by the sight of whom others go mad — and yet do not desire [them]? How many things do they themselves [behold], by the sight of which they either rejoice and exult, or shudder,

(col. 841)

and [at whose sight] the beasts flee, we despise? There is, besides the bare sight, something [else] which allures a man — another [thing], especially in the desire and love of riches. There is in the minds of men a certain instilled precept, and an opinion drawn from elsewhere, that the possession of gold, silver, garments, houses, fields, and very many similar things is exceedingly excellent and useful. Take away this opinion. If you should see silver or gold, what [reason] is there why you should make [more] of it than of many other things which lie open to all? Zeuxis's Helen [i.e. his painting] seemed to very many most artful, most elegant, most beautiful — and especially to Nicomachus, a lover and connoisseur of such paintings. On the contrary, a certain [other] spectator said to himself that she seemed not beautiful. To him, indeed, Nicomachus [replied] — as it is, in Plutarch, in the cited book: "Take my eyes for yourself, and she will seem to you a Goddess." And there is a common verse: "Whoever loves a frog, thinks the frog to be a Diana." Doubtless human minds are steeped with these and those opinions, and so, the things which fall upon their eyes, they either desire or set aside. Among some nations the price of gold and silver is either none, or very small. The

like reasoning [holds] of gems, houses, fields, vineyards, and the like. Among us [there is] an insane love of all these, because we reckon it beautiful to excel in these. Achan saw the garment, the gold, and the silver (of which above), and straightway coveted [them]. How many thousands of Israelites had seen more of garments, and of silver, and of gold, and yet did not covet [them]? It was fixed in the minds of these that God's Law about the anathema was to be obeyed; that it was to be violated by them by no compact; that it was better to have no riches at all than to have God angry; [and] that spoils would still be enough, if they retained his benevolence and favor. But Achan had no care of these things; he judged it advantageous to gather up something of riches, [and] to let slip no occasion of them. Josephus adds that he judged [it] a hard and bitter [thing], that one who had undergone dangers should withdraw what he had found from his own use, and give [it] to God — and to Him, indeed, [who is] in no way needy. For Josephus is thus to be understood, not as Rufinus renders [it], "to give to God, and not to one more needy." For [Josephus] does not speak of the needy, as Judas [does] at John 12:4[–6]; so neither [does] Achan. And in Greek it is [read] Τῷ Θεῷ καὶ μὴ δεομένῳ [*t■ The■ kai m■ deomen■*, "to God, and to [Him] not being in need"]. Masius (fol. 131) thinks that Achan had persuaded himself that this theft was divinely granted to him, because Scripture says (Deut. 20:14) that from captured cities the plunder is to be taken. Steeped, therefore, and maddened with these depraved and false thoughts, was Achan. And so, as soon as he saw these things, he coveted [them]; as soon as he coveted, he took [them] away. This, then, is to be done by us: that from the very first milk we form the mind with good and true knowledge; that we learn sayings consonant with the divine truth; that, finally, we instruct ourselves with those precepts which set God's will, deity, and glory before absolutely all things — which subject the pleasures of the body to reason — [and] which count all fleeting and fugitive things of little worth. So it will come to pass that we bear off a far nobler and more generous triumph — by saying, "I did not see, I did not covet, I did not take away" — than he who said "I came, I saw, I conquered" [*veni, vidi, vici*]: [namely,] surely the victory by which we may escape the punishments set before those who, with that unhappy Achan himself, say: "I saw, I coveted, I took away."

Question VIII. In what manner did Achan cover his thefts?

Our [text] itself answers, in our text: "I hid [them] in the earth against the middle of my tent, and covered the silver with the earth [I] dug up." That "against the middle of the tent" means "in the middle of the tent," as is plain from the Hebrew. The Seventy [LXX] thought it enough to render "in my tent." Two other [phrases] are variously expounded. One is that "in the earth." For either he placed these [things] on the ground — namely, upon the earth itself — or, the earth being dug out, he made a pit, and hid [them] there. And Josephus indicates this sense, saying generally that he made a deep pit in his tent, and buried in it what he had stolen. The other [phrase concerns] the silver, which specifically is said to be "covered with the earth dug up." For since in the Hebrew it is "and the silver *under it*": some will have that hidden "under the garment," as Masius and Junius; some "under the earth," as our [Vulgate]; some "under the tongue and garment," as Cajetan; some "under all these," as the Seventy and the Chaldee Paraphrast [Targum]. But why no one has expounded [it] "under the tongue," or "the rule" alone, I wonder — since in the Hebrew [the word "it" is] of the feminine gender, and that "under it" is much more easily referred to it [the tongue] than to the more remotely-placed garment. To me Josephus's exposition is approved, because with it agree, not badly, both the Hebrew and our [Vulgate] — nay, even the Seventy and the Chaldee — provided we notice that they more openly assign the lowest place in the pit to the silver. For why would Achan have buried the silver alone, and not likewise the gold and the mantle? Of the mantle it might perhaps be said [that it was buried] lest it be spoiled by the earthy damp or cold. But of the gold, what could be said? And he could have wrapped and protected that garment either in a little chest [*cistella*], or by some other thing; or [it might be] that for at least some days it would be free from all harm and rotting. But now it could be asked, first, why Achan hid these things? Secondly, why in this manner? To the first it is answered: because all iniquity is light-shunning [*Lucifuga*]. "He who does evil hates the light" (John 3:20). Fear now beat and lashed his conscience, lest Joshua's

excellent prudence should search into the vessels and baggage of all the tents. To the latter [question] — because it can embrace several little sub-questions — somewhat more is answered. For, first, he dug a pit and hid [them] there, because in the tent itself, above the ground, if any search were made, they could have been found. And this — I know not how — the immoderate desire of earthly riches has, beyond the other vices: that those who have them almost look to the earth. Therefore misers [*Eucliones*] bury their gold and silver, [and] hide their treasures in wells and pits; they consign [their] soul and whole heart to the earth. For "where thy treasure is, there also is thy heart" (Matt. 6:21). Is it because riches — dug out [of the earth], the incitements of evils — seek again, as it were, their [own] origin and fatherland; [and] love the darkness of the earth, like moles, and wish to be buried again? There was one at Lacedaemon [Sparta] who was accused of having hidden "owls," in jest as well as in earnest, in the roof of his house — that is, coins stamped with the image of an owl. Almost all the other avaricious and sordid treasure-hoarders are Pluto-

(col. 843)

nii [i.e. of Pluto]: they do not raise themselves into bright and lofty roofs, but cast [themselves] down into the earth, into deep pits. *Secondly*: he dug in the tent, because if [he had dug] outside, he could have been seen by others, and asked what, and for what purpose, he was digging. *Thirdly*: he dug in the middle of the tent, that there might be less suspicion, and that he himself might always have his booty before his eyes, and might see whether there was any disturbance in that earth, or any searching. *Fourthly*: in the highest place in the pit he put the mantle, protected in the way I have said; in the middle the gold; and lowest [imo] the silver. And the cause of this order could be that he thought to draw out the garment [first], lest it be spoiled the sooner. Then the gold — because, since it was raw, and not yet stamped, it could not [yet] be said [to have been] brought from Egypt, or from the regions of the Kings Sihon and Og — [and] finally, when all fear of danger was past, the Jerichoite shekels. Was the middle place granted to the gold as to the most excellent? For someone [says] that the gold is not very aptly subjected to the word "silver." There were perhaps other causes too, but known to the thief himself — if indeed that most mad man then did anything by reason and deliberately, not in a disturbed and as it were fortuitous manner. One general cause of all pleased Josephus: that he [Achan] thought — ὡς τοὺς στρατιώτας, οὕτω καὶ τὸν θεὸν λήσειν [*h■s tous strati■tas, hout■ kai ton theon l■sein*], that is — that, just as [he escaped] his fellow-soldiers, so he would escape the notice of God himself. O madness! "Whither," says David (Ps. 138[139]), "shall I go from thy spirit? and whither shall I flee from thy face? If I ascend into heaven, thou art there; if I descend into hell, thou art present." But of this afterward. Yet that [his] sons saw all these things, and yet were unwilling to betray their Father's sacrilege, R. Eliezer writes (ch. 38).

Question IX. Of what kind was Achan's sin?

I have hitherto indeed called [it] "theft," as the Lord also calls [it] (v. 11), because Achan took away another's property against the Lord's will, and indeed as secretly as he could — although nothing is secret from Him whose eye penetrates and discerns all things, of which more [in] q. 21, Abulensis. But this name of "theft" is less and milder than the magnitude of the crime bears; and therefore it is rather to be called "sacrilege." For all the things Achan took were sacred and devoted to God, as was understood from the questions of the previous chapter. But since by St. Thomas (2a-2ae, q. 99, a. 3) three species of sacrilege are established — namely, of person, of place, and of thing — of which species [is] this sacrilege? Of the third. For things which are sacred, [and] which for that reason [were] either to be consumed for God's honor (like the mantle), or to be set apart and preserved (like the silver and gold), were irreverently and unworthily taken away for another use. But in this species of the sacrilege of things the same St. Thomas enumerates about seven degrees, of which it can be disputed whether they are specific — namely, so that those three species are, as it were, three genera, under which are other species — or only accidental, just as, in the same lowest species of quantity and quality, [there are] more intense and more remiss degrees. But omitting these, I say, first, that

the sacrilege of the mantle is properly in none of those seven degrees. For the first is [the sacrilege] of the sacraments; the second, of the sacramental vessels; the third, of sacred images; the fourth, of relics; the fifth, of the ornaments of the Church; the sixth, of the ornaments of its ministers; the seventh, of the goods, whether movable or immovable, that are decreed for sustaining the ministers of the Church. I say, secondly, that the gold and silver pertained to the fifth degree — although they could be applied to those things which are of the sixth and seventh degrees. I say, thirdly, [that] if things are referred to this or that degree in so far as they could or ought to be such-and-such (if indeed they existed in the nature of things), thus the sacrilege of the mantle could be reduced to the fifth and sixth degree.

Question X. Achan's sacrilege being so hidden, how was it detected?

Nothing is so hidden that it will not at some time be laid open. And Achan's sacrilege was laid open and detected in a sixfold way. *First*: by the public loss. *Secondly*: by God's entreaty and interrogation. *Thirdly*: by God's response. *Fourthly*: by the lot. *Fifthly*: by Achan's own confession. *Sixthly*: at last, by the eyewitness finding of the things he had hidden away. For when an expedition had been undertaken against the neighboring city of Ai, and it had accomplished nothing — nay rather had brought loss and disaster — this disaster begot grief and mourning in the whole army of the Israelites; the grief and mourning [begot] humble prayers to God, and an interrogation of the causes of so great an evil; the interrogation [begot] a response; the response, the casting of the lot; the lot, the confession of the sacrilege itself; the confession, the finding of the sacrileges, and a beholding placed beyond all doubt — as all [these things] are narrated in the text.

Question XI. The description of the city of Ai, its reconnaissance, the beginning of the war against it, and the receiving of the loss and disaster?

First: "Hai" [Ai] either signifies the same as "hi," because both are written with the same Hebrew letters עי [■*Ai*], or it is certainly wholly akin to it. And this word signifies a "mound," a "solitude," [and] a "desolation" (Num. 21:12; Ps. 78:1; Job 30:24; Jer. 26:18; Mic. 1:6; ch. 3:12). And, that the force of the former letter ■*ayin* [ע] might be expressed, the Seventy [LXX] render [it] γαὶ [*gai*] — as, in "Gomorrah" and others, was said above (q. 4). And so, in Augustine (in the book of *Locutions and Questions*), it is read *Gai*; and it is rendered by Origen (hom. 8) *chaos*; by Chrysostom's translator it was (hom. 1) "I saw the Lord"; by St. Fulgentius (bk. 2 to Maximus, ch. 3), *Gæ*; [and] in [the questions on] Haggai, ἀγγαὶ [*angai*] for the Hebrew *hahai* — of which soon. Of the Innovators [Protestants], who innovate everything in the proper Hebrew names, not least Calvin calls [it] *Ai*. It is also called (Neh. 11:31) *haia* עיא; and Masius thinks that the *aleph* [א] was added at the end by [Nehemiah], so that the force of the article might be expressed, by which in this chapter, and ch. 12:28, it is named *hal-ai* [ha-ai]:

(col. 845)

and this article is prefixed to it, so that it may be distinguished, as it were, by excellence, from [the other] "Hai" — another, which is placed among the Ammonites (Jer. 49:3). And perhaps Josephus regarded this too, when he calls that Canaanite [city] Ἄιναν [*Ainan*], and its citizens Ἀιναίτας [*Ainaitas*]. But its site is thus given here (v. 2): *Which is beside Bethaven, toward the eastern region of the town of Bethel*. From two other, doubtful, places it is described — namely, by [its] nearness to Bethaven, and by the fact that it is more easterly than Bethel, which inclines more to the west and south. In this way:

> ***[Figure: a square map, oriented by the four winds, with lettered points and a legend.]*** *The square's sides are marked for the compass; a diagonal runs from the lower-left corner up to the upper-right corner (e, Jericho), with a point K on it, and a small triangle at the lower-left. Legend:*
>
> *- **a** — East [Oriens] (top)*
>
> *- **b** — West [Occ.] (bottom)*

- ***c*** *— North [Sept.] (left)*

- ***d*** *— South [Merid.] (right)*

- ***e*** *— Jericho [Hierich.]*

- ***f*** *— Ai [Hai]*

- ***g*** *— Bethaven, the desert [Bethauen solitudo]*

- ***h*** *— Bethel*

- ***i*** *— Bethaven, the city [Bethauen vrbs]*

- ***k*** *— [no entry]*

But here, concerning the former place [Bethaven], these things are to be noted. **1.** That Bethaven is "the house of iniquity" [*domus peccati*]. **2.** That Bethaven, here omitted by the Seventy [LXX], is elsewhere called by them "the house of On" [*domus on*] — because in Hebrew *auen* [אָוֶן, "iniquity"] and *on* [אוֹן] are written with the same letters, and *on* signifies the sorrow which is wont to arise from sin — so that οἶκος Ὼν [*oikos* ■*n*, "house of On"] in the Septuagint is *beth-on*. **3.** Below (ch. 18:12) a certain desert of Bethaven is set down; but it is uncertain, says Masius here, whether the desert itself was so called, or whether it is rather to be called "the desert of Bethaven itself" — so that Bethaven was either a village or a town [named] *On*, from which the name [came] to that solitude. Yet almost all think it was some town (Abulensis, q. 6; Ribera, on Hosea 4, nos. 32, 33; Adrichomius, in [the tribe of] Benjamin, no. 40, sec. 4). Is it the same city as Bethel? To Lyra it is the same; but certainly it ought to be distinguished [from Bethel] at least from the words of this place. Yet it is not to be denied that this name [Bethaven] was sometimes imposed on Bethel itself, out of contempt and mockery — namely, when Jeroboam's calf began to be worshipped in it, and [the place] which had been "the House of God" (Gen. ch. 28) began to be "the house of sin" (Hosea 4 and 5; Abulensis, qq. 6, 7, 8, 9). **5.** Before the idolatrous worship of this calf was in Bethel, whence had that town — whose proper name was *Bethaven* — been so called? Abulensis answers (q. 11) that it had another name among the Canaanites, but was so called by the Israelites, either because idols were worshipped there with some special cult, or because some chief of them was worshipped. Now concerning the latter place, which is Bethel, these things are to be noted. *First*: that it is a city, as is plain from many places of Scripture. *Secondly*: that it signifies "the house of God," for the cause handed down at Gen. 28. *Thirdly*: that it was formerly called *Luz*, as is had in the same place. Where, since in Hebrew there are two words, *oulam Luz* — that is, "*olim Luz*" ["formerly Luz"] — they are wrongly joined in the Greek, as if this were the ancient name of the city. For in the old books, and in St. Augustine (on Genesis, qq. 85 and 113), it is read ουλαμμαους [*oulammaous*]; in others, ιαλάμ [*ialam*; the Greek indistinct]; in the corrected Seventy, ουλαμλυζ [*oulamluz*] — [all garbled forms of "Ulam-Luz"]. But of this name [I shall say] something again [from] Judges ch. 1. *Fourthly*: how [Bethel] is or is not distinguished from Bethaven has just been expounded; but one controversy remains — were there formerly two "Bethels," or two towns properly so named? Radak, and R. Isaiah, and Ribera (on Hosea ch. 4, no. 29) set up two: one in the tribe of Ephraim, whose ancient name was *Luz*, [and] which was then called *Bethel* by Jacob and his posterity; the other in the tribe of Benjamin. But Lyra, Abulensis, [and] Masius (below, ch. 1, q. [4], v. 2) say there is one city — with whom I agree, although (as Masius warns in the cited place), if we would speak properly, *Luz* was the city, [and] *Bethel* the field near the city. But that Lyra will have this one Bethel to be Jerusalem, and to have received the name *Bethel* not from Jacob (Gen. ch. 28) but earlier from Abraham (Gen. ch. 12), on account of his adoration toward the west — I utterly deny, with Abulensis, Masius, [and] Ribera. Concerning the nearness of these places, thus Masius: "How great the space of ground was between Jericho and Ai, is written in the old commentaries on Exodus which are named שמות רבה [*Shemoth Rabbah*]. For there, at ch. 23, these words are read: '*The region of Canaan is called the desirable land, because it was longed for by all Kings. For between Ai and Jericho there are only three miles, and yet each city had its own King*,' etc." Consonant with these are the [things] which our men, who surveyed those places, have written: that Ai was situated about three leagues from the fountain of Elisha,

toward the north, on the western part of the mount which the common people now call *Quarantana*, from CHRIST's fast — because there he endured forty days for our sake (for that that fountain is in the territory of Jericho is certain from the sacred history). And [as for] the space which by the Gauls is called a "league," this by the Hebrews [is] מיל *Mil* (a word taken from the Latins, as if you should say *milliarium*); it is [so] named, containing about two thousand five hundred paces — that is, as much of a journey as a man on foot completes in the space of an hour with the usual pace. Although there is [a place] where, for a thousand

(col. 847)

paces, you may find this word placed by the Hebrews. Moreover, from Ai to Bethel [there] was scarcely a longer interval than of one league.

II. The spies, in their great military prudence, sent [reconnaissance] ahead to the place against which he [Joshua] was planning war, in the manner said in ch. 2. But between the Jericho-reconnaissance and the Ai-reconnaissance there is this difference: that the spies of the former had to enter the city itself (above, ch. 2, v. 1); but these Ai-[spies did] not, but [surveyed] only the land — or, as it is called here, the "territory" (v. 2). For while the Israelites' camp was still beyond the Jordan, the Canaanites opened their gates; but now, after they see that these have crossed the Jordan, they shut and fortify all their own [places]. Who these spies were is indicated by no one. But when these had seen the small city from afar, they returned, announcing that very few soldiers were needed to take it (v. 3). "Why," they say, "shall all the people be vexed in vain?" In Hebrew: "Do not weary all the people [by going] thither, because they (the enemy) [are] few." Do not weary [them], I say, by going thither, by going up to those mountains, by fighting with those enemies. Hence the Seventy [render it] μὴ ἀναγάγῃς [*m*■ *anagag*■*s*, "do not lead up"]. **III.** The counsel of the spies — about sending few warriors to Ai — pleased Joshua; and so he sent only three thousand (v. 4). Calvin disapproves this facility [rashness] of Joshua: "Since," he says, "it was necessary a little later to advance farther with all the forces, to send ahead a small band for the sake of storming the city does not seem to have been [a mark] of military skill." But Calvin seems little skilled, who does not remember that common [saying]: "Things are done in vain through more, which can be done through fewer." And what does military science or skill prescribe — that huge armies be led against forts, little towns, [and] petty enemy troops? Yet Calvin goes on: "Certainly it was useful for the multitude that 20 or 30 thousand be scattered here and there for foraging." Sometimes it is useful, sometimes useless. And granted it were then useful, was it necessary that these so-many thousands be sent to Ai? He who indeed scatters [men] here and there for foraging does not send all joined together at once, but sends a third here, a fourth elsewhere, or more thousands, as seems expedient to him. But he still goes on: "Add that, in making the slaughter, although all willingly offered their throats, there was business enough to weary a few men." By two sons of Jacob, Simeon and Levi, all the males of the city of Shechem were slain with utter slaughter (Gen. 34:25); and by very few, huge slaughters have not rarely been made — in the most crowded battle-lines of enemies, and in the vastest camps — both in sacred and in profane history: how, then, would three thousand men be wearied among the Ai-people, [who were] not so very many? But suppose they be wearied — what then? Is it a crime [*piaculum*] for soldiers — and soldiers indeed [who are] assaulting, fighting, slaying, and conquering — to be wearied? If, therefore, Joshua's deed be weighed on the balance of human prudence, he did excellently; and his love and gentleness toward the subject people is to be praised and imitated, in that he was unwilling to impose on them, without cause, an unnecessary labor. But if the same action be referred to the secret counsel of God, it was most fitting to the divine plan — that he might both rouse the people, and unnerve it with excessive terror and grief. For if, three thousand being routed, so great a trembling and mourning arose, what if all the forces of the Israelites had been driven into flight? And yet [so it would have been], on account of Achan's sacrilegious guilt. **IV.** Joshua, therefore, began the war of Ai by sending three thousand fighting-men (v. 4). But Abulensis (q. 12) disputes copiously why Josephus writes (bk. 5) that thirty thousand were sent; and after various answers he concludes that Josephus, in his manner, either erred, or exaggerated the matter more than

is fair. But although elsewhere often little or no defense at all is available for Josephus, here he is free from all fault. For it was his old translator Rufinus who said "thirty thousand," not Josephus, who, with the Septuagint, expressly writes that there were sent τρισχιλίους ὁπλίτας [*trischilious hoplitas*], that is, three thousand soldiers. **V.** But these, as soon as they came thither, struck with terror turned their backs; and when, down the slope of the mount on which Ai was situated, they fled back into the camp, the Ai-people themselves pursued them in trepidation, from the gate of their city as far as *Sabarim* — that is, either "until they had broken or crushed them," as the Chaldee [Targum] renders, as if it should be read *schebaram* or *schobram* (for *schabar* [שבר] is "to break"); and almost all the Greeks signify the same: or "as far as the place called *Sabarim*," that is, the place of breakings, or of shatterings, or of crushings — the name perhaps imposed from this event, as we see done elsewhere. And there fell in that flight 36 men, not 30 only, as it is in q. 36 of the *Questions from the Old Testament* in tome 4 of St. Augustine — as if, from each thousand, 12 men. Some think this happened to them because they were privy to Achan's sacrilege. But that rule of law prevails with me: "He who is not proved bad is presumed good." And Josephus calls [them] ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς καὶ σπουδῆς ἀξίους [*andras agathous kai spoud■s axious*, "good men, and worthy of esteem"], and [says] that by Achan's fault alone they were not at all protected by God, and were therefore slain — [as] that cited question 36 of St. Augustine [holds]. And R. Eliezer (ch. 38): "On account of Achan," he says, "thirty-six just [men] died" — although it could easily happen that there was in them some other sin, which by death, according to God's judgment, they deservedly paid, and perhaps washed away. Yet if God willed, He could, without any fault of anyone, inflict bodily death on someone. For neither, says that cited question 36 from the Old Testament, "in such cases is [He] a debtor, so that He be held liable." But of this again below, q. 36.

Question XII. What, having learned of the slaughter and flight of their own, did the Israelite people, and its Leader Joshua, and the elders, do?

I. Of the people we read thus (v. 5): "And the heart of the people feared, and was melted like water." In the Greek similarly, except that in the latter part [it has] ἐγένετο ὥσπερ ὕδωρ [*egeneto h■sper hyd■r*, "it became like water"]. But in the Hebrew, word for word, thus: "And the heart of the people was melted, and became into water," or "and became water." The metaphor, as is plain, [is] elegant — from the fact that soft water yields most easily,

(col. 849)

fluctuates, flows, and glides here and there. For so the minds of the grieving and the fearing are softened; they resist not [him who is] pressing, or even lightly touching; they are agitated here and there by anxious thoughts; they stand firm in nothing; and their [powers] go off into nothing. As at Gen. 49 [there is] a hyperbole, by which this metaphor is heightened in the Hebrew, [which] the Seventy and the Latin modify and explain — just as, at 1 Sam. 25:37, of the harsh and foolish Nabal it is said: "And his heart died within him, and he became into a stone," or "became a stone." The Seventy: γίνεται ὡς λίθος [*ginetai h■s lithos*, "he becomes like a stone"]; the Latin, "he became as it were a stone." But if some more curious [person] should ask: Could nevertheless, from excessive grief or fear, a man's heart — whether as to its whole self, or as to a part of itself — be properly turned into water and stone? I answer, first: if Lot's wife was turned into a statue of salt, the heart too can be turned into water and stone. Secondly: certain members of men sometimes petrify, [or] turn watery, by some disease. Thirdly: sometimes the entrails of men and of cattle are found stony. Fourthly: naturally, by the force of grief or pain alone, a stone and water of this kind is not made — just as neither [was it made] in CHRIST the Lord, when blood and water came out of his side. Fifthly: if it were done, a man could not live long, especially if the whole heart, or a great part of it, so blackened or melted. But our Israelites lived afterward — every fear and mourning laid aside, they exulted with all joy. Therefore [it is] mere hyperbole here.

II. Of Joshua two [things] are handed down (v. 6 and following). The former is common to him with the elders; the latter is proper to him, [treated] in the next question. That former [is] threefold. First, to rend the garments. Second, to fall to the earth — and indeed with a threefold circumstance worthy of note: the first, [falling] prostrate; the second, before the ark; the third, until evening. Third, to cast dust upon the head. Of the first I spoke in Esther ch. 4, qq. 1 and 2; of the second, in the same book, ch. 14, q. 7; of the third, in both places already cited, and in Judith ch. 4. And from the ancient institutions of the Abrahamides [Abraham's descendants], not a few [customs] flowed to the Gentiles. And so, in Euripides' *Hecuba*:

> *"…upon the ground / she lies; her ill-starred head is befouled with dust." [*ἐπὶ χθονὶ / κεῖται· κόνει φύρεται τὸ δύσδαιμον κάρα*]*

In the Latin Tragedian [Seneca], in the *Octavia*:

> *"…Aegesta rends her garments, and tears her hair, and bedews her face with sorrowful weepings."*

And, to pass over Achilles at the death of his [friend] Patroclus in Homer, behold, in Virgil, book 12:

> *"…Latinus goes with rent garment, defiling his hoary hair befouled with unclean dust." [Aeneid 12.609–611]*

But these [are], for those Gentiles, signs of immoderate grief; but for the Israelites, symbols of divine worship, and of the utmost submission and religion toward the highest Godhead. For among those [Gentiles], otherwise, it is the leaders who make much [of appearances] — says Seneca (ch. 24, to Polybius) — [so] that in afflicted affairs they deliberately feign cheerfulness, and hide adverse things with a feigned gladness, lest the soldiers' spirits, if they see their leader's mind broken, themselves also collapse. But Abulensis asks (q. 15): since Joshua was not High Priest, nor had received from God Moses's extraordinary right and power, and therefore could not enter the Holy of Holies — how could he prostrate himself before the ark of the Lord? He answers that the ark was very often outside the Holy of Holies — as when it was carried around Jericho, and when it was brought into the Israelites' camp (1 Sam. 4); and [that] then, indeed, covered and wrapped (lest it could be seen naked), it stood in the open, so that before it anyone could either kneel or fall on his face. But I add that the same could be done by all, even though it [the ark] remained in the most covered and innermost sanctuary. For he who stood or lay before the gate of the tabernacle, or of the temple itself, in one of the courts, with his face turned toward the sanctuary — he was said to stand and lie "before the ark" too, though not so nearly or immediately. And to this can be referred that [text of] Ps. 98:5: "Adore his footstool." That [Joshua] lay before the ark until evening indicates a fast, and great constancy in prayer — which, however, seems to be begun not from sunrise, but from that hour of the day at which [came] the understanding [news] of the unlucky outcome of the war. They [the 3,000] were therefore sent early in the morning to fight the city of Ai, and returned in haste while it was still before noon. It is well enough understood that, by a synecdoche, some prayer and fasting can be called [that of] "the whole day," as it is called by Josephus in words to be cited shortly.

III. All these same [things] the elders of Israel did with Joshua — [the elders] who are so called, first indeed by reason of age, then and much more by reason of office. For just as

> *"The senate [senatus] has its gentle name from old men [senes],"*

yet not all senators are therefore old men: so also among the Jews, "elders" [*senes*] are called the princes of the tribes and families, and all the senators who bore the person [role] of the whole people. And therefore Josephus [speaks] of them all thus: "When they had put on sackcloth over their garments the whole day, they were in tears and mourning, nor did they take any care of seeking food."

Question XIII. What [was] Joshua's prayer to God?

Joshua's own prayer to God is described (v. 7 and following). All the others, indeed, prayed attentively, and — as is wont to happen in such a case and goad [of distress] — from the inmost feeling of the soul; but the

special [prayer] of the Leader himself, and [his] piety and supplication, was [such], which is wholly pathetic [full of pathos], consisting first in a certain grieving expostulation; then in a sad and impossible wish; and finally in the reasonings of these words. The first expostulation is at verse seven: "Alas, O Lord God" — the Seventy: Δέομαι κύριε [*deomai kyrie*, "I beseech thee, Lord"], and almost similarly the Chaldee [Targum], "receive my prayer"; but in the Hebrew it is the particle אנא [*ana*], which the same Interpreter [Vulgate] renders at Jeremiah [1:6] by a threefold "a, a, a" [ah, ah, ah], because in that place it indicates a certain other feeling — as is noted by Abulensis, who adds this, "that thou shouldst deliver us," to be taken either permissively — "that thou shouldst suffer us to fall into the hands of the Amorites, and to be destroyed by them" — or consecutively: "Because thou hast led us across the Jordan, behold, it has now come to pass that we are cast to the fury of the Amorites, and are slain and perish by them." For neither did Joshua — sad and mourning though [he was] — will [to attribute] to God this end [purpose] set forth in leading the people to this side of the Jordan,

(col. 851)

this purpose in leading the people to this side of the Jordan — namely, that he might deliver it to the enemies, and would that it be conquered and destroyed by them. Yet, since in all promises of that kind this condition is always inherent — namely, if indeed nothing be done against God, [and] one does not deviate from His laws and precepts — Joshua could suspect and fear what was [the case]: namely, that something had been committed against God, [and] His laws and precepts violated; and therefore that God, perhaps angry, now willed to exact punishments from the Israelites. And this interpretation has [in it] a confession of the divine justice, and of that condition placed in the promises; and at the same time an inquiry into a hidden sin, if perchance any has been committed by the people. As if he should say: "Behold, O Lord God, not relying on our own strength did we set foot into this land, but with thy great power as leader and protectress; and yet now we are terrified, cut down, put to flight. What is the cause? What fault? What crime of ours against thee? Not in vain dost thou strike us with these evils; not without cause dost thou send terror and flight upon us before these impure nations — [thou] who so magnificently, powerfully, and wondrously spread the dried channel of the Jordan beneath our feet. Has anything been done by us against the condition of thy promises? And if there is, what is it?" The Septuagint say: "Why did thy servant make the people cross the Jordan?" — because the Lord [used] Joshua himself, who [was] His servant, [employing] his work and ministry in this matter. Yet Josephus seems to think that Moses is meant. And, in the way now expounded, the expostulation, [thus] taken, [does] not [have] that atrocity of meaning which Masius shudders at, and on account of which he will not have it to be an expostulation (as the Rabbis teach in the Talmud, tractate *Sanhedrin*, ch. 6). And the "Amorites" can be taken either specifically here, or generally for the Canaanites, as was said above (ch. 1 and 5).

II. [Then comes] the wish: "Would that, as we had begun, we had remained beyond the Jordan." Some render [it] from the Hebrew: "Would that we had willed to stay beyond the Jordan." Masius: "Would that we had been content, [and] had remained on this side of the Jordan." But our interpreter [Vulgate does] well: **1**, because [the Hebrew] יאל [*ya■al*] also means "to begin," as at Gen. 4:26; **2**, because in the Hebrew the particle "and" [ו] is interposed; **3**, because it is most usual for the Hebrews to omit and [leave to be] understood the particle of similitude [comparison]: so that the sense is, "Would that, as we had begun, we had also remained beyond the Jordan." But the Seventy [render]: καὶ εἰ κατεμείναμεν καὶ κατῳκίσθημεν παρὰ τὸν Ἰορδάνην [*kai ei katemeinamen kai kat■kisth■men para ton Iordan■n*, "and if we had remained and dwelt beside the Jordan"]. But the wish, as I said, is impossible, because a past thing, and a done deed, cannot be made undone — as when that [poet] said:

> *"O that Jupiter would give me back the years gone by!" [Virgil, Aeneid 8.560]*

And of this kind are many wishes of those who repent of their past life. But [the Israelites in] Num. 14, who wished, "Would that we had died in Egypt," sinned. Abulensis answers (q. 17): "Joshua's word was [a thing]

bad [in itself], yet it was tolerated, because he said it out of a great bitterness of heart — [he] who would not have said it, [if] remaining without bitterness in tranquillity; yet because he said it trusting in God's goodness [piety], it was not imputed to him for evil — just as [in the case] of Moses, when, praying for the whole people, he said, 'Either forgive them this fault, or blot me out of the book of life, in which thou hast written me.' For that was a bad thing said, because he asked contrary to charity; yet because, kindled with zeal and remaining in grief, he said it, it is not imputed for evil. But that Joshua said [it] with a good mind is plain from what he did: because in this bitterness he had recourse to the Lord, prostrate before the ark. Yet if he did not trust in His goodness, he would not pray to Him. Likewise it is plain from his following words, which are the words of one praying and persuading, [and] not of one despairing." But indeed in these words neither Moses nor Joshua said [anything] evil, or sinned. Of Moses it is shown in Exodus; of Joshua it is plain: because he was not even in the least reprehended by God, and because it is permitted to wish that an evil which is past had never existed — since this very [wish] has a certain aspect of good; and therefore it can be wished, just as one who is led by repentance for past things wishes that he had never sinned.

III. Three reasons, both of the expostulation and of this wish, are subjoined — namely, from the person of Joshua, of the enemies, and of God: but with great motion of a grieving and humbly-praying soul. The *first reason* (v. 8): "My Lord, what shall I say, seeing Israel turning their backs to their enemies?" For that "my Lord," in Hebrew it is "in me, Lord" [*bi Adonai*] — a manner of speaking whose use in supplications is very great, and some will have [something] understood [with it]: "Attend"; others, "In me, Lord, be thine eyes and ears"; others otherwise. But our [Vulgate] best expresses the force. And "to say" embraces both the interior utterance of the soul, which is thought, and the exterior, which is made with mouth and sound. The *second reason* (v. 9). See the third in the same place. "And what wilt thou do to thy great name? Tell [me], therefore, I beseech, the sin on account of which thou art angry with us — on account of which thou makest us to be routed by those whom we ought to have routed: forgive us that very [sin] clemently. For if the sin be not expiated, and thou hast not shown thy accustomed care of us, we shall surely all perish: our name utterly — [the name] which arose from thy servant Israel — shall be utterly extirpated. But that the name of poor little men be extirpated is perhaps a small loss, or rather none, if it be regarded in itself; but that thy name, O God — which is truly great — [should] not be celebrated with due glory and honor, nay rather be contemned, and mocked, and cast off and exterminated, is of such a kind that nothing could be more harmful, more deadly, and more sorrowful. And yet so it will be, if thy wrath persist against us, and thou goest on — as thou now beginnest — to afflict us with fear, flight, [and] slaughter before the Canaanites. For the Gentiles will say, as [in] Num. 14:16: 'Their God could bring the Israelites into the land; [but] in it he could not preserve and protect them. Our gods are stronger than he, greater, be-

(col. 853)

-ter [better]. Our exalted hand, and not the Lord, has done all these things" (Deut. 32:27). This prayer can not badly be used by Christians against the Turks — especially when they take cities, [and] profane altars and temples, as is now said to be done in Transylvania by a certain impious blind Moses [*Cæculus Moyses*], formerly a Calvinist, now an Apostate and a Mahometan. And indeed, if it is allowed to compare small things with great: while I daily hear so many and so slanderous tongues of so many and so malevolent [men] against the Society of JESUS — while I see and read so many and so virulent [libels], huge calumnies, sycophancies, and lies, which are minted now at Paris by some Arnauld [I know not whom], now at Leiden of the Batavians and at Amsterdam and elsewhere, in Latin and in French — I cannot but pray, with Joshua, to JESUS, our Lord and Saviour, and, most of all, insist upon that last clause: "What wilt thou do, O good JESUS, to thy great name?" Great, and truly great, and (as the Hebrew article indicates) eminently, above all other names, great is the name JESUS — a saving name, the name of the Saviour. From this thou didst will the Society of JESUS to be named. This [Society], for more than 40 years led out of Egypt by thee, governed [by thee], and brought into the lands and cities which thou didst will, has declared war on the spiritual

pleasures and vices of the Jerichoites; it has assailed the mound and city of the heresies, [the] Ai; but behold, it [the Society] itself is overthrown, put to flight, [and] torn and mangled with every kind of reviling and insult. How the heretics exult! With how great joy do they dance! How often do they boast among themselves that it is all over with the ancestral religion, with the holy Roman Church, with the whole Catholic faith — in which, and through which alone, thy great name is celebrated and sanctified on earth? How often do they glory that their hand [is] exalted, that truth stands with them, that they are masters of a purer and more reformed doctrine? These things indeed are false. For neither, the Jesuits being torn away, is the Christian faith — which rests on far other columns — pulled down as one; nor does truth, and the sincerity of doctrine, stand with the heretics — just as the Canaanites, too, would falsely have said their hand exalted, or God powerless to preserve the Israelites any longer. Yet these [are] the voices, the gloryings, the triumphs of those [men]. And what wilt thou do to thy great name, O CHRIST JESUS? "Not to us, O Lord, not to us, but to thy name give glory." Let this thy very name be sanctified; and, for the sake of the same, "be propitious to my sin, for it is great" (Ps. 24[25]:11).

Question XIV. To Joshua's petition, what [was] the response of God the Best and Greatest?

First, indeed, God bids Joshua, [who was] lying [prostrate], to be raised and to stand; then he opens the cause of the loss received; thirdly, he inculcates [that], unless this cause were removed, it would come to pass that the loss already begun be perpetuated; finally, he explains how that cause is to be removed. **1.** (v. 10) "Arise." In the Hebrew, indeed, it is "arise for thyself" [*surge tibi*], but in such a way that nothing can accrue thence to the Latin and Greek text — unless perhaps some greater emphasis, which in verbs of this kind, [those] which pertain to motion, is very frequent among the Hebrews: as also [at] 2 [Sam.] 2:21, "Turn thee to the right, or the left"; [and] Prov. 20:14, "'It is bad, bad,' says every buyer, and [then] goes off [pleased] with himself." **2.** "Why liest thou prostrate on the earth?" It could be rendered, "Why this?" [or] "To what end this thing?" "Thou [art] prostrate upon thy face." But it is certain that God does not use the interrogation for the sake of learning a cause that had been hidden from him. For he is omniscient, and Joshua himself had sufficiently set forth why he had so prostrated himself. Nor does the Lord blame [him] for having given himself immoderately then to grief — which Calvin asserts, and [which] was refuted above; nor does he even reprehend the mode of supplication, which is seen in the prostration, [as too] humble, as Calvin himself confesses: but that interrogation urges Joshua himself to a greater humility, [and] to the taking up of a new consideration about the cause of so great an abasement. For it is, as it were, a wonder at a new thing, and casts shame and blush upon him [who is] cast down and supplicating; and at the same time it meanwhile admonishes [him] to arise. And because, from the utmost submission of soul and effort to appease God, he did not at once raise his countenance [nor] rise to his feet, nor make an end of prayers, [the command] is repeated at verse 13 — the same, "arise." **Secondly**, the cause of the loss received is disclosed at verse 11 — generally, indeed, [a] sin; specifically, the sin in the theft and sacrilege of the anathema, of which above (qq. 8 and 9). And because, by human judgment perhaps, the sin could seem light, the Lord shows it exceedingly grave by fourfold words, and a quadrupled particle even in the Hebrew, for which our Interpreter put "and," "what," "and also." And a "lie" [*Mendacium*] is here named, because all had pledged themselves to take nothing of the anathema (ch. 6:18, 19, 20); but now it was done otherwise. Cajetan would gladly say that the Israelites were asked whether they had taken anything of the anathema, and that all — even Achan — denied [it], and so lied. Yet there is no likelihood of truth [in that]. And the sin is attributed, in the plural, to several Israelites, though [there] was [only] one — for a cause of which afterward. **III.** The terror of losses of this kind will be perpetual, unless this sin be expiated. And a twofold cause is repeated. *The first*: because "the people itself has become an anathema" — as it is said in Hebrew and Greek — that is, the Israelites are devoted to destruction, and worthy to be utterly taken away from the midst, like an anathema; or, as our [Vulgate has it], "the people is polluted with the anathema." *The second*: because the Lord does not will to be

with a people so polluted. But what, and how great [a thing], it is "for the Lord to be with someone," was said in ch. 1. Yet he does not say precisely that he is unwilling to be present with the Israelites any longer, but with a condition, which the Latin renders thus: "until you crush him who is guilty of this crime"; but in Hebrew and Greek: "unless you shall have destroyed the anathema from the midst of you." And the mode of destroying and routing [it] is handed down next. **IV.** How the cause of those evils is to be removed is explained in a fourfold way. *First*: by hastening from prayers to the other things which need to be done — "Arise." *Secondly*: by proclaiming a sanctification to the whole people — "Sanctify the people," in the manner set forth above (ch. 3:5), by the washing of garments, the purity of bodies and souls, and abstinence [sleeping apart] that night. *Thirdly*: by saying to the same [people]

(col. 855)

the same people, that the cause of the received disaster is the sacrilege, and that it cannot come to pass that every calamity thereafter be absent, unless it be removed from the midst. *Fourthly*: finally, the remedy [is given], by prescribing [it] in a twofold way: one, indeed, placed in inquiring out the source (v. 14); the other in punishing [the culprit] once found (v. 15).

Question XV. What method of inquiring out the guilty one was prescribed by God?

The Lord thus divided the whole people, so that that one head [person], in which the crime resided, might at last be found. And the division was of this fourfold kind. *The first*: of the whole people into its tribes. And it was sought from these tribes which was liable to this crime. When this was ascertained, [there] was a second division of this one tribe into families, or clans and kindreds, of which it consisted. And of these likewise it was sought which was liable to the same crime. And when this was detected, there was a third division made — of his family, into all its houses. And when it had been likewise sought and found, the fourth and last division was made — of the found house, into the individual heads. And after the inquiry, the source [culprit] was found. For this was the best, most expeditious, and most compendious method of finding him who was sought, among so many and so great thousands of men. For the distinctions and numbers of families, houses, and heads were ready to hand. And indeed the Jewish tribe [Judah] was here found guilty of the sacrilege, the family of Zerah, the house of Zabdi, the man Achan. But here there are some doubts.

The first: was the Levitical tribe [included] in that inquiry of the tribes? Answer: Because the Levites too had entered Jericho, and could sin no otherwise than the men of the other tribes, the Levitical tribe was altogether called into the question too. You will say: therefore there would have been 13 tribes? It is answered, first: in the text it is not here asserted that there were only twelve. Secondly: when it was a matter of things which were altogether common to the whole people, the Levitical [tribe] held its place among the tribes of Israel; and yet nonetheless only 12 tribes were reckoned, because those two which were propagated from Joseph — Ephraim and Manasseh — were taken as one, and were called "the Josephic" [tribe]. So in the 12 gems of the Pontiff's Rational [breastplate], one was the Levitical; in the 12 stones of the Jordan, one [was] Levitical; and at Gilgal likewise (above, ch. 5). But when there was anything which touched only the profane [lay] tribes, the sacred Levitical tribe was indeed excluded, but the Josephic [tribe] was distributed into two [Ephraim and Manasseh]; and so the number was still of 12 tribes. See Abulensis, qq. 24, 25, 26, 27.

The second: ought the whole tribe, family, and house to come forward, or [only] the chief and masters of each? That [only] the chief came forward, Masius judges to have sufficed — namely, for each tribe its prince, who was called φύλαρχος [*phylarchos*, "tribe-ruler"], as was expounded in ch. 3; for each clan or family, a Prince, who [was] δήμαρχος [*d■marchos*, "clan-ruler"]; for each house, an elder, and as it were the father of the whole house. This is probable. Yet that the tribes, families, [and] houses presented themselves entire is not improbable either. But when [it came] to the fourth division, it was altogether

necessary that all, and each singly, present themselves.

The third: ought women and children to have presented themselves in the fourth division? Abulensis denies (q. 28), because men only entered the city of Jericho; but [it is] more likely that women and children too were comprehended in that fourth inquiry. For although, in the first assault — when the city was to be burst into, and slaughter [was] to rage upon all the Jerichoites — men only, and warriors, entered it, yet afterward every sex and age could enter, as was said (ch. 6, qq. 11, 25, 31); and therefore [could] also steal something. For women and children too [are] thievish. And it is established, from laws which are directed to the masculine gender and forbid something, that women too are included.

The fourth: In this fourfold partition of the people, how could it be found which tribe, clan, house, and head [person] was guilty of the sacrilege? This [is] worthy of its own question, as follows.

Question XVI. Whether by lot, or by the oracle of Urim and Thummim, or by some other way, the guilty tribe, clan, house, [and] person were detected?

Cajetan says the manner is unknown. Yet of those who have investigated this very [point], there are three opinions — and there can be four. *The first*: the Rabbis say that all the tribes were brought before the ark, and by it — First, the tribe which was guilty [was] as it were seized by a hand thrown [upon it], and retained so that it could not move itself; then, similarly, the family; thirdly, the house; fourthly, finally, the person. *The second opinion*: that part of these was found by the Urim and Thummim oracle, part by the lot. So Rashi, Radak, and (from R. Eliezer, ch. 38) Lyra. For they say all the tribes were brought before the sight of the Lord, and the gem of that [tribe] which was guilty [was] darkened, as it were blackened, in the Pontifical breastplate, and so [it was] detected; but thereafter the families, houses, and persons of this tribe were sought by lot. *The third opinion*: that all shone out [were revealed] by lot; and so Ralbag [Gersonides] thinks. *The fourth opinion*: that all were laid open by the Urim oracle. For although [Cajetan] set forth that manner — which indeed I have seen — no one of them [held it]; yet from the things which are said about the manner of this oracle, both as to consulting and as to responding, in book 1, ch. 9, it appears it can be posited; and it would please me, unless the third opinion pleased [me] more. *First*: because Josephus expressly makes the Israelites [do] this thing κληροῦν καὶ προστιθέναι τὸν κλῆρον [*kl■roun kai prostithenai ton kl■ron*, "to cast lots and to bring forward the lot"]. *Secondly*: because the Latin Interpreter [Vulgate], at v. 14, for that which in Hebrew is "whom the Lord shall have apprehended," and in Greek "whom the Lord shall have shown," rendered "whom the lot shall have found" — expressing, namely, the manner by which the Lord apprehended and showed that [tribe]: not by the throwing of a hand, not by the oracle of Urim and Thummim, but by lot. *Thirdly*: because in similar partitions of the people, and inquisitions of persons, other [Scriptures] show the lot to be customary — 1 Sam. 10:20, in the election of King Saul; ch. 14:42, in the tracking-down of him [Jonathan] who had violated the prescribed fast — so that the lots

(col. 857)

I may meanwhile cite: Lev. 16 [the scapegoat], [Num.] 34, Jonah 1, Luke 1, Acts 1. *Fourthly*: Of the four proposed opinions, this [lot] one seems the aptest — because the first is fabricated, and is futilely drawn from the little word "he apprehended" [*Apprehendit*], at v. 14. For who does not know that source [culprit] to be "apprehended" who is surely indicated and detected when before he lay hidden? The second [opinion] divides the manner of inquiring, and from mere arbitrary choice ascribes part of that manner to the Rational [breastplate], part to the lot. But it is better and truer that all was investigated by one and the same way. The fourth lacks any author, nor does it preponderate over the third by any argument. *Fifthly*: The author among the Hebrews especially good and noble who hands down this third opinion; and to it assent St. Thomas (2a-2ae, q. 95, a. 8), Gratian (26, q. 2), Abulensis (qq. 29 and 30), Andreas Masius (fol. 129), Ribera (on Jonah 1, no. 41), Gregorius de Valentia (disputing that question of St. Thomas, 12, point 3), Gregory of

Toulouse (bk. 34, ch. 5), Valerius Marcius Marniensis (*De doctrina promiscua*, ch. 21), and among the Innovators, Chytraeus (fol. 47), [and] Zwinger (vol. 5, bk. 4).

Question XVII. How manifold [is] the lot?

The divisions of lots are various. *First*: the lot is either "ludic" [playful], like dice and things similar to games, or "serious." *Second*: and the most usual [division] is handed down by St. Thomas in the place cited, at the end — that, of serious lots, some are "divisory" [dividing], some "consultory" [consulting], some "divinatory" [divining]. Namely, either mere knowledge is sought through the lot, or also some action. And [as for] mere knowledge — though it can be of things past and present as well as future, yet because it is chiefly exercised in future things, therefore, says the same St. Thomas, if it be asked what is future, it is called a "divinatory" lot. But when, besides knowledge, an action is regarded, that [action] is considered specifically — namely, the giving and applying of some thing to be assigned to someone: whether that thing be some good — such as honor and dignity, some wealth placed in estates, fields, or other portions of land, in moneys, cattle, townships [*municipia*], or other similar [things], [or] finally some prerogative in the order of some pleasing and sought-after action; or whether that thing be an evil — such as death or other penalty and trouble; and so it is called a "divisory" lot. Or [the] action is considered generally — namely, whatever can fall under counsel and deliberation — and [then] the lot is "consultory," under which the "divisory" could be contained. For in this [consultory lot], either it is established about a good or an evil to be brought [on someone], and it is sought by lot only whether someone is worthy of it; or it is established that someone is worthy of that good or evil, but it is sought by lot what kind of good or evil is to be imposed on him; or, finally, neither is established, and both are sought by lot. For example, it is established here that on him who committed the sacrilege the penalty of fire is to be brought; but it is not known who [is] the sacrilegious one. But it could happen that the sacrilegious one were known, yet his punishment unknown; or that both he himself and the punishment [were] unknown; and the lot could be used for the inquiry of all [these]. But indeed all these same [things] can be inquired by human counsel, care, and industry, and not rarely found. Therefore the divisory [lot], taken generally, can be reduced to the consultory. Yet because in the business of dividing things of this kind the lot is wont to be more frequently employed, [the divisory] can not badly be distinguished from [other] actions and other lots. I am not unaware that these lots are expounded otherwise by Cajetan too (in the *Summula*), and again otherwise by Abulensis (q. 35); but either that division is little or not at all accurate, or [is to be] explained in the way already said.

Again, from [their] end, this other division can be [made]: The lot either seeks a knowledge proper to God alone — of which kind is [that] which is occupied about the thoughts of hearts, which is most certain about inconstant and fortuitous things, which finally [is] most perfect and greatest — or [it seeks] an inferior knowledge, which falls under the created intellect, which is conjectural and imperfect. *Secondly*: [a division may be made] from the efficient cause, which [is] twofold — principal and instrumental. And that [principal] is here again twofold. For either it is the man who openly effects those very [things] by which that lot-knowledge is sought; or it is he who secretly directs what he openly effected by that hook [instrument], and brings out, through it, the knowledge that was sought. The name "caster" [*sortitor*] is given to both causes — to the former often, to the latter more rarely, yet sometimes: as when, in the *Troades* (Act 4), in Seneca, it is said: "Who [is] so powerful and fierce [a one], and a fierce caster of the unjust urn?" But the former [the human diviner] is properly called *sortilegus* and *sortiarius* [lot-reader]; and he is either he himself who seeks the lot, or another chosen by him — such as a priest, or some little boy — lest, namely, any fraud intervene, while this holy priest, ignorant of it and a stranger to it, is [so] held; but those who cast look at all things with attentive eyes. Masius, on verse 16: "In sacred history it is [found] where the lots are handled by those upon whom the casting falls, as 1 Chron. ch. 24. It is also [found] where [they are handled] by others, and, as I think, by priests. For 'cast [lots],' says Saul, 'between me and my son Jonathan.' Sometimes [one] himself is the presiding minister of the divine casting, as [in] ch. 18 of Joshua." Cicero (2,

On Divination): "The lots are mixed by a boy's hand, and drawn." The Poet:

> *"The boy thrice took up the sacred lots for him; / from the cross-roads the boy brought back to him all things sure."*

Yet these names, bent to the worst sense, began to signify only the superstitious; and among the Gauls, [they signify] those little women who deal with a demon — [women] who in Germany are called *Heren* and *Buholdt* [hags, witches]. And so the lot is either from the casters themselves, or from some priest, or from a little boy. The latter cause [i.e. the presiding, principal one] is reckoned to be God, or a false-god [*Deaster*] — such as fortune, a demon, [or] heaven. For the good Angels, who can also temper the lot, are attributed to God as, [it were,] ministers. And so the lot is reckoned either divine or superstitious. But from the instruments by which the lot is made, there can be as many kinds of lots as [there are] of those instruments. I have indicated the instruments in Esther ch. 3, q. 4, in which lots are sometimes placed; and there could be added water (as in Plautus, and Pausanias in the *Messenica*); likewise altars and sacred tables (from Nicephorus, bk. 16, ch. 11 and 18; the Frisian Laws, tit. 74; Caelius Rhodiginus, bk. 20, ch. 27; Suetonius, in [the life of] Tiberius). There are other instruments which are used for the lot, as in St. Thomas (2a-2ae,

(col. 859)

quaest. 96, a. 3): points [marks], molten lead, slips [of paper], reeds [straws], dice, and a book. And this [book-lot] is either divinatory — as in [Gregory] of Tours (*History* bk. 4, chs. 16 and 20; bk. 5, chs. 14 and 47), Metaphrastes (on St. Theodore, September 11), St. Augustine (*Confessions* bk. 9, last ch., and *Epistle* 119, ch. 20), Ranulph (*Polychronicon* bk. 7, ch. 6), Cedrenus (on Heraclius), Gregoras (bk. 8, on Andronicus), [and] Cardano (*On the Variety of Things*, bk. 14, ch. 68) — or profane; and so, of old, [there were] lots from Musaeus the Poet, and likewise Homeric and Virgilian [lots], of which Spartianus [treats] in [the life of] Hadrian. For poets are reckoned as though "inspired" [*entheoi*, ἔνθεοι, "god-filled"], and a care of the gods, and divine. And they themselves used to say:

> *"There is a god in us; when he stirs, we glow. / From the aethereal seats that spirit comes." [Ovid, Fasti 6.5–6]*

Again, letters — ancient and unknown ones — [as] in Cicero (*On Divination* 2), [serve] as marks: as in Plutarch (in the *Apophthegms*), with Dionysius, who [was] a Syracusan, afterward a Tyrant, when by lot he had drawn the letter μ, and another, mocking, said [it meant] μωρολογήσεις [*m■rolog■seis*, "you will speak folly"] — nay, said he, μοναρχήσω [*monarch■s■*, "I shall rule alone"]. Hence [come] characters variously formed in various ways — in earth, in ash, [with] fingernails, and the like — of which Saxo Grammaticus [treats] (bk. 14, on Denmark), [and] Bodin (*On Demons* bk. 1, ch. 6).

Rings [are used], as in Plutarch (in [the life of] Timoleon); a bean, as in the same [author] (bk. *On the Education of Children*), [and] Herodotus (bk. 6), and among the Gauls at this time, when on Epiphany day they choose Kings by lot. An arrow, as in Ezek. 21. Rods, as in Tacitus (bk. *On the Customs of the Germans*) and Gonzalez Mendoza (bk. 2 of the *Chinese History*, ch. 4), [and] Hosea 4:12. Little sticks [*taleoli*], as in Saxo (in the place cited) and title 14 of the Frisian Laws, where they are called "tennij," as it were fir-branches — since the fir-tree is [called] *Tennenbaum* in German. Leaves — whence the lot of Mercury among the ancients. Knives thrown up and fallen back — today commonly [used] even among children at play. Six hundred [countless] other [ways], according as it comes into anyone's mind.

Thirdly: [a division] from the matter about which [the lot] is concerned. And it is either "near" [*propinqua*] — namely, the knowledge of a hidden thing, as above — or "remote" [*remota*] — namely, the very thing about which the casting is [made], such as kingdoms [or] estates. For so, as is understood from Seneca (*Hercules Furens*, Act 1), the blind Gentiles used to say:

> *"Jupiter holds the stars, Neptune the sea, Pluto the nether realms: / three [gods] hold their three ancestral kingdoms, each his own."*

And so the land of promise was divided [by lot], as will appear below (ch. 13); so also Holstein was divided, as Chytraeus says (in ch. 1 of [his commentary on] *Judges*). So too other goods, or inheritances (the law *Meminimus*, in the *Code*, bk. 10, tit. 34). *Secondly*: spoils [are] frequently [divided] among soldiers; and so [were] the garments of Christ the Lord (Matt. 27). *Thirdly*: captives, as in Seneca (*Troades*, Act 1): "Behold, choosing a master for the daughters-in-law and daughters of Priam, the urn casts [the lot]"; and Act 4: "The turned urn gave masters to the captives." *Fourthly*: provinces among the Romans, as appears from Cicero (*On the Consular Provinces*) and elsewhere. *Fifthly*: those to be handed over to death — as Achan, and the decimated soldiers, as in Livy (decade 1, bk. 2), Dio (bk. 41), [and] Socrates (bk. 11 of the *Tripartite [History]*, ch. 8) — or those to be afflicted with any penalty, as in Delrio (bk. 4 of the *Disquisitions*, [sect.] 4, q. 1), [and] Caesar (in the *Gallic War*). *Sixthly*: judges, among the same Romans, as Sigonius attests (*On Judgments* bk. 2, ch. 12), [and] Alexander ab Alexandro (bk. 5, ch. 2); legates, and others, as in Tacitus (*Histories* bk. 4); senators, as in Dio (q. 54). *Seventhly*: the order in the Senate, or [the right of] pronouncing judgment, as in the same Alexander (bk. 4, ch. 11) and law 14, *ff.* [*Digest*] *On Judgments*. *Eighthly*: place in the battle-line, and the order of watches, [and] the assault, and of many other affairs, as in Livy (bk. 2, decade 3) [and] William of Tyre (bk. 12, ch. 24). *Ninthly*: place at the banquet, [as in] Athenaeus (bk. 8). *Tenthly*: the matching and combat of athletes, [which] Lucian shows in the *Hermotimus*; the going-forth of chariots in the circus, as in Bulenger (bk. *On the Circus*, ch. 13). *Eleventhly*: certain Saints [chosen] for imitation and invocation — as today, [for] as many months as there are, [it is done] in the sodality of the Blessed Virgin and in the Society of JESUS; formerly publicly in churches, as is plain from the turning wreath made for that purpose at Würzburg [Herbipolis] in the civic church of the Blessed Virgin, and from Bonfini (on St. Elizabeth), [and] Cardano (bk. 16, *On the Variety of Things*, ch. 92), Francisco López (*History of Mexico* 21, on Ferdinand Cortés), [and] finally from Caesarius (bk. 8, ch. 62). *Twelfthly*: sacred ministries (Luke 1:8) and dignities (Acts 1).

Fourthly: [a division] from the form. And it [the lot] is as manifold as [is] the composition and use of the instruments for the seeking of the lot — which even today is very well known in many [cases]. Other divisions can be made — for example, from the place, like the Praenestine [lots], of which Cicero (*On Divination* 2); the Geryonean [lots], near Padua, [as in] Suetonius (in [the life of] Tiberius, ch. 14); the Delphic [lots], as in Horace (in the *Art [of Poetry]*):

> *"…And the prophetic verdict of the lot-diviner / did not differ from Delphi about the divine future." [Horace, Ars Poetica 218–219]*

From the time — [lots] ancient [and] modern; from other circumstances, of which below — such as [lots] religious, profane, permitted, [and] forbidden.

Question XVIII. Are lots fortuitous?

Writers sometimes use these names — *sors*, *fors*, *fortuna* [lot, chance, fortune] — for the same thing, and sometimes distinguish [them]: as when the Satirist says (Satire 1) [Horace, *Satires* 1.1.1–3]:

> *"How comes it, Maecenas, that no one lives content / with the lot which either reason has given him, / or chance has thrown his way?"*

And in the former way [*fors*] the lot [*sors*] is not so much to be called "fortuitous" as [it is called] "chance" [*fors*]; but in the latter way, not every lot [is] fortuitous, since reason gives some [lot], [and] chance does not throw it. But the name "lot" [*sors*] seems then to be taken rather for a thing which someone has, or which has fallen to him — whether by inheritance, or by industry, or in any other way whatever. But [as for] the casting of names [by lot], and [the question] about the lot in so far as it is [the sign] of a hidden thing through instruments of this kind (of which above, q. 17) — whether the indication be referred to knowledge alone or to action — [here] it is asked whether it ought to be reckoned fortuitous. But it must be answered, *first*: that Fortune was of old reckoned by the wretched Gentiles [to be] a God, or some goddess — in whose name

Juvenal says [*Satires* 10.365–366]:

> *"[It is] we [who] make thee, Fortune, a goddess, and set thee in heaven."*

Concerning her names and temples [there is] much [in] bk. 1, ch. 13; Alexander ab Alexandro; on the painting, Cebes in the *Tablet*; and Albertus in the second [book] of the *Physics*, chapter six. And so neither lots, nor any effects [of chance], are altogether fortuitous, because chance is no Divinity [*Numen*]. And so St. Augustine (*City [of God]* bk. 4, ch. 18) denies that there is any Fortune; and (*Retractations* bk. 1, ch. 1) he says: "In three books of mine, *Against the Academics*, it does not please me that I so often named 'fortune' — although I did not wish any goddess to be understood by this name, but the fortuitous

(col. 861)

outcome of things, either in [things] of our body, or in external [goods] or evils." And a little after: "It repents me that I so named 'fortune' there, since I see men to have [it] in a very bad habit, [that] where one ought to say 'God willed this,' [they] say 'Fortune willed this.'" *Secondly*: Fortune is sometimes called a thing whose cause is hidden from us. "Perhaps," says Augustine in the same place of the *Retractations*, "what is commonly named 'fortune' is governed by a certain hidden order, and we call nothing 'chance' in things except [that] whose reason and cause is secret" — and so very many lots may have been fortuitous, yet not all, because it is established that God is the cause of some, as [was the case] with this [lot] concerning Achan. But in that way [things] innumerable — even those which [happen] by nature, and always happen — would be fortuitous; and likewise very many [things are] fortuitous to the ruder [sort] which [are] not [so] to the more learned. The turning of the magnet toward the Arctic region, for example, [is] fortuitous to all; and an eclipse to all the less instructed — of which kind were those [men] of whom Rojas [treats] in his *Astrolabe*. And so, in q. 32, Abulensis perhaps argues these things. *Thirdly*: Fortune is sometimes called a particular efficient cause, in respect of some effect which, with some effect [aimed at] deliberately — or, as the Philosopher says (ch. 6, bk. 2 of the *Physics*), κατὰ προαίρεσιν [*kata proairesin*, "according to deliberate choice"] — is joined to that [effect] which was aimed at, [though] not aimed at deliberately. So Aristotle, in the place cited, and, in the exposition of that place, the weightier philosophers — as much the Christians (Soto, Toletus, the Coimbrans) as the Gentiles [pagans]. And in this way most call lots fortuitous, as Abulensis (qq. 32, 33) here, and Cajetan (on the *2a2ae*, q. 96, a. 8). Yet I think it must rather be said, *first*: because, in lots, whatever things are done are inquired into and found — all these are done by a fixed purpose and provision of the mind. For the lot-caster does not merely employ the instruments of the lot — for example, he does not merely throw the slips into the urn, shake [them], [and] draw [one] out, but he also aims at this, that he may know and embrace what those [slips] shall have indicated: nay, for this very reason he uses them, that he may find this out. Just as, therefore, if someone were to dig in a field to this end, that he might find a treasure, that finding would not be fortuitous — so neither [are] lots fortuitous. *Secondly*: In every fortuitous outcome there must be two effects, of which the one is aimed at through itself and primarily, [while] the other is joined to it beyond all expectation and all effort. But in casting lots [there is] only one primary effect, and no other is joined to it beyond the caster's expectation. For primarily the caster aims at the knowledge of the thing which he desires to know, and no other effect is thereafter associated with this per accidens — at least in so far as [it comes] from the lot itself. For it is another matter if, from elsewhere, envy, grief, contention, or something similar arise, which was not thought of nor deliberately sought. *Thirdly*: Because, if there were anything fortuitous in the lot, most of all would [it be] that confluence of causes, of which — from Boethius — Abulensis [treats] (qq. 36, 37). But not even that is fortuitous. For that the caster throws his hand into the urn and draws out a slip, is plainly voluntary. And that this slip — which pronounces this man King, or [the man] guilty of the sacrilege — is drawn out, [is] also voluntary: either generally, and as it were confusedly, in so far as all will that this [slip] fall to someone; or singly, and precisely, in so far as of its own accord [each] freely binds and determines itself to the drawing-out of this slip — [namely, the caster] who draws it. But in some lots it can happen that it be determined by nature, or by some other external

cause, whence the knowledge is proximately drawn: but howsoever it be, the lot-casters always will it so, and aim at it. Just as the election of a King is not called fortuitous — although the individual electors are ignorant which [candidate] the votes, whether the more [numerous] or the better, will choose — because all will that someone be chosen, and are now doing this one [thing]: so neither [is] the casting of lots fortuitous. And again, just as, when I wish to walk, my walking is not fortuitous — although I do not precisely know whether I move the [one] foot first, or with what muscles and vital spirits I move both — so neither is the casting of lots to be placed among fortuitous [things], although in it something be distinctly unknown, since that very [thing] is nonetheless desired and sought after. *Fourthly*: Clearly St. Thomas (q. 96, in the cited third article) indicates both that lot-actions are done deliberately, and that through them the outcome of the lots is deliberately inquired into. "Divination," he says, "(the lot-kind) is made from the consideration of those things which come about from certain [things] which are done seriously by men for inquiring out something hidden." But if lots be not from Fortune — for the causes already stated — neither will they be from chance, although this [term "chance"] extends more widely to them. For nothing happens in these which, as it were [their] mark, is not proposed and sought. And all these things I understand in respect of the casters themselves. For in respect of God, all the somewhat wiser Philosophers know [that] nothing at all [is] fortuitous, or from chance; and St. Augustine teaches [it] (*On the Trinity* bk. 3, ch. 4, and *83 Questions*, q. 34), [and] Abulensis (q. 31). The Coimbrans, in the place cited — although that reasoning of theirs is not pleasing, by which they take it universally that God cannot be the per-accidens cause of anything: because he can be the per-accidens cause of a sin, when he concurs efficiently with the action of a creature, which [action], for example, is a theft or an adultery; and yet he does not aim at a sin of this kind, whose per-se cause is something worse and baser. But perhaps they are speaking of positive being. But away with that [saying] of Ausonius:

> *"Fragile are the affairs of men [which] the Lot nourishes and rules and destroys."*

And likewise that doubt of Claudian:

> *"Or is nothing fixed, but does uncertain Lot wander? / And bring and bring back the changes, and do mortal things have [only] chance?" [Claudian, In Rufinum 1.12–13]*

Question XIX. Are lots evil by their own nature?

Cajetan (*Summula*, under "lot") says the divinatory lot is evil by its own kind. Yet toward the end of that section, "Briefly," he says, "to use lots is not, of its own kind, an evil." Abulensis omits the divinatory, and asserts both the divisory and the consultory [lots] to be indeed from an evil, yet in themselves neither [of them] evil; but the consultory, indeed, [to be] in some measure, as he says, evil.

I say, *first*: Those lots, in which a fitting adjustment of them to what is sought is expected from a demon, or from a God — a false and empty one — are by their own nature evil. Of the demon it is plain, because this is to have fellowship with him, [and] to be willing to be instructed and taught by him: [and] to attribute to him, as it were, some honor and worship. Of the [false] God

(col. 863)

it is likewise plain, because "it is nothing" (1 Cor. 8:4); and the demon plays the person of it, as though it were something. And so [this] is partly a vanity — to expect, from a thing which is not, that some thing come to pass — [and] partly idolatry and superstition.

II: Lots whose adjustment [*temperatio*], too, is expected wholly and certainly from heaven [the sky], [are] by their own nature evil — because a power is attributed to heaven which it lacks, as Cajetan explains (on the *2a2ae*, in the place cited). And to these and the above lots belong those [treated] in Cicero (*On Divination* 2), in Agrippa (*On Occult Philosophy* bk. 2, ch. 54, and the bk. *On Geomancy*, fol. 393); nay too those [in] Canon Law (C. 26, q. 5, ch. *Qui divinationes*; ch. *Sortes*; and [the Decretals,] *On Lots*, ch. *In tabulis*). To

[these] also belong the sins and punishments of lot-castings.

III: Lots in which either the end, or the matter, or the mode (or form) is vicious, are by their own nature evil. For if their end be to wish to attain a knowledge not befitting man, and proper to God, [then] who skilled in morals would deny [it] to be vicious by its own nature? For in these moral [matters], the goodness or the vice of actions is regarded from the end. The matter will be vicious if the mode and form [be] vicious — as if fraud intervene: in the way it was done by Cresphontes against the tokens of Aristodemus, in Pausanias (in the *Messenica*), [and] Victorius (bk. 25 *Various Readings*, ch. 15). And [so it is vicious] if, as [it is] in the Comic Poet, the lot of the one were of poplar[-wood], of the other of fir[-wood], in the water.

IV: With these and other similar false and depraved opinions and modes removed, lots are not evil by their own nature. *First*: The whole kind of lot is universally praised in Scripture. Therefore it is not vicious of itself. For nowhere are idolatry, homicide, adultery, theft, and the like praised without qualification. But of lots [it is said], Prov. 16:33: "Lots are cast into the lap, but they are disposed by the Lord." And ch. 18, v. 18: "The lot represses contentions, and judges even among the mighty." *Secondly*: Lots are sometimes commanded by God — and indeed not to some one man only, or to two, in secret, but to the whole people of Israel, at once and openly, as in this place, and Lev. 16. *Thirdly*: they are everywhere and often used in the Scriptures, nor is there anywhere any reproof of them. Who, then, would dare to believe them vicious of themselves? *Fourthly*: they have always been in use among Christians too, as St. Luke indicates (Acts 1), and those who write about the dividing [of the missions] of the Apostles — as I noted in [my] little book *On the Apostles*, and as Gregory of Tours, Caesarius, and others cited above (q. 17) note. *Fifthly*: it is even now used in many military and civil affairs — as in dividing an inheritance among a family [*herciscunda familia*] and other goods, in receiving [assigning] holy governorships, in choosing sacred ministers at a time of pestilence (St. Augustine, *Epistle* 80), in giving alms (the same, bk. 1 *On Christian Doctrine*, ch. 28), in doing certain actions (St. Bonaventure, in the *Life of St. Francis*, ch. 13; Peter of Blois, *Epistle* 30), and in similar [matters]. *Sixthly*: those cited at the beginning nearly grant this — Cajetan (on the *2a2ae*, at the eighth article of the cited question, concerning lots which are committed to fortune), Abulensis, nay St. Thomas himself in article 8 of the cited question, when he says: "Such a lot (namely, which expects a judgment from God) is not, in itself, evil"; and he proves it by the authority of St. Augustine (Sermon 2 on Psalm 30), saying, "the lot is not something evil" — as it is also cited (36, q. 2, ch. 1). Origen (homily 23 on this book), when he had gathered from the Scriptures those [passages] adduced a little before in favor of lots, concludes [that] they are not evil. "For us," he says, "the lot drawn from [handed down by] the Apostles designates [something], because where, from an entire faith and with prayer sent before, the lot is drawn, what the will of God holds in secret, the lot declares openly to men." Nay, he thinks in the same place that it comes about by lot to the Angels, that this [one] or that be the guardian of this man, [or] the president of this province or affair. As for the lot, Gregory of Toulouse (bk. 34, ch. 5, at the beginning) says, "the uses of lots seem in a manner to be established among things indifferent [*adiaphora*]." *Seventhly*: That is not evil of its own kind, all of whose species are sometimes good; but the divisory and consultory species of the lot are sometimes good, as is granted by all, and the divinatory too can be good — because nothing hinders any human knowledge (even of a future thing which can fall under conjecture) from being sought, in the way [it is sought] in the two above kinds of lot, [where] the truth of distributing, or of doing something else, is sought. For there is no reason [for making the] reasoning different. *Eighthly*: If anything should vitiate the lot from its own kind, [it] would be because there is no power in the lot to be able aptly to show the truth sought — for there is no connection of those things which are done in casting lots with any truth. And it is against right reason to seek one thing through that which has no power of showing it; for an action and investigation of this kind [would be] vain. But I deny the assumption [minor premise]. For God concurs, either by some special concurrence or by a general one only, to the composing and directing of lots. If by a special [one], it is now certain that in lots there is a very great power of indicating the thing which is sought. Whence in Cicero (bk. 1 *On Divination*) his brother Quintus says: "Lots, [when] drawn so that they fall out aptly for the matter, I believe

can come about by divine [power]." If he concurs only by a general course, it must indeed be confessed that no true and certain power is present [in the lot]: yet there is some feeble [power], which exists not so much from the thing itself as from some watch-post [expectation] of men, while they hope God will concur by some special providence — and this because he himself can [do so], because he sometimes does [so], because he sometimes has praised the use of lots. But now to take up a way which sometimes leads certainly [to the goal], sometimes indeed does not, yet is hoped to be about to lead [there], [is] not vicious of itself. He who, about to set out for India, commits himself to the sea, undertakes a truly doubtful, dangerous journey, utterly uncertain from the force of winds and storms; and yet in this very [act] — provided the other [things] which ought to be present be present — there is nothing of depravity of itself. He supposes it will come to pass that the journey succeed, [though] perchance it will not succeed. "From a rope [cable]," as it is wont to be said, [comes] a fit voyage — and yet who would seriously disapprove it?

Question XX. Of lots which of their own kind are not vicious, are some forbidden, some permitted?

Many [things] are not evil of their own kind which nonetheless are sometimes forbidden, sometimes permitted. The eating of hare's flesh and swine's flesh has nothing evil of its own kind, yet was of old forbidden to the Israelites by God (Lev. 11:2, 6, 26). Of other flesh-meats too, today, in fasts: there is no vice in the eating of itself, yet [it is] excluded by the Church on those days, [but] on others indeed allowed. I say therefore

(col. 865)

I say therefore, *first*: Forbidden [are] all those lots in which the crimes of certain men are inquired out — for example, thefts, fornications, and the like (title *On Sacrileges*, ch. *In tabulis*; and 26, q. 5, ch. *Sortes*). And the reason is, because there is no power at all in the lot to indicate any crime, unless God effect it in a special way, as was said above. But that he thus effects it, is uncertain; and therefore the knowledge cannot be certain from which it would be allowed to condemn a man of a crime, and to bring either his life or his fame into peril. It is another matter when it is certain that God concurs to an indication of this kind by a special efficiency — as when he commands the lot, as in this place, in the detecting of Achan's sacrilege; or when there is present, from elsewhere, some very great conviction of a special divine concurrence, as [in] 1 Sam. 14, [and] perhaps also Jonah 1. Otherwise it can not rarely happen that the lot condemn innocence.

II: The lots of the saints too [are] forbidden (ch. *Aliquanti*, 26, q. 5; and ch. *Si quis clericus*, there, from the Council of Agde, ch. 42; and [the First Council] of Orléans, ch. 32; and the chapter *Sortilegi*, q. 1, the same Cause 26; and in Burchard, bk. 19, ch. 5). But it must be observed that "lots of the saints" is used in two ways. *First*: those by which we cast lots for [choosing] some of the saints, as it were masters of the virtues to be imitated, and our patrons to be invoked. And that these flourished of old, and flourish in our time among the pious, I said above (qq. 17 and 19). *Secondly*: those by which the saints were said to be used [i.e. invoked], but falsely, since they contained superstitions and demonic frauds and impostures. And of these the cited Canons speak, as is plain from their words. For in one [it says]: "They are zealous for auguries, and under the name of a feigned religion, through those [lots] which they call 'lots of the saints,' they profess the science of divination." In the other: "the lots which they falsely claim to be the saints'." And from these the name "lot-caster" [*sortilegus*], when it is criminal, is drawn, Isidore says (bk. 8, ch. 9). And to these belong [the lots] which by others were called, by a more special word, "lots of the Apostles" — as though, in the opening of books, or in other impious and superstitious lot-castings (of which above, q. 19), [the Apostles] had foretold the future, uncovered secrets, [and] chosen Matthias. Just as [is] also that falsehood which I saw painted in a certain large manuscript volume of a distinguished Abbess in the monastery of St. Odilia near Molsheim — [the volume] of Herrad of Hohenburg — by a painter, while he painted the election of St. Matthias: namely, that a dice-lot [*aleatoria sors*] was employed by the Apostles.

III: For the choosing of the prelates of the Church, all lots — as much mediate as immediate — are forbidden (ch. *Ecclesia vestra*, title *On Lot-casting*), where Honorius [says] thus: "We forbid, by a perpetual condemnation, the use of the lot in elections." I said "as much mediate as immediate," because those to whom Honorius writes had not chosen a Bishop by lot, but by compromise [delegated agreement]; but the one who was to choose the compromise-delegates [*compromissarii*] they had themselves delegated by lot, and so the lot was carried immediately, indeed, upon the elector of the compromise-delegates, but mediately upon the Bishop at last. But what [is] the cause of this prohibition? Abulensis brings forward one (in this place, q. 36): because, while a magistrate is created by election, not by lot, Christians are the more trained to trust in God. For we know that he himself has care of the least little sparrows (Luke 12) — how much more of the greatest good of the Commonwealth and the Church? We know likewise, from Jeremiah (ch. 10), that our actions are directed by God, and (from Prov. 21) that the King's heart is in his hand. Therefore [God] is to be trusted [to] be present at the elections, and to instruct and bend minds and wills to the choosing of this [man] or that. But someone might answer, *first*: [that] God is indeed to be trusted; but that this trust is exercised so much the more in casting lots, the less it has of human regards, and the more simply and entirely the verdict is expected from God. *Secondly*: [that] by this reasoning not only Ecclesiastical magistracies could not be made, but also Political ones — for example, that Kings, Dukes, [and] Judges could not be created by lot — against St. Thomas (in the cited article) and the present-day experience in the Republic of the Venetians (Contarini attesting, bk. 1 *On the Same Republic*), and in other places too, as Panormitanus notes (on the last ch. *On Lot-casting*). It must therefore be said [that] the government of the Church's not being committed to lots is rightly disapproved, for three reasons. *The first*: Because, after the Apostle Matthias [was] chosen, there was never afterward any use of lots in Ecclesiastical elections. *The second*: Because the Fathers had warned that that example [is] by no means to be imitated — St. Jerome (on Jonah 1) and the Venerable Bede (on Acts 1), adduced [in Gratian] (26, q. 2, ch. *Non statim* and ch. *Non exemplo*). *Thirdly*: Human affairs are always to be conducted, so far as is permitted, by human counsel and prudence, and not to be committed to that thing [the lot] which is blind, which rashly does this or that, having no fixed reason why it should pronounce this [man] rather than that. Therefore, much more, in the same way, are sacred matters to be handled; and with human counsel and wisdom are prayers to be joined, and the other ways of conciliating God. And this Abulensis intimates at the end. But Cajetan clearly affirms [it] in the place cited. *First*: indeed, because the end of an Ecclesiastical principate is far holier and higher. *Secondly*: Because its matter, about which one ought to be occupied, [is] likewise far holier and more august. *Thirdly*: Although God could also give counsel in the lot, yet it befitted Christians — if not in every matter, yet at least in the creations of the sacred Prelates, on whom the most of good or evil depends — to be called away from the uncertain, and often fallacious and dangerous, use of lots. *Fourthly*: Many wise men have disapproved the lot even in the creations of Political magistrates. Therefore, even if the Church tolerates it, yet in its own governance it rightly prescribes a wiser, safer, and more reasonable mode.

That antecedent is plain, first, from the *History* of Tacitus (bk. 4), where Helvidius — a weighty [man], both a Philosopher and a Senator — discourses [that] "morals are not discerned by lot and urn: [that] votes, and the judgment of the Senate, were devised, that they might penetrate the life and reputation of each one." Philo, at the beginning of the book *On the Appointment of a Prince*, [says], no less truly than eloquently: "It pleases some," he says, "that princes be created by lot — [but] surely to no advantage of the subjects. For the lot pertains to good fortune, not to virtue. And so it often happens that the lot raises to the principate those whom a good man would not tolerate in the number of his subjects: for even lesser Princes, who by others are called Lords, do not take all home-born or purchased [slaves] into their household service, but only the obedient and compliant; the rest — the refractory and incorrigible — they sometimes put up in a herd to the spear and the auction, as unworthy even to serve in the household of a good man. How much less does it befit

(col. 867)

to commit the Lordship, and the principate of whole cities and nations, to the lot — [a slippery matter], hanging on unstable fortune. Certainly, in the curing of the sick no one thinks of lots; for physicians are not taken by lot, but each most skilled [one] is chosen. Likewise, when it is a question of the prosperity and safety of seafarers, it is not decided by lot who shall go up to steer the stern — lest perchance some unskilled [man] contract shipwreck even in calm and serene [weather] — but someone is sought who has learned the art of steering from youth: that is, one who has often sailed, and has traversed either all or most seas, who well knows the markets, the harbor-anchorages, [and] the havens, whether they be on the mainland or on the several [islands]; who also knows how to find paths in the sea, from the observation of the stars, skilled in the constellations, and directing his courses to their motions — so that he makes a way through pathless [waters], and, in a new manner, opens the seas to a land-animal, and renders the crossing easy; and afterward [governs] great cities, populous, full of inhabitants, and their administration, and the care of private and public affairs, sacred and profane — [an art] which one might deservedly call the art of arts and the science of sciences: [and this] shall we commit to an uncertain and fortuitous thing, the examination of the truth being cast aside?

St. Ambrose (bk. 5 of the *Hexaemeron*, ch. 21): "In lots there is an outcome, not a judgment; and often, by an irrational chance, by the lot the very last is preferred to the better [men]." St. Chrysostom (on Ephesians, homily 2):

> ὁ κλῆρος οὐκ ἀρετῆς ἐστι ἀλλὰ συντυχίας· ὡς ἄν τις εἴπῃ, ὡς ἂν εἰ ἔλεγε κλήρῳ γενομένους ἡμᾶς ἐξελέξατο, τὸ δ᾽ ὅλον ἀπὸ τῆς προαιρέσεως προειδώς, τουτέστιν, ἑαυτῷ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀφώρισεν, οἷον ἑώρα ἡμᾶς περὶ γενέσθαι κεκληρωμένους. θαυμαστὴ γὰρ ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ πρόγνωσις, καὶ πάντα εἰδυῖα πρὶν γενέσεως αὐτῶν.

[Chrysostom: "The lot is not of virtue but of chance — as one might put it, as though he had said, 'having become [ours] by lot, he chose us out'; but the whole [truth is that], foreknowing [us] from [our] purpose [proairesis] — that is, having chosen [us] for himself, he set [us] apart — [he chose us] such as he saw we should be, [as if] allotted. For wondrous is the foreknowledge of God, which knows all things before their coming-to-be."]

And therefore, in bk. 1 *On Divination*, Cicero [says]: "What magistrate, or what more illustrious man, uses lots?" But in the other places lots have almost grown cold [fallen into disuse].

One example can be objected — of St. Matthias the Apostle, chosen (Acts 1). Some answer that the Apostles were not yet then filled with the Holy Spirit (the Venerable Bede, on Acts 1). Next, that it was their privilege, which cannot make a common law. The same Bede, cited (q. 2, ch. *Non statim*, 26); and St. Jerome (on Jonah 1), cited (ch. *Non exemplo*, in the same q. 2, 26); [and] Abulensis (q. 41). But I answer, *first*: [that] this example avails to prove that opinion which I handed down in q. 19 — namely, that the very kind of lot is not evil by its own nature. [For] how would the Apostles, all together, in council, with prayers employed, dare publicly to attempt and effect a thing condemned by its own evil [nature]? *Secondly*: The number of the Apostles ought to be twelve — not more nor fewer, [but just] some one [man to fill it]. Out of the whole number of disciples, two were, for the filling-up of that number, chosen not by lot, but by counsel and reason — Matthias and Joseph [Barsabbas]: but each [was] of such great virtues and divine ornaments, that the one could not be preferred to the other, [nor] be discerned, by human judgment and prudence. It was permitted, therefore, to run to some more divine mode, by which the election — begun, and carried down to these two — might be completed by God's reckoning-pebble [vote], as indeed was done. *Thirdly*: No lot-casting of this kind [existed] while [it] was disapproved and forbidden by law. But now, as was said above, [it is] otherwise. Before the flesh of hare or of swine, and the eating of other animals — as much swimming as walking and creeping — was forbidden to the Jews, rightly could their Patriarchs and forebears, or they themselves in Egypt — Moses, Aaron, and all the Jews — eat of them. But after the law was passed, to eat [them was] a sin. So [it happened] in the communion under both species: of old, through the Manichaeans, and again in the

previous century, through the Bohemian and German heresies, [it came about] that it was forbidden to the laity. Before, it had always been in each one's choice.

Fourthly: If, in so great a necessity, [and] with so great care, so many fit for the Episcopate and the government of the Church had been chosen with so great care, and [if] a discernment so difficult, and (to human counsel) impossible, arose among them, it would be permitted [to use lots] — with this hope too, [the same hope] which the Apostles [had]. Because, at such a point of necessity and human prudence, the human law would now seem not to bind — as is manifest from those things which are wont to be taught concerning the obligation of positive law. And this Cajetan intends in the *Summula*, when he says: "From the matter of the elections of spiritual ministers too, if the prohibition of positive law be set aside, I see no sin, if [the choice] were committed to lots over certain chosen and suitable [men], as was done in the election of the Apostle Matthias." And this Origen also thoroughly teaches, cited just now on this book (homily 23), saying that even the Apostles themselves were holier and more prudent than those who choose Bishops today.

IV: To lots is wont to be recalled the die [dice-play], under which are contained all games which depend on doubtful chance. And it [dice-play] is variously forbidden by various [laws], as may be seen in the *Pandects* (title *On the Die and Dice-players*), and in the *Code* (*On Dice-players and the Playing of Dice*, bk. 3, tit. 43). Let there be consulted Gregory of Toulouse (*Syntagma* [bk.] 1, [ch.] 39, ch. 3), Aerodius (bk. 3, tit. 9), [and] Molina (*On Law and Justice*, Disputations 509, 510, 511, 512). A pleasant riddle indeed about these dice was circulated in the previous days: [that] the bones of the dead revive, which, pricked with certain marks, give very many [men] to death [ruin].

V: All those lots [are] unpermitted which lack the due causes or circumstances; the others [are] permitted. But causes or circumstances of this kind will be more conveniently relegated to the following question.

Question XXI. What [are] the conditions of the permitted lots?

Lots which are engaged in play alone require the conditions of that virtue which by Aristotle is called εὐτραπελία [*eutrapelia*, "wittiness, good-humored playfulness"]; but those [engaged] in play and some gain [require] the conditions both of that virtue and of justice — concerning which, [see] Molina in the place cited. *II*: The conditions of serious lots are various.

The first [is] necessity. As long as affairs can be conducted by the force and judgment of human reason, so long must one abstain from serious lots. Because human reason is the rule of human life, and, as it were, [its] carpenter's-level [*amussis*]. Always, therefore, must all our actions be measured out to it. Otherwise it would be a mere tempting of God — as St. Thomas says (a. 8 of the cited question). For, as St. Ambrose says (on Luke ch. 1, [the passage] on the entrance of Zechariah): "the things which are sought by lot, [those] are unknown; and where they are found, how they were found is not known." But it is not [a mark] of prudence to keep a mode of acting which is not known and explored. But I understand "necessity" not as extreme and physical, but moral — which is understood [to hold] unless God clearly signify or inspire [otherwise]; and [it is not present] if we can equally conveniently [determine] something by counsel as

(col. 869)

by lot. Hence, therefore, we shall gather: *First*, that it is not lawful to use lots rashly and promiscuously. *Secondly*, that it must be diligently attended [to] whether, by human industry, we can perceive what and how [is] to be done. *Thirdly*, [that] if, after human judgment and industry, anything of quarrels, suspicions, or that kind of evils remains, it is lawful to lull it to sleep by lot. For although the extreme necessity may not appear, yet there is that moral [necessity] which suffices for acting well (Prov. 18:18). *Fourthly*: If it is established that two are innocent, or that on neither's guilt sufficiently grave conjectures appear, it will not be lawful to cast a lot between them, [as to] which is guilty. Likewise, if two [are] unfit to rule the Church, one must not seek by lot which [is] the fitter. If the portions of a matter to be divided [*res herciscunda*] [are] clearly

unequal, one must not cast lots over them. If, finally, in some matter the right of the two is unequal, there is no place for the lot between them. The reason [is] because concerning all these, human reason alone can judge and determine.

The second [condition]: according to the magnitude of the thing which is sought by the lots, there ought to be present in them a reverence toward God and prayer. In the sacred writings, because lots occur only concerning weighty and great matters, therefore we always see prayers and great veneration [attending them]. As in this very place, [with] the raising [washing] of garments and the sleeping-apart [*secubatio*], as was said concerning the sanctification (q. 12, and ch. 3, v. 5); and "before the Lord [there] is a confrontation" (Lev. 16:16); prayers (1 Sam. 14, Jonah 1). Even the Gentiles say, before the lots, "Arise, invoke thy God" [Jonah 1:6]. Nay, for this cause the same [Gentiles] of old cast, equalized, [and] drew lots in certain temples, in the sight of certain gods — as is understood from Cicero's books *On Divination*. (Acts 1.) The Apostles, [when] about to cast lots, prayed: "if any," [Peter] says, at that place; the Venerable Bede: "let those who, compelled by some necessity, think that God is to be consulted by lots after the example of the Apostles, see that these Apostles did this only [after] the assembly of the brethren was gathered and prayers poured out to God." And this Origen too advised (homily 23 on this book), as [was] said before. But if the matters be very small — although it is good always to invoke God, yet if it be not done, nothing is sinned. The reason [is] because God is prayed to for this, that he may in a special way temper the lots and bid [them] fall aptly; but even if this be not done in small things, it matters little or nothing. And those who, in matters of this kind, wish the lot to come out in whatever way, without a special effecting of the divine concurrence — those all cede, by their own quasi-right, from a compact, so that whatever shall have fallen out be accepted. And in rules of this kind this cession [is] not iniquitous. To that condition of divine reverence, that [condition] can not inconveniently be recalled which St. Thomas, in the place cited, makes the third — namely, lest the divine oracles be turned to earthly affairs. For so St. Augustine (Epistle 119, ch. 20; and cited, 26, q. 2, ch. *Hi, qui*): "those who read lots from the Gospel-pages — although it is to be wished that they do this rather than run to the consulting of demons — yet even this custom displeases me: to wish to turn the divine oracles, which speak concerning another life, to secular affairs and to the vanity of this life." Yet if earthly affairs were taken up as they ought to be taken up by us Christians — [namely] that by them we should use [them] toward the glory of God and our eternal life — there would be no irreverence to sacred [things] of this kind. For the oracle Urim and Thummim too was applied to [things] of this kind, as appeared in bk. 1. And our God is also the giver and preserver of this earthly life, and from him daily bread is assiduously sought. But those who, on account of the prayers of old joined to lots, think this whole business of casting lots [to be] ceremonial, and therefore [think] that, by the abrogation of the ceremonies of the old law, this ceremony of lot-casting too has ceased — [these] indeed seem to be deceived. For what ceremony [is it]? Of what thing [is it] a sign? Or [are] prayers joined to anything [therefore] a ceremony of that old law which is now antiquated? But neither does that [argument] disprove every use of lots — which the same [men] say, [that] God promised all things to those who pray, but not to those who cast lots. Yet [Scripture] approves that prayers not be omitted, in greater matters at least, as [was] explained.

Question XXII. When and how was the lot conducted in [the case of] Achan?

On the day after the Israelites had prayed and received the divine response, all, quite early in the morning, came to cast lots before the ark of the covenant, or [rather] approached the court of the tabernacle; and among the first, the Leader himself, Joshua (v. 16) — always the most diligent of all, always earlier than all. But the lot, according to Abulensis, seems to have been cast into the urn by slips [of paper], and drawn. And it is probable, though not certain — just as [it is] uncertain by whom the same [lots were] cast, mixed, and drawn, as Masius rightly says.

Question XXIII. How, with the occasion of a night intervening, did Achan not flee, but awaited the announced — and indeed the last — lot?

Since Achan was conscious to himself of the sacrilege, and the lot [had been] prescribed by God and now introduced with great religion, and a night intervened meanwhile — how did he not snatch himself away in flight? How did he not attempt to escape the appointed punishment in the nocturnal darkness? How did he dare, with the rest, to approach the ark of the Lord, the divine tribunal, the heavenly judgment and indication? Nay, when, by the first casting of lots, his tribe [was] now truly marked, by the second his clan, by the third his house — why did he delay? Why did he not betake himself to his feet? Why did he wait until, as to his own [name], the name of the one [man] was openly published, and he was apprehended as though by a divine hand, and publicly proclaimed sacrilegious? A wonder indeed. Yet several causes of that delay can be given. *The first*: It was a camp, and that [was] hedged on all sides by guards and watches. And because the committed sacrilege had now been divinely disclosed, all [places] were full of suspicion. If anyone had lifted a foot [set out], this crime could easily be laid upon him. On that day too all [were] intent on the sanctification for the lots of the morrow. Whoever had done anything else, [or] turned aside elsewhere, the eyes, thoughts, and hands of all would have been turned upon him. What, then, would Achan do? Whither and how would he flee? — and especially at the morning dawn, when all Israel stood gathered before the seat and eyes of God? How great

(col. 871)

a force, indeed, flight has for the incriminating of someone, Julius Clarus teaches (bk. 5). *The second*: Perhaps so depraved an opinion had entered Achan's mind that he thought his deed hidden even from God. For sometimes the mind of the sinner is so blinded by desire, and almost by madness and frenzy, that with that [man] in Job (ch. 22, v. 13) he says in his heart: "For what does God know? And he judges as though through a mist. Clouds [are] his hiding-place, nor does he consider our [affairs], and he walks about the poles of heaven." *The third*: Grant [that] he felt better and truer [things] about God; [Joshua] himself, that prince, was perhaps suspect to him, as though he had feigned a lot prescribed by God, or [as though] there were no power in this [lot] — [that it] was only an empty scarecrow of the timid. *The fourth*: Yet let the lots be something: [still] there are many thousands of Israelites, and there was occasion for manifold and notable spoils. Who would believe that all the others kept their hands from them — [that] he alone was overcome by desire? There will perhaps be several among whom [there] is anathema, and who have perhaps stolen much more and greater [things]. The lot will betray those others: [but] as for me, it will be silent. *The fifth*: But [even] should it betray me too, I shall take exception against the vain and fallacious mode of inquiry: I shall show that the lot is by no means to be believed — especially in a matter of such moment, when it is a question of a man's fame and life; [and] that this [method] has not hitherto been employed among the Israelites; [that] no faith is to be put in a new manner of searching out crimes; [that] otherwise it would come to pass that safety itself could be brought into peril. For [suppose] there are two innocent [men]; let them be compelled to try the lot concerning a capital crime. One or the other, surely, the dread lot will seek — [an] innocent [man], nonetheless. This manner of inquiry, therefore, must be resisted at [its] nascent beginnings. These and similar [thoughts] are wont sometimes to come into the mind of criminal men, lest flight take counsel for their safety. But another cause too not rarely holds them, and, fixed deep [within], restrains them: namely, thoughtlessness and an admirable stupor, which invades even prudent, anxious, and otherwise cautious men after some crime undertaken, so that they think of none of these [precautions] — [but] cling to the very footprint of the crime, [and] all but summon the executioner himself. We see [it] daily in homicides, thefts, and poisonings. Into the prisons so many little women and men are dragged, so many consumed by the flames, burdened with so many suspicions, sometimes with such manifest accusations and indications of [their] accomplices on the spot, [and yet], though they could most easily flee, they remain in the same place, [and] attempt no flight. Conscience, namely, snatches away all [presence of] mind from them; and God the

avenger urges them to punishment — as [it is] found to have happened in many other ways, Plutarch attesting (in the book *On the Delayed Vengeance of the Deity*). Whence also that [verse] of Ausonius:

> *"When Ibycus perished, the high-flying crane was [his] avenger."*

And these [causes] pleased Abulensis, for [explaining] this, toward the end of the 42nd question. But what if — since nothing else is established — we think better [things] of Achan? For he could thus have reasoned with himself: "I have sinned. My sin is conspicuous to God. Now he declares himself angry at the people: he prescribes a lot, by which I may be found. I shall await the outcome, whichever he shall will. Does he will me to be publicly infamous? I have deserved it. I will undergo the infamy. Does he will me to be condemned to the fire? I am worthy of it. I will await the sentence. Ash, according to my desert, shall I be made."

Question XXIV. Achan, [once] betrayed by the lot, how did Joshua lead [him] to the confession of [his] sin?

The first manner, by which Joshua led Achan — now accused and indicated by the lot — to the confession of [his] sin, was twofold. *First*: a bland and gentle address (v. 19), "my son." What name, what bond, could more flow into his heart? Good princes are, as one of the ancients advised, the Fathers of their subjects, and pursue them with a paternal love — why not Joshua too? Achan, indeed, had degenerated, and by his crime had struck the greatest grief into that so great Prince and Father of his. Yet because [Joshua] now beholds him himself oppressed with grave sadness, he is not vehemently angry against him: he does not reproach [his] avarice, wickedness, [or] the disaster received; but he addresses [him] gently — [so] that, because it behooved to employ the extreme severity by God's command, he consoles [him], by word at least, since by deed it was not lawful. He gives an example to Princes and Magistrates, notable for all to imitate: that they prefer to be more inclined toward mildness, and moderation of soul, and gentle speech. Rightly, in Stobaeus (Sermon 20), Epicharmus [says] ἐπιπλάζειν ὅτι χρὴ τὸν θυμόν, ἀλλὰ τὸν νόμον [Serarius renders: "It behooves that not anger, but Law, prevail"]. And therefore Abraham too, to that wretched and unhappy rich man now sunk to the netherworld, says, "son, remember, because thou didst receive good things in thy life" (Luke 16:25). *Second* [manner]: the serious and effective proposing of the thing to be done. For instead of what he could have said in a word — "confess thy sin" — he employs four phrases, of which the latter always contain a greater explication of the former. And [he gives] first of all also the reason and argument why Achan ought deservedly to confess the crime. For he says (v. 19): "Give glory to the Lord God of Israel" — as if he should say:

> *That by which glory is given to God is deservedly and gladly to be done by us; / but by confessing our sins, glory is given to God; / therefore [it is to be done].*

Instead of "give glory," in the Hebrew it is "Place, or set, glory," but with the same sense; and therefore the Seventy [LXX] too render δὸς δόξαν ["give glory"]. Nay, on account of the added Hebrew particle "na," it could still be rendered more gently: "give, I pray, glory to God"; or "give now glory to God." For in either way, as indicated above, that "na" is everywhere rendered. *Secondly*: the word "confess" — to God, namely. For in Hebrew it is "give confession to him" — to whom, namely, it had just now been said that glory is to be given. And in Greek δὸς αὐτῷ τὴν ἐξομολόγησιν ["give to him the confession"]. "Confession," says St. Augustine (on Psalm 94), "is taken in the scriptures in two ways. There is a confession of one praising, and there is a confession of one groaning. The confession of one praising pertains to the honor of him who is praised. The confession of one groaning pertains to the penitence of him who confesses. For men confess when they praise God: they confess, when they accuse themselves." And he confirms this distinction of confession a little after: "If confession were always [that] of a penitent, it would not be said in the Gospel of the Lord himself: In that hour Jesus exulted in the Holy Spirit, and said: I confess to thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hidden these things from the wise

(col. 873)

and prudent, and hast revealed them to little ones. Was Christ, then, a penitent because he confessed? Nothing could he repent of, because he had done nothing culpably: but he confessed unto the praise of the Father." One can add those [passages] in the Psalms, so many: 42[43]:5 ["the sound of confession, of one feasting"]; 104:1 ["confession and comeliness"]; 111:3 ["confession and magnificence"]; 148:13 ["his confession above heaven"]; Ps. 33:2 ["confess to the Lord on the harp"]; 100:4 ["in hymns confess to him"], and very often elsewhere. It must be said, therefore, that the name of "confession" — as much Hebrew as Greek and Latin — is taken not only "when we subject ourselves to God as [guilty] sources," as Masius will have it always to be [the case] in the scriptures (fol. 133) — for this is clearly refuted by St. Augustine, from the example of CHRIST the Lord confessing to the Father (Matt. 11:25) — but universally, when we either profess and proclaim the magnitude, wisdom, power, goodness, and beneficence of God, or recognize and confess our ingratitude toward him, [our] impiety, and [our] sins. But which confession is here demanded of Achan? Surely the latter, which is [that] of one groaning and acknowledging [his] fault; in which, nevertheless, a great praise and glory of God is always contained, as will be said below. But this, which was a confession to God — ought it [only] to be made so [greatly] in Achan's heart? or with the very lips and voice too, but secret from all men? in a place where Achan was alone? [that] he alone should hear himself? [that] no other of men be present? [that] the ears of no one should receive that confession? This most of the Innovators think is now "to confess to God." But that confession extends more widely. For [there is] one who confesses also to a man, the servant of God, and for God's sake — as Achan did in this place, as is understood from what follows. For the third phrase is: "Show me what thou hast done" — in Hebrew, with that same particle "na": "Declare to me, I beseech, what thou hast done"; or, "Declare now." Thou hast not declared hitherto, thou hast kept silent up to now. Now thou seest thyself pointed at, as with a finger of God: confess to me what thou hast perpetrated. *Fourthly*: "Hide not." In Hebrew: "hide not from me" — anything, namely. In Greek μὴ κρύψῃς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ["hide not from me"]. And so the true manner of confessing is indicated: that we conceal nothing from him to whom we confess, but bring forth and disgorge all things. And so indeed did Achan, as follows (v. 20), and as [was] already expounded above (qq. 3, 4, and following).

Question XXV. How, by the confession of his sin, could Achan give glory to God?

That [phrase], "Give glory to God," some think to be a formula for binding men by an oath, as [in] John ch. 9, v. 24. But "I," says Masius, "as I do not wish to repudiate or refute this utterly, so I cannot altogether approve it, since nothing appears in that narration of John [to show] that the Pharisees wished the blind [man] to speak under oath: [they] who rather, offended by the accused humanity of Christ, were zealous to turn the man away from proclaiming his [Christ's] divine power, and to lead [him] to ascribe the whole benefit to God alone." Maldonatus, on that same passage of John (ch. 9, v. 24): "The manner," he says, "is a way of speaking usual to the Hebrews, by which the accused were wont to be interrogated as though adjured by God with a solemn rite, admonished by these words that they stood before God, and that his majesty was to be revered by them — lest, then, they should lie before him who knew all things well, [and thereby], as though judging him to be ignorant of human affairs (which was a great injury against God), [whereas] they should rather defer this honor to him: that, by the reverence due in confessing, they should show in truth that they believed him to be ignorant of nothing. So, therefore, they said 'give glory to God' — just as the Spanish judge says, 'place thy hand here,' the cross being held out; and the Frenchman, 'Raise thy hand,' as [one] about to swear by God." And this fits rightly, as much this [passage] as other passages of scripture: John 9:3, Ezra 9:8. But more is to be added. *First, generally*: Truly, by the confession of sins, glory is given to God — and indeed [glory] so much the greater, the more hidden and greater they [the sins] are. For by that very [act] the sinner in a manner professes that He is all-knowing, since [the things] which lay hidden from all men, and were stored and enclosed in the sole recesses of souls, [the sinner] of his own accord brings forth into the

open and lays bare. He professes also that God is merciful — [in] that, by the confession of these [sins], as by a certain humility and by the affliction and trouble of himself, he might hope that something [of pardon] is obtained. He professes the same Lord to be supremely to be revered and feared, while by his command, or cause, and name, those things are said and declared which human fear and shame so hides, veils, wills, and wraps up that [the sinner] would wish them, if it could be, never to be found out by any of mortals. Let us hear St. Augustine in [his] enarration on Psalm 94: "Does not this too," he says, "pertain to the praise of God, when thou confessest thy sins? Nay, it pertains most of all to the praise of God. Why does it pertain most of all to the praise of God, when thou confessest thy sins? Because the physician is praised so much the more, the more the sick man was despaired of. Confess, therefore, thy sins, the more thou didst despair of thyself on account of thy iniquities. For so much the greater is the praise of the one forgiving, the greater the enormity is of the one confessing [his] sins. Let us not think, then, that we have departed from the praise of the canticle, if we understand here too the confession by which we confess our sins. And this pertains to the praise of the canticle: because when we recognize our sins, we commend the glory of God." *Secondly*: [that] Achan gave glory to God in other ways too, in particular — because he professed God [to be] most truthful, whose unknown sin was most truly indicated by lot to all; [that] he himself, among so many thousands, [was] the one [man] most truly convicted of sacrilege; [that] the same [God is] most just, who did not permit the Israelites to be stricken with disaster rashly, nor without cause; [that he is] most worthy of all reverence, whose precepts are all to be most accurately obeyed, and none [of them] to be violated; [that he is] most holy, from whom no things whatsoever dedicated [to him] ought to be turned away by anyone and transferred to [another's] use; [that he is] most just, who most justly appoints punishments for misdeeds; [that he is] most powerful, whose sentence and punishment no one can escape by any force, art, flight, [or] hiding-place. *Thirdly*: If [the question] be treated of the confession which is made to priests among Christians, besides the aforesaid ways, glory is given to God also [in these]. *First*: Because the sacrament is taken [as] instituted by Christ Jesus himself; and by that very [fact] the worship of *latria* is attributed to Christ the Lord. *Secondly*: Because for his sake we subject ourselves to men, since they are his priests and ministers — and indeed most humbly, in a most humble matter, most troublesome and most full of blushing. *Thirdly*: Because the effect redounds to the highest glory of God, while the sinner is absolved from [his] sins, is washed from [his] filth, [and is made] clean and

(col. 875)

pure entirely, and from an enemy [becomes] a friend, from a slave of the Devil a son of God, from one liable to Gehenna an heir of paradise: then he gives thanks to God, praises his mercy and infinite kindness, and by a more amended life displays the divine grace to all, [and] assiduously proclaims God in this and the future life. All these [things] can, though copiously, be shown. But I will conclude with that discourse of the cited St. Augustine, by which he explains those words of Psalm 95: "Confession and beauty [are] in his sight." "Dost thou love beauty?" he says. "Wilt thou be beautiful? Confess. He did not say 'beauty and confession,' but 'confession and beauty': thou wast foul, confess, that thou mayest be beautiful. Thou wast a sinner, confess, that thou mayest be just. Thou couldst make thyself foul, thou canst not make thyself comely. But of what sort is our Bridegroom, who loved [thee] foul, that he might make thee beautiful? How, says someone, did he love [her] foul? 'I came not,' he says, 'to call the just, but sinners.' Whom dost thou call sinners, that they may remain sinners? 'No,' he says. And how will they not be sinners? Confession and beauty [are] in his sight. For they confess their sins, they vomit up the evils which they greedily devoured. They do not return to their vomit, like the unclean dog, and there will be confession and beauty."

Question XXVI. Why did Joshua strive to lead Achan to the confession of his sin?

That Joshua strove for this seems, first, to certain of the Jews, [to be] that he might confirm the force and authority of the lots, which he was about to use in the dividing of the promised land. Others (in the Talmud, tractate *Sanhedrin*, ch. 6; and the book *Tanchuma*) [think it was] that he might quell the sedition [already] stirred up. For those [rabbis] hold that the tribe of Judah, when it had seen itself branded with sacrilege — with so great a disgrace, by the voice of the lot — took great grief, blazed up in anger, [and] flew forth to arms, as though the iniquitous lot deceived and lied. Joshua therefore led forth the confessing culprit into the midst: and so all was calmed. But the former [reason] could indeed be some cause, yet as it were an assisting one, and perhaps beside all thought of Joshua himself then. The latter seems a Rabbinic fabrication. For [what evidence is there of] a tumult of this kind — what, [is there] anywhere even the least sign [of it]? And had not Joshua most clearly signified that this casting of lots was spoken and appointed by God? How could he have wished to abuse so great a tribe with the empty fiction of a lot, and to appease God, and to bring all that great tribe into that [belief]? Rather, then, it must be said. *First*: that Joshua aimed at this, that glory be given to God, as was said — by showing [that God is] most knowing of all things, that all things are most open to his eyes, that he is most truthful in what he speaks and shows (whether through himself, or through oracles and lots of whatsoever kind); [that he is] most just, who did not bring the disaster of Ai upon the Israelites without grave cause. *Secondly*: that he aimed also at the advantage of Achan himself — [so] that, since he had to die, his heart might be touched with true penitence, [and] by a humble confession of the crime he might render God propitious to himself: [and] that he might ascribe to Him glory, in the way handed down in the previous question. *Thirdly*: that he might call away the minds of all from every crime, and from all hope of hiding some committed crime and bearing it unpunished. Rightly, in the third book *On Duties*, Cicero [says]: "In every deliberation the hope and opinion of concealing and hiding [wrongs] must be removed. For it ought to be sufficiently persuaded to us (if only we have made any progress in Philosophy), that even if we could hide from all gods and men, yet nothing is to be done avariciously, nothing unjustly, nothing lustfully, nothing incontinently." And Solon:

> Αἰεὶ οὔτε λέληθε διαμπερὲς ὅστις ἀλιτρὸν / Θυμὸν ἔχει· πάντως δ᾽ ἐς τέλος ἐξεφάνη.

[Solon: "Never for long does he escape notice, whoever has a sinning heart; utterly, in the end, he is brought to light."]

Fourthly: that an example be given to all Judges, before they consign the guilty to death, [showing] in what manner they ought to strive that the guilty confess the crimes for which they are to be punished — whether the truth of them has to be sought out by questionings and tortures, or not. Let there be consulted Gregory of Toulouse (bk. 48, ch. 12). *Fifthly and last*: that a manner most useful for moving them, and for leading them to all the best [things], be shown to us, [we] who wish some sinners [to be] saved and drawn from the peril of Gehenna. We know that [saying] of St. James (ch. 5, v. 20): "that he who shall have made a sinner to be converted from the error of his way, has saved his soul from death." Let us say, therefore, to one erring, and holding the depraved ways of crimes — [our] brother, friend, [our] neighbor: "Give glory to God, and confess to him, and show to the priest what thou hast done, [and] hide from him nothing."

Question XXVII. Of what kind [was] Achan's confession?

That [confession] was not indeed a sacred [confession] of the kind which, among us Christians, flourishes for the expiation of sins (for it was not yet instituted, nor did Joshua discharge the priestly office); yet it indicates not a few [things] which avail toward that [confession]. These, since I have already before (q. 3, and following) set forth the confession itself, it will be worth the labor to note briefly. And first indeed, [we note] that, for a sinner to compose himself to confession, there is need of the divine aid, to rouse [him]. For so the lot moved Achan, and Joshua's exhortation, which struck not only his ears, but the inmost [part] of [his] heart. *Secondly*: Achan confessed first generally, then in detail. The same [thing] we do, when at the beginning we say "I confess," [and] then recount our faults. *Thirdly*: Achan grieved — and indeed from the

heart — that he had offended God, touched with true penitence and contrition. For although Calvin doubts this in this place, yet his [Achan's] words, and the manner of the words, indicate it; [and] so does the force of Joshua's exhortation, and the very outcome at last, of which afterward. So must we too be — for God's contempt through our sins — grieving and sorrowful, and so set up [our] confession. *Fourthly*: "Truly," he says, "I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel." Behold, he does not acknowledge his sin by silence alone, [nor] by the pallor or blush of countenance, by the fixing of [his] eyes on the ground, [nor] by a stupor of soul: but present in mind, obeying Joshua, revering God with a great sense of grief — and, as I think, with a great force of hot tears — he begins the confession; and he does not merely say "I have sinned," but, wholly moved quite piously and holily, "Truly," he says, "I have sinned" — as if to say: I give glory to God. My sin, which I most secretly hid — yet all things lie open to his most perceiving eyes. There are lots [which are] indeed

(col. 877)

of themselves fallacious and uncertain: but this [lot], which the Lord commands, [and] which his servant and our leader Joshua carried out, is most true and most certain. I had persuaded myself [that there was] either a slight sin, or none, if in so great a multitude of such rich spoils I should filch [something] slight which was at hand. But this judgment of mine was false. Truly I have sinned." And he interposes a certain grave comparison of himself with God, which has the greatest force for exciting and displaying a notable and pious grief of soul. "I," he says, "have sinned against the Lord God of Israel": I, a vile creature, against my Creator; a most vile little servant, against the Lord of heaven and earth; I, a most abject little worm, against God; I, the dregs and refuse of the Israelite people, have sinned against the God of Israel. O the unworthiness of my sin! O the blindness of my mind! O most senseless senselessness! Truly have I sinned against the Lord God of Israel. *Fifthly*: "And thus and thus have I done." Some sometimes extenuate their sins in confessions: they cover and obscure [them] with wrappings and circumlocutions of words; they lay [the blame] on the demon, on the fragility of the flesh, on bad companions; they accuse others, and excuse themselves in every way. But Achan accuses only himself, and indeed plainly, distinctly, roundly: "And thus and thus have I done." "It is an emphatic expression," says Calvin (otherwise a most importunate assailant of sacred confession): "'this and that I did': by which he signifies that the individual parts of the deed were set forth distinctly and in order." Nor indeed did he state only the thing which he did, but the manner and the circumstances. For these are what those [words] "thus and thus" signify. *Sixthly*: He goes on and recounts in order what he did, what he stole, how many things in number, of what quality, of what price. "A cloak," he says, "of scarlet, very good: two hundred silver shekels: a golden bar of 50 shekels." It is not enough in confession to say, "I was drunk, I fornicated, I stole," but the number, the quantity, and other grave circumstances are to be added. And therefore he also adds — although it had not been necessary — that he did [it] out of his mere concupiscence; and that he took the design of hiding the deed, and in fact accomplished [it]. This surely [is] the form of confession, and a certain idea [pattern] of it, to be gazed on by us not rarely. For truly, as Horace rightly [says]:

> *"The evil shame of fools hides unhealed sores." [Horace, Epistles 1.16.24]*

Origen, on that [passage of] Lev. 5, "if he shall have sinned in one of these, let him declare the sin which he has sinned," [says]: "There is something wonderful, a secret, in this. For all things are to be declared, in every kind, and all [the things] we have done are to be brought forth into the public — whether we do anything in secret, whether we have committed anything in speech alone, or even within the secrets of thoughts — all must needs be published, all brought forth; brought forth, moreover, by him who is both the accuser of sin and the instigator: for he now instigates us that we may sin, and he also accuses [us] when we have sinned. If, then, in [our] life we anticipate him, and are ourselves our own accusers, we escape the wickedness of the devil, our enemy and accuser: for so too elsewhere the Prophet says: 'Tell thou thy iniquities first, that thou mayest be justified.'" And (homily 2 on Psalm 37): "See," he says, "what the divine scripture teaches us, that

one ought not to conceal sin inwardly. For perhaps, just as those who have food shut up undigested within, or [matters] of humor or phlegm gravely and troublesomely pressing on the stomach, are relieved if they have vomited: so those who have sinned, if indeed they hide and retain the sin within themselves, are inwardly pressed, and all but suffocated by the phlegm or humor of sin. But if [a man] himself becomes his own accuser, while he accuses himself and confesses, he at once vomits out the offense too, and digests away the whole cause of the disease." St. Ambrose (Epistle 3) treats not a few [things] which make for this. And first indeed, [he treats] how we all are wont to sin: "To sin," he says, "belongs to no one [but the frail]; to amend [is the mark] of the wise, and to correct the error, and to do penance for the sin." Then, [he treats] that penance and confession are indeed troublesome to us, yet very useful and necessary: "Yet that (namely, to do penance) is," he says, "difficult in this life," etc. "Rare [is] confession of sin, rare [is] penance, rare among men the assertion of his own word," etc. "But if anyone," he says, "sick, pretends himself sound, he will be the more sick," etc. Finally, [he treats] that a confession is of no profit in which one does not act sincerely: "This fault," he says, "the priests do not take away." And (fol. 512): "It will not please the Lord, if the priest eat the sacrifice in which there is a fraud of the oblation, [and] not the diligent sincerity of confession." And it befits [us] to bring forth our sins before the priest so much the more willingly and sincerely and plainly, the farther we are removed from Achan's peril. He knew that by this confession of his he was to be condemned by Joshua, and consigned to the most grave punishment of the fire; and yet so openly, entirely, and candidly did he confess his deed. But we, by our confession, incur no peril of the body at all; [rather] we obtain the highest liberty, tranquillity, [and] happiness of soul. In no way can the priests [do] what the Lutheran Preachers [do], who — as they report in the sermon on the punishment of Nicolaus Crell, the Saxon Chancellor — said openly to the very people that [Crell] indeed was unwilling that the confession be revealed, yet [that] he had confessed to [the preacher] so many and so great [things] that he was most worthy of punishment. So too a senior Hamburg Preacher betrays, in a sermon, his fellow-penitent who had confessed a theft to him. A Hildesheim Preacher [betrayed] a Hildesheim citizen, and another [man] who had confessed a grave other crime, likewise upon the table [publicly], one of ours being present — and the Superintendent marveling at the folly of the Lutheran Confessors, and [their] inept garrulity. There was also a certain kind of confession carried over from the Israelites, by a certain rite, to some Gentiles. So [it was] that, in Samothrace, those who wished to be initiated into the rites had to declare their crimes before the sacrificer — as Plutarch relates in the *Apophthegms of the Lacedaemonians*. When Antalcidas refused to do this, and said, "if anything had been perpetrated by me, that indeed is known to the gods," he went away excluded from the initiation of those rites. But those rites were vain, and vain too his reasoning against confession. For it was not obscure to the God of Israel [that] Achan's sacrilege [had been committed]; but he willed him to humble himself, and to confess it openly. Lest, then, we be excluded from the most sacred of all sacred things — from the body and blood of the Lord, and from the sanctuaries of eternal life — why should we not shake out all the hiding-places of our vices? [Why not] gladly declare all our offenses — into the ears of one priest at least, who does not bind these [sins] but absolves [them], does not command [us] to be led to the flame but snatches [us] from the perpetual flame, does not afflict [us] with death but presents [us] with immortal and most blessed life, through the merit of Christ the Lord and the power received from him? I therefore, a foul sinner, will set myself before the venerable eyes of my true Joshua; and when to me — by himself, and his own

(col. 879)

vicar, my spiritual father, whom our Germany beautifully calls *Beichtvater* [father-confessor], I will not hesitate to say: "My son, give glory to the Lord God of Israel, and confess, and show me what thou hast done. Hide nothing."

Question XXVIII. How, and why, was the eye-witness inspection of Achan's sacrilege made?

First: How the inspection of this sacrilege was made, verse 22 teaches. For Joshua sent to the spot ministers, who in Hebrew are called *malachim*, in Greek ἄγγελοι [*angeloi*], that is, "messengers." These, using great speed, ran thither: they found all: they quickly brought the found [things] to Joshua and the whole people: [and] before all they poured out and threw [them] down. *Secondly*: But Joshua sent those [messengers], first, that glory might be given to God — [glory] so much the greater and more illustrious, the more confirmed both the lot and Achan's own confession were, and the more certain. For thus more and more did the divine omniscience, the highest truth and justice, shine forth, and [the matter] was held, as it were, explored and beheld by the eyes and hands of all. But every care is to be taken up by us, that we inquire not only into the glory of God, but into a greater and more conspicuous [glory]. *Secondly*: That, since by the nefarious sacrilege the anathema had been impeded, [that] — as it were, from the spoils — a certain thing like a holocaust might be perfected: that nothing remain in profane use which was sacred and devoted to God: that all, even so little, be rendered to Him, [and] all be consumed by the flames. *Thirdly*: That there be an example to Judges, how diligently they ought to inquire into all things, when it is a question of some man's blood: let them see whether the guilty [man] who confesses the crimes does that very thing either from fear of the tortures, or from despair of pardon, or from a stupor of soul, or acts from some other perturbation. In a matter of so great moment, there can scarcely be too much caution. But those who were sent — why did they run [thither] so [eagerly]? *First*: Because they were good and faithful ministers to their Lord. For this goodness and fidelity of theirs binds wings to their hands and feet, and winged sandals [*talaria*]; but on the contrary, sloth and unfaithfulness make [men] slow-paced and hesitating. "The sluggard says, there is a lion outside, I shall be slain in the midst of the streets" (Prov. 22:13). *Secondly*: These ministers loved not only their Lord, but also the good of the community. And therefore they strove to remove and take away the cause of every evil from it as quickly as possible. *Thirdly*: That there might be to all servants an example of ready obedience, of speed and alacrity — which the wise man greatly commends (Prov. 22:29): "Hast thou seen a man swift in his work? He shall stand before Kings, nor shall he be before the ignoble." "For these [things]," says Euripides in [the] *Alcmena*:

> δούλοις ἄεισα κἀφ᾽ ὅτῳ τεταγμένος / εἴη τις ἀνδάνοντα δεσπόταις ποιεῖν.

[Euripides, Alcmena: "For slaves [it is best], upon whatever [task] one is appointed, to be doing what is pleasing to [their] masters."]

But than a servant [who is] slow, yawning, [and] stretching himself, what [is] more troublesome? "Just as," says the same our Wise man (Prov. 10:26), "vinegar to the teeth, and smoke to the eyes, so [is] the sluggard to those who sent him." *Fourthly*: That we may understand of what sort we ought to be toward the heavenly Lord, and the true JESUS, when he commands something. For we must run — and, if it could be, fly — whither he wills us. Known indeed, yet very much to be noted, [is] that [saying] of St. Ambrose (in the chapter "on Mary's departure into the hill-country," bk. 2 on Luke): "The grace of the Holy Spirit knows no slow endeavors." Whence [in] Isaiah 18:2: "Go, swift Angels [messengers], to a nation rent and torn." *Fifthly*: That we may recognize the diligence of Joshua himself, when something was commanded him — either by Moses of old, or by God now. For as [are] the masters, such also [are] the servants. καὶ μέτεστι τοῖς δούλοισι δεσποτῶν νόσου [*kai metesti tois douloisi despot■n nosou*, "and slaves partake of their masters' malady"], says the same Euripides. *Sixthly*: In executing the divine sentences and judgments, how great a speed of the heavenly Angels do we suppose [there is]? How gladly do they perform the [things] which look to the glory of God and the common good? Truly, even the true JESUS is called (Isaiah 8:3): "Hasten to take away the spoils, make speed to plunder." And the same [is] "seeking judgment, and swiftly rendering what is just," in the same [prophet] (ch. 16, v. 5). But why did the same [men] so throw down "the [things] which they had found" before the eyes of all? If the [vowel-]points be removed from the Hebrew word, it could be read "he threw [it] down," or rather "he poured them out"; and so some in the Talmud of the Rabbis read [it], and said [that] Joshua, when he had beheld those stolen trifles, being indignant and bearing ill so great an offense of God for such tiny things, poured them out on the ground before the ark with these words: "Wast

thou, O Lord of the world, about to slay for these [things] a great part of the Israelite senate?" But that reading is rejected by all the other Rabbis, by all the texts which consist of [vowel-]points, by the Chaldee Paraphrast, [by] the Seventy, and [by] all the Latins: and therefore [it is] also a stupid interpretation, and insulting to Joshua himself. It must therefore be said that the sent ministers poured out those [things] to show how [greatly] they detested this crime.

Question XXIX. With what punishment was the sacrilegious Achan afflicted?

Achan's punishment is described as to [its] antecedents, as to the punishment itself, and as to [its] consequents. Those [antecedents] are in his leading-down to the place of execution, [his] escort, and [the] address [to him] (vv. 24, 25). The punishment is [in] verse 25. The consequents are either two — the ceasing of the divine wrath (v. 26), and the naming of that place (in the same verse) — or three, if there be added the heap of stones, piled up for an everlasting detestation and infamy. But concerning the punishment of Achan himself, three [things] are now to be explained. The first is, what the difficulties concerning it are. The second: what the opinions [are]. The third: which of all these [is] the best.

I: These are the difficulties. *First*: The Lord commanded (v. 15) that the sacrilegious [man] be burned. But here he is not said [to be] burned. For (v. 25) "all Israel stoned him." But only his goods were consumed by fire (ibid.). *Secondly*: The Seventy, though in the same v. 15 they rendered "the sacrilege [is] to be burned," afterward make no mention at all of a burning — not even in the case of Achan's own goods. *Thirdly*: Josephus too mentions nothing, neither of the burning nor of the stoning. *Fourthly*: In the Hebrew text, word for word, that punishment is thus described, as Vatablus and Cajetan note: "And all Israel stoned him with a stone: and they burned them with stones. And they raised over him a great heap of stones, unto

(col. 881)

to this day.

II: From these words, moreover, seven opinions were born, of which the main heads [are], as it were, two. The one is, that Achan was not truly burned, but only stoned. So many authors seem to think, who assert [he was] stoned, and do not add [that he was] burned — as the Apostolic Constitutions (bk. 7, ch. 3), the Seventy themselves in this place, [and] St. Thomas (on 1 Macc., ch. 3, v. 5). But this very [opinion] is handed down with a fourfold diversity. For, *first*, Rashi says that nothing at all is to be had concerning his [Achan's] burning. For the words by which that [burning] seems to be prescribed (v. 15), he thus expounds in the Hebrew: "And it shall be, [that] whatever shall be found in the anathema, [Israel] shall burn it itself with fire, and everything which is his." But what was found was Achan's tent. This, therefore, had to be burned, and all the [things] which pertained to it. So the Rabbi here [Rashi]. *Secondly*: Others [say] that a mention of burning is indeed had, but they explain [it] in three ways. *First*: that any punishment whatever is signified [by "burning"]; because all grief burns, as it were, the soul — for so [in] Deut. 4: "The Lord led you out of the iron furnace of Egypt," that is, out of the most grave and most wretched servitude of Egypt. So St. Augustine (in question 9 on this book). *Secondly*: that sometimes not every punishment, but that [punishment] which purges us from sin, and consumes and destroys it as though a certain flame, is called "fire" — as [in] 1 Cor. 3, [and] Num. 31:23; and so Achan [was] "burned," because purged from sin by stoning. So again St. Augustine: "Most rightly," he says, "is it said that the stoning was a fire; elegantly is it recognized that that punishment purged the man, lest hereafter he perish by that sin. Which the vessels in Leviticus also signify, which are commanded to be purged by fire." *Thirdly*: that Achan was to be burned, but by an everlasting fire, into which that unhappy [man] was cast down. So that those words about burning contain a prediction, [pointing] to the prophecy of what was to come. And therefore the Lord did not say "ye shall burn [him] with fire," but "he shall be burned with fire": because the Israelites were not going to burn Achan, but the Lord. So, in the same place, St. Augustine — concerning whom three [things] are to be observed. *First*: that he affirms none of these three [things] which have now been said, but only shows that any of these can be said.

For since he follows the text of the 70 Interpreters, and these (as I said above) treated only in v. 15 of Achan being burned, and afterward rendered [it] only [as] "stoned," it came to this, that he argued with himself thus: Either Joshua afterward changed the fire-punishment appointed by God for the sacrilegious [man] into stoning; or by "fire" he understood something other than we commonly [do]. But the former is not to be said. For a holy man would not have been disobedient to the Lord, and by his own judgment changed the Lord's precept. Saul the King changed [a command] once afterward (1 Sam. 13) — but with how great crime, and [with] God's wrath! The latter, therefore, is to be taken up; and then it must be inquired how the stoning which, according to the 70, Achan suffered, can be called "fire." "Two causes," says St. Augustine therefore, "occur to me — not that both hold, but that [it be] one of them, why he was not burned with all his [goods] by a visible fire." *Secondly*: [It seems] that there is, in that same exposition of Augustine, a slip of memory [μνημονικὸν ἁμάρτημα, *mn■monikon hamart■ma*], while, instead of the cited [passage] of Numbers, he cited Leviticus in that place. *Third*: [It seems] that there lurks an error in Abulensis (q. 61), while those two latter explanations are attributed not to Augustine but to Adamantius [Origen] — as is plain from the words there adduced, which are nowhere in Origen, but are in Augustine himself, and likewise in the text and margin of question 73.

The other division of opinions [holds that] Achan was afflicted with both punishments, of burning and of stoning — but in two [different] ways. *First*: [that he was afflicted with] both at once while alive — so that, while he was set upon his pyre and the fire was [applied], and the wretch was now burning, upon him at once a shower of stones was poured out by the surrounding people. So Cajetan, and perhaps R. Eliezer (ch. 38) and the book *Tanchuma*, of which afterward. And likewise Masius once [says]: "Meanwhile," he says, "while Achan is led down, while the pyre is built, kindled, [and] mounted, the people, eager to appease the Divinity, did not restrain their hands from throwing stones — as happens, while each strives to seem most vigorous in [averting] a public ruin, which is to be repelled." But [an opinion] diverse from and discrepant with these authors, [and] threefold, is brought forward as its ground. *The first*: For Cajetan judges it was done for the sake of mitigating the punishment, that he who had frankly confessed his sin might be less tortured by fire. *The second* [reason]: *Tanchuma* [says it was] for the sake of augmenting the punishment — [so] that, because he had violated the Sabbath, he should be stoned; because [he was] sacrilegious, he should be burned. *Thirdly*: Masius ascribes the whole [thing] to the rashness and fury of the crowd, [and] to [its] impatience of delay. *Secondly*: Both [say] he was afflicted with a punishment, but the one [punishment] while alive, the other [when] dead. But which [did he suffer] alive, and [was] first afflicted [with]? Masius doubts. For at first: "It is truer," he says, "and I think simpler, that Achan, with all his goods and [his] children, was indeed burned by God's commands." But afterward: "yet perhaps that opinion would not be absurd, if we should say the burning commanded by God looks to the corpses." But Abulensis (qq. 55 and 65) constantly and clearly says [he was] first stoned, and his corpse afterward burned, and covered with stones; and this Vatablus, Junius, Tremellius, [and] Calvin express in their [own] text. These [are] the opinions concerning Achan's death.

III: But among them, that seems to me the truest which [holds that] Achan [was] first indeed burned alive, then indeed overwhelmed with stones — [the Israelites] detesting the wicked [man] as though [he were] ashes. For, first, God had commanded (v. 15) that the sacrilegious [man] be burned. Therefore, if [he] was not burned alive, either God changed this sentence of his, or Joshua did not obey it, or understood it otherwise. Not the first, because God is not inconstant, nor does he change a pronounced sentence, unless some condition be understood — [which] being posited, there would be another judgment, as sometimes happens in a threatening prophecy: for example, if that [sentence] which Jonah announced to the Ninevites, of [their] impending destruction after forty days [were changed] — but here [it is] an absolute sentence, not a prophecy. Not the second, on account of the highest reverence of Joshua himself toward God, of which above: and because, surely, if he had failed in anything of the [things] which God had commanded, he would not have borne [it] unpunished — just as not only Saul, cited above, [did not], but neither [did] Moses and

Aaron (Num. 20:12), [and] Deut. 1:37. Not the third, because in a historical matter, when it is seriously commanded by the Lord what is to be done, the words are not to be taken in some I-know-not-what metaphorical or allegorical sense, but properly,

(col. 883)

or in that way in which they are commonly wont to be used. Otherwise all servants could play with their masters' commands, after the fashion of a certain Aesop. When, therefore, the Lord describes the whole method of the lot article by article, and adds the punishment of the detected sacrilege, one must not go off to I-know-not-what tropes, but do what the words properly describe. And truly [it] is wont so to be done in all the sentences of Judges too. For who would bear him who should interpret [as one] to be chastised with a sharp rebuke [the man] whom the Judge has pronounced [is] to be struck with the sword? — because the "tongue" is sometimes called "a sharp sword" (Ps. 56:5, Ps. 63:4), and "a sword [is] in the lips of some" (Ps. 58:8). But again, when this punishment is appointed against someone, that he be burned, it is understood of him [being] alive, unless from some clause, particle, or usage of the sentence something milder be gathered — as Corsetus shows [in his note] on Covarruvias (bk. 2 *Various Resolutions*, ch. 10). *Secondly*: In verse 25 not only the punishment, but also the order of the punishment is described. For when [something] is treated of others than Achan, it is said first, "they burned them [*ipsos*]," or "them [neuter]"; then, "they overwhelmed them," or "them, with stones." Therefore the same punishment, and the same order, is to be understood in [the case of] Achan. For [that he] was burned is not [expressly] said in a marked way, but from the precept of the Lord previously laid down it is sufficiently given to be understood — from which, as [was] said a little before, [one] could not depart — and only this is added here which, besides that which had before been expressly said, was superadded: namely, the stoning. But because concerning the burning of all [the things] which were Achan's it had before been prescribed together with Achan, [the text] subjoins generally, as much concerning the punishment as concerning the order: "and they burned them or them: and with stones they overwhelmed them or them." Then [the text] returns to the very author of the crime, explaining that, besides the common [treatment] both to him and to others — [namely] the burning and the throwing of stones — there was something proper to him: the piling-up of a great heap of stones, of which afterward. *Thirdly*: When God first brings [in] some law, he is wont to punish its violation quite severely. But this [was] the first of all laws concerning the anathema promulgated in the land of Israel. *Fourthly*: "It was customary," says Masius, "to expiate sacrileges by fire: nor could an anathema altogether be more [thoroughly] abolished, so to speak, than if, going off into flame and smoke, it were dissipated and vanished." But Anathema were not only inanimate things, or brute animals, but the very men who had criminally and impiously taken or profaned something sacred, or who were devoted to God, sacred, and detestable, as was said in chapter 6, question 33. *Fifthly*: If we inspect all the other opinions before recounted, they have either many discordant [points], or certainly more scruples than this [opinion] of mine. For the first [opinion] openly does violence to the text. For since the lot is said to have "apprehended" the tribe, the clan, the house, [and] finally "apprehends" him who [was] the source [culprit], and it is at once added, "And it shall be, [that he who is] found in the anathema shall be burned." And it is plain from what is subjoined, "and everything which is his" — namely, [the goods] of the [man] found — because he violated the pact of the Lord, namely the same [man] found. "And he has done a work of folly in Israel." But if it should please [one] to play, or rather to rave, with that Rabbi [Rashi], would it not be permitted, in the Hebrew, to say [that] the niphal verb "yissareph" [*iffareph*, "he/it shall be burned"] does not admit an accusative after it? And that therefore [it is] rather to be rendered, "his mattock [*ligo*] shall be burned, and everything which is his"? For because he dug the earth with a mattock, and buried the plundered riches — the sense would be [that] this mattock, this instrument of the crime, and all the other [things] of the same Achan, were to be burned; and instead of "otho" [him/it] we should read, with those very same Hebrew letters, "utho," which is "his mattock," as [in] 1 Sam. 13:19. But the other reading of the sentence would say only generally that the sacrilegious [man] is to be afflicted with punishment; but would not define what that [punishment] ought to be. But so, in every

matter, it would be permitted to take the genus for the species. But the third and fourth [opinions], because [they are] metaphorical, are already rejected by the first argument, and are rejected by many [arguments] from Abulensis (qq. 61, 62, 63, 64). *The fifth* [opinion]: That [Achan], alive, should at once be burned [and] at once assailed with stones, [is] unheard-of. For one stone conveniently driven into him would have freed him from the greater trouble of the fire, and he himself, [when] hit by the throw of several stones, would have smothered the flame. But if, half-scorched, he had afterward been exposed to the stones, or half-stoned, [and then] afterward dragged to the fire, both would have had to be done with great effort and a careful hand — which neither the reckoning of the desired time and speed, nor indeed the text, seems to bear, [the text] which relates that not a half-dead [man], but a whole and "sacred" [devoted] one, was to be burned, [and] relates the whole [man] also [as] stoned. *The sixth* [opinion]: But I do not believe [he was] stoned before [being] scorched, because it is both against the order of the text, and against the reasons above adduced. To which I add: if the stones had preceded the burning, it would have come to pass that, by an adventitious punishment, the culprit would be snatched from his own chief [punishment] — by an accessory [punishment] from that which [God] had distinctly decreed and commanded. But in my seventh [opinion] there is only this much of difficulty, [that it is] not expressly asserted in the text that Achan was cremated. But that kind of brevity, and silence, is most frequent in the scriptures; and it is so much the less to be disapproved, the more easily the thing which is passed over in silence can be understood from the antecedents or consequents — as [in] Gen. ch. 3, v. 8, where in the Hebrew that [phrase] is passed over in silence, "Let us go out of doors." But Rabbi Eliezer, in the cited chapter 38: "Why," he says, "the burning and the stoning? The stoning, because the sons of Achan knew that matter and did not indicate [it]: the burning, because on account of them 36 [men] had died."

Question XXX. What things, and what men, were burned and overwhelmed with stones together with Achan?

The things indeed which are recounted in the text as abolished by the flames with Achan, and overwhelmed with stones, [are] fourfold. *The first*: All [the things] taken away by the sacrilege — the cloak, the silver, and the gold. *The second*: Brute animals — oxen, asses, and sheep. *The third*: The tent. *The fourth*: The whole household stuff — namely, [things] for food, for clothing, for the kitchen, for war, and if [there be] any similar. For every kind of domestic instrument, and all possession of goods, is contained in the Hebrew phrase — all [the things] which were Achan's, [which] he willed to be destroyed by fire (v. 15). And [the text] relates [them] destroyed (v. 25), according to our Latin version, where the 70 are silent. But as for men — whether any others were burned together with him — there is a twofold opinion.

(col. 885)

One, the common [opinion], [is] that his sons and daughters were burned with him — who are clearly related (v. 24) [as] led with him to the deadly valley of execution. *The second* [is the] opinion of certain of the Jews (in Abulensis, qq. 68 and 73), among whom [are] Ralbag [Gersonides] and R. Isaiah — [namely] that Achan alone was burned and stoned, but his sons and daughters were led thither for the sake of watching. Cajetan too says [it is] uncertain whether the punishment was inflicted on them, but [asks] whether [it is the mark] of a wise [man] to depart from the common and well-worn [reading], without cause, without argument and reason. Surely Cajetan did not wish to depart [from it] either. And truly, if we consider the text rightly, [it] is clearly enough signified. For in the same manner, and to the same end, the sons and daughters are said to be led into the same place to which [were led] both Achan's stolen goods and cattle, the tent and the household stuff. But these were led [thither] to be burned, as those confess who have feigned for themselves the other opinion. Therefore [so were the children]. *Secondly*: All the Israelites ran together thither to the spectacle of the execution. Why, then, for that cause, was it necessary that the sons and daughters be led [there]? Nay, even if they had been led [there] on that account, I do not know whether that would have been recorded,

since other much greater [things] are passed over. Because, therefore, the Hebrew text (above, q. 29) can be rendered — I was saying — "they burned them [*ipsos*, masc.]" or "them [*ipsa*, neut.]," it would be more convenient if we render [it] "them [neut.]," not as Calvin, Tremellius, and others [render it], "them [masc.]." *First*: Because in these [neuter] the sons and daughters too can be comprehended; but not, if we should render [it] "them [masc.]," would we rightly include in them the anathema-things, the beasts, the tent, [and] the household stuff. And therefore the Latin renders (v. 25) "and all [the things] which were his." Again (v. 15) "he shall be burned with fire with all his substance." By which words, surely, that exposition of St. Augustine is utterly excluded, which expounds "all the works of the sacrilegious [man] burned," because he so posited a "metaphorical" fire, namely, or "eternal" (above, q. 29). But the wife of the same Achan — [was she] comprehended in the same punishment? Abulensis denies [it] (qq. 54 and 68), and says all the authors deny [it]. And truly there is nowhere here any express mention of her. But why [she is] omitted, Abulensis thinks [there is] a cause in the same place. *First*: Because she was not anything of the husband's [property]. *Secondly*: Because (Exod. 34) God did not punish husbands in [the persons of] their wives, but in [their] sons and daughters, unto the fourth generation. But surely that a wife is something of the husband — nay, a great [part], and as it were half of his part — the scripture shows (Gen. 2:24, 25; Matt. 19:4, 5). And truly, with Dathan and Abiram, their wives too perished (Num. 16:27, 31). But in Exodus are shown the punishments — not any whatever with which God might sometimes wish to punish sins, but only those with which [he punishes] even the future posterity of a man. What, then, if we should believe [her] to have died beforehand? Especially since Abulensis says (toward the end of q. 72) that this can be believed of the older sons. Certainly, in the book *On Attend[ing]* (vol. 2), there is a saying of St. Ephrem: "Achan, with [his] whole family, [was] stoned by all the people."

Question XXXI. Why were inanimate things, and brute cattle, burned?

Junius, with his [collaborator] Tremellius, answers [that] God condemned, in Achan's goods and things, "the instruments of contagion." But surely the [things] which Achan stole were rather the matter of the contagion and sin than [its] instruments. But oxen, asses, and sheep [were] not even the matter. This whole [thing] was therefore done for the utmost detestation of this crime, and for the calling-away of all [men] from it, and for a warning that God's precepts are to be most accurately kept. For so we read that Dathan and Abiram, with [their] tents, [their] cattle (as it is in the Greek), and all [their] household stuff and substance, utterly perished (Num. 16:31, 32); so [in] Deut. 13:12 and following, where the Israelite cities, if perchance some stain of idolatry had defiled them, are commanded to be utterly burned up, with [their] citizens, cattle, and all household stuff. Whence also they are called by the Jews "niddachoth" [banished] cities, that is, exterminated and proscribed. So (above, ch. 6, q. 38) all the Jericho-things [were] destroyed. But [as to] why not the cloak alone, but the silver too and the gold, were burned up — not without cause might someone be in doubt. For in the previous chapter it was said that these were to be brought into the Lord's treasuries, and [so] it is said by Abulensis (q. 40). It can be answered, *first*: that they were indeed unclean before, by the contagion of the Canaanites, but were made much more unclean by the new sacrilege of this Jew: and therefore [were] deemed unworthy to be stored in the sacred treasury of the Lord — just as the impious and sacrilegious Jews afterward judged that the money of Judas was not to be sent into the *corban* [treasury] (Matt. 27:6). *Then*: [it was] signified that it not rarely happens that [things] which were gold and silver, and which were about to come, as most noble gifts, into the Lord's treasuries, [are] burned by everlasting fires through the crime of some one [man]. There is, for example, some youth of good talent, of illustrious character, born for letters, made for all piety and religion. Some depraved [man] lies in wait for him, and depraves him, and makes [it so] that he who was to be most useful and most illustrious in the Church of God becomes a heretic, a worthless [man], and lost. Another had resolved to enter the state of holy religion. But this holy purpose is snatched from him by someone's wickedness. And what but the Lord's treasure is [thus] snatched away? Another had now taken up religion, and begun to strive toward all the best [things] with a great zeal of

perfection and a keen care. Someone dissuades [him], and so praises to him sloth and idleness that from that most holy endeavor of his he slackens greatly, and passes an idle and little-religious life. Is not he [thereby] turned away from the Lord's treasury, and made fuel for the eternal fire?

Question XXXII. Why were Achan's sons and daughter burned?

That Achan's sons and daughters suffered these punishments on account of [their] own sin, certain Rabbis of old asserted (in Abulensis, q. 69) — namely, in the Talmud tractate *Sanhedrin* ch. 6, and in ch. 38 of R. Eliezer; and they placed that sin in this, that they were accomplices of the parent's sacrilege, and did not indicate [it], as was said above (q. 8). And [it] once pleased the fathers of the Council of Aachen under Pepin (bk. 1, ch. 2). And the same opinion now pleases the Innovators, Junius and Tremellius. "He condemned,"

(col. 887)

they say, "[in the persons] the contagion of complicity." And to this matter can be brought the word of God (Deut. 24:16): "The fathers shall not be slain for the sons, nor the sons for the fathers; but each shall die for his own sin." And Ezek. 18:4: "The soul which sins, itself shall die." And again (v. 20): "The soul which sins, itself shall die; the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father." And Jer. 31:30. And St. Bernard (epistle 326): "The punishment ought not to be equal, where the cause is unequal." Others will [have it] that they [the children] came to that [depth] of calamity on account of the father's sin. For (Exod. 34:7) it is said: "Who repayest the iniquity of the fathers upon the sons and grandsons, unto the third and fourth generation." This question can be treated in two ways. 1. Briefly and precisely, by saying only: on account of whose sin was this punishment inflicted on them? whether on account of [their] own or the father's? 2. More fully, so that both the adduced scriptures may be reconciled, and other [things] may be recalled to this question, with which it is entirely connected, [namely]: Can anyone be punished on account of another's sin? In the former way, therefore, I say.

First, whether Achan's sons and daughters were of such an age that they could be accomplices of the paternal impiety, or whether [they were] younger, is not established. So Cajetan, and Abulensis (qq. 70 and 72), who nevertheless, in the same places and in q. 53, grants that they were younger by birth, and not yet emancipated from the father's power. *Secondly*: If they were younger in age than to be able to consent to the paternal sacrilege, and to approve it either by [active] help or by silence, they were burned on the father's account; but if [they were] older, they could indeed be accomplices, yet that is not [thereby] necessary. Because he [Achan] could have received these spoils at Jericho without their knowing [it]; and buried [them] in his tent, they likewise not knowing. For if they had been so grown-up as to dwell outside his tent, it is plain that he could have hidden and buried the plunder in his own tent, they being ignorant. But if [they were] older indeed, yet so that they were still in the father's family, and used the same tent with him, it could happen that either by night, they sleeping deeply, he dug [it]; or by day, sent them meanwhile elsewhere, as though to do some other thing; or, they again approving and watching, he dug, but persuaded [them of] some other cause of the digging — for example, that he might have a little pit for keeping a cooler drink, or that he might keep some vegetables and roots, as is sometimes done here among us, or that he might set up some little column in the middle of the tent — or indeed something else accommodated to the place, the time, and [his] wit. If they were accomplices, they perished by their own crime — not so much because they did not accuse the father (to which Abulensis, on Deut. 13, q. 3, [and] Gregory of Toulouse, ch. 16, bk. 32, utterly deny that they were obligated; but others assert [they were], on the *2a2ae*, q. 68, a. 1, as Salonius there, controversy 3) — as because it pleased them, and they held it ratified and pleasing, as though they might thereby become richer. But if they were conscious to themselves of nothing, [the fact] that they were cremated is to be imputed to the father. *Thirdly*: It seems likely that Achan's sons and daughters were of every kind — that is, partly still little [children], and ignorant of all evil, partly somewhat grown-up; and that these, either all or certainly some of them, had noted with their eyes what the father had done, and had delighted, as it were, in that notable gain.

And so [they] perished, condemned to the fire partly for the paternal, partly for [their] own guilt. The other [things] which you might require concerning these, you will find in the other manner of treating this question, below (qq. 36 and 39).

Question XXXIII. On what men, or things, is the punishment of cremation inflicted?

Punishment is not properly inflicted on the things of men, yet it is said to be inflicted for the sake of the men themselves who are punished. And to the question it can be answered, generally, [that] either men or their things are rightly burned, on whom [or which] either good laws, or good and prudent Judges, decree that punishment. But specifically, *first*: the Sodomites were burned of old (Gen. 19); and [so] at this time too, as the laws prescribe, by which, when I was traveling from Nuremberg thither to Altdorf, I saw two [men] burned. *Then*: adulteresses (Gen. 38:24); and the same [is] even now practiced among the Saxons, [still] Gentiles [pagans], as the most suitable author, St. Boniface, relates (in his letter 19 to King Ethelbald) — from which [is] the chapter *Si gens Anglorum* (dist. 50). *Thirdly*: the incestuous (Lev. 20:14). *Fourthly*: the sacrilegious (this chapter 7; and *ff.* [the Digest], the law [assigning] the punishment of sacrilege to the *Lex Julia* on peculation). *Fifthly*: authors of public damages, among the Philistines (Judg. 15:6). *Sixthly*: Hither too perhaps can be referred the murmurers against God, who were as it were burned and bitten to death by the fiery serpents (Num. 21). *Seventhly*: Magi [sorcerers], St. Gregory (bk. 1 *Dialogues*, ch. 4), [and] Mariana (*Affairs of Spain*, bk. 7). *Eighthly*: Evildoers, whoremongers, and Witches of every kind, today, from law 3 of the *Code*, *On the Maleficent*; Delrio (bk. 5 *Magic*, sect. 16). *Ninthly*: Heretics. Zonaras (in the life of Alexius); St. Antoninus (in the *History*, part 3, title 19, ch. 1, §4). See Bellarmine (bk. 3 *On the Laity*, ch. 22). And although the Innovators often clamor against ours, yet in the thing itself they have approved [it] — since the Basel [people] dug up David George [Joris] again, not four days [dead], but more than two years [dead], and burned [him], as in the year 1559 it came out in a certain booklet of the Academy of that place, in which this [is] the sentence of the Judges: "Since David George had been the author and favorer of a most pernicious sect, and [was] guilty of [violating] the divine majesty and the Christian religion, [it is decreed] that his corpse, or bones, and whatever should remain in his sepulchre, be dug up, [and taken] outside the Stony Gate, where the extreme punishment is taken on the condemned, together with [his] books, and his effigy [suspended] high on a spear, as it had been hung; [and] be dragged, placed upon a cart, by the executioner, and all [these things], placed at once upon a pyre, be reduced to ashes — not otherwise than as would be done with David George himself by Imperial Law, if he himself were surviving." And before, by Calvin's zeal, Michael Servetus was burned alive at Geneva, in the year 1553, on the 27th day of October — as his published Acts there attest, and Theodore Beza relates in the life of that same Calvin. And in the epistles of the same Calvin (p. 147), concerning a certain Anabaptist and Helvidian: "He was thrown into prison," writes Bullinger, "to be burned with fire unless he should sing a palinode [recant]. Nevertheless Curio, beaten with rods, was cast out from Rhaetia." *Ninthly* [so printed — the printer's numbering repeats here; read "tenthly"]: Slanderers: P. Aerodius (bk. 9, ch. 20, from Ammianus). *Tenthly*: Agents and procurators of imperial affairs, who had afflicted the provincials with injuries (law 9 of the *Code*, *ut causa fiscalis*). *Eleventh*:

(col. 889)

One who had broken through the Nile's embankments (the sole law, in the *Code*, *On the Embankments of the Nile Not to Be Broken*). *Twelfth*: Male slaves with whom their mistresses had secretly consorted as wives (the sole law, in the *Code*, *On Women Who Joined Themselves to Their Own Slaves*). *Thirteenth*: Parricides, in the *Ecloga* [under the title] περὶ πατροκτόνων [*peri patrokton*■*n*, "concerning parricides"]. *Fourteenth*: Slaves who had given [their] effort to the ravishing of virgins and nuns [*sanctimoniales*] (the sole law, *Code*, *On the Rape of Virgins*). *Fifteenth*: Slaves who had plotted against the life of their Masters, as law 28 (*ff.* [the

Digest], *On Punishments*) says. *Sixteenth*: Coiners of counterfeit money, or forgers of gold pieces [*solidi*] (law 2, *Code*, *On False Money*). *Seventeenth*: The registrars of cities [*tabularij*] granting a false immunity (law 1, *Code*, *On Immunity Not to Be Granted*). *Eighteenth*: One who had given to barbarians, by a criminal faction, the means of harm against the Romans, or if anyone in another way distributed [such means, once] made (law 9, *Code*, *On Military Affairs*). *Nineteenth*: Jews and Heretic "heaven-worshippers" [*coelicolae*] who had inflicted injury on those returning to their senses [converting] from their sect (law 3, *Code*, *On the Jews*). *Twentieth*: Those who have wickedly handled the most sacred Eucharist. Surius, in [his] history, [treats] once and again of Jews in Germany and Poland. But many are sometimes burned alive without [judicial] laws, from the anger and cruelty of Princes — not only holy Martyrs, but others also: as by Gallienus's command, [those] who had sought his captive father in the [triumphal] procession, in Trebellius [Pollio]; by Probus's command, the authors of the murder of Aurelian and Tacitus, in Zosimus (in [the life of] Probus). But this is nearly always observed today, that for those who repent of their crimes there is not a burning-alive, but strangulation and then burning, as Covarruvias explains (bk. 2 *Various Resolutions*, ch. 10, toward the end), and Clarus (q. 99, no. 7).

But the things which are sometimes burned on account of human crimes are various. *First* indeed, cities and the dwellings of men (Deut. 13:16); and there is an example in Sodom and Gomorrah (Gen. 19), in our Jericho (ch. 6), Ai (ch. 8), Jerusalem (Jer. 21:10), and so many others, to whose number can be referred those which the Martian flames [of war] drank up. *Second*: Idols (Deut. 7:5); all the vessels of the Baalic worship (2 Kings 23:4); that nefarious golden calf which the mad Israel adored (Exod. 32; Deut. 9:22). *Third*: Anathema-things [devoted things], such as [were] prescribed here in ch. 6. *Fourth*: Sacrilegious spoils, as these Achanic ones, ch. 7. *Fifth*: The bones of the impious (2 Kings 23:16). *Sixth*: Unfruitful earth (Heb. 6; 2 Kings 23). *Seventh*: Finally, books and papers [that are] wicked, impious, impure, magical, [and] heretical. Concerning the Atheists, Cicero (*On Divination* 1), [and] Lactantius (bk. 1 *On the Anger [of God]*, ch. 9). Of magical [books] there are examples: Acts 19; in Chrysostom (homily 38 on Acts); Ammianus (bk. 29); Athanasius (*On the Incarnation*); Nazianzen (oration on St. Cyprian); St. Augustine (on Psalm 61); Marcus (in the life of St. Porphyry); and the law *Mathematici* [*Code*, title] *On the Bishop's Hearing*. Of Saracenic [books], in Nicholas [I] (bk. 1, *On the Consultations of the Bulgars*). Of the Alcoranic [books] of the Turks, in Gómez (bk. 2, on Francisco Ximénez, Cardinal). Of the Talmudic or impious blasphemies of the Jews, in Thomas of Cantimpré (bk. 1 *On Bees*, ch. 3, no. 7); Sixtus [of Siena] (bks. 2 and 9 of the *Library*); and many others cited in the former Rabbi [above, ch. 33]. Of the heretical books of Arius: Socrates (bk. 1, ch. 6); Sozomen (bk. 1, ch. 20); Theophanes (in [his] Chronicle). Of Eunomius: Theodosius (in the Code, law 26). Of Eutyches and Apollinaris: the law *Quicunque* (*Code*, *On Heretics*); St. Leo (to Turibius, ch. 16); Theophanes (in [his] Chronicle); St. Prosper (in [his] Chronicle). Of Nestorius: [the title] *On the Highest Trinity* [Code, bk. 3]; from Ephesus; Cornelius Severianus; Novella 42. Of the Monothelites: the 6th Synod (Act 13). Of the Iconoclasts: Balsamon (on the 7th Synod). Of Adalbert: bk. 2 in the life of St. Boniface. Of the Hussites, Lutherans, Calvinians, and the like: Cochlaeus (in the Hussite history), and Surius (in [his] history). For rightly might you say of all [these] what Blessed Cyril once said (Catechesis 6) of the books of the heretic Buddas: that they are "monuments of impiety." But see Bellarmine (in the place cited, ch. 20), and — [he] who after him most diligently and most learnedly treated this whole disputation concerning these and other writings pernicious to faith, reputation, or the integrity of morals — our [own] Gretser (bk. *On the Right and the Custom of Prohibiting Noxious Books*). But just as St. Peter (2nd epistle, ch. 2, v. 6) says the burning of the Sodomites [was] "an example of those who were about to act impiously," so all these flames ought either to deter us by the magnitude of the crimes which are avenged by them, or to persuade [us] that here [now] some beginning of those [flames] is already being made, which no Ocean shall ever extinguish.

Question XXXIV. Why were stones cast upon the ashes, or the half-burned bones, of all [these]?

In the Digests (law 28, *On Punishments*): "The highest punishment," says Callistratus, "[is] condemnation to the fork [gallows], the burning of the living, [and] the amputation of the head." And in book 21, Celsus [says]: "By 'the last,' we interpret the punishment to be death alone." But if death is the highest and last punishment, why is [cruelty] still exercised upon corpses, or rather upon the unhappy remains and ashes of corpses? But [these are] doubtless [signs] of the extreme and highest punishment there; and by Apuleius (bk. 10) death is styled "the extreme [punishment]," by Suetonius and Livy "the last punishment," because after it — [seeing] that it may bring present pain to the body — nothing more can be inflicted. Whence also our Lord (Luke 12:4): "Be not terrified by those who kill the body, and after this have no more what they may do." Nay, as the Latin [sage] of the Gentile wise men [Seneca] discourses (epistle 93): "as we neglect hairs shorn from the beard, so that divine mind, about to go out of the man, judges [it] to pertain to itself no more — whether the fire burn up that receptacle in which it is kept, or a wild beast tear it apart, or earth cover it — than [it does] the afterbirth to a newborn infant. Whether the birds scatter [it] cast forth, or it be consumed, given as prey to the dogs of the sea — what [is that] to him?" Yet the force of the living strives, for various causes, still to torment corpses. And this [is] either well or ill. Well indeed, *first*, while it shows that foulness and magnitude of some [man's] wickedness to be [such] that, if it could be, more punishments would have to be heaped upon the wicked [man]. *Secondly*: While by that very [act] it wishes to terrify the living and watching mortals, that they abstain from such crimes, for which [there] survive punishments so dire and infamous beyond death. *Thirdly*: That to the wicked and criminal [men] themselves, while living, some pain be inflicted from the future evil, while it is signified to them that their bodies are so contumeliously to be handled, torn, and mangled. But ill [is] the same [thing] done in quite various ways; but concerning which there is now

(col. 891)

no need to treat [further]. And that this contumely of corpses is sometimes very bitter, Plutarch indicates (in the book *On the Delayed Vengeance of the Deity*), when he says that Dionysius the Tyrant seemed to be afflicted with a greater injury when his dead body was cast out by the Syracusans, than if a divine vengeance had been sent upon his sons. But of those three causes, the two former stirred up this [hail of stones] upon the burned Achan and his things. For the Israelites wished, each for himself, to make attested how greatly they detested the committed sacrilege, the violation of the divine precept, and [to attest] their own future obedience thenceforth in these and other such [matters]. For because the individuals could not bring the flame to those [things], they each seized stones, by the throwing of which they might show themselves to abhor this crime, and might render the angry God propitious. But whether this very thing was foretold to Achan, some conjecture can be made from this, that to Abulensis (qq. 55 and 65) this stoning seems then to have been commanded by God, when the cremation was ordered. But Masius and others think [it] was as it were fortuitous and sudden, born from the impetus of the people, indignant and raging against the wicked [man], as [was] intimated above (q. 29). If [it] was then commanded by God, surely those two [things] were pronounced to Achan at once — the burning-alive and the stoning — so that, from a certain foretelling, as it were, of those punishments, he might perceive beforehand some trouble and grief. But if [it was] not then commanded, [it was] not even foretold. Either is probable.

Question XXXV. Achan being now overwhelmed, why was a heap of stones raised [over him]?

"They gathered," says our text (v. 26), "upon him a great heap of stones, which remains unto the present day." By which words three [things] are signified. *First*: That this was done to Achan alone, but not to his sons, daughters, and things. And therefore Vatablus renders inconsiderately, "They raised upon them a heap of great stones." For the Hebrew clearly says, in the singular, "upon him," and [it is] noted also by Ralbag; and the Greek [has] ἐπέστησαν αὐτῷ σωρὸν λίθων μέγαν [*epest■san aut■ s■ron lith■n megan*, "they

set upon him a great heap of stones"]. Nor did Masius necessarily say that [there] is [here] an enallage of numbers [a grammatical change of number]. For since the context had put the plural number so accurately, why would it suddenly have changed [it]? Why, without necessity, is a trope feigned? *Second*: The same [was] done deliberately and of set purpose, but not by a fortuitous and rash heaping of the people. For the Hebrew verb "of raising," the Latin "of gathering," [and] the Greek τῷ ἐφιστάναι [*t*■ *ephistanai*, "the setting-upon"], indicate care and solicitude. And this is confirmed from [the fact] that Josephus says this heap was heaped up not at that same time when Achan was burned and stoned, but the following night. Whence Masius also calls [it] "a tomb." *Third*: That this heap was great and long-lasting. For that [it was great] is expressly stated; but this [that it was long-lasting] is signified by that [phrase], "which remains unto the present day." And to this clause is subjoined the same force which [is subjoined] to other similar [clauses] above (ch. 4, v. 9; ch. 5, v. 9). Josephus says [the tomb] was τάφον ἀτίμητον καὶ καταδίκῳ προσήκουσαν [*taphon atim*■*ton kai katadik*■ *pros*■*kousan*, "a dishonored tomb, and one befitting a condemned [man]"], that is, a dishonored sepulchre, and [such] as would befit a condemned guilty [man]. But why for Achan such a sepulchre was raised, the reason is at hand: that not only at the very time of the execution, or [for] a few days afterward, but always, as it were fresh, Achan's punishment might be before the eyes of all; and so more and more they might flee from everything which stirs up the wrath of the Divinity, and especially from sacrilege — [that sacrilege for] which [Achan] had, with so great a heap of stones, [been] overwhelmed in that place. Someone once wrote, concerning a notorious robber:

> *"Under this mountain of stones lies buried Balista; / by night, by day, traveler, take thy way in safety."*

And that heap cried out, both to those who then lived and to all who followed, that a sacrilege lay buried beneath it: [and] that therefore they should flee sacrilege as diligently as possible. And that heap seems to have been built up and piled from all those stones which had been hurled both at him and at all his other [things], so that he who had been the author and prince of so great an evil to all might always in a manner bear the punishment of all: and so [that] he who had not before allowed the [things] to be burned that were to be burned, might himself be burned; and he who had covered, and as it were buried, the [things] which were not to be covered with earth, might himself, unburied, be covered by a mass of stones.

Question XXXVI. How, through Achan's punishment, was the Lord's fury turned away from the Israelites?

This question is understood [as compounded] of three, as it were, propositions. The first is: with one [person] sinning somewhat gravely, the whole people and community is reckoned to sin. The second: with one thus sinning, God is angry also against some whole people and community, and by him it is punished. The third: with that one [person], who thus sinned, being punished through [i.e. in] the people and community, God ceases from [his] anger and from the punishment of the people. But I speak not of the first and original sin of all men — in which the first and second proposition [is] most clear — but of an actual [sin]. The first indeed is shown at the beginning of this chapter (v. 1): "the sons," it says, "of Israel transgressed the commandment, and usurped [something] of the anathema." But this one Achan [alone] had done, as has hitherto appeared; and [at] v. 11: "Israel has sinned, and transgressed my covenant, and they have taken of the anathema, and have stolen and lied"; (v. 12): "Israel is polluted with the anathema." Nevertheless that contagion of sin is not of such a kind that there is truly sin in the individuals, but only that there is truly [sin] in one alone, [while] in the others [it is reckoned] through a certain moral estimation, the cause of which will afterward be given. But falsely do Junius and Tremellius here charge the Israelites [as] if they truly sinned — "because they neither" (to retain their words) "kept Achan from sin, nor from the contagion and guilt, which God had foretold above (ch. 6:21)." For how ought they, or could they, have kept Achan from sin? They sinned, therefore, synecdochically, and as to a certain moral imputation. The other [proposition] is also plain from this same [passage], v. 1: "The Lord was angry against the sons of Israel." And [those] who had been sent against Ai

[as] warriors, at once turning [their] backs, were struck, and there fell of them 36 men

(col. 893)

at verse fifth. And afterward, when Joshua seeks the cause of this disaster (v. 7), he understands (v. 11) [that] it was Achan's sacrilege. St. Chrysostom (homily 6 on Ephesians): "That you may know," he says, "to how great a punishment they are liable who are caught in such sins, consider those things which are ancient. One had stolen sacred moneys, though he was a military man: and all perished. Do you know the history? I speak of [the son] of Carmi, who had stolen the anathema." And a little after: "God knows [how] to punish even the just together with the impious — of which kind it happened in [the case of] Daniel, in the three boys, of which kind in innumerable others, of which kind in wars, which happen even at this time." St. Augustine (bk. 6 *Against Julian*, ch. 7): "Concerning the anathema [that was] forbidden, because one usurped [it], vengeance proceeded against those who had not done this, nor known that it was done." Salvian (bk. 7 *On Providence*), when he had recounted the softness of Carthage, [its] lust, and [its] other companion impurity, and the disasters and miseries proceeding from it, subjoins: "But this," he says, "was the disgrace of a few: and [that] which was not perpetrated by the many could not harm all." Now indeed I have said above very often that in the people of God the crime even of one was a plague of many — as, from the theft of Achar, the people fled; as, from Saul's zeal, a pestilence arose; as, from David's numbering, a mortality: for so the Church of God is, as it were, an eye. For as into an eye, even if a small speck of dirt fall, it blinds the whole light; so in the Ecclesiastical body, even if a few do filthy [things], nearly the whole light of the Ecclesiastical splendor is darkened. And therefore the Savior himself named the principal part of the Church an "eye," saying: "The lamp of thy body is thine eye. If thine eye be single, thy whole body will be lucid. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body will be dark." Whence the Apostle: "Know ye not," he says, "that a little leaven corrupts the whole lump?" The sacred scripture is full of other examples, as 1 Sam. 14; 2 Sam. 21 and 24. Whence that adage of the Hebrews: "Woe to the wicked, and woe to his neighbor." Which by Hesiod is thus expressed:

> Πολλάκι καὶ ξύμπασα πόλις κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπαύρει.

[Hesiod, Works and Days 240: "Often even a whole city suffers for a bad man." Serarius's Latin: "Often the whole people pays for the ill deeds of [one] man."]

By Homer more fully, when (Iliad, bk. 1) he tells in fable of the plague sent by Apollo into the camp of the Greeks, because — as Calchas, far the most excellent of all the augurs, explains to Achilles:

> ἦ τ᾽ ἄρ ὅ γ᾽ εὐχωλῆς ἐπιμέμφεται *(Apollo, namely)* / ἦ θ᾽ ἑκατόμβης· / ἀλλ᾽ ἕνεκ᾽ ἀρητῆρος ὃν ἠτίμησ᾽ Ἀγαμέμνων.

[Homer, Iliad 1.65–67: "whether he (Apollo) blames [us] for a vow, or for a hecatomb; but [it is] on account of the priest whom Agamemnon dishonored."]

Because, I say, King Agamemnon had ill received God's priest, and had been unwilling either to send back his ravished daughter Chryseis, or to accept the offered gifts. *Third*: [this is] also set here (v. 12): "I will not be any more with you, until you crush him who is guilty of this crime." (v. 13): "Thou canst not stand before thy enemies, until he be destroyed out of thee, who is contaminated with this crime." But now, he being destroyed, the fury of the Lord was turned away (v. 26). For because, while the people itself inquires into the author of the crime and punishes him, it openly professes that it wills not the offense of God, nor [his] wrath; [and that it] wills to obey all his precepts; to detest the sins and crimes by which he is deservedly provoked, and to do penance, as it were public, by tearing from its own body a certain member of its own — therefore by a punishment of this kind the Lord is appeased. Just as also [in] 2 Sam. ch. 21; nay, by the sole will of inflicting the punishment — publicly, and [as far] as the matter allowed, attested seriously and in the very deed — [the Lord] was appeased (1 Sam. ch. 14, v. 44). And this cause and opinion also once drove the Delphic citizens — [so] that, when they had brought an unjust death upon Aesop, and therefore were divinely afflicted with the most grievous punishments of various diseases and of sterility, they might, with public

tears as it were, beg pardon of the gods (albeit false); the cities of Greece walked about in mourning, and, moreover, through heralds sought everywhere with cries [that] he who wished to take vengeance should come forth, and appoint a punishment — [they declaring] that they would of their own accord and gladly undergo it, whatever at last it might be — as Plutarch relates in the book *On the Delayed Vengeance of the Deity*.

Question XXXVII. For what causes does the Lord rightly punish some innocent [persons], with temporal punishments, on account of the guilt of others?

By the sin of another alone — which is called "original" — we are all truly made sinners; but by the sins of others, however enormous, if to them nothing has been committed or omitted by us, we are never truly and properly polluted: yet by their temporal punishments we are truly and properly touched and tortured, as was said in the previous question. But the causes of this thing are [these]. *First*: The society, and the conjunction of certain men among themselves, which exists either from a certain natural bond — as between a father, children, and kinsmen — or from a moral, economic, and public [bond] — as between the same [persons as] citizens of a commonwealth and kingdom — or, finally, from a supernatural and Ecclesiastical [bond] — as between the same [persons as] Christians of the Church, sharers of the same religion, colleagues of the same college. For this consociation makes [it so] that a multitude of men is as it were one body, as the Apostle explains (1 Cor. 12 and Eph. 4); and likewise, among the profane [authors], Livy, [and] Maximus of Tyre (in orations 5 and 20). Now indeed, on account of the disease, wound, and ulcer of one member, we see the others languish, and all be tortured. What wonder, then, if, with one sinning, the others are reckoned in a manner to sin, who are of the same body with him, and on his account fall into certain evils and troubles? "It is shown," says St. Augustine (q. 8), "how greatly connected this is, in the society of the people itself, [in] the universality — that they are reckoned not in themselves as individuals, but also as, [it were,] parts in a whole." *Secondly*: The same conjunction effects [it] that, [seeing] we are partakers of the prosperity, joy, fame, and glory of those who are held in the same body with us, why then [should we] not [be partakers] also of [their] adversity, sadness, infamy, and disgrace? *Thirdly*: Through a communion of this kind of punishments, there is cast upon all that care and solicitude, that not only [each] himself may not sin, but that others too, joined by some bond, may not sin. For who would not gladly and studiously provide that [his] children, kinsmen, relatives-by-marriage, fellow-citizens, associates, fellow-soldiers, subjects, servants, parents, masters, Princes, Lords, Pastors — [men] finally of all orders — do not commit anything, if he understood himself to be called to punishment for their offenses, [and] about to fall in the same ruin with them? "Among them," says St. Augustine in this place,

(col. 895)

(q. 8): "who fear such [things], discipline is established, that not only each be on guard for himself in the people, but that they mutually apply diligence to one another, and, as [members] of one body and of one man, some members be solicitous for others." *Fourth*: In God's power is the highest right over all our wealth and opportunities, the highest arbitration of our fame, honor, and glory, [and], finally, the highest power over the life and death of all. Therefore, by his own judgment, he can snatch these [things] from men in what way and when he wills, as [was] already touched above (q. 11): therefore he can do this most [rightly] then, when some cause underlies [it] which seems just and equitable not only to himself (which, whether known to us or not, [is] always best and most just) but also to our judgment — otherwise slight and feeble. But that we should participate in the prosperous and adverse [fortunes] of those who are more conjoined to us — is not [this], as I said a little before, upright and equitable? *Fifth*: The order of the whole world has this, that some things are for the sake of others, and for the safety and standing of one, another perishes and falls: with one perishing and falling, others perish, and more fall together. Why, then, should this not happen in [the case of] men too? *Sixth*: All good [men] are of that mind, that what of good they have, they would wish to be diffused

to as many as possible; what of evil, to be contracted and to stick in themselves alone: but the evil, on the contrary, [wish] that what of good they have be contracted, and that what of evil be in themselves alone, [and] be spread to as many as possible. The Lord therefore sometimes accommodates himself to the will of both, embracing the good will and [that] of the good, and sometimes directing [it] more wisely: using well the evil will of the evil, and leading it over to a certain greater good, neither desired nor thought of by them. *Seventh*: The living sometimes inflict on the dead certain [things] which, by this extension of punishments to others, seem [more] bitter. *Eighth*: Mortals learn, from the punishment of the innocent, how great and how capital a plague to the [human] race sin is, [seeing] that it is thus punished not in one alone, who bound himself by it, but in many others too. *Ninth*: They learn also, if for the fault of one a multitude is punished, what if the whole multitude should sin? "It is signified," says St. Augustine in the cited place, "how great an evil would be done, if that whole congregation had sinned, when not even one [man] could be so judged that from him the rest could be secure." *Tenth*: In the evils which come upon the guiltless on account of the guilty, there is — either always, or certainly very often — a certain bite of grief, which purges and stings the guilty themselves more keenly. For [those] whom these evils involve, are either their sons and friends, whom they love, or others. If [they are] sons and friends, [it is] a trouble and grief to them, that they are tortured by their [own] fault. "Very often," says St. Gregory (bk. 15 *Morals*, ch. 31), "the Father is struck in [his] sons, that he may burn more keenly: and the grief of the Father is repaid to the flesh of the sons, in so far as, through the punishments of the sons, the iniquitous death of the father is suffered." If [they are] others — is [it] not bitter and grievous [for them] to know that they, on account of evils of which they [are] the authors, are hateful and detestable to all? that they and theirs are held in hatred by all? that their name is torn by the voices and curses of all? that all their memory is cursed with dire [imprecations] by all? For it comes about, in a manner, always, that these [things] are either seen by the guilty [while] still living, or, if not yet seen, are felt beforehand in the mind and foretasted, or certainly are not unknown to [them when] dead. So that, if they are in the place of torments, they are tortured more; if [they are] among the blessed, [where] nothing of grief falls upon them, yet they pity the wretched more, and are busy to bring them greater help with God. And are not all these things done — is it not the best, wisest, [and] most just [thing]? *Eleventh*: Although — as the reasons hitherto adduced prove — God the Best and Greatest could, by his own right, for the sake of the highest good of the whole world, and especially of the men themselves, punish with temporary evils, [and] even with death itself, the upright and [those] altogether affine to no fault, for the favor of certain wicked [men]: yet it is the opinion of the noble Theologians that he never does this, unless in those very [persons] whom another's sins and miseries implicate, there also be, or have been, some proper fault of their own, on account of which they are most worthy of those evils and miseries. *First* indeed, because it seems more consonant to the divine goodness that he deprive no one of his benefit, unless he deserve [it]. *Second*: Those who, on the occasion of another's calamity, suffer something — either they are little infants, who by their own act can as yet sin nothing, or [they are] older [ones], who could now sin of their own accord. If [they are] little infants: [they] either have not yet expiated original sin through holy baptism, or [have] expiated [it]. If not yet expiated: death is owed to them under that name, not temporal or eternal life. "For the wages of sin [is] death" (Romans, ch. 6). If [they have] expiated [it], they are still worthy of the same, and of the other evils of this life. For by that sin, which is or was [theirs], man is always rendered liable, once he has not fully paid this debt. Hence St. Augustine (bk. 6 *Against Julian*, ch. 10) teaches [that], among the other evils of this life, even baptized little ones suffer the incursions of demons. St. Gregory (bk. 15 *Morals*, ch. 31): "What is it that little sons are very often snatched by demons, unless [it be] that the flesh of the son is punished by the father's punishment?" If [they are] older: first, they are of the same condition as the little infants, as to the debt of original fault: then, of a much worse [condition]. Because they now add certain sins of their own, the least of which are not unworthy of the extreme discomforts and tortures of this life, [and] even of death itself, if it be considered how great and of what kind it is to offend the divine majesty in even the least matter, and how little and almost nothing it is, [that good] which it happens [one] loses of the good of this life. Rightly, therefore, does God always [act], when for the cause of the guilty he sometimes strikes his [own] guilty ones

with [his] darts. *Twelfth*: But that all these things may cling to the mind more tenaciously, I will transcribe here the words of two writers, of whom the former [is] excellent among the Latins and Christians — [though] not professing Theology; the other, among the Greeks and Gentiles, following reason alone as [their] guide. I [the first]. From the second book of Justus Lipsius's *On Constancy* (ch. 16): "But indeed some unmerited and innocent peoples are punished, thou sayest. For [this is] this second complaint of thine — or rather, let me call [it] a calumny. Incautiously, young man, dost thou so speak? Are the unmerited punished? Where in the world, then, [are] peoples found by thee without fault? [It] would be presumption — nay, rashness — to place that [innocence] in some single man: [and] dost thou nothing doubt to establish peoples and nations sinless? Most vainly. For we sin, and we all have sinned, I know: born in a stain, we live in a stain: and [there are] now the arsenals of heaven, that, to speak with that Satirist,

(col. 897)

the [arsenals of heaven] would be without a weapon, if thunderbolts were always sent [only] upon the deserving. For not as fishes, born and nourished in the brine, yet do not taste of the salt: so [neither] is it to be reckoned [that] men [are] in this dregs of the world, [and] themselves without dregs. But if all [are] in fault, where [are] those unmerited peoples? For punishment is always most justly the companion of fault. But that inequality, thou wilt say, displeases: that certain [men] are oppressed who have sinned lesser [things], [while] they flourish and reign who [have sinned] great [things]. This was it, was it not? Thou wilt, I suppose, snatch the balance of heavenly justice from [God's] hands, and weigh it by a certain sense of thine own, and by thy weights. For to what else does this estimation of equal and unequal offenses look, than [that] which thou takest upon thyself before God? But consider two [things] here, Lipsius. The first: that another's faults cannot, [and] ought not, be estimated by a man. For how [could they]? Wilt thou, [poor] little man, weigh sins equitably, thou who dost not even attend [to them]? Wilt thou lawfully discern them, thou who dost not [even] see [them]? For [that] which thou easily grantest me — [namely] that it is the mind which sins: through the body indeed, and these instruments of the senses, but so that all the moment and weight of the crime is from itself [the mind]. Which is so true that, if thou determinest someone to have sinned unwilling, he has not sinned. But if this is [so]: how, I pray, wilt thou see through the sin itself, thou who [seest] neither its couch nor its seat? For thou canst not see a mind [so] foreign, any more than thine own. Great, therefore, is this vanity — or rather temerity — of thine, [in] claiming a censorship and estimation in a matter neither fully seen nor to-be-seen, nor known nor to-be-known. Secondly: consider that, though it be most [entirely] so, yet there is nothing evil here, nor iniquitous. Not evil, because it is for the good of those very [persons] who are chastised at once even in the least faults. That [is] a Divine love: and by right always suspect [is] the slowness to which a graver punishment adheres. Likewise not iniquitous: because we have all deserved punishment, as I said; nor ever, even in the best, [is] that purity [such] that some stain does not remain, to be washed off, as it were, by this salt water of disasters. Wherefore, young man, dismiss this most intricate suit concerning the estimation of faults, as a terrestrial and lowly delegate Judge: leave [it] to God, who will take cognizance of it far more equitably, and more certainly, from a higher tribunal. He alone [is] he who can weigh merits: he, who, without any paint or ceruse of dissimulations, sees virtue and vice in its own true face. Who could impose upon him, who searches out external [things] and likewise internal [things]? who sees the body, and the mind? who [sees] tongues, and fibers? [things] finally open and hidden? and who sees not the deeds themselves alone, but their causes, and progressions, in clear light. Thales, once asked εἰ λήθοι θεοὺς ἄνθρωπος ἀδικῶν [*ei l■thoi theous anthr■pos adik■n*, "whether a man doing wrong could escape the notice of the gods"], answered truly, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ διανοούμενος [*all' oude dianooumenos*, "nay, not even [when merely] intending [it]"]. But we, on the contrary, [are] here in a cloud; who not only do not see hidden crimes, but [those which are] committed under the tunic (as they say) and in the bosom — [these] we scarcely [see even] once they are laid open and dragged into the light. For we discern not the fault itself, and its force, but certain external footprints of [the deed] committed and already fleeing. Often the best to us [are those] who [are] worst to God: and, on the contrary, the rejected [are those] who [are] chosen by Him. Close,

therefore, if thou art wise, [thy] mouth and eyes concerning the deserving or undeserving. A cause so obscure is not well known off-hand [*de plano*]."

From the same [work], ch. 17. "But the third [objection] too — [that of] Justice cast upon thee — is a fog to be wiped away: [the objection] concerning the Substitutes. 'For God,' they say, 'transfers punishments too unjustly: and grandsons ill atone for the faults of [their] elders.' Ha? Is this so new or wonderful? Nay, I marvel [that] those mock-heroes marvel: since daily they themselves do this in their own land. Tell [me], prithee, [do] not the benefits which are given to the elders by a Prince, on account of [their] virtue, pass to the grandsons? Surely they pass. Nor otherwise [is it], I think, in the fines and punishments which are imposed on the same [descendants] for a crime. Behold, in the crimes of high treason or [lèse-]majesty, manifestly some are in the fault, others in the punishment. And human severity so aims at this, that laws are passed which punish innocent children with eternal want — that death be to them a solace, and life a punishment.

"It is the malignity of your minds! You wish [that] this be lawful to some King or dynast, [but] you do not wish [it lawful] to God? To whom, nevertheless, if thou examinest, [there is] the cause of this severity not a little more just. For we have sinned, and rebels to this great King we all [were] in one [man]; and through so many propagations of the stock, that first stain [was] propagated to the unhappy offspring. So there is a certain nexus and chain of these crimes before God: nor [is it] a fresh sinning, so to speak. My father, or thine, has now begun [it], but [before them] all the fathers of the fathers. What wonder, then, if he punishes in the descendants not properly diverse offenses, but [ones] joined by a certain communion of seed, and never intermitted? But that I may omit these sublime [matters], and treat with thee by a more popular way of reasonings: know this. [That] God conjoins [things] which we, through weakness or inexperience, separate: and [that he views] families, towns, kingdoms, not as some various or confused thing, but as one body and nature. That [family] of the Scipios or the Caesars is, to him, one [thing]: the Roman or the Attic city, through all its age, [is] one: one likewise [is] the Roman Empire. By right. For there is a certain bond, and a society of laws and right, which binds these great bodies; and effects [it] that among [men] sundered by [distance of] age there be a certain communion of rewards and punishments. And so [are] the Scipios of old good? — before that heavenly judge [it] profits their posterity too. [Are they] evil? [it] harms [them]. We Belgians, some years ago wanton, avaricious, impious, atone [for it]. Because in every external punishment God looks not upon the present things alone, but re-looks-upon the past too: and with the weights of both these times he tempers evenly the scale of his justice. I said, 'external punishment.' And I would have thee note [it]. For not the faults themselves are transferred, nor is there made a certain confusion of crimes: [that] is absent: but the punishment only, or certain chastisements, are those [things] which are about us, not in us: and they look properly to bodies, as to wealth, not to this internal mind. But what injury [is there] here? For surely we are willing to be heirs of the advantages and rewards, if any be owed to [our] elders: why should we refuse the burdens and the punishments?

> *"Delicta maiorum immeritus lues, / Romane." [Horace, Odes 3.6.1: "Thou, undeserving, shalt atone for the sins of thy ancestors, O Roman."]*

So sings that Roman bard. Truly — except that he adds 'undeserving.' For [it is] most deservedly, because the ancestors deserved [it]. But the poet could see the effect, [he] did not rise to the cause. But as, in one and the same man, we by right punish in [his] old age some offense committed in [his] youth: so God [punishes], in empires or kingdoms, old sins. Because by the external reasoning of communion they are a certain one [thing] to God, and conjoined. These intervals of times do not divide us in his sight, who holds all eternity enclosed in his capacious mind. Or [shall we say] that those Martian wolves [the Romans] of old overthrew so many cities, broke so many scepters, with impunity? [that] they drank so much slaughter and blood, they themselves ever un-rained-upon [unpunished]? Then at last I would confess [that] there is no avenger-God, who hears and sees what we do. But it is not so. It is necessary that they pay the penalties, sometime, even in their posterity — slow, though not late. Nor is this conjunction, in God's sight, of times only: but also of

parts. This I mean to say. Just as, in a man, when the hand, foot, [or] belly has sinned, the whole body atones for it: so in some common assembly, [the] fault of the few, all [must] often expiate. Especially if those who sin be, as it were, certain worthier members — as kings, Princes, magistrates. Truly Hesiod, [speaks] from the very inner-shrine of wisdom:

> Πολλάκι καὶ ξύμπασα πόλις κακοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπαύρει, / Ὅστις ἀλιτραίνει καὶ ἀτάσθαλα μηχανάαται. / Τοῖσι δ' οὐρανόθεν μέγ' ἐπήγαγε πῆμα Κρονίων.

[Hesiod, Works and Days 240–242: "Often even a whole city suffers for a bad man, whoever sins and devises reckless deeds. Upon them Cronion [Zeus] brought great woe from heaven."]

(col. 899)

Λιμὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ λοιμόν.

[Hesiod, Works and Days 243, the fourth line: "famine together with plague." Serarius then gives a Latin verse rendering of the whole:]

> *"For the crime of one, the whole city pays the penalties, / if anyone bear himself sacrilegiously or unjustly: / Jupiter hence, from high heaven, sent disasters — / a plague or a famine."*

So the whole fleet of the Argives perished. "For the crime of one, and the madness of Ajax son of Oileus." So in Judaea a single plague most justly took away seventy thousand men, on account of the unjust desire of the king. And sometimes the contrary. When all have sinned, God selects one, and a few, as it were expiatory [victims] for the public fault. In which [selection], if for a little while he departs from that rigid law of parity, yet from that very inequity a new equity arises: and there is a certain clement justice toward the many, [in] what seems severity toward the few. Does not even the schoolmaster's rod strike some one out of the number of the wanton flock; [does not] the general chastise a few, by decimation, out of a routed army? — yet each [does so] with a salutary counsel, because that punishment of the few nonetheless terrifies and amends all. I have often seen physicians cut a vein in the foot or arm, when the whole body ached: how do I know whether the same [holds] here? For these [are] secret things, [utterly] secret, Lipsius: and, if we are wise, we shall not too closely touch that sacred fire, of which we men can perhaps see certain sparks and flashes: [but] we cannot [see] itself. As those who fix their eyes too keenly on the Sun, lose them, so [do they lose] all the light of the mind who strain it upon this light. Let us abstain, therefore, I judge, from curious [inquiries], and [from those] with the peril of the question: and let this at least stand for us, that faults cannot, [and] ought not, be estimated humanly. [That] there is another balance with God, another tribunal. And howsoever those hidden judgments hold themselves, they are not to be blamed by us, but to be borne, and revered. This one sentence I press upon thee, by which I will impose [my] hand upon this matter, and at the same time [close] the mouth of all the Inquisitive:

> *"The judgments of God are many [and] hidden: none [are] unjust."*

II. From Plutarch's booklet *On the Delayed Vengeance of the Deity*. First, a certain Timon disputes against the derivation of punishments upon the descendants, and says: "[That] which Euripides complains of, and objects to the Divinity:

> *"The children often atone for the wicked crimes of [their] parents." [Euripides, via Timon]*

Even if we be silent, I think [it right] to reprehend [it]. For if those who have offended have already paid the penalties, it is not fitting that those who have done nothing unjust be punished. Since not even those who have perpetrated the crimes are reckoned to be consonant with justice or equity [if they were] to undergo punishment twice for one and the same thing. Accordingly, if the divine vengeance proceeds slowly, and the punishment which is owed to the wicked at length, late, afflicts the innocent — [God] does not rightly compensate the iniquity by the slowness." He [Timon] brings forward next eight or nine examples, by which he proves this very [point]. But when Plutarch had said all these [to be] either fables, or [things] similar to

fables, he goes on to show, by at least six arguments, how rightly it is done by God, that he pours out punishments from some upon others. And the first indeed agrees with my second [cause]; the second with the fourth; the third with nearly the same; the fourth with the first; the fifth with the seventh; the sixth with the first and fifth. Now, with one breath as it were, we have heard all these [as] one cause, [and] the eighth [argument] lucidly perorating. "That," he says, "the matter may at once, at the threshold, lie open and be made clear, let there be led into memory the honor which is wont to be had for those whose ancestors received the gods in hospitality; and also that fair portion which was conferred on the successors of Pindar, in the sacking of Thebes. For who would not deservedly be delighted by that pre-eminence of honor which so long coalesced and grew up among the Greeks? — unless [it be one] to whom, according to the same Pindar, a cold flame has fashioned a black heart. I pass over now the herald's-praise similar to this at Sparta, which is wont to be proclaimed after the Lesbian song, in memory and honor of that ancient Terpander: for it seems to rest on the same reasoning. But you I call, Philtiades, who among the Boeotians hold [it] worthy to be far preferred to others, since you proclaim yourselves sprung from illustrious parents; and you who among the Phocians are wont to glory on account of the race of Daiphantus — be present to me, I say, and a help, when Lycormas and Satilaeus divide between themselves the ancestral honor of the Heraclidae, and, restoring the Stephanophoria [garland-bearing], sing that it exceedingly befits [those] begotten from Hercules to obtain firm and grateful honors. Since [Hercules] himself, when he had affected the Greeks with immense benefits, had obtained no worthy reward and retribution." "Most beautiful, by Hercules," he says, "and quite worthy of Philosophy, [is] the contest thou hast proposed. Dismiss, therefore, ho! I say, that vehement kind of accusation, and take it not ill if sometimes those be punished who are sprung from wicked and depraved parents; or cease to glory and be praised for that honored nobility, [and] for [that] pre-eminence. For it behooves, if we desire to retain the honor of virtue or nobility in our race, [that we] also reasonably, on account of the permanent vengeance of crimes, not be indignant, but rightly reckon that these [things] mutually concur, and are converted [into one another] equally and evenly. For [he] who, sprung from Cimon, [is] excellently honored at Athens, but, [seeing those] descended from Lachares and Ariston despised, grieving with indignation discerns [this] — he seems quite fickle and heedless, nay rather more contentious, and troublesome to the Divinity. For he blames [it] when he discerns [that] the sons of unjust and wicked men fare happily: and again he criminates [it], if he perceives the offspring of the shameful and wicked to be coerced or utterly taken away; and he equally reprehends God, and accuses [him], whether he afflicts the son of a just, or of a guilty, father, or affects [him] with discomfort. And these [men] I set up as, [it were,] certain obstacles — exceedingly hostile and bitter accusers — against thee. Thence, resuming as it were the beginning of the nexus, so, [as men] disposed concerning the divine reasons, let us — from the darkness and inextricable errors — with intrepid piety lead [them] back to [their] duty, and let us persuade them [that] God does nothing but what is right, and is recognized [as] quite becoming; but [that] we, indeed, cannot, in these [things] which we are daily wont to do, show or express the manifest truth. As, for example: why we order the children of those who have died of phthisis [consumption], or of dropsy [*aqua intercus*], to sit [with their] feet immersed in water, until the dead [parent] be cremated: for by that compact [it is believed] the diseases are transferred, or [rather] believed [that they] can by no means pass over to them. And again, for what cause a she-goat, if it take the eryngium herb into its mouth, halts the whole flock, until the shepherd, coming upon [it], drive [it] off. There are also very many other [things] which contain latent forces, and produce incredible effects, and, with a stupendous swiftness or slowness, pass over from some to others. But we are wont to admire the intervals according to time, not place. For which is the more stupendous? Whether the plague which took its beginning in Ethiopia, filled Athens, took away Pericles, and ill-affected Thucydides? Or if, on account of the crimes of the Delphians and Sybarites, the vengeance of [their] crimes at length flowed down upon [their] descendants? For [things] have, from the last [ones], certain relations to the first, and affinities, the cause of which, although we be ignorant [of it], yet we know for certain [that they] happen not without reason. Accordingly, why, [seeing that] not only upon the stock of men, but publicly upon cities, the divine vengeance sometimes stalks — [why this] seems to have the pretext of justice, since a city is one

thing, and continuous, and admits no change, as animals [do], nor is wont [one] to be made from another, but is always conformable, and everywhere like to itself — [the vengeance justly demands punishment for] all the things which it does,

(col. 901)

the causes and the merits of all the things which it does, as long as it retains the nexus and series of the community, and preserves [its] unity, if it has been wont to recover itself. For if, on account of an interval of time, someone should wish to make several [cities] out of one city, he would be like [one] who should try to make several [men] out of one man: since [the man] who is now older was formerly younger, and once altogether a youth. These [reasonings] indeed would be like the Epicharmian [sophisms], out of which the augmented discourse of the Sophists grew, when they say [that he] who once received a loan now owes nothing, since he has become another [person]. And [that he] who yesterday was invited to dinner, today comes uninvited, for he exists [as] another. Accordingly, the changes in each one of us are greater than age is wont to make publicly in cities. For if, after the thirtieth year, someone should revisit Athens, he would surely recognize the manners now flourishing, the movements, disciplines, studies, the people's favor, anger, and hatred, and the rest of that kind, quite similar and conformable to those ancient and prior ones. But a man's form he would, though known and familiar, scarcely be able, meeting [it] after so great a space of time, to recognize. But the variations of manners, which by every reasoning, labor, passion, [and] by laws too, are easily changed, [these], to that [city] which is always present [continuous], seem to contain an absurdity and a wondrous novelty. But a man, from [the time] he is born, is called one [and the same] to the very end: and since the same [thing] befalls the city, [which is] thus permanent, we deem it worthy too that it be liable to the reproaches of [its] progenitors, since it deservedly desires to enjoy their glory, honor, and power, and reckons this just. Unless we should wish to plunge all affairs into the Heraclitean river, into which, they say, no one enters twice without being utterly moved [changed], and passing into an alien nature. If, therefore, a city is a certain continuous thing, and exists as one and conformable in a perpetual series, it is necessary too that the race proceed from the same beginnings, and refer back [carry on] a certain power and society. For [what is] begotten from that from which it is begotten cannot be severed or set apart as a certain constructed workmanship, since it was begotten from it, not by it, in such a way that it is contained [in it] as a certain part — both to be duly honored, and justly punished — and is carried round in its own self. And, unless I should seem to jest, I would indeed assert that the statue of Cassander, melted down by the Athenians, suffered far more unjust [things], and the body of Dionysius, dug up by the Syracusans after [his] death, was affected with a greater injury, than if a divine vengeance had been carried down upon their sons. For the statue of Cassander, by its own nature, could receive no injury, and the soul had long since left the dead body of Dionysius. But to Nisaeus, Apollocrates, Antipater, and Philippus, and all the rest sprung from wicked parents, there is a certain quite proper part of [their] progenitors implanted, and it adheres to them — not troublesome or burdensome, but [that] by which they are nourished in life, governed, and are wise. It is not, therefore, a wonder nor absurd, since they proceed from those [parents], if, for their [parents'] crimes, they take up too a part of the vengeance — since [the things] which are reckoned blessed among men, they have obtained and possess on account of those [parents]. And universally, I say, whatever [is] useful in medicine, that same we reckon to be also just. And truly he is to be laughed at who should assert [it] iniquitous to cauterize the thumb, when the vertebra of the hips ached; or to lacerate the midriff, when the liver was wasting with corruption; or, if anyone, on account of a weakness of the hooves, should anoint the tops of the horns of oxen. So too in avenging crimes, he who thinks any other [thing] just than to heal wickedness, and is indignant when he sees the physician proceed to the cure of a disease by a far different way, and insinuate medicines for some [parts] through other [parts] — as [when they] cut a vein, that [the patient] may be relieved of an ophthalmia — he surely seems to profit not far beyond [his] sense-perception, and does not consider the schoolmaster, who seizes some one of the boys to admonish the rest; and the general, who, when he takes away every tenth man, leads all back to duty. Accordingly, not only to a part on account of another

part, but also to a soul on account of a soul, far more than to a body on account of a body, are affects, vexations, passions, and amendments wont to accrue. For there, as it seems, it is necessary that the same passion and change be innate [naturally arise]; but here it is necessary that the soul, driven by imaginations, on account of fear or confidence, be made worse or better." These [things say] those wise men.

Question XXXVIII. Whether human Judges can extend even the temporary punishments of the guilty to the innocent?

Some Nations, or rather certain Tyrants, seized by too much anger and cruelty, have done this: but [it] must be thus determined. *First*: On account of the atrocity of a crime, that punishment can sometimes be transferred from the guilty to the innocent which takes away faculties [wealth], honors, [and] the celebrity of [one's] fame and name. This all the Jurisconsults teach, and the daily experience in [cases] of injured majesty [treason], in poisoners, and similar [cases]. *Second*: The punishment of death can, outside war, be inflicted on no innocent [person] on account of any other's fault, however enormous. And in that [matter] many cautions [are] still to be applied, concerning which [see] elsewhere — Deut. 24:16, where a precept is given to Judges: "The fathers shall not be slain for the sons, nor the sons for the fathers: but," etc. St. Augustine (q. 8 on Joshua) clearly established this of the difference between the judgment of God and of man: that God can embrace the guilty and the innocent in the same punishment, [but] not man. For when he had first said, "Is that a precept to men [as] judging, that they punish no one for another? But the judgments of God are not of such a kind, [God] who by his high and invisible counsel knows to what extent he may extend even a temporal punishment of men, and a salutary terror," afterward he subjoins: "If Achan had been found by someone, and apprehended, and, guilty of that crime, had been brought to the judgment of Jesus [Joshua], it is by no means to be thought that the man, [as] judge, would have punished, either for him or with him, anyone else, who was in no way held to the fellowship of his deed. For it was not lawful for him to exceed the mandate of the law, which was given to men, that by his judgment — which is commanded or permitted to a man against a man — he should not reckon one to be punished for another's sin. But by a far more secret justice does God judge, [God] who is powerful even after death, [in a matter] which a man cannot either free or destroy. Therefore the visible afflictions of men, or [their] deaths — since to those on whom they are inflicted they can both harm and profit — the Lord, in his hidden providence, knows how justly to dispense to each, even when the sins of some seem to be avenged in others." And again: "With a man [as] Judge, no one ought [to pay] visible punishments, unless for his own fault." The reason seems [to be] because [a man] has not any right whatever over the life of a man, but [a right] modified, so that it cannot rightly be taken away from him by anyone, unless a fault be found in him. For, among human goods, since life [is] the greatest of all, it is just that no one be despoiled of it who has not rendered himself unworthy of it by his own fault. St. Thomas (in the place cited): because man, as to [his] soul, is altogether free, [belonging to] no other. There is added [the point] that in a matter of so great moment it is better to put a bridle upon the Judges, than that a too free faculty of pronouncing concerning the life of unblamed men be made. See St. Thomas (2a2ae, q. 108, a. 4, ad 2); Alphonsus de Castro (bk. 2 *On the Punishment of Heretics*,

(col. 903)

of Heretics*, ch. 10 and following); and the Interpreters of Law, on the chapter. So [have] we [treated it], q. 25, sect. 2.

Question XXXIX. Whether the Lord can inflict, even on the innocent, the punishments by which the souls of the guilty are tortured in this or the future age?

In this age [life], the punishments [are] indeed of this kind: the removal of divine grace, the subtraction of divine aids, the bites and anguishes of conscience; but in the future [age] there is the punishment of loss, and

of sense, [both] purgatorial [and] eternal. *First*, therefore: the Lord can inflict none of these punishments on anyone ordinarily, unless a fault reside in him. Because either these are wont never to be snatched away from a man except [as a consequence of] the contrary sin, or [they are] never [inflicted] except [as] following a preceding fault. And this [is] clear enough as to the individual [punishments]. And this is [what] St. Augustine teaches (in the cited question 8): "It is not to be believed [that], by the punishments which are inflicted after death, one can be condemned for another." And afterward: "invisible punishments, which cannot but harm, and cannot profit — no one, with God [as] Judge, pays [them] for another's sins." Again (q. 9): "It is not to be believed that the sons of Achan, for the sin of the father — of which they were innocent — [were], even after death, burned with the punishment of infernal fire. For that death, indeed, which awaits all, although it come from the first [original] sin, yet, because we are so born that we must necessarily die, [it] is, when hastened, useful to some. Whence it is read of a certain [man], 'He was snatched away, lest malice change his understanding.'" St. Gregory (ch. 31, bk. 15 *Morals*): "In the flesh, sons are sometimes punished even from the father's sin. But, original sin being blotted out, they are not held, in the soul, by the wickedness of [their] parents." *Secondly*: If the sole absolute power of God be considered, he could surely withdraw grace and aids from a man, and inflict the torments both of temporary and of eternal fire; but neither would they have the account [nature] of a true punishment — which is the companion and consequent of some sin — nor is the divine power now to be considered [in that way], but in that way in which he has decreed and is wont to act: [namely] that on an undeserving [person] such great and such horrible miseries be not imposed. And this latter [view] Scotus holds (bk. 4, dist. 41, q. 1), Marsilius (1, dist. 49), and in the same place Gabriel, Gregory, and others of that scholastic family — which [thing] those do not deny who first assert that [other view], the Thomists. And so, concerning the evils of this life, which are punishments not in respect of the innocent, but of the guilty, Boethius speaks (bk. 4, prose 5).

Question XL. How do the scriptures agree — which say, and deny, [that] the punishments of the guilty are transferred to the guilty, and especially of parents to sons?

That these punishments are transferred from the guilty to the innocent, the scriptures say — partly by the words of Exod. 20:5 [and] ch. 34:7, partly by examples, of which hitherto. But the same [scriptures] deny [it]: Deut. 24:16, Ezek. 18:4 and 20, Jer. 31:30, as I cited above (q. 31). In each of these opinions, says St. Gregory (bk. 15 *Morals*, ch. 31), "while a dissimilar sense is found, the mind of the hearer is instructed, so that it may subtly seek out the way of discretion." Various, therefore, are the responses of various [authors]. *First*: [that] (from the cited place of the same St. Gregory, and from it Rabanus, bk. 4 on Exod., ch. 20) the punishments of original sin are extended to sons before baptism, [but] not [those] of any actual [sin] after baptism. *Secondly*: [that] in the Old Testament this transference of punishments had place, [but] not in the New. St. Augustine (bk. 6 *Against Julian*, ch. 12). *Thirdly*: [that] the punishments of parents pertain to sons, if indeed they imitate their [parents'] wickedness and crimes: otherwise not. The Chaldee Paraphrase on Exod. 20; St. Gregory and Rabanus (in the places cited); St. Augustine (bk. *Against Adimantus*, ch. 7); St. Chrysostom (homily 29 on Genesis); St. Jerome (on Ezek. 18); Anastasius of Nicaea (q. 32); St. Anselm (*On the Conception of the Virgin*, ch. 25). *Fourthly*: [that] while the parents live, their evils are extended to the sons, [but] not [when the parents are] dead. Because in the former way a greater grief afflicts them; in the latter, none. So some in Abulensis (q. 71). *Fifthly*: [that] the same miseries are extended to little sons, and [those] not yet emancipated, [but] not to adults, and [those] emancipated, [who are] altogether pure of the crime. Because those [little ones] are something of the parents': these [adults] not. So some in the same [author] (q. 7). *Sixthly*: [that] by the divine judgment punishments are carried over from one to another, [but] not by the human. St. Augustine (here, q. 8; and bk. 6 *Against Julian*, ch. 9 and following); Eusebius (*Preparation for the Gospel*, bk. 12, ch. 25). *Seventhly*: [that] corporal and temporal punishments are drawn over to the innocent, [but] never spiritual and perennial [ones]. St. Thomas (2a2ae, q. 108, a. 4, ad 1); and, as

it seems to me, Origen (bk. 7 *Against Celsus*), where thus: "Their own punishment awaits the impious, who, having despised the remedies which were offered, persist in a malice (so to speak) incurable. Yet we, by the doctrine concerning future punishment, draw back many from sinning. But let us consider what, in Celsus, a priest — whether of Apollo or of Jupiter — may answer on this. 'Slow,' he says, 'grind the mills of the gods, and [they grind] upon the children of children, and [those] who shall be born from them.' See how much rather [is] that [saying] of ours: 'The fathers shall not die for the sons, nor the sons die for the fathers. Each shall die by his own sin.' Likewise that [saying]: 'He who shall have eaten a sour grape, his own teeth shall be set on edge.' Likewise that: 'The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, and the father shall not bear the iniquity of the son: and the justice of the just shall be upon him, as the iniquity of the unjust shall be upon him.' But if anyone should say that that [saying], 'upon the children of children, and [those] who shall be born from them,' is similar to this ours: 'Who repays the sins of the fathers upon the sons, unto the second and third generation, [of those] who hate him' — let him learn that, in Ezekiel, this is said [to be] a parable, reprehending those who say, 'The fathers ate a sour grape, and the teeth of the sons were set on edge': which saying that [other] soon follows: '[As] I live, says the Lord, [it shall not be so], but each shall die by his own sin.'" *Eighthly*: [that] not even corporal and temporal punishments are ever drawn over to those who are guilty of no fault at all: but only to those in whom some fault has resided. To me, that reconciliation of the scriptures seems to be conveniently and truly made through the 3rd, 7th, and 8th responses. But where this or that is more fitting is to be said [determined] in Exodus, and in the Prophets. The seventh response indeed pertains here, and likewise, as it were a certain makeweight [ἐπίμετρον, *epimetron*], the responses 4, 5, and 6 — as [is] clear from the above disputations.

(col. 905)

Question XLI. Was Achan adjudged to the eternal fire, or rather to heavenly felicity?

[St. Augustine] does not indeed deny [that] Achan [was] saved and blessed, but somewhat doubts (q. 8). But Cassian affirms [him] damned (*Conferences* 1, ch. 20), [and so do] the Fathers of the Council of Aachen under Pepin (bk. 2, ch. 7), and nearly Rupert (ch. 31). I judge [him] freed from the eternal [fire] by a temporary and suddenly-extinguished fire, and received into heaven. *First*: Because good authors also so judge — Cajetan (in this place), Abulensis (qq. 55 and 65), Masius (fol. 138), and all the Rabbis (in tractate *Sanhedrin*, ch. 6, fol. 43, col. 1, and 44). *Then*: Because there was in him a great force of repenting, and an all-pious confession, full of grief and of reverence toward God, as [was] declared above (q. 27). The Rabbis, with Abulensis, add another reason: that, to [Achan] now about to enter the pyre, Joshua said (v. 25) not simply, "Let the Lord disturb thee," but added "in this day," as if he should say [that] he indeed, in this life, was to be tortured and exterminated on account of his sin, [but] not in the future. R. Eliezer (ch. 38): "Because, before God the holy and blessed, he gave confession or glory, Achan has a part in the future age. For it is said, 'Let the Lord disturb thee in this day.' On this present day thou art Achor, that is, disturbed: and thou shalt not be Achor in the future age." And Masius: "To us, indeed," he says, "that seems credible: but not on account of those words, but rather on account of that ingenuous confession. For that בְּיוֹם הַזֶּה [*bayom hazeh*, 'in this day'] we reckon to signify nothing else than that oft-used בְּיוֹם הַזֶּה [*bayom hazeh*], 'as today,' or 'as this day' — which the Seventy-two [LXX] expressed in this place too. And it is nearly a mark of a thing to be affirmed, as though by a certain evidence: as if thou shouldst say, plainly, altogether, utterly, clearly, openly, and as certainly as thou seest the light of the present day, which thou enjoyest." But to me it seems [to be] not so much a mark of affirmation, as of time — set there, that it may be signified [that] the time of punishment [is] not so much [going to be] none thereafter, as those Rabbis will [have it], as [that it] ought indeed to have been sooner, [and] yet [is] now already deservedly [ended]. Elias, in the *Thisbi* [Tishbi], under the word *hathad*, relates this exposition, as if it were a prayer, thus: "Let the Lord disturb thee in this day: and be thou not disturbed in the future age." But that God, the highest source of

piety and clemency, assented to the prayer of so pious and clement — most pious and most clement — a man, Joshua — who would wish to doubt? But thou wilt object three [things]. *First*: Rupert (on Joshua, ch. 31): "Although," he says, "Achar answered by confessing, 'Truly I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel, and thus and thus I did,' yet he could not merit any pardon, because, namely, the confession was too tardy. For Israel was disturbed before he acknowledged the guilt, and the truthful lot, with God [as] author, betrayed the person before he [betrayed] the fault." I answer. *First*: in the one [respect], he was perhaps too late. *Secondly*: [it] can nevertheless be explained [that] Achan's confession was thus late, and to it all pardon [was] denied, as to the temporary punishment which he had to undergo. Of this [temporary punishment], as is plain from the antecedents, Rupert there speaks. *Thou wilt object secondly*: [that] those whom I cited at the beginning, and especially the Council of Aachen under Pepin (bk. 2, ch. 1), attribute eternal death to Achan. I answer [that] the severity of his opinion is left by us to Abbot Moses, in Cassian: but Rupert and the Fathers of Aachen seem to have thought this to be the opinion of St. Augustine — whose words and opinions the Fathers use very much in the former Council of Aachen under Louis I. Secondly, in the other [work], as I said, [it is] St. Augustine's opinion [that Achan was saved]. *Thou wilt object thirdly*: [that] the opinion adopted by the words of many [is] that penance is not to be deferred to the extreme time of life — because a single example is found of one to whom [penance] so late profited, namely of the thief crucified with CHRIST JESUS. I answer [that] this [is] the single example, [but] manifest, namely, and almost undoubted, on account of the adjoined most certain testification of God: "Today thou shalt be with me in Paradise." [It is] not meanwhile that [example] which is less manifest, and [rests] in a certain hazard, [that is] to be cast aside: nay [rather it is] eagerly to be embraced, for the consoling of the minds of many whom the prison, the fetter, and the executioner hold, and for exhorting [them] to penance. Behold, when Achan bound himself with a most wicked sacrilege, [and] had stirred up the most grievous wrath of the Divinity against the whole people, [and] had been the cause of the deadly slaughter of several Israelites, and of the most shameful flight of some thousands: [when] by the divine nod, and by the judgment of the lot, [he was] betrayed, and by the divine sentence now adjudged to the most bitter punishment of fire; [when] there remained no, or the least, watch-post of denying, excusing, [or] escaping; [when] he was snatching with him into the same destruction his sons, daughters, and all his [goods] — and yet, because he confesses [his] sin so ingenuously, sincerely, and grievingly, because he gives glory to God, because he wishes to bear the decreed punishment with an even, submissive, and patient mind — [thereby] he turns away God's wrath from the people, [and] restores himself into His grace: from the pyre to heaven, from the flames to refreshment [*refrigerium*], from the crash and weight of the stones to the aethereal seats of the blessed, he flies away — as far, indeed, as that old status of the Old Testament bore. Who would despair of [pardon for his] sins? who would not recognize himself, [led] into prison and chains, [to be] brought as [it were] to the most excellent port of penance and salvation, by a great benefit of God? [who would] not gladly receive any capital sentence pronounced by Judges, and use it as [it were] a notable instrument of satisfaction and penance? and so [render] God, the Saints, and all men favorable to himself? O splendid occasion! O great benefit of God toward sinners! It is not altogether rashly said by the common [folk], "more go from the gibbet to heaven than from the bed": but yet let this comparison be removed, which, as [it is] odious, so [it is] uncertain, or rather false.

Question XLII. Whom can Achan's punishment terrify?

Those most of all, surely, who imitate his wicked deeds — as [are] the avaricious, thieves, [and] the sacrilegious; and as many as, by some crime and wickedness of their own, disturb a community and some assembly. Hence St. Ambrose (bk. 2 *On Duties*, ch. 26): "For the rest," he says, "so have the manners of men brooded over the admiration of riches, that no one is deemed worthy of honor unless [he be] rich. Nor [is] this a recent usage, but — what is worse — this vice has now long since grown inveterate in human minds.

(col. 907)

For when Jericho, a great city, had fallen at the sound of the priestly trumpets, and Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun was gaining the victory, he learned [that] the strength of the people was weakened by avarice and the desire of gold. For when, from the spoils of the burned city, Achan had taken up a golden garment, and two hundred silver didrachmas, and a golden tongue [wedge], [being] brought before the Lord he could not deny [it], but betrayed the theft. Old, therefore, and ancient is avarice, which began with the very oracles of the divine law. Nay, for the sake of repressing it, the law of God was given. On account of avarice, Balak thought Balaam could be tempted by rewards, to curse the people of the fathers — and avarice would have conquered, had not the Lord forbidden him [to proceed], [bidding him] abstain from the curse. And on account of avarice, Achan, [being] cast down, had led the whole people of the fathers into destruction. And so Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun, who could make the sun stand still lest it advance, could not make the avarice of men stand still lest it creep on. At his voice the sun stood: avarice did not stand. And so, with the sun standing [still], Jesus completed the triumph; but with avarice advancing, he almost lost the victory." In Prudentius (in the *Psychomachia*), when Avarice was recounting [her] palms and triumphs, [she] at last begins:

> *"Jericho too saw, amid its own funerals, how much / our hand could [do], when the victor Achan fell, / notable for slaughters, and proud of the ruin of walls, / [yet] succumbed, captured by the gold from the conquered enemies: / while, gathering the marked anathema from the forbidden ashes, / insatiable, he drains the mournful spoils of the ruins. / Him neither a noble tribe, nor [that] of the ancestral people, / [nor his] parent Judah aided — [Judah] noble by [being] one day near to Christ, / and a Patriarch happy in such a grandson. / [But] to whom the example of [their] race is pleasing, let the form / of [their] end please [them] too: let the punishment be the same for those whose crime is one."*

Concerning thieves, the Apostolic Constitutions (bk. 27, ch. 3): "'Thou shalt not steal.' For Achar, on account of theft, was slain by stoning." But concerning the sacrilegious, the Council of Aachen under Pepin (bk. 2, ch. 1), when it had related [the passage] of Joshua forbidding the Jericho anathema, [says]: "Observe, diligent reader, and curious hearer, [that] two [things] are commanded in these words which have been set forth [before]. The one, namely, by which it is prescribed [that] one must altogether beware, lest anything of those [things] which are consecrated to the Lord be touched; the other, by which it is commanded [that] whatever of gold or silver, and iron, and all bronze vessels there be, be consecrated to the Lord and stored in his treasuries. And thou must beware, lest — by even thinking of those [things] which are consecrated to the Lord — thou [be] thus guilty of transgression, and others on thy account be under sin, and be disturbed; and attend sagaciously, in what manner the treasuries of the Lord, at his command, are increased; but observe this too diligently, lest by thy craft, or cupidity, those [things] which are consecrated in the Lord's treasuries be carried off. But that [the things] which, at the Lord's command, Joshua had prescribed to be done, were afterward fulfilled — the following [verses] attest. And they burned the city, and all [the things] which were in it, except the silver and gold, and the bronze and iron vessels, which they consecrated into the treasury of the Lord. But [as for one] who — enticed by a certain rash daring — thinks he can, openly or secretly, filch from those [things] which are consecrated to the Lord: let him be deterred by the example of Achan, who, inflamed by the heat of avarice, secretly filched for himself, from those [things] which were to be consecrated to the Lord — namely a scarlet garment, very good, and two hundred silver shekels, and a golden bar of fifty shekels — and, lest he be caught, hid [it] in his tent, the earth being dug up, his children and domestics being conscious [accomplices] — [things] which surely were consecrated to the Lord. On account of whose monstrous crime, a certain part of the Israelite people was slain before their enemies; and Joshua, consulting the Lord, heard these [things]: 'Arise, why liest thou prostrate on the earth? Israel has sinned and transgressed my pact, and they have taken of the anathema, and have stolen, and lied, and hidden [it] among their vessels: nor will Israel be able to stand before their enemies, and will flee them, because it is polluted with the anathema. I will not be any more with you, until you crush him who is guilty of this crime.' Note that the illicit deed of one, the whole Israelite people is related to have done: and that, on account of the crime of one, upon the people of God a great menace of the Lord is made — namely, that we could neither have God with us, nor stand before our enemies, until he perished who was contaminated with a crime of this

kind. But how Achan himself, by Joshua — Israel being marshaled to him by its tribes — [was] most skillfully examined, and detected, and [how] he confessed his guilt; how too he fell by a hail of stones, and all [the things] which were his were consumed by fire — the following [verses] disclose. Nevertheless these [things] are greatly to be feared, and to be guarded against by all marked with the faith of Christ, lest, on account of the illicit — nay, sacrilegious — deed of others, they neither have the Lord with them (which God forbid), nor prevail to stand before their enemies. But the perpetrators of so monstrous, nay sacrilegious, a deed, it much behooves to beware, lest, on account of their cupidity — which they either exercise or desire to exercise toward things sacred to God — they acquire for themselves, after the manner of Achan, eternal death, and God's offense against others, and a miserable ruin before their enemies. But to the number of the sacrilegious, Rupert (in [his book] on Joshua, ch. 21) reckons Christians of various kinds, and especially Simoniac Clerics, who abuse the goods dedicated to the worship of God: "It was to be [going to happen]," he says, "(which today we see) that, namely, the Church of God should be not a little disturbed by the avarice, and at the same time the ambition, of false brethren. For what? Are not all [of us] who have been baptized in Christ Jesus [those who] anathematized Jericho — that is, this world — by renouncing the devil and all his pomps? But behold, there have gone out from us very many imitators of Achar, of the tribe of Judah — [those], namely, who, professing the Catholic faith (which is to be, or be called, of the tribe of Judah — for 'Judah' is interpreted 'confession') — took of that anathema, and stole, and lied, and hid [it], and stored [it] away within their vessels. For while, under the appearance of piety, [being] fair kindlers [of incense] and religious, they are zealous for avarice — which is the service of idols — and make all things venal by a spiritual malice, what [do they do] but steal the anathema, and lie, and hide [it] among [their] vessels, nay among their [own] consciences? This root of malice, and the bitterness of this gall, first in Simon the Great [Magus], through the mouth of Blessed Peter the Apostle, the universal Church of Christ terribly anathematizes, and shows [it] to be a heretical hydra. 'Not, therefore,' says the Lord, 'will Israel be able to stand before their enemies, and will flee them, because it is polluted with the anathema.' For where, in priests, or in those who preside, avarice reigns, and money obtains the principate, these who are Israel — holding the arms of the virtues against the vices, and willing, as is fitting, to argue, beseech, [and] rebuke — cannot stand against the enemies freely resisting, since [these enemies], whom money protects, [are such] that they are not even sometimes reproved for their vices with impunity. Whence also, in the Evangelist Matthew, we hold a saying said by a beautiful mystery: that when our Lord, having made a scourge of cords, had cast the sellers and buyers out of the temple, then at last the blind and lame came to him in the temple, and he cured them. He did not cure the blind and lame before he had cast those robbers out of the den, because, namely, vices cannot be cured, nor virtues illustrated, unless first Mammon be cast out of the hearts of the priests — or the priests themselves, with that god of theirs, be cast out of the temple of God. This, I say, was to be, and therefore was usefully to be foreshown

(col. 909)

in that one Achar — what kind, or how great, according to his name (which is interpreted "tumult" or "disturber"), a disturbance or punishment is laid up for all his imitators. Rightly, therefore, [and] severely, and without any pardon, was it avenged upon him for such a theft — all Israel stoning him, and all [the things] which were his were consumed by fire." Not dissimilar [things] may be read in Peter Damian (bk. 5, Epistle 78, which is the ninth [letter] to the Clergy of Fano).

Question XLIII. Concerning the sacrilegious Calvinians and Lutherans — what [do] the Lutherans and Luther [say]?

Most worthy [it is] that [something] be here related concerning the Lutherans and Calvinians, perpetrating so many and so great sacrileges everywhere. The testimony of the Lutheran Chytraeus: "Achan," he says, "is an image of many Princes and private [men], who filch the Ecclesiastical goods destined for God and for divine

uses, and transfer [them] into their own private advantages and conveniences. For [that] which has once been dedicated to God, and to His Church, and to the conservation of doctrine, and to the [purposes] of divine worship, and to the feeding of the poor: that cannot be taken away, and occupied or received by heirs or patrons, without the impiety of [sacrilege upon] the earth, and [without] sacrilege — but ought to be placed for the pious uses of the Church: of studies, of doctrine, of the poor, of schools, of hospitals. And that such thieves and plunderers of Ecclesiastical goods are punished — [a thing] consonant to the divine law and the written laws — with dreadful punishments, present and eternal — not only the present example of Achan, deleted with [his] whole family and all [his] goods, but also daily [examples], running into the eyes of all, of princes and cities, demonstrate — [princes and cities] which, under the pretext of the Gospel [i.e. the Reformation] having occupied the goods of monasteries and colleges, are much more wretched, and draw upon themselves and [their] posterity the malediction of God. For as the feathers of eagles, mixed with the feathers of other birds, are reported to surpass and consume them: so Ecclesiastical goods, mixed with the patrimonies of princes and private [men], consume and dissipate both — experience teaches [it], which even among the Gentiles gave origin to the proverb, 'the gold of Toulouse.' And a saying of Chrysostom is worthy of memory (Homily on 1 Cor. 5):

> πολλάκις τὰ εἰσενεχθέντα κακῶς ὀλίγα, τὰ καλῶς κείμενα ἐξέβαλε πολλὰ ὄντα. οὐδὲν γὰρ σαθρότερον πλεονεξίας· κἂν τὴν κλεῖν ἐπιθῇς τῷ τοιούτῳ ταμιείῳ, κἂν θύραν, κἂν μοχλόν, εἰ καὶ πάντα ποιεῖς, πλεονεξίαν ἔνδον τὸν χαλεπώτατον λῃστὴν ἀποκλείσας, καὶ πάντα δυνάμενον ἐξενέγκειν.

[Chrysostom: "Often the ill-brought-in few [things] have cast out the well-laid many. For nothing is more rotten than covetousness [pleonexia]: even if thou put the key upon such a storeroom, even a door, even a bolt — even if thou dost all [these things] — [thou hast] shut covetousness inside, the most grievous robber, and [one] able to carry off all."]

[The Latin rendering:] 'Often a small profit ill-gotten has overturned ample wealth honorably acquired. For there is nothing which more easily corrupts all [things] than [what is] acquired by avarice and fraud. For even if thou add a bar to such a chest, and fortify it with an outer door and a bolt, yet thou keepest the most violent robber — fraud and avarice — shut up inside, which can carry off and dissipate all.'" Nor indeed could the very parent of all those sacrilegious [men — Luther] himself deny these [things]; nay rather (in the *Table Talk* [Symposiaca], ch. 4, fol. 596) he proved it by the example of the Aesopic eagle, which, when it had seen roast flesh sacrificed on a certain altar, flew down; with [its] hooked talons carried off a piece, and, swift, flew back into its nest. But to that sacred piece there clung a burning coal, which, gradually seizing the dry material of the nest, kindled the whole of it, and burned up all its chicks. So our eagles of old — now Harpies — swoop upon the Ecclesiastical goods, the chalices, the estates, the tithes, and the houses, [and] snatch whatever they can: they carry [them] into their treasuries, patrimonies, and private hoards. But no advantage [comes] to them thence. Their nests, faculties, and all possessions are burned up: they themselves are reduced to poverty, [their] children must beg: not rarely too all their posterity is cut off, so that often the whole lot of the feudal estates returns to the Church — as may be seen in the castles of nobles and counts, and in other goods. Whence, indeed, have so many estates, villages, and certain towns fallen to the Bishop of Würzburg in these few years? Whence, to the Archbishop of Mainz, such notable counties — the Königstein and the Loßen? "This," says Luther in the same place, "has been ascertained by experience itself: that those who have drawn Ecclesiastical wealth to themselves have, by that very [act], been reduced to want and beggary." And, lest anyone could doubt, he praises the testimony of one of the Saxon equestrian nobility, testifying this very [thing] of himself and [those] like himself. This [man] was Burchard Hundt, councillor of the Saxon Elector-Duke John. "We nobles," he said, "drew the goods of the monasteries into our own noble goods; but now those have devoured and consumed these of ours, so that we now have neither the goods of the monasteries nor of the nobles." And again, at another time — [something] which is nevertheless written in the same place — the same Luther said: "Ecclesiastical goods are like the feathers of an eagle. Those, if they be joined to other feathers, devour and consume them. So Ecclesiastical goods, by right and by wrong joined

to other goods, bring ruin to them, so that at the last nothing at all of the residue remains to the sacrilegious [man]." I praise in Luther so rich and copious a testification of the truth. But I greatly disapprove and condemn [the fact] that he himself was the chief exhorter and master to rapines, robberies, and sacrileges of this kind: and [that] he then at last sent forth those querulous and truthful voices [only] when he had seen [that], from those Ecclesiastical goods sacrilegiously taken away, far less returned to himself and his Preachers than he desired and wished. As I showed from his words in [my] little book *On the Priests of Joshua*, no. 66. And truly, while his insane dogmas flourish, sacrileges too will flourish; and wretched mortals will attend more to [that] which they have learned to be lawful for them through him, than to his subsequent complaints and palinodes. So that in the Diet of Regensburg of this very year — 1603 — in which I write these [things] again, that single cause of the plunderers of the monasteries has hindered good [men] very much, and would have introduced the greatest perturbation of the public and most sacred justice in the empire, unless — as hitherto — the prudence and vigilant care of the Emperor, and of the princes defending his authority, should watch. Zwick, at Constance, concerning the men of his sect, wrote to Calvin (in the year of the Lord 1541), as is read in this [man's] Epistles (p. 34): "A great part of ours believe [that] they have then only truly escaped the kingdom of Antichrist, if they may sport with the goods of the Church at [their] pleasure, and be subject to no discipline." Most true.

Question XLIV. How, from the books of the Gentile and Heretic Poets, orators, and Philosophers, do some at times become Achans?

In Cassian (*Conferences* 1, ch. 20), Abbot Moses: "Whatever," he says, "has crept into our hearts,

(col. 911)

has crept into our hearts, or whatever dogma has been let in to us — let us most diligently scrutinize whether it be purged by that divine and heavenly fire of the Holy Spirit, or whether — pertaining to Jewish superstition, or descending from the swelling of secular Philosophy — it [merely] displays piety on the surface only. Which we shall be able so to fulfill, if we do that Apostolic [precept]: 'Do not believe every spirit, but prove the spirits whether they be of God.' Of which kind are those too [who are] deceived, who, after the profession of a Monk, [are] enticed by the elegance of speech, and by certain dogmas of the Philosophers, which at first face — sounding [consonant] with certain pious senses and consonant to religion — deceive as [it were] by the glitter of gold, [and] those whom they had once enticed by the surface (deceived, as [it were], by bronze coins and false [ones]) they have rendered perpetually naked and wretched, either recalling them to the din of the world, or drawing [them] over to heretical errors and swollen presumptions." Which [thing] we read that Achan too, in the book of Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun, suffered — who, coveting and stealing a golden bar from the camp of the Aliens [Philistines], deserved to be struck by the anathema, and to be condemned to eternal death. Origen (homily 7): "Let us see," he says, "of what kind Achan's sin is: 'he stole,' it says, 'a golden tongue [wedge], and placed it in his tent.' I do not think [that], in that theft of a little gold, there was so great a force of sin, that it should stain so numerous a Church of the Lord. But let us see, whether perhaps the interior understanding of that sin be [so] great, and its bitterness [so] grave: There is much beauty in words, and much in the discourses of the Philosophers or Rhetoricians — who are all of the city Jericho, that is, men of this world. If, therefore, thou findest among the Philosophers perverse dogmas adorned with the assertions of a brilliant discourse, that is the golden tongue. But see, lest the glitter of the work deceive thee, lest the beauty of the golden discourse snatch thee away: remember that Jesus [Joshua] commanded all the gold which should be found in Jericho to be anathema. If thou readest a Poet, weaving gods and goddesses in measured verses and in resplendent song, be not delighted by the sweetness of eloquence. It is a golden tongue: if thou takest it up, and placest it in thy tent — if thou introducest into thy heart those [things] which are asserted by them — thou wilt pollute the whole Church of the Lord. This the unhappy Valentinus did, and Basilides, this the heretics Marcion too did: those stole

golden tongues from Jericho, and tried to introduce into the Churches the not-right sects of the Philosophers, and to pollute the whole Church of the Lord. But let us follow the preceding example of the fathers, [and] examine more diligently, lest anyone have a Jericho tongue hidden in his tent, and let us cast the evil out from our own selves; because, even if we cease [neglect], God will reprove, so that [the culprit] himself of his own accord confesses and says: I stole a golden tongue, and pure bracelets [*dextralia*]. Seest thou of what kind [of] theft he stole? he steals a tongue and pure bracelets. And 'pure bracelets' are works in which nothing divine is mixed, but the whole is conducted according to man. Finally, in our disputations too, it is the custom to say that we do not call Christ a mere [*purum*] man, but confess [him] God and man. But that [which] Jericho steals is said to be 'a little' [*parum*], that is, 'without God' [*sine Deo*] — which surely was, to the thief, the cause of [his] sin. And therefore let us feel nothing merely human about Christ, but let us confess [him] God equally and man — because the wisdom of God too is called 'manifold,' so that through these [things] we may deserve to take a share of the wisdom of God, which is Christ Jesus our Lord, to whom is glory and dominion unto the ages of ages, Amen."

Question XLV. How do Heretics and Apostate Monks become Achans?

Certain Orthodox [bishops], in a Letter to Pope Agapetus (concerning whom Baronius [writes], year 536): "We know," they say, "[it is] well, if you inform our most pious Emperor, and the Princes lovable to Christ himself, that those communicate with the anathema who have the anathema in their midst — as the ancient scripture shows us in Achan and Jonathan, who knowingly and unknowingly fell into the anathema, and, by being ignorant of these [things], were in danger of perishing with them, since in the midst of them was the anathema. And [we know it is well] if you remind [them], by their beloved and cherished empire dedicated to God, to lead to God those who have been led away by them [the heretics] from the right faith — and, if [the empire] cannot do this, [that] the plotters against the Church be repelled." And afterward again, to the Emperor Justin: "It is to be feared, most pious Emperor, lest, on account of much delay, we too suffer that [fate] of the Israelite people — having in [our] midst [men] anathematized by every priesthood — [that people] which, because it had in its midst Achan and Jonathan, subjecting themselves to the anathema in knowledge and in ignorance, was in danger of perishing entirely, although it was ignorant that it had the anathema in its midst. Do not, therefore, most Christian Emperors, despise such an evil, but [with] over-much zeal [strive] toward the knowledge of God." But Turrianus (bk. 1 *On Monastic Vows*): "Now," he says, "it is known to all, what punishments God took upon Israel on account of one Acham, who had secretly turned aside, from [the things] consecrated to God, a scarlet cloak, and two hundred shekels and a golden bar. But upon the culprit himself — who, by God's will, the lots being drawn, was detected — this sentence [was] pronounced: 'whoever shall be detected in this crime, shall be burned with fire, with all his substance, because he has transgressed the pact of the Lord, and done a wicked thing in Israel.' And a little after: 'and Acham answered Joshua, and said, "Truly I have sinned against the Lord God of Israel, and thus I did, for I saw a scarlet cloak,"' and what follows. Then is subjoined the punishment, and the cause of the punishment: '"because," he says, "thou hast disturbed us today, let God disturb thee in this day"; and all Israel stoned him, and all [the things] which were his were consumed by fire: and they gathered upon him a great heap of stones, which remains unto the present day: the name of that place was called "the valley of Achor," that is, of disturbance.' If — as I have often said, and shall say more often — whatever [things] are written, are written for us, upon whom the ends of the ages have come: what punishment, I pray, is decreed for those who have taken and turned aside, from [the things] consecrated to God, not a scarlet cloak, or two hundred shekels, or a golden bar, but themselves — that is, the living temple of God, and the vessels of the Lord dedicated to God? who have hidden the cloak of their order in the earth, as that Acham [hid] the scarlet [one]: and have covered over the golden and divine rule of religion, the earth being dug up, as far as [it was] in their power, likewise as Acham — nay, worse than Acham? since he confessed [that he had] sinned, but these are not even willing to repent. Wherefore, as he, after confession, experienced fire in this life, so these Apostates

will experience everlasting flames in the other age, unless they prefer to repent. Worse, moreover, than Acham. For he disturbed his [fellow] countrymen — for thirty-six men fell, on account of his sin, in the battle, as the history itself attests, the rest being turned to flight: but these, of whom I speak, disturb very many brethren — that is, Christians — by scandal, of whom they slay some, while by their example they teach and persuade [them] to do the same; others they draw back from the order of Monks, lest they ever suffer themselves to be dedicated to it — for whom it is more expedient that, with a millstone [*mola asinaria*] hung from the neck, they be drowned in the deep of the sea, than that they scandalize one of the little ones. But because those, in whose midst Acham was a culprit, were punished with the slaughter of thirty-six men, the severity of this example teaches us [that] they too sin who [receive] fugitive and Apostate monks of this kind — whether open or hidden, such as they are who, under the pretext of translation [transfer] or exemption, seek autonomy — [they] sin, I say, who

(col. 913)

receive [these apostate monks], and hold [them] among the number of their own. For if it is not lawful for me to detain, for my use, another man's servant, against the Lord's [master's] will, how would it be lawful [to detain] him who, putting off the power over his own body, has been ascribed to God into the order of Monks, and confirmed this by the pledge of a vow of obedience — [how lawful] to have [him], against his [order's] authority and will, among my ministers, [him] who now cannot be mine, but [is] of that order to which he is bound by vow? How, then, will they grant to another what they themselves do not have? — since they have been made beforehand the anathema of the Lord. Or how would it be lawful for those Lords [Masters] to enjoy the anathema of the Lord, and to turn [it] to their own uses, after the example of Achan?"

Question XLVI. How greatly must one beware, lest — after the manner of Achan — we harm the community by sinning?

St. Chrysostom (homily 1 on the words of Isaiah, "I saw the Lord"), showing [that] the prayers of the just do not profit those who, without penitence, persevere in sin, brought forward the example of the Israelite people from Num. 20 and Deut. 1: but he then goes on thus. "And why do we recall that this happened to the whole people of the sin — nay [rather], [that] the sins of a few disobedient [men], nay of one, overcome the favor of [many] justly commanding? And this, again, thou wilt be able to perceive from the same Israelite people, which — while Moses administered the Commonwealth — when they had burst into the land of the foreigners, and joined battle with them, [see] how certain of them, raving [in lust] upon their women, brought in the disaster and destruction of the whole people. But that [thing] which I shall speak of happened in one — namely Achar, who, when he had taken up a variegated robe from the anathema, kindled the wrath of God even against the people. But I also conjecture [that] to some of those present the history is unknown. Wherefore it is necessary that, speaking briefly of this, I both admonish those who know, and teach those who do not. Achar, then, was one of the number of those who crossed the Jordan with Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun — [Joshua] who had before been chosen by God's judgment to succeed Moses, and who bore the type and figure of our true Savior Jesus Christ. For as that [Joshua] led the people out of the desert, through the Jordan, into the promised land, so our Savior too led us over — out of the desert of ignorance and idolatry, through holy and salutary baptism — into the heavenly Jerusalem, to the mother of the firstborn, in which the mansions of true rest are prepared, where [is] a life ignorant of sedition, and peaceful. This [Joshua], then, when he had brought the Israelites across by the power of Him who had set him over the people, and had now moved the army to Jericho, contriving that new and admirable siege, the walls being about to fall, what does he say among the people? 'This city shall be anathema, and whatever is in it, to the Lord of Sabaoth, except Rahab the harlot. Her ye shall save. Beware, therefore, of the anathema, lest ever, coveting, ye take of it, and destroy us. Consecrated are,' he says, 'all [the things] which are in the city': for that is what 'anathema' means. Let no one, therefore, steal from those [things] which are consecrated to the Lord God, and destroy us

from the earth.' Perilous was the precept, [set forth] with much diligence both of God commanding and of Joshua bearing the law. For it could scarcely be that, in so great a multitude, this law should not be violated, since there were many things which impelled [them] to this. For either the instability of that people and desire of gain, or [the fact] that not all had heard the precept proclaimed, or the variety of the spoils — as [it were] a bait set forth, enticing [those] greedy of having — would easily have driven [them] to the transgression of the law. And nevertheless that law had been passed: and peril hung over the head of the transgressor. What, then, after these [things]? The walls fell, and whatever was in the city came into the hands of the besiegers. And so, while the whole people kept this precept, the transgression of one stirred up the wrath of God against the whole multitude. 'The sons of Israel,' it says, 'sinned a great sin, and pilfered and took of the anathema, and Achar the son of Charmi took of the anathema, and the wrath of the Lord was angered against the sons of Israel.' And yet [it was] one who had sinned. How, then, did the sons of Israel sin, and God was angry with the sons of Israel? Seest thou how the sin of one summons vengeance upon the whole people? How it rendered God a hostile enemy against the multitude? Since, therefore, the transgression of the law had been perpetrated, and no one was privy [to it], except God alone, who knows hidden [things], the vengeance indeed was deferred: but [the one] who had perpetrated this — although he seemed to lie hidden — was nonetheless burned by [his] conscience as by a fire. There came, therefore, the time in which [it] should come to pass, [that] which God had threatened, and in which the sin should come into the open. 'Joshua sent,' it says, 'men from Jericho to Ai [Ga]. And there went up thither about three thousand men, and they fled from the face of the men of Ai, and [these] slew of them thirty-six men, and pursued them, and cut them down, and the heart of the people was frightened, and became like water.' See the punishment of one sin. See the most bitter blow: one had sinned, and upon the whole people death and trembling rushed in. What [is] this, O good Lord? Thou alone [art] just, and thy judgments [are] right. Thou renderest judgment to each according to his own deeds. Thou, lover of the human race, hadst said [that] each shall die in his own sin, and [that] no one shall pay punishments for another. How, then, is this thy just judgment? All thy [things] are good, O Lord, and very good, and dispensed for our advantage. 'A certain plague,' he says, 'is sin: through vengeance let it be published, and paraded before all, lest it corrupt all — that, when they shall have learned how great menaces one transgression has begotten, they may flee vengeance — an eternal vengeance otherwise to be taken from many. Seeing, therefore,' it says, '[that] Joshua could not stop the flight, he rent his garments and prostrated himself on the earth, mournfully uttering those laments which the divine Scripture relates. What, then, did the Lord answer him? "Arise, why liest thou thus prostrate? Thy people has sinned, has transgressed my pact, and Israel will not be able to stand against the face of their enemies, until ye take away the anathema from your own selves."' He proclaims, therefore, this among the people; and [the one] who had perpetrated this is betrayed by God, [and] he confesses. 'For Achar answered,' it says, 'to Joshua, saying: Truly I have sinned in the sight of the God of Israel, thus and thus I did. I saw in the spoil one beautiful variegated cloak, and two hundred silver didrachmas, and one golden tongue of forty didrachmas, and, coveting, I took [them], and behold, these are buried in the earth in my tent.' He brings forth all into the open, after he had perceived that [Joshua] had judged all without a lie, nor did he distrust the witness [who was] betraying himself. But see the ignominious

(col. 915)

and pernicious death: 'Joshua,' it says, 'drew Achar down into the valley, [and] his sons and daughters, and his calves, and his beasts of burden, and all his sheep, and his tent, and all whatsoever he possessed, and the people overwhelmed all these with stones.' This [is] the reward of transgression — such a vengeance of God, which cannot be avoided through craft. Knowing these things, therefore, let us think [that] troubles are brought upon [us] by our sins, and, examining our crimes each single day, let us ascribe the cause not to another, but to ourselves: for not the negligence of princes only, but much more our own offenses, have called down [our] evils." But this [example] R. P. Claudius Aquaviva, General Superior of the Society of JESUS — imitating [Chrysostom] and the others cited above — uses, in a certain letter, to exhort to the zeal

of perfection and of charity, by that same example of Achan, thus: "If God exacts a most religious manner of life of us, so that the industry of the Society may be salutary for the helping of [our] neighbors, how much more severely will he require [it], that the Society itself not only decline nothing from [its] state through us, but rather, by [our] vigilance and striving, extend and raise itself from our [level] to greater [things]? To which end, surely, [it would be] no slight spur added to us, if we should think [that], out of us all, one body is compacted, and [that] there is such a consensus of the members among themselves, that each must fear, if by his own fault something of peril redound into all the rest of the body. It is plainly a wonder, and horrible, and worthy [as a thing] on account of which both ears of the hearers (as the scriptures say) should deservedly ring — to recall [that], among Israel — illustrious under Joshua [as] Leader, but glorying in God [as] Prince and Governor, and then led out by his command into the battle-line — on account of one Acham's theft from the Jericho anathema, how [greatly] almost the whole camp was disturbed, [Israel] being routed by the enemy in [the loss of] three thousand of the bravest of Israel, and God severely denouncing, 'Israel will not be able to stand before their enemies, and will flee them, because it is polluted with the anathema' — and, [what is] far more horrific, 'I will not be any more with you, until you crush him who is guilty of this crime': And although the sacrilege was of one, yet (as Augustine notes) it afflicted and struck all. Whence, he says, let not each care for himself alone in the people, but let them mutually apply diligence to one another, and, as [members] of one body and of one man, let some members be solicitous for others. By which compact, surely, the eternal judge indicated how great the community of individuals in some assembly and sodality is, since none of them is reckoned alone by himself, but the individuals are as [it were] certain parts in a whole. Seest thou, says Chrysostom, how the sin of one summons vengeance upon the whole people? How it rendered God a hostile enemy against the multitude? But thy judgments are good, O Lord, and dispensed for our advantage. 'A certain plague is sin: through vengeance it is published and paraded before all, lest it corrupt all — that, when they shall have learned how great menaces one transgression has begotten, they may flee vengeance, [an] eternal vengeance otherwise to be taken from many.' For this reason, most holy men — who, endowed with the spirit of true humility, acknowledged themselves never stripped of human vices, and, inflamed with charity, glowed with zeal for [their] neighbors — thought their [own] sins (which is reported of Catherine of Siena, and others) to have given cause for all the evils by which the Church was vexed. But for us, whom not only that common bond of the one Church connects, but a certain closer nexus of the same institute and vocation still binds — how much more is it to be feared, lest that which is privately committed by individuals be atoned by a grave evil and wound of the whole body? Nor is it [only] atoned, but by the perilous imitation of the example it creeps further: for that thing slides more readily to ruin, once it has begun [to slip]. For this cause, moreover, I had said a little before [that] there is placed in each one of us a great power and faculty, that the Society may be in that state which answers to the wishes of us all — since we can not only obtain this from God by most chaste prayers (just as [we obtained] both the true religion for foreign nations, and the pristine splendor of the Church) but also we, who are associated by a closer bond, shall merit the divine benignity, [that] with what full eyes of mercy [God] may sometime look [upon it], and lift up the whole Society. Hence also let that [follow]: if each single member of this body polish and adorn itself with a better cultivation, [it is] consequent that, from the ornaments of the several parts, the brightness and beauty of the whole too may shine forth." But rightly does Epictetus [say] (ch. 35): ἐὰν ὁ ἑταῖρος ᾖ μεμολυσμένος, καὶ τὸν συναναστρεφόμενον αὐτῷ μολύνεσθαι ἀνάγκη [*ean ho hetairos* ■ *memolysmenos, kai ton synanastrephomenon aut*■ *molynesthai anank*■, "if a companion be defiled, it is necessary that he who consorts with him be defiled too"].

Question XLVII. How are masters, Pastors, [and] Bishops sometimes the cause that some Achans — who by their sins harm the community — arise?

"That [thing]," says Origen (in the cited homily 7), "must not be run through idly — that, with one sinning, wrath comes upon the whole people. This happens in this way, when priests, who preside over the people,

wish to seem benign toward offenders, and, fearing the tongues of sinners — lest perhaps they speak ill of them, [being] unmindful of priestly severity — are unwilling to fulfill what is written: 'Reprove the sinner before all, that the rest may have fear'; and again: 'Take away the evil from among your own selves.' Nor, kindled with the zeal of God, do they imitate the Apostle saying: 'I have handed over such a man to Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved.' Neither do they strive to fulfill that [precept] of the Gospel — that, if they have seen [someone] sinning, first they meet [him] secretly, afterward too with two or three witnesses. But if he has despised [this], and after these [things] has not been amended by the Church's correction, let them hold [him], expelled from the Church, as a Gentile and a publican. And, while they spare one, they contrive the destruction of the whole Church. What [kind of] goodness is that? what mercy is it, to spare one and bring all into peril? For a people is polluted by one sinner, just as by one diseased sheep the whole flock is infected; so too, with one fornicating, or committing whatever else of crime, the whole [flock] is polluted. And therefore let us watch one another, and let each one's conduct be known — most of all to the priests and ministers. Nor let them think they rightly say, 'what does this concern me, if another acts ill?' This is [for] the head to say to the feet, 'what does it pertain to me if they ache? If my feet are ill, it is no interest of mine, provided the head endure in health.' Or if the eye should say to the hand, 'I need not thy work, what does it pertain to me if thou grievest? if thou art wounded? Shall I, the eye, be disturbed by the sickness of the hand?' Such, then, is [what] they do who preside over the Churches, not thinking that we are all one body, [we] who believe, having one God, [and] Christ, who binds and holds us together in unity — of whose body thou, who presidest over the Church, art the eye — [placed there] surely for this, that thou mayest look round upon all things, survey all things, [and] foresee even things to come. Thou art a Shepherd; thou seest the little sheep of the Lord, ignorant of peril, borne through precipices, and tending through steep places — dost thou not run to meet [them]? dost thou not recall [them]? dost thou not at least restrain [them] by [thy] voice, and deter [them] by the cry of correction? So [ill] art thou mindful of the Lord's sacrament, that — whereas He, the ninety-nine left in the heavenly places, on account of one little lost sheep which had wandered, descended to the earth, and

(col. 917)

and, [when it was] found, thou didst carry it on thy shoulders to heaven — [that] we in nothing at all follow the example of the master, the Pastor, in the caring for the little sheep? We do not say these [things] for this, that anyone be cut off for a light fault: but if perhaps someone, admonished and corrected for an offense once and again and a third time, has shown nothing of amendment, let us use the physician's discipline. If we have anointed [it] with oil, if we have soothed [it] with plasters, if we have softened [it] with a poultice, and yet the hardness of the tumor does not yield to the medicines, the sole remaining remedy is [that] of cutting [it] off. For so the Lord says: If thy right hand scandalize thee, cut it off, and cast it from thee. Does then the hand of our body ever scandalize us? or, of this hand of the body does the Gospel say: Cut it off and cast it from thee? This is what he says: that I, who seem to thee to be a right hand, and am called a Presbyter, and seem to preach the word of God — if I do anything against Ecclesiastical discipline and the rule of the Gospel, so that I make a scandal of the Church to thee, let the whole Church, conspiring in one consent, cut me off [as] its right hand, and cast [me] from itself. For it is expedient for thee, O Church, to enter into the kingdom of heaven without me [as] thy hand — [me] who by acting ill made a scandal — than to go with me into gehenna. These [things] we have said for this reason, because we have seen [it] related in the sacred scriptures, that on account of one sinner the sons of Israel were made anathema, so that they were conquered by [their] enemies." Arnobius (bk. 4): "Whoever suffers a sinner to sin, he ministers strength to [his] audacity."

Question XLVIII. Why, and whence, [is it] called the valley of Achor?

Near Jericho, close to the camp of Gilgal, on the Northern side, was this valley. And — just as [was] said concerning Gilgal, in [connection with] the circumcision (ch. 5, q. 10) — by a prolepsis [anticipation], at verse 24 it is called by the name Achor, although it received that name afterward, as those last words of the chapter note: "And the name of that place was called the valley of Achor, unto this day." But the cause of that naming — although in the Latin it is sufficiently understood, nay is signified by the particle "quae" [which] — is nevertheless added in the Hebrew, "idcirco" [therefore]. And in the Greek διὰ τοῦτο [*dia touto*, "on account of this"]: where it still remains to be asked, what this is, on account of which it was called the valley of Achor? Abulensis (in this very chapter, once and again), and Ribera following him (on Hosea 2, no. 88), think [it] named not from Achan himself, but from the Hebrew words of Joshua (v. 25), "Because thou hast disturbed us, let the Lord disturb thee." But Theodoret, Theophylact, the Gloss, and Paul of Burgos [derive it] from the proper name. I [derive it] both from Achan's proper name and from these words. From these words indeed, because — [in] that they willed [it thus] — this was done here: [Achan] is disturbed [*exturbatur*], and torn out from the number of the [living] men; but from his name, because, looking to it, and aiming at its derivation, Joshua uttered those words. Moreover the Seventy rendered (v. 24) φάραγγα Ἀχώρ [*pharanga Ach■r*, "the ravine of Achor"]: but afterward, twice, they retained the two Hebrew names, joining them, and softening the hardness of the Hebrew guttural letter, ἐμεκαχώρ [*emekach■r*]; and it can be rendered word for word, "valley of Achor"; or "valley of disturbing, of tearing-out, of exterminating." For if anyone should not wish Achor to be a proper [name], it will be an infinitive: "to disturb, and to tear out, and to exterminate." St. Jerome (in the Epitaph of the Mother Paula): "The valley," he says, "of Achor, that is, of tumult and of disturbances, in which theft and avarice was condemned." But to me this valley seems to be this whole world: or certainly the place of tortures and torments. For in that [world], what [is there] but disturbances, tumults, destructions, exterminations? But in this [place of torment], what, but flames, stones, and extreme punishments? Into this valley he comes, and in it is utterly exterminated — concerning whom [is that of] the Apostle (Gal. 5:10): "He who disturbs you shall bear his judgment, whoever he be." And a little after: "Would that they were even cut off, who disturb you": likewise to everyone whosoever it is said, by the true and great Joshua [Jesus], "Because thou hast disturbed us, let the Lord disturb thee": Thou hast disturbed my Church by the depravity of dogmas, by the impurity of morals, by the scandal of [thy] life; thou hast disturbed these [who were] before concordant, walking in the way of the Lord's commandments, abhorring the Jericho spoils; thou hast disturbed my little flock, my peculiar-possession, my Company. Let the Lord disturb thee. And this will especially come to pass, when he shall come in his majesty, and all the Angels shall stand with him, and, sitting upon the seat of his majesty, he shall say to all the Achans: "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire, which is prepared for the devil and his Angels." Be it far [from me], O Lord Jesus, [that] thou bid me come into this valley: permit not that I disturb anyone by any deed or word. And I know well enough [that], unless my disturbing has gone before, no exterminating of thine will follow. In Hosea 2:15 the same Allegory is taken for the calamitous and wretched place of this world. But now we must go on to the undertaken war of Ai.

Of the Wars: Caput VIII — The Second War, of Ai [Bellum II. Haiense]

Caput VIII — The Second War, of Ai [Bellum II. Haiense] (opening)

1. And the Lord said to Joshua: Fear not, neither be dismayed: take with thee the whole multitude of warriors, and, rising up, ascend to the town of Ai. Behold, I have delivered into thy hand its king, and the people, and the city and the land. **2.** And thou shalt do to the city of Ai, and to its king, as thou didst to Jericho and its king: but the spoil, and all the animals, ye shall plunder for yourselves: set an ambush for the city behind it. **3.** And Joshua arose, and the whole army of warriors with him, to go up to Ai: and, having chosen thirty thousand strong men, he sent [them] by night, **4.** and commanded them, saying: Set an ambush behind the city: and withdraw not far off: and be ye all ready. **5.** But I and the rest of the multitude, which is with me, will approach from the opposite side against the city. And when they shall have come out against us, as we did before, we will flee, and turn [our] backs, **6.** until, pursuing, they be drawn far off from the city: for they will think we flee as before. **7.** Us, therefore, fleeing, and them pursuing, ye shall rise up from the ambush, and lay waste the city: and the Lord your God will deliver it into your hands. **8.** And when ye have taken [it], set it on fire, and thus do all [things], as I have commanded. **9.** And he dismissed them, and they went to the place of the ambush, and sat down

(col. 919)

between Bethel and Ai, on the Western side of the city of Ai. But Joshua that night remained in the midst of the people. **10.** And rising at daybreak, he reviewed [his] companions, and went up with the elders at the front of the army, walled about by the aid of the warriors. **11.** And when they had come and gone up over against the city, they stood at the Northern side of the city, between which and them was a valley in the middle. **12.** But he had chosen five thousand men, and set [them] in ambush between Bethel and Ai, on the western part of the same city: **13.** but all the rest of the army directed [its] battle-line to the north, so that the last of that multitude reached the Western side of the city. Joshua, then, went off that night, and stood in the middle of the valley. **14.** And when the king of Ai had seen this, he hastened in the morning, and went out with the whole army of the city, and directed [his] battle-line against the desert, ignorant that an ambush lay behind [his] back. **15.** But Joshua and all Israel gave way from [their] place, feigning fear, and fleeing by the way of the wilderness. **16.** But they [the men of Ai], shouting together, and mutually exhorting one another, pursued them. And when they had withdrawn from the city, **17.** and not even one had remained in the city of Ai and Bethel who did not pursue Israel (having burst out, [and] left the towns open), **18.** the Lord said to Joshua: Lift up the shield which is in thy hand against the city of Ai, for I will deliver it to thee. **19.** And when he had lifted up the shield over against the city, the ambush, which was lying hidden, rose up at once and, hastening to the city, took it, and set it on fire. **20.** But the men of the city, who were pursuing Joshua, looking back and seeing the smoke of the city ascend up to heaven, could no longer scatter this way and that: especially since those who had feigned flight, and were making for the wilderness, most bravely stood against their pursuers. **21.** And Joshua and all Israel, seeing that the city was taken, and that the smoke of the city was ascending, turning back, struck the men of Ai. **22.** For those too, who had taken and set fire to the city, going out of the city against their own, began to strike the enemy in the middle. When, therefore, the adversaries were being cut down on both sides, so that no one of so great a multitude was saved, **23.** they also seized the king of the city of Ai [while] living, and brought [him] to Joshua. **24.** Therefore, all being slain who had pursued Israel tending toward the deserts, and falling by the sword in the same place, the sons of Israel, turning back, struck the city. **25.** And there were, who fell in that same day, from man even to woman, twelve thousand persons, all [of] the city of Ai. **26.** But Joshua did not draw back the hand which he had stretched out on high, holding the shield, until all the inhabitants of Ai were slain. **27.** But the beasts and the spoil of the city the sons of Israel divided among themselves, as the Lord had commanded Joshua. **28.** Who

[Joshua] set fire to the city, and made it an everlasting mound: **29.** its king also he hung on a gibbet until evening and sunset. And Joshua commanded, and they took down his corpse from the cross: and cast [it] at the very entrance of the city, a great heap of stones being piled upon him, which remains unto the present day. **30.** Then Joshua built an altar to the Lord God of Israel on Mount Ebal: **31.** as Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded the sons of Israel, and [as] it is written in the volume of the law of Moses: But an altar of unpolished stones, which iron had not touched: and he offered upon it holocausts to the Lord, and immolated peace-offerings. **32.** And he wrote upon the stones the Deuteronomy of the law of Moses, which he [Moses] had set forth before the sons of Israel. **33.** And the whole people, and the elders, and the leaders and judges stood on both sides of the ark, in the sight of the priests who bore the ark of the covenant of the Lord — the stranger as [well as] the native. Half of them [stood] beside Mount Gerizim, and half beside Mount Ebal, as Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded. And first indeed he blessed the people of Israel. **34.** After these [things] he read all the words of the blessing and the cursing, and all [things] which were written in the volume of the law. **35.** He left nothing untouched of those [things] which Moses had commanded, but repeated all before the whole multitude of Israel, [including] the women and little ones and the strangers who dwelt among them.

COMMENTARIVS.

What Ai [was], and where the city was situated, [and] in what manner the war against it was begun, [was] said in the previous chapter, from question 11. But now its completion — much happier than that beginning — is set forth: because, the sin being expiated, the Lord was now propitious. And there are two parts of this chapter. In the former, the occupation and burning of the city is narrated: in the latter, how a certain pious ceremony, prescribed of old by Moses, was now brought to effect. And first indeed, the Lord snatches Joshua — and in him the whole people — from the fear taken up from the previous disaster (v. 1), and instructs him about the whole plan of the war in a threefold way. *I*: As to the restored beginning of this war. The whole multitude of warriors had to be led out. Partly indeed, that by their very multitude they might shake off all fear; partly that they might understand [that] God willed indeed to be present to them and to bring aid, yet not without their [own] work and hand — and therefore not [that], as was done at Jericho,

(col. 921)

[the walls] were about to fall [of themselves], but they [the city] were to be taken by them [the Israelites] themselves. For miracles are not always to be done: nor is one manner of acting always to be employed. But afterward a twofold division of this very great multitude of warriors is signified. One [division], of those who were chosen by Joshua out of the whole multitude. And some will [have it] that these were 30 thousand, as the third verse expressly has: others, 35 thousand, because to these 30 thousand they add another five [thousand], concerning whom [is] v. 12; and the Rabbis make a double ambush, in the former of which were 30,000, in the other 5,000. Yet it is more likely that these five thousand were culled and chosen out of those 30 thousand: and that they alone [were] in the ambush, which was only one. The other part of the warriors was all the rest of their multitude: except that small particle which was left to guard the camp, the women, the children, the elders, and the other baggage. For no mention is made of this [guard], because either from the usual custom of guarding camps it is sufficiently understood (as [in] ch. 6, q. 3), or because it is a trifling thing. See elsewhere, q. 20. *II*: As to the end of the war (v. 2). Ai had to be burned, and all who should be found in it slain, even the King himself: yet now with this difference, that no anathema was borne against it. And therefore it was lawful to take from it as much spoil as [one wished]. But note: when the Lord had begun the sentence in the [third] persons, he afterward changes the number and says, "ye shall plunder for yourselves." Because those Leaders act most badly and most inconsiderately, who turn aside to themselves all or nearly all the spoil, but to the soldiers, by whose peril and blood the victory stands, leave nothing, or very little. How many hatreds, tumults, [and] seditions of soldiers against Leaders and Captains [arise] hence? *III*: As to the middle plan of the same war, the Lord bids [Joshua] go up against the city of Ai, and

behind its back he sets an ambush. But because the Lord was speaking at Jericho, in the camp of Gilgal, and these were toward the East, it comes about that it is understood [that] the ambush had to be placed at the western side of the city of Ai (v. 2; ch. 9). And all [things] were diligently done by Joshua, as is described (vv. 3–13), where [things] already noted elsewhere are to be repeated. Concerning Joshua's vigilance, and [his] good example, by which he goes before all: for he rises in the morning (v. 10), [and] ascends at the front of the army — that is, before all; or, as the Seventy [have], πρώτων ["of the foremost"]. But also by good example the elders went before, with all the others, together with him: that is (as Masius says) the other Princes of the people, or [those] more advanced in age (as Abulensis [says]). See above (q. 4, on the wars, and again on the elders, often). But then the battle (v. 14): the King of Ai, made bold by [his] previous victory, began [it], when he had gone forth against the appointed place (as R. Isaiah and Masius [say]), or [the appointed] time and hour (as Ralbag and Rashi [say]), or a signal (as the same R. Isaiah [says]) — toward the desert, which is called Bethaven, as he had proceeded in the previous chapter (q. 11). Joshua with his own entered upon a feigned flight. And, the stations and the whole city being deserted, they [the men of Ai] went out to pursue those [Israelites] — [they] who were in Ai and Bethel (v. 17). But some think the Bethelites, out of fear of the Israelites, their own town being deserted, betook themselves, with their goods, into the better-fortified Ai, and so had now gone out with the men of Ai. Yet nothing hinders [it] being said [that] the Bethelites were in their own town, and, when they had seen [it] either from higher watch-posts, or had learned from sent scouts and swift runners that the Israelites [were] fleeing, at once ran up to help utterly destroy the fugitives (as [in] Judg. 7:24, [and] Judith 15:6). While these [things] happen, the Lord said to Joshua (v. 18): Lift up the shield which is in thy hand against the city of Ai. And he held [it] lifted up until the victory was full (v. 26). For, the ambush being roused, and the burning being of not the whole city but of some part, the smoke appeared to the pursuers; warned by which, they desisted from [their] pursuit, and their pursuers began to drive [them] into flight and to destroy [them] with utter slaughter. Then a huge spoil was collected from the whole city (v. 27); and at last, the flame being cast in, by which that [city was] reduced into ashes and a mound [it remained] for a long time afterward. Yet because it had not been struck by anathema, as I said, it was afterward restored by the Benjamites, [being] either in the same place, or certainly in the neighborhood (2 Ezra [Nehemiah], ch. 11:31).

Question I. Are there, properly [speaking], ambushes in war?

Abulensis (q. 6, at the 2nd argument) says: if we should wish to speak properly, the setting of ambushes is not against enemies. For ambushes are [set] against those who ought not to beware of ambushes. But surely this notion of Ambushes is too narrow and novel, against the Grammarians, Rhetoricians, and all Philosophers — nay, against Abulensis himself. For if, as he says, enemies ought always to fear ambushes — the properly-called [ambushes], namely, of which he treats — then [ambushes] can be against them; or, if his reasoning [be] firm, there will nowhere in the nature of things be ambushes. For who ought not to beware of them? Who does not receive from God prudence, that he may decline whatever things might harm him? For "to use reason too," says Cicero (bk. 1 *On Duties*), "and speech prudently, and to do what thou doest considerately, and to see in every matter what is true, and to guard [it], befits [a man]: but on the contrary, to be deceived, to err, to slip, to be beguiled, as ill befits [a man] as to rave and to be out of [one's] mind."

Question II. Whether it is lawful to use ambushes in war?

"[That] which," says Calvin, "some here ask — whether it is lawful to overwhelm enemies by guile and through ambushes — arises from crass ignorance." But these two questions on this matter — the tenth and eleventh — St. Augustine treats in this place. With Calvin, then, as judge, [was] that so great a man [Augustine] crassly unskilled? This [is] too crass a reproach of Calvin, too crass an impudence; but he himself adds two reasons. The former: "For it is certain that wars are waged not by striking alone, but that those are reckoned the best leaders who are strong in art and counsel more than in force." The latter: "Then,

[that] as each has become an old hand by long use, so [he is] the best soldier." How certain these [reasons] are, we shall see afterward; but be it [so], let them be most certain — is it not on that account [still] to be inquired into? Many [things] are certain to some, which are not [certain] to others: many [things] are inquired into, which are certain to all. But they are inquired into for this, that they may be more explained, [that] their reason be investigated, [that] they may turn out more certain. What [is] clearer than that God is? yet Calvin proves it (Institutes bk. 1, ch. 3 and 4). What [is] more certain to Christians than that Sacred Scripture is of the highest faith and authority? yet the same [Calvin] proves this — although he interweaves not a few false [things] — in the same bk., ch. 7. I will not bring forward [others] who, either here or elsewhere, discuss this most noble question — Theologians, Jurisconsults, Politicians, Heretics, who are indeed many; but, lest anyone could doubt, I will bring forward the several [points]. *First*: All fraud and guile ought to be absent from a good man — of which kind we all ought to be; let it be far [from us] always. For that [fraud] too greatly repugns fidelity, truth, and simplicity — [things] much commended in scripture and in the doctrine of the profane wise men (Gen. 20; ch. 25, 27)

(col. 923)

(Gen. 20; 25; 27; Job 1:1 & 8; ch. 2:3; Prov. 3:32; ch. 10:9 & 20; ch. 11:5; ch. 28:10 & 18; Phil. 2:15; Eph. 6:5; Cicero, bk. 1 *On Duties*). On the contrary, how often, and how gravely, are the crafty, the cunning, the old-hands [*veteratores*], the double-hearted, blamed? *Secondly*: It is the law of nature, that what we do not wish to be done to us, we should not do to others. But who wishes to be dealt with by ambush? *Thirdly*: Ambushes are always done secretly — and [are they always done] rightly? Of their kind, therefore, are all liers-in-wait, concerning whom [is] Luke 6[?]: "He who acts ill, hates the light." Job 29[24]: "The eye of the adulterer loves the darkness." *Fourthly*: Deut. 16: "Justly [pursue] what is just, [that] thou execute [it]." But to lie in ambush is to act fraudulently: to act fraudulently is to act unjustly. *Fifthly*: [That] which, in a matter in which one [is] not judge and prince, regards war — that [same], before a judge, regards the disputation of law among others. But in this disputation of law it is not lawful to use frauds — neither for the plaintiffs, nor for the defendants, nor for the Judge. *Sixthly*: If it be lawful to use ambushes in war, it will be lawful [to use] lies too. *Seventhly*: It will be lawful, too, to use arms and insignia and standards falsely-counterfeited. *Eighthly*: Likewise a new and unusual kind of arms, and order of battle-lines. *Ninthly*: It will be lawful, too, to rescind pacts and covenants. *Tenthly*: It would even be lawful to imbue darts and weapons of every kind with poison, for the destruction of the enemy: [and] to infect springs and rivers with the same. *Eleventhly*: It would be lawful to see to it that cooks, cup-bearers, physicians, and other domestics of that kind take off [kill] our adversary Leaders by poison. *Twelfthly*: It would be lawful to hire assassins, and send [them] against them. *Thirteenthly*: It would likewise seem permitted to stir up, by songs and magical arts, tempests and storms against the enemy — [and] to cast the illusions of ten-thousand [myriad] tricks upon them. *Fourteenthly*: Many and excellent men of old — even Gentiles — judged this whole kind of ambush [to be] hissed off from a war which is rightly waged. How much more ought the same mind and opinion to be ours, [we] Christians? In the *Rhesus*, Euripides:

> οὐδεὶς ἀνὴρ εὔψυχος, ἀξιοῖ λάθρα / κτεῖναι τὸν ἐχθρόν.

[Euripides, Rhesus: "No brave man deems it worthy to kill his enemy by stealth." Serarius's Latin: "No man of right mind would wish to kill an enemy secretly."]

Concerning the Tibareni, who used to reveal to the enemy, in good faith, the place, time, and hour of battle, [see] Caelius Rhodiginus (bk. 8, ch. 30). The Achaeans so greatly abhorred malicious machinations and hidden guiles, that they were unwilling to conquer even the most hostile enemies by fraud: and Polybius praises them under this name (bk. 13), and indicates the cause by which they were moved: namely, that they judged that victory [to be] neither splendid nor firm, unless one conquered — fighting openly and by agreement [*ex condicto*] — those who were opposing in [strength of] spirit. "Base," says a certain [author] in Isidore (bk. 18), "[is] a victory sought by guile." "There is no greater victory," says Claudian (*On the [Sixth]*

Consulate of Honorius), "than that which subdues enemies who confess [defeat] in [their] mind too." For those who have succumbed by fraud and guile easily rise up again, reckoning themselves conquered not by virtue, but by the occasion and art of [their] adversaries. Florus (bk. 1, ch. 13): "A holy and wise man," he says, "will know that to be a true victory which is procured with faith safe and dignity entire." But while ambushes are being set, can faith and dignity stand safe and entire? When Alexander was persuading [him] to use the occasion of the night against Darius, Polyperchon, "Away with it," he said. "It is not mine to seek stolen victories." And the same [Alexander] did not deign to strike Orodes fleeing, nor, meeting him, to give a blind wound with a hurled [spear-]point; but ran against [him] face to face, and matched himself, man to man — not better by stealth, but by brave arms.

But against ambushes, this [is my answer]: before I fight in the open, a twofold distinction is to be observed here. First: ambushes are either of words or of deeds. Second: the war which one party of the belligerents wages is either just or unjust. Concerning ambushes of words there is now no need [for me] to speak, because I have said something elsewhere on Judith (ch. 13, qq. 6–10), and it will again have to be said in the following ch. 9. But concerning ambushes of deeds there is one sentence: "In an unjust war it is not lawful to use ambushes; in a just [war] it is lawful." The former part [is] clear from this, that [things] which are referred to an evil end and action are all evil: Prov. 24:15, "Lie not in wait, and seek not impiety in the house of the just." The latter [part], which is most to be regarded here, is proved: *1.* by the most clear example of this place, which the best and most holy leader of war, Joshua — nay, God himself, who prescribed to Joshua the ambush — supplies. *2.* St. Augustine (q. 10): "[That] which," he says, "God, speaking to Jesus [Joshua], commands — that he set for himself an ambush behind [him] — that is, warriors lying in wait to ambush the enemy: hence we are admonished [that] it is not unjustly done by those who wage a just war: so that a just man ought chiefly to think of nothing in these matters, except that he undertake a just war — for whom it is lawful [*fas*] to make war. For it is not lawful for all [men]; but when he has undertaken a just war, whether he conquer by open battle or by ambushes, is nothing to [does not affect] justice." St. Jerome (on Ezek. 17): "As long as thou dost not aid [the enemy] and dost not enter a pact [with him], it is [a matter] of the prudence and fortitude given by God either to deceive or to defraud the adversary, howsoever thou canst." *3.* The same explanation and sentence of so great a father is approved (Gratian, 23, q. 2, ch. *Dominus*). *4.* All the Theologians embrace the same, of whom the chief [is] St. Thomas (2a2ae, q. 40, a. 3); Abulensis (on Judg. 7, q. 30). *5.* The civil law too, "on guile" [*de dolo*], in the Pandects — and I cited [it] (q. 6, on Judith ch. 13) — likewise all the Interpreters of law on the same law, and most copiously Cephalus (Consilium 696). There can be added the Law *nihil interest* (*ff., On Captives*), and the law *non solum* (*Code, On Commerce and Merchants*). *6.* Also various other writers, as Virgil (Aeneid bk. 2), cited by St. Jerome in the place cited: "guile or virtue — who would ask in an enemy?" Quintilian (bk. 2, ch. 13): "Sometimes," he says, "it will profit to have turned [one's] back, by a feigned flight." Pindar (Isthmian, Ode 4): "One ought, by trying, to break the adversary in any way whatever." Homer (Odyssey, bk. 11): "to finish off the enemy either by guile, or with drawn sword at close quarters." Polybius — because he had before seemed to praise the Achaeans — says (bk. 8) [that], of military deeds, those are of less praise and moment which are perpetrated openly and by force, [than] those [done] by guile and from occasion. Xenophon (*On the Cavalry-Commander*): ὄντως οὐδὲν κερδαλεώτερον ἐν πολέμῳ ἀπάτης [*ont■s ouden kerdale■teron en polem■ apat■s*], that is, "In truth nothing in war [is] more useful than guile." Ammianus (bk. 17): with no distinction of virtue and guile, all prosperous outcomes of wars ought to be praised. Which some Italic Poet [expresses] thus:

> *"To conquer was ever a praiseworthy thing, / whether one conquer by fortune or by wit."*

Perhaps here too could be referred [that] which is much weightier than all these — Prov. 24:6: "With a disposition [plan] is a war entered upon (or, as it is in the Hebrew, with various thoughts): and there will be safety, where there are many counsels." *7.* There are added the examples of the most illustrious leaders, Gentiles and Christians,

(col. 925)

Agesilaus, in Plutarch — [with a philological note: it must be read ἀδικεῖν ("to wrong"), not ἀποπρονοούμενον, which is no word in the Greek tongue; nor ἀδίκως ("unjustly"), for even ἀδίκως πολεμίους παραλογίζεσθαι ("to outwit enemies unjustly") is impious [ἀσεβές]; but τοὺς δὲ πολεμίους παραλογίζεσθαι ("but to outwit the enemies"), etc.] — that is: to afflict with harm [him] who has entered a treaty with us is impious; but to deceive enemies is not only just and very glorious, but also pleasant and profitable. Brasidas, in Thucydides (bk. 5): "those thefts of war have the fairest praise by which one most deceives the enemy, and profits [his] friends the most." What [is] more celebrated than the Lacedaemonian warcraft? Yet the first [Spartans], though most pugnacious, deemed that action more worthy, and more befitting a man, which was set up by reason and mind, than that [done] by force and strength. And therefore that leader among them who had conquered by force and just battle [sacrificed] only a cock; but he who could [conquer] by fraud and persuasion, [sacrificed] an ox — [choosing], namely, a lesser and a greater victim for a lesser and a greater usefulness and praise of victory. Caesar (bk. 4 *On the Gallic War*, and bk. 1 *On the Civil War*): he always preferred to accomplish the matter without a wound of his own [men], and used to say [that] "it is no less [the mark] of a Commander to conquer by counsel than by the sword." The fierce and barbarous Franks of old — how [did] Constantine the Great [conquer them] except by craft and guile, as [is] in Panegyric V? Christian wars against the infidels and Turks — how great an abundance of that kind of ambush do they give? And whom of the Pontiffs, priests, and learned [men] has our age ever reproved [for it]? — our Belgium is the field of them, both those [ambushes] which the heretics and those which the Catholics contrive. How [was] Lier recovered? how [was] the fort of Wachtendonk recently [taken], though a little after lost again? how [was] Amiens captured? Nay, [these] are honored with the honest and splendid name of stratagem, of which Frontinus and Polyaenus are full. *8.* St. Thomas brings the reason (in the cited place). In the common custom of life, no one is bound to open to another — even if he be deceived — the hidden [things] which he says or does. Therefore much less is anyone bound to open to enemies the [things] which he prepares for their destruction. But surely, in that reasoning, that antecedent can seem doubtful, if indeed another be so deceived that he thence draws a loss, and especially death. For some Philosophers denied this to be just — of whom Cicero (*On Duties* 3). Then, be that antecedent true, only this much will be gathered: that it is lawful to be silent and not to do something by which he [the enemy] might find out the thing which is concealed; but not to do something by which the same thing be covered, and by which he be drawn into destruction. But these differ not a little — "not to do something whence knowledge could be," and "to do [something] whence knowledge is not, and [something] be thought to be, which is not." And therefore, perfecting this reason of St. Thomas, Abulensis (q. 6) adds: "it is not only lawful to conceal what we do or intend, but even to feign that we do something else, that we may catch them." But what [is] the proof of this? if there is any doubt in the antecedent of St. Thomas, how much greater in this? — for there [it is] only [a matter] of an act of business; here, of a pretending. I think indeed the thing which is said by these [men] to be true; but on account of the authority of scripture and the Fathers cited above, not on account of the force of reason — unless it be more explained and confirmed for its sake. *9.* Therefore: to whom the right of a just war belongs, to him that power seems [to belong], that openly and secretly, by omitting and by acting in whatever way he can, [he may harm] the enemy by [means] which are not forbidden — by nature, by God's [law], and by the [law] of the nations (I add, and, among Christians, by the Church's laws). For the very word and nature of "war" imports this whole power, as its difference from "duel" shows, and the common consensus of both the wise and of somewhat more learned peoples. *10.* What is mine, when it is not lawful by [ordinary] law [to reclaim it], I can either recover or protect by every non-forbidden means. *11.* By the law of nature, it is lawful to look more to my own and my [family's] advantages, safety, and life, than to others'. Therefore, that less blood be shed in war by me and mine, fewer perils be approached, fewer losses received, it is lawful to circumvent by ambushes the enemy contriving all the worst against me. *12.* To a bad knot a strong wedge must be applied. But what knot [is] more knotty than a struggle over safety and life? *13.* The

enemy against whom a just war is waged is iniquitous and wicked, and seeks all means of destroying me — and indeed unjustly. I therefore will rightly employ against him all [means] not forbidden, for his destruction. *14.* We capture wild beasts and the greatest monsters not only by open force, but even by hidden nets, pits, and javelin-throws — why not [also] those who, in the manner of beasts (from which the name "war" [*bellum*] is derived, rather than from some antiphrasis I-know-not-what), invade us and ours wickedly, unjustly, and criminally — [why not] pierce [these] enemies with open and hidden darts? [why not] finish [them] off by insidious and hidden war? *15.* Finally, this opinion is proved from those [arguments] which have been discoursed against [it], either by [their] solution or by [their] exposition.

To the first [objection]: Only that fraud and guile repugns virtue and a good man which contains injustice. Otherwise a certain guile is good, as I showed (q. 6, in ch. 6 of Judith). But that simplicity is commended which has nothing of fraud and of exposed evil guile. But that [simplicity] which [is] imprudent, stolid, and insipid, is rejected — as St. Gregory shows (bk. 4, Epistle 31, to Maurice Augustus), who had called him [Gregory], in his letter, "simple," that is (as he interprets [it]), "foolish." For in Sacred Scripture, when "simplicity" is put in a good sense, it is often associated with prudence or rectitude. Whence also of blessed Job it is written: "He was a man simple and upright"; and Blessed Paul the Apostle admonishes, saying: "Be ye simple in [regard to] evil, and prudent in [regard to] good." And Truth itself, through itself, admonishes, saying: "Be ye prudent as serpents, and simple as doves" — judging [it] very useless if either prudence be lacking to simplicity, or simplicity to prudence. That, therefore, he might make his servants learned in all things, he willed them to be both simple as doves and prudent as serpents: in so far as, in them, the astuteness of the serpent might sharpen the simplicity of the dove, and the simplicity of the dove might temper the astuteness of the serpent. On the contrary, those whose mind is quickly turned to evil, and [who] take cunning counsels unjustly, and cook up iniquity in [their] heart indeed, [but] in [their] work display I-know-not-what goodness — these are called "astute" [*astuti*], "crafty" [*versuti*], and "cunning" [*callidi*]. Yet there is [a place] where these three [words] are taken in a good sense, both in scripture and among the good authors of Latinity: yet never, so far as I know, [is] "veterator" [taken so] — unless it be taken simply for "veteranus" [a veteran], as the laws prescribe (Digest, *On the Aedilician Edict*) — so that [it is] false, [that] which Calvin said above, [namely] "that [he is] the best soldier who has, by long use, become a veterator [old hand]." For [he] who by long use has best learned the wily art, he is the worst

(col. 927)

as Budaeus shows. And therefore Joseph Scaliger too was warned (bk. 2 of the *Minervalia*) not to call, as he had begun, Catholics and men of the ancient faith "veteratores" [wily old foxes].

To the second [objection]: The law of nature is understood of the will, which, conformably to reason, does not wish this or that — as Abulensis rightly [says] (q. 6, ad 1).

To the third: All sins indeed, by a certain force of nature, dread the light, on account of the natural reproach and disgrace which follows them: yet meanwhile there are many secret [things] which, for other causes — and those good — ought to be hidden and covered. Tobit 12:7: "To hide the secret of a King is good."

To the fourth: That fraudulent [thing] is disapproved only which [is] unjust, as [in the response] to the first. Otherwise, "they are not ambushes [in the bad sense], nor properly frauds, when they repugn neither justice nor an ordered will," says St. Thomas in the place cited.

To the fifth: Covarruvias disputes (in his manner — neither briefly nor negligently — bk. 1 *Resolutions*, ch. 2) by what artifices, in a good cause, it is lawful for the defendant or the plaintiff (nay, even for the Judges themselves) to use, before the Judges. But here only this much is to be said: [that] much more is lawful to him who has a good cause than to him who has a bad [one]. Much more, therefore, in war.

To the sixth: The consequence is denied. Although Albericus Gentilis, from the flock of the Innovators, in England, grants (ch. 5, bk. 2 *On War*) that it is lawful to use lies against the enemy.

To the seventh: Arms and standards, made in this or that manner and color, are not of themselves, or by the common consent of men, so utterly applied to that one side or the other, that the other party could not, by good right, take the same [for itself]. It is granted, therefore, that this is lawful.

To the eighth: It is likewise granted [to be] lawful. For these are the inventions of military reason and prudence: and of old it was lawful to abandon those pitched battles which — in Cassiodorus (bk. 1 *Variae*, [letter] 30) — [are called] "pugna," and stakes and arrows, spears and swords, and other [weapons] of that kind, even to our arquebuses and bombards — concerning the recent invention of which Magius (in the *Miscellanea*) devised six hundred [things]. A certain Muscovite, when the most praiseworthy King of Poland, Stephen, had begun to set fire to his [the Muscovite's] wooden defenses with hurled red-hot balls, complained and raged that the right of war was violated, and the honor of arms polluted, by a new fraud — as [is] in Lipsius's *Poliorcetica* (bk. 5, ch. 5).

To the ninth: The consequence is denied. "It is clear," says St. Ambrose (bk. 1 *On Duties*, ch. 29), "that even in war faith and justice ought to be kept, nor can there be any honor if faith be violated." And likewise (bk. 3, ch. 10). "Many [things]," says Seneca (bk. 5 *On Benefits*, ch. 21), "have no law, nor [legal] action." But the custom of human life, stronger than every law, gives access. No law commands that the secrets of friends not be uttered: no law [commands one] to keep faith even with an enemy. Yet I will complain of him who has not kept [secret] a secret conversation, and I will be indignant at a faith given and not kept. Because, although Seneca then thought [it was] against no civil law, yet it was against the natural [law]; and, because usually an oath [*sacramentum*], which [is] by no means to be violated, is wont to be interposed, [it is] against the divine [law]. Truly Silius: "By far the best [is] that [man] of warfare, to whom [it is] the last and the first [concern] to protect [his own]."

Faith amid wars. Jurisconsults indeed sharply dispute whether faith pledged [i.e. pacts] must be kept with robbers and criminals: and not a few deny [it], as Zasius, Alciatus, Bodin; yet no one asserts [that faith is] not to be kept with enemies. And even that very [man] who, otherwise, opened a window to fraud, simulation, and all impiety for very many most unhappy [readers] — Machiavelli (bk. 3 *On the Republic* [Discourses], ch. 40) — when he had taught [that], in warlike affairs, guile and fraud can be employed with great glory (which, taken generally about warlike [matters], [is] false; about warlike *just* [matters], true), added (fol. 607): "That fraud which is done, in a military matter, by breaking faith [and] by not keeping a pact, [is] by no means glorious."

To the tenth, and the two following arguments: These arguments — and [those] similar to it — are insidious [captious]; the same [which] the impious proposed to CHRIST the Lord (Matt. 22:17): "is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar, or not?" Yet because it is one thing to give counsel about a certain man, in a certain case and time, another to seek the truth generally, I say, *first*, [that] here only, as in the whole question, it is asked whether it be lawful — to him who wages war not in any way [whatever], but in a just manner and [with a just] cause — to take off, if he can, the unjust adversary and his soldiers by poison. *Secondly*: It is one thing whether it be lawful to do this, another whether it befit this or that [person]: "All things [are] lawful for me," says the Apostle (1 Cor. 6:12), "but not all things are expedient." And again (ch. 10:23): "All things are lawful for me, but not all things edify." Whence the Law *semper* (*ff., On the Rules of Law*): "not only what is lawful is to be regarded, but also what is honorable." *Thirdly*: I see two opinions of the Jurisconsults. One, of Baldus and the older [jurists], who judge [that] to one waging war justly there is the right and power of scattering poisons among the enemy, if indeed there be occasion, and of taking them off by these. "It is lawful," says he (bk. 2, Consilium 188), "to kill an enemy by poison, as Vegetius teaches." Concerning this Vegetius indeed — whether, and where, he teaches this — I do not trouble [myself]; but that is Baldus's opinion. The other [opinion], of the more recent [jurists], and indeed of very few — namely, of two Gentili

brothers: Alberico (*On the Right of War*, ch. 6) and Scipio (in the annotations on bk. 2 of the *Solymeis* of Torquato Tasso); and these fight indeed with a multitude of reasons (for that one [Scipio] brings forward 20), but which have more of noise than of substance. *Fourthly*: I think, nevertheless, universally speaking, [that] this is lawful in a just war: yet often — out of regard for [the customs] of wars, of enemies, of usage, of glory, and other similar [things] — one ought not to descend to this last degree of ambush. The former part of the posited conclusion is proved by the [above] reasons, and by the dissolution of all the recentiores' reasons: from which [dissolution] there is light for the latter part too.

The first reason [of the Gentili]: Some Barbarians have sometimes used poison. Answer: Not whatever men — even Barbarians — do is straightway evil. *The second*: Poisons bring death at once by a light touch. Answer: So much the more quickly is the foul evil of war ended; a bridle is put on injustice; the blood of the just-defending party is spared. *The third*: The contest of arms is [thereby] taken away. Answer: This very [thing] is sought by all ambushes — that there be an end to fighting with arms. *The fourth*: Wounds are doubled by poisons. Answer: 1. It is not always so, nor properly. 2. It is lawful to inflict several blows on someone, that the defender of an unjust cause may fall more surely and quickly. *The fifth*: Animals do not do this. Answer: 1. That is true, because brutes do not act by wit. 2. Many [animals] even

(col. 929)

even pour out poison too, as serpents [and] snakes. *The sixth*: Injury is done to the natures of things. Answer: [It is] no greater injury than when we use wood, iron, or other usual [weapons] for the slaughter of enemies. *The seventh*: This [poison] is infamous. Answer: When [it is] for the sake of justice and the public advantage, against an iniquitous [enemy], and [an enemy] scarcely — or not even scarcely — to be overcome otherwise, there is no cause of infamy. Yet if any such [infamy] be feared, let one abstain — as I was saying in the second place. *The eighth*: It is against God, as Florus says. Answer: [Only] if the war be not just. *The ninth*: It is against the customs of the ancestors, as Valerius says (bk. 6, ch. 5), [and] Livy (bk. 42). Answer: 1. Nearly the same could be said of other ambushes. 2. The Romans did not use [it], because they could overcome their [enemies] conveniently otherwise. 3. Others did use [it], as Solon, the wise-man of Greece (in Pausanias, last bk.; Frontinus, bk. 3); and the Amphictyons (in Polyaenus, bk. 6); others [too] — although, on account of the great occasion of sin given, [they] displease [me] who are said to have sent prostitutes infected with that impure disease into the camp of the Gauls, so that thence the "French disease" [*morbus Gallicus*] was named (in Fallopius, in the preface to [his] book on this disease, and Guicciardini, bk. 19). *The tenth*: It is [the way] of robbers. Answer: To lay ambushes is [the way] of robbers too; but robbers do it unjustly. *The eleventh*: It is not warlike, because clandestine. Answer: So the whole kind of ambush would not be warlike. *The twelfth*: It is a crime of treachery. Answer: In him, sometimes, who gives the poison — not in him who, waging a just war, sees to its being given. But of this afterward. *The thirteenth*: It is against honor and innocence. Answer: So it is, if it be done without a just cause of war. *The fourteenth*: Physicians forbid anyone to give poison from among their own [drugs]. Answer: Rightly, because it is theirs [physicians'] to cure, not to kill: and, through some one poisoner, the whole nation of physicians is ill spoken of. *The fifteenth*: Philosophers and other Writers deny [that poison] is to be given. Answer: And I indeed would wish [it] given to no one — just as [I would wish there were] no ambushes, nor war, nor any cause of war. But yet, when just arms are taken up, I have not seen even one author who precisely accuses that [as] a crime, but only [one who warns of] a certain manner, time, [and] caution. Then, to these authors, other authors can be opposed. *The sixteenth*: The adulterer and others [are] to be killed by iron [the sword], not by poison (law 8, *ff.* [Digest], *On Punishments*). Answer: When, in the tribunals, some one punishment is imposed on the guilty, not on that account are all the others — as if never granted in another kind [of case] — condemned. *The seventeenth*: Those who interpret that law feel thus. Answer: As to the sixteenth. *The eighteenth*: War is a contest by force. Therefore it ought not to be waged by poisons. Answer: [I answer, thirdly:] Force [*vis*] is indeed sometimes distinguished from poison, as [in] *ff.* (law 1, *On the Silanian Senate-decree*): yet often it [poison]

is contained under the very name of "force." 2. The consequence too is denied, because so very many good ambushes would [thus] be rejected. *The nineteenth*: War ought to be [waged] by those [means] by which human force can resist. Answer: Poisons can indeed be resisted by prudence and diligence, lest they be taken; 2. if they be already taken, by antidotes. But if the venom has already insinuated itself to the heart, it cannot be resisted by force indeed — but neither [can] a lethal blow, a running-through, [or] a piercing [be resisted]. *The twentieth*: By poison, sometimes not [only] the harmful [guilty] are taken off, but the innocent too — as if wells and rivers be corrupted by poison. Answer: 1. A circumstance of this kind can sometimes make [it] unlawful which would otherwise be lawful. 2. Justly, sometimes, in warlike slaughter, the innocent are laid low along with the guilty — as [was] said of the little children of Jericho (ch. 6), and [as is] that noted [saying]: "Whatever [madness] the Kings rave, the Achaeans are scourged" [Horace, *Epistles* 1.2.14].

To the eleventh [objection]: It is sometimes lawful to use the ready service of certain [men], even if they themselves act ill — for example, of usurers, deserters, and the like. But whether anyone can solicit them to [administer] poisons depends on that question [treated] a little before: whether it be ever just to administer poison? For if there is a just cause, one can invite and lead over whomsoever to it, then use their service for that which is otherwise lawful. But just as there were sometimes [men] who wished to attack the enemy only in open battle, never by ambush (as is said in argument 14), so there was also a spirit so generous in some, that they did not suffer themselves to be either authors or accomplices of poison — [men] among whom [this] is especially celebrated, both in others and truly in Seneca (Epistle 121) and Claudian (*On the Gildonic War*), who [writes]:

> *"Fabricius sent back to the King the harmful poisons which [a servant] had promised to mix for [his] master, the fraud being laid bare — [the King] whom he assails in [open] war; and he refused a war to be waged through the wickedness of a servant."*

To the twelfth: as to the eleventh. *To the thirteenth*: All magic [is] utterly forbidden, because it repugns entirely the natural, divine, and human law. [It is] unworthy of Christians — although some of them are written to have used it (Bodin, bk. 1 *Demonomania*), [and] to have sent forth that voice: "If I cannot bend the gods above, I will move Acheron" [Virgil, *Aen.* 7.312]. Away with the Argonauts, the Zoroastrians, and others, concerning whom [see] Plutarch (in the *Politics*), Diodorus (bk. 60), Arnobius (*Against the Nations*, bk. 1), Eusebius (bk. 1 *Life of Constantine*), Zonaras (vol. 3). *To the fourteenth*: As in nearly all arts, so once — especially in the battles of the human race throughout the world — there was greater simplicity and rudeness. In these [battles] there was a great zeal for the ostentation of bodily strength, and to this they referred nearly everything (as today certain barbarians and rude [peoples] refer [it]) — that it might appear which [side] be more robust, more enduring, more spirited. And therefore of old they used to fix the place for a future battle, and likewise the time, and almost the manner — witness Livy (bk. 42), Polybius (bk. 13), Plutarch (in Pyrrhus and others). The old Florentines, lest they should seem to attack the enemy by ambush, were wont, for a whole month before they led out their forces against him, to ring assiduously a certain bell, which they called "Martinella," that there might be a continuous sound by night and by day — as Michel Lord de Montaigne notes (in his own *Miscellanies* [Essays], bk. 1, ch. 5), where he also relates [that] the inhabitants of the kingdom of Ternate not only declared war to their enemies, but announced all their forces, arms, and manners of fighting. But because the end of wars is not [the ostentation] of bodily strength, nor of wealth, of power, nor the skill of arms, nor the audacity of spirits, but the defense of justice, men gradually judged [it] better to tend to this [end] with the least loss of their own, and [judged] that the concealment of their counsels, and good guiles, could sometimes be employed. And so there was a departure from that old simplicity of wars — which, however, there were some who more approved and more loved, moved by various and diverse causes, of which there is now no need to speak. And I indeed would altogether wish [that men] would withdraw

(col. 931)

from all wars: [that] all men whatsoever would protect a holy peace among themselves, and a Christian concord of souls. But because that is not [so], and, will-they nill-they, wars are horrid, it must further be seen in what manner they can be rightly waged — according to God's nature, and [according to] the laws, both political and Ecclesiastical, of the commonwealth — [and] what in them [is] lawful or unlawful. To the authors and examples, therefore, brought forward in that argument 14, are objected [other] authors and examples (concerning which before) — others, although some of them regard private enemies and enmities (concerning which nothing here). Among which, rightly, a certain Wise-man in Stobaeus (Sermon 1): μηδενὶ ἐπιβουλεύσαιμι, ἐπιβουλευόμενος δ᾽ ἄνευ ἀνάγκης τοῦ τι ἀνδραγαθῆσαι, ἀπαθὴς διαφύγοιμι [*that is*: "May I plot against no one; and, [when] plotted against, without the necessity of doing some [aggressive] brave deed, may I escape unharmed"]. But if someone should plot against me, would that I might escape without any perturbation, short of the necessity of perpetrating anything which is indeed wicked and incurable. And these [things it seemed good] to discuss a little more copiously about the whole [matter] of warlike ambushes, once [for all]: because both in the scriptures that question recurs again and again, and [because] it is of interest to know [that] the right of them belongs to none but just warriors.

Question III. Of how many kinds, how great, where, and when did Joshua place ambushes?

Joshua seems to have built a double ambush: one indeed in the position of the camp, another in the feigning of flight. And in the former, again, some of the Rabbis say there were two: one, which contained five thousand men, and were placed by night to the west of the city of Ai; the other, which — placed the next day, in the morning, toward the North — concealed thirty thousand men. But of these [see] above, in the commentary on the chapter.

Question IV. How did Joshua place the ambushes so secretly that they were neither perceived nor detected by the men of Ai?

Calvin — the very apex, forsooth, of human prudence — attacks in this place the imprudence of Joshua himself in composing and placing the ambushes. "It seems, indeed," he says, "little prudently [done] to send off so great a crowd, [to expect] that it should arrive by hidden routes at a place fit for ambush. For, though they proceeded silently, in best-composed columns, yet it was necessary that a noise be raised by the mere movement of feet. Now if someone should say [that] no one met them, because all the inhabitants of the region had fled from the deserted fields into the city — surely a little after it will be narrated [that], before the Israelites approached nearest to the city, their arrival was known by the King of Ai: which could scarcely have been done without scouts. Now, [even] granting that no one met [them] in the fields — yet it was difficult to pass by, and by night to place ambushes in an opportune place, and to sit there, without betraying themselves by some indication." But I judge everything [to have been] done most prudently by Joshua: and this I gather not only from the rest of his prudence, but also from those [things] which I see here. He had before sent scouts toward Ai (ch. 7, v. 2); these without doubt saw, and reported to Joshua, the situation of the places. It [the region] was mountainous, and hindered by the windings of valleys. Joshua could, therefore, hide his men in them, and contrive the ambush. Then he could send them thither not by the straight [way], past the city, but by a circuit, and by some windings of the road. Thirdly: "The outcome proves the deeds." If Joshua had not done everything most prudently and skillfully, surely either the Bethelites or the men of Ai would have perceived and detected the ambushes. But they neither perceived nor detected [them]. Besides, there was now, on account of the previous little-victory, such elation and security of the men of Ai, that they exceedingly despised the Israelites, over-confidently trusted in themselves, [and] relaxed [their] more intent watches and reconnaissances. For [as to] what Calvin says — [that] "Joshua's arrival at the city could scarcely have been known by the King of Ai without scouts" — [this] is refuted from v. 13, where it is said

[that] Joshua came into the valley nearest the city, which stood in a high place, and [was] thus seen by the King of Ai. Finally, [He] was present who had promised a sure victory — God. "I will not contend," says Masius, "if anyone here, more religiously insisting on the very sacred words, should say [that] both the eyes and the minds of the men of Ai were so blinded by God, that they did not, by any sense, perceive so great an army lying hidden behind the city, for so many hours": and Calvin himself [says], "A wonderful favor [of God] appears especially in this, that he blinds all, lest they get any scent of the ambush."

Question V. By what signal roused did the ambush take the city?

The signal, by which those who were in the ambush were called forth from their hiding-place, the Rabbis, Theodoret, Josephus, and Abulensis (q. 10) think to have been that [shield] which [was] raised by Joshua — because it is written (v. 19), "And when he had raised the shield over against the city, the ambush which was lying hidden rose up at once" — just as [one] raised a shield from a ship, in Alexander ab Alexandro (bk. 4, ch. 2); [and] Lysander and others [gave] other signals in the same place. But — that I may not assent — these [reasons] hold me [back]. First: If this signal had been given for calling forth and rousing the ambushers, then, once it was given, Joshua could have let down his hands and done something else. Secondly: Between the ambush and Joshua were interposed Ai, and its valley, and perhaps not a little of other space. How could a signal be given to them, over so trifling a thing, from so distant a place? Thirdly: It had not been agreed between Joshua and the ambushers that, at the raising of such a signal, they should leap out from the ambush. For it was suddenly prescribed to Joshua — and beyond all his own expectation — by God (v. 18). Therefore, even if they had seen this signal, they would not have stirred themselves, nor understood what Joshua wished signified by it. Fourthly: Cajetan, Masius, and others judge [that] this was not the signal for this thing. Fifthly: Joshua saw Ai taken from the ambush and set on fire, [and] the men of Ai pressed from behind and cut down: and yet he remained fixed in the same place, and held [his] hand extended in the same [direction]. He was looking, therefore, at something other than to call the ambush out from [its] hiding-place. I judge, with the already-cited Cajetan and Masius, [that] that raising was a signal and mystery of another thing; but that those who were manning the ambush were roused by other signs to invade the city — [namely] because they heard the shout of battle and the discordant sounds; because they saw the greatest multitude come out of the city, and indeed — toward the end — with the greatest confidence, in no order, and with joyful haste,

(col. 933)

and saw that the walls [were] sufficiently deserted, the gates bare of guards, [and] the city emptied of brave men. Yet if, on account of the authority of Josephus and Theodoret, anyone should wish [to say] the ambushes were roused to the irruption by this raising [of the shield] — not exclusively, provided only that raising be not said to have been made for this alone — [I do not object].

Question VI. What, and to what end, was Joshua bidden by the Lord to raise?

Our text (v. 18): "Raise," he says, "the shield [*clypeus*], which is in thy hand." For the sake of a better explanation, [I] will put here, as it were word for word, the Hebrew: "Extend the *cidon* [kidon] which [is] in thy hand, toward Ai itself, because I will give it into thy hand. And Joshua extended the *cidon* which [was] in his hand, toward the city itself." It must be known, first, [that] that [word] *cidon* is expounded quite variously. For the Chaldee Paraphrast renders [it] *romcha*, that is, a lance or spear: the 70 here [render it] γαΐσον [*gaison*]; Job 39:23 [render it] μάχαιραν [*machairan*], as it seems; ch. 41:19, πυρφόρον [*pyrphoron*]; 1 Sam. 17:6, ἀσπίδα [*aspida*]; Jer. 6:23, ζιβύνην [*zibyn■n*]; ch. 50:42, ἐγχειρίδιον [*encheiridion*]. Our [Vulgate], here indeed, [renders it] "Clypeum" [shield]; Job 39 and 41, "hasta" [spear]; in each place of Jeremiah, "scutum" [shield]. The same our [Vulgate], and the Greeks, in Ecclesiasticus [Sirach] ch. 46, v. 3, [render it] "rhomphaeam" [a great sword]. For thus these [have it]: "What glory did (Jesus

[Joshua] son of Nun) obtain, in raising his hands, and casting against the city the *rhomphaea*?" but our [Vulgate], by an enallage [change of number], "*rhomphaeas*" [swords]? Now indeed all the Rabbis say [that] here a lance was raised by Joshua, and with it a banner [*vexillum*]. Abulensis (q. 10) grants [that] a lance [was] raised, but [says] that from it a shield, not a banner, hung. But Junius and Tremellius interpret [it] "banner": "Extend that banner which is in thy hand," and, "Joshua extended the banner." And (v. 26): "Joshua did not draw back his hand, which he had extended with the banner." Masius, in [his] Commentary, does not define whether it was a shield or a spear.

I say, therefore, *first*, [that] it ought not to be understood [as] a banner. 1. Because the Hebrew word nowhere signifies that, as [is] clear from all the places adduced and the interpretations of the Greeks. 2. Because in battles the same [men] are not wont to be both leaders and standard-bearers. But Joshua was the leader; and he already had the *cidon* in his hand. He would therefore have been at once both leader and standard-bearer. 3. Because that [notion] about the banner was invented by the Rabbis, so that a signal might thus be given by Joshua to the ambush — which [notion] was, in the previous question, [shown] less proved.

Secondly: The Hebrew *cidon* seems to signify every kind of weapon which one, holding [it], either wounds an adversary or defends himself from him; and so it is rendered now "sword," now "spear" and "shield." For in Job and Jeremiah it is distinguished from javelins and arrows, which one does not hold, but casts at the enemy. And rightly *cidon* accedes to the Hebrew *cid*, which signifies (Job 21:20) "affliction," and, as it were, "slaughter" [*caedes*] — from which perhaps it is even derived by name — and likewise "cado" [I fall] and "occido" [I kill]. Eusebius of Emesa expounds [it] "lance," and cites Diogenianus, who says it is ἐμβόλιον ὁλοσίδηρον [*embolion holosid■ron*, "an all-iron point"], and others who would have [it] be κόντιον [*kontion*, "a small pike"] — for which, in Procopius, the Interpreter reads ἀκόντιον [*akontion*, "a javelin"].

Thirdly: More rightly here is *cidon* rendered "shield" [*clypeus*], because Symmachus renders [it] ἀσπίδα [*aspida*], and (as indeed is read in Theodoret) Josephus [does]. 2. So [does] our old Interpreter [Vulgate]. 3. "Because there is [a place]," says Masius, "where the 70 called a shield γαῖσον [*gaison*]." And so the difficulty which St. Augustine tries to explain (bk. 6 of the *Locutions*) would easily cease. For when the Latin and the 70 version had: "Extend thy hand with the *geson*, which is in thy hand, against the city" — and he then followed this version — "This locution," he says, "would not be to be noted, except on account of the name which is obscure to those in whose usage it is not. For what 'geson' may mean is not easily understood: this the interpreter Symmachus is reported to have called a 'shield.' But the Seventy Interpreters, according to whom we treat these [things], who put 'geson' — I wonder whether in the Greek tongue too they wished a Gallic spear or lance to be understood: for those [things] are called '*Gaesa*,' of which Virgil too makes mention, when he says of the Gauls painted on the Aenean shield:

> *"Two gaesa each brandishes in [his] hand." [Virgil, Aen. 8.661–662]*

Fourthly: When the Hebrew says "extend in [the] *cidon*," [it] is understood — the hand [being extended] with the shield — thus: "Extend thy hand upon [holding] the shield." For this v. 26 openly signifies, when it says: "he did not draw back the hand which he had extended on high"; or, as [it is] in the Hebrew, "he did not lead back his hand which he had extended." And clearly the 70: ἐκτείνειν τὴν χεῖρά σου ἐν τῷ γαισῷ [*ekteinein t■n cheira sou en t■ gais■*, "to extend thy hand with the geson"].

Fifthly: When the same Hebrew says "extend the hand upon the shield," [it] can be understood in two ways. 1. That Joshua may extend [his] hand together with the shield. 2. That he may lean, as it were, on that *cidon* of his, and so hold [his] hand extended — as Moses [did] (Exod. 17), and as in the Poet:

> *"As, weary, [the shepherd] leans upon [his] staff, and sits on a rock, / the Shepherd soothes [his] sheep with a reed-song."*

The former sense seems apter. 1. Because Joshua's shield, or boss, would have to have been quite big and high, on which he might conveniently hold [his] hand leaning and extended — unless perhaps he had first

placed it upon some rock, that it might be higher. 2. Because our Interpreter signifies this, when for the same [thing] he takes "to raise the shield" and "to raise the hand upon the shield." For if the hand [is] to be raised or extended with the shield, the shield surely [is] to be raised. 3. So [do] other Interpreters, even the Innovators. 4. Because the Hebrews' "in" is put for "with," their Grammarians teach, from Is. 7:24, Exod. 15:19.

Sixthly: Joshua seems to have been bidden to extend [his] left hand, because it is said, "extend in [the] *cidon*, which [is] in thy hand"; but the shield is wont to be in the left [hand]. And then, with [his] right hand, he either signaled to his men what needed to be done — namely, that they strike by cut and thrust, [and] spare no one — or rather he extended [his] right [hand], like the left, holding in it a sword or spear. And perhaps both these [things were] signified by the *cidon*, which was in each hand: but in the right [was] a sword or spear, in the left a shield. And therefore indeed it is said: "extend the hand" — namely, each [hand] — "in [the] *cidon*," that is, "in [the] arms," which are in each of thy hands. And certain Interpreters explained one kind of weapon, which [was] in one hand; others the other, which [was] in the other. Whence it appears [that] Joshua's posture was either [that] of a man praying, with both hands extended, or [that] of one fighting, who with one hand casts a shield against the enemy, [and] with the other aims a sword.

Seventhly: But to what end was Joshua bidden to raise the shield in that manner, and turn [it] toward Ai? Cajetan and Masius answer generally: to the signification of some thing. For it is not from nothing that the Leader of the army, at the time of battle, thus

(col. 935)

keeps holiday, as it were fixed in one place, [and] stays — but what [is] that thing [signified]? *First*: That Joshua might show God to be [the one] who waged the war against Ai, and destroyed them. *Secondly*: That in this war — the first of all in Canaan waged by the Israelites hand-to-hand with the enemy — the memory of the first [war], which was waged with the Amalekites, might be renewed: in which [Amalek war] Moses conquered with hands raised to heaven; but here Joshua conquers also with hands extended. *Thirdly*: That the true JESUS, victor of this world, might be indicated — who overcame Ai (that is, this vast and impious world) and its King the devil, not only with hands extended on the cross, but by extending his own arms too toward Ai — persuading the cross to his followers in every part of the earth, and at every time; protecting them with it, [and] finishing off all enemies with it. I cited (bk. 1, ch. 3, [q.] 14) some words of St. Augustine from Sermon 93 on time, which it will be worth the labor to repeat here. *Eighthly*: The place where Joshua now extended the shield, the Author of the Chronicles thinks to be the "threshing-floor" [*area*], on which the unhappy Uzzah touched the pushed and tottering ark, and it is called (1 Chron. 13:9) "the threshing-floor of Chidon" [*area chidon*]. But of this again [in] 2 Sam. ch. 6.

Question VII. When, and how, did the Lord command the extension of the hand and shield?

I: He commanded [it] in the very feigning of flight, when [Joshua] ran from the valley toward the desert, partly to the North, partly to the East. *II*: But Abulensis thinks (q. 9) [that] God commanded this to Joshua by some exterior voice, indeed, but [one] which an Angel formed — not [an Angel] who appeared to him in an assumed human figure, but [one] who lay hidden, concealed in some surrounding cloud. I would prefer to think God spoke to him by a spiritual voice, which he formed in his [Joshua's] intellect by itself, or in [his] imagination through an Angel — as I set forth when I treated of Prophecy at the beginning of [my commentary on] Isaiah, and again in the Biblical Prolegomena.

Question VIII. Whether in this battle any of the Jews were slain? and of the enemy, who and how many?

First: Radak judges [that] some of the Jews fell in the battle and the flight (although a feigned [flight]), because in v. 15, in the Hebrew, in the passive niphal, it is *yinnag'u*, "they were struck." On the contrary, Rashi will have none of the Israelites slain — and rightly. For if, on account of the 36 recently slain, there was such sadness, fear, [and] lamentation, how ill would they bear now some of their own to be laid low and butchered — after the author of that slaughter [was] punished, after the divine exhortation to battle, after such bright promises of victory? This would not have befitted the divine goodness sufficiently, nor [would it have befitted] such great counsels of ambush and flight. And to what end would it not have been indicated how many fell? But other Rabbis explain the Hebrew word by the usual community of that conjugation with the *hithpael*, [thus:] "they feigned to be struck and cut down." But the 70, by [rendering] with ἀναχωρεῖν [*anach■rein*, "to withdraw"], and our [Vulgate] with "to give way from [their] place," show [that] that Hebrew [word] means "they were moved from [their] place, [and] driven from the place to which they had come." For that by that word is also signified "to arrive somewhere," or "to touch [reach] some place," the matter and usage teach (2 Chron. 28:9, Esther 9:1, Ps. 87:4, Gen. 28:12, Is. 25:12). *Secondly*: Of the enemy, Abulensis thinks no Bethelites fell before ch. 13. But this is rejected from what was said above. *Thirdly*: Twelve thousand fell, as many men as women (v. 25). Abulensis gathers one [thing]: that Ai was not a great city, of which the number — both of the men and of all the women — [was] so small.

Question IX. Why was Ai destroyed by fire? (v. 28)

Someone might wonder, says Masius: "and not without reason, why God ordered this city too to be utterly destroyed — [God] whose counsel and will, nevertheless, was that the Israelites should not only exterminate the Canaanites from the whole region, but should themselves also inhabit their places. And there is extant, in Xenophon, a most prudent deliberation of the supreme Commander Cyrus, by which it is shown [that], for waging war rightly in another's dominion, it is most advisable not only to snatch from the enemy, as much as can be done, very many strongholds, but also to procure for oneself and one's own very many [strongholds]: since those who do not do this differ nothing from those who sail through a vast sea. For they indeed sail with a perpetual course; but what part of the waves they have once run through by sailing, that they hold no more than [what is] still untouched. But God did not will his Israel to trust in human reasonings, but to lean on His single aid and grace, to observe His nods [signals], to have all confidence placed in Him alone, [and] to look upon His single benevolence as the safest refuge. He willed indeed [that], the old colonists being gradually routed, they should procure for themselves dwellings in Canaan, and cultivate the cities left by those [colonists]. But the enemy was not yet so far repressed that it was advisable [that] any fortified places remain, which could be a refuge for him again — especially since they [the Israelites] themselves had not yet discharged the commanded ceremony at Mount Ebal and Gerizim, to which the whole multitude was to be led away. And besides, to hold strongholds and towns with garrisons, before a great part of the war was finished, would have been nothing else than to increase confidence in oneself, [and] to diminish [confidence] in God. Moreover it is credible [that] the soldiers were more inclined to preserve this city than to lay it waste — since the Commander so keenly orders it to be burned up." See [the things] said about Jericho (ch. 6). In their time, Eusebius of Caesarea and St. Jerome (in the book on the Hebrew places), when they described it [Ai], say: "Now only a deserted place is shown."

Question X. The King of Ai — in what manner, and why, [was he] hung? (v. 29)

First: since it is said in the Hebrew (v. 29) "hung on a tree [wood]," the 70 explained of what kind this wood was: namely δίδυμον [*didymon*], that is, "double" [twin]. For there is one cross [that is] simple, another composite: and this [composite is] either decussate [X-shaped], or *immissa*, or *commissa* [T-shaped] — as Lipsius (bk. *On the Cross*) and our [own] Gretser (bk. 1, chs. 1 and 2, *On the Cross*) expound at length. This King, therefore, [was hung] on a *commissa*

(col. 937)

cross, which — usual in those times — had a shape very similar to the old Hebrew *thau* [ת] and the Latin T. Whence by the Rabbis it is called also *hashethi haereb* [the "warp and woof"]. Procopius of Gaza, however, [says]: "perhaps the wood was μονόξυλον [*monoxylon*, a single piece]." *Secondly*: There is, even in captured Kings, something venerable and august, I-know-not-what; and the punishment of the cross was quite infamous. Whence [it is called] both "the tree, and the unlucky wood" (in Livy 1, and Seneca Epistle 101); "the infamous stake" (in the *Catalecta* of Virgil); "a most shameful death" (Wisdom 2); "Cursed [is] the hanged one" (Deut. 21:23, Gal. 3:13). Nay, none but the vile and abject persons of slaves were hung — whence, in Tacitus (bk. 4 *Histories*), "a servile punishment"; [in] Lactantius (bk. 4, ch. 26), "[a punishment] unworthy of a free man, however guilty"; [and] in Arnobius (bk. 1 *Against the Nations*), it is called "a punishment infamous [even] for vile persons." Yet the King of Ai was affected with it: *first*, because he had so badly received the Israelites, and, more insolent and swollen from that little-victory, almost insulted Joshua himself and God. *Secondly*: Because, when God wished to destroy the Canaanite nations for [their] sins, he wills greater punishments to be inflicted on their heads [chiefs], because from them especially the examples of crimes are wont to remain in the people.

Question XI. When was the King of Ai taken down from the cross, and why?

I. That he remained on the cross until evening and sunset, the text says (v. 29). Truly indeed; but in the Hebrew and Greek, that [phrase] which is added about the sunset begins a new sentence, thus: "And when the sun set, Joshua commanded." And this seems added, because the name "evening" [*vespera*] sometimes embraces almost the whole afternoon time, as [was] said above, when the Passover was treated of; and it is plain from 2 Sam. 11:2, where — [in the passage] where our [Vulgate] says David "rose from his couch after midday" — the Hebrew says, "at the time of its evening." The 70: πρὸς ἑσπέραν [*pros hesperan*, "toward evening"]. *II*. He was taken down from the cross at sunset, because Joshua commanded [it]. But he commanded [it] because the Lord had commanded (Deut. 21:23). The cause is there added: because "cursed by God is he who hangs on a tree, and thou shalt by no means contaminate thy land, which the Lord thy God shall give thee in possession." And some of the Rabbis indeed — as R. Isaac (in the book *On the Bonds of Isaac*) — say [that] there he who is hung is called "a curse" not "of God," but "of the Judges," because there *elohim* [means] "Judges," as also elsewhere. But the rest say it is "a curse of God" — either because he cursed God by the impiety of some word or deed (and so the Chaldee Paraphrast and Ralbag), or because the cross is the most detestable of all punishments; and therefore it is enough [that] he was affected with it, nor is there need [that] he suffer a longer infamy in the eyes of all men. Add that "to be left unburied" was held [to be] also a very great punishment, and an argument of barbaric cruelty. And therefore a great disgrace and mark would have been branded on the land of the Israelites, if the Israelites had let [them] hang unburied longer — especially since, on account of the sun's heat in those regions, the hung corpses would at once begin to dissolve, drip, and stink, by which things too the land seemed to be defiled. Masius brings other reasons too. But that [instance] about the descendants of Saul, left longer on the gibbet, was extraordinary, and divinely granted to the vows of the Gibeonites (2 Sam. 21).

Question XII. Where, and how, was the King of Ai buried?

I. At the entrance of the city, and — as the Hebrew says — "at the gate of the city," or "where the gate is opened," the corpse was cast. The 70: ἔῤῥιψαν αὐτὸ (namely σῶμα [the body]) εἰς τὸν βόθρον [*errhipsan auto … eis ton bothron*], that is, "they cast the corpse itself into a pit." Nor indeed did they read "Pechath" for "pethach" with the letters transposed, as Masius thinks; but they omitted this whole [phrase] about the "gate" — which, as often elsewhere, is expressed here not by the one [word] "petach" alone, but by another name too, "schaar" — and indicated [that] he himself was buried, and covered by the ditch. *II*. But over him let a

monument be raised of cast and heaped stones, for his perpetual infamy — as [was] said above (ch. 7) concerning Achan.

Question XIII. What [is] the allegory of the storming of Ai?

"These [things] being heard" (says Origen, homily 8), "it is likely [that] the hearers say, 'what [is] this to me? what does it profit me, if I learn that those who dwelt at Ai were conquered — as if similar, or even more powerful, wars were not either waged or being waged?' Was this the care of the Holy Spirit, that — so many destructions of so great and noble cities being passed over — the battle of the city of Ai should be inscribed and committed to the sacred volumes? It would perhaps be rash, [this thing] which we do, trying to explain places of Sacred Scripture so arduous and so difficult: but if you aid us by your prayers, we shall not only escape the fault of audacity, but also God the Father of the Word, embracing our devotion, will give a word in the opening of our mouth, by which both you may be edified, and we may obey not undevoutly." He then subjoins the allegory — but I say [it] briefly: "This world is Ai, as the interpretation of the name and the malice of the city declare. To storm this world — [it being] to be captured by sacred eloquence and pious virtues — the true JESUS sent, of old, a few [men] under the law of nature and of Moses: Patriarchs and Prophets, and their disciples and intimates: but they profited little; nay, [some] of them [were] partly slain, partly put to flight and mocked — because there was a great sin in the people of God. JESUS himself came, and transferred the punishment of this sin onto himself, and expiated it by his death. Then the people, whom he gathered into his Church, he divided into two troops. One attacks the world openly; the other from ambush. The former seemed at first to be cut down and to flee, when the Christians were seized by tyrants and tortured to pieces. Who would not think it was over with that religion? that those [others] had triumphed [over it]? And JESUS himself, who had descended into the most obscure valley of the deepest humility, seemed even to be conquered and to yield, when he was driven to the cross. But he stood firm at last, turned [his] face [about], extended toward Ai [his] hands full of prayers to the heavenly Father, and the arms of the cross, of patience, chastity, humility, and of all virtues; all the soldiers stood firm with him: they began to turn back those who

(col. 939)

those [very ones] who wished to pervert and destroy them; to put the impious to flight; to take the metropolis of all crimes, Ai, [to] burn [it], [and] to establish [it as] an everlasting mound. But in ambush were placed as many as, lying hidden in mountains and caves, buried in solitudes and caverns of the earth, in sheepskins and goatskins, lived needy, straitened, [and] afflicted; and by their prayers, sighs, and fastings — sometimes even by miracles — deceived and stormed the world: they carried off very many of its inhabitants, and most ample spoils. But they also contrived most-hidden ambushes — [they] who, near Ai, in the midst of the crowds of men, in the forum and the assemblies, in the halls of Princes and Kings, instructed with a holy zeal of souls, by the innocence of [their] life and the example of chaste morals, with divine grace, burst into the wicked city, and cast in the flames of holy charity, so that the fire might invite very many to the same [fire] — not to be extinguished, but to be increased. Finally they took the King himself, the Cacodemon [evil-spirit], when they compelled him to serve them, not to command [them]: they drove him to the cross, when they affixed all sins and vices to some unlucky tree, or removed [them] from themselves through the cross of CHRIST the Lord: and they exposed [him] detestable to all ages by a heap of stones, when, by the firmness of [their] examples, and the hardness and constancy of [their] discipline, they made [it so] that posterity detest and trample him. But in what way he was crucified "on a double wood," Adamantius Origen says (in the cited place), it is worth the labor to know. "The cross of our Lord Jesus Christ was double [twin]. A wondrous discourse, perhaps, and new, seems to thee — that I say the cross was double: this is, it consists of a double and twofold reason. Because visibly indeed the Son of God was crucified in the flesh; but invisibly, on that cross, the devil, with his principalities and powers, was affixed to the cross. Will this not seem true to thee, if

I produce the Apostle Paul [as] witness of these [things]? Hear, then, concerning those [things] which he himself pronounces. 'That which was contrary to us,' he says, 'he took away from the midst, affixing it to his cross; despoiling the principalities and powers, he led [them] in triumph, freely triumphing over them on the wood of the cross' [Col. 2:14–15]. Although in other copies it is had, 'TRIUMPHING IN HIMSELF,' but among the Greeks it is had, 'ON THE WOOD.' Therefore [there is] a double reason of the Lord's cross: the one, that by which the Apostle Peter says [that] CHRIST, crucified, left us an example; and this second, by which that cross was the trophy [*tropaion*] of the devil, on which [Christ] was both crucified and triumphed. Therefore, finally, the Apostle Paul too said: 'But God forbid that I should glory, except in the cross of my Lord JESUS CHRIST, through whom the world is crucified to me, and I to the world' [Gal. 6:14]. Seest thou that Paul too has set forth a double reason of the cross? For he says two contrary [things] are crucified: himself [as] holy, and the sinful world — after that form, without doubt, which we said above, of CHRIST and the devil. For we are crucified to the world, then, when the coming prince of this world finds nothing in us. And the world is crucified to us, when we do not receive the concupiscences of sin." And Peter Damian (in the sermon on the exaltation of the holy cross, in Surius, vol. 5): "The King of Ai (as the history narrates) was hung on a double gibbet: so the king of death is hung on a double gibbet — because, while he kills Christ, he is crucified on the very cross which he found." Again Origen (in the same place): "But another [thing] too occurs to me, considering in the passage JESUS fleeing from the face of the army of Ai. What thinkest thou it is, that Jesus, fleeing, designated? Let us see whether perhaps there be something [in this], that by fleeing we may conquer, and [whether] there be some perfect virtue in flight. Paul the Apostle teaches us, saying: 'Flee fornication.' Seest thou, then, [that] there is a certain spirit of fornication, which we ought to flee — whoever we [are who] wish to remain chastely and piously and modestly in CHRIST. This, then, is the flight which has salvation; this [is] the flight of virtue; this flight confers beatitude. And not only the Spirit of fornication is to be fled, but in a similar way, as it was said, 'flee fornication,' let us hear it said to us, 'flee avarice, flee envy and malice, flee detractions and evil-speakings' — which, however, I know not whether anyone escapes, I know not whether anyone evades. Such was that army of Ai, which JESUS taught his soldiers to flee, and concerning which perhaps he commands his disciples, saying: 'If they persecute you in this city, flee into another.' For he wishes us to flee from enemies of this kind, wishes us to be made far from evils of this kind: and if we shall have been able meanwhile to evade the contagions of these evils to be fled, then, seeing our devotion, and the purpose of a holy mind and each [several] virtue, [there are] those, perhaps, concerning whom the Apostle says: 'Are they not all ministerial spirits, sent into ministry for the sake of those who take the inheritance of salvation?' Who perhaps are the holy Angels: who, seeing us suffer the persecution of demons, rise up against those who persecute us, and, cutting [them] down behind [our] backs, meanwhile destroy them all. For JESUS is with those who suffer persecutions, more than with those who persecute. And rightly: because he delights to be with those who flee pride, who flee guile, and who flee lying. If, then, we should so understand those [things] which are written, the reading will perhaps seem worthy of the style of the Holy Spirit. For what does it profit me, if I know that the king of Ai was hung on a double wood? But if I should know [that] the virtue of the cross is double, on which both CHRIST is hung in the flesh, and the devil with his army is triumphed over, my soul will be edified from the understanding of the sacrament."

Second Part of Chapter 8 — On the Ceremony on Mounts Ebal and Gerizim

The whole history of this ceremony, performed on Mounts Ebal and Gerizim, is here indeed not omitted by the 70 Interpreters, but transferred into the following chapter 9, and postponed after the two first verses of the same chapter: although, from other Greek texts, and from Origen (homily 9), the same order seems once to have been among them which is in the Hebrew and Latin. But that ceremony holds itself thus. *First*: The whole people — both as to the Israelites and the Proselytes, both men and women, and children — had to go to those mountains. *Then*: One altar had to be raised. *Thirdly*: Likewise twelve stones [had] to be erected, and to be incrusted with lime [plaster]. *Fourthly*: On these the law [had] to be inscribed. *Fifthly*: On the altar

sacrifice [had] to be made. *Sixthly*: Six tribes had to be on one of these mountains, six on the other. *Seventhly*: In the middle of these mountains — namely, in the very valley — [they] had to stand with the priests of the Lord, with the ark. *Eighthly*: By these, with a great and strained [loud] voice, a certain formula of blessings and cursings had to be recited, in such a way that the whole people could respond to the individual [clauses], "Amen." This [is] the rite of that ceremony, which — in the Hebrew and Latin text, and, as I said, in some Greek [texts] — is here narrated to have been performed by Joshua with the whole people. But more [is] to be discussed in that whole rite.

(col. 941)

Question XIV. Of what sort, and where, [are] Mounts Ebal and Gerizim?

Benjamin of Tudela, in [his] Itinerary: "Gerizim," he says, "is a mountain pleasant with springs and gardens; but, on the contrary, Ebal [is] arid, full of rocks and stones. And that one [Gerizim] indeed was situated toward the South, but this [Ebal] toward the North." But in what part of the land of Canaan they are situated is controversial. The common opinion, he says, [is] that [they are] near Shechem — which was afterward called Neapolis, and in the time of the cited Benjamin was commonly called everywhere "Naples" or "Nables," not "Nebilas," as its [Hebrew] Interpreter renders. For thus the Gauls today still call Italian Neapolis; of which [Jews], in Benjamin's age, [there was] the greatest multitude in the Holy Land — namely about 500 years ago. But, a few years since, the Geographic discipline — a man excellent (as [is] clear from his notes on Ptolemy and the Tables of the world), as Masius, familiar to him, relates — judged [them] to have been near Ai, and this very city [Shechem] to have stood on the high ridge of Gerizim. His reasons [are] these. *The first*: The 12 stones — concerning which before, and again afterward — were transferred from the Jordan to these mountains. Not, therefore, so far from the Jordan were these mountains, as they would be if they were at Shechem. *The second*: Shechem was as it were in the middle of the Canaanite enemies. To go there now, therefore — the enemies not yet destroyed — and to lead down the whole unwarlike crowd of elders, women, and children — what prudence would that be? what temerity [would it not be]? *The third*: Since Moses was beyond the Jordan when he prescribed this very ceremony, he seems to have pointed out these very mountains by hand and finger, as if they were near and in the eyes of all, when he said (Deut. 11:30, from the Hebrew word for word): "Are not these (mountains) in Transjordan, behind the way of the sunset?" *The fourth*: Abraham is recorded to have placed an altar between Ai and Bethel (Gen. 12:8). Therefore it is likely [that] God willed [that] which the people were building on Ebal to be built in the same place, and plainly in the same footstep. For this greatly availed for imitating Abraham's faith, and for exhorting the people by that old memory. *The fifth*: St. Jerome (book on the Hebrew places): "There are, near Jericho, two neighboring mountains, looking at each other, of which one is called Gerizim, the other Gebal [Ebal]. But the Samaritans think these two mountains to be near Neapolis: but they err vehemently. For they are very far distant among themselves; nor can the voices of those blessing or cursing be heard between them, which scripture commemorates." And when he had said [they were] near Golgol (which [is] also Galgal [Gilgal]), the mountains Gerizim and Gebal, he subjoins: "The Samaritans, therefore, err, who wish to show the mountains Gerizim and Ebal near Neapolis, since scripture attests them to be near Galgal." And similar [things] are in St. Epiphanius (bk. 1, heresy 9), as I will note again toward the end of the question. Abulensis seems doubtful. For here (q. 20) he says [they are] near Ai, and Deut. 11 similarly; where, however (as I will show afterward), he says [they are] near Shechem.

Yet from the common opinion I am not driven off. *First*: Because scripture clearly, without any ambiguities — so that there be no place for tergiversation — recounts Gerizim near Shechem (Judg. 9:7): "Jotham stood on the top of Mount Gerizim, and, with raised voice, cried out and said: Hear me, ye men of Shechem." If he could be heard by the men of Shechem, surely it is necessary [that] this mountain was nearest [to them]. The Geographer answers [that] Mount Gerizim was, by a long and perpetual [continuous] ridge, produced

[extended] from Shechem all the way to Ai, and further even to Jericho, and near to Galgala [Gilgal]. But this is to feign mountains which are none, nor indicated by any Geographer or ancient Historian. For between Ai and Shechem itself and Gerizim are the mountains Bethel and Ephraim; and from these to Shechem [is] a very long plain. And it is confirmed from Genesis (ch. 12, v. 8), where Abraham, descending from Shechem, is said at length to have come to the Eastern mountain, which is at Bethel — as if a great Plain intervened, and after it that Bethel mountain. *Secondly*: Josephus — born and reared in those places, who surveyed the same places, and long and constantly defended [them] by arms — says our Joshua set out ἀπὸ σημείων [*apo s■mei■n*, "from the appointed positions"] with the whole people, and there, where Moses had foretold, set up an altar. And again (bk. 5, ch. 9) most plainly: ὑπέρκειται τῇ Συχέμ τὸ ὄρος Γαριζίμ [*hyperkeitai t■ Sychem to oros Garizim*, "Mount Gerizim lies above Shechem"]. *Thirdly*: All the Rabbis feel the same, so that in tractate Sanhedrin (ch. 6) and tractate Sotah (ch. 7) they say these mountains [are] about 60 miles distant from the Jordan. And yet, if there had not been a certain and explored opinion among all the Israelites, either — as I indeed think — they would have denied these [things] to have been done on Gerizim, by that name, because on it was built the temple adversary to the Jerusalem [temple] (of which I spoke in [my commentary on] Maccabees), and because they hated the Samaritans exceedingly — to whom Eusebius attributes that opinion — nor would they have conceded to them so much glory and celebrity of this deed. *Fourth*: Benjamin, cited at the beginning of this question: "The city Shechem," he says, "lies in a deep valley between the mountains Gerizim and Ebal; in which [city] there are about a hundred Cuthites, observers of the Mosaic law only." These, as I said, they call Samaritans. *Fifth*: Christians, who either inhabit those places or visit [them], all attest the same — among whom, in the description of the Holy Land, Brocardus: "Not far from the southern gate of Shechem is the well of Jacob, on the way which leads to Jerusalem, where the Lord, sitting on the well, asked drink from the Samaritan woman (John 4). Above that well, to the right, is a high mountain having two heads, of which one is Mount Gerizim, the other Mount Ebal." Abulensis (Deut. 11, before question 8): "Mount Gerizim is distant from Shechem a little more than as it were half a league, or nearly one. Ebal is a little beyond, more toward the East, so that it is as it were a league and a half, or not so much." *Sixth*: In the Bordeaux Itinerary these too are read: "NEAPOLIS. There is Mount Agarizen [Gerizim]. There the Samaritans say Abraham offered sacrifice; and they ascended to the top of the mountain by 300 steps in number." *Seventh*: In Photius (p. 564), Damascius, an Ethnic [pagan] writer:

> ὁ διάδοχος Πρόκλου ὁ Μαρῖνος γένος ἦν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ Νέας πόλεως, πρὸς ὄρει κατῳκισμένης τῷ Ἀργαρίζῳ καλουμένῳ, ἐν ᾧ Διὸς Ὑψίστου ἁγιώτατον ἱερόν, ᾧ καθιέρωτο Ἀβραάμος, ὁ τῶν πάλαι Ἑβραίων πρόγονος.

[That is: "The successor of Proclus, Marinus, was by race from Neapolis in Palestine, [a city] settled near the mountain called Argarizon [Gerizim], on which [is] the most holy temple of Zeus Hypsistos [the Most High], to which Abraham, the ancestor of the ancient Hebrews, had consecrated [it]."] Which the Latin Interpreter (p. 373) so renders that he thinks "ᾧ" [to which], not "ὃς [who] had consecrated," is to be read; but the Ethnic writer himself put, for God, the impious name of his own god, "Διός" [of Zeus]. *Eighth*: That I may make the end in that [scripture] from which I began: Sacred Scripture seems to signify sufficiently [that] these mountains are far distant from the Jordan, when Deut. 11:30 says: "Which are beyond the Jordan, behind the way which turns toward

(col. 943)

the sunset, in the land of the Canaanite who dwells in the plains, over against Galgala [Gilgal], which is near a valley reaching and entering afar." For, *first*, in the Transjordan he places them. *Secondly*: Not [near] the Jordan properly, but at a sufficiently long interval, behind the way by which one comes to the sunset: far from Ai, where the Amorite was (above, ch. 7, v. 7) — namely, in the land of the Canaanite, not of any [Canaanite], but of him who dwells in the plain, or in the plains which are opposite the Gilgal-place, that is, as it were directly [across]; so that, if in Gilgal, placed in the East, a line be drawn straight toward the West,

these Canaanites are touched, in whose land these mountains are. *Thirdly*: And that all error may be removed, there is added, in the Hebrew, "near the oak [terebinth]," or "the trees [of] Moreh." But these were near Shechem. For thus thou hast in the Hebrew (Gen. 12, v. 6): "and Abram passed through into the land, as far as the place [of] Shechem, as far as the tree [of] Moreh" — where our [Vulgate] renders, "as far as the noble valley." Why he did so, and again in Deuteronomy rendered "a valley reaching and entering afar," see Abulensis (Deut., ch. 11, at the end of the Commentary). *Ninth*: Finally, the common opinion is confirmed by the dissolution of all those [reasons] which the Geographer disputed against [it].

To the first: It was denied (ch. 5, in [the questions] on those [things] which happened after the crossing, q. 6).

To the second: [He] who dared to cross the Jordan [and] to carry himself into Canaan — why would he not dare to advance further into it too? What imprudence is it, when thou hast so many thousands of warriors with thee, [when] the way is convenient, [when] no enemy meets [thee], [and when] thou placest [thy] hope in God, [and] with Him [as] leader, to proceed into hostile [territory], however far [off]?

To the third: Moses did indeed point [his] finger at the whole Transjordan region, and, seeing it as [it were] depicted on a little tablet, and showing [it] to others, was speaking — just as if, speaking of the Alps or nearer mountains, I should stretch out [my] hand toward the East, and point out the Trans-Rhenane [region].

To the fourth: Abram raised an altar near Shechem too, and indeed earlier than near Ai (Gen. 12) — so that that [was] the first of all the altars of Abraham himself in Canaan, and indeed for this cause, that God appeared to him and promised him this land. And therefore Shechem had more of moment for imbuing the Israelites with faith, and with the holy imitation of Abraham, and with the religion of the place, than the neighborhood of Ai. And "on that [mountain]," says St. Jerome (Questions on Genesis), "Jacob grew strong [*convaluit*] from his lameness, and was made *salem* — that is, whole [unharmed]."

To the fifth: Into that opinion of his, Eusebius was led rather than St. Jerome — [Jerome being] only the Interpreter of that cited booklet [of Eusebius] — the words of the 70 being ill understood. For when [in] Deut. 11 they say τὸ τοῦ Χαναὰν ἔθνος ἐχόμενον τοῦ Γολγελ εἶναι [that the nation of Canaan is *next to* Golgol], he [Eusebius] thought "ἔχεσθαι" [*echesthai*] to mean "to be near Galgat [Gilgal]," whereas — as I said above from the Hebrew — it means "to be opposite, over against." And therefore the opinion of the Samaritans, which he calls an error, was, both to Jews and to Christians hitherto — even after this disputation of Eusebius — the most received by all. But it must be noted [that] among the 70 [it] is always written γαριζείν & γαιβάλ; in Josephus it is declined γάριζις & γαιβάλος; among the Latins [it] is written now "Hebal," now "Gebal," or "Ebal" — because it begins from the same rough [aspirate] letter from which [the name] Ai was said (ch. 7, q. 11) to begin. In the before-cited Epiphanius (bk. 1, heresy 9) it is written χαρζείν. And he seems even to place those mountains near Jericho, beyond the Jordan, and says the Samaritans were wont to turn themselves toward those mountains when they prayed — because four idols of their peoples were hidden there: and so [they were wont] to admit idolatry secretly, and as it were unknowingly, as is repeated in 2 Kings 17. But because to the Hebrews "Har" is "mountain," from it and "Garizim" [the word] was conflated — as we saw in Damascius — ἀργάριζον, as it were "mount Gerizim," as [is] noted in the notes on Photius (fol. 977); and also in the above-cited Bordeaux Itinerary, "Agaresen" for "Argaresen," or, with the article, "Hagaresen."

Question XV. On which mountain [was] the altar? and on this one or that, which tribe, and how [arranged]?

I. On Ebal the altar was raised (Deut. 27, v. 5; and here, v. 30), not on Gerizim. *First*: Because there ought to be one altar. *Secondly*: Because perhaps the Lord then already willed to deprive the future temple of the Samaritans on Gerizim of an altar, as if that temple were empty and void.

II. On Gerizim were these six tribes: Simeon, Levi, Judah, Issachar, Joseph (or Ephraim), and Benjamin. But on Ebal, Reuben, Gad, Asher, Zebulun, Dan, Naphtali (Deut. 27, vv. 12, 13). The Rabbis give the cause: because the first six were the sons of free wives; the rest [were sons] either of handmaids, or certainly the last-born of the free [wives].

III. In the cited chapter of Deuteronomy these tribes are said to have been "upon" [*super*] those mountains, but here (v. 33) "beside" [*iuxta*]. But the Hebrew particle "hal" [■al] can be rendered "upon," "beside," and "in." Now part of them was at the root of the mountains, nearly beside the priests, who were in the lowest valley; but part on the upper ridge of the mountains; and these are said to have been "upon," those "beside" the mountains. Surely [those] who were beside the mountains, and as it were opposite [them], are described here to have been the "elders [and] leaders" — who in the Hebrew [are] "schoterim" [officers], concerning whom before (ch. 1) — and the "Judges." But they did not sit, but — as [it is] in the same place of Deuteronomy — "they stood," by which, namely, a greater and more religious attention, veneration, and reverence might be signified. But it is not to be doubted that, in a good and beautiful order, the six tribes of each mountain, and the families and houses of the tribes — the women, boys, and girls — were arranged: so that there was there no ἀταξία [*ataxia*, disorder], no disturbance, levity, or wantonness; nay, [there was] not even any danger from enemies, if perchance any should rush in from elsewhere.

(col. 945)

Question XVI. Of what kind was the altar on Ebal?

Of unpolished stones, which iron did not touch, was the altar, as is said here (v. 31) and [in] Deut. 27, v. 5. But why the Lord willed such [an altar], various [men] have thought out various reasons. *First*: Abenezra [Ibn Ezra] — because [it is] a sacrilege [that], from stones which are applied to the highest worship of God, any fragments perish, or fall into rubbish and dung. *Secondly*: Rambam [Maimonides], in the book *Moreh Nebuchim* — lest, from the fragments of such sacred stones, idols be feigned under some appearance of religion. *Thirdly*: Ralbag and R. Isaac — lest God, who is most perfect in Himself and needy of nothing, seem to need human work and art for the completion of His altar. *Fourthly*: The same [say] — lest men refer that which they receive from God, through altar and sacrifice, to their own labor and work [as its source]. *Fifthly*: Abulensis (on Deut. 27, and Exod. 20, q. 40) — lest the altar itself be adored as an idol, if it had beautiful, polished stones, shaped into certain figures. *Sixthly*: Very many Rabbis — as Nachmanides, Bachya, and others in Mechilta, Tanchuma, and the Talmud — [say]: lest anything pernicious and harmful to the life and safety of men touch the altar, from which and through which safety, life, and prosperity is conciliated to all men by God; but what [is] more pernicious than iron? what more deadly? *Seventhly*: Masius — lest there be anything in the altars which men might admire, besides the very sacrifice of our salvation, which is the body and blood of the Lord; which was figured by the victims of the ancients, and foreknown by them, [and is] now known and believed by us. "To which," says the same Masius, "I think that [thing] also looks, that our elders so greatly detested [it] if any image or picture were seen on the altars: as is handed down in the writings of Optatus, Bishop of Milevis. For he relates [that] the Donatists tried, by this thing procured through fraud, to violate the reputation of the religion and sacred [rites] of Catholic men. And St. Augustine — his contemporary, I think — infers from this (sermon 6 *On the Words of the Lord*) [that] some have statues in place of God [*pro Deo*], because they place them on the altars." How this last [point] is to be taken, I will say a little after: but of these reasons, several seem little firm; let there be some, however, as they are called, "congruities." To which I rightly add [these reasons], why God willed his altar [to be] of earth and rough stones. *First*: That he might signify [that] the sacrifices and victims of the Old Testament were rude and formless — [being], namely, types and figures of the one sacrifice of CHRIST JESUS, which, once done bloodily on the altar of the cross, is wont to be repeated bloodlessly every day. *Secondly*: That he might show how rude and unpolished and hard the altar of that same CHRIST the Lord — the truest and

most precious victim — was to be: [namely] the cross itself, as Procopius indicates. *Thirdly*: That it might be noted [that] no altar of the ancients ought to be perpetual, but [that], just as they were easily constructed from earth and rough and horrid stones, so [they would be] most easily destroyed. *Fourthly*: That, suddenly and everywhere, when God had willed, there might be occasion for raising an altar to Him — since it demanded nothing laborious or artful. *Fifthly*: That the Lord might show [men] to look upon themselves [as] the victims rather than the altars, and to be delighted rather by the purity and sanctity of those [victims] than by the price and art of these [altars]. *Sixthly*: The Masian reason pleases me exceedingly; but as to the statues [images], which he added — what is [that]? Does he wish none of them to be on the altars? But [it is a mark] of religion, to some priests, to celebrate the sacred [rites] — [religion] which [is] sometimes even divinely approved by miracles — without at least the image of the crucified [Christ]; and those altars are looked upon as, [it were,] most religious, which are adorned with very many most beautiful pictures and statues. I say three [things]. *First*: Pictures and statues which may be thought [to be worshipped as] gods are by no means to be placed on the altars; and of these Optatus and St. Augustine speak (sermon 6 *On the Words of the Lord*), where he [Augustine] shows [that] those Christians acted ill who reclined [at table] with the Gentiles in idol-temples: and although these [Christians] said the "genius of Carthage" was not God, yet he teaches [that] it was held by them in place of God, because an altar was set up and raised to it. But no Catholics set up any altar with images or signs and statues: but [only] to God alone. *Second*: But to adorn altars with pictures and statues which refer to CHRIST the Lord, and the heaven-dwellers [saints], is good; to lack the same is not evil. *Third*: It can, however, be called into question, which is better and more conducive. Some — as the Capuchins — regard the simplicity and poverty by which God is delighted, or [look to] the peril of a lapse into some superstitions [that comes] from a certain excessive rudeness; and these [set up] either no, or very few, images; the Greeks indeed set up no statues, as neither [do] the Tzernians and the Poznanians, concerning whom, in their tongue, [is] the book *On the 12 Languages*, [by] Postellus. But others reckon [that], by however much altars are more adorned in all things — both in material and in art — by that very [degree] more of honor is done to CHRIST the Lord Himself, and [to] His truest and highest sacrifice; and they judge [that] souls curved down on the earth are more raised up and kindled to the worship of God; and these employ all the elegance of sacred vestments, vessels, pictures, and sculptures. Let neither condemn the others, and let each abound in his own judgment. One faith, one charity joins, in this age, the men of the Society of JESUS and the family of the Capuchins. How disparate, however, [are] their temples! How adorned [are] the [temples] of those, how unadorned and simple the altars of these! But from all altars are to be removed all images and statues which [are] more effective of levity, wantonness, [and] vanity than of piety — which are wont to be painted and fashioned by wanton or heretical painters — concerning which see the Council of Trent (sess. 25, on invocation), and Molanus and Paleotti (*On Pictures*). How absurd [is] either the painter, or [he] who described [ordered it] to the painter, by whom in the Bleidenstatt temple [was painted] the Gentile [pagan] Lucretia! How scurrilous and foul that type of the extreme [Last] Judgment in the temple of St. Stephen at Mainz! But enough. Abulensis, moreover, notes here [that] iron [is] not forbidden, by which perhaps the stones might be dug out from the quarries, but [only that] by which they might be sculpted and carved. Rude altars of this kind, too, around Trebizond, Arrian relates himself to have seen.

Question XVII. What sacrifices were made on Ebal?

The kind of sacrifices [is] double: bloody [*cruentum*] and unbloody [*incruentum*]. Of the former [bloody], among the Hebrews three are found

(col. 947)

[three] species: holocaust [burnt-offering], peace-offering, expiatory or for sin [sin-offering]. But of the unbloody [kind], Calvin notes one species (on Leviticus, ch. 6) — the goat, namely the emissary [scapegoat]

— concerning which [he speaks] thus (fol. 263): "This alone in the law was an expiatory [piacular] sacrifice without blood." There can be added, from the law of nature, the sacrifice of Cain (Gen., ch. 4); [and] of Melchizedek (ch. 14); but from the usage of the Gentiles, those [sacrifices which were made] at the horn-altar of Delian Apollo — as is [related] in Plutarch (in the book *Which Animals Are the More Prudent*), Ovid (in the Epistle of Cydippe), Callimachus (in the Hymn to Apollo), Diogenes Laertius (in [the life of] Pythagoras), and Alexander ab Alexandro (bk. 6, ch. 2), where [there is] more. But from the sacred rite of the Christians [there] is the most holy Eucharist, which [is] often [called] by Nazianzen ἄναιμος καὶ ἀναίματος θυσία [anaimos kai anaimatos thysia, "the bloodless and unbloody sacrifice"]. But of what kind the offered genera of sacrifices here were, [the text] declares (v. 31): "Joshua offered upon it [the altar] holocausts to the Lord, and immolated peace-offering victims." But [it] is to be understood [that] Joshua offered these through the priests — as [being] Leader of the people and Prophet of God, who commanded [them] to be done: just as also the people, in the Hebrew [text], is narrated to have offered the same sacrifices through the same [priests], and as [it were] through the public ministers of divine worship. For thus that one [text] has: "And they [the Israelites] made to ascend [caused to be offered up] holocausts, and immolated peace-offerings." But what these [sacrifices] are, and how they differ, I have said in Exodus. See Ribera (bk. 4, *On the Temple*), [and] Sigonius (bk. 4, *On the Republic of the Hebrews*).

Question XVIII. Whether, besides the Altar's stones, some others [were] erected?

Josephus seems to establish [that they are] the same as the stones of the altar — those which are said here to have been erected by the people; and Masius attributes this opinion to him. Abulensis, in this place (q. 26), notes [that] he indeed handed down [something] different in Deuteronomy; yet now he concedes [that] they can be called the same, because in Deuteronomy the very stones of the altar had to be smeared with lime (ch. 27, v. 4). But to what end, unless that in them might be inscribed [those things] which were there ordered to be inscribed? Yet I think they were different [distinct]. *First*: Because in Deut. 27, v. 4, [the stones] are said first to be erected and to be incrusted with lime; but afterward the altar is ordered to be built (v. 5). But if those erected stones pertained to the altar itself, by that very [fact], that they were erected, the altar would already have been built. For they were firmly and in order arranged. Then, to the [altar] stones, not incrustation and smoothing, but roughness and native scabrousness is attributed (v. 6). *Secondly*: Because this is the opinion of very many, and of [men] not common — as of Cajetan, of Masius, and, as it indeed seems to me, of Josephus himself. For when he had named a single βωμὸν [b■mon, "altar"] for sacrifice, he says afterward [that] τὰς ἀρὰς [tas aras, "the curses"] or imprecations were inscribed ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν [epi t■n b■m■n, "upon the altars"] — that is, upon those erected and lofty stones. For he calls these βωμὰς [b■mas, "altars, high-places"]. Otherwise there would have been several altars there, against scripture. And therefore the old Interpreter of Josephus errs, saying [that] "on the altar [ara] were written the curses" [maledictiones] — since Josephus uses the plural number. And lest thou say [that] it was written by Josephus ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν [epi ton b■mon, "upon the altar"], see, in this very matter, Deut. 27 in the 70 [LXX]: γράψεις ἐπὶ τῶν λίθων [grapseis epi t■n lith■n, "thou shalt write upon the stones"], and here (ch. 9): ἔγραψεν ἐπὶ τῶν λίθων [egrapsen epi t■n lith■n, "he wrote upon the stones"]. For Josephus, therefore, I would rather group [him] with that other opinion — [that of] Origen (homily 9), concerning whom [see] below.

Question XIX. How many, how great, and of what kind [were] these stones?

First: They were twelve, namely for the number of the twelve tribes. For Moses too had set up just as many, when he was about to recite the law to the Israelites (Exod. 24, v. 4); and that reasoning pleases Masius — that what Moses had done there, his disciple Joshua does the same here. *Secondly*: They are handed down by all [to have been] huge; and for that reason they are called by Josephus βωμοὶ [b■moi, "high-places"], as it

were *Bamoth*. *Thirdly*: The same stones were indeed rough and unpolished — either because time did not allow that they be polished, or because in that way [writing] could be inscribed on them more easily, more quickly, and [in] greater [amount]. But, with a plastering of lime applied, they had to be smoothed (Deut. 27, v. 4). For thus they were both rendered more conspicuous to all by [their] whiteness, and, as I said, admitted writing more easily and more quickly — and indeed as much [writing] as one pleased to inscribe. These the 70 [LXX] call ὁλοκλήρους [holokl■rous], "whole and entire," concerning which [see] question 27.

Question XX. What, then, [was] inscribed [on] these stones?

The conjectures [are] various. *First*: [that] the five books of Moses were written on these stones. So the book *Te■amim* [■a■amim, "of the accents"], or "of the apices [points]," and, in the tractate *Sotah*, some of the Talmudists. *Second*: only Deuteronomy, but the whole [of it]. [So] Abulensis (Deut., ch. 27, q. 1; here, q. 27 and 28). *Third*: only a portion of this [Deuteronomy] and of the other books of Moses, in a fourfold [manner]. For some inscribe only the ten precepts [the Decalogue] — as Lyranus and some of the Hebrews. To others [it] seems [that] those precepts were inscribed which Moses explained in Deut., ch. 6 — namely, concerning the unity of God, and concerning the love of God. For these are the chief [precepts], and [were] chiefly explained in the secondary delivery of the law which Moses made, as a doctor of the law delivered by God. So Cajetan. Others [understand] a compendium of all the Mosaic laws, which they say consists of 613 precepts, of which the affirmative are 248, the denying and prohibiting 365. So R. Abenezra [Ibn Ezra], and the many who followed him. Finally, others place [only] the blessings alone upon the same [stones] — among whom is Masius, and the already-cited Josephus seems [to belong]. But what Calvin wishes, [he] does not sufficiently explain. "To the opinion," he says, "of those I willingly subscribe, who [understand] by the repeated law (and written on the stones)

(col. 949)

...understand a copied exemplar [transcript], which the common [people] name a 'copy' or 'duplicate.'" But whichever of all these conjectures thou follow, always on the stones was a copied exemplar — not the autograph itself of Moses. Yet he [Calvin] adds [that] it is not credible to him [that] the whole volume was there engraved. But concerning which volume — of the whole law (which the Jews comprehend in 5 books), or of Deuteronomy alone? At length, "by the name of 'law,'" he says, "I think the summary and the sanctions are denoted." But which summary? Whether as Lyranus, or Cajetan, or Abenezra [Ibn Ezra], or Josephus expounded [it]? So, when he seems to explain the matter, he either passes it over in silence, or entangles it. But to me the second conjecture is pleasing — [namely] that these stones, I say, were inscribed [with] the whole [of] Deuteronomy. For thus [is it] expressly [stated] here (v. 3): in the Hebrew, *mishneh torath mosheh* [the copy/repetition of the law of Moses], which is "Deuteronomy," as our [Vulgate] renders [it], and the Greeks in the royal copies. And it is confirmed from Deut. 17, v. 18, where [is] the same Hebrew word, and the Greek [word] in the 70 [LXX] themselves; and here (v. 32) is added: "which he [Moses] had digested [set in order] before the sons of Israel" — in Hebrew and Greek, "[that] which he had written." *Secondly*: The cause which frightens most [people, so that] they do not here establish the whole [of] Deuteronomy, is its magnitude, which could not be contained by these stones. And indeed Origen thought (homily 9) [that] the matter could not be explained without allegory. But in truth [it] could easily be contained. For they were, as I said above (q. 19), quite large, and many in number, and all well incrusted and leveled on each side, so that on them as much as possible could be written. For I cannot approve [that] which Masius reckons without any argument — [that] the same thing and the same words [were] depicted on all [the stones]. For to what end the same cabbage [reheated] so many times? [Anyone] who had read one or another stone would have passed over the rest, wearied and nauseated. Not so. But on one stone was one twelfth portion of the whole [of] Deuteronomy, on another the [next], and so on in order — whether these twelfths be taken precisely, or not, as the sense would bear a little more or less. *Thirdly*: That cause too could frighten some — [namely] that too

much time would have to be spent on writing Deuteronomy. But in truth that is nothing. For it was not necessary [that] only one [person] write; but there could have been several — for example, twelve, single scribes for the single stones. Nay indeed, perhaps single tribes furnished, for their [own] stone, six writers each, so that to one of the writers, [when] wearied, another might at once succeed; and thus the whole matter would at once be accomplished. And, that this and the reasoning adduced above may be more evident, let us take all the verses of Deuteronomy. These are 1055 in number. On the single stones, therefore, there will be 87 verses — 43 on one side of it, and a half [43½], [and] on the other just as many. And if there were six writers for each of the stones, each [writer] had 14 and a half verses to write. How expeditiously and quickly could all these [things] be done? *Fourthly*: In the other conjectures there are some [points] that are disapproved. For neither into any [of them] does the proper meaning of the Hebrew and Greek word placed here fall; nor is there any [conjecture] which does not, of its own accord, select — or rather feign — something which it would prefer [to be] the thing described, as is taught in the cited place of Abulensis: that meanwhile I may now say nothing of the little-accurate numeration of the 613 precepts, concerning which I have said a good deal in Exodus.

Question XXI. How was the inscription of Deuteronomy made upon these stones?

In Deut. 27, v. 8, it is commanded that there be inscribed on these stones "all the words of the law, plainly and lucidly"; [in] the 70 [LXX], σαφῶς σφόδρα [saph■s sphodra, "very clearly"]; in the Hebrew, "by explaining well [distinctly]." But some of the Jews thought — in the cited book *On the Apices [Points]*, and in R. Elias [Elijah Levita] (preface 3, in *Hammasoreth* [the Masoreth], fol. 44) — [that] here is signified [that] the points [vowel-points] were affixed, by which we see most Hebrew Bibles today pricked [pointed]. But *first*: those points were not yet then invented, as I said against Cevallerius [Chevallier] and his disciple Hugh Broughton in the Biblical Prolegomena — [drawing] from that very cited place of R. Elias, where he brings forward very many Rabbis [as] supporters of this opinion of his; to whom can be added more recent Christians — Hieronymus Vallensis [Jerome of Vallès] (in the book *On the Hebrew Accents*), Arias Montanus (preface to the version of Pagninus), Genebrardus (preface on the Psalms, and on Ps. 104, v. 1), Leo Castrius [León de Castro] (preface on Isaiah); and, from among the innovators, also Münster (in *Melecheth ha-dikduk*, fol. 17, 18, 19), Scaliger (in the *Fragments on the Emendation of Times*, fol. 32), [and] the University of Wittenberg (in the book against Scherer). *Secondly*: Yet be it [granted] [that] there were even then points — [still] it is not necessary [that] they be signified by these words. For [the words] effect only this much: that these [words of the law] be written plainly and elegantly, with letters neither too meager [thin], nor with words too joined together and compressed.

Question XXII. How many, and of what kind, were the blessings [precations] and imprecations?

There seems to have been regard [had] to the number of the tribes. For in Deut., ch. 27, from v. 15, are enumerated 11 imprecations; and it is likely [that] just as many favorable blessings answered to them — although mention is made of only a few (ch. 28). Of what kind they are, and with how various good or evil [things] they are heaped up, one may read in the same place (ch. 27 and 28).

Question XXIII. In what manner did the priests conduct themselves in pronouncing these blessings and imprecations?

First: In the valley itself some of them stood, and carried the ark of the covenant. *Then*: Around these [stood] the other priests and all the Levites. *Thirdly*: Around these stood the elders, leaders, and Judges. *4*: Next, all the tribes, ascending toward the summit of the mountains. *5*: The beginning of all [things] was made from the

blessing, as is expressly noted (v. 34), where Joshua first read "all the words of the blessing and of the cursing," but afterward "all [things] which were written in the volume." But Joshua blessed the people either through himself — namely, as a Prophet — or through the priests, as was said above concerning the sacrifice (q. 17). And therefore the Talmudists err (in the tractate *Sotah*), saying [that] from the very [words] of the law

(col. 951)

[saying that from the very] recitation [of the law] this ceremony was begun. *6*: Some priests — chiefly those who seemed most vocal [loud-voiced] — recited the law. *7*: They turned themselves toward Gerizim and pronounced the blessings, toward Mount Ebal the cursings. And to both, the native condition of the mountains seems to have been fitted [suited]: for Gerizim [was] fertile and pleasant, and therefore toward it all the blessings of prosperity were rightly conceived [directed]; but Ebal [was] barren and unlovely — [so] it fittingly received the imprecations and detestations. *Eighthly*: To each [clause] the people responded with a great voice, "Amen." For although those more remote from the valley might perhaps not sufficiently hear the priests' voice, yet the very plan of the ceremony and the vociferation of the foremost [leaders] admonished them, and drew forth from all the notable "Amen."

Question XXIV. When did the Israelites come to these mountains for the sake of this ceremony?

In the Jerusalem Talmud, R. Israel holds [that] after the fourteenth year of [their] entry into this land the Israelite people came to these mountains and performed this rite; Josephus (in the place cited above), after the 5th year; in the Babylonian Talmud (tract. *Sotah*, ch. 7), other Rabbis [say] on the very same day on which the Jordan was crossed. But these last were refuted above (ch. 5, after the crossing, q. 6). But both these and all the others are refuted by the narration of this chapter, because the performance of this ceremony is at once subjoined to the storming of Ai; and even much more, because in the same narration there is a particle which does not permit us to wander off to another time — namely (v. 30), "then" [tunc]. And therefore the disturbance of order in the text, and recapitulation, which Rashi here contrives — as Abulensis says (q. 17) — is to be rejected; and it is to be said [that], after Ai was stormed, the Israelites set out hither, yet not without absolutely any interval of time. For, as Abulensis teaches (q. 20), a return was made by the Israelites into the camp, and — the old men, women, and all the children being taken up thence, with the other impedimenta — the march to these mountains [was made]. For those [warriors] did not set out without these, as is clear from the last verse of this chapter; nor could, nor ought, [either] these or those to have set out amid so many enemies and perils [without one another].

Question XXV. How long was labor given to this ceremony?

To define either the hours, or the days, during which they lingered on these mountains and completed that ceremony, I indeed cannot; yet [that] the days were several appears from these [considerations]. *First*: Because so many and so vast stones had to be dug out, for the altar and for the inscription of the laws. *Secondly*: Because so many holocausts and so many peace-victims were offered. *Thirdly*: Because, in the eating of those peace-victims and the sacred feasts, at least a second and a third day was set aside by the whole people. For in Deut. 27, v. 6, it is said: "Thou shalt immolate peace-offering victims, and shalt eat there and feast before the Lord thy God." *Fourthly*: Lime [had] to be prepared, and with it the Deuteronomic stones [had] to be smeared and polished; but before these, coated [with lime] and polished, had dried [enough] to admit the writing, one or another day had to be waited — yet not more, because these [things] were being done now in high summer, as [is] manifest from the time of the Jordan-crossing, the Passover, and the destruction of Jericho, expounded above. *Fifthly*: The inscription easily claimed one day for itself. *Sixthly*: What, finally, of the recitation of the law itself, and the pronouncing of the blessings and

detestations? And from here all returned to the camp at Galgala [Gilgal].

Question XXVI. Why was this whole ceremony undertaken?

Lyranus says this ceremony was undertaken for the thanksgiving for the victory at Ai. Abulensis opposes him (q. 16): "It must be said," he says, "[that] that immolation of victims was in no way for rendering thanks for the victory obtained, but for obeying Moses, who had commanded it to be done after the entry into the land (Deut. 11 and 27)." And indeed this is the primary cause; but there is no harm in seeking other causes too. For why did Moses command this? [Was it] not, *first*, that for so many and so great benefits received and to be received, there might also be an action of thanks? Origen (homily 9, at the beginning): "after JESUS had overthrown Ai, it was fitting [that] he offer to the Most High some worthy gift — the gift of all — for so great a victory." *Secondly*: A covenant with God — as in Exod. 24 — deservedly had to be renewed by the Israelite people at the entrance upon this land and upon such great victories. *Thirdly*: By a solemn rite the consecration of this land had to be begun, as Calvin — [though] an enemy to the consecration of places — confesses. *Fourthly*: Particular causes too can be sought from the several [things] which were done. *Fifthly*: that it might be a document [lesson] to us [of] what we ought to do, when through the tears of penitence we enter into a new life, and cut down the spiritual Jericho and Ai. We must proceed to the mountains of blessings and cursings, of prosperities and adversities — the Northern and the Southern. There [we] must sacrifice to the Lord; there [we] must erect stones, and inscribe [them] with Deuteronomy — with the new, I say, and latter law of a better life; with the lime of divine grace the inborn roughness of [our] depravities must be smoothed; the blessing must be received from the true JESUS; the Law must be heard from the priests — and the denunciation of eternal goods and evils. But [there is] more of allegory in the next question now [following].

Question XXVII. What [is] the allegory of this ceremony?

Origen pursues the allegory in his usual way (hom. 9): *1*. He shows [that] we are the stones. *2*. From them the altar must be constructed. *3*. On which CHRIST JESUS writes his law. *4*. [That] the same JESUS quickly completes this writing. *5*. [That] there are two kinds of those who are on the mountains of the Church, and are not saved. *6*. [That] the law is read and explained to us by JESUS. *7*. [That] there are many, to the ears of whose heart the law is not read. *8*. [That] in the Christian Church there are, spiritually, women, infants, [and] proselytes. I will excerpt a few words on the several [points].

(col. 953)

Concerning the first. All we who believe in JESUS CHRIST are called living stones, according to what Scripture pronounces, saying: "But you are living stones, built into a spiritual house, in a holy priesthood, that you may offer spiritual victims acceptable to God through JESUS CHRIST" [1 Pet. 2:5]. And just as we know [it] to be observed in these earthly stones — that these stones indeed which are stronger and more powerful are cast first into the foundations, so that upon them the weight of the whole building may be trusted and superimposed; but others which are next, that is, a little lower than they, are ranged nearest to those which are in the foundation; and those which are yet lower, a little above the foundations; then next, in comparison of the stones, those which are weaker are placed in the higher parts, and near the very ridge-tops of the roof — so understand now also, concerning the living stones, [that] there are some in the foundations of this spiritual building. But who are these who are placed in the foundations? The Apostles and Prophets. For thus says Paul, teaching these very [things]: "Built," he says, "upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, the corner-stone itself [being] CHRIST JESUS our Lord" [Eph. 2:20]. But that thou mayest prepare thyself the readier, O hearer, for the construction of this building — that thou mayest be found some stone nearer to the foundation — learn that CHRIST himself is the foundation of this building which we have now described. For thus says the Apostle: "For no one can lay another foundation besides that which has been

laid, which is CHRIST JESUS" [1 Cor. 3:11]. Blessed, therefore, [are] they who upon that so noble a foundation shall have constructed religious and holy buildings.

Concerning the second. Who, thinkest thou, are these whole [entire, unbroken] stones? The conscience of each one knows who is whole, who is uncorrupted, unpolluted, immaculate in flesh and in spirit; who is he into whom iron has not been thrust — that is, who has not received the fiery darts of the malignant one's concupiscence, but has extinguished and repelled them with the shield of faith; or who is he who never received the iron of battle, the iron of war, the iron of lawsuits, but [is] always peaceable, always quiet, and mild, and conformed to the humility of CHRIST. These, therefore, are the living stones, out of which JESUS our Lord constructed an altar — out of whole stones, into which iron was not thrust — that he might offer upon them holocausts, and the sacrifice of salvation.

Concerning the third. If thou wilt see how, the first law being weakened, JESUS writes a second law, hear him saying in the Gospels: "It was said to the ancients, Thou shalt not commit adultery. But I say to you, if anyone shall look upon a woman to lust after her, he has already committed adultery with her in his heart" [Matt. 5:27–28]. And "it was said to the ancients, Thou shalt not forswear thyself. But I say to you, Swear not at all" [Matt. 5:33–34]. Thou seest the Deuteronomy which JESUS wrote on living and whole stones — not on tablets of the carnal heart, not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God [2 Cor. 3:3]. But if thou wilt know more evidently on which hearts JESUS has written the law, and on which he has not, this too I will disclose to thee from the authority of the Scriptures — that thou mayest take consolation, thou who art called from the Gentiles, and not fear the boasting of those who glory that they have received the law of Moses written on tablets or on paper. Hear, then, on whose hearts the Lord JESUS has written the law; Paul says: "For when the Gentiles, who have not the law, naturally do the [things] which are of the law, these, not having the law, are a law unto themselves. Who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them" [Rom. 2:14–15]. If, therefore, thou shouldst see the Gentiles come to JESUS and believe in him, and fulfill the work of the law which those who had received the law cannot fulfill, do not doubt to say of them, that JESUS has written Deuteronomy on those whole stones.

Concerning the fourth. Our Lord JESUS does not need much time to write Deuteronomy — to fix the second law in the hearts of believers, and, in the minds of those who are worthy to be chosen for the construction of the altar, to seal the law of the spirit. For as soon as anyone has believed in JESUS CHRIST, the law of the Gospel is also inscribed in his heart, and inscribed in the sight of the sons of Israel. For there were present then, when the sacrament of faith was being handed over to thee, the heavenly virtues, the ministries of the Angels, the Church of the first-born. For if we rightly understand "Israel" to mean "the mind seeing God," this is most rightly said rather of the ministering Angels — according to the Lord's own sentence, saying concerning infants (and thou too wast an infant in baptism): because "their Angels always see the face of my Father, who is in heaven" [Matt. 18:10]. Before these sons of Israel, therefore, who were present at that time, when the sacraments of faith were being handed over to thee, [they] seeing the face of God, JESUS wrote Deuteronomy in thy heart.

Concerning the fifth. I see it thus: [that] there are two kinds of those who by faith hasten and press on toward salvation. One [kind] of those who, kindled with the desire of the heavenly promises, strive with the utmost zeal and diligence lest even the least single beatitude pass them by — having the desire not only of taking the blessing, and of being made [a partaker] in the portion of the saints, but also of standing in the sight of God, and of being always with the Lord. But others there are who also themselves tend toward salvation, yet not so much from love of the blessings or the promises themselves, as rather having this in prospect, and saying: "It suffices me not to go into Gehenna; it suffices me not to be sent into eternal fire; it suffices [me] not to be cast out into the exterior darkness." Since, then, in each of the faithful there is such a variety of purpose, this seems to me to be designated in this place — that those halves who march beside Mount Gerizim (that one which was chosen for the blessings) singularly signify those who come to salvation not from fear of

punishment, but from desire of the blessings and the promises; but those halves who march beside Mount Ebal (on which the cursings were pronounced) signify those others who, fulfilling from fear of evils and dread of punishments the [things] which are written in the law, arrive at salvation. Here now it is of God alone to know, out of all us sons of Israel, who it is that, kindled with the desire of the good itself, does what is good, and who of us tends toward the good from fear of Gehenna and dread of the eternal fire, and strives and hastens to fulfill the [things] which are written. For it is certain that those are nobler who do what is good from the desire of the good itself and from love of the blessings, than those who pursue the good from fear of evil. JESUS alone, therefore, is [he] who can discern out of the whole people minds and souls of this kind, and set some indeed on Mount Gerizim for the blessings, but set others on Mount Ebal for the cursings — not that they may receive the cursings, but that, beholding the prescribed cursings and the penalties appointed for sinners, they may beware to incur them.

Concerning the sixth. JESUS reads the law to us; he does not [merely] reveal to us the secrets of the law. For we who are of the Catholic Church do not spurn the law of Moses, but receive it — provided, however, [that] JESUS read it to us; for thus shall we be able rightly to understand the law, if JESUS read it to us, so that, he himself reading, we may grasp its sense and understanding.

(col. 955)

Concerning the seventh. Even now — whether when the scriptures are read in the Church, or when a discourse of explanation is brought forth to the people — following the authority of scripture we say: See, the words of the law are indeed read by JESUS, yet to very many they are not read; because JESUS reads the law [only] to those who have had ears to hear.

Concerning the eighth. First, [the terms] "women," "little ones," [and] "proselytes" can be taken singly; then together thus: if the whole Church be taken at once, by "men" indeed are understood those who know how to stand perfect in all things, armed against the wiles of the devil; but by "women," those who do not yet from themselves do the [things] which are useful, but [do them] by imitating [their] betters and following their examples — of whom the [men] are also said to be the head. For the head of the woman is the man [1 Cor. 11:3]. But "infants" will be those who, faith being lately received, are nourished with the milk of the Gospel. And "proselytes" seem [to be] the catechumens, or those who now strive to associate themselves with the faithful. Concerning these several [classes] John too, thinking similar [things], writes in his Epistle, and assigns to each several age its own proper deeds. Nevertheless — JESUS reciting the law to you, and revealing to our hearts the spiritual understanding — [I exhort you]: neither [do you], proselytes (that is, catechumens), remain catechumens any longer, but hasten to receive the grace of GOD, that you too may be numbered in the Church of the sons of Israel; and you, infants, do not become children in [your] understanding, but in malice be little ones, and in [your] understanding be perfect [1 Cor. 14:20].

Of the Wars: Caput IX — The Third War: The Gibeonite [War]

Caput IX — The Third War: The Gibeonite [War] (opening)

1. Now when all these [things] were heard of, all the kings beyond the Jordan, who dwelt in the mountains and in the plains, in the places near the sea and on the shore of the great sea — these too who dwelt beside Libanus, the Hittite and the Amorite, the Canaanite, the Pherezite and the Hevite, and the Jebusite — **2.** gathered themselves together, that they might fight against Joshua and Israel with one mind and one resolve. **3.** But those who dwelt in Gabaon, hearing all that Joshua had done to Jericho and Ai, **4.** and cunningly devising, took for themselves provisions, laying old sacks upon [their] asses, and wine-skins rent and sewn up again, **5.** and very old shoes, which for a token of age had been patched with clouts, [and being] clothed in old garments: the loaves also, which they carried for the journey, were hard and broken into fragments. **6.** And they went on to Joshua, who then abode in the camp at Galgala [Gilgal], and said to him, and at the same time to all Israel: We have come from a far country, desiring to make peace with you. And the men of Israel answered them, and said: **7.** Perhaps you dwell in the land which is owed to us by lot, and [then] we cannot enter into a covenant with you. **8.** But they [said] to Joshua: We are thy servants. To whom Joshua said: Who are you? and whence have you come? **9.** They answered: From a very far country thy servants have come, in the name of the Lord thy God. For we have heard the fame of his power, all the [things] which he did in Egypt, **10.** and to the two kings of the Amorites who were beyond the Jordan, Sehon king of Hesebon and Og king of Basan, who was in Astaroth. **11.** And our elders, and all the inhabitants of our land, said to us: Take in [your] hands provisions for the longest journey, and go to meet them, and say: We are your servants; enter into a covenant with us. **12.** Lo, these loaves — when we went out from our houses to come to you, we took [them] hot; now they are become dry, and broken up by exceeding age. **13.** These skins of wine we filled new; now they are burst and undone. The garments and shoes with which we are clothed, and which we have on [our] feet, by reason of the length of the longer way are worn and almost consumed. **14.** They took therefore of their provisions, and consulted not the mouth of the Lord. **15.** And Joshua made peace with them, and, a covenant being entered into, promised that they should not be slain; the princes of the multitude also swore to them. **16.** But three days after the covenant was made, they heard that [the Gabaonites] dwelt near, and would be among them. **17.** And the children of Israel moved the camp, and came into their cities on the third day, the names of which are these: Gabaon, and Caphira, and Beroth, and Cariathiarim. **18.** And they smote them not, because the princes of the multitude had sworn to them in the name of the Lord the God of Israel. Therefore all the common people murmured against the princes. **19.** Who answered them: We have sworn to them in the name of the Lord the God of Israel, and therefore we cannot touch them. **20.** But this we will do to them: Let them indeed be reserved that they may live, lest the wrath of the Lord be stirred up against us, if we should be forsworn; **21.** but let them so live, as to hew wood and carry water for the use of the whole multitude. And as they were speaking these [things], **22.** Joshua called the Gabaonites, and said to them: Why would you deceive us by fraud, that you should say: We dwell very far off from you, whereas you are in the midst of us? **23.** Therefore you shall be under a curse, and there shall not fail from your stock [one who is] a hewer of wood and a carrier of water into the house of my God. **24.** They answered: It was told to us thy servants, that the Lord thy God had promised his servant Moses that he would deliver to you the whole Land, and

(col. 957)

[that he would deliver to you the whole Land, and] destroy all its inhabitants. We feared therefore greatly, and provided for our lives, compelled by dread of you, and entered upon this counsel. **25.** But now we are in thy hand: do to us what seems good and right to thee. **26.** So Joshua did as he had said, and delivered them from the hand of the children of Israel, that they should not be slain. **27.** And he decreed in that day that they

should be in the service of all the people, and of the altar of the Lord — hewing wood and carrying water — until the present time, in the place which the Lord should choose.

COMMENTARY

A double Gibeonite war could be constituted: one, of the Israelites against the Gabaonites themselves; the other, of the same [Israelites] on behalf of them. Of the former [is] the discourse here; of the latter — which will also be called the Adonizedekite [war] — [in] the following chapter. And the former indeed was waged not with arms, nor with hand and blood, but was seized, turned aside, and impeded, by [the Gabaonites] themselves, against whom it should have been waged, by a certain guile. But there are two parts of the chapter. In the former, the preparation of very many Kings for war against the Israelites is delivered (vv. 1 and 2). In the latter, the seizure and turning-aside of the Gibeonite war (as I have already indicated); which contains as it were seven things done:

I. There is the trepidation and fear of the Gabaonites (v. 3). *II.* Their crafty counsel for obtaining peace (v. 4 and following). *III.* The covenant struck with them incautiously by the Israelites (v. 14). *IV.* The detection of the whole guile (vv. 16, 17, 18). *V.* The murmuring of the Israelite common people because of that striking of the covenant (v. 19). *VI.* The composing and settling of the murmur (vv. 19, 20, 21). *VII.* The punishment of the Gabaonites themselves (v. 22, to the end of the chapter). But in the former part it is to be noted that those Kings who had prepared war against Israel are described in a twofold [way].

First. From the places in which they dwelt — which [are] a fourfold [set of] regions of the Canaanite land: 1. Mountainous. 2. Level or champaign [plains]. 3. Maritime, which are toward [the shore] of the great sea, that is, of the Mediterranean shore. 4. Those which are over against Libanus, or beside Libanus, concerning which above (ch. 1 and ch. 5, in the Commentary). Then, they are described by the names of six peoples. For there are: 1. the Hittites, in Greek χαττα῀ν [chattaïn]; 2. the Amorites; 3. the Canaanites; 4. the Pherezites; 5. the Hevites, in Greek εὐαῖοι [euaioi]; 6. the Jebusites. The seventh in Canaan was the people of the Gergesites, as appeared above (ch. 3, v. 10; and Gen. 15; Deut. 7) — [but] in this place, and sometimes elsewhere, omitted, because [it was] small, as Abulensis says (q. 3). Yet the Septuagint here enunciated it, before the Jebusites, in the sixth place. But beautifully concerning this passage [does] Origen [treat in] homily 9: "The history of the deeds," he says, "is manifest, and needs no explanation, because it was evidently fulfilled; yet from these visible [things] which were done, let us contemplate the wars and triumphs which our Lord JESUS the Savior waged — although in him too we see these fulfilled visibly. For the kings of the earth, the senate and the people, and the Roman Princes came together to storm the name of JESUS, and Israel with [it]. For they decreed by their laws that there should be no Christians. Every city, every order, assails the name of the Christians. But just as then all those kings, coming together against JESUS, could do nothing, so neither shall the princes, or those contrary powers, be able to obtain [this] — that the race of the Christians be not more widely and profusely propagated. For it is written that, by how much the more they humbled them, by so much the more did they become more numerous, and grew exceedingly strong. And we trust that not only shall our visible enemies and adversaries not be able to prevail against us, but also that swiftly — our Lord JESUS conquering — Satan shall be crushed under the feet of his servants. For with him as leader his soldiers shall always conquer, so that we may say, as it is written in Esdra: 'Because from the Lord is the victory; and I [am] thy servant; blessed art thou, God of truth.' Whom may we too always invoke, that he give us the victory in CHRIST JESUS our Lord, to whom is glory and dominion. Amen."

Question I. What city [is] Gabaon, and where?

"Gibbon" [Gibeon] it is wont to be called today by the Innovators, who admire more the modern points [vowel-pointing] of the Hebrews than the 70 Interpreters, the Latin text, and all the expounders of the most received usage. Benjamin of Tudela says [that] in his age it was called Garaan David — perhaps Gabaan —

and [that it is] distinct from the Gabaa of Saul, concerning which [in] 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 11:4, chs. 13, 23, and 26. But it is described below (ch. 10, v. 2) thus: "Gabaon was a great city, and one of the royal cities; and greater than the town of Ai, and all its warriors most valiant." And by these words four [things] are shown about this city. *First*: its size — that [it was] great. *Secondly*: [its] dignity — that [it was] "one of the royal cities." But in the Hebrew, not "one," but "as [it were] one of the royal cities": so that, on account of [its] size and excellence, it may seem rather similar to such royal cities than [that it was] one of those which had a King. For although Abulensis asserts (ch. 10) [that it] had a King, yet nowhere here [is there] ever [anything] about any Gibeonite King — neither in the sending of the legates, nor in the covenant, nor in the war which followed (ch. 10). And so in the Greek [texts], ὡσεὶ μία τῶν μητροπόλεων [h■sei mia t■n m■tropole■n], that is, "as [it were] one of the mother-cities [metropoleis]." And therefore either a particle of this kind — "as," "like" — dropped out in our [Latin] text, or the Interpreter took that particle not to diminish [the sense], but to affirm [it]. As elsewhere — for [example], the word in John 1, "as [it were] the only-begotten" [John 1:14] — or rather "one of the royal cities," [where] "as it were" [is understood] on account of the likeness: just as if some man were said [to be] eloquent, and "one of the ancient Orators and wise Philosophers"; and so the sense [is] always the same. *Thirdly*: the comparison with the city of Ai — which at the beginning had given only trouble and grief, but afterward only joy and spoils — [namely] that [Gabaon was] greater than it. *Fourthly*: the virtue and strength of its citizens and inhabitants — that not some few of them, but

(col. 959)

[not some few of them, but] all [its] men most valiant. For although in the Greek there is no superlative, and the 70 render [it] by the positive — πάντες οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτῆς ἰσχυροί [pantes hoi andres aut■s ischyroi, "all its men [are] strong"] — yet the Hebrews rightly render "gibborim" [as] "most valiant," because the Hebrew "gibbor" imports a certain force and surpassing excess of strength. And so Nimrod is called [gibbor] (Gen. 10, vv. 8 & 9), [and] Goliath the Giant (1 Kings [Samuel] 17); thus [is] God [called, in] Ps. 23[24], v. 8, and in [Ps.] 32[33], v. 16. Yet often elsewhere [the gibborim] are rendered "strong" and "powerful" (2 Kings [Samuel] 1:19; ch. 17:7; ch. 23:8; 2 Chron. 32:3; Eccles. 9:11; Judg. 5:14; and elsewhere).

The same city, with respect to Jericho and Ai, is western; with respect to Jerusalem, northern; and [that] it is distant from these [i.e. from Jerusalem] by 50 stadia, says Josephus (bk. 2 of the *Captivity* [*Jewish War*], ch. 22 — in the Greek, ch. 37), that is, 6½ Italian miles, [and] in our German [miles] not quite two; but in leagues, as Benjamin says in his Itinerary, three — ἔγγιστα τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις [engista tois Hierosolymois, "very near to Jerusalem"], says Josephus (bk. 5).

That it stood in a higher place, the name derived from [its] height is an argument; and Adrichomius, [citing] from Brocardus, saying [that] it was situated on Mount Silo [Shiloh].

Its inhabitants were of the fifth of the nations enumerated above — namely the Hevites — as [is stated] below (ch. 11, v. 19). If, however, the name of the Amorites be taken generally, as I have said is done elsewhere, the Gabaonites are called "Amorites" (2 Kings [Samuel] 21:2). But this Gabaon, and the other [city], St. Jerome thus briefly depicts in the book *On the Hebrew Places*: "Gabaon, whence the Gabaonites came as suppliants to Jesus [Joshua], was once a Metropolis-city, and royal, of the Hevites, and fell into the lot of the tribe of Benjamin; and now a village of the same name is shown at the fourth milestone from Bethel, toward the Eastern region, near Rama and Rennon, where Solomon, victims being immolated, merited a divine oracle." And it too was set apart for the Levites. Concerning the waters of Gabaon, and the battle once joined at them, the Prophet Jeremiah narrates (ch. 41, v. 12).

Question II. Which [were] the other cities of the Hevites, joined to Gabaon?

There are numbered, in this very chapter (v. 17), three other cities of the Hevites [allied] to Gabaon — joined not by neighborhood only, but by alliance and concord too: 1. Cephira — χεφιρὰ [chephira] in the 70,

χεφειρὰ [chepheira] in Josephus. 2. Beroth — βηρὼτ [b■r■t] — passed over by Josephus. 3. Cariathiarim, that is, "city of woods" [Holkstatt]; in the 70, πόλεις (perhaps πόλις) Ιαρίν [poleis / polis Iarin, "city of Jearim"]. Its citizens are called by Josephus καθερημῖται [kather■mitai]. But [that] these were subject to Gabaon, Adrichomius says — and [it is] likely. *First*: because Gabaon was, as I said (q. 1), after the manner of the royal cities. *Secondly*: greater [cities] are wont generally to preside over the lesser cities of the same nation. *Thirdly*: because the text hints [it] (v. 17), when it says "they came into their cities" — namely, of the Gabaonites; and in the Hebrew is added: "their cities are Gabaon, Cephirah, and Beeroth, and Ciriathicharim" — which last is elsewhere called "Cariath baal" and "Baalah" (1 Chron. 13; Jer. 26:20), not far from Bethsames [Beth-shemesh] (1 Kings [Samuel] 6, last verse, and ch. 7, v. 1). Arias Montanus says: "To those cities of the Canaanites names were once given, from various causes, in which the chief parts are held by the situation of the place, [its] nature and character, and the conveniences and inconveniences noted from neighboring and adjoining things: but by this reckoning 'Gabaon' [is] a Canaanite word, in Latin 'culmen' [summit], in Spanish 'cumbre.' 'Chaphrah' — or, as [in] that tongue, 'Hachephirah' with the singular mark [singular form] — is called 'a little lioness,' in Spanish 'la leoncilla.' 'Becroth' [= 'wells'] (putei), 'Pozos' in Spanish. 'Cariath iegarim,' 'city of woodlands,' in Italian 'civitella boschi.'" *Fourthly*: St. Jerome (bk. *On the Hebrew Places*): "Iarim," he says, "[is] a city of the Gabaonites." Of these cities, therefore, there was one mind of all — [concerning] the warding off from themselves of the imminent war of the Israelites.

Question III. What [was] the cunning of the Gabaonites for turning away from themselves the war of the Israelites?

The Gabaonites thought to bring the Israelites to this: that it might be permitted them to live through [the Israelites] themselves, and, if possible, to retain their cities, fortunes, and liberty [as] their own. But because they saw that this could not be obtained by open means — since [the Israelites] had resolved to bring utter destruction upon all the Canaanites, and had in very deed already brought [it] upon [the people of] Jericho and Ai — they turned to frauds and guiles: namely, to send legates who would feign that they came from a far country, and who, out of admiration of the valor and works which their God had done for them and through them, would ask for peace and a covenant. For they reckoned that for those who dwelt outside the borders of Canaan there was no peril [to Israel], and that to them peace and a covenant might easily be granted. But because in the Hebrew, in the Greek, and in some Latin [copies] there is also the particle at v. 4 — thus: "they also acted in cunning," or "and they craftily devised" — Rashi asks: to what is that "also" [etiam] referred? He answers, [it is] referred to the ancient fraud of the sons of Jacob against the Shechemites — Gentile [kin] of the Gabaonites (Gen. 34). But Radak [refers it] either to the walls of the men of Jericho and the forces of the men of Ai — so that, just as [Israel] had used these against [the enemy], so [the Gabaonites now used] cunning; or to the fraud of the Israelites against [Jericho and Ai], by which they had conquered them, so that by that same [fraud they might] now conquer and deceive the conquerors themselves. But it must be said briefly. *First*: that that Hebrew particle is redundant [pleonastic]. *Secondly*: that it is referred to the counsels of the other Canaanites — [so] that, just as those pursued open counsels toward war and fury, so these [Gabaonites pursued] hidden and crafty [counsels] toward peace. But the whole of their guile and cunning consisted in this: that they might persuade the Israelites that they were far from them, that they were not included within the borders of Canaan, [and] that they dwelt in some more remote region. And for this they used feigned and simulated double signs — of which some were placed in things [deeds], others in words. The "things" [deeds] were threefold.

The first, the provisions [viaticum]. For they feigned that it was now old and stale from the long time of a long journey. For this is what v. 4 signifies — in the Hebrew, in the hithpael from "tsud" [to provision oneself], as the Chaldee [Targum] explains, and the Latin when it renders "they took provisions for themselves"; and the 70, in which [it is] ἐπεσιτίσαντο [epesitisanto, "they provisioned themselves"]; and it is confirmed, because at v. 11 is "tsedah" [provision], ἐπισιτισμὸς [episitismos], and at v. 12 "hitstatiadnu."

Yet in today's Hebrew Bibles it is read at v. 4 "they undertook an embassy" or "they feigned [one]," from another word, "tsir," which signifies "a legate." This error or variant arises from the similarity of the Hebrew letters daleth [ד] and resh [ר]. But this provision is reckoned [as] double: bread and wine. Those [loaves] (v. 5) were hard and broken into fragments — hard indeed, [as] if at the very beginning of the journey they had been fresh and warm

(col. 961)

[fresh and warm], as the Gabaonites also affirm (v. 12), and had meanwhile dried up, as the Hebrew word "iabesch" [yabesh, "dried"] says (v. 5); and therefore were hard, and dissolved and comminuted into fragments and crumbs (v. 12). For just as moderate moisture gives softness to bread, and is a certain [thing] like rennet [coagulum], by which the whole coheres to itself, so excessive dryness brings hardness, and a dissolution of all the parts — which, however, long shaking [agitation] too could effect. Yet this latter [point], concerning the loaves broken into fragments, others explain in two further ways. In one, that the loaves were scorched, and thoroughly parched by the great heat of the sun. So the Chaldee Paraphrast [Targum], Aquila, Symmachus, and Rashi, deriving the Hebrew "necudim" from "iacad" [yaqad], which is "to burn"; and so our Interpreter [the Vulgate] seems to have rendered [it in] 3 Kings [1 Kings] 14, v. 3, "crustulam" [a little cake]. In the other, that the loaves were mouldy, and affected with spots of various color, as [it were] with points [specks]. For "necudoth" and "necadim" are "points [specks]." So Pagninus, Vatablus, Cajetan, Masius, Abulensis — and perhaps the 70, when they call [them] βεβρωμένοις [bebr■menois, "gnawed, corroded"]. But Radak approves all the expositions; yet Ralbag prefers our Latin [rendering].

Secondly. The other "thing" [deed] are the vessels — namely, the sacks, in which the loaves and the other [things] necessary for the journey were enclosed; and the wine-skins, in which was the wine. All were laid waste and torn (vv. 4 and 13), and variously mended and bound up again (v. 4).

Thirdly. The garments and shoes, which [were] old, worn, and sewn up with patches [pittacia] (v. 5). A "pittacium," in Celsus (bk. 3, ch. 10), is a little cloth which, smeared with ointment or some other medicament, is wont to be bound to the forehead or to some limb; and it is generally taken for little fragments — as here, for the various little pieces of leather with which the shoes were, as it were, spotted [patched]. And by these things, as I said, they wished [their] journey [to be] signified [as] a long one, and their land [as] very far distant from Canaan. But the former things [the provisions] they had placed upon [their] asses, as the Latin, Hebrew, and Chaldee text has (v. 4) — not, however, upon their own shoulders, as the 70 say (or rather, their faulty codices, which have ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων [epi t■n ■m■n, "upon the shoulders"] for ἐπὶ τῶν ὄνων [epi t■n on■n, "upon the asses"]). Nor can that former reading be proved either from St. Chrysostom (on Ps. 14) or from Josephus, so as to be [supported] by the Annotations of the 70. For [Josephus] is entirely silent [on it]; [Chrysostom] says only βαστάσαντας [bastasantas, "having taken up, carrying"], but adds neither ὄνοις [onois, "on asses"] nor ὤμοις [■mois, "on shoulders"]. And whatever [the truth] be concerning these authors, "asses" rather than "shoulders" [is] here to be read, as St. Augustine taught long ago (q. 12). Thou seest, moreover, here the ancient simplicity which travelers employed in carrying their food, as I have expounded (Tob. 6, q. 3). "But afterward," says St. Chrysostom (hom. 2, on the words of Isaiah, near the end), "inns and taverns were everywhere devised along the roads, that the beasts together with the travelers might be refreshed from labor and trouble" — concerning which also Oecumenius and Theophylact (on Acts, ch. 28), [and] Rhodiginus (bk. 8, ch. 30). Yet today in Greece there are no public inns, but among private [persons] lodging [must] be sought by favor or by money, as the most illustrious Duke of Olyka says (Epistle 4).

Question IV. What, how, and in what language, did the legates of the Gabaonites speak to the Israelites?

First. The legates of the Gabaonites joined false words to the false signs of things [deeds], narrating the length of their journey, and the growing-old and consumption of their [provisions] (vv. 6, 9, and 11). But to the false [things] they mixed certain true [things] about the victories of the Israelites (vv. 9 and 10); and they asked for a covenant (v. 6), where in the Hebrew, as also at v. 11, is "foedus inite" [enter into a covenant], or "strike [one] with us." For "King of Hesebon" (v. 10) the 70 put "King of the Amorites," and after "Astaroth" they add Ἐδραείμ [Edraeim]. But the cities were both trans-Jordanian, of which the former is called Astaroth Carnaim (Num. 32), the latter Edrai (Num. 21:33; Deut. 3:1; and chs. 31 and 10). "[A] very long way" the same legates hint by all [their] words and signs; yet here [there is] no superlative in the Hebrew and Greek (v. 11), but only [at] v. 13, as to the sense. *Secondly.* But the manner of speaking these [words] was a cunning, framed with manifold [craft], which should be most apt for persuading. *First*: Because before a pious ruler, and [one] most loving of God's honor and glory, and before princely men of great piety, they say (v. 9) [that] they came "in the name of the Lord," or "to his name" — concerning which below. *Another* [Secondly]: They relate the victories of the Israelites, ascribing them wholly to God himself (vv. 9 and 10). *Third*: They speak always most humbly of themselves, and most magnificently of the Israelites, calling them their "Lords." *Fourth*: They are silent about the victories against Jericho and Ai. For since these were most recent, if they had made any mention of them, they would have seemed to have come not from a far country (as they wished to appear) — unless perhaps they had said [that] these [victories were] heard by them not [from] their own citizens and nobles, by whom they had been sent, but only [heard] by themselves, on the very journey, in the preceding days. But because they were performing an embassy, and speaking in the public name of their [people], they rightly kept silent about those most recent laurels of the Israelites, and did not touch upon them even under their own [private] name as [things] heard. And in this very [thing] there was still greater force and prudence. For if, [when] the [things] which had been done beyond the Jordan were [merely] heard, the Gabaonites were so moved and stirred to friendship and covenant with the Israelites — what would have happened, if they could have heard of the wondrous crossing of the Jordan, of the ruin of the walls of Jericho, [and] of the storming and burning of Ai? *Thirdly* [the third head — the language]: In what language the Gabaonites conversed with the Hebrews, Abulensis disputes (qq. 12 and 13); but it is to be answered as above (ch. 2, q. 25). For just as Rahab spoke with the spies, so these too [spoke] with Joshua and the other Israelites.

Question V. Whether the Gabaonites rightly employed the fraud of things and words?

Concerning the simulation and guile of things [deeds] I have already answered (ch. 8, q. 2) — if indeed the war was just for them, as Abulensis thinks (q. 15), and [as] was disputed by me above (q. 3 on these wars, before ch. 6). But concerning the words, it is certain that they lied; and then it comes into question: Whether it is sometimes lawful to circumvent enemies by some lie? Albericus Gentili — [one] of the Innovators — answers (bk. 2, *On War*, ch. 5) [that] enemies can be circumvented by a lie in two ways. *First*: by not speaking to them. *Secondly*: by speaking to them; and this

(col. 963)

[can be done] again in two ways: for either we speak to them without any promise or contract, or with a promise and within a contract. [Gentili holds, then, that] it is lawful to impose a lie on enemies in every way outside a contract, but within a contract never. But —

First. The most certain and most received opinion of St. Augustine (in the books *On Lying* and *Against Lying*), which St. Thomas also proposes (2a2ae, q. 40, art. 3), is that no kind of lie is lawful. And therefore, whether we speak to our own [people] or to enemies, and whether contracting or not contracting, every lie whatsoever is always to be removed. The Innovator objects three [things]. *First*: All the Philosophers — as Plato, Xenophon, Lucian, the Jurisconsults, Physicians, Rhetoricians, and Theologians older than St.

Augustine, as he himself testifies about them (q. 68 on Leviticus) — reckoned that some lie could sometimes be admitted. *Second*: By insidious deeds [ambushes] it is lawful to deceive enemies (above, ch. 8, q. 2); therefore also by lies. For in simulated works too there is a lie, as St. Thomas says (2a2ae, q. 111, art. 1); [so also] St. Ambrose, Aristotle (in the treatise *On Truthfulness*), Archidamus in Stobaeus (serm. 62), and Clement of Alexandria (bk. 3, *Paedag.*, ch. 3) — when he exclaimed about that man who dyed his hair lest he seem grey: "What would he say truly who has a lie even upon his head?" He concludes thus: "It could be called the lie of David, who sometimes acted the madman." *Third*: He collects the examples of those who seem to have lied — Elisha (4 Kings [2 Kings] 6), Rahab (above, ch. 2).

To the first: I deny [it] concerning all Theologians. For neither the Prophets, nor the Apostles, nor so many others conceded any lie. Concerning the Philosophers and the like, it is no wonder that they erred here, who erred in greater [matters]; and so [did] those Christians who followed them, as Origen and others (see Molanus, bk. 1, *On Keeping Faith with Heretics*, ch. 5). *To the second*: I deny the consequence, because words by their nature are referred to indicating the mind's meanings, but deeds are not — [only] by accident; and so there is some lie in them, yet improperly and by accident. *To the third*: Concerning the individual [examples], [it] has been said, or is to be said, in its own place.

Secondly. Even if it were lawful to circumvent enemies by a lie, yet it would not be lawful for all, but only for those whose war was just — as [was] expounded above concerning ambushes (ch. 8, q. 2).

Thirdly. From all contracts with an enemy, every lie and guile of words ought to be entirely absent; and this the same Jurisconsult [Gentili] there rightly hands down (also ch. 4). Pericles, therefore, [was] wicked (Frontinus, *Stratagems* bk. 4) — who, having covenanted [that] the future enemies [would be] unharmed if they laid down their iron [weapons], slew those same [men], because they had kept iron clasps on their cloaks: here the word "iron" [was meant] of arms. "By iron, not by gold, let us both decide life," says Pyrrhus in Ennius. (Thucydides, bk. 2:) The Plataeans [were] wicked, who, having covenanted to give back captives, gave them back slain — as if the captives were corpses, and a dead man were [still] a man. Wicked [was] Alexander, who granted the defenders a safe departure from the city, but ordered them, when they had advanced a little on the way, to be killed — by which an inexpiable stain clung to the warlike deeds of Alexander, as [men] write. And deservedly, if only this is asked: whether, if it was covenanted that they might safely leave the city, they could thus be captured and killed after they had left. For there is no one who would so covenant, and no reason why he would.

[Whoever] is captured in a temple is to be released — and so released that his pursuit be difficult. This is the best law here, unless something else has been agreed. Dercylidas, Thibron, [and] Paches [were] wicked, who, having promised the besieged a return into the besieged city if they came to them, then threatened those coming with death unless they surrendered the city; and so they granted a return [only] into a surrendered [city] — but that surrendered [city] was not the [one] into which they had covenanted a return. Wicked [were] the Samnites, who, having covenanted with the enemy about removing a stone throughout the whole circuit of the wall, remove [it] from the lowest part, and so remove the whole wall — but if a stone had to be removed from the wall, the wall assuredly did not have to be removed. Wicked [were] the Campanians, who were [bound] to leave half the arms to the enemy, but cut all the arms in two and left the half of the cut [pieces]. And equally wicked [was] that Roman who cut all of Antiochus's ships [in two], because the King had to hand over half the ships by the treaty; and here [he] is called by Valerius a wicked trickster. For this is not a division, but a ruin of everything. As Cascellius wittily [says] in Macrobius (bk. 2, *Saturnalia*, ch. 6): "If thou dividest the ship, neither thou nor thy partner will have [it]." And the Interpreters [comment] on the ridiculous deed of him who had thus bought half a fig-tree, and wanted the middle of each [fruit] (Jason and Alciatus, [on] L. 12, 13, "if a certain [thing] be sought"). And Labeo and Sabinus [hold] that if a torn garment be given back, or the thing be returned corrupted, the thing seems to be absent [not returned] — which Decius, and Ulpian, and Paulus approve (L. 13, 14, *On the Meaning of Words*). The Romans, again, [were]

wicked, who, promising that Carthage should be free, transferred the word of the promise to the citizens — of whom the community consisted — not to the walls and buildings, which they ordered destroyed (Appian, *Punica*). For although there be this difference between "urbs" [city] and "civitas" [community] — that "urbs" [is] the buildings, "civitas" the inhabitants — yet [that] is a wholly sinister and far-fetched interpretation, which does not sound right to the ears of the common [people]; for this subtler [distinction], neglected everywhere, does not agree with the [true] difference. Nor even is a "free" community left, which is ordered to migrate elsewhere: a command to migrate from one's own dwellings is nothing short of captivity. Nor is a community without a city, buildings, and walls, in which much of the community's nature consists. But indeed in several [passages] of that Third Punic [War] you could scarcely defend the Romans. Wicked too, in the Second [Punic War], [were] those Roman soldiers who, captured by Hannibal and so released on [the terms] that, if the senate would not exchange the captives, they themselves should return to Hannibal — and [who] said they were freed from the [oath's] obligation because, when they had gone out from Hannibal, they had returned by a contrived plan on the same day, and so, the oath about returning being [thus] fulfilled, they had departed bound by no condition. This fraudulent cunning of theirs was reckoned so base that there was no one who did not brand it with reproaches, decrees, [and] marks [of infamy]. And Cicero [judges] concerning this deed [that] one must always consider what thou hast meant in [good] faith, not what thou hast said (Gellius, bk. 8, ch. 18; Cicero, bk. 3, *On Duties*). And generally the Theologians [say], concerning an oath: "By whatever art of words each may swear, yet God, who is the witness of conscience, so takes this [oath] as he understands [it] to whom it is sworn," etc. (ch. 9, q. 22, causa 5). The same fraud [was] in these soldiers; and yet far more monstrous was [that] of Otho, Bishop of Mainz, than others narrate and note (Sabellicus, bk. 12; Ennen, bk. 8; Alciatus, *On Presumptions*, ch. 17; bk. 4 of the *Deeds of the Archbishops of Mainz*, [Archbishop] 10, where [it is] written not "Otho," but — more correctly — "Hatto"). Wicked [were] Agnon, Cleomenes, and the Thracians, who, having covenanted a truce for some days with the enemy, meanwhile did something hostile in some night — as if night were not contained under the appellation of "day," although [the truce] had been said not of one day but of several. And when that which is transacted [is treated] not in mid-daylight, but in darkness — [it is] even noted by a proverb, this "Thracian device." Also the pacts of the Pharisees concerning

(col. 965)

[the pacts of the Pharisees concerning the sabbath] they relate to have been said insidiously: because, when they had landed in Libya, and had obtained from the inhabitants of the place that they might be there a night and a day, they afterward would never depart — as if safe by this pact, [taking it] as if it meant, and as if it had been agreed, that [the pact] should last until [there] be day, and [there] be night, forever. And perhaps the Phoenician tongue, likewise the Libyan, more nearly favors this fraud (nay, without the "perhaps" — because HADIOM ["the day"] or LAILA ["night"] can signify either) — which [fraud] is detected more manifestly and impudently in the Latin. So too the other above-mentioned [tricks] of the Greeks, the Opicans, the Scythians, and others. Those same Phoenicians brought in that other device about the ox-hide, having bought only "AS MUCH [LAND] AS THEY COULD SURROUND WITH AN OX-HIDE." And another device the same [Phoenicians] devised elsewhere, in Athenaeus (bk. 8). But they too were then caught by the Greeks with equal arts. For the Greeks, who owed them ships, hand [them] over without rudder, oars, [and] sails — as though these were [real] ships: insidiously, but against insidious [men]. Wicked [were] the Locrians, who, having covenanted a perpetual friendship "while they should tread that land, and carry those heads upon [their] shoulders" — [then], the earth which they had before put into [their] shoes, and the heads of garlic which they had secretly placed on [their] shoulders, being shaken out, moved war. These most futile devices — which perhaps thou couldst use, as Numa and Brutus are reported to have used [them], to avert some savagery, but here thou couldst not use. Wicked [was] Ariandes; wicked the Persians, who likewise, having covenanted friendship "while that land should stand [remain]," — the ditch made beforehand, and the earth which covered [it] and on which they were standing, being opened up, pressed down, and cast down beneath,

— thus vaunted themselves freed by the pact, that land not standing [remaining]. And such [was] the device of the Perugians, disapproved even by the Perugian Jurisconsults: that there should be peace between the Pope and the Perugians "so long as they should have upon [their] body [something] of the *vite*" — which word in Italian signifies both "lives" [*vitas*] and "vines" [*vites*]. But the Perugians understood [it] of themselves concerning the vine, which they carried hidden in [their] bosom, and which they afterward cast away; and so they ceased to have [it] on [their] body, and renewed war with the Pontiff — who, trusting the treaty, where he had understood "life," was now acting securely. These are devices so rotten and putrid that, in recounting and refuting them, I could seem excessive.

Fourthly. Abulensis holds (q. 15) [that] the sin of the Gabaonites was very small, because [it] was a dutiful [officious] sin, for preserving life; therefore, he says, [it is] as it were of no fault. But for the Israelites, unless much had followed to counter [it], [it] would have been pernicious. And [that] these — in 1 Chron. 2:22 — are called, on account of this lie, "men of Cozeba," or "of the lie," in the Hebrew and Greek text, the Rabbis and Talmudists agree (ch. 5, in *Bababathra* [Bava Batra], fol. 916).

Question VI. What [did] the Israelites [say and do] at the embassy of the Gabaonites?

First, the Israelites said to the legates of the Gabaonites — or, as [it is] in the Hebrew, to the Hevite — or some [one] of these (v. 7): "Perhaps you dwell in the land which is owed to us by lot, and [then] we cannot enter into a covenant with you." *Secondly*, Joshua said to the same (v. 8): "Who are you? or whence have you come?" *Thirdly* (v. 4): The Israelites took of the provisions of those legates. *Fourthly* (same place): "And they consulted not the mouth of the Lord." *Fifthly* (v. 15): "Joshua made peace with them, and, a covenant being entered into, promised that they should not be slain." *Sixthly*: "The princes of the multitude also swore to them." — The first [point] seems to be clearer in the Hebrew: "perhaps thou dwellest in the midst of me — and how shall I strike a covenant with thee?" The third indeed seems clearest [in its motive]. For it is on this account that the Israelites seem to have taken of their provisions, that is, of the bread — that they might see whether, as the legates said, it was so dry and reduced to crumbs, or mouldy; and they handled [it] with [their] hands, and perhaps even tested [it] with [their] teeth — so also Radak and R. Isaiah. Others obscure these words in a fourfold [way]. *First*: [that], most grievous hunger pressing, that bread was devoured by the Israelites. But what [could be] more absurd, in that blessed course of victories, and the very great abundance of spoils and crops? *Secondly*: for "they took" [susceperunt] others render "they learned" [didicerunt] — and this explains that effect of exploration which I mentioned. *Thirdly*: The Chaldee [Targum]: "The Israelites," it says, "assented to the insidious words of the Gabaonites" — as if [the verb] came not from "tsid," but from "tsadad," that is, "to lie in wait": a Hebrew derivation which displeases at once anyone who looks even a little at the grammar. *Fourthly*: Some, finally, hold [that] the bread was taken by the Israelites from the Gabaonites, because in the ratifications of covenants it was the custom to pour a libation and to eat bread together; likewise sacrificial flesh, or salt, or wine, or something similar — as [is] clear from Curtius (bk. 8), Homer (bk. 3 of the Iliad), [and] Alexander ab Alexandro (bk. 5, ch. 3). So Lyranus, and Arias Montanus — saying [that] this is observed today by all the Orientals, and by many of the Western islands; and [that] he himself experienced in Ireland [Hibernia] the greatest tokens of goodwill and friendship to be placed in the dividing of bread, the eating together, and the drinking of ale. On [v.] 14: since God does not truly and properly have a mouth [os], it is agreed [that] here is signified by it the divine oracle — and indeed, as Abulensis, Arias, and Masius confess, that which was done through the Urim and Thummim, concerning which [see] bk. 1, ch. 9, q. 23 and following.

Question VII. Whether the Gabaonites embraced the true religion of the one God?

Masius seems to deny [it]; and Abulensis clearly [denies it] (q. 20). But I reckon [that], when that embassy of theirs came, they were themselves prepared to embrace and profess publicly the same religion with the Israelites; and [that] many were already imbued with true faith — which, however, afterward in all [of them] became fuller and more perfect, partly by the teaching and example of Joshua, the Priests, and others, partly by the sight and consideration of God's new miracles. *First*: Because before the crossing of the Jews through the Jordan, they had heard (just as Rahab too, above, ch. 2) of the wondrous works of God for the Israelites. Therefore they had the same occasion for believing as Rahab herself; but she had by then already believed in the true God, as we saw above (ch. 2, q. 17). But now there had been added the marvelous crossing of the Jordan and the ruin of the walls of Jericho. Much more, therefore, could they [reckon] the God of the Israelites to be the true God, and believe in him. And [that] they believed, this profession of theirs shows (v. 9): "We have heard the fame of his power," or, as in the Hebrew [it is] more simply, "we have heard the fame," or "the report of him: all [things] which he did in Egypt," and what follows. *Secondly*: The same [Gabaonites] say to Joshua: "Thy servants have come, IN THE NAME OF THE LORD THY GOD." What is [it] "to come in the name of God"? And what [does it mean that] those who were once idolaters come "in the name of God" — not of any [god whatsoever]

(col. 967)

[not of any god] whatsoever, but of him who is the God of Joshua, who enriches him with the whole people, who protects and increases him with so many and so wondrous victories? Is it not to confess themselves stirred up by him to that embassy? Is it not to profess his name and glory? Josephus expresses this very [thing] more clearly: μαθόντες ἐκ Θεοῦ χάριτος καὶ δωρεᾶς [mathontes ek Theou charitos kai d■reas], that is, "when we had learned [it] from the grace and gift of God." And the text could also be thus rendered by a Hebrew [reading]: "Thy servants have come to the name of the Lord thy God" — as if they said: "to profess the name and glory of the Lord thy God, to worship and venerate him, to take up his religion and ceremonies, we thy servants have come." And note [that], for "Lord," in the same Hebrew text is that ineffable name IEHOVAH. *Thirdly*: So St. Augustine thinks (q. 13): "Not unfittingly," he says, "are they by all means to be believed [to have believed]: even though they wished to deceive men for their own safety, yet [they are believed] not to have feared God deceitfully among his people." And (q. 14): "They believed God, whom they had heard to have promised his own people that he would overthrow those nations, and obtain their land; and this faith of theirs he in some way rewarded, by not destroying them." *Fourthly*: Origen, although he is drawn by Masius to the contrary opinion, seems to feel the same (homily 10), when he says [that] the Gabaonites [are] "a small portion of those who are to be saved, and [that] Joshua held a judgment befitting their faith." Lyranus agrees, and Abulensis in some way (qq. 6 and 34, though not q. 20). Arias Montanus (fol. 256): "What thou askest," he says, "[namely] who we are — that is, what beyond other men we have obtained, or attained, or professed, [when] we resolved to seek you — of this be more certain: [that] we venerate and worship the name of your God, studiously and diligently known; and [that], chiefly for the sake of worshiping and celebrating him, we have desired to be joined to you in fellowship; and [that] we have done this, not impelled by fear or necessity, but by an ardent zeal of piety." Cajetan similarly: "Thou wilt note, prudent Reader, that the Gabaonites profess [that] they came in the name of Iehovah Elohe Israel [the LORD, the God of Israel] — that thou mayest understand [that] they now show themselves prepared for the worship of the Most High God, who is worshiped by Israel." *Fifthly*: Not a few of the Jews attest the same, among whom is R. Nachmanides (on Exod., ch. 23). *Sixthly*: Of the Innovators, Calvin: "They show," he says (fol. 38), "[that] they came in the name of God — as if they professed that they gave glory to God, and indeed to the God of Israel; wherein there underlies a tacit rejection of the superstitions to which they had been accustomed." Albericus Gentili too acknowledges [it] (bk. 3, *On War*, ch. 19, fol. 650). Thou wilt ask, then, whether, and when, they were circumcised? I answer, first, [that] it was indeed not necessary for the true worship of God that they be circumcised; but because — that they might wholly bind the Jews to themselves — they professed the Jewish worship, they were indeed themselves circumcised — yet not [until]

after Joshua's coming to them, and after the repelling of the war threatened against them, concerning which [see] below.

Question VIII. Whether the Israelites could strike a covenant with the Gabaonites?

Of the Innovators, Calvin denies [it] in this place, once and again; and, of his followers, the Jurisconsult Alberic Gentili (bk. 3, *On War*, ch. 19): "I think," he says, "[that] Joshua could not enter into any covenant with them, whatever the great Interpreters of the Bible may think otherwise." And again afterward, often. And [it is] also the opinion of Abulensis (qq. 19 and 20). In [my commentary on] the book of 2 Maccabees, however (ch. 2, q. 23), I said [that] it was not forbidden by Deut. 7:3 for the Israelites [to make] a covenant with all Gentiles, but only with the seven nations of the Canaanites — as is clear from Exod. 34:11, and expressly from the Jews' negative precept 48 and 49, which is "schebel lichroth berith leschibah hammim," that is, "no covenant is to be entered with the seven peoples." And this the first words of the Israelites with the Gabaonites indicate (in the previous question): "How shall I strike a covenant with thee?" Yet this [prohibition] concerning the seven Canaanite nations — [as] I have already expounded above (on Rahab, ch. 2, and ch. 6) — is to be taken [as holding] unless they should embrace the true faith and worship of the true God, as Rahab did. Now I add: if the covenant were private, with some one [individual], it could be made even with all his goods saved; and so it was done in Rahab['s case]. If the covenant were public, with a city or cities, [then] they would have to concede their land, cities, and estates to the Israelites as to the true lords appointed by God. And this latter the Gabaonites do, since so often — as we saw above (q. 4) — they profess themselves servants of the Israelites. But concerning the former [point] — "whether they were imbued with the true religion of God" — was the previous question. It is confirmed, first, from Deut. 20, v. 10. For the Jews confess [that] here [there] is a general sentence about all peoples who should want peace from Israel, even if they be Canaanites. But the Gabaonites do not wait until they be besieged, but come of their own accord: they become suppliants; they take up the sacred [rites] of God. But in v. 16 of the same chapter it treats of the Canaanites who reject peace [and] persevere in idolatry. *Secondly*: From ch. 11 below, v. 20, as above. *Thirdly*: Calvin confesses [that] peace ought to be offered them by God's command; and yet — as if God were a hypocrite and dissembler — he refuses [it] to be given. *Fourthly*: With me agree St. Augustine (qq. 13, 14), Lyranus, Cajetan, [and] all the Rabbis; of the Jurisconsults, Decianus (bk. 3, consilium 20); of the Innovators, Tremellius and Junius on this passage.

Question IX. Whether the Israelites struck the covenant with the Gabaonites rightly — [in] the manner [in which] they struck [it]?

The Israelites could strike a covenant with the Gabaonites (by the previous question, 8); yet we see them reprehended in the text (v. 14), when it is said: "and they consulted not the mouth of the Lord." Then Joshua in some way acknowledges the fault, and the other Princes of the multitude, when they preserve the Gabaonites only on this [ground], that they had promised them safety by oath (v. 18); and this one [thing] they answer to the murmuring multitude (v. 19). *Thirdly*: finally, because — as if a covenant ought not to have been struck with them — Joshua and the other princes impose on them a penalty and perpetual servitude.

Yet I say, *first*: if the Gabaonites had been as foreign, and as remote from the Canaanites, as they wished to seem, the covenant would have been rightly struck with them by the Israelites, because nothing else was covenanted than that they be allowed to live. But this the Israelites could promise to all remote nations not provoking [attacking] them — much more, to [those] asking [for it].

Secondly: If the Gabaonites had been recognized [as] as near as they were, and indeed [as] of the seven Cana-

(col. 969)

[and indeed of the seven] peoples of the Canaanites, the same pact could have been entered with them — because, as was said (qq. 7 and 8), they professed [that] they wished thenceforth to be worshipers of the true God, and gave themselves wholly into the power and dominion of the Jews, so that they called themselves their servants.

Thirdly. Yet the Israelites conducted themselves in various [ways] imprudently and faultily in the striking of that same covenant. *First*: That, in a matter of such moment, at this beginning of the wars, at this entrance upon that religion, the Princes did not consult the Lord. For either it was clear to them [that] Canaanites falling away from idolatry could be spared, or it was not clear. If it was clear, [yet] it would have been good to consult the oracle of the Lord, so that there might be the same opinion for all, even the common folk, and no occasion of murmuring given to them — which [murmuring] arose from this, that they thought [that], these [Gabaonites] being preserved, the inheritance and wealth promised to them was being diminished. If it was not clear, much more ought they to have roused [asked] the Lord [as to] what must be done. *Secondly*: That they believed them so rashly — not inquiring more diligently what their nation was, where situated, of what forces, of what worship; nor desisting until they had understood [these things]; not applying [even] a little of the Geographic science which was present in some [of them] by discipline and some use, or could be present by a certain natural judgment; not questioning those who had been spies anywhere; not inquiring anything of the Canaanites who were already in the camp; not conjecturing anything from their language; not even examining sufficiently those arguments by which those legates tried to prove [that] the journey had been a long one for them. For it was easy to think [that] all these could be done by guile and fraud, as indeed they were being done: namely, that old and mouldy loaves, worn and broken sacks and skins, could be brought out from a nearby place; garments frayed and torn; shoes mended and re-sewn with many patches — as Abulensis abundantly shows (q. 8). *Thirdly*: That they seemed to be taken and delighted too much by some praise of theirs, when they saw legates sent to them, for the sake of peace and covenant, from regions so distant and remote. *Fourthly*: That they applied too much speed to a business of such moment, delaying nothing — not even, as it seems, for one day. For otherwise rumor would have informed the whole camp, and Rahab and her household could have heard something [of it]. Deservedly, therefore, were the Princes reprehended by the Lord; deservedly they themselves acknowledge their fault; deservedly they afflict with a penalty and servitude those by whom they had been deceived and circumvented — concerning which again below.

Question X. When and how did the Israelites find out the fraud of the Gabaonites? [heading printed "IX"]

The text answers (v. 16): "three days after the covenant was entered, they heard that they dwelt near, and would be among them." And (v. 17): "The children of Israel moved the camp, and came into their cities on the third day." But the Israelites heard [that] the Gabaonites were neighbors — either from Rahab's household, as Abulensis holds, or from the foragers and provisioners, who ran out here and there in troops into the places near the enemy, as Masius holds and Josephus hints. For these could reach as far as these cities of the Gabaonites. But Arias [Montanus] thinks [that] the Gabaonite Ambassadors, [when] returned, brought so great a joy to their people, on account of the ratified covenant, that the fame spread abroad far and wide at once, and so came to the ears of the Israelites. However that be, on the third day after the ratification of the covenant, this error was discovered by certain hearing [report]; but on the sixth day after the same ratification — which [was] the third after the hearing — [it was discovered] by certain sight and experience, when Joshua had moved the camp forward to these Gabaonite places.

Question XI. Whether the Israelites were bound by the oath given to the Gabaonites?

When — as Quadrigarius says of the Lucanians, in Gellius (bk. 1, ch. 19) — the Israelites found out [that] "words had been given to them by deceits," was it necessary for them to stand by the pacts and agreements? There are two extreme opinions, and between them two middle [ones]. Of these, the former [extreme] is [that] it is lawful [fas], with enemies, to swear and to forswear [break oaths], as one pleases. This is handed down [to have been the view] of Gentili's — I know not whose — Lysander, who, on Plutarch's testimony, was wont to say: "boys are to be deceived with knucklebones [dice], but men with oaths." The latter [extreme] is Gratian's: [that] that unlawful oath is to be kept, which [concerns] a thing not evil in itself, but yet forbidden by some positive precept — which [precept] in general indeed was known to be obeyed, but in particular was not known [to apply] in that matter which was sworn; so that it is not ignorance of law, but of fact (causa 22, q. 4). "But since by all these [arguments] unlawful oaths are proved not to be kept, [the objection] is raised, that Joshua did not destroy the Gabaonites, against the Lord's precept, because the elders of Israel had confirmed peace with them by oath. But it is to be noted, that the elders of Israel, although they knew [that] it was commanded by the Lord that they destroy the nations of the land of promise, yet — deceived by the Gabaonites — did not know [that] these were inhabitants of the land promised to them." And afterward: "Therefore the unlawful oath which is forbidden to be kept is to be understood [as that] which is known to be unlawful when it is sworn; but if it is not known to be unlawful, ignorance itself excuses — if it be thought to be lawful — [ignorance] not of law, but of fact." The third opinion, and the former of the middle [two], is Cajetan's: [that] this oath was lawful, and [that] the Israelites were bound by it, so that they were held to keep [it]: "The chief men," he says, "who had sworn, judged the oath ought to be kept, out of reverence for the divine name. And deservedly, because, although deceived, they nevertheless had to admit the Gabaonites [as] not hardened in the worship of idolatry, but prepared for the worship of the Most High God, and fearing his judgments." For [that] the divine decree (Exod. 34 and Num. 33) is to be understood of the obstinate, is made manifest below in ch. 11, where the reason for the disparity between the Gabaonites and the other peoples is rendered — [resting] on the hardening of the others, and the non-hardening of the Gabaonites. And so the oath was not against the decrees of God, and therefore was to be kept — although they erred in the manner of covenanting, because they consulted not the mouth of the Lord. The latter of the middle opinions is [that] the Israelites were not bound by that sacrament [oath], because a fraud was done to them by the Gabaonites. For since these [Gabaonites] had said [that] they dwelt far outside the borders of the land of Canaan, the mind of all who swore was directed toward such [men], and [men] so remote and foreign.

(col. 971)

Since, therefore, the Gabaonites were not such [as they claimed], the Israelites were bound to them in nothing. Their excessive cunning is indeed disapproved — [those] who in words indeed swear one thing, but interpret [it] otherwise in mind, and think themselves to bear a mind unsworn; but these our [Israelites] swear this very [thing] which they understand in mind and decree [to be] true, and nothing else, by word. But the matter is otherwise [than the Gabaonites represented], and therefore they were wholly unbound. "Error in the substance [corpus] vitiates the contract" (Law 19, *On the condition of purchase*). But in the substance of this contract and covenant there was a great error — and that indeed of those who were covenanting, admitted [introduced] by the fraud of the Gabaonites. The common rule is [that] "a promise does not bind the parties under the good faith of a false assertion." And "in a promise extorted by guile, and made through error, the oath effects nothing, nor does it supply the defect of consent. An oath which has no consent, has no spirit. Where consent fails, there [fails] also the law of nature."

Question XII. Since the Israelites were not bound by that oath, [did they] rightly keep it?

To some [it] seems [that] this oath was not rightly kept. *First*: Because in the Council of Elvira [Elibertinum] (ch. 1), and in Gratian (causa 22, q. 4), it is said: "A rash determination is laudably to be dissolved: nor is it a prevarication, but a correction of the rashness." And Bede (on the feast of the Beheading of St. John): "Foolish vows," he says, "are to be broken." More [things] to the same effect are adduced [in] the same causa 22 (chapters "si aliquid," "Actione quarta," "si quis praeventus," "Mulier"). *Secondly*: Because the whole assembly of the Israelites disapproved the keeping of this oath, and murmured against the Princes. *Thirdly*: The obligation of the oath ceasing, the former condition of the Israelites returned. But that was of such a kind, that they had to bring utter destruction and ruin upon all the Canaanites (Deut. 20, v. 16). *Fourthly*: Cicero (bk. 1, *On Duties*): "Who does not see that those promises are not to be kept, which one had promised compelled by fear, or deceived by guile?" — To others [it] seems [that] the oath was rightly kept, in a threefold [manner]. *First*: Because God had either revealed or inspired [that] it must be done thus. So partly Abulensis, partly others [cited] in him (qq. 30, 31, 32). *Secondly*: Because the princes thought themselves bound by it. Although indeed [one] is not [truly] bound, yet they could by no means act against their own conscience, because "everything which is not of faith is sin" (Rom. 14, last verse). *Thirdly*: Because, although they knew indeed [that] they were not bound by it, yet — to show how greatly the sacredness of an oath is to be esteemed — they wished to keep it, and rightly kept [it]. And this pleases me exceedingly. For, *first*, no law forbade Canaanites who bid farewell to the vain superstitions of idols to be preserved safe and unharmed, as I said above (q. 8). *Secondly*, so great an ignorance of law seems scarcely to fall upon so great a Senate, and so great a Prince — and the same, so great a Prophet, Joshua — and upon the High Priest Eleazar too, whom Josephus [is] witness to have been present at all these [affairs]. *Thirdly*: No revelation is read of; [but] inspiration in benefactions of this kind is rightly granted. *Fourthly*: The Lord approved the judgment about this rightly-observed oath, both then, and many years after — as is clear from [what is] no less than 2 Kings [2 Samuel] 21. *Fifthly*: In this way a greater occasion was given to the Canaanites of converting themselves to the true God; and a greater reproach of most just punishment [was given] to the stubborn, and [those] contumacious in idolatry. *Sixthly*: So also St. Ambrose thinks (bk. 1, *On Duties*, ch. 29; bk. 3, ch. 10), whose words will be cited later. *Seventhly*: To be tenacious of promises and oaths, even with some inconvenience to oneself, has greater force for moving the minds of others to sacred fidelity, than if what was incautiously promised or sworn should at once be rescinded. Whence also St. Bernard (Epistle 219): "It is reckoned a disgrace among the Franks to loose an oath, however ill it was publicly sworn." *Eighthly*: This constancy of the Israelites in [their] agreements and pacts is praised in the chapter "Venerabilem" (in the Extra[vagantes], *On Election*): "Since the Gabaonites had filched an oath from the sons of Israel by fraud, yet they [the Israelites], the fraud being known, would not rashly go against it."

Question XIII. In so great a readiness to believe the Gabaonites, could anything of virtue — either Joshua's or Israel's — be noted [marked]?

"He who believes quickly is light of heart, and shall be lessened" (Ecclesiasticus 19:4) — whether [this is said] of divine faith, as Origen seems to feel (bk. 6, *Against Celsus*), or of human credulity only, as St. Bernard holds (Epistle 190). [As] Euripides says: "of prudent distrust [σώφρονος ἀπιστίας, s■phronos apistias] there is nothing more useful [οὐκ ἔστι οὐδὲν χρησιμώτερον, ouk esti ouden chr■sim■teron]" — and this Alciatus declared, from Epicharmus, by a not ungraceful emblem. And in [bk.] 1, *On Duties*, Cicero: "To slip, to err, to be ignorant, to be deceived — we reckon [it] both an evil and a base thing." And afterward he enjoins [that] "nothing is to be committed such that one must sometime say, 'I had not thought [it].'" Therefore [Israel] cannot be wholly excused, nor freed from all [charge of] excessive facility and credulity, as was noted above (q. 9). Yet in that very [thing] there is an I-know-not-what worthy of love and praise. For it appears [that] both Joshua and the other Israelite princes were good men — simple, open, by no means crafty or suspicious. And this St. Ambrose saw, and greatly praised (bk. 3, *On Duties*, ch. 10): "That ancient formula concerning guile — not of the jurists, but the sentence of the Patriarchs — the divine scripture

evidently expressed in the book of the Old Testament which is entitled 'Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun.' For when the fame had gone out among the peoples [that] the sea had been dried up at the crossing of the Hebrews; [that] water had flowed from the rock; [that] daily nourishment was ministered from heaven, abundant for so many thousands of the people; [that] the walls of Jericho had fallen, struck by the sacred sound of the trumpets and battered by the shouting of the people; [that] the king of the Gethaeans too had been conquered, and hung on a tree until evening — the Gabaonites, fearing the strong hand [of Israel], came with craft, feigning themselves to be from a far country, and [that], having long journeyed, they had worn out [their] shoes [and] frayed the coverings of [their] garments, so as to show tokens of aging [things]. But the cause of so great a labor was the desire of earning peace and entering into friendship with the Hebrews; and they began to ask of Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun that he confirm a fellowship with them." St. Augustine (on Psalm 147): "What does peace do? It does not judge concerning uncertain [things]; it does not affirm [things] unknown. It is more inclined to believe well of a man than to suspect ill. It does not grieve much to err; it long believes well even of an evil [man]." And therefore, in Bababathra (ch. 5, fol. 91), an honorific name [is given] to Joshua himself,

(col. 973)

"Iokim" [Jokim] (1 Chron., ch. 4, q. 22) the Rabbis explain [as signifying], because he kept the oath. Thence afterward arose that evil, that scarcely does one believe another otherwise than under oath; and [thus] is done that which St. Augustine says (bk. 1, *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, and from him the [decretal] chapter "Non est," causa 22, q. 1): "that the oath is from the evil — not of the swearer, but of the unbeliever, by whom one is compelled to swear." See our Rosignolus (bk. 4, *On the discipline of Christian perfection*, ch. 26).

Question XIV. Whether any penalty could be imposed on the Gabaonites for the fraud, and what?

If tablets [a written contract] bound the Israelites [to the] covenant, they could have imposed nothing on the Gabaonites but what had been written down for them. But now [the tablets] did not bind, as [was] discussed above. Therefore, for the impostures and lies, some penalty could be inflicted — partly for the injury and disgrace brought upon the Israelites, partly that others might be deterred from guile and fraud, while the fraud was, in the sight of all, [punished as] fraud.

But *I*. That penalty ought not to have been death. *First*, because the fraud and guile had been constructed by them not for the destruction of anyone, but for their own safety — arising not from malice, but from necessity. *Secondly*, because the Gabaonites desired to be initiated into the sacred [rites] of the Jews, as [was] expounded before. To take them, therefore, out of life [was] not sufficiently humane and equitable.

II. That penalty ought also not to have been extermination and exile from all the borders of this land: because this would have been to hinder those who wished to devote themselves to the divine worship, and to expose the Neophytes [new converts] to the most certain perils of [their] former superstitions — since outside that region the immense Ocean of idol-madness was everywhere. And for this cause, for the Jews — who [were] nevertheless born, reared, advanced, and strengthened in the true worship of God — exile, which would be outside all the borders of Canaan, was none [i.e. never imposed], as I recall reading somewhere; but they were permitted to flee to certain cities of that same divine community, sharers of [the same] religion (Deut. 21). And hence that complaint of David (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 26:19): "They have cast me out today, that I should not dwell in the inheritance of the Lord, saying, Go, serve strange gods."

III. There could have been a penalty which would take away [their] goods, transfer [them] from their cities and places into certain other places (yet of Jewish dominion), despoil [them] of liberty, [and] devote [them] to certain public works and ministries — as will be said in the following little question. For so the Romans,

because the Brutii had defected to Hannibal, appointed them for the inflicting of the punishments of malefactors, as Festus [is] witness. And Gellius (bk. 10, ch. 3) [says] thus: "When Hannibal the Carthaginian was in Italy with an army, and the Roman people had fought several adverse battles, the Brutii, first of all Italy, defected to Hannibal. The Romans, taking this ill — after Hannibal had departed from Italy and the Carthaginians had been overcome — did not, for the sake of ignominy, enroll the Brutii [as] soldiers, nor hold [them] as allies, but ordered [them] to obey and serve the magistrates going out into the provinces, in the stead of servants. And so they followed the Magistrates as, in the stage-plays, [those] who were called 'lorarii' [thong-men], and bound or beat those whom they had been ordered [to]." Of the Lucanians and Picentes, for the same cause, we read in Strabo (bk. 5, at the end), [that they] had to αὐτοὺς σκυτάλας ἡμεροδρομεῖν καὶ γραμματοφορεῖν [autous skytalas h■merodromein kai grammatophorein] — that is, "to be couriers and letter-carriers."

Question XV. What penalty was imposed on the Gabaonites for [their] lies and deceptions?

The penalty imposed on the Gabaonites is delivered thus (v. 21): "Let them live, so as to cut wood and carry water for the use of the whole multitude." (v. 23:) "You shall be under a curse; and there shall not fail of your stock [one who is] a cutter of wood and a carrier of water into the house of my God." (v. 27:) "Joshua decreed in that day that they should be in the service of all the people, and of the altar of the Lord — cutting wood and carrying water — unto the present time, in the place which the Lord should choose." Four [things], then, are contained in these words, which signify the penalty of the Gabaonites. The first is the very genus or species of the penalty — namely, servitude, as will appear from the matter itself a little later, and [as] it is expressly so called in the Hebrew (v. 23), when Joshua says to them: "There shall not fail from you a servant." And in the 70: οὐ μὴ ἐκλείπῃ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλος [ou m■ ekleip■ ex hym■n doulos], that is, "let not a servant fail from you." And Joshua named this servitude — as a certain grave evil — by the name of a curse, saying (v. 23), in the Hebrew, "cursed [are] you"; in the 70, ὑμεῖς ἐπικατάρατοί ἐστε [hymeis epikataratoi este, "you are accursed"]. By which curse the Talmudists (in the order "On women," tractate Ketuboth, ch. 8) think the Gabaonites [to have been] excluded forever from all marriage-alliance and affinity with the Israelites — but they bring forward no reason [for it]. Rather, an allusion is made to the curse by which Noah adjudged Ham and Canaan servants to [their] brothers (Gen. 9:25). The second [thing]: the genus or species of this servitude. "Jesus [Joshua]," says St. Jerome (in the epitaph of Paula), "condemned the Gabaonites [to be] water-carriers and wood-cutters." But in our text, and in the Greek, they are called "cutters of wood," ξυλοκόποι [xylokopoi], [and] "carriers and porters of water," ὑδροφόροι [hydrophoroi]; but the Hebrew calls them "drawers of water" — so that they seem to have had both to draw water and to carry [it]; and a like reckoning [holds] for the wood, that they should both cut it in the woods, and bring it to the woodpile. But [that] this was, in those places and times, the lot of the most abject and, as it were, lowest of men, appears from Deut. 29:10, where, when Moses reckoned up all — proceeding from the highest to the lowest — he said: "You stand today, all of you, before the Lord your God — your princes, and tribes, and elders and teachers, all the people of Israel, [your] children and wives, and the sojourner who dwells with thee in the camp — except the cutters of wood and those who carry water"; but for "except" it can be rendered, with the 70, "even to the cutters of wood and carriers of water," or "the cutters of wood [being] included." *Third*: From St. Ambrose (bk. 3, *On Duties*, ch. 10): "Jesus [Joshua] punished the Gabaonites with the service of a viler ministry." The third [thing derives] from the ancient contempt of camp-servants [calones] and sutlers [lixae]. *4.* But to whom they should render this servitude is expounded in the text in a threefold [way]. First, to "the whole multitude" of the Israelites (v. 21). Secondly, to "the house of God" (v. 23). Thirdly, to "both — the people," I say, "and the altar" (v. 27). And this very [thing] could be done in two ways. First, that the Gabaonites should truly carry wood and water for the private [uses] of the Israelites, and likewise for the uses of the tabernacle. Secondly, that [they should carry them] only for the public uses of the

taberna-

(col. 975)

[should do the same] only for the public uses of the tabernacle. But because the tabernacle and altar are public, and common to all the Israelites, while they served this [tabernacle], they served all and each, and the whole assembly at once, or the multitude. The former mode has [as its] author Abulensis (qq. 33 and 43) — but so [that] the Gabaonites were not condemned to that private ministry of individuals, except up to the division of the land; [while] R. Moses of Gerona [Nachmanides holds] [that] they served even any [individual] of the people after the distribution of the land. The latter mode Masius, Cajetan, and Arias hold; and so the same condition of servitude always remained unchanged — which seems more consonant with the institution and the judicial sentence; and so they are called by Josephus δημόσιοι [d■mosioi], that is, "public servants." *Fourth.* How long the Gabaonites had to serve this servitude. It is answered (v. 23): "forever." And (v. 27): he who, after Joshua, added some words to this book (as [was] said in the Prolegomena) says [that] in his own time this servitude was still flourishing in the temple of Jerusalem. For there is the place which the Lord chose (2 Chron. 7). But since this temple was afterward destroyed and burned by the Romans, how [is it that] St. Ambrose (bk. 3, *On Duties*, ch. 10) said [that] in his own time the same ministry [servitude] had remained? For thus [it] is read: "A milder sentence, but more lasting. For the penalty of the ancient cunning remains — deputed, by hereditary ministry, to the services [duties], unto this day." I answer, [that] St. Ambrose looked not to the very day on which he was writing, but imitated the Joshuan writing [text].

Question XVI. Where was the domicile of the Gabaonites thereafter?

Since their servitude was bound to that place which the Lord had chosen for his sacred [rites] — as the last verse of this chapter has [it] — someone might not undeservedly reckon [that] they always had their domicile in a place of this kind. But that place was now in the camp at Galgala [Gilgal], afterward in Shiloh (below, ch. 18), then in Nob (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 22); afterward in Gabaon (1 Chron. 21:29 [cf. 2 Chron. 1:2]), thence in Bethsames [and] Cariathiarim (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 6); and at length constantly in Jerusalem — both a little before the temple was built, in David's time, and afterward, when it was built by Solomon. And where else would they have dwelt? For they had to cede their land, estates, and goods; and in fact we see [that] the city of Gabaon was assigned to the priests (below, ch. 21). Three other cities [were] so distributed, that with Gabaon two were in the tribe of Benjamin — Cephira and Beroth — [and] the third in the tribe of Judah, namely Cariathiarim (below, ch. 18, and 2 Kings [Samuel] ch. 4). And so [that] the men, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, dwelt at Jerusalem, Bertram says (in the book *On the Jewish Polity*). But how could so great a multitude of men — as great as was in the great city of Gabaon, and those other cities — be packed into one city or village, and that often not large? For besides the city of Jerusalem, how small [were] the other seats of the tabernacle? How, into Jerusalem itself — with so many citizens, Priests, Levites, Princes, and the royal court — could the services of the tabernacle alone be housed? Abulensis therefore reckons (qq. 44, 45, 46) [that] the Gabaonites [were] left in their ancient cities, and [that] they set out by turns to the function of their service [to the place] where the Lord's altar was. I should rather reckon [that], at the division of the land (for from the following chapter and war it is clear [that] they themselves remained in their [own] cities before the division), they were divided among various places, together with the Priests and Levites, or even among the places nearest to the place of the tabernacle; and so came to their wood-gathering and water-gathering. For if they had remained in their [own] cities, either they would have retained their old goods, houses, fields, vineyards, and other conveniences — or all would have ceded to new lords. If the former, a good portion of the land of Canaan would have been withdrawn from the Israelites; if the latter, peace and concord could scarcely have long remained in those cities. For how could the Gabaonites — most cunning in wit, most numerous in number, most strong in might, as has been seen hitherto — endure sojourners now lording it in their [own] houses, [and endure] to serve? "Fear is not a

lasting master of duty." Granted, at these beginnings of the wars — while the camp of the Israelites is [there] together, while [the Israelites], armed, occupy the region — let those [Gabaonites] remain in [their] duty: [but] what afterward, when the Israelites are dispersed? when, having attained peace and leisure, they lay down [their] arms? when, with relaxed and loosened minds, they possess the land? would [the Gabaonites] not have risen up against the dwellers in their [own] cities and houses? would not the sight of their former walls, tables, and bedchambers, [and] the pleasantness of [their] gardens and estates, [and] the sense of a most delightful liberty, have stirred them to some sedition? For if the mere recollection of former comforts stirred up such great tragedies in so many [cases], what would the daily and constant sight do? There are added the other arguments placed above, and Abulensis's own palinode [retraction] (on 2 Kings [2 Samuel], ch. 21, q. 16). But that a tower of Jerusalem was assigned [to them], that they might lodge in it, someone thinks, as will be said below (q. 20).

Question XVII. Whether a wage was given to the Gabaonites [while] serving?

The before-cited Rabbi of Gerona [Nachmanides] reckons [that], since after the division of the land their work for wood and water was required by anyone, it could be refused to no one; but that, for it, a wage had to be given them by all. But because they served the tabernacle and altar both before and after the division of the land, this note of Abulensis pleases me (before q. 44): "Concerning these too, although nothing is expressed [as to] what should be given them for [their] sustenance, yet it is to be believed [that] they gave something: because, since they were in the daily ministration of the Lord's altar, they could not have leisure for their own works of agriculture. Just as, therefore, certain rights [dues] were assigned to the Priests and Levites, by which they might be sustained (concerning which Num. 5:2; 18:2; Deut. 18) — so to the Gabaonites some [things] would be assigned for sustenance, which the princes afterward had appointed, namely from the alms and gifts given into the sanctuary. For, according to the Apostle, he who serves the altar ought to live from the altar (as is written, 1 Cor., ch. 9). But the Gabaonites served the altar, supplying it [with] water and wood for its needs; therefore they ought to live from the altar

(col. 977)

[therefore they ought] to live from the altar; that is, from some revenues or proceeds of the sanctuary." Yet God appointed nothing concerning these, but only concerning the revenues of the Priests and Levites — because at the time when God established the law in the desert, the Gabaonites had not yet been assigned as ministers; otherwise he would have commanded something to be given them.

Question XVIII. Whether, by the festival of the Xylophoria [wood-carrying], the wood-servitude of the Gabaonites was taken away?

The festival of the Xylophoria [wood-bearing] was, among the ancient Jews, on the 22nd day of the month Ab, which corresponds to our August. And since they were wont to name those months, on which some chief feast-day fell, "melachim" — that is, Kings — the month Ab, or August, was also called "King," because, as R. Jacob ben Asher says (in the book *Orach Chaiim*, or *Way of Life*), "in it [there] were those cutting wood for the oblation." For when, in the times of Ezra, the Israelites entered a new covenant with God, they said (Neh. 10:34): "We cast lots, therefore, concerning the oblation of wood among the Priests, and the Levites, and the people, that they might be brought into the house of our God, according to the houses of our fathers, at [appointed] times from the seasons of the year, unto the [next] year — that they might burn upon the altar of the Lord our God, as it is written in the law of Moses" (namely, Leviticus, ch. 6). But for "according to the houses of the fathers," the Hebrew and the 70 say "into the house of the fathers," which is the House of God (in the same place, last verse), or the temple. And Josephus describes this feast-day thus (bk. 2 of the *Captivity* [*Jewish War*], ch. 31), in the Greek: Ἐν τῇ τῶν ξυλοφορίων ἑορτῇ πᾶσιν ἔθος ὕλην τῷ βωμῷ προσφέρειν, ὅπως μήποτε τροφὴ τῷ πυρὶ λείπηται· διαμένει γὰρ ἄσβεστον ἀεί [en t■ t■n

xylophori■n heort■ pasin ethos hyl■n t■ b■m■ prospherein, hop■s m■pote troph■ t■ pyri leip■tai; diamenei gar asbeston aei], that is: "At the festival of carrying wood [it is] the custom for all to offer wood or fuel at the altar, so that fuel may never be lacking to the fire. For it [the fire] remains ever unextinguished." Since, then, on the day of bearing wood, all bore wood, and that custom had long since prevailed — where were the Gabaonites, and what were they doing? Did the people voluntarily take away their wood-servitude from them? [Was it] on account of their number, greatly diminished by Saul (2 Kings [2 Samuel] 21)? [Was it] on account of some greater and more abundant compensation for the loss inflicted on them? Was it the religion and piety of the people, that they reckoned [it] a glorious [thing], and of their own accord laid upon themselves — for the veneration of God and the public liturgy of the altar — the otherwise vile and contemned office of camp-servants [calones]? Or rather [was it that] the people, as the lot fell to each, or as devotion urged him, designated wood from their own [woods], or from woods or portions of woods, or bought [it] from others' [woods] — which they would then offer to God, standing indeed and not yet cut — but the Gabaonites would afterward cut it and carry it to the temple? For thus both the custom of the people and the service of the Gabaonites cohere best.

Question XIX. Whether, by the probatic [sheep-] pool and the fountain of the temple, the water-servitude of the same Gabaonites was taken away?

[That] πρόβατον [probaton] is "a sheep" or "a beast" is agreed by all; and therefore προβατικὸν [probatikon is] "of sheep," "of cattle," or "pastoral." But as to what [is said] of the probatic pool (John 5:1): it is read in two ways in the Greek [texts]. For either it is "in [the probatic pool]," or — as more manuscript codices have — "upon," or "at the probatic," that is, "the cattle-pool"; or it is "the probatic pool," or "cattle-pool." In the former way read nearly all the Greek codices, and chiefly the Vatican [codex], most ancient and most correct; in the latter, Theophylact (in the text and commentary). If the former reading be held, the pool will here scarcely produce any difficulty. For "probatic" [there] will be called not the pool itself, but the gate itself, which is called the "cattle[-gate]" (Neh. 3:2). If the latter reading please someone more, he will be able to say [that] the pool is called "probatic" because it was beside the probatic or cattle gate; and so it will again give no difficulty. But because Ammonius, Theodotus of Mopsuestia, St. Jerome, Theophylact, [and] Euthymius hold [it] called "probatic" because to it the sheep to be slaughtered were led, and in it the intestines of the slain victims were washed — it seems [that] there was no need for the Gabaonites to draw water and carry [it] into the temple. Then Aristeas narrates, in his embassy [account], and Tacitus (bk. 5), [that] there was in the temple of Jerusalem "a fountain of perennial water." To what end, then, the Gabaonite sutlers [water-carriers]? I answer, [that] to dispute more accurately about that probatic reading is not [the business] of this place. On it, Nebrissensis [Nebrija] may be seen (in the *Quinquagena*, ch. 5), Brugensis [in his] notes, [and] Maldonatus on John. But, however it be read and explained, I say [that] neither by it [the pool] nor by that fountain is the servitude of the Gabaonites taken away — although there might be some diminution and alleviation of their labor. For to the lavers [luteres] and basins of the temple much water still had to be carried; likewise, to wash the pavements, and the shambles [macella], or the places of the slaying of victims, [there was] much [to carry]. So that this was only a convenience — that not so much water had to be brought, nor from so far. In Tacitus, however, the "fountain of perennial water" is not clearly said to be in the temple; but, since he is enumerating the ornaments of Jerusalem, he seems to place it in the city only.

Question XX. Whether the Gabaonites are the Nethinim?

Frequent [is] the mention of the Nethinim in the divine Codex [Scripture], and indeed in such a way that they are understood to pertain to some service of the tabernacle and altar, since they are numbered almost with the ministers of the temple, and often after the Levites, and the temple's doorkeepers and singers (1 Chron. 9:2; 1 Esdras [Ezra] 2:70; ch. 7:2 and 24; ch. 8:20; 2 Esdras [Nehemiah] 3:26 and 31; ch. 7:46, 60, 73; ch. 10:28;

ch. 11:3 and 21). But [that] these Gabaonites [are] so called [Nethinim], no one, that I know of, doubts. *First*: Because [they are named] after the Priests, Levites, singers, and doorkeepers, [and] the other ministers of the temple, besides the water-carriers and wood-cutters. *Secondly*: Because the name fits. For the Hebrew word "nathan" means "to give." But in this place (last verse), in the Hebrew, "vaiitheneem Iehoshua" — that is, "And Joshua gave them, on that day, [as] cutters of wood and drawers of water, to the multitude and to the altar of the Lord." And in the same way, Ezra ch. 8, v. 20, "ou min hannethinim"

(col. 979)

"ou min hannethinim schenathan David," that is, "And of the Nethinim whom David gave." For the Gabaonites were given ["nethinim" = "given"] to the temple and altar of the Lord, when they could otherwise have been applied to other, profane, uses, as was said above (q. 14). *Thirdly*: So also Sigonius judges concerning the Nethinim (bk. 5, *On the Republic of the Hebrews*, ch. 7); [and] Masius, Rashi, and other Rabbis; our Villalpandus (bk. 3, *On the City*, ch. 23, p. 207); and, of the Innovators, Junius and Tremellius on this passage, [and] Peter Martyr (on 3 Kings [1 Kings], ch. 7). But it can be objected [that] one sees, from the already-cited Ezra ch. 8, [that] the Nethinim were given and appointed ministers of the altar, first of all, by David. For although Joshua gave the Gabaonites, yet he does not seem to have distinguished them by the name of Nethinim. The cited Sigonius and Rashi answer [that] this is true: [that] they took the name of these [Nethinim] from David, but the thing [reality] and the service from Joshua. But Masius prefers [that] both the thing and the name existed already from the times of Joshua, [though] Ezra mentions David as, as it were, their author — because, as he [David] reduced the Priests and Levites into certain classes and turns of ministry by a new order (1 Chron. 23), so also [he did] the Gabaonites, or those Nethinim. Nay, is it not certain [that] David adjoined certain others, from the subdued and subject nations, to the same ministries? — especially since Saul had killed many of the Gabaonites (2 Kings [2 Samuel] 21), as Abulensis hints (same place, q. 12). But Villalpandus teaches (in the cited place) [that] their habitation was then in Ophel [Orphelim], a certain [place] like a workhouse [ergastulum]. But Rabbi Maimonides treats copiously of these (in [the] Halakhoth "Issurei Biah," ch. 12, fol. 135), and says [that] the Davidic Nethinim were punished with a heavier penalty than the Gabaonites [were] by Joshua. For these [Davidic ones] — since [when] there was no sanctuary — could enter into the assembly; but those [Gabaonites] could not [do so] forever, even when there was no sanctuary. And that Rabbi adds the cause of this heavier penalty: that David had seen the excessive impudence and cruelty of the Gabaonites against the posterity of Saul (2 Kings [2 Samuel], ch. 21); and therefore, lest the Nethinim too grow too insolent, he wished them to be pressed [oppressed] more heavily.

Question XXI. Whether many Gabaonites [were] slain by King Saul, and why?

First. [That] some Gabaonites [were] slain by King Saul, the Lord himself narrates (2 Kings [2 Samuel] 21:1). But the number of the slain is nowhere set forth. Yet [that] they were very many appears from the divine punishment of this slaughter. For a three-year famine afflicted the Israelite people, in David's time, as is there narrated; and, that that shed blood might be expiated, it was necessary, by God's command, to give to the Gabaonites seven of Saul's posterity, who should be afflicted with the harshest and most shameful death among the Jews — namely, driven to the cross. That [slaughter], then, which had to be punished by so foul a punishment of so many royal heads, and by so dire a famine of so many years upon the whole people of God, must needs have been a very great slaughter. Yet the magnitude of the number is had more clearly and more certainly, in a threefold [way], from v. 5 of the same chapter. For the surviving Gabaonites themselves call Saul, *first*, "the man who wore them down [attrivit]," [in the] Hebrew, "who consumed [them]," that is, destroyed almost all [of them]; [in] Greek, συνετέλεσεν ἐφ᾽ αὐτούς [synetelesen eph' autous, "he made an end upon them"]. *Secondly*, "who oppressed [us] unjustly," [in] Greek ἐδίωξε [edi■xe], "persecuted." To remove one or another [man], of one city, is not to oppress or persecute it [the whole city]; but in the Hebrew

is had "dimmah lanu," that is, "he plotted in mind against us," or "devised evils against us"; and this seems to be signified in the 70 by παραλογία ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐξολοθρεῦσαι ἡμᾶς [paralogia apo tou exolothreusai h■mas, "a cunning device, from [the intent] to destroy us utterly"], that is, "he cunningly and craftily reasoned how he might destroy us." For "paralogismus" [false reasoning] includes cunning and guile also in this ch. 9, in the 70, v. 22. For, for that [phrase] "why did you wish to deceive us by fraud," [in] Greek [it] is διατί παρελογίσασθέ με [diati parelogisasthe me, "why did you deceive me"]. And in the Hebrew, for "damah" is "ramah" — so that either [word] seems to import a crafted and premeditated thought, with a certain cunning. *Thirdly.* In the Hebrew the Gabaonites go on to say: "We have been destroyed or exterminated" — by Saul, namely — "so that it was not permitted [us] to subsist anywhere in all the border of Israel." Whence most clearly [is] discerned a multitude of slain Gabaonites in all the places of the land of Israel. But the Hebrew text can also be taken otherwise. *1.* That this third [clause] be referred to the second, thus: "He craftily contrived how we might be utterly cut off, so that it should nowhere be permitted [us] to subsist in all the borders of Israel." And the same multitude of the slain is understood. *2.* That it be a petition, thus: "Let us destroy [him], I pray," or "let us exterminate him, lest he (namely, through his posterity) be able anywhere to subsist in all the borders of Israel." And our Latin version renders this sense, and the Greek 70 themselves. And so, from the magnitude of the penalty and, as it were, of the retaliation [talio] which they seek, let it be understood how great a slaughter the King inflicted on them.

Secondly. But why Saul did this — there is a fourfold opinion. *The first* [that of] Rashi: because Saul hated the priests, and had killed them in Nob (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 21); and therefore had killed the Gabaonites along with them — or because, these [priests] being killed, all the stipend and daily food of those who were fed by them (as was said) was taken away; or because they were slain together with them. *The second* [that of] Lyranus: because he wished to hand over all their cities to the Israelite people, and to leave nothing in them for the Gabaonites. *The third* [that of] Junius and Tremellius: because, when he was exterminating the necromancers [pythons] and soothsayers from the land (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 28:3 and 9), with the same zeal of his he resolved to remove the [Gentile] nations and the pursuits of nations from the midst of Israel, on account of the Lord's command (Exod. 23, at the end; Deut. 7 and 20). *The fourth* [that of] Abulensis (q. 16, on that ch. 11, bk. 2): that Saul might supply what had been omitted by the Israelites at this time — namely, that he might kill with death the Gabaonites, to whom Joshua and the other princes ought not to have granted life, and to which [killing] at last all the Israelites had assented. But indeed the cause is delivered in the text itself (v. 2): "Saul wished to strike them out of zeal, as if for the sons of Israel and Judah." But this cause of "zeal" is very general; and the now-cited opinions try to render a special and proper cause, by showing in what thing this zeal of Saul was placed. But *the First* is a very inept opinion. For Saul killed the priests not "out of zeal for Israel and Judah," but out of anger and fury against David, for his own sake. And *the Second* has [only] as much probability as [does] the Gabaonites' dwelling in their own cities, concerning which above (q. 16). *The Third* is false. For the Gabaonites were no longer reckoned to the [Gentile] nations and their superstitions and magic, since, initiated into the sacred [rites] of the Jews, they served their sacred tabernacle and altar

(col. 981)

[served their tabernacle and altar]. The *Fourth* [opinion], therefore, is to be embraced, which shows the magnitude of Saul's sin — since he condemned the deed of Joshua, the most wise and most holy Leader and Prophet, the judgment of all the other princes, [and] the assent at last of the people; he preferred his own judgment to [that of] all; he approved the murmuring of the commons tumultuating at the beginning; and he impiously violated the religion [binding force] of the covenants and oaths, now confirmed for a long time.

Question XXII. From these Gabaonite [matters], what [is there] for the reforming of morals?

By what [things] morals may be reformed — many [lessons] can be drawn hence. *I.* How disparate [is] the mind of those who hear, and see, the same divine things! Some come to their senses, and are turned to better [things]; others remain in their sins — nay, devise and contrive worse [things]. The Gabaonites heard the marvels which the Lord had done for the sake of the Jews, and joined themselves to their sacred [rites]. The Hittites, Amorites, Canaanites, Pherezites, Jebusites, and Hevites heard [them], "and gathered themselves together likewise, to fight against Joshua and Israel, with one mind and one resolve" (this ch. 9, v. 1).

II. There is nothing to be feared, when we tend toward the promised land of the heavens, even if against us there conspire, "with one mind and one resolve," the Hittites, Amorites, and the others already named — who are all the impious, the phalanxes of demons, the columns of evil companions, the troops of heretics, the whole world itself, the flesh, and the devil. "If God [be] for us, who [is] against us?" If Joshua [be] our Leader, who shall oppress even the fewest and weakest [of us]? And for this passage it will avail, if thou look at the interpretation of the names which these nations have. The Hittite is "terrible"; the Amorite, "talkative"; the Canaanite, "merchant"; the Pherezite, "rustic" [pagan], dwelling in unwalled villages; the Hevite, "messenger and Judge"; the Jebusite, "trampler [treader-down]."

III. To no one ought this life, and any possession whatsoever of the fleeting goods of this world, to be so dear, that for their sake he would lie. Otherwise the true Jesus will take vengeance. The Gabaonites lied. But [it was] "for [their] safety and the preservation of their life." Were [they] unpunished before Joshua?

IV. Enemies surrendering themselves and supplicating are deservedly to be heard. Whence also that ancient Dodonaean oracle: μηδ᾽ ἱκέτας ἀδικεῖν, ἱκέται ἱεροί τε καὶ ἁγνοί [m■d' hiketas adikein, hiketai hieroi te kai hagnoi, "do not wrong suppliants; suppliants [are] holy and pure"]. This Chytraeus proves by the examples of Otto I, Henry III, Conrad, Sigismund, Maximilian, and Charles V — [Chytraeus], although a Lutheran, [saying] thus of this: "Charles V pardoned the Duke of Jülich, [the Duke] of Württemberg, and many other suppliant princes and cities after the Smalcaldic war, and moderated the penalty" — as the Poet of Mainz wrote of him: "One hand wages war, the other renders peace; as of a certain Attila, he grants treaties to suppliants, and lays low the rebellious."

V. [Men] most wise and most holy — because they are men — we see sometimes err, slip, and sin in some circumstance, even while they act well. Joshua and the other Princes did well [in that] they gave peace to those envoys asking for it, [and] assented to their petition; but they did ill [in] that they did not consult the mouth of the Lord (v. 14).

VI. In all things — but especially in those which have something of doubt and peril — we ought always to consult the mouth of the Lord, to see what his holy law prescribes; what the Prophets, Evangelists, Apostles and Apostolic men, and the sacred Canons [prescribe]. For so also David did (2 Kings [2 Samuel] 21).

VII. The sanctity and religion [binding force] of covenants and oaths ought to be firm before all. Joshua and the Princes — even when they saw themselves deceived by the fraudulent arts and words of the Gabaonites, and basely mocked; when they detected them in the midst of their [own] inheritance; when they saw the people taking [it] ill and tumultuating — reckoned [that] what they had sworn was by no means to be rescinded. St. Ambrose (bk. 3, *On Duties*, ch. 10): "In all things, therefore, faith [good faith] is comely, justice pleasing, the measure of equity delightful. But what shall I say of the other contracts — and especially of the purchase of estates, or of transactions and pacts? Are they not formulas of honesty [requiring] that evil guile be absent, and that he whose guile has been detected be liable to a double penalty? Everywhere, therefore, the consideration of honesty preponderates, which excludes guile [and] casts out fraud. Whence David the Prophet rightly brought forth a general sentence, saying: '[He who] did no evil to his neighbor.' Not only, then, in contracts (in which even the faults of the things which are sold are ordered to be disclosed; and, unless the seller has made [them] known — although he has transferred [them] into the purchaser's right — [contracts] are voided by an action for guile) — but also generally, in all [things], guile ought to be

absent: simplicity is to be opened, truth to be intimated. And this ancient formula concerning guile — not of the jurists, but the sentence of the Patriarchs — the divine scripture evidently expressed in the book of the Old Testament which is entitled 'Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun.'" Masius accuses the levities of our times in perjuries and false swearings. But see St. Chrysostom in several places, and Michael Baius (in the little book *On the Antwerp Oath*, in the year 1582).

VIII. [That] it is lawful sometimes to inflict some penalty even on surrendered enemies — but, according to the variety of faults, a greater or a lesser [one]. St. Ambrose (bk. 1, *On Duties*, ch. 29): "How great justice is, can be understood from this — that it is excepted neither by places, nor by persons, nor by times — [justice] which is reserved even for enemies. As, if it be agreed with an enemy [that] either a place or a day [be set] for battle, [it is] reckoned against justice to anticipate [him] either in place or in time. For it matters whether one be taken [captured] in some battle and grave conflict, or by [some] superior favor or some chance. Since, indeed, on more violent and faithless enemies, and on those who have injured [us] more, a more violent vengeance is rendered — as on the Midianites, who through their women had made very many of the people of the Jews to sin, whence also the anger of God was poured out upon the people of the fathers. And therefore it came about that Moses, [as] victor, allowed none [of them] to survive; but the Gabaonites — who had assailed the people of the fathers by fraud rather than by war — Joshua did not storm [utterly destroy], but afflicted with the hardship of an imposed condition."

IX. Hypocrisy and dissimulation are to be shunned by us, [we] who cannot deceive our Jesus. For all [things] lie open to his eyes. No antiquity and humility of garments, no want of bread and drink, no lack and cheapness of all things, will commend us to him — even if we should seem, before the eyes of men, most religious, most humble, [and] most poor.

X. If ever some [affair] of someone, against [his] superiors,

(col. 983)

[If ever some [affair] of someone, against [his] superiors,] should chance to give occasion of murmuring, yet we ought always to bear ourselves modestly toward them — by the Joshuan example of this people, who, the Princes bringing forward some reason, at once acquiesced (although it was not firm enough; although, even if it were firm, they could have eluded it, as the Romans [did] in the Caudine peace; although a great [thing] seemed to be given to the Gabaonites out of the peace, and a great loss to be received, on account of the very ample spoils, and some lost portion of certain places; although, finally, the Princes' consent to the covenant was not free from some fault and rashness).

XI. On the contrary, if there be some murmur of inferiors, and a cause underlie it — as can sometimes happen — [and] not some unjust [murmur], the example of Joshua and the other Princes is here to be looked at, who did not reckon [it] against their authority if they yielded a little something to the people; and, since they could less honestly and usefully revoke the whole of what had been sworn, they thought out some middle [course], whereby they might satisfy both the Gabaonites and the people, and depart in no thing from the laws of God.

XII. The modesty of the Gabaonites is also to be imitated — [they] who first were not ashamed, ragged, in cheaper little cloaks, to come to the camp of enemies, into the sight of Joshua and the Princes; to profess themselves servants of these, and of the whole people; then to become camp-servants [calones] and sutlers [lixae] — that is, to live [as] the vilest, as it were, slaves. Necessity indeed extorted this from them; but a happy necessity, which compels to good, as St. Augustine said (Epistle 45).

XIII. This too, in Joshua and the princes, is not unworthy of imitation — that in all things they have greater regard for the divine glory than for their own profit. For because they had sworn "in [the name of] the God of Israel," as the Hebrew says — or, as our [Vulgate], "because they had sworn in the name of the God of Israel" — therefore they will [have] the oath [to be] sacred and holy; and, although they could have applied

the Gabaonites' labor to their own advantage only, yet they prefer to assign [it] to God's tabernacle and altar. How many [there are who] take [it] ill that servants and handmaids are more religious, more given to prayers, more removed from fraud and wantonness, [and] more God-fearing [than themselves]? Not so Joshua, not so those Princes, who give the Gabaonites wholly to sacred works.

Question XXIII. How charming an allegory [is] the heretical Gabaonite history!

It is not enough for the Devil, the enemy of truth, to lead men out of the Catholic faith into heresy; but he tries to drive [them] headlong even from one [heresy] into another, and [that] always a worse [one]. Gregory Paul of Brzeziny, therefore — that he may carry over to Antitrinitarian errors those who had hitherto clung to Luther and Zwingli — says [that] those are "Gabaonites" who, although they otherwise make nothing of the Fathers, Councils, and antiquity, yet toss these about [appeal to them] in the article of the Trinity. "Beware," he says (in Hosius and Rescius, in the *Ministromachia*), "of the Gabaonites among you, who imposed upon the people of God with torn garments, mouldy bread, etc. Under the name of our God they said they came; and [that] it was imposed upon the people of God by them — the scripture says — because [Joshua] did not consult the mouth of Jehovah. Let not the Fathers, antiquity, [and] Councils impose upon you. For those are old rags, which you [yourselves] first tore in the other articles of faith. Let our one Master be CHRIST: the mouth of Jehovah is to be consulted, not [that] of men." There are also very many here [who are] Gabaonites, who impose upon us — [who] profess themselves friends, and yet meanwhile desire nothing else than to lead the people back to Egypt in various ways, and by the Augsburg Confession — which the Lord will afterward reveal to you. But just as the Lutherans and Calvinists snatched away all the defenses of antiquity for themselves in the defense of the Most Holy Trinity against the Antitrinitarians, so, most impiously, both those and these glory [boast] that the mouth of the Lord, and the true interpretation of the scriptures, is with them.

Question XXIV. The Catholic allegory of the same history

Sidonius Apollinaris (bk. 9, epistle to Principius) signifies [that] those Christians who are less furnished with virtues are joined to the rest, [the] more perfect, in the Church, as the Gabaonites [to] the Israelites; and he wishes the same conjunction for himself too, on the day of judgment: "pray," he says, "that — by a desirable and religious departure [death], having discharged [ourselves] of the anxieties and burden of the present life, when the holy day of judgment shall have shone forth — we may, at the resurrection, be joined to your ranks [as] imitators, or [at least] under the occasion of a Gabaonite servitude; because, according to the heavenly promises which they pledged concerning the sons of faith to be gathered from the nations, so may pardon console us the guilty, while glory awaits you the blessed; and [so that], though we be divided by a difference of deeds, yet [we be] not [divided] by a distance of places." But already before, Origen (homily 10) had signified almost the same, saying [that] by the Gabaonites are signified Christians who will indeed be saved, but as [it were] through fire — namely, with some penalty — just as the Gabaonites remained safe and unharmed, yet not without every [i.e. not without some] penalty. "Those Gabaonites," he says, "I reckon to be a certain small portion of those who are to be saved — yet so that they are saved not without the branding of some mark." And afterward: "although the Gabaonites confessed that they had heard and knew of the divine marvels, yet they did nothing worthy of faith, nothing [done] with admiration of such great virtues. And therefore Jesus, seeing the narrow and scanty purpose in their faith, keeps a most just moderation toward them, that they might merit salvation — [they] who, although they had brought little of faith, yet would not receive the sum of the kingdom or of liberty, for this [reason], that their faith was ennobled by no accession of works — since the Apostle James pronounces faith without works to be held [as] dead. Yet it is to be known — inasmuch as we are taught by the shadowings-forth of figures of this kind — that if there be any such [people] among us, whose faith has only this much, that they come to the Church, and bow their head [and] render services to the priests, honor the ministers [servants of the day], [and] contribute something to

the adornment of the altar or the Church, yet apply no zeal to cultivate also their morals, amend their acts, put off their vices, cultivate chastity, mitigate anger, restrain avarice, curb rapacity, and remove from their mouth evil-speaking and foolish talk, or scurrility and the poisons of detractions — let such [people], who will not amend themselves, but persevere in these [faults] to the last old age, know that a part and lot with the Gabaonites is to be assigned them by the Lord Jesus." But to me it seems [that] by the Gabaonites are also signified [those] who, although they were formerly proud and arrogant (for "Gabaon" imports "elation," as above, q. 1), now humble themselves in food, drink, clothing, and all [their] furniture.

(col. 985)

These indeed at the beginning do not yet have true humility, and so seem humble as if falsely and feignedly; yet through that humiliation they try to come to true humility, and by it to conciliate and win over JESUS for themselves — lest they perish with the other impious nations of the Canaanites (of whom above), but be joined by covenant to CHRIST JESUS, be preserved by him, and serve him and his members in whatever way it shall please him. Does he wish them to become camp-servants [calones]? They are ready: they go to the woods; they take axes; they cut down trees; they divide and saw the felled [wood]; the divided and cut [wood] they load on beasts and shoulders, and carry to the house of God, to the altar of God. Does he wish them to be sutlers [lixae]? "We are in [thy] hand," they say, "O great Leader, we are thine: what seems good and right to thee, do to us" (v. 25). To all services of whatever kind — provided they be received by CHRIST JESUS into grace and friendship — they are most ready: they refuse no kind of office, of labor, of contempt and lowliness. And these, although in this age they may seem cursed before men, are yet so dear to God that, if anyone injure them — even Saul, or some King — he most sharply avenges their injury, and wills them to be forever there, where is the place which he deigns to choose. Among these Gabaonites [thus] humbling themselves — and now sincerely, in unfeigned faith and charity, ministering to the Lord's tabernacle — may I be [reckoned], I pledge myself, O good JESUS. AMEN.

Of the Wars: Caput X

The Fourth War — namely the second Gabaonite [war], or the Adoni-zedekian [war]

[The text of Joshua, chapter 10:]

1. When Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, had heard these things — namely, that Joshua had taken Ai and destroyed it (for as he had done to Jericho and its king, so he did to Ai and its king), and that the Gabaonites had gone over to Israel and were their confederates — 2. he feared greatly. For Gabaon was a great city, and one of the royal cities, and greater than the town of Ai, and all its warriors most valiant. 3. Therefore Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, sent to Hoham king of Hebron, and to Piram king of Jarmuth, and to Japhia king of Lachish, and to Debir king of Eglon, saying: 4. "Come up to me, and bring help, that we may storm Gabaon, because it has gone over to Joshua and to the children of Israel." 5. So the five kings of the Amorites, being assembled, went up — the king of Jerusalem, the king of Hebron, the king of Jarmuth, the king of Lachish, the king of Eglon — they and their armies; and they camped about Gabaon, laying siege to it. 6. But the inhabitants of the city of Gabaon, which was besieged, sent to Joshua, who was then abiding in the camp at Gilgal, and said to him: "Withdraw not thy hands from helping thy servants: come up quickly, and free us, and bring help; for all the kings of the Amorites who dwell in the mountains have gathered together against us." 7. And Joshua went up from Gilgal, he and all the army of warriors with him, most valiant men. 8. And the Lord said to Joshua: "Fear them not, for I have delivered them into thy hands; none of them shall be able to withstand thee." 9. So Joshua, going up from Gilgal the whole night, came upon them suddenly. 10. And the Lord troubled them at the sight of Israel, and slew them with a great slaughter at Gabaon, and pursued them by the way of the ascent of Beth-horon, and cut them down as far as Azeca and Maceda. 11. And when they were fleeing from the children of Israel, and were in the descent of Beth-horon, the Lord cast down upon them great stones from heaven, as far as Azeca; and many more were killed by the hailstones than were slain by the sword of the children of Israel. 12. Then Joshua spoke to the Lord, in the day on which He delivered the Amorite in the sight of the children of Israel, and said before them: "Move not, O Sun, against Gabaon, nor thou, O Moon, against the valley of Aijalon." 13. And the Sun and the Moon stood still, until the nation should avenge itself on its enemies. Is not this written in the book of the Just? So the Sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to set for the space of one day. 14. There was not before nor after so long a day, the Lord obeying the voice of a man, and fighting for Israel. 15. And Joshua returned, with all Israel, into the camp at Gilgal. 16. For the five kings had fled, and had hidden themselves in a cave of the city of Maceda. 17. And it was told Joshua that the five kings were found hidden in a cave of the city of Maceda. 18. And he commanded those who were with him, saying: "Roll great stones to the mouth of the cave, and set careful men to keep them shut in; 19. but do not you stand still: pursue the enemy, and slay all the hindmost of the fugitives; and do not suffer those whom the Lord God has delivered into your hands to enter into their cities." 20. So the enemy being slain with a great slaughter, and almost consumed to the point of annihilation, those who were able to escape from Israel entered into fortified cities. 21. And all the army returned to Joshua at Maceda, where the camp then was, safe and in whole number; and no one dared to mutter against the children of Israel. 22. And Joshua commanded, saying: "Open the mouth of the cave, and bring forth to me the five kings who lie hidden in it." 23. And the ministers did as they had been commanded, and brought out to him the five kings from the cave: the king of Jerusalem, the king of Hebron, the king of Jarmuth, the king of Lachish, the king of Eglon. 24. And when they had been brought out to him, he called all the men of the army who were with him, and said to the chiefs: "Go, and set [your] feet on the necks of these kings." And when they had gone, and were treading the necks of the prostrate [kings], 25. he said again to them: "Fear not, nor be dismayed; take courage, and be strong; for so will the Lord do to all your enemies, against whom you fight." 26. And Joshua struck and slew them, and hanged them upon five

gibbets; and they hung until evening. 27. And when the Sun had set, he commanded the soldiers to take them down from the gibbets. And, taken down, they cast them into the cave in which they had lain hidden, and placed huge stones at its mouth, which remain to this present day. 28. The same day Joshua took Maceda, and struck it with the edge of the sword, and slew its king and all its inhabitants: he left not in it the least remnant; and he did to the king of Maceda as he had done to the king of Jericho. 29. And he passed, with all Israel, from Maceda to Libnah, and fought against it; 30. and the Lord delivered it, with its king, into the hands of Israel; and they struck the city with the edge of the sword, and all its inhabitants: they left not in it any remnant; and they did to the king of Libnah as they had done to the king of Jericho. 31. From Libnah he passed to Lachish, with all Israel; and investing it with his army, besieged it. 32. And the Lord delivered Lachish into the hands of Israel, and he took it the next day, and struck it with the edge of the sword, and every soul that was in it, as he had done to Libnah. 33. At that time Horam, king of Gezer, came up to help Lachish; and Joshua struck him, with all his people, even to leaving none alive. 34. And he passed from Lachish to Eglon, and surrounded it, 35. and stormed it the same day; and he struck with the edge of the sword all the souls that were in it, according to all that he had done to Lachish. 36. He went up also, with all Israel, from Eglon to Hebron, and fought against it, 37. took it, and struck it with the edge of the sword — its king also, and all the towns of that region, and all the souls that dwelt in it; he left not in it any remnant: as he had done to Eglon, so he did also to Hebron, consuming with the sword all that he found in it. 38. Returning thence to Debir, 39. he took it and laid it waste — its king also, and all the surrounding towns he struck with the edge of the sword; he left not in it any remnant: as he had done to Hebron and Libnah and their kings, so he did to Debir and its king. 40. So Joshua struck all the land — the hill-country and the south, the lowland and Asedoth [the slopes] — with their kings; he left not in it any remnant, but slew all that breathed, as the Lord God of Israel had commanded him, 41. from Cadesbarne even to Gaza; all the land of Gosen even to Gabaon. 42. And all their kings and their regions he took and laid waste at one onset; for the Lord God of Israel fought for him. 43. And he returned, with all Israel, to the place of the camp at Gilgal.

COMMENTARY

The chapter has two parts. In the former, the **fourth** war of Joshua and the Israelites is described; in the latter, the **fifth**, and other [matters]. Now I call [this] fourth [war] the "Gabaonite," because it was waged against them [the Israelites] by the five Chananaean Kings, and on their behalf by Joshua and the Israelites. I also call it the "Adoni-zedekian," because the author and chief leader of this war was Adoni-zedek, the Chananaean King. And, **first**, his preparation for the siege of Gabaon, and the summoning and confederating of the four other Kings to himself, is set forth (verses 1, 2, 3, 4). **Then**, the siege of Gabaon itself (verse 5). **Thirdly**, the embassy of the Gabaonites to seek Joshua's help (verse 6). **Fourthly**, the bringing of help (verses 7 & 8). **Fifthly**, the battle (verse 9) — accomplished indeed by a human hand, but much more by the divine [hand], two or three miracles being employed (verses 10, 11, 12, 13, 14). **Sixthly**, the victory (verses 15, 19, 20, & 21). **Seventhly**, [the matter] of the Kings, who were conquered and captured: [their] punishments (verses 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27).

(col. 987)

Question I. Who were the five Kings that besieged Gabaon?

They are called generally (verses 5 & 6) "Kings of the Amorites." But it is added (verse 6),

"who dwell in the mountains." Now that the Amorites are twofold — Transjordanian and Cisjordanian — I said before; and it is agreed that these [Cisjordanian ones] are now being treated. But again, sometimes "Amorites" is taken *properly*, sometimes more *broadly*, so as to embrace all the Chananaeans; and the word is here taken in this [broad] way, as Abulensis shows (question 5). For otherwise it will appear a little later that Jerusalem belongs to the Jebusites, [and] Hebron to the Hethites…

(col. 989)

…[that Jerusalem belonged to the Jebusites, and Hebron to the Hethites.] But they are said to have dwelt "in the mountains," because their chief cities, and a great part of [their] dominions, were set in the mountains; and these are among the "hill-country" [places] of which [Scripture speaks] in Luke 1, verses 39 & 65. But specifically, of these five Kings, the first was **Adoni-zedek, King of Jerusalem**. [The reading] is old, as is clear from Eusebius and the Greeks; [but] in the Seventy a corruption has stuck, among whom Ἀδωνιβεζέκ (*Adonibezek*) is read for Ἀδωνισεδέκ (*Adonizedek*) — the meaning of the words and the position of the places being changed. For Bezec is a city declining from Jerusalem toward the South, concerning which [see] Judges 1, verses 4 & 5. The **second** King (verse 5) is the King of **Hebron**, whose name (verse 3) is *Oham*, or, as the Hebrew says it with aspiration, *Hoham*; in the Seventy he is called Ἰλάμ. The **third**, **Piram, King of Jarmuth** — by the Hebrews today, with a changed manner of pronunciation, called *Piram*, King of *Iarmuth*; in the Seventy, Φιδών, King of Jerimuth. The **fourth**, **Japhia, King of Lachish** — in the Seventy, by a certain allusion to the name of Jephte (Judges 11), Ἰαφιέ; nay, as it were by a contraction from Ἰαφθάε, as it is written there. The **fifth**, **Debir, King of Eglon** — for the change of the final *nun* is easy, and its rendering among the Greeks by their *rho* (ν for ρ); but in the same Seventy the King is called Ἀδωλάμ for Eglon, which city, below (chapter 17, verse 12), is called Εἰλάμ, and is distinguished from Ἀδωλάμ in the same place (verse 15).

Question II. How, and from what, is Jerusalem named?

That the city of Jerusalem is called by various names, Lyranus shows on Genesis chapter 28, in these two verses:

> *Solyma, Luza, Bethel, Hierosolyma, Jebus, Aelia —*
>
> *the holy city is called "Jerusalem," and "Salem."*

But in these [names] not so much the art [of the verse] as the matter is to be regarded. And first we must treat of the most usual and most celebrated of the ancient names — namely, *Salem* [and] *Jerusalem*.

Concerning *Salem*, then, it must be known, **first**, that by this name "peace" (which is more usually called *shalom*) is signified — as the Apostle is author (Hebrews 7, verse [2]), and our Interpreter [Vulgate] (Psalm 75 [76]), when he renders: "In peace is His place made." **Secondly**: by St. Jerome (in the book *On Hebrew Places*) *Salem* seems to be reckoned threefold. **One**, which is *Shechem* — and this [is] beyond doubt among all; although Villalpandus (on Ezekiel) would have *Salem* [to be] an epithet of Shechem itself, not [its] proper name (in which way, at Genesis 33, verse 18, for "Jacob passed over into Salem, the city of the Sichemites," the Innovators [Protestants] Junius and Tremellius translate, "Jacob came safe to the city of Shechem"). **The second**, which was near the western side of Aelia, or Jerusalem, in the time of Eusebius, or of St. Jerome himself. **The third**, at the eighth milestone from Scythopolis, in the plain — a village which is called *Salumias*. And thus some understand the words of St. Jerome. But to me it truly seems that St. Jerome there acknowledges only *two*: one, which is not Shechem itself, but [a place] of Shechem, or which belonged to Shechem as to [its] metropolis. For so he speaks in the cited little book *On Places*: "Salem, a city of the Sichemites, which (namely, Sichem) is Shechem." And in the Epistle to Evagrius, *Salim* is called a town of the metropolis Shechem. And Salem is situated in the plain, and is distant from Scythopolis (or Beisan) 8

miles. For in the same little book, near the end of the letter "A," [Jerome] says thus: "*Aenon* near *Salim*, where John baptizes, as it is written in the Gospel according to John; and the place is shown even now, at the eighth milestone from Scythopolis, toward the south, near Salim and the Jordan." Whence it appears that those words of his, in the same [book] — "Also at the eighth milestone from Scythopolis, in the plain, a village is called *Salamias*" — are to be referred to the former Salem, from which he had taken the beginning of [his] discourse. But the other *Salem* [is] near to Jerusalem, set opposite it toward the west.

Thirdly. Yet it seems a *third* Salem must be added, which is Jerusalem itself. For [in] Psalm 75 [76], where our [Vulgate], as I said a little before, renders "peace," the Chaldaean [Targum] said, "in Jerusalem His place is made"; and therefore there is added, "And His habitation in Sion." And it is the common opinion of nearly all that Jerusalem was also called *Salem* — to which Josephus adheres, and in this place also Masius, and R. P. Salmerón (Prolegomenon 42), [and] Arias (in the book *On Jerusalem*); nay, even St. Jerome himself (in the *Epitaph of Paula*): "she entered," he says, "the three-named city, Jebus, Salem, Jerusalem"; and [in] the Epistle to Dardanus: "Thy metropolis, O Judaea — first Jebus, then Salem, thirdly Jerusalem."

Fourthly. The *Salem* whose King Melchizedek is written to have been (Genesis 14, verse 18) is thought by Josephus to be the third Salem, that is, Jerusalem; and very many agree with him. But by St. Jerome [it is thought to be] the first, which is also *Salim*. His words, in the Epistle about Melchizedek to Evagrius, are these: "A town near Scythopolis, which to this day is called *Salem*; and there is shown the palace of Melchizedek, which, by the magnitude of [its] ruins, shows the magnificence of the ancient work — concerning which, in the latter part of Genesis also, it is written: 'Jacob came to *Socoth*' (that is, 'to tents'), 'and built himself houses there, and tents, and passed over into *Salem*, a city of the region of Shechem, which is in the land of Chanaan.' It must also be considered that Abraham, returning from the slaughter of the enemies — whom he pursued as far as *Dan* (which today is called *Paneas*) — was on the road not from Jerusalem, but from the town of the metropolis Shechem. Of which we also read in the Gospel: 'Now John was baptizing in *Aenon* near *Salim*, because there were many waters there.' Nor does it matter whether they name it *Salem* or *Salim*, since the Hebrews very rarely use vowel-letters in the middle [of words], and the same words are pronounced with different sounds and accents according to the will of readers and the variety of regions." Yet these reasons of St. Jerome do not carry me away from the common opinion. **First**: because Abraham then dwelt not in Shechem, but in Hebron (Genesis 13, verse 18; chapter 14, verse 13), and therefore the road for him returning thither was not far from Jerusalem. **Then**: because the valley — which is also called "the King's valley" (Genesis 14, verse 17) — is not far from Jerusalem (2 Kings [2 Samuel] 18, verse 18).

Fifthly. The village which, near Jerusalem, in Eusebius's time was called by the name of *Salem* itself: either, after [Jerusalem] was built up (of which a little later) and the word "Jerusalem" began to flourish, [the village] retained that simpler name, as it were certain deserted remnants; or [the name] was once transferred from that place to the city of Jerusalem itself — [being] common to both on account of [their] nearness. But let us now treat of the compound [name].

I. Today, in the Hebrew text, it is written *Ierushalaim*; and so it is frequently called by the Innovators [Protestants] of religion and of speech, from whom [they] have also coined an entirely new word in their [own language]…

(col. 991)

…in the version of Junius and Tremellius, *Ierusalaim* and *Ierusalayma*, as in the notes on chapter 14 of Genesis. To me, however — since the present-day points [vowel-points] did not exist of old, as I have often said, and as St. Jerome too indicated a little before — the ancients seem to have read *Ierusalem*. For so the most ancient Seventy read [it], and so the Chaldaeans read [it] even today; and, as to the last syllable, [so do] the Syrians, when they call [it] *Urischlem*, as may be seen throughout the whole New Testament.

II. But from what the name is derived, [there are] various opinions. For, **first**, Josephus — and our [authors], says St. Jerome (Epistle to Evagrius) — all think that the name *Hierusalem* is compounded of Greek and Hebrew: namely, from the Greek ἱερόν [*hieron*, "sacred thing / temple"] and the Hebrew *Salem*. But this, says the same St. Jerome, the very mixture of a foreign tongue shows to be absurd. I add that Josephus says it consistently neither with himself nor with others. **Not with himself**: because in book 7 of the *Antiquities*, chapter 3, he says that τὸ ἱερόν is called by the Greeks "walls," and that, because David surrounded the old

Salem with walls, it was therefore so called; but in book 7 of the *[Jewish] War*, chapter 18, he gives [as] the cause, that Melchizedek built τὸ ἱερόν — that is, the temple — in the same Salem (which [view] Hegesippus embraced, book 7, chapter 3, as [he did] almost all the other [opinions] of Josephus). **Not with others**: because neither David, nor Melchizedek, nor any others at all from [that] region then commonly used the Greek tongue.

Secondly. It seems to Lyranus (chapter 1) and to Adrichomius (book *On Jerusalem*, no. 1) that it is called *Hierusalem* as if *Iebusalem*, one letter being changed into another for the sake of euphony. **Thirdly**. From the holy possessors after David, as if *ioresch*; for *iarasch* is "to enter upon an inheritance," "to possess something by inheritance." So Postellus, in his *Cosmography*, folio 8. **Fourthly**. Others derive [it] from *ruum*, which is "to be high," and *salem*, with *Iod* prefixed — which [letter is] otherwise often formative of proper names, as in Israel, Ismael, Jacob, Isaac, and the like — so that *Ierusalem* is "high Salem," because the city was steep in [its] site (as Tacitus says, book 5 of the *Histories*; and as our Prophet [says], Psalm 86 [87]: "founded on the holy mountains"; and likewise Jeremiah, chapter 30, verse 18: "the city shall be built upon its own height") — and so that it may thus be distinguished from the other Salem, which is Shechem, concerning which St. Jerome [speaks] in the cited place. **Fifthly**, from *raah*, which is "to see," and *Salem*, which is "peace" — so that, as was said above from the Apostle, *Ierusalem* [is] "the vision of peace," or "the city in which peace is seen." And this derivation, before the others, pleases me. **First**, because when Abraham, about to sacrifice his son, was asked by him — since otherwise the fire and the sword were at hand there — where then the victim was, he answers (verse 7): "God will see for Himself," or "will provide." And afterward, when God had supplied a ram in Isaac's stead, and had provided for Himself concerning the victim, Abraham called the name of that place "God will see" (verse 14); and from that time afterward that mountain was called "The Lord will see," as is added in the same place. But that name is there today written in Hebrew in two ways: once, *Iehovah ireh*; then, *Iehovah ierae* — of which the former properly means "The Lord will see," but the latter, "The Lord will be seen," or "will appear." But afterward that ineffable name of the Lord was dropped, and the latter word was aptly joined with the ancient name of that place, and [the name] was made [and] called *Ierusalem* (Baruch 4, verse 30): "Be of better courage, O Jerusalem; for He who named thee will exhort thee" — that is, "will exhort [thee] by leading [thee] to comfort and peace," or "will console thee." For

in Greek it is παρακαλέσει σε ὁ ὀνομάσας σε ["He who named thee will console thee"]. The allusion, namely, is to God Himself, from whom it received the name (as was said above), and to the "peace" which [the city], by its own name, conveys. And some say that, according to the Hebrew letter, it is read: "Be of better courage, O Jerusalem; for He who named thee will console thee." And although this is altogether the same as what has already been said according to the Latin and Greek letter, yet I wonder where they read that Hebrew text, since it is not [found] at all in the Hebrew Bibles. **Thirdly**. This formation of its name agrees nicely with a similar one. For [in] Judges 6, verse [32], Gideon was called *Jerubbaal*, because his father had said, *Iareb [bo] habbaal* — that is, "let Baal avenge himself on him," or "let him contend against that Baal." **Fourthly**. This is the common opinion — even of more recent [writers], such as Masius, Arias, and the like — which seems to be approved by the Church, since in the dedication of a church she sings:

> *Blessed city Jerusalem,*
>
> *called the vision of peace.*

Hence also [in] Psalm 83 [84]: "The God of gods shall be seen in Sion." And [in] Luke 2, when that most blessed old man Simeon saw Christ the Lord in the temple of Jerusalem itself: "Now," he says, "Thou dost dismiss Thy servant, O Lord, for my eyes have seen Thy salvation." But Arias seems to join this [interpretation] with the former, which regarded "height," below (chapter 15, page 437), when he says: "The name *Ierusalem* signifies the same as 'high,' or 'conspicuous,' 'peace to be beheld,' and 'perfection'; because, in order that it might be distinguished from the other Salem in the same region, it received the prefix *Ieru*, [a

thing] to be of great mystery of amplitude."

III. But why it is read today in Hebrew as *Ierusalem* in the **dual** number — mystical reasons are wont to be brought forward by some: for example, that by it might be signified the figure of that other, twofold Jerusalem — namely, of the Church militant and triumphant; that there might be shown to us a twofold peace to be sought — spiritual and bodily, eternal and temporal, with us and with others — through Him who is our peace (Ephesians 2), who appeared there, and was seen in the temple, the dwelling of peace — seen, I say, with [His] twin nature; and to whom, when born, the heavenly ones sang: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will." And these and other similar reasons are not disapproved by me, provided they be held [as] secondary, and some primary [reason] be found. This [primary one] some say to be, that Jerusalem was as it were twofold — upper and lower — as Arias Montanus explains (in the *Apparatus*, in the book *On the Site of Ancient Jerusalem*): built, namely, upon two chief mountains, as Tacitus relates (book 5 of the *Histories*): "Two hills," he says, "of immense height, walls enclosed — [walls] slanted by art, or curved inward." But at the time at which Joshua came into Chanaan, not yet was each [part of the] city raised up, but only one of them; and therefore it appears that in the Hebrew was read only *Ierusalem* [in the singular]. But the later Rabbis, in order to show the amplitude of this city now [so] named, and to amplify [it] by the very sound, put a little *chirik* point beneath, and so begot the dual number from the singular. And from these two Hebrew names are derived those two [forms] used by the Greeks, *Solyma* and *Hierosolyma*. For Stephanus Byzantinus [is] ridiculous, when he fetches *Solyma* from the Solyman mountains — since those are in Pisidia, and the Solymi, in Homer, are a Southern people, like the Aethiopians…

(col. 993)

…[like the Aethiopians], as Strabo explains (book 1), and the insipid Tacitus — when [he derives it] "from Hierosolymus [as] leader" [these] foolish [men, follow him] in the same [author], book 5 of the *Histories*; who, as he himself says, "have handed down that the Solymi, a nation celebrated in the poems of Homer, gave to the city [they] founded the name *Hierosolyma*, from their own [name]." But the wicked Lysimachus — who, in Josephus (book 1 *Against Apion*), at the end, [derives it] ἀπὸ τῆς ἱεροσυλίας, that is, "from sacrilege" — says that at first, indeed, the city was called by [its] founders ἱεροσύλα ["temple-robbery"], because the Jews, coming into Chanaan, plundered and burned all the shrines of the gods, and out of those spoils raised up this city; but afterward, by [their] posterity, on account of its infamy, [it was] called ἱεροσόλυμα. For, as Josephus rightly objects against him, it is certain that the Hebrews imposed Hebrew, not Greek, names on things; and the Hebrew *Ierusalem* signifies something far other than the Greeks' τὸ ἱεροσύλαν, as [was] expounded above.

Now, as to the other names which Lyranus recited before in his Distich — *Luza* and *Bethel* — these are not names of Jerusalem itself, as is clear from those things which are said [at] Genesis 28, verse [19], and from St. Jerome (book *On Hebrew Places*), where [he says] that Bethel is distant from Jerusalem 12 miles toward Neapolis (or Shechem); and again, that Luza — which is the same as Bethel — is distant from the same Shechem 3 miles. But *Iebus* (or *Iebusi*) was named from its inhabitant, the Jebusite (below, chapter 18, verse 28; Judges 9, verses 10, 11, 14; 1 Paralipomenon [Chronicles] 11, verses 4 & 5). And *Aelia* was so called for this reason: that the Emperor Aelius Hadrian had utterly overthrown the former Jerusalem, not leaving a stone upon a stone, and in its place — not, indeed, in the very same spot, yet a near one — built, as it were, a new city out of its ruins, to which he gave a name from himself. For so St. Jerome [says] often, as in the *Epitaph of Paula*: "Jerusalem was afterward raised up by Aelius Hadrian, out of the ruins and ashes of the city, into Aelia." On chapter 1 of Joel: "We read of Aelius Hadrian's expedition against the Jews, who so burned Jerusalem and its suburbs, that out of the remnants and embers of the city he founded a city of his own name, Aelia." On Jeremiah, chapter 19: "The name of the city of Jerusalem itself is today void [disused], and by Aelius Hadrian it is called Aelia; and, together with [its] former habitation, it lost also [its] former

name, to shake off the pride of its inhabitants." And this name [Aelia] is very frequent in Eusebius's little book *On Places*; but by some it is called, not precisely *Aelia*, but *Aelia Capitolina* — as [it is] used by Ptolemy (book 5 of the *Geography*): "ἱεροσόλυμα," he says, "or [as it is] now called *Aelia Capitolina*." And in [the life of] Hadrian, Dio — or Xiphilinus from him: "When he had led a colony into the city of Jerusalem, which had been overthrown, and which he called *Aelia Capitolina*, and had caused another [temple], of Jupiter, to be built in the place where the temple of God had been, a great and long-lasting war began to be stirred up." And it is called *Capitolina* on account of this Jupiter, who [is] *Capitolinus* — [from his] temple — as Scaliger shows (*Animadversions on Eusebius*, page 199).

But other names too are gathered by others. **First**: Eusebius (book *On Hebrew Places*): "*Area Ornea* [the threshing-floor of Araunah] is Jerusalem" — nay rather, a place in Jerusalem, where afterward the temple was built (3 Kings [1 Kings], last [chapter]). **Secondly**: *Ariel* — Eusebius in the same place, and St. Jerome on Isaiah. **Thirdly**: *Mello* [Millo], according to Postellus in [his] *Cosmography*; but it was only a place in Jerusalem, concerning which [see] 3 Kings [1 Kings]. **Fourthly**: *Libanus* [Lebanon], according to the Chaldaean Paraphrast [Targum], chapter 4 of the Canticle [Song of Songs], verse 15 — or

on account of [its] beauty and height, or on account of the whiteness of the temple — concerning which [see] Josephus (*[Jewish War]*, book 6, chapter 14). **Fifthly**: *Tsedek*, [so named] by Masius in this place, because [its king] is called *Adoni-zedek*, like *Melchizedek*. But if Jerusalem had been *Tsedek*, there would have been no need to add "King of Salem," as is added [in] Genesis 14, and to the Hebrews 7 — especially since, according to Masius, *Salem* is Jerusalem. (Another account of the royal name will be given later, in Question 5.) **Sixthly**: today it is called by the Turks *Quds Mubarak*, that is, "the blessed sanctuary," as Scaliger — cited before — says (*Animadversions on Eusebius*, page 212).

That its founder is sometimes said by Josephus to be Melchizedek, and sometimes David, I said above; [and that] Moses and the Jews [are made its founders], coming into Chanaan out of Egypt, by Lysimachus; [while] Tacitus (book 5 of the *Histories*) makes Hierosolymus the leader [its] author. But only that part of the building is to be attributed to David which on Mount Sion was called the "city of David" — since Jerusalem already existed, and he had occupied it only by great force and labor (2 Kings [2 Samuel] 5). And that Jerusalem already existed before the coming of the children of Israel out of Egypt, [their king] Adoni-zedek is a witness. But [the story of] Hierosolymus the leader [is] a mere fable — as also [are] the Solyman mountains and peoples, as regards the beginning of this city. About Melchizedek [it is] probable indeed, yet not certain.

But concerning its site, construction, extent, and exploits, things to be admired could truly be written, no less aptly than what was written about the city of Rome by Lipsius and Stapleton; but these [things lie] now outside the dance-floor [the scope] of this place. Let Arias, Adrichomius, Abulensis, Salmerón, [and] Villalpandus be consulted, in the places indicated. By the Prophets it is certainly called "the holy city," or "holy" (Isaiah 52; Daniel 9; Nehemiah 2); and by the Evangelists (Matthew 4 & 27; Apocalypse 21); by David, "the city of God" (Psalm 86 [87]), "the city of the Lord of hosts, and of the great King" (Psalms 45, 47 [48]), "the fortified city" (Psalm 107 [108]); by Jeremiah (Lamentations 2), "a city of perfect beauty, the joy of the whole earth"; by Tacitus, near the beginning of book 5 of the *Histories*, "a famous city, and steep in [its] site"; by Pliny (book 5, chapter 14), "by far the most illustrious of the cities of the East."

Question III. Which [city] is Hebron?

This place would require the antiquity, names, and the like of this city to be explained, as I have already done for Jerusalem — except that the same, and a nearly more convenient, occasion will present itself below (chapter 14), where see Question 5.

Question IV. Which are Jarmuth, Lachish, Eglon?

These three cities were afterward in the tribe of Judah, as will be clear below (chapter 15). But *Ierimoth* (or *Iarmuth*) was twofold: one in the tribe of Issachar, concerning which [see] chapter 21; and the other [is] this one — which the little book *On Hebrew Places* says is distant from Eleutheropolis now at the fourth milestone, now at the tenth (unless it means that there are two of the same name, which [would be] a fabrication). But where Eleutheropolis was, was known in that author's time, [but is] now most unknown; nor [is there] hardly any mention of it, except in the *Itineraries* of Antoninus. Very…

(col. 995)

…[Jarmuth] lay toward the south from Jerusalem. *Lachish* was from the same [city] toward the west; of which there existed, in Eusebius's time, a village [at the] 7th mile from Eleutheropolis. *Eglon* also lay from Jerusalem toward the south, but less so than Jerimuth.

Question V. Why the King of Jerusalem summoned to himself four other Kings

The cause is given in the text [as] one general [cause] (verse 2): "because he feared greatly." But of [his] fear [there are] three causes (verse 1). **The first**: from the extreme severity — or, as he himself thought, cruelty — of the Israelites toward the captured cities. **The second**: from the voluntary peace-making of the Gabaonites with them, which the Hebrews expressed by a *hiphil* verb, [and] the Latin [translator] by "going over [as deserters]," following the Seventy, who translated [it] αὐτομόλησιν ["a going-over"]. **The third**: from the covenant, by which the Gabaonites were now in the midst of the Israelites, joined and allied with them — whether they all still remained in their own cities, or some of them were now in the camp of the Israelites. Yet Arias seems to understand what is said in the Hebrew, "they were in the midst of them," [as meaning] "in the midst of the Chananaeans themselves." For thus [the Chananaeans were] greatly harmed by the Gabaonites, since they would necessarily supply the enemy with everything easily, would withdraw [things] from them [the Chananaeans], and would inflict damages [upon them]. These two latter causes are confirmed by the greatness of Gabaon, concerning which [see] above, chapter 9, question 1.

Question VI. Why the King of Jerusalem [was] the first to summon those other four Kings to himself

Masius brings forward two causes. **One**: that he himself was, as it were, midway between Gabaon and the camp of the Israelites, as is clear from the situation of the places; and therefore [was] nearest to danger. **The other**: that he excelled the other kings in dignity. And this [excellence] in dignity Arias Montanus has excellently set forth in this place, from the very etymology of the name of King *Adoni-zedek*. "*Zedek*," he says, "or *Tsedek*, signifies 'justice' and 'equity'; to which is joined the name *Adon*, and by composition *Adoni* offers [itself] to be rendered in Latin [as] 'lord of justice,' or 'one set over justice'; [and] if to the same the name *Melech* or *Melchi* is joined by composition, it must be translated into Latin [as] 'King of justice.' And in the first book of Moses we read that, in Abraham's time, Melchizedek the king of Salem — that is, 'king of justice' — was [so] surnamed, who was both Priest and King, and who, meeting Abraham as he returned from the slaughter of the enemies, congratulated [him] and approved the victory in the name of God. But that the city of Salem [was] called by another name, *Ierusalem*, we taught in the *Sacred Apparatus*." And the surname of "justice," ascribed to this one King beyond the others (though all Kings ought to be vindicators of justice and judgment, by that very fact that they are Kings), indicates that something singular must be attributed to this [one]: namely, some surpassing power, granted to this one [King] by the rest of the Kings of that region — [by] the posterity of Canaan — for the examining and judging of public causes, and [those] of greatest moment, and royal [causes], and for settling controversies by equity and law; since otherwise so many kings in the same region, [being] mutually hostile, could not lack a constant material of contentions and struggles. It pleases [me]

— it seems, therefore, to have pleased all — to set some one [man] over themselves for the greatest and royal causes, both of [their] peoples and of [their] kings; and that for this thing the King of Jerusalem was chosen — descended from the Jebusite, sprung from Canaan's third son, lord of an illustrious city, and seated in the middle of the region; and that to this [man] also fell the dignity of high priest among them — a priest, I say, consecrated to God, the supreme source [of authority], whose authority the rest, both peoples and kings, would reverently observe, in that manner in which now the Christian Kings reverence the Roman Pontiff (who is also himself a King), and observe his decrees in causes brought forward in the name of religion — and would that they observed the same in all royal controversies! For the Christian Commonwealth would enjoy a far greater peace and tranquility. And so the surname of "justice" attributed to this one Prince, and joined to the name "Lord" or "King," indicates to us that his power of justice was altogether surpassing, and royal over [other] lords and kings — so that we may interpret *Melchizedek* [as] "King of justice," and "the justice of the king," or "of kings"; [and] *Adoni-zedek*, [as] "Lord of justice," and "the justice of lords." And we judge that this [King] exercised the cognizance and judgment of all public causes pertaining to the preservation of the nation, the race, and the kingdoms; and therefore that, of this matter which is now being narrated, he was in the first place called the "head."

Theophilus, indeed, relates (*To Autolycus*, book 1) that it is handed down by some that others succeeded Melchizedek both in dominion and in the priesthood — among whom [are] Abimelech (Genesis [20]), Ephron (Genesis 23), and, with Monceius as author (chapter 1 of the *Specimen*), Job himself, because he was wont to sanctify [his] sons daily. But I would not deny that Job indeed performed a priestly office; yet that he was a priest according to the order of Melchizedek I altogether deny, since he was not even conversant in Salem. About Abimelech and Ephron [I treat] elsewhere; but about Adoni-zedek [it is] certain [that] — if he was Melchizedek's son [and] successor in the priestly office — he had nonetheless degenerated from that first [priesthood] to idolatry, and yet retained his authority among the Gentiles; just as also many others among the same Gentiles were priests of supreme power, like that one of whom Strabo [speaks], book 12: ὁ ἱερεὺς μέγιστος ["the greatest priest"].

Question VII. How did Joshua raise the siege of Gabaon, and put the Kings to flight?

Joshua, being made more certain of the siege and danger of the Gabaonites (verse 6), at once — "having made ready," says Josephus — that is, with all his forces, hastened up (verse 7). Where two things are to be considered. **First**, that he left a garrison in Gilgal, [the camp] fortified with that defense by which there was need against sudden incursions and mishaps. **Secondly**, that he employed great speed in bringing help to the Gabaonites. For at once he set out on the road toward Gabaon: he marched the whole night, and "at dawn," says Josephus, he suddenly rushed upon the besieging enemies (verse 9). He did not think that, after the day's labors, sleep should be taken by him in the night; he did not despise the Gabaonites — either as slaves and bondmen, or as impostors (men who, not long before, had deceived him and the other princes by fraud, and had cast [him] into great danger among the seditious common people); he did not permit himself to be affected by any annoyance; he did not, in his own eyes, make light of the danger, and of [the harm] of delay…

(col. 997)

…and [the harm] of delay — the [excuses] which were not lacking — he did not weave together. For could he have said: "Gabaon is a great city; can it not bear a siege [for] some few days? It is one of the royal cities; does it tremble so quickly at the camp of Kings? It is greater than the town of Ai; and yet the men of Ai dared to join battle with the Israelites. All the inhabitants of Gabaon are said [to be] most valiant — let them give some specimen of this their valor; let us see what they can [do] by themselves." None of these things did Joshua either say or think; but, in order that he might drive off altogether every injury from those whom he

had once received into [his] protection, with no reckoning had of himself or of human petty calculations, [being] summoned, he at once flew [to them]: he brought aid, he raised the siege. A speed worthy everywhere [to be imitated], which princes should imitate toward [their] subjects, allies, and confederates. [That is] that known [saying] of Hesiod: μηδ' ἀναβάλλεσθαι ["put it not off"]. We have sometimes seen — and lamented — many notable cities, very faithful subjects, the best and most constant allies, deserted through I know not what trifling delays, and [so] wretchedly, [and] often, come into the power of [their] enemies. But let us truly, and with great Joshua, say: "O Lord, make haste to help me" — He will make haste, He will run up, He will fly [to us] most swiftly, most speedily.

And Joshua was confirmed by the Lord for this war (verse 8), when the Lord, of His own accord, addressed him in that way which was expounded [in] chapter 8, question 7: "And the Lord said to him: 'Fear them not'" — or, as others prefer, [it was] an inquiry by the *Urim* oracle. For Joshua, remembering how greatly it had cost him not long before — and indeed in the very cause of these same Gabaonites — not to have consulted the mouth of the Lord, by no means now omits this very thing; but, as soon as he hears of the siege of Gabaon, he refers the whole matter to the Lord, and asks the oracle.

Question VIII. How did the Lord trouble these Kings?

The Chaldaean [Targum], with the Hebrew Rabbis, interprets the Hebrew word [as] "to break, to crush, to scatter"; but our [translator] better, [as] "to trouble," "to dishearten with dread and fear," "to make faint of all counsel and effort." For, **first**, these verbs of closely-related kinship — *hamah* and *hamam* — have this force, of which the latter is [used] in this place. **Secondly**: because in the same matter the Lord uses the same word [at] Exodus 23, verse 27: "I will send My terror before thee, and [will] slay" — that is, "I will dishearten [them] with dread and fear." **Thirdly**: in both places the Seventy said ἐξέστησεν — for in Exodus it is ἐκστήσω, here ἐξέστησεν. **Fourthly**: because the "crushing" or "breaking" which the Chaldaean has can only be taken of the breaking of [their] spirits, and the meaning is the same; but if it be taken of the breaking of [their] bodies, the same thing would be repeated twice, since there follows: "and He crushed [them] with a great slaughter."

But why is a terror and disheartening of this kind attributed to the Lord? For it seems to be beyond nature and the usual custom of men, that — by a sudden, unforeseen, and utterly unexpected arrival and onset of enemies — enemies, however many, and equipped with all things, should be terrified, should cast away every plan of fighting, [and] hastily take to headlong flight. How many ancient, how many recent examples [are there]! It must be answered that this terrifying and troubling is attributed to God for a twofold cause. **One**: because all

those things which are rightly done even by human prudence, zeal, and labor, are owed to Him as to the prince [and] cause of all things. **The other**: because, above the common order of things, God concurred toward this matter — **first**, indeed, by confirming and inciting Joshua himself (verse 8); **then**, by arousing fear in the enemies themselves, in two ways. **First**, by bringing it about that they persuaded themselves for certain that the enemies were much stronger, either in number or in strength — whether natural or supernatural — while they think that a certain heavenly power and divinity is present with them. **Then**, by bringing it about that their blood flees back to the heart, and the vital and animal spirits grow numb, as it were by a kind of cold. For hence [come], afterward, feebleness of counsel, pallor of faces, trembling of limbs, disturbance of [their] ranks, the taking to flight.

You will say: if God brings it about that the enemies seem stronger, in number or in strength, than they are, [then] He [seems] to set a false thing before the senses and minds. I answer that neither is false; because, granted that those whom He wishes to conquer are fewer men in number, yet they are more, since heavenly [ones] are joined to them — spirits who help them; and so [at] 4 Kings [2 Kings] 6, verse 16, Elisha said to his servant: "Fear not, for there are more with us than with them." Moreover, even if [only] one of the Angels

should help a man — however feeble, [and help] the feeble — they [together] are assuredly stronger than anyone. If God [is] with someone, would not any army, however numerous, truly and deservedly judge him to be stronger than itself?

Question IX. Whether the terror cast upon the enemies was a "Panic" [terror]

About "Panic" terrors there is much talk in the mouths of many, even while they expound these sacred [matters]. But I briefly apply two little distinctions. **First**: *Pan* is either the feigned and fictitious god of the Heathens, or the true God. For since τὸ πᾶν signifies "the all," it truly answers to that Name [Him] from whom all things are and are governed, and who in a certain way is all things; and so [say] Clement of Alexandria (book 1 of the *Stromata*), Eusebius (book *On the Preparation [of the Gospel]*, chapter 9), Baronius (volume 1 of the *Annals*), and Masius, from Plutarch (book *On Oracles*). **Secondly**: "Panic" terrors are either true, and aroused by a true cause, or feigned and empty. Thus Cicero often calls [them] τὰ πανικά in the Epistles *To [his] Friends* and *To Atticus*; [as do] Pausanias in the *Phocica*, and Synesius (book *On Providence*). And Polyaenus gives the cause (book 1); [also] Lipsius (*On the Roman Militia*, book 4, Dialogue 11), as will be cited below. Otherwise, and more copiously, Angelo Poliziano (*Miscellanies*, chapter 28).

Now I say, **first**: this terror was not from *Pan* the fictitious god, but from the true God, as is clear from the text (verse 10); and therefore it was [a "Panic" terror] in that latter sense — "Panic," not in the former — since not even the fable about Pan had then yet been devised. **Secondly**: this [terror], as much as all the others which are sent by God — terrors and consternations of [men's] minds — have a true cause, as [was] expounded above (question 8). And so [at] Leviticus 26, verse 36: "Upon those of you who shall remain, I will send fear in their hearts, in the regions of [their] enemies; the sound of a flying leaf shall terrify them,…

(col. 999)

Caput X (opening)

…and so they shall flee as though from the sword: "they shall fall when none pursues; and they shall fall one upon another, as men fleeing from battles — none of you shall dare to resist" [the words of Leviticus 26:36–37]. And [see likewise] Judges 7; 4 Kings [2 Kings] 19; 2 Chronicles 20. And, as Lipsius [relates] above: "When Bacchus," he says, "on his Indian expedition, was in some hollow valley with his forces, and an infinite multitude of the enemy [pressed] from the opposite side, and some had grown afraid in spirit, then Pan advised that at night the army of Dionysus should raise a very great clamor; which, when it was caught up and amplified by both the rock and the valley, [caused] the terrified enemy to give themselves to flight." Hence it came about that terrors of this kind are called "Panic."

Question X. By what route did the terrified enemies flee?

First, they "received a great slaughter at Gabaon" (verse 10) — that is, at Gabaon, or in the territory of Gabaon, as above at chapter 5, verse 13. **Then**, where flight lay open, they began to flee toward Beth-horon, which, set upon a high place, had an ascent by which one climbed up to it, [and] a descent by which one went thence toward Azeca and Maceda. Whence at verse 10 there is mention of an *ascent*, [and] at verse 11 of a *descent* — just as also in 1 Maccabees 3, verse 24 [the descent of Beth-horon].

Now Beth-horon is twofold, the upper and the lower; and that [upper one] is placed by some in the tribe of Ephraim, but both — by St. Jerome (in the *Epitaph of Paula*) — in the tribe of Judah, near Emmaus. And of both again afterward: chapter 16, verses 2 & 5; chapter 18, [verses] 13, 14; chapter 21, [verse] 22; 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 13, verse 18; 2 Kings [2 Samuel] 2, verse 29. Both are said to have been founded by Sheerah, daughter of Ephraim (1 Chronicles 7, verse 24), and both restored and fortified by Solomon (2 Chronicles 8,

verse 5). Whence, in the passage cited, St. Jerome [says]: "Thence (that is, from Nicopolis, or Emmaus) setting out, he ascends to lower and upper Beth-horon, cities built by Solomon but afterward destroyed by the varied tempest of wars, looking to the right toward Aijalon and Gabaon, where Jesus [Joshua] the son of Nun fought against the five kings, and commanded the sun and the moon."

Neither [of these] is the Betoro or Bethoro concerning which [there is mention] in the *Itinerary* of Antoninus, as Masius teaches against Ziegler. That Maceda is at the eighth milestone from Eleutheropolis, Eusebius writes in his little book *On Places*. And between it and Beth-horon was Azeca, as is clear from this passage; concerning which [see] below, chapter 15 [of Joshua], verse 35; 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 17, verse 7; 1 Chronicles 12, [verse] 36; 2 Chronicles 2, verse 9; 2 Esdras [Nehemiah] 2, [verse] 30; Jeremiah 34, verse 7.

Question XI. What, how many, and of what kind were the stones the Lord hurled upon the fleeing?

First, the text names these stones twice (verse 11), and in the latter place says they were "stones of hail" — in both places the Seventy [render it] λίθους χαλάζης (*lithous chalaz■s*, "hailstones"). And Ecclesiasticus [Sirach] 46, verse 6, [says this happened] so that the stubborn Chananaeans might be crushed by that plague which against Pharaoh's Egyptians was the seventh (Exodus 9, verses 23–24). God could, to be sure, have cast down upon them stones not of hail in like manner; and that some such [stones] did fall at some time, Pliny relates (book 2, chapter 60) — though with fables about the stone of the Sun. **Secondly**, that these stones were *large*, the text expressly asserts. Large hail is often recorded [in the histories]: of 12 and 16

feet in length, about the year of the Lord 823 and 824, as it is in Sigebert and in Bonfinius (book 10, decade 1). [Hail] of goose-egg [size], in the year 1183, as Bergomensis writes; [hail] in which there was, as it were, carved out the sign of the cross, the face of Christ, and this name, "JESUS THE NAZARENE," in the year of the Lord 1240, according to Vincent of Beauvais (book 30 of the *History*, chapter 138) [and] Nauclerus (generation 41). [Hail] of the size of a hen's egg in the year 1392, as the compiler of the *Chronology* says; [hail] of such size that on it appeared men's faces with beards, [and] women with their hair and veils, in the year 1395, according to Krantz (book 9, chapter 3); [hail] of goose-egg [size] again in the year 1400, according to Robert Gaguin (book 9); indeed of [the size of] three eggs in the year 1441, according to the compiler of the *Chronology*; [hail] of ostrich-egg [size] in the year 1470, according to Bergomensis, Palmerius, and Bonfinius (decade 4, book 2); and at last [hail] of such great size that in the Württemberg dominion it shattered the windows and roofs of Rotenburg on the Neckar, in the year 1507, according to Surius.

But how great precisely the Joshuan hail was is not indeed clear to me; yet not in vain does Scripture call it "great," so that it perhaps yielded to none of those [hailstorms] which have been recorded. And this can be proved from the effect: for far more died by the stones of the hail than those whom the children of Israel had struck with the sword (verse 11). **Thirdly**, from the same effect one understands of what *kind* the stones were: heavy, namely, angular, sharp — most apt for overwhelming, wounding, and tearing apart. And therefore, in the cited place, Ecclesiasticus says it was χάλαζαν δυνάμεως κραταιᾶς (*chalazan dyname■s krataias*, "hail of mighty power") — that is, [hail] which struck with such force and great impetus that it laid the enemy low; while meanwhile, by a great miracle, it touched not at all the Jews who clung to their [enemies'] backs, as though it had the power and intelligence to distinguish the pious from the impious, the faithful from the unfaithful, for a cause to be indicated in the following question. That thunder and lightnings arose at the same time, Josephus is witness.

Question XII. Whence were these stones sent, by whom were they made and cast, and were they obtained by Joshua's prayers?

They are said to have been sent "from heaven" (verse 11); but the name "heaven" must be taken for the *air* — for so "heaven" is often taken in Scripture: as when the birds are called [birds] "of heaven" (Psalm 8; Matthew 6, verse 26; chapter 13, verse 32). And so sometimes in Aristotle's *Meteorologica* ἀήρ (*a■r*, "air") is so taken; and in Cicero, *Tusculans* 1, when he says: "that it may penetrate this heaven, in which clouds, rains, and winds are gathered, which is both moist and murky on account of the exhalation of the earth"; and in Pliny (book 2 of the *History*, chapter 38): "For our forefathers called *this* too 'heaven,' which by another name [is] *aër* — all that which, like a void, pours forth this vital breath. Below the Moon is its seat, and far lower"; and chapter 59: "We have received [reports] that the crash of arms and the sound of the trumpet have been heard. That the heaven itself burns is not at all wonderful, and has more often been seen when fire is seized by a greater force from the clouds." And the heading of chapter 60 is: "On stones falling from heaven." For this heaven [i.e. the air], subject to that great [heaven], is the workshop of hail, as also of the other things which the Philosopher calls μετέωρα (*mete■ra*, "meteors"). Hence, says Pliny (chapter 38), [come] clouds, thunders, and other lightnings; hence hails and hoar-frost, rains, storm, whirlwinds. Hence very many evils of mortals, and Nature's war with herself. [These stones, however,]…

(col. 1001)

…[these stones, however,] are stones made by the work of Angels in the region of the air; and [are], as it were, vibrated and hurled by their hands — so that, as was said above, by a sure and aimed blow they might strike the Chananaeans [and] spare the Israelites. These Angels, moreover, I judge to have been *holy* [ones], who fought for the people of God — although not a few ascribe the hail by which Egypt was overwhelmed to *alastores*, wicked spirits (from Psalm 77 [78], verses 48 & 49), and among these our [fellow Jesuit] Del Rio (*Magical Disquisitions*, book 2, investigation [*disquisitio*], question 11).

That Joshua by his prayers obtained this downpour of rushing stones the context of this chapter does not indeed assert, but Ecclesiasticus [Sirach] (chapter 48, verse 6) [does]: "Joshua called upon the Most High, the Powerful, in besieging the enemies on every side; and the great and holy God heard him, in stones of hail of exceedingly strong power."

> *[Translator's note: the print reads "chapter 48" here, but the passage quoted is Ecclesiasticus (Sirach)* ***46:6*** *— the chapter on Joshua — which Serarius himself cited correctly as 46:6 on the preceding column (1000). The "48" is a slip.]*

Whence it appears that Joshua, when he saw the enemy slipping away in swift flight, and that not so many of them were falling as the good end and the necessity of this war demanded, lifted up his hands to heaven, and, becoming a suppliant to God, [prayed] that those whom the Israelites could not [lay low] with the sword, He Himself might deign to lay low with showers of hailstones. And to this prayer too could be referred those words of verse 12, "Then Joshua spoke to the Lord."

Question XIII. Whether in this battle the Sun and Moon stood still?

That the Sun and Moon stood still, the text plainly says (verse 13). For when Joshua had said (verse 12) "Sun, move not against Gabaon, and Moon against the valley of Aijalon," it is at once subjoined (verse 13): "The Sun and the Moon stood still"; and again: "So the Sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to set." And to this [event] he who wrote of the harmony of Scripture refers that [passage] of Habakkuk (chapter 3, verse 11): "The Sun and Moon stood still in their habitation." But there the whole discourse seems metaphorical, and only to declare and indicate the supreme power and might of God whenever He wills to punish mortals — embracing, [among such acts,] those which were *not* done here, as that which immediately precedes: "The flood of waters passed by; the deep uttered its voice; it lifted up its hands" [Habakkuk 3:10]. Yet I would not deny that the Prophet had regard to this [Joshuan miracle], to show that by God's nod the Sun and Moon can be made to stand and be held back from their course.

But since our history [here in Joshua] is so clear and perspicuous, there have nonetheless not been wanting those who have poured out [the claim] that the Sun did *not* stand still, but only *seemed* to stand. And this in three ways. **First**: some will have it that the Sun merely *advanced more slowly* — yet still advanced. So Rambam [Maimonides] and Ralbag [Gersonides]. **Secondly**: some [say] that, with the Sun's own motion in the heaven neither halted nor slowed, [the Sun] indeed set with its [usual] confused velocity, but that in its place [above the horizon] there was substituted by God a certain body, after the likeness of the Sun, exceedingly bright; and some will have this [body] to have been the inflamed Moon — so Radak and his father R. Joseph Kimchi — others, some other [foreign] nature which God furnished with immense light: and so R. Shem Tob, or the *Moreh Nevuchim* [the *Guide of the Perplexed*]. **Thirdly**: others, finally, contend that absolutely nothing was changed in the heaven, but that something only *seemed* to be changed…

…because Joshua accomplished on earth deeds so great and so renowned, that it seemed rather that the day was lengthened and the Sun stood still, than that he carried them out so swiftly. For not even if the day had been increased by several hours could he have done more or greater things. — But all these [opinions] are manifestly against the most luminous light of this most clear history, which all the other interpreters, Greek and Latin, have seen and believed; in whose name, as it were, [speaks] St. Augustine (book 21 of the *City of God*, chapter 8): "In the divine books we read that even the Sun itself and the Moon stood still, when the holy man Joshua, son of Nun, had sought this from the Lord God, until the battle begun should be ended in victory." But those who feign either a Sun slower than usual, or a substitute splendor in its place, while they all — that the miracle (which Scripture clearly hands down) may, philosopher-like, seem great to the rude and unskilled in their words — *evade* [the plain miracle], they coin new miracles of their own. For it is no less contrary to the wonted order of things that the Sun's revolutions should be made faster or slower than usual, than that it should rest a while. Nor is it without marvel or novelty that a new body should be fixed in the heaven above the horizon when the Sun has already set, which should seem to scatter sun-light in every direction. And those who attribute such swiftness to Joshua, that it seemed an addition was made to the day, these are of all men either the dullest in wit or the most impudent in audacity. For who ever, sacred writer or profane, so described swiftness? What orator or poet, to extol some man's diligence and speed in carrying out affairs, ever so used metaphor or hyperbole? On the contrary, indeed, when things are irksome to someone, by their endurance and patience the days, or nights, which are otherwise short, are wont to seem longer — as in Plautus (*Amphitryon*, act 1) and Horace (Epistle 1):

> *As the night is long to those whom a mistress deceives, and the day*
>
> *long to those who owe labor; as the year is slow*
>
> *to wards whom the harsh guardianship of mothers oppresses:*
>
> *so slow and unwelcome to me flow the seasons that delay*
>
> *my hope and my plan of action.*

And indeed the swiftness of actions can never be perceived except together with [the perception of] the shortness of the time in which they were done.

Two things, however, here have some difficulty, and must not be glossed over. **One** is that in the Hebrew text Joshua said to the Sun and Moon not that they should *stand*, but that they should *be silent*; and afterward it is at once subjoined: "And the Sun was silent." For *dôm* [דום] and *d■mam* [דמם] in Hebrew mean "to be silent" and "to be still." That word [*be silent*] moved Aquila of Pontus to use this verb of "being silent" in his version of Scripture; it moved also the ancient Jewish Rabbis in the book *Tanchuma*, and Rashi, to say that the Sun sings praises to God at every hour, and was therefore bidden by Joshua to be silent for a while. These idle tales Abulensis [Tostatus] refutes copiously (questions 13 & 14): partly because the Sun is not animate; partly because it lacks the organs of articulate voice, and that hardness and softness [of parts] which is necessary even for the unshaped sounds of wagons; and finally because that most holy man Joshua, who was

most zealous for [God's] praises, would never have bidden a celestial herald to fall silent from the divine praises. — But there is no need to linger on these matters. For those Rabbis speak of a "harmony" by a trope, [meaning] namely that by its splendor, the beauty of its light, its magnitude, its efficacy,…

(col. 1003)

…[the Rabbis speak of a "harmony" by a trope, whereby the Sun] by its splendor, the beauty of its light, its magnitude, its efficacy, [and its] usefulness rouses men and Angels to the praise of God. And of this same "harmony" [is] Job 38[:37]: "Who shall make the harmony of heaven to sleep?"; of the same, the royal Prophet [David], Psalm 18 [19:1]: "The heavens declare the glory of God," etc., [and] "Into all the earth their sound has gone out"; Psalm 112 [113], verse 3: "From the rising of the Sun to its setting, the name of the Lord is worthy of praise" — as those ancient Rabbis expound this verse. "To God," says Tertullian (book *Against Hermogenes*, chapter 44), "even inanimate and incorporeal things sing praises" — [as] in Daniel chapter 3 [the canticle of the three children]. St. Augustine, on those words of Psalm 148 [verse 13], "His confession is in heaven and in earth," [says]: "What is the confession of God? Is it that He confesses [Himself]? No — but that all things confess Him; all things cry out. The beauty of all things is, in a manner, the voice of those confessing God. Heaven cries to God, 'Thou hast made me, not I'; earth cries, 'Thou hast founded me, not I.' How then do these cry out? When they are considered, and this [truth] is found: from thy consideration they cry; from thy voice they cry." See St. Ambrose (*Hexaemeron* book 2, chapter 4 at the end; book 4, chapter 1); St. Chrysostom (homily 1 to the people [of Antioch]); Titelmann (book 7 on physics, chapter 24); the little book *On Doxology*, book 3, chapter 6.

There were certain Pythagoreans who posited a most sweet harmony in the heaven; but some took this in the *proper* [literal] sense — whom Aristotle rejects (*On the Heavens* book 2, chapter 9), and whose arguments against Simplicius the Coimbrans have lately reinforced (in the same place, question 1, article 2). Others thought it *allegorical*, and interpreted it variously — as Macrobius (book 2 *On the Dream of Scipio*, chapter 3), Glareanus (*Dodecachordon* book 2, chapter 13), Abulensis [Tostatus] (in this place, question 14).

Now therefore I say: by that Hebrew word of "being silent," [Scripture] signified metaphorically *rest*, and cessation from all motion — the likeness being drawn from this, that just as one who speaks moves his mouth and the other instruments of the voice, and stirs up some noise, so too does one who *moves*; whereas, on the contrary, he who is *silent* is also he who makes an end of moving himself and stands still. Therefore the Seventy here [render it] στῆτι ὁ ἥλιος (*st■ti ho h■lios*, "stand, O Sun") [and the like], and our [Latin] likewise, "Be not moved," or "Stand," and "it stood." So in 1 Samuel 14, verse 9: "If they shall have spoken thus to us, 'Remain [where you are]'" — and at once the explanation is added, even in the Hebrew: "let us stand in our place." And the same verb can likewise be taken [so] in Psalm 38[39]:7, Isaiah 23:2, Lamentations 2:18, where it is said: "Give thyself no rest, neither let the apple of thine eye be silent."

And this manner of speaking is usual among the Germans. For when they wish someone who is walking, running, exerting himself, or dragging something, to *cease*, they are wont to cry out *still*, or *halte still* — though properly *still sein* means "to be silent." Whence also Radak, on Psalm 4, says that *dem■m■h*, or "silence," is taken in two ways: sometimes [it is] rest from speech and voice; sometimes rest from work and motion. And this latter [sense], which he calls *schethikath vehathchenuhah* [the silence-and-the-rest], he proves from several Scriptures: Psalm 106[107:29], where we have "He set the storm into a breeze," or "into silence" — that is, "He made the storm cease and rest"; and Psalm 4[:5], where for "be ye pricked [in conscience]" the Hebrew is "be silent" — that is, says Genebrardus there, "do penance in silence and fear." Radak there also cites "the silent stone" from Habakkuk 2, verse 19; but this seems rather to belong to the *former* signification, since a stone is destitute of voice.

The **other** [difficulty], which has some difficulty, is of this kind. Ecclesiasticus chapter 48, verse 5, says not that the Sun *stood still*, but that it *went back*. For as to what our [Latin] says, "Was not [the Sun] stopped by

his (Joshua's) anger?" —

> *[Translator's note: the print reads "chapter 48"; but the gloss "(Joshua)" and the Greek quoted just below show this is again the Joshua passage = Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) **46:4–5** (cf. the note at column 1001), not the Hezekiah passage of Sirach 48.]*

[—the Sun went back.] In Greek it is οὐχὶ ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ἀνεπόδισεν ὁ ἥλιος — that is, "Did not the Sun go back at his hand?" For ἀναποδίζειν is "to return, to be driven backward, to retrace one's step," and, as Cicero properly speaks, *repedare* ["to step back"]. And so of the Moon, when at the death and eclipse of CHRIST the Lord it had gone backward, Dionysius the Areopagite said in the Epistle to Polycarp (page 442): οὐκ εἰς μέσα ἄμφω εἰς ἑαυτὰ ἀντιμεθισταμένων ["the two not changing place toward themselves into the middle"]. Our [Latin] translator, in that passage of Ecclesiasticus, took that verb — as elsewhere [the Seventy take] certain others — *passively*, and rendered it "was hindered"; but the *manner* in which [the Sun] was hindered he did not express. For it could be hindered both by standing still *and* by going backward. But if we weigh the force of the Greek verb, the Sun will have been hindered by ἀναποδίζειν — namely, [by being] driven and carried backward.

Two answers can be given. **First**, that the Sun's "going back" in Ecclesiasticus is taken for its *not advancing further*. For whatever is in [its] course and, on the spot — whether of its own accord, or by some force applied from without — comes to rest, seems, as it were, to turn back and recall its step. In which manner one of the saints said, "On the way of the spirit, not to advance is to go back"; and among the Mathematicians, in the doctrine of the spheres, it is called *solstitium* ["a standstill"] — not that the Sun properly *stands*, but that it goes no further. **Secondly**, that the Sun *first* indeed suddenly went back, but *then* stood fixed, immovable, and at rest; and that here [in Joshua] only the *rest* is expressed, [while] that "returning" [is expressed] in Ecclesiasticus. But which [answer] is the more probable, a later question will show.

Question XIV. Whether the Sun and Moon can stand still naturally?

That these heavenly bodies can naturally halt, the author of the *Scholastic History* [Peter Comestor] once said, as Abulensis [Tostatus] reports (on 4 Kings, chapter 20, question 25; and on 1 Chronicles, chapter 4, question 18). And although he brought forward no reasons [for it], it pleases [me] to adduce four on its behalf. **First**: every year we see two solstices, the summer and the winter [one]. **Secondly**: that the planets are, and are called, "stationary," experience teaches, and Astrology in the *Theorics*. **Thirdly**: the noble Mathematician of this age, Nicolaus Copernicus — called "a second Ptolemy," and praised both by our Clavius (chapters 1 & 4 of the *Sphere*) and by Magini (in the book of the *Theorics*, in the preface to Torialus and to the Reader), and by many others — teaches that the Sun is always at rest, and is the center of the whole universe (book 1 of the *Revolutions*, chapters 9 & 10). **Fourthly**: the motions of the lower heavens are natural, since (as Aristotle teaches at the beginning of *On the Heavens* book 1, chapter 2) every physical body claims for itself some [proper] motion; therefore the *rest* of these same [bodies] is also natural — for of motion and of rest there is one and the same principle, a natural one (book 2 of the *Physics*, chapter 1). The decision of this question is fit and bound up with various [matters] which pertain to the disputations of other sciences.

I say briefly. **First**: if the heavens — and so the Sun and Moon — be considered according to Aristotle's opinion, in no natural way can there be rest and a standing-still in them. For hence, in *Metaphysics* book 9, chapter 4, text 17, he said that "it need not be feared that the heavenly bodies should stand still." And he adds the cause of this: that there is not in them a potency [for the]…

(col. 1005)

…[there would lie a danger] of contradiction — namely, that [the heavens] should both be moved and not moved. To this opinion of their Master [Aristotle] most of the Greek Philosophers thoroughly assented: Themistius, Philoponus, Simplicius (on *Physics* book 2), Alexander of Aphrodisias (book 2 of the *Natural Questions*, chapter 18).

Secondly: if according to the truth [of the matter] these same heavens, and the Sun and Moon, be regarded, rest can in some way be called natural to them. But this mode can be set forth, with probability, in two ways. **One**: that the heaven, by reason both of its matter and of its form, is said of its own nature, and from the propensity of its nature, to be moved and not moved *indifferently* — to undergo motion, and to cease from it. So the Coimbrans (*On the Heavens* book 1, chapter 2, question 3, article 4). **The other**: that, by the propensity of its nature — which the conjunction of such matter and form produces — the heaven simply wills to *rest* in such a place as natural [to it], because, namely, it is composed of that most tenuous watery matter, as is the air, and that which above this is called fire, though [the heaven] itself is still grosser than either. And thus the heavens are now moved in a circle — and so the two great luminaries here [the Sun and Moon] — in that manner in which the air and that fire are now said by the Philosophers to be turned, for the use of men; except that these lower [bodies] are snatched along by the higher bodies, but the heavens [are moved] by a cause devoid of body [an incorporeal mover], as the common opinion of the Philosophers and Theologians says — on which [see] the same Coimbrans (*On the Heavens* book 2, chapter 5, question 5). But after the Day of Judgment, and whenever some greater utility can come to be for men (which is known to God's judgment alone), their settled order and rest can be natural.

Thirdly: although it is natural for the Sun and Moon *not* to be moved in their heavens but to rest [under such conditions], yet in Joshua's time it was a great *miracle* that they rested — because the divine order, by which He governs this world, [is] so established and perpetually maintained (unless some extraordinary cause, such as will appear hereafter, intervene), that the heaven, with restless motion, day and night, journeys round in its orbit, and [so do] all its stars, both the fixed and the wandering.

But the [arguments] which the head of the Question raises are not difficult. For **to the First**, concerning the solstice, answer has already been made in the previous Question. **To the Second**: the planets never *truly* stand still, but [only] appear after the manner of those that stand still, since the two lines — [the line] of their true [motion], and [the line] of the centers which their epicycles have — are drawn with equal speed relative to the Zodiac into different parts of the heaven; namely so, that by however great an arc of true motion the planet's line is rolled into the preceding signs, by so great an [arc] of true motion the line of the epicycle's center is carried into the following [signs] — as Peurbach explains in the second part of the *Theorics*, and Magini (book 2, chapter 11), where he also explains that this "station," though apparent, is nonetheless false, [and] that it falls upon the Sun and Moon [too] — because they lack epicycles. **To the Third**: Copernicus is indeed in other respects a noble Mathematician, and deservedly praised; but, along with others, these two hypotheses of his especially are hissed off the stage by all. The *former*, that the Sun is the center of the world; the *latter*, that the Earth is in the fifth heaven with the lunar orb, below Saturn, Jupiter, and Mars, above Venus and Mercury and even the Sun itself, fixed to an epicycle, by a threefold motion of the heaven.

…[carried about] by a threefold [motion]. And although he dedicated those *Revolutions* of his to the Supreme Pontiff Paul III — that he might escape all reproach — yet these hypotheses, if they were asserted as truly and seriously [held], I do not see how they could even be free from heresy. For Scripture always attributes *rest* to the Earth, and *motion* to the Sun and Moon; so that whenever those heavenly bodies do rest, it signifies that this comes about by a great miracle. "The Earth," says Ecclesiastes (chapter 1, verse 4), "stands forever. The Sun rises and sets, and returns to its place, and there, being born again, wheels through the south, and bends toward the North." Psalm 42 [as printed; the verse is Psalm 92(93)], verse 1: "[The Lord] has established the world, which shall not be moved." Psalm 102 [as printed; the verse is Psalm 103(104)], verse 5: "Who hast founded the Earth upon its own stability; it shall not be inclined for ever and ever." [It is

to be] added that all the Philosophers of all [schools] — except Nicetas and a few Pythagoreans — blow away and condemn that opinion; [against it are] all the pronouncements of the holy Fathers, all the schools of all the Theologians. Nor indeed is it safe or seemly, in matters so certain and clear, to invent falsehoods and to defend [mere] problems.

Elias [Levita] in the *Tishbi* [says]: "The heavens are called *galgallim* [גלגלים, 'wheels']" — because, as in Psalm 77 [76:19 Vulg.], "the voice of [Thy] thunder [is] in the *galgal* [wheel]," namely from this, that they go round assiduously. And there are seven *galgallim*, in each of which is one of the moving stars, which the Heathen falsely called "wandering [stars]" and "Planets." Hence rightly Seneca, in the book *To Polybius [On Consolation]*, chapter 26, compares the Emperor [Caesar] to the heavenly bodies: "From the time," he says, "that Caesar dedicated himself to the world, he took [himself] away from himself; and, after the manner of the heavenly bodies — which restlessly ever unfold their courses — he is never permitted anywhere to halt, nor to do anything of his own." **To the Fourth**: since it conflicts with nothing of what has been said, there is no need to answer.

Question XV. Whether evil Angels can make the Sun and Moon stand still?

[It is] an old rumor about magicians, and a boast of those same [magicians], that they themselves can drive backward the Sun and Moon, and the other eyes of the world, and all the heavenly bodies, make them stand, and impel them in whatever way they will. Tibullus (book 1, elegy [2]):

Her, the sorceress, I have seen drawing the stars down from heaven;

by [her] chant she cleaves the path of the swift lightning.

In Ovid, in the Epistle of Hypsipyle concerning Medea:

She strives to draw down the reluctant Moon from her course,

and to hide in darkness the horses of the Sun.

Horace, Epodes, Ode 5:

…the stars charmed down by a Thessalian voice,

and [she] tears the Moon from the sky.

And the last Ode [Epode 17]:

…from the pole

I could tear down the Moon by my words.

More grandiloquently [than] all, Lucan (book 6, on Erichtho):

The successions of things ceased; and the day, drawn out

by a long night, hung fixed; the aether obeyed not the [natural] law.

The headlong world grew torpid at the chant once heard;

and Jupiter, urging on with his swift axles,

marvels that the impelled poles go not round.

I pass over that kind [of thing] in Seneca's *Medea* and *Hercules Oetaeus*, in Claudian (book 2 *Against Rufinus*), and in many others. Petronius certainly…

(col. 1007)

…[Petronius] Arbiter, when he had brought on a witch boasting in various and portentous ways, attributes these [powers] too to her at the last:

Why do I tell of lighter things? The Moon's image, drawn down

by my chants, descends; and Phoebus [the Sun], his orb reversed,

is forced, trembling, to wheel back his raging horses.

But in truth it is agreed that all wizards and witches accomplish all these and similar things not by the power of chants, herbs, and other like things, but by the work of evil demons. Then indeed, since the Sun and Moon of their own accord desire to come to rest (as was said in the previous question), the demons seem able to impede the impulse which is applied to them from without for motion. And Lactantius, expressly (book 7, chapter 17), seems to attribute to Antichrist the power of stopping the Sun: "He will hold back," he says, "fire from descending from heaven, and [will make] the Sun stand still from its courses."

But in very truth those unhappy spirits can do none of these things. The report about them is false and too poetical; empty and lying [is] the great boasting of the Magi and the sorcerers; and all the prodigies of Antichrist himself are counterfeit and void of all truth, as the Apostle testifies (2 Thessalonians 2:9). But the reason why a demon cannot hinder the courses of the heavens and stars is not that it could not [do] this by its own natural powers (for many of the demons are Angels who, as the common opinion holds, preside over the moving of the heavens, equal or even superior [to the rest] in power and strength of action); but, **first**, because, on account of [their] sin and the punishment inflicted upon them, all the wicked [spirits] are subject to all and each of the good Angels — so that, though estranged from them by [their] evil will, yet in actual fact and effectively, in matters that do not depend on anyone's free will and that are not against the common course of nature, they avail nothing. **Then**, because the fixed orders and motions of the heavenly things are established and predetermined by divine providence, so that against them no force of any creature can do anything — neither change nor impede them. Nor indeed is it fitting that, in the house and region whence, for their crimes, they were cast out, they should have any further power. But if you wish [for] more, betake yourself to our [fellow Jesuit] Del Rio (book 2 of the *Disquisitions*, questions 10 & 11), [and] Abulensis here, question 81.

Question XVI. Whether any one of the good Angels could stay these same heavenly bodies of the Sun and Moon?

From the second argument of the preceding conclusion it is now nearly clear what must be answered. Yet [let me speak] still more distinctly.

I say. **I.** The Angels, to whom this office has been committed by God — to move the heavens and the stars — could indeed by their own power and freedom desist from [that] motion; but inasmuch as they are now holy and blessed, in no way can they [do so], unless God should command otherwise, because they cannot transgress God's will and precepts, nor lose their own felicity. And both [these] would happen if they neglected the committed work. And the loss of felicity does not arise from that which Aristotle hints at in *Metaphysics* 12, chapter 7, text 38 — as if [the Angels] either did not imitate the first cause of all things, which by itself, immediately and entirely, moves the first heaven

(for whether Aristotle meant this or not, it is false, as the Coimbrans show, *On the Heavens* book 2, question 6); nor [does it arise] because they would be less partakers of His beloved goodness if, through that motion, they did not pour something of good into the corporeal world, as Abulensis explains Aristotle here (question 82) — for they can be partakers of the divine goodness in various other ways, and can communicate their own power and good to creatures when it so seems [good] to them — but [the loss of felicity arises] from this, that, deflecting from God's prescript, they would be justly punished and deprived of that greatest good of felicity.

II. The same Angels, the turners of the heavens, when God wills [it] and signifies [it] to them, can make an end of turning [the heavens], and so delay the Sun and Moon, and fix [them] in a certain position. And that

this was in fact done here is clear also from what has [already] been said.

III. All the other holy Angels, who are greater and more sublime than these very turners [of the heavens], can by their own power and strength break and impede the impulse of those [turners], [and] hold back the heavens and stars from their wonted course, those [turners] being unwilling and resisting; yet they never either do this, or can now morally do it. The former part is clear from the proportion of greater powers to lesser. Just as, if a weaker man should wish to move a staff, and should try with all his might, but another much stronger than he should be unwilling and resist, the staff will remain unmoved: so too in the motion of the heavens, if a greater Angel should resist a lesser. The latter part is had from the reasoning of the first conclusion.

But that it may be clearer: I object that any other Angels can resist the Angels set over the celestial motions. For in Daniel 10, verse 13, the Angel-prince of the kingdom of the Persians, for some advantage of the Persians themselves, resists Gabriel — and so vehemently that, unless St. Michael had brought him aid and help, the good Gabriel would have had to succumb and be conquered (same chapter, verses 13, 20, & 21). In the same way, then, let us suppose, for example's sake, that in the wars in which God sometimes willed the Israelites to be conquered, it was expedient that — to the favor of the enemy whose prince was some Angel — the day should be prolonged [and] the night shortened: could not that [Angel], against the will of the turners of the stars and heavens, rein in the Sun and Moon, and set [them] somewhere without all motion? I answer that he could not. Because in those [matters] in which they do not have the divine will clearly perceived, the Angels can, each according to his own office and holy zeal, resist — as did those who are set against [the Angels] of the Israelites and the prefects of the Persians; but in those [matters] in which the divine will is known to them, [they can] in no way dissent and fight, neither [against] God nor among themselves. Otherwise all those disadvantages of sin and punishment which were [stated] in the reasoning of the first conclusion must necessarily be incurred. But now, what is more clearly perceived by all the Angels than the general canons of divine providence in governing the world? Than the fixed and ratified axioms of governing the world? Than the decrees ever kept, since the founding of the world, in the motion of the heavens? Therefore, to do or attempt anything against these — unless the Lord Himself should command otherwise — has never been permitted to any Angel, nor is it [permitted]; nor [is it permitted any Angel], in restraining the heavenly orbs, to display force and effort against the will of the other Angels who turn them.

(col. 1009)

Question XVII. What were the efficient causes that, in the Gabaonite war, the Sun and Moon stood still? And what did the first [cause], namely Joshua, effect?

Two efficient causes are indicated in the text, to which a third can be added. The **first** is Joshua, who brought about the standstill of the Sun and Moon in a twofold manner. **First**, by *praying* to God. For this is what those words signify (verse 12): "Then Joshua spoke to the Lord" — and the Seventy: ἐλάλησεν Ἰησοῦς πρὸς κύριον (*elal■sen I■sous pros kyrion*, "Joshua spoke to the Lord"); the Chaldaean [Targum]: "then he will praise the Lord." For although these words (as I said, question 12) can also be applied to the prayer by which Joshua sought the storm of hail-stones, yet they show most clearly, and without any winding of words, that he employed prayers to God for obtaining the portent that followed. Cajetan [says]: "Join, O prudent reader, two things written here: namely, that Joshua then spoke to the Lord, the fount of being, and that he spoke a word to the Sun and Moon — that you may weigh that the first [act] raised [his] mind to God, supplicating for a complete victory, and that God inspired him to enjoin the delay upon the Sun and Moon." Again, afterward, it is said — or hinted — that God obeyed Joshua's voice (verse 14), as I shall explain below.

[Translator's note: the print here reads "verse 4"; the verse meant is Joshua 10:14, "the Lord obeying the voice of a man."]

He had therefore sent up [his] voice to God, by which he asked that the day be made longer, and that the Sun not set so quickly. For since, as is had in verses 8 and 11, God had delivered the Amorite into the sight of the children of Israel — that they might, namely, subdue, destroy, and utterly exterminate them — and [since] he saw that a great multitude of them was slipping away from the swords of the pursuing Israelites by the rushing onset of the hail, he sought that more daylight be given for pursuing them, and for slaying them with the sword and (as I indeed think) [the longer] with the hail. For if [the day] did not press on, it would not have been permitted to pursue them further; nor would the hail have caught the fugitives, or have seemed so clearly to catch [them].

Secondly [manner]. Joshua brought about the same standstill by commanding the two heavenly bodies, the Sun and Moon (verse 12): "Sun, against Gabaon move not, and Moon, against the valley of Aijalon." St. Jerome, in the *Epitaph of Paula*: "Jesus [Joshua], son of Nun, fighting against the five kings, commanded the Sun and Moon." And the same [Jerome], book 2 *Against Jovinian*: "Jesus, son of Nun, commanded a standstill upon the Sun and Moon, and prolonged the fasting, and the victory of the army, beyond one day." Tertullian, in the book *Against the Psychics* [*On Fasting*]: "Jesus of Nun commanded a standstill upon the very elements; the Sun stood still at Gabaon." And in the *Poem Against Marcion*, book 3:

He stayed the Sun together with the Moon, while he conquered the enemy.

The Author of the *Marvels of Sacred Scripture* [pseudo-Augustine], book 2, chapter 4: "When the five kings of the Chananaeans were gathered into one, to fight against the children of Israel, and when the cohorts were joined from the opposite side, and the victory was passing over to the side of God's people, Jesus, son of Nun, prince of the people of Israel, commanded the Sun, at mid-day, that it should not move, and the Moon to stand where it had been, until God's people should take vengeance on the enemy." Nor indeed did Joshua exercise this command of his secretly and silently, but openly and clearly, before the children of Israel, says the text (verse 12); and it was so serious and imperious that Ecclesiasticus (chapter 46, verse 5) ascribes it to [God's] mighty hand.

[Translator's note: at "his hand" the print has a Greek word that does not resolve clearly at the available resolution; the reference (Sirach 46:5) and the sense ("by his hand the Sun was stayed") are not in doubt.]

But there can be here a doubt which, because [it is] rather long, can have its own question.

Question XVIII. Whether Joshua rightly asked and commanded that the Sun and Moon should deflect from the constant and perpetual law of nature?

For, **first**, that most wise man — the great disciple of the great Moses — surely knew this fixed and constant Law of the divine providence in administering the whole world: that, night and day, without any interruption at all, the Sun and Moon should run through all the regions of the world by their assiduous revolutions. How, then, did he dare to ask that the contrary be done — since the Angels (as was said above, question 16) cannot for that reason restrain the stars from their gyres, because they are knowing and aware of the general and everlasting laws and decrees which God fixed for governing the world? **Secondly**. Then, of a petition of this kind — such an example of the rest of the heavenly bodies — he had, in all past antiquity, neither seen nor heard any. How, then, did he bring himself in mind to ask a thing so unusual, so repugnant to the order of the whole world? **Thirdly**. But now, to command anything to inanimate things, which feel nothing at all, seems foolish; [and to command] things not subject to our power [seems] bold and arrogant, nay even unjust. **Fourthly**. The leader of the people ought to have taken care not to commit anything, before those who were entrusted to his care and prudence, whence they might suspect him to be rash, foolish, arrogant, unjust, and vain. How, then, does he pray and command so portentous a miracle — not secretly, by himself, but publicly,

in the sight of the children of Israel? How base and notable, how shameful a disgrace, hung over [him], if it had not succeeded according to his heart's wish!

But in very truth Joshua prayed rightly [and] commanded rightly. For he knew that God, who had laid down the laws of the world's governance, could do something beside and above them, and had imposed on Himself no necessity of never dissolving and relaxing these. He had seen so many and so great prodigies in Egypt, in the forty-year journey through the vast wildernesses, in the cut-off flow of the Jordan, in the casting down of the walls of Jericho; so many others, and [things] placed so far above nature, he had learned by reading and hearing; the omnipotence of God he had learned so solidly and plainly from the Law, from Moses. He now clearly saw this [event] to be an occasion for demonstrating this divine omnipotence to all, a juncture for illustrating the supreme glory of the Lord, an opportunity for laying the enemies low and for helping and enlarging the people of Israel — so that he broke forth into these prayers and this command most prudently, most zealously, and most religiously. There is a certain faith, which is wont to be called [the faith] "of miracles," concerning which the Apostle [says] many things in chapter 13 of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. This [faith] both shows and inwardly persuades that God can [work] miracles, and that He wills [to work them] at such a time, in such a place, with such other circumstances. Whence, in matters so arduous, so removed from the common use of nature, so opposed to the known order, [by] that [faith]…

(col. 1011)

…[by] that [faith] there is to the saints a confidence to ask these [miracles] from God, [and] to command them even to dull, brute, and inanimate things. So Matthew 17, verse 20: "Amen I say to you," says the Lord, "if you have faith like a grain of mustard, you shall say to this mountain, 'Pass from here to there,' and it shall pass; and nothing shall be impossible to you." Luke 17, verse 6: The Lord said, "If you have faith like a grain of mustard, you would say to this mulberry tree, 'Be uprooted and transplanted into the sea,' and it would obey you." So Elijah (3 Kings [1 Kings] 17, 18; 4 Kings [2 Kings] 1); so Moses; so Gregory Thaumaturgus, St. Martin, St. Bernard, and others who were renowned for miracles — all the saints did [so]. St. Jerome, on Isaiah, chapter 28: "By the confidence of God dwelling in him, this man spoke [to the Sun]," he says. St. Ambrose, book 1 *On the Offices*, chapter 40: "Jesus [Joshua] of Nun, when battle was rising against the Gabaonites, and he feared lest night should hinder the victory, by the greatness of his mind and faith cried out, 'Let the Sun stand still,' and it stood still, until this victory should be completed." St. Bernard, in [the work] by the author of his *Life* (book 2, chapter 7): when he was urging that one must act constantly against the Leonine schismatics, and pray ardently, "Joshua," he says, "fights; and, that the day might suffice for the completion of the victory, [the day] being prolonged, he does not so much pray as command that the Sun stand still; and his faith merits both the Sun's obedience and the victory over the prostrated enemy."

To the former two contrary arguments, then, an answer has now [been given] — except that it must be added (what was only said in the previous question) that the Angels cannot, by their own decision — even for some advantage of certain men foreseen by them — contravene those Angels who turn the heavens, on account of that knowledge of the manner instituted and preserved by God for guarding and governing this world, by which [knowledge] the aforesaid [Angels] are supreme. And if they did not have this [knowledge], or if, from another [knowledge] of His immense power, they wished to ask that something be done otherwise by Him and through Him, it would be no less permitted to them than to men.

To the Third. When command is given to things devoid of the sense of life and of reason, the command is borne immediately upon those [things] — but this is *improperly* called "command"; remotely, however, and ultimately, it is borne upon the intelligent nature [governing them], and thus it is "command" properly. But this intelligent nature is either good or evil; and again, either subject to him who commands, or not subject; finally, command is given either in those things and affairs which openly change the predetermined and ordinary government of the whole world, or in things and affairs which openly contravene nothing of that government, and are, as it were, private. **First**, then: if the nature to which command is given is good, and

subject to him who commands, it will always comply in private matters, [but] not in others — for example, if some one of the higher Angels should command something to one of the lower [Angels]. But in matters which touch the whole world, and are, as it were, public, it will not comply, because these depend on the nod and will of God alone, and in these the lower [Angel] is not subject to the higher Angel. **Secondly**: if the nature for which [one] acts is good, and is not of itself subject — in any matters, private or public — to him who commands, but he who commands interposes the will and command of God, and truly and rightly indicates [it], that good nature will obey, both in private and in public [matters], in whatever way it can. For example, if a lesser Angel should command, in God's name, a greater [one]

something; likewise, if a man should command any of the Angels, and interpose this will and command of God, and truly indicate [it] to that Angel. **Thirdly**: if the nature to which command is given is evil — whether subject to him who commands or not subject — we say that, as often as God's authority is truly shown, it is right for it to undertake the commands in all things. If God's authority is not interposed, it will sometimes obey, sometimes not obey, in the matters which it does of its own accord — not in those which are commanded it by God. For example: an evil Angel is now subject to any good [Angel]. If, then, a good [Angel] should command anything in any matter by God's authority, [the evil one] can in no way resist here. If [the good Angel] should command it something without God's authority — if indeed this depends on the demon's power alone, as [when] it tempts someone, [or] afflicts [him] with bodily or spiritual molestations — the unhappy demon will have to obey. But if a demon were commanded by God to harass a nation, or some man, with certain calamities, and a good Angel, without God's authority, should order it to desist, it would not obey. The like reasoning [holds] concerning some holy man, if he should command anything to one of the demons. See, on Tobit chapter 8 (questions 7 & 8), concerning the manners of binding demons, by which [same] manner a limit can be set upon that [demon] too, by a certain stronger force and quality impressed [upon it].

Now I answer to the argument: it is foolish to command inanimate things *properly* or *simply*; but to command in such a way that the command pertains to the intelligences, or Angels, who preside over those things, or can do something in them — that, indeed, is consonant with prudence and wisdom. For so also Christ the Lord commanded calm to the sea and the winds (Matthew 8, verse 26, and following). Again, [to command] things which are in no way subject to our power is indeed bold, arrogant, and unjust. But if things of themselves do not fall under the power of men, but [do] by God's concession — and [if] men be considered not precisely as men, but as men full of God and furnished with divine authority — they can, without any mark of boldness, arrogance, or injustice, command both good and evil Angels. And thus Joshua commanded: the Sun and Moon *improperly* [not in the strict sense], the Angel-movers of the Sun and Moon *properly*; and that, not by his own human power and authority, but by [that] of the Deity, by whose inbreathing and impulse he used the imperative phrase. "In this command," says the second book *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture* (chapter 4), "the luminaries rest not by the authority of a human command, but they obey the command of the Lord commanding that they should stand still. For the creatures of God do nothing on account of the word of a commanding man, but they do that which the Lord, obedient to the prayer of His servant, commanded. For so it is related: 'The Sun stood still against Gabaon, and the Moon at the valley of Aijalon, the Lord obeying the voice of a man.'" And so, among other things, St. Cyriacus marvels that a charioteer was given by God to the Sun and Moon — namely, Joshua — as the Metaphrast [Symeon Metaphrastes] narrates under September 29. And in the Talmud (tractate *Pirke Avoth*, chapter 5 [al. 3]), the Rabbis, while they praise the 80 disciples of Hillel himself, say that 30 of them were worthy [men] for whom the Sun would stand still, as Joshua had made it stand. Rambam [Maimonides] repeats this in the *Yuchasin*, folio 159. But these are Rabbinic bubbles [idle fancies].

(col. 1013)

To the Fourth. The answer is clear from what has now been said. For since he established this command not by his own counsel, or [his own] boldness, but by divine instinct and admonition, he was surely confident that he would not be deceived. And therefore — that the glory might be greater to God, the author of the whole miracle, and greater the eagerness and faith among the people — he willed, openly and publicly, before the eyes of all, with [his] voice, that he might be heard by all, to bind the Sun and Moon, [great] as they are, and to despoil [them] of all motion.

Question XIX. What did the other efficient cause, namely God, effect?

The other efficient cause is indicated in the context [to be] God, who (verse 14) is said "to have obeyed the voice of a man." Now it must be observed that in the Hebrew there is a verb "of hearing," which often signifies not simply "to hear," but "to hear effectively" — just as the Latin [does] too; and that especially in two ways. **First**, that it be "to hearken [grant the request]." **Secondly**, "to obey." Calvin, then, here wants the former notion, of "hearkening": "Which verb [*shama*]," he says, "some translate 'to obey' — [a rendering] which I reject as too harsh." But, **first**: our [Latin] translator rightly judged it to be translated thus [as "obey"] — [a translator] in whom there is both a skill in the Hebrew tongue and an authority far greater than in Calvin; and [so did] the Latin and Greek Fathers, all of them, [and] the Seventy themselves, when they rendered [it] ἐπακοῦσαι θεὸν ἀνθρώπου (*epakousai theon anthr■pou*, "that God obeyed a man"). **Secondly**: in the Hebrew it is here, word for word, "to hear *unto* a voice," which elsewhere means "to obey" — Genesis 26, verse 5: "all the nations of the earth shall be blessed in thy seed, because thou hast obeyed my voice" — as Calvin himself, in that place, acknowledges it to be rightly translated, although he takes it ill that Abraham's obedience is so clearly declared the cause and merit of the blessing. Proverbs 5, verse 13: "Why have I detested discipline, and my heart has not acquiesced in rebukes, nor have I heard the voice" (in Hebrew, "and I did not [hear] *unto* the voice") "of those teaching me" — which is, not to obey their voice and admonitions. So Jeremiah chapter 32, verse 23; chapter 22, verse 21; 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 12, verse 14; chapter 28, verse 21; and elsewhere. **Thirdly**: the Lord is said (Psalm 20, verse 3) "to grant the desire of [one's] heart, and not to withhold the wish of his lips" — which is, in reality, to obey him, as indeed Calvin holds, though he still makes some exception: "Although," he says, "God is said in the psalm to act according to the desire of His servants — which amounts to the same as 'complying' — yet it is better to avoid whatever seems to force God into order [i.e. to subordinate Him]." But how does this seem to force God into order? Is it because it signifies Him [to be] inferior to a man? [that] He is compelled by the [man], since the [man] commands and the [other] obeys? This we shall see a little later. For now it is enough that the Hebrew verb is rightly translated by "to obey," and that Calvin ought not, by his own discretion, to force Scripture into order, and to interpret it as he pleases. **Fourthly**. But what of his disciple Junius? Did he heed his master? No, but he translated "hearken to the voice of a man" — which the schoolboys of the Grammarians know to be "being obedient." But the Lutheran Chytraeus, on this passage, says: "The Lord obeys the will of a man, and changes the order of nature on account of Joshua's prayers." And of the Rabbis, Radak — as often as he uses the same Hebrew verb for "to obey," on Psalm 2 — as when he says "as [it were]…"

…[what wonder is it that the Sun should obey God, when Scripture has] the son obey the father, and David [obey] God? In a like miracle too, Josephus (book 14, chapter 3, page 419): to Onias praying for rain, γινόμενος ὑπήκοος ὁ θεὸς ὗσεν — that is, "God, becoming obedient, sent rain," or "gave rain." And what of the miracle [obtained] through the Christians, in the time of the Emperor Marcus Antoninus Verus, divinely obtained — [as] the Poet Claudian, otherwise a Gentile, [tells] in [the panegyric on] the sixth consulship of Honorius?

> *— Every compliance of the Thunderer*
>
> *the character of Marcus was able to merit.*

It is to be observed, **secondly**, that in the Hebrew it is had: "And there was not [a day] like this day, before it and after it, for the Lord to obey," or (as the Seventy translate) "that the Lord should obey the voice of a man." And so a twofold meaning can hence be elicited. **One**, that God never thus obeyed, nor will obey, the voice of any man. **The other**, that the cause why such a day never has been, nor will be, is that God obeyed the voice of Joshua. Either sense can be tolerated; yet the latter is the more received. And indeed from the former it is also gathered most well [that the latter is true]: for if [God] never [obeyed] thus, as on that day He obeyed (or ever will obey) the voice of a man, then on that day He obeyed. And this sense seems to be confirmed from what is subjoined: "And [the Lord] fighting for Israel" — in Hebrew, with a causal particle: "because God fought for Israel."

It is to be observed, **thirdly**, that three modes can be given by which God "obeyed" the voice of a man. The **first** is according to the *effect*, because God did the same [as] if He were subject to a man and obeyed him. For in this manner of speaking, God is said to be angry, to rage, to be led to repentance, to laugh, and the like — which are attributed to God ἀνθρωποπαθῶς (*anthr■popath■s*, "after the manner of human passions"); or, as the Hebrews say, *Hal derech maschal bilschon bene adam* — that is, "by way of parable, according to the language of the sons of Adam," or of man — as Radak relates on the cited Psalm 2. The **second** [mode is] according to *efficiency*, because God brought it about that, at [His] command, the creatures — Sun and Moon — stood still; and so He "obeyed" not in Himself, but in His creatures. And this mode was indicated above by the Author of the *Marvels of Sacred Scripture*. And God did this either by signifying to the assistant Angel [*paredros*] of those heavenly bodies that for so many hours it should cease to turn them, or by withdrawing His own influx necessary for [their] motion. And this could be done in two ways. **First**, that He should withdraw the influx both from the heavenly bodies and from the Angel itself. **Secondly**, that [He withdraw it] from the heavenly bodies alone — and then there would be place for the latter mode, if the Lord moved the heavens by Himself, immediately; which, however, is rejected by the more noble Theologians and Philosophers, as may be seen in the Coimbrans (book 2 *On the Heavens*, chapter 5, question 6). The **third mode** is according to *voluntary subjection* — not in that manner in which God, made man, "came to Nazareth with [His] parents, and was subject to them" (Luke 2, verse 51), but [in this:] that, by inciting Joshua himself to command the Sun and Moon, and by persuading him, through the faith of miracles, that the Sun and Moon would stand still, God had in a manner already bound Himself that He would see to this. And this is not what Calvin said — "[God being forced] into order" — but it is [a matter of] explaining His immense goodness toward men, whereby it comes about that He Himself, before they dare even to think of it, binds Himself to them for those things which, at His own impulse and assurance, they shall have asked to be done. For of this kind is also that [event] in Exodus 32…

(col. 1015)

…[Exodus 32,] verse 10: "Let me alone, that my wrath may be kindled against them." Whence St. Jerome, on Ezekiel 13: "We read that Aaron set himself against the fire [of wrath], deprecating [praying for] the people of Israel — that he stood in the midst, and set [himself as] a wall for the people's safety. Jeremiah too is bidden to run to meet the Lord, and to stand against His wrath by the perseverance of prayer. For just as a wall is set against the enemy, and by the same plan one runs out against [him] who comes from the opposite side, so the sentence of God is broken by the prayers of the saints." Whence also it is said to Moses: "Let me alone, and I shall destroy this people." For to whom it is said "Let me alone," it is shown that he has the power of holding [God back]. St. Gregory, explaining that [text] of Job (chapter 9, "God, whose wrath no one can resist"): "It is a great wonder," he says (book 9 of the *Morals*, chapter 9), "that no one is said to be able to resist God's wrath, since the divine words testify that many have run to meet [withstood] the indignation of the heavenly punishment. Did not Moses resist God's wrath, who, raised up for the falling people, restrained the very onset of the heavenly stroke by the offering of his own death, saying: 'Forgive them this offense; or else blot me out of the book which thou hast written'? Did not Aaron resist God's wrath, when among the

falling and the dead he took the censer, and, kindled [with zeal], tempered the fire of the punishment? Did not Phinehas resist God's wrath, who, slaying in the very act those wantoning with the foreign [women], offered his zeal to the divine indignation, and appeased the fury with the sword? Did not David resist God's wrath, who, offering himself to the striking Angel, obtained the grace of propitiation, and at that time achieved his purpose? Did not Elijah resist God's wrath, who, when the earth was so long parched, recalled by [his] word the rains withdrawn from heaven? How, then, is it said that none can resist the divine wrath, when it is shown by evident examples that many have often resisted? But if we weigh subtly both these words of blessed Job and the deeds of those [men], we recognize the truth — that the divine wrath is *not* resisted; and [also] the truth, that many have often resisted. For all the saints who run to meet God's wrath receive *from Him* [the power] to be set against the onset of His stroke; and, so to speak, with Him they rise up against Him, and the divine power sets them against itself: namely, because, in that outwardly they maintain a [pleading] against [His] wrath, inwardly the grace of the One [who is] angry cherishes them, and inwardly He lifts up these His servants, whom outwardly He tolerates as if [they were] adversaries. He bears, therefore, the contradiction of those who pray, which He Himself prompts, and is, as it were, opposed by [those who are] unwilling [to let Him strike] — [the opposing] being commanded to be done by the same [God]. For to Moses it is said: 'Let me alone, that my wrath may be kindled against them, and I will destroy them, and make of thee a great nation.' What is it, to say to a servant 'Let me alone,' but to offer [him] the boldness of deprecating? — as if it were openly said to him: 'Weigh how much you avail with me, and know that you will be able to obtain whatever you pray for on behalf of the people.'"

And according to this mode, Joshua could have commanded rest to the Sun and Moon, even if they were moved immediately by God, and so the command would properly be borne upon Him [God]. But [the cause] which I said could be added — let us see [it as] the third cause.

Question XX. What did the third efficient cause, namely the Angel, effect?

The third cause is the Angel set over these stars. For he, receiving the command of Joshua and of God, immediately restrained that power by which he turns them about; and so they began to stand still. Concerning this [Angel]…

…there are nevertheless a few little questions about the Angel. **First**, whether one and the same in number is the mover of the Sun and Moon? It is not improbable that all the heavenly orbs are turned by one and the same Angel, as some prove [following] Fracastoro, in the *Homocentrica*, chapter 7, section 1. Nor does this one engine [of argument] much trouble them — [the objection] of the Coimbrans (book 2 *On the Heavens*, chapter 5, question 8): "Every Angel, as it has a certain and definite essence, so is circumscribed by certain spaces of place, and therefore cannot assist the celestial machine with that presence which is necessary for governing it duly, and for undergoing motions so various and so dissimilar." For the Angels have indeed a definite essence, place, and power of acting; but it does not therefore follow that it is not present to several heavens, and does not move them variously — since both the places of the heavens are finite, and only a finite power is required for moving them. For we see one and the same soul in number to be in the most diverse parts of the body, and to effect the most diverse motions in them. Moreover, those who assign several Angels to several heavens nevertheless confess that the one Angel is not, in one whole sphere, present according to essence as in a place, but in a certain position of that sphere. The **other** opinion, however, is more widespread, and drawn from the founts of Aristotle (*Metaphysics* 12, chapter 8, from text 47); from whom, however, in this matter I am rather unwilling [to draw], because, by the precepts of Christian teaching, I see them [his followers] most defiled. For that Philosopher will have it that there are just as many Angels as there are heavenly orbs — whereas our [Scripture] cries out (Daniel chapter 7, verse 10): "Thousands of thousands ministered to Him (God), and ten thousand times a hundred thousand stood before Him."

But whether one Angel in number turns the Sun and Moon, or several — there is **another** little question: from what Hierarchy and order of the Angels are these movers? It is not clear. Yet the Prince of the sacred school, St. Thomas (book 3 *Against the Gentiles*, chapter 80; and *Opusculum* 10, article 17), holds it probable that they are from the second Hierarchy, and from its middle order, which, according to St. [Dionysius] the Areopagite (chapters 6 & 7 of the *Celestial Hierarchy*), holds [the rank of] the Virtues.

Third: whether the motion of the Sun and Moon ceased by the Angelic *knowledge* [cognition] alone? This depends on that question: whether the faculty by which the Angels move the orbs of the heavens differs from their intellect and will? And many indeed think it does not differ — and these would say that all motion of the Sun and Moon was taken away by [a change of] knowledge alone: Averroes and Soncinas (on *Metaphysics* 12); Durandus, Bassolius, Hervaeus, [Gregory of] Rimini [Argentinensis], Thomas [Aquinas] (on Book 2 of the *Sentences*, distinctions 7, 8, & 14). But I, with Henry of Ghent, Aureolus, [Francis of] Meyronnes, Cajetan, [and] the Coimbrans, think that the motive power of the Angels differs from their intellect and will; and therefore that the Angel not only willed to move the Sun and Moon, but also enjoined his will upon the motive faculty itself, that it should impart no motion to those stars.

Fourth: how did the Angel of the Sun and of the Moon understand that this was the will and command of God — that, against the common order of things, these stars should rest awhile? Did he believe Joshua [when he] signified this very thing? But he was not ignorant that "every man is a liar"; [and that] many [have] rashly [asserted] many things beyond what is right and just, beyond [their] powers, and above nature…

(col. 1017)

…[many have] rashly [attempted to assert such things]. And, granted that he knew Joshua [to be] a good man and a notable Prophet — did he [the Angel] not know that the Prophets sometimes speak in a [merely] human way, without any divine impulsion? And indeed one Angel does not hearken to another Angel, whom it otherwise knows [to be] good and holy, as was said from Daniel chapter 10 (question 16). How, then, would [the Angel] comply with some man — however excellent and great — yet commanding in heaven either a sun-standstill or a moon-standstill? Did the Lord make him more certain of His will and command by some revelation? I think both [things] concurred together at one and the same point of time: that Joshua, moved by God's instinct, said to the Sun, "Stand," and likewise to the Moon; and that God, at the same time, showed the Angel that this was of His [own] will; and therefore that Angel at once obeyed Joshua's command.

Question XXI. Where did the Sun and Moon stand still?

Three places are handed down in the text, where the Sun and Moon stood still. **The first**, Gabaon (verse 12), concerning which [see] above, question 1. But this seems to be read very variously. The Latin says: "Sun, against Gabaon move not." The Greek: στῆθι ὁ ἥλιος κατὰ Γαβαών ("Stand, O Sun, over against Gabaon"). The Hebrew: "Sun, in Gabaon rest." Some, indeed, have interpreted the Latin [to mean] that the Sun should not move *to the disadvantage of* besieged Gabaon; but neither do the other texts bear this, nor [does] what is added concerning the Moon ("against Aijalon," which was not besieged, that it should not move), as Abulensis observes (question 17). Some [interpret it] that [the Sun] should [not] move toward Gabaon from the eastern horizon — but I shall say afterward that the Sun was then not in the eastern quadrant. Others [interpret]: "set not upon us while we fight in Gabaon" — but the Israelites had already advanced beyond Gabaon toward Azeca, while they pursued the fleeing Chananaeans there. Abulensis, however (questions 15 & 16): "O Sun, which standest in Gabaon, move not." Arias [Montano] nearly agrees, saying that the Sun then seemed to overhang the city of Gabaon; and so the Greek κατά is here taken for "in," as also below, verse 13: κατὰ μέσον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, that is, "in the midst of heaven." But the Latin, on the contrary, means "over against" [*è regione*]: because, just as Joshua was leaving Gabaon behind his back, pursuing the enemy toward the west, so also he had the Sun behind him — as if it either hung straight over Gabaon, and was,

from the higher place, as it were opposite to him, or was very near to the city, placed as it were between Joshua himself and that city; and so, again, in a manner, it could be said [to be] "over against the region of Gabaon" — overhanging, indeed, the Gabaonite territory, but, by a straight line, distant from the city itself. For things that so appear are commonly said to be "set over against." And so both [statements] are true: that the Sun was *in* Gabaon, and *over against* Gabaon.

The second place is the valley of Aijalon, where the Moon is said to be — in the Seventy it is called "the valley of Aijalon" [αἰλών]; in Isaiah, chapter 28, verse 21, "the valley of Gabaon"; in [the tribe of] Benjamin's Itinerary, "the valley of the Moon." Eusebius thus describes it in the book *On Places*: "Aijalon, a valley, and a steep [height], above which, when Jesus [Joshua] once prayed, the Moon stood still — near the village, which until now is called Aijalon, toward the east of Bethel, distant three miles from it, not far

from Gabaa and Rama, cities of Saul." But almost all say that Eusebius slipped here. **First**: because Aijalon was farther from Saul's Gabaa — for this Gabaa is in the territory of the Benjamites, [but] Aijalon [is] in the tribe of the Danites. **Secondly**: instead of "Bethel," Ziegler and Masius correct [it to] "Shiloh." **Thirdly**: [the tribe of] Benjamin counts from this valley of Aijalon up to Gabaon one league. **Fourthly**: St. Jerome, correcting Eusebius in the cited place: "Moreover," he says, "the Hebrews affirm that Aijalon is a village near Nicopolis, at the second milestone for those going to Aelia [Jerusalem]." And indeed the same St. Jerome, in the *Epitaph of Paula*, signifies also that between Nicopolis (which, in question 10, I called Emmaus) and Jerusalem are Gabaon and Aijalon — that is, more to the east than Nicopolis, nay even than Gabaon, as is established from this, that St. Jerome says it [Aijalon] is distant two stones — that is, two miles, or 16 stadia — from Emmaus, toward Jerusalem. But Emmaus was distant from Jerusalem 60 stadia (Luke 24, verse 13). Therefore Aijalon [is] at 44 stadia [from Jerusalem], while Gabaon is distant from the same [Jerusalem] 50 stadia, as was said above (chapter 9, question 1); and therefore I cannot assent to Adrichomius, who makes Aijalon much more to the west than Emmaus and Gabaon. Yet all hand down that Aijalon is more to the south than both Gabaon and Emmaus. As for the Moon, it is right to understand that it was not moved over against it [Aijalon], or that it stood still in it, in the same way as was said of the Sun above — whether the context meant *poetically* to signify the same place, as Masius judges, or not; which will be examined afterward.

The third place [is] at verse 13: "the midst of heaven" [*medium caeli*]. Abulensis (question 12) says that there is a twofold "middle" of a thing: **one** according to *equidistance*, **the other** according to *interposition*. And [he says] that "middle" is here taken in this latter mode — just as above, [chapter 7,] verse 13: "The anathema is in the midst of thee"; and Isaiah 6, verse 5: "I dwell in the midst of a people having polluted lips." But surely "middle" is here taken in the *former* mode. For, first, by "interposition" everything is called "middle" [by him] which is between the extreme limits — as any part of a line between its extreme points, and so any part of the hemisphere between the extreme points of rising and setting which touch the horizon, is called "middle." But surely this is not the "middle of heaven," but the "middle of the hemisphere." Then, here is a word [in the Hebrew] which properly signifies "middle" by the equality of the intervals of the parts — namely *chetsi* [חצי, "half"]; whereas above, in chapter 7, it is *be-kerbecha* [בקרבך, "in thy midst"]; in Isaiah 6, *betoch* [בתוך, "in the midst"]. **Thirdly**: it would have sufficed to say "the Sun stood still," because, since it had been said before "let it not move against Gabaon," or "let it stand still in Gabaon," it would have been sufficiently understood that it stood still there, and not in the little portions touching the horizon. But the text meant to signify something more: that the Sun not only stood still in Gabaon, but had also there reached the summit of the *middle of heaven* [the meridian], and in it — as Sedulius says (book 1) — stood fixed. Now it must be known that "the middle of heaven, which is the middle by equidistance," is taken in three ways. **First**: from any point to any other set diametrically [opposite]. **Secondly**: from a conspicuous point to another, likewise as it were conspicuous…

(col. 1019)

And so there are points of the Sun — both of rising and of setting — on the horizon, which divide the hemisphere of heaven set above the horizon from that which is below. **Thirdly**: the point which is the "middle" in the *conspicuous* hemisphere — namely, when the Sun reaches the meridian circle. For this the sphere-scholars [astronomers] call τὸ μεσουράνημα (*to mesouran■ma*, "the mid-heaven") — either because it is the middle of the *whole* heaven (if it be referred to the point diametrically opposite, according to the first notion), or because it is the middle of the *conspicuous* heaven; and so it is commonly taken. But all [these] are taken either strictly and geometrically, so that it be a true precise diameter and a truly precise middle, as the words themselves import; or a little more broadly and commonly, so that that too be called "middle" which is not far from the middle. For things which differ little seem to differ nothing — as was said at chapter 6, question 30, concerning midday.

And it is sufficiently clear. **First**, that "the middle of heaven" is here not taken in that first of the three modes, because in whatever part and position of heaven the Sun be, it is thus always "in the middle of heaven," even if it is at the Antipodes, in the hidden hemisphere. Nor is it taken in the **second** mode, because the points or times of rising and setting are wont to be marked by their proper names — *mizrach* [מזרח, "east"] and *erev* [ערב, "west / evening"], or "ascent" and "descent." Therefore in the **third** mode the Sun stood still "in the middle of heaven" — taking it strictly or broadly, as shall please [us] from the following question, which will also produce not-to-be-rejected authors of this exposition. But some Talmudic Rabbis add (in the tractate *Avodah Zarah*, chapter 2, and in the *Pirke de R. Eliezer*) a *fourth* place where the Sun stood still — namely, the line of setting — because Scripture is [worded]: "the Sun hastened not to set." But this came about because it rested midway in mid-heaven, and did not proceed to its setting with the wonted velocity.

Question XXII. In what month, day, [and] hour did the Sun and Moon stand still?

First: it is an almost universally-spread saying among the Jews that this happened in the month *Tamuz*, which is the fourth month of the year (reckoned from the vernal equinox by the [lunar] illumination), and corresponds to our [calendar] partly [in] June, partly [in] July. "The wars," says the *Seder Olam* (chapter 11), "of Jericho and Ai and Gabaon were done within a three-month [span]; on the third day of Tamuz. And Joshua said before all Israel: 'Sun, against Gabaon move not, and Moon against the valley of Aijalon'; and the Sun and Moon stood still, until the nation should avenge itself on its enemies." Which day R. Joseph hands down to have fallen on the summer solstice. Whence we gather that the beginning of the month *Nisan*, or [our] March, was in that year the day of the vernal equinox; the same think Arias [Montano], Lyranus [Nicholas of Lyra], [and] Genebrardus. But when I consider the deeds [actually] done up to this point, it seems that these starry standstills fell at the beginning of the third month — which is called *Sivan*, and corresponds to our [calendar] partly [in] May, partly [in] June — or at the end of the second [month], which is our *Iyar* and April and May. For, as was concluded above (questions 29 & 31): Jericho was set aflame on the 29th day of the first month. The two Israelites, then, could have advanced on the 30th day toward Ai — [those] who were repelled with disaster and disgrace. But be it so: granted there was still rest in the camp on that day, and indeed on the following day, which

was the New-moon of the second month, and for this reason a feast[-day] — [then] at least on the second light [day] of the same second month, the same [Israelites] assailed the city of Ai, and from it were then cut down and put to flight. There followed, on that very day, the lamentation and prayers, and at the same time the oracle concerning the casting of lots, and the casting of lots itself. On the third day Achan was burned. On the fourth, Ai was taken and burned. The fifth was the Sabbath, and so [there was] rest. On the sixth, [they] went to the mountains Garizim and Ebal. There they stayed the whole week. Thence the return to Gilgal was on the 13th. With the Gabaonite envoys the treaty was concluded on the 14th. On the sixteenth day, their fraud was detected. And from that 14th day, the rumor concerning the Gabaonites was spread far and wide,

and [the kings] hatched various plans for besieging them, and the Kings made themselves ready for twelve or thirteen days — namely on the 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 20th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th, 27th — and then Joshua was able to rush upon them, and to forbid the Sun its course. Nor does it seem necessary to add more days, if we look at the nearness of those Kings, the sudden rush to arms of those times, and the necessity of the danger hanging over those same Kings — as you see in this table.

Days of the Second Month

| Day | | Event | |---|---|---| | 1 | ■ (Tue.) | as is clear from question 31, chapter 6 — the **New Moon** | | 2 | | first battle of Ai | | 3 | | the burning of Achan | | 4 | | second battle of Ai | | 5 | | [the Sabbath — rest] | | 6 | ■ (Sun.) | going to the mountains Gerizim & Ebal | | 7–12 | | — | | 13 | ■ (Sun.) | return to Gilgal | | 14 | | treaty with the Gabaonites; and hence the rumor of it, and the preparation of war against them | | 15 | | — | | 16 | | the Gabaonites' fraud detected | | 17–23 | ■ (Sun. on 20) | …and the preparation of war against them [continuing] | | 24–26 | | — | | 27 | ■ (Sun.) | **the Sun and Moon stood still** | | 28–30 | | — |

Secondly. The Rabbis who assign the rest of the Sun and Moon to the fourth month of the year [do so] all either on the third day of that month (as we heard above from the *Seder* [Olam]), or certainly hand down that it happened immediately after the new moon — as Radak and R. Isaiah. But I ascribe it rather to the fourth day of the *third* month; because, although the days of the second month marked above would suffice, yet [the events] seemed to be more conveniently accomplished…

(col. 1021)

…all [the more conveniently], if we reckon somewhat more days. For perhaps there was not such haste in each [event], and perhaps more time was spent at Gerizim and Ebal, and likewise in preparing the Gabaonite siege. **Secondly**: because the Moon was more to the east than the Sun — for the [Sun] was in Gabaon, the [Moon] in Aijalon, as was expounded above (question 21). Now there is an Astrological canon: "Whenever the Sun is low above our horizon, and the Moon, more to the east, is above the horizon, [the Moon] is always either full, or certainly tends toward the full." And therefore the Moon could not then be at the *end* of the second month, when it loses almost all its light and hastens toward the new moon, with which the following month begins; but after this new moon had begun, it was now rather going toward the greater perfection of [its] light. Now the fourth day of the third month was a Sunday [*dies Dominicus*], because by the Gentiles it was once called "the day of the Sun," *der Sonntag*. For since the last day of the preceding second month was the fourth weekday [Wednesday], the third month will begin on the fifth weekday [Thursday], and therefore the fourth day will thus be Sunday:

| Day | | | |---|---|---| | 1 | ■ (Thu.) | | | 2 | ■ (Fri.) | | | 3 | ■ (Sat.) | | | 4 | ■ (Sun.) | the Sun & Moon stood still |

Rabbi Eliezer too (chapter [51]) thinks it was the Day of Preparation, or the eve of the Sabbath [Friday]. But what R. Joseph said above — that it was the summer solstice — falls [to the ground] from all these [considerations]. And indeed this miracle would have been less wonderful (at least to the common [people]) if the Sun had stood still on the solstitial day. But Isaiah (chapter 28) proclaims the supreme admirableness of this miracle.

Thirdly. Concerning the *hour* of the day, the Authors think in three ways. **Some** suppose it was the evening time, when the Sun was near to setting — so Cajetan in this place, Abulensis (question 12, and after [question] 86), and likewise of old Sulpitius [Severus] (book 1 of the *History*), as far as I can understand him. **Reason one**: because Joshua would have asked for the Sun to stand still in vain, [had he not] feared the impending night. **Reason two**: the same Joshua saw the Moon; therefore the Sun was already setting, which would otherwise have obscured it by the brightness of its light. **Reason three** — so Cajetan puts it: "By saying 'wait,' [Joshua] insinuates that the Sun was setting; for unless he had seen the imminent setting of the Sun, he would not have said to the Sun, 'wait.'" **Others**, however, say it was the noon hour — whether

"midday" be taken strictly, or broadly and commonly for the time around midday. So Lyranus [Nicholas of Lyra], Vatablus, Arias [Montano], and Radak. Masius thinks both opinions probable. To me the middle [view], which fixes [it at] midday, seems the more probable. **First**: because above (question 1) it was understood that the Sun stood still "in the middle of heaven," which is effected by the meridian circle. **Secondly**: because this is for the most part the opinion, even of the ancients. For Sedulius (book 1):

> *The Sun stood still in Gabaon, and on the summit of mid-heaven*
>
> *[stood] fixed: unwonted to rein in the panting light, the day [thus] drawn out toward evening;*
>
> *nor did the Moon run on, sluggish in its own order,*
>
> *until the burning sword [of Joshua], with ravaging arms,*
>
> *should consume the huge [host of the] enemy, the very pole conspiring [with him]:*
>
> *even then the attendant stars beheld the [Lord] to come, foreshown by the name JESUS [= Joshua].*

Theodoret (question 13 on Joshua): "This," he says, "also prefigures the prodigious deed of the Savior. For just as, when the Prophet fought, the Sun stood still, so, when our Savior by His death dissolved death, the Sun at midday held back its rays, and filled the earth with darkness." The Author *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture* (book 2, chapter 4): "Jesus, son of Nun, Prince of the people of Israel, commanded the Sun, at mid-day, that it should not move." There can be added the Rabbis cited at the end of the previous question, when they say that the Sun rested not only toward the west, but even in mid-heaven. But does R. Eliezer, cited before — when (in chapter 51) he says it was the eve of the Sabbath — thereby deny it was midday? For from this [midday] [the eve of the Sabbath] is wont to begin, as is clear from chapter 46, where he calls the sixth hour of the day "the eve of the Sabbath." **Thirdly**: if it had been the evening hour, Joshua would have had the setting Sun before his eyes, because he was going toward Maceda, to the west; but it was said above (question 21) that the Sun stood still in Gabaon [behind him]. **Fourthly**: the Moon was in Aijalon, therefore in the part of the Zodiac nearest [to the Sun]; therefore it was very thin, and so could likewise have been obscured by the Sun's rays. **Fifthly**: the [arguments] objected can be easily resolved.

To the first: Joshua was aiming at the fullest victory in his mind, and the utter slaughter of the enemy; and therefore he judged that more hours than would remain on that day were needed for the matter — especially since the multitude of the enemy was great, and the flight manifold. **To the second**: first, it is not even necessary that the Moon was seen by Joshua; it is enough that he was not ignorant that it was at that time near the Sun. Secondly, the Moon is often seen by day, even when near the Sun, on account of its very great nearness to the earth above all the stars — on account of which, too, although smaller than almost all the others, it nevertheless appears much larger. Thirdly, Abulensis himself does not hold that the Sun was then setting, yet holds that the Moon was seen by Joshua. **To the third**: "the Sun hastened not to set" means only that it did not set so quickly as it ought otherwise, by its custom, to have set. For otherwise it always hurries, and with most rapid course, where it has risen, hastens to its setting, [and] where it sets, to its rising — so that, in the space of one hour, it is handed down by the Astrologers to run through more than 162,000 miles. And the Hebrew verb does not properly mean "wait," but either "be silent" or "be still," as above (question 13); for although one who waits is still, yet not everyone who is still waits.

Question XXIII. How long did the Sun and Moon stand still?

The delay which the Sun made, standing still, Scripture indicates in two ways. **First** (verse 13), [it indicates] it to have been as great as would suffice for routing and cutting down the enemy: "The Sun and Moon stood still, until the nation should avenge itself on its enemies" — or, as St. Augustine says (book 21 of the *City of God*, chapter 8), "until the battle begun should be ended in victory." For it was for this end that this delay was asked by Joshua, as expounded above. But it must be noted, first, here, that in the Hebrew…

(col. 1023)

…[the Israelites are called] by the name "gens" [nation], or in Hebrew *goi* — which some of the Rabbis think otherwise befits only idolaters. Then, that "for the nation," in the Greek, is "God" — namely the chief author of this vengeance: ἕως ἡμύνατο ὁ θεὸς τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτῶν ("until God avenged them of their enemies"). **Secondly**. In the same verse 13: "The Sun hastened not to set for the space of one day." In which words, first, [it] displeases [me] what Abulensis teaches (questions 70 & 87): that "the space of one day" is here spoken [of] because there was then no time, but [only] as great a duration and space as there *would* be, if there *were* time. For the Translator took "a day" and "the space of a day" for the same thing — as appears from this, that there is no mention of this "space" in the Hebrew, in which [it goes] thus: "And the Sun hastened not to set, as on a completed day"; nor in the Greek, in which [it goes] thus: εἰς τέλος ἡμέρας μιᾶς ("toward the end of one day"). Then, that time can exist even if all the heavens be at rest, Physiology [natural philosophy] now admits — as is proved in Toletus, from this very passage (book 4 of the *Physics*, chapter 14, question 16). St. Augustine (book 11 of the *Confessions*, chapter 23): "Let no one tell me that the motions of the heavenly bodies are [identical with] times; because, when at someone's wish the Sun had stood still, that the victor Joshua might carry through the battle, the Sun stood, but time went on. For through its own space of time, which was sufficient, that battle was waged and finished."

It must be known, **secondly**, that concerning these same words of the text — and so concerning the *time* of the resting Sun — there are various opinions. **The first** is that of Rambam [Maimonides] and Ralbag [Gersonides], saying that [the Sun] did not rest for any moment at all, but that this day [merely] *seemed* to be, as it were, a complete day — that is, the longest, such as the solstitial [day] is wont to be. But these have already been refuted above; and the Hebrew commentator in the *Moreh Nevuchim*, Shem-Tob, says their words are "hot and windy." **The second**: [that of] St. Macarius (homily 50): that it stood still for two hours — unless there be an error in it, of which afterward. **The third** is of those who think the Sun rested three hours — as Toletus (book 2 *On Generation*, chapter 11, question 10); and the same opinion is attributed to St. Augustine by the same Toletus (in the cited question of *Physics* book 4); but in the cited words of [Augustine] there is no word about hours. **The fourth**: the common [opinion], that it stood still 12 equal hours, either fully or almost fully, so that the light of that day was of 24 equal hours. **The fifth**: 24 hours, so that the light was of 36 hours, and the whole day of 48 hours. So R. Eliezer (chapter 51), when he says: "they stood still, each, 36 hours, until the going-out of the Sabbath." So too, of the Rabbis, all those who hand down that the Sun stood still 12 hours at midday and as many at setting — concerning whom [see] questions 21 & 22. Of ours [Christians], perhaps St. Justin (*Dialogue against Trypho*, near the end). **The sixth**: that it stood still 36 whole hours. So, clearly, the Chaldaean Targum, at the beginning of chapter 7 of the *Canticles*. And the same could seem [to be] the opinion of St. Justin, already cited, because he says the Sun put off its setting for 36 hours. **The seventh**: counts 42 or 54 hours of this rest. For [its author] says that whole day was of 66 hours; and therefore, if "day" be taken for "light," the Sun's rest will have been 54 hours; if for the whole natural day, the same rest will have been 42 hours. "How long it stood still," says Arias [Montano], "we find nothing certain in the Scriptures; although the authors of the Hebrew homilies, led by certain subtle reasons, have written that it stood still sixty-six hours."

The **fourth** opinion takes me by the hand before the others, and joins me to itself: that the standstill alone was of 12 hours, the light of 24 hours, the whole time of light and night 36 [hours]…

…[of 36] hours. For, **first**, Ecclesiasticus teaches this in words by no means obscure (chapter 46, verse 5): "One day became as two." For although Abulensis (question 87) delays over this [as if it meant] I know not what, it is openly refuted from the Greek, in which [it goes] thus: μία ἡμέρα ἐγένετο πρὸς δύο — that is, "one day was made into two," or was prolonged after the manner of two days. Now, are there not "twelve hours of the day" — equal ones, namely (John 11, verse 9)? Therefore the hours of two days are 24. **Secondly**: our text here (verse 13): "The Sun hastened not to set for the space of one day." But this "space"

is, as I have already said, [the space] of 12 equal hours. **Thirdly**: lest anyone think fewer [hours] are to be given to these "hours of one day," the Hebrew adds that "a day" must be taken full and complete: "The Sun hastened not to set, as on a complete day" — that is, for as great a time as is [the time] of a complete day. And again, lest anyone believe that more than 12 hours were added to that same day, it is said, in the same Hebrew, in the singular, "as on a day" — which the Seventy and our [Latin] rendered "a day." **Fourthly**: the ancients had the same opinion. St. Dionysius the Areopagite (Epistle to Polycarp): "For one day," he says, "the Sun and Moon stand still." St. Ephrem (in the sermon on the sinful woman, volume three): "By the holy hands of Jesus, son of Nun, stretched out to Him who had appeared in the height of the air, and by a word alone, he made firm the course of the elements, so that one day lasted as [long as] two." Tertullian (book *Against the Psychics*, chapter 10): "The Sun stood still in mid-heaven, and did not approach its setting, even to the end of one day." St. Jerome, on Isaiah, chapter 28: "In the valley of Gabaon, under Joshua the Prince, the Sun stood still for the space of one day." The Author *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture* (book 2, chapter 4): "Thus he enclosed two days in one, and the Moon did not run on for the space of a day."

To me it seems that the same is the mind of St. Macarius, in the cited place, when he says εἰς ὃ ἐπιτάξαι τῷ ἡλίῳ ὥρας… "two hours"? For why does no other author count only *two* hours, nor is there any conjecture why it should be so counted? I think it was written δύο ὦ or ωρ, or διώρα, or by the arithmetical letters ιβ [= 12]; and, with that least of letters, the iota, vanishing, there remained only β [= 2]. And in this way it can be said that that whole day — at the midday-time of which the Sun began to stand still — was of 36 hours; for the νυχθήμερον [day-and-night period] had, by the wonted manner, 24 hours, and to it were added the 12 hours of the solar rest. I confess, nevertheless, that if anyone should contend that here "day" is taken not for "light" only (which is of 12 hours), but for the *nychthemeron*, which is of 24 hours, then the cited Scripture-passages and the Fathers can be accommodated to him — and so much the more solidly, in that here not simply "a day" (which often signifies "light" only) is written, but "a complete day," as if to distinguish it from that [day] which is of only 12 hours, since the completeness of [the whole day] embraces 24 hours.

Question XXIV. Whether so long a day had never been before?

The text expressly asserts this (verse 14); but because in the Hebrew it is only had, "There was not [a day] like this day before," and in the Greek, "There was not such a day," [some] have thought…

(col. 1025)

Masius thought that this day is not compared with others in length *simply*, but in length [combined] with such an end and effect: "It is not treated," he says, "of the length of this day comparatively; but it is preferred to any [other] days only in this: that God prolonged no other day, at the prayers of that man, for the sake of cutting down the enemy, by interrupting the Sun's motion, as He prolonged this one." But both the Rabbis of the Hebrews and the Greek and Latin Fathers have handed down that the comparison is made in *length*; and this seems sufficiently gathered from the fact that, when [the text] had said the Sun stood still and did not run on to its wonted setting, it at once subjoined: "There was not before and after [a day] like this day," or "there was not such a day" — that is, so long. And therefore Arias [Montano speaks] better than Masius: "What we read in the Latin," he says, "'so long a day,' is to be referred not only to the *space* [duration], but to the *quality* and *excellence*: that that day was notable beyond all example — first by [its] magnitude and the duration of light, then [as] most remarkable by the very efficiency and power of God." But this must now be seen: whether so long a day truly was not [seen] before? From the opinions of certain Rabbis, the Rabbi Shem-Tob, cited before, relates (in the *Moreh Nevuchim*) that the Sun stood still also at the command of Moses, and indeed for a longer [time]. Otherwise — which those Rabbis greatly abhor — Moses would have been surpassed by Joshua in some matter, the master by the disciple. But this is a mere fabrication of theirs, explained nowhere in Scripture, handed down by no one's memory. But whether on that account Moses is

less than Joshua, St. Thomas long ago disputed (*Secunda Secundae*, question 174, article 4, [reply] to [objection] 2) — of which, perhaps, afterward. For now let this be observed (which must be applied also to the following question): that those longest days — which, from a certain position of the sphere, [are had] somewhere — are of two months, and of three, and even of half a year, namely from the [terrestrial] latitude of 69 degrees of pole-altitude, in July, as is clear in chapter 3 of the *Sphere*. For here the discourse is of a land of the same, or a like, climate [latitude] with Judaea.

Question XXV. Whether so long a day has [never] been afterward?

It seems there was [such a day], **first**, when he who is described in 1 Chronicles, chapter 4, verse 22, "made the Sun stand still." For, as the author of the traditions on that book says: "The Hebrews hand down that this [man] was Elimelech, the husband of Naomi, the father of Mahlon and Chelion; in his time the Sun stood still, on account of the transgressors of the Law, so that, this great miracle being seen, they might be converted to the Lord their God." Since, therefore, the Sun then had to stand still not for cutting down the bodies of enemies, but for moving, by the magnitude of the miracle, the minds of the unfaithful, and joining them to God, it seems probable it stood still longer than now [in Joshua's time]. **Secondly**: in the time of King Hezekiah (Isaiah, chapter 38, verse 8): "The Sun returned by ten lines, through the degrees by which it had descended"; and afterward it descended the same [degrees] again, so that the same space of ten lines was traversed by the Sun three times on the same day — first, by keeping its wonted course; secondly, by returning through a miracle; thirdly, by descending again. But ten lines are ten hours. Therefore that [day] was of thirty hours — that [span] tripled through the ten

lines of the Sun's passage; to which, if the two other [hours] remaining of that day be added, the light was of 32 hours, and the whole νυχθήμερον [day-and-night] of 44 hours. **Thirdly**. There is (says St. Augustine, book 21 of the *City of God*, chapter 8) in the books of Marcus Varro, whose title is *On the Race of the Roman People*, [a passage] which, in the same words in which it is read there, I will here set down: "In the heaven a wondrous portent arose. For in the star of Venus — most noble, which Plautus calls *Vesperugo*, Homer *Hesperos*, calling it most beautiful — Castor writes that so great a portent arose, that it changed its color, magnitude, figure, [and] course: which thing happened so [as] neither before nor afterward. Adrastus of Cyzicus and Dion of Naples, noble Mathematicians, said this happened in the reign of King Ogyges." Varro, so great an author, would not call this a "portent" unless it seemed to be against nature. I add: and unless Venus so changed its course that it greatly prolonged either the night or the day. For, Venus changing its course, the Sun too must have changed [its course], as will be said below. **Fourthly**. In the *Lives of the Fathers* (book 1, chapter 16; and thereafter book 1, *Example* 12, example 11), it is narrated of Blessed Mutius the hermit, how he made the Sun stand still, until he should come to the village where the sick man whom he had resolved to visit lay. Was not that day longer than this one? **Fifthly**. Turpin, in the *Life of Charlemagne* (chapter 28): "While he," he says, "was running thither after them with his whole army, the Sun stood immovable, and that day was prolonged by the space of, as it were, three days." **Sixthly**. The Heathen write that the night of Hercules's conceiving was a "three-night." In the other hemisphere, therefore, one day was long, after the manner of three days, the light remaining for 36 hours. For hence [comes] that [passage] of Sosia in Plautus's *Amphitryon*, gazing at the heaven:

> *So. Certainly, by Pollux, I know — if there is anything I may believe, I will hold it for certain —*
>
> *I believe that on this night Nocturnus has slept off his drunkenness.*
>
> *For neither do the Septentriones [the Wain] move anywhere in the heaven,*
>
> *nor does the Moon change anywhere, but, as it once rose, [so it stays];*
>
> *nor do Orion's-belt, nor the Evening-star, nor the Pleiades set.*
>
> *Thus the constellations stand fixed, nor does the night anywhere give way to the day.*

And a little after:

> *So. Nor do I think I have seen [a night] longer than this one —*
>
> *except that one which, having been beaten, I hung through [in punishment].*
>
> *But this one, by Pollux, has surpassed even that by far in length.*
>
> *I believe, by Pollux, that the Sun is asleep — and well soaked [with drink];*
>
> *it is a wonder if he did not treat himself to a little [too] much at dinner.*

But in very truth all these [instances] are no obstacle: so great a day, after that Joshuan one, was never, in that climate or a like one, either seen or heard of. And therefore I answer:

To the first: nothing is had there, in the Hebrew and Greek text, about anyone who "made the Sun stand still." But there is only named, in [the Hebrew], a certain "Iokim," and in the Greek "Ἰωακίμ" [Joachim], so that this [matter] about the Sun seems to have been brought into the text by certain [interpreters], because, since the root of that name signifies "to rise" and "to stand"…

(col. 1027)

…some began to inquire why it [the name] had [its] name from "standing," and the Rabbis of the Jews referred it to the Sun — being [as they are] bold to invent and say anything whatever. And when certain of the Christians had heard this, they noted it in the margin of their Bibles; and since our Translator had translated this proper name "who made [it] stand," others added "the Sun." For we see many similar proper names translated there — as, in the same verse, "men of lying," and "of the secure," and "burning," for the [proper names] of the men Cozeba, and Joas, and Saraph; in the Greek, ἄνδρες χωζηβὰ καὶ Ἰωὰς καὶ σαραφ. Yet I find, in the Talmudic tractate *Baba Bathra* (chapter 5, folio 91b), that this very "Iokim" is not Elimelech, but Joshua; and that those others, Joam and Saraph, "the Secure" and "the Burning," are Mahlon and Chelion, the sons of Elimelech — as I advise on Ruth (chapter 1, question 3). But be it so: granted the Sun truly stood still, commanded by Elimelech; it would be enough for [counting it] a miracle and a permission [granted] to the saints, if the unbelievers had seen it standing three or four hours. Whoever desires other [things] about this, let him unroll our [comment on] Barradas (book 5 on the Gospel, chapter 8).

To the second [Hezekiah's sundial]. Various are the difficulties about the solar regression in Hezekiah, which I tried to explain, on that chapter 38 of Isaiah, in more than 30 little questions. But now I say briefly. **First**, that some deny the Sun went back, but think that only its *shadow* went back — as the Rabbi Abarbanel; of ours, Arias Montano (on Isaiah), and Burgensis (in the additions, on 4 Kings, chapter 20); but I disapproved of these there (question 20). **I say, secondly**, that to others the Sun seems to have gone back, but by the name of "single lines" they understand not single hours, but either half-hours, as Cornelius Bertramus (chapter 3 of the *Lucubrations* of the Frankenthal [scholars]), or quarter-hours, as others, as I noted on the same place of Isaiah (question 22). **I say, thirdly**, that to others it is pleasing [to hold] that single hours are single lines — but that the Sun went back through them suddenly, and in one, so to speak, moment of time. And so once said Eustathius of Antioch (in Glycas), and the Author *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture* (chapter 28). **I say, fourthly**: if single lines denoted single hours, and through them the Sun went back, and again advanced step by step, [then] 12 — or otherwise 26 — hours were added to the customary hours of that day; and so the light was of 32 hours, but the whole νυχθήμερον of 44, as is objected. But there is then a threefold response. **The first** is, that "day" is here taken [as] "complete," for the whole space of light and darkness, which contains 24 hours; and so the Joshuan light would have been of 36 hours, and therefore greater than the Hezekian, and the whole nychthemeron of 48 hours, and therefore also greater than the Hezekian — to omit, meanwhile, what Lyranus disputes here, and on Isaiah, and on 4 Kings, concerning the reckoning of equal and unequal hours; especially since I judge that neither the Joshuan standstill of the Sun nor the Hezekian going-back of the Sun happened at the [time] which that same Lyranus posits. **The second**

is, that the Hezekian day was indeed *simply* longer than the Joshuan, but here it is only denied [to be] longer *in the slaughter of enemies and a happy victory*, as Masius said above (question 24). **The third**, and easier: that no day was longer than that one, up to the time at which someone inserted this clause into the Book of Joshua — concerning which [I treat] in the prolegomena.

To the third [the Venus portent]. St. Augustine himself responds, first (in the same book 21, chapter 6): "We are not bound to believe all that the history of the Gentiles contains, since the historians themselves, as Varro says, disagree among themselves on many things, as if on purpose and of set industry." **Secondly**: Venus is said to have *changed* its course, not to have *stood still*, or to have prolonged the day. And perhaps it changed [it] in that manner which the Astrologers afterward noted, and for the sake of which they devised so many eccentrics and deferents.

To the fourth [Mutius the hermit]. It seems the Sun then stood still for a short time — perhaps one hour only, or another — as is understood from the reckoning of the journey, and the Sun's setting [coming] contrary to expectation, and finally from the words of the story itself; which, since they are beautiful and fruitful, it pleases [me] to adduce here: "At a certain time, Mutius came from the desert to visit the brethren whom he himself had instructed. And when one of them was at the point [of death], it was revealed to him by the Lord that [the brother] was about to die. But the hour was now toward evening. He hastened, therefore, that he might [reach] him [in time]. But the village where the sick man lay was still far off by a [long] space. And, unwilling to enter the village by night, and at the same time meditating within himself the word of the Savior — by which He says, 'Walk while you have the light in you,' and 'he who walks in the light does not stumble' — when he saw the Sun now sinking, he said to it: 'In the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, stand still a little while in thy course, and wait for me until I come to the village.' And when [the Sun] had now begun to sink a little, it stood still in part, nor did it set before the man of God reached the village. And this was made manifest to all those who were standing there. Standing and watching the delays of the Sun in setting, all marveled what this might mean — that for so many hours the Sun did not descend to its setting. But seeing father Mutius coming from the desert, they asked him what this sign was that the Sun showed. And he answered them: 'Do you not remember the word of our Savior, saying: "If you have faith like a grain of mustard, you shall do greater signs than these"?' And when they understood that by his faith the Sun itself had stood still, they were struck with great fear; and very many of them joined themselves to his discipleship, and began to follow him."

To the fifth [Turpin]: almost more faith is to be given to Herodotus than to Turpin in history, as is shown more than once by the most Reverend and most Illustrious Baronius.

To the sixth [the Hercules fable]: let the impure fable [perish] from here — impure, [associated] with Joshua — which nevertheless I wished to touch as an argument, that I might in some manner imitate St. Augustine in the books *On the City of God*, when, from the feigned and incredible [things] which the wretched Gentiles believed, he invites them, and with them all, to believe the true and solid miracles of God. "If," he says (book 21, chapter 6), "the demons were able to exalt the works of the magicians (whom our Scripture calls 'sorcerers' and 'enchanters') so far, that the noble poet [Virgil] seemed to agree with the senses of men when he says, of a certain woman who was strong in such art:

> *She promises by [her] chants to release the minds*
>
> *of whom she will, but to send harsh cares on others;*
>
> *to stay the water in the rivers, and to turn the stars backward;*
>
> *and she rouses the nocturnal ghosts: you shall see the earth*
>
> *bellow under [her] feet, and the mountain-ashes come down from the mountains —*

how much more is God able to do [things] which to the unfaithful are incredible, but easy to His power?"

(col. 1029)

And to believing this very standstill of Joshua, [Augustine] likewise afterward invites [us] (chapter 8).

Question XXVI. When the Sun and Moon stood still, did the [other] stars and the other orbs of the heavens stand still [too]?

Someone might say that the stars and the other orbs of the heavens did not stand still, because Joshua neither asked for that, nor does the text in any way intimate [it]. Abulensis indeed disputes many things about this (questions 19, [20], 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33). But because they are Physical and Astrological [matters], I do not wish to drag so many things in here. Certainly Dionysius the Areopagite (Epistle to Polycarp) reckons either part to be probable. Nor is there doubt that, by other modes and miracles, God could have brought it about that the Sun alone rested, and the Moon alone with it. Yet I say briefly that the whole machine of the stars, and of all the heavens, stood still together with the Sun and Moon. **First**: because either a great perturbation of the celestial motions would have followed, or a huge number of many miracles would have had to be joined and heaped up [to prevent it]. But now, with all the orbs standing still together, there is no perturbation, and so many miracles need not be heaped up. St. Augustine (book 21 of the *City of God*, chapter 8), when he had brought forward from Varro the little story about the star *Vesperugo* [Venus] (cited above, question 25), continues: "What has been so arranged by the Author of the nature of heaven and earth, as the most orderly course of the stars? What is established by laws so fixed and sure? And yet, when He willed — He who rules by [His] supreme command and power what He founded — the star most notable above the rest in magnitude and splendor [Venus] changed its color and magnitude and figure, and (what is more wonderful) the order and law of its course. It assuredly then troubled the Canons of the Astrologers, if there were any then — [canons] which they have written, as it were by an unerring computation of the past and future motions of the stars, by following which they have dared to say that this, which happened concerning Lucifer [the morning star], neither before nor afterward happened." But if, together with [one] star, it could come about that all the other stars likewise changed their course with the wonted tenor and proportion, [there would be] a great avoidance of this disadvantage which St. Augustine rightly objects. Just as, if in Joshua's time there had been Astrological Ephemerides, in their calculations there would have been no error at all, no change of numbers, but only — the same numbers rightly remaining — all things would have happened one day later [than predicted], if any had been predicted. **Secondly**: the Sun and Moon are the leaders of the celestial host. Therefore, when they stood still, it is probable that all the other constellations stood still. **Thirdly**: there was no other reason for Joshua to ask the Moon to stand still, than that the concord of those stars might be preserved in [their] motion. For he sought only the Sun's light for destroying the enemy, and willed [the Sun] to be borne to its setting only after they were destroyed. But he had no need of the Moon's light; nor, had he needed it, could he have received much, since it was not yet full, nor would it delay long in setting after the Sun, as is clear from what was said in question 22. Therefore, lest the consent and harmony in the revolutions of the stars and of the other heavens should be dissolved and broken, rightly was there a rest of all.

Fourthly, [and] so it seemed [right] not only to Abulensis, in the places cited, but also to Cajetan, Masius, [and] the Coimbrans, and of old to St. Maximus [the Confessor] (in the Epistle to Thalassius), [and] to the Author *On the Marvels of Sacred Scripture* (book 2, chapter 4), whose [are] these words: "This delay of the luminaries committed nothing new in nature, although it showed some new [thing] sometimes born for [some] ministry. But that variation also disturbed nothing in the course of the year and of the remaining days, since equally the Sun and Moon, each one, rested in its own order. For if one luminary should run while the other meanwhile rested, it would throw into confusion the accustomed course of days and months and years. But while both had this delay, [the Sun] proceeded, as it were after the wonted day, to the limit of its setting. For the Moon is not commanded to stand because it then, in the presence of the Sun, profited [anything] for

the illumination of the battle, but lest anything in the fitting passage of the luminaries should be destroyed through the rest of the one and the course of the other." And a little after: "But the Moon not only rested in this station, but could not meanwhile carry on the custom of its increase or decrease. For if, while the Moon stood still, it should — though standing — carry on its increases or decreases, that lunar increase, [going] beyond the Sun's course, would disturb something in the reckonings of the cycles." And when he had reviewed the sum of all the lunar cycles, he concludes that, since the cycles agree among themselves and return without any variation, "it is manifestly understood that that delay or reversion left nothing hindered or unwonted in the accustomed course of the luminaries and of the times."

The holy Joshua, since he was knowing and skilled in the most liberal arts — but especially in Astrology — knew well enough that from the rest of the chief stars a fitting and connected rest of the others [followed], and that it would be enough if he commanded the most splendid orb of the Moon (most exposed to the eyes of mortals) to halt its step together with the Sun. But the text narrates not all things, only those which are chief; the rest it commits to [men's] thought and good reasoning — as, concerning the tide of the sea, the Author *On the Marvels* says in the cited place. Indeed the text is so fond of brevity that, although the Moon rested with the Sun (as has been said up to now from verse 13), yet [the text] repeated only the former [the Sun], not the latter [the Moon], when in the same verse 13 it said, "So the Sun stood still."

Question XXVII. From the rest of the Sun and Moon, did a rest of all things follow in the sublunary world?

It is an old axiom and decree of the Peripatetics, that all these lower [things] depend on the motion of the heavens, [and] that, [the heaven's motion] ceasing, [the motion] of these…

(col. 1031)

…[the motion] of these — all motions and changes [would cease]. But by this one example all that is clearly refuted, since, the heavens being unmoved, the motions on earth were then so great — of some fleeing, of others pursuing and striking the turned backs [of the foe]. For at such a time and in [such] a war, that I may speak Plautinely:

> *Each man, for himself, [does] that which each can and avails [to do];*
>
> *he gives forth [blows], he strikes; the weapons break; it resounds —*
>
> *the heaven [resounds] with the roar of men; from [their] breathing and panting*
>
> *a cloud forms; they fall by the force of [the] wound, and of [men's] strength.*

There is added also the authority of the good Philosophers, who deny that an agent — otherwise well disposed, and endowed with its own force — would act, if it were applied to a patient [thing] similarly disposed, while the heaven was at rest. If some matter, dry and easy to catch fire, were rightly and closely brought to fire, and the heaven suddenly ceased to turn, [they say] it would not burn. Among these Philosophers are Scotus (book 2, distinction 14, question 3); Richard [of Middleton] (in the same place, book 2, [distinction] 2, question 6); Durandus (book 2, part [of] distinction 5, question 3); Henry [of Ghent] (*Quodlibet* 11, question 15, and *Quodlibet* 14, question 1) — if it be rightly weighed; Toletus (book 2 *On Generation*, chapter 10, question 12, [reply] to 7).

Yet I would gladly employ some distinctions. **The first**: the substances which are below the Moon are either bodies, or bodily forms, or the souls of men. **The second**: the motion of the heavens is the cause of the motions which are in this sublunary orb either *universal* only, or also *particular*.

I say, therefore, **first**: the motion of the heavens ceasing, all those [things] naturally cease of which it [the heaven's motion] is the *particular* cause — for example, the particular motion of the Moon is reckoned the cause of the tides of the sea, as is explained in book 2 of the *Meteorologica*. If, therefore, the Moon be not

moved, there will be no reciprocation [ebb and flow] of those tides — which the Author *On the Marvels* teaches, in the place often cited, thus: "Since we have shown in all [respects] that the course of the sea agrees with the lunar [motion], and that [the Moon] then rested, although it is passed over in silence by the words of Scripture, does not the observable passage [tide] of those things itself proclaim it?" **Secondly**: the motion of the heavens ceasing, it is not necessary that all those [things] naturally cease of which [the heaven's motion] is the *universal* cause; because there is not, between its universal influx and the effect in lower [things], an *essential* connection — as Suárez copiously and subtly does [show] (volume 1 of the *Metaphysics*, disputation 22, *On the concurrence of the first cause*, section 5). **Thirdly**: the souls of men, if at any time they have no need of the motion of phantasms [mental images], can understand and reason while the heavens are entirely at rest. But when they do need the motion of phantasms, [these acts] for the most part pertain to those [things] of which the heaven is only the *universal* cause. But the actions of human men are "motions" only in a very broad [sense]; and therefore their ceasing too is "rest" only in a broad [sense]. On the occasion of this question, Abulensis throws in thirty-four questions about the number of the elements, [their] motions, qualities, and the like — namely from question 36 to 69. But I relegate all these general [matters] to their own place, to Physics.

Question XXVIII. How could Joshua, and the whole people, bear the weight and heat of so long a day?

Behold, the whole night Joshua the leader made [the] journey, and with [their] leader the Israelitic people. In the morning they rushed upon the enemy. And from morning right up to evening they fought — "to evening," I say, which at last came not after twelve hours, as is the custom at other times, but after twenty-four, or after twenty-six and thirty [hours]. But who [is] of so iron a body, [with] hands or feet so adamantine, that he could bear so long-lasting a labor of fighting, running, [and] slaughtering? Especially when [there was] no rest interposed, no meal, no food. There is indeed sometimes, in a great multitude, some one [person] of such bodily strength, such greatness of soul, and such endurance of labors, that he could bear two whole days, or three, [of] hunger, thirst, and all bodily exertion; but that so many [men], so different in bodies and souls, should persevere so long in these troubles and labors — that, indeed, is very unusual and very wonderful. And so we see that Jonathan bore ill the fasting enjoined by his father Saul, while Israel pursued the enemy (1 Kings [1 Samuel], chapter 14, verses 29 & 30). But I think that God — who had inspired into Joshua that thought of staying the Sun — breathed into him, and into all the rest of his soldiers, a certain bodily force, so that what they otherwise either could in no way [do], or certainly scarcely [do], they now bore most excellently. And this was either some quality infused into their bodies, or rather a supernatural and extraordinary sustaining, by divine influx, of the powers which they had naturally — so that neither were the organs of motion wearied, nor did the vital spirits either fail or grow faint. For if God could check the headlong impetus of the Sun and Moon, much more could He blunt and drive away the flux of the natural humors and spirits, and hunger, and weariness. If some natural [things] are — in one respect, [as the Greek says,] "unseen," in another "breathless," in another "untouched" — why could He not also equip the Israelites against the very troubles and necessities of [their] bodies, and would the Lord not will [it] at such a time and place? And this divine antidote [*alexipharmacon*] against weariness and hunger and thirst lasted until — [the enemy] being conquered on that day — [they] came either to Gabaon, or to some neighboring safe place, where hunger was taken away by feasting, and the bodies refreshed by sleep.

Question XXIX. Whether it is a greater miracle for the Sun to stand still, or to go back?

In his *Dog-day [Conversations]* (first colloquy), Simon Maiolus says: "That the Sun stood still was indeed an excellent miracle; but another is to be preferred to this — namely, if the Sun should go *back*." Yet I do not

see the reason for this. For the terminus *from which* and the terminus *to which*, in these circular motions, are not of themselves opposed. Then, whatever terminus you name, to which the Sun has gone back, it is certainly of such a kind that the Sun would afterward come to it, and would tend to that very [point] from which it had advanced; on the contrary…

(col. 1033)

…[the regression of the Sun by ten lines (in Hezekiah)], though accomplished, is such that in it only this seems wonderful: that the Sun returned to the same terminus by a more compendious [shorter] way, the wonted revolution being interrupted; not, however, that it *simply* returned. But for the same Sun to *stand* in whatever place and position of heaven [it may be] is *simply* wonderful. And indeed, in the motions which are called "straight," is it not as wonderful — or almost more wonderful — if a stone falling from a higher place should hang, as it were suspended, in the middle space of the air, than if it should go back up? In the motions which come about from a certain equilibrium, we see that it is more difficult to make those [things] which so move *stand still*, than to impel [them] to one side or the other. For a struck bell, when one has made an end of pulling [the rope], does not at once rest, but is agitated, and for some time still keeps moving to and fro. A wheel, once impelled, you could more quickly and easily impel to the other side than make it rest entirely from motion. But I say briefly:

First. As to the power of God, by which every miracle [comes to] be; as to the force of the Angel, the mover of the heavens; and as to the form of the celestial body itself, and its propensity to motion and rest — each miracle is *equal*. The first is clear, because there is not greater power in the one than in the other — [a power] which in every miracle is always infinite. The second is also clear, because the impression of motion upon the heaven brings no greater labor or difficulty to the Angel than the cessation of that impression. The third is clear from what was said above (question 14).

Secondly. The Joshuan standstill of the Sun seems *greater* than the Hezekian regression. **First**: because it was done imperiously [by command] by a man. **Secondly**: because it was done in a more illustrious place and manner, in the sight of all the Israelites. **Thirdly**: for the advantage and safety of more [people]. **Fourthly**: because the Joshuan day was longer. **Fifthly**: [there was] a greater novelty, and a more unusual miracle, in the Sun. **Sixthly**: because together with the Sun the Moon also stood still — not merely by some consequence, but by the same command and order of Joshua. **Seventhly**: that the miracle of the standing Sun was performed for a greater and more illustrious cause than [that] of the returning [Sun], is clear from what is narrated in 4 Kings [2 Kings] 20 and Ezechiel 38.

> *[Translator's note: the print reads "Ezechiel 38"; the Hezekiah sundial passage is Isaiah 38 (with 2 Kings 20), which Serarius cited correctly as Isaiah 38 elsewhere — a slip.]*

Question XXX. Whether on account of this miracle Joshua [is] greater than Moses?

No one, I think, can deny that the miracles and portents which Moses performed were all circumscribed within the compass of this lower world. All the plagues of Egypt, the division of the Red Sea, the food of manna, and all other things of that kind, took place in the air, the water, and the earth: nothing was ever done by him in the spheres of the heavens, nothing in the stars. Who, then, doubts that in this matter Moses is surpassed by Joshua? But [Scripture says], at the end of Deuteronomy: "There arose no more a Prophet in Israel like Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face." What certain Rabbis have fabricated on this account, I have indicated before (question 24). But others, to whom that fabrication is displeasing, answer variously. **First**. R. Joseph Albo (book of the *Foundations* [*Sefer ha-Ikkarim*], oration 3, chapter 8) [holds that Moses] excelled all the Prophets in this one [thing]:

that the imaginative power of those [other prophets] was struck first by the divine afflatus, [and] through it then the rational [power]; but in Moses, after he had once seen the Angel in the bush, the rational power [was] always struck by God without any imagination. But from those [things] which have been disputed elsewhere, it is established that on Mount Sinai there was an Angel who, bearing the person of God, spoke to Moses. And again, did he not, in the sacred approach to God, sometimes receive vocal oracles with his [own] ears, which were then suggested to the mind through the phantasy?

R. Maimon[ides] (book 2 of the *Moreh Nevuchim*) will have it that Moses performed miracles in the sight of *more* of the Israelites than any of the other Prophets — even than Joshua himself; because of him it is written, "in the sight of *all* Israel," but of Joshua [only] here (verse 12), "in the sight of Israel." But surely this is to hunt syllables too much, for the sense of both phrases is the same. For this too is said below (verses 15, 24, & 43) — that *all* Israel was now with Joshua. And indeed, was all Israel, none excepted, always present to Moses when he performed some wonderful thing? Were there always more present than now to Joshua?

The same [Maimonides], writing on the Mishnah, answers otherwise — that Moses excelled all the other Prophets in four ways. **First**: because the mind of those [others] was roused by an Angel, [but] Moses' [mind] by God alone. **Secondly**: that others beheld divine [things] in dreams, in sleep, but Moses [while] waking. **Thirdly**: that others were wont to be frightened by the divine afflatus, but Moses conferred discourses with God familiarly, as a friend with a friend. **Fourthly**: that others were not always, when they wished, divinely inspired, but Moses [was inspired] as often as it pleased him. But as to the first, I said a little before that Moses' mind too was sometimes struck by Angels through phantasms. As to the second, certain of the Prophets also received some oracles [while] waking — as often our Joshua (as we have seen up to now), and Elijah, Elisha, Jeremiah, and others. As to the third, the others were not always frightened, and Moses himself was sometimes frightened — for [in] Hebrews 12, verse 21: "I am terrified," he says, "and trembling" — as St. Jerome relates (on Amos, chapter 5) that the Apostle [Paul] knew this from tradition. As to the fourth, Moses was inspired by God when he sought and willed it; I think the same befell almost the other Prophets too, although perhaps their mind was moved much more quickly and easily than his. Yet I find none of all the Prophets who besought God to be taught and roused [by Him], nor [who] obtained [it].

Masius reckons that Moses excels all the Prophets not in the magnitude of [his] miracles, but only in [his] exceptional familiarity with God. But [others] show that the magnitude of the miracles too was regarded in that place of Deuteronomy — [namely] the words which follow there: "in all the signs and portents which [God] sent through him, to do in the land of Egypt." Wherefore I gladly descend to the explanation in St. Thomas (*Secunda Secundae*, question 174, article 4): that as to *some particulars*, some of the Prophets surpass Moses — for example, as to this very miracle of Joshua; but as to *all things regarded together*, Moses is to be preferred to all. And this Theodoret declares…

(col. 1035)

…and this Theodoret declares, that prince of the Theologians, [reckoning] the gifts and offices of the Prophets [to be] four: **First**, the clear cognition of the mind, or intellectual vision. **Secondly**, the imaginative cognition, or imaginary vision. **Thirdly**, the announcing of those [things] which have been received from God. **Fourthly**, the confirmation of the same through miracles. But these are, as I said, to be taken cumulatively, not severally — and indeed especially the three last. For whether Moses saw the essence of God (which St. Thomas asserts in the first [respect]) has been discussed in [the commentary on] Exodus.

Question XXXI. Whether the ancient writers remembered so great a miracle?

If [the question] is asked about the ancient writers whom blind Heathendom has left to us, none of them remembers this standstill. For when St. Augustine wished to gather similar [instances] to make [this] credible to the Gentiles (book 21 of the *City of God*, chapter 8), he nevertheless adduced nothing except the change of

Hesperus [the evening star], concerning which above (question 25), from Varro. And indeed, of all the things which happened before the Trojan War, there is a stupid ignorance and the deepest silence among all the Gentiles; or, if anything was stammered by them, it is most full of fables — so that Varro called the earlier ages "mythical" [μυθικά], and Diodorus Siculus acknowledges the same (at the beginning of his *Library*), [as do] Ptolemy (in the *Almagest*) [and] Plutarch (in [the lives of] Theseus, Numa, Aristides, and others). But if any ancient writers whatever — even Israelites — are sought, one is cited by the Latin and Hebrew text itself (verse 13): "Is not this written," it says, "in the book of the Just [Jasher]?" The Seventy do not indeed have it in this place, but other Greek [copies do], as is understood from Theodoret (question 13). But to me it seems in no way probable, what Arias insinuates — that perhaps this book was written by a Heathen. For the old Scripture never cites Gentiles, nor would it wish to give the Jews — then still weak, and too prone to the superstitions of the Gentiles — any occasion of reading them. And that this book is much later than Joshua's times is understood from 2 Kings [2 Samuel], chapter 1, verse 18, where it is said that there is written in the same [book] about the sad slaughter of Saul and Jonathan. And so that appears [to be true] which I said in the Prolegomena: that certain clauses were added to this Book [of Joshua] by later [writers] — not, however, [that] it was written by some one of [those] later [men], as nevertheless Theodoret here judges (question 13), when he explains why our Joshuan [author] cites that book. The words are: "The author, wishing to teach us the power of this Prophet — namely, that by a word alone he had checked the advance of the great luminaries, until he should conquer, for the dignity of [his] command — suspecting lest anyone should not give credence to the words, said that this is found in an ancient record." Wherefore it is established from this place that some one of the later [men] wrote this [other] book, the occasion being taken from another book.

Question XXXII. Who [is] the "Book of the Just" cited in the text?

Cajetan pronounces that it is not clear; but I read nine opinions of others. **The first**: that it is the book of a certain [man] who is called *Jashar*, that is, "upright." So Calvin, in his Latin text. **The second**: [the opinion] of Calvin's Genevan disciples, in their French version — that it is the book of an author who is called "director" or "corrector"; for they translate, "Qui n'est pas escrit au livre du droiturier" ["Is it not written in the book of the upright one?"]. **The third**: [the opinion] of the Talmudists (in the tractate *On Foreign Worship* [*Avodah Zarah*]), and of the book which is called *Bereshith Rabbah*, and of our Lyranus — that it is Genesis itself. **The fourth**: [the opinion] of Radak — that it is the Pentateuch; and it seems [to be that] of the Chaldaean Paraphrast [Targum], when he says, "Is not this written in the book of the Law?" **The fifth**: of certain [authors] in Abulensis (questions 84 & 85) — that it is the twelve Minor Prophets. **The sixth**: in the same place — that it is the Prophet Habakkuk himself. **The seventh**: of Abulensis himself (question 86) — that it is a certain book constructed by Moses, about past and future things, very similar to our Apocalypse. **The eighth**: of Masius — that it is ancient commentaries of deeds done, or Annals; and Junius and Tremellius embrace this in [their] annotation on this place. **The ninth**: of Arias Montano — that the book is [a book] "of the upright," or "of the upright and equitable," or, as our [Latin] translates in the plural, "the book of the just" — because, in just and equitable

domestic matters, it teaches about the highest benefits of God toward men, and about their offices and ceremonies toward Him. For in chapter 1, verse 18 [of 2 Samuel], by the Seventy it is called τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ εὐθοῦς (*to biblion tou euthous*) — that is, "of the upright"; and among us [books] are called "books of duties" which are about duties. But although Arias said that the same [book] could have been written by Gentiles — which I disapproved in the previous question — yet he himself prefers [to think] it was rather penned by some one of the Israelites.

Question XXXIII. Whether the [things] which our text adduces from the cited Book of the Just are poetic, and verses?

Masius and Arias affirm [it]. And the latter [Arias] indeed (page 317) says chiefly four [things]. **The first**: that all the books of Moses, and all the others which are called by the Hebrews the "former Prophets," were composed not in loose [prose], but in speech bound by feet and verses. **The second**: that the Book of the Upright likewise consists of verses. **The third**: that it is nevertheless different from the foregoing, because the reckoning of the meters is different. **The fourth**: that these [things] are manifest to those who have joined to the study of the sacred tongue [Hebrew] the knowledge of poetry. But Masius hands down five [things]. **The first**: he notes three verses here (verse 13) — two indeed in the words which precede those of which [is] the discourse here, "Is it not written," etc., and a third after. The first is:

> *Sun, in Gabaon, rest; and Moon, in the valley of Aijalon.*

The second:

> *And the Sun rested, and the Moon stood still, until the nation should stand against its enemies.*

The third:

> *And the Sun stood in the midst of heaven, and hastened not to set, as on a complete day.*

The second [of Masius's points]: at this time these meters are scarcely known. **The third**: in St. Jerome's time they were still known, as is clear from him, and from the Rabbis of the same time, in the Talmudic tractate *Sopherim*. **The fourth**, of himself, thus: "I indeed have put — for why should I not confess my curiosity — not a little study into finding out that matter, but in vain. For without one to point the way beforehand, I see that I perceive nothing sufficiently certain about the numbers of the Hebrew syllables, and therefore nothing about the measures and modes of the verses." **The fifth**: in today's Hebrew [copies] the [reading] of these verses is faulty…

(col. 1037)

…[the reading] is [faulty]; because the two [words] which in [verses] 2 and 3 are redundant ought to be transferred to the first, where they are lacking — so that, namely, in the first there be read *haseth mesh & ha-yareach*; in the second, *shemesh* [not *tashemesh*]; in the third, *shamaim* [not *ha-shamaim*].

But I say. **First**: the verses of the Poets do indeed consist of feet and meters; yet not [everything] which consists of these is [therefore] poetic and verse — as is clear from Cicero (book 3 *On the Orator*, and from the book entitled *Orator* ["The Perfect Orator"]), where he teaches that loose prose discourse [too] is rhythmical and built up with certain feet. And St. Jerome (in the preface to Job) hands down that there are certain loose [arrangements] of feet; and likewise St. Augustine, in the books *On Music*.

II. In Sacred Scripture there are meters and feet, and there are also *poetic* verses. The former part is clear from what has just been said; the latter is handed down by Josephus (book 1, last chapter), when he says that Moses, at the last time of his life, left to the Israelites a *hexameter meter* (μέτρον ἑξάμετρον), which he left in the sacred codex. This, then, is either Deuteronomy, or rather that part of Deuteronomy which is [in] chapter 32 [the Song of Moses]. But that Deuteronomy was written in iambic tetrameters, the same St. Jerome says (in the Epistle to Paula of the City), as will appear below; and the Venerable Bede (in the book *On the Metrical Art*, volume 1, pages 46, 53, & 58). Philo (book *On the Contemplative Life*) says that ancient *trimeter* songs existed, made then in various kinds of meters; just as Plato (book 2 *On the Laws*) said that the most ancient songs of the Egyptians were poems of Isis. Concerning the book of Job, the same St. Jerome [says] thus, in the preface to it: "From the beginning of the volume up to the words of Job, among the Hebrews it is prose. But from the words of Job, in which he says, 'Let the day perish in which I was born, and the night in which it was said, A man is conceived,' up to that place where, before the end of the volume, it is written, 'Therefore I reprehend myself, and do penance in dust and ashes' — they are *hexameter verses*, running with dactyl and spondee, and, on account of the idiom of the language, frequently taking in also other feet, not of the same syllables, but of the same times [quantities]. Sometimes, too, a sweet and tinkling

rhythm is produced, [though] freed from the numbers of the feet — which the metrically-skilled understand better than the simple reader." And (Epistle 113): "It begins [as] prose; it glides into verse; it ends in pedestrian [prose] speech." St. Augustine (book 4 *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 20): "That discipline of Music, in which this rhythm is found, was so far not lacking to our Prophets, that the most learned man Jerome mentions even the meters of certain [of them] — only in the Hebrew language; whose truth, that he might preserve it in the words, he did not translate these [meters] from there." Suidas, on the same Job: "You have the book of this Philosopher singing with much both Homeric and Platonic nightingale-subtlety." Whether the Psalms are true songs, Alphonsus Mendoza disputed in a special question. But about these and other [things], let us hear the same St. Jerome. He, in the Epistle to Paula of the City, cited a little before, [says]: "You must know that in the earlier Psalms, by single letters [acrostics], single little verses are appended, which consist of iambic trimeter. But the later ones consist of iambic tetrameter, as also the Canticle of Deuteronomy is written. In the hundred-and-eighteenth Psalm, single letters are followed by eight verses [each]. In the hundred-and-forty-fourth, single letters are assigned to single verses. There are those who think that others also begin in this order [are acrostic], but their opinion is false. You have also, in the Lamentations of Jeremiah, four alphabets [acrostics], of which the two former

are written, as it were, in Sapphic meter — because a heroic comma concludes the three little verses which are connected together and begin with one and the same letter. But the third Alphabet is written in trimeter, and the [verses] begin with [groups of] three letters, but three verses [begin] with the same [letters]. The fourth Alphabet is similar to the first and second. The Proverbs of Solomon, too — their last [section] closes an alphabet which is reckoned in iambic tetrameter, from that place where it says, 'A valiant woman, who shall find?'" In the Preface to Eusebius's *Chronicle*: "What is more melodious than the Psalter? — which, after the manner of our Flaccus [Horace] and of the Greek Pindar, now runs in iambus, now sounds in Alcaic, now swells in Sapphic, now advances with a half-foot. What [more solemn] than the Canticle of Deuteronomy and of Isaiah? What graver than Solomon? What more perfect than Job? — all of which run, among their [own people], composed in hexameter and pentameter verses, as Josephus and Origen write." In the Preface to Job: "If it seems incredible to anyone that there are meters among the Hebrews, and that — after the manner of our Flaccus, and the Greek Pindar, and Alcaeus, and Sappho — either the Psalter, or the Lamentations of Jeremiah, or almost all the songs of the Scriptures, are comprised [in meter]: let him read Philo, Josephus, Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea, and by their testimony he will prove that I speak the truth." [So Jerome] also saw [it], in the prefaces to the Lamentations, to Isaiah, [and] to the books of Kings; [and] Eusebius (book 1 of the *Preparation* [*Praeparatio Evangelica*], chapter 11); and the Rabbis, in the place cited from the Talmud.

III. This ancient reckoning of the verses, which is said to be in the Scriptures, is *not today thoroughly understood*. For although Arias, in his fourth point, seems to censure the ignorance of those who say this, yet among these [admittedly] ignorant — even after many and grave labors put into that study — we have heard Masius candidly professing his own name [admitting his ignorance], in his fourth point. Bellarmine professes [the same] (last chapter of the *Grammar*); Genebrardus (on Psalm 4); Radak (on the same Psalm); the Talmudists (in the cited tractate *On Scribes* [*Sopherim*]); Arias Montano himself (on Isaiah, chapter 5). But let me add the words of R. Moses Habib, as Genebrardus translated and illustrated them (book 1 of the *Chronology*): "The sacred songs of the ancients," he says, "as in the Psalms, Job, [and] Proverbs, are *distichs*. But some are measured by a certain number of syllables, so that the former verse is now longer, now shorter than the latter, as the genius of the composer bore [it]. Others consist of an equal measure — except that sometimes the former verse differs from the latter in the number of syllables, but not of times. For that difference they supply by the consonance of the ears and the motions of the gutturals, or they absorb the inequality of the voice by [its] charm and melody — as when, among the Latins and Greeks, for an iambus a tribrach, for a spondee a dactyl or anapaest, for a dactyl a proceleusmatic, etc., is put." He afterward illustrates this by examples — as from Psalm 119[, and] 146, Proverbs, and Job 6. But I said that that ancient

poetry is not today thoroughly understood, on account of another, more recent [system] now in use among the Rabbis, which R. David Yahya explained in one little book, and Bellarmine in the place cited.

IV. I judge that the Book of the Just either consisted *wholly* of verses, or [at least] a great part [of it]; because elsewhere too, when it is cited (2 Kings [2 Samuel], chapter 1, verse 18), its language is poetic, and after the manner of verses — painted and sonorous — just as also that which is cited from the Book of Wars (Numbers, chapter 21). Yet I would rather here confess that something in its meters is obscure and unknown to me, than, with Masius, to transfer anything from one place to another, only in order that a verse may at last be feigned [made] known to me.

(col. 1039)

Question XXXIV. Why is the same Book of the Just cited by the text?

Theodoret said before (question 31) that it was cited so that more credence might be won, among some [readers], for this wonderful and portentous history about the Sun. Arias too confesses the same, at first (page 317), when he says: "We judge that this passage was taken from another of the sacred books, for the sake of testimony and attestation; and we have learned that this is observed in the narrations of the greatest events." But afterward (page 318) he seems to deny this, and to affirm that it is cited only so that the [things] which were in that Book of the Just — [being] obscure on account of the poetic style — might be explained: "Along with the other [things]," he says, "of the writings of histories and disciplines, these too are not in [our] hands, which nevertheless in those times had been most widely-known and most-sung — so that they were sought as testimony in the [making of the] sacred narrations; and that not for the sake of producing belief, but rather of confirming and explaining the truth narrated in those books. For those [things] which were contained in writings of this kind, because they had been sung in the poetic kind of speech, were held [to be] less clear, on account of [their] tropes and figures — which is seen by this very example produced in this narration." Yet nothing prevents both causes from being rightly joined. For although the sacred letters need no external support to win belief for themselves, yet sometimes — out of regard for certain [persons] who are much moved even by foreign testimonies, and for the sake of fuller explanation — these [testimonies] are rightly employed, as was done by St. Paul, when he cited the poets Aratus (Acts 17) and Callimachus (as Origen will have it, book 3 *Against Celsus*), or rather Epimenides (as is clear from Plato, book 1 *On the Laws*, Cicero *On Divination*, and Diogenes Laërtius), [in the Epistle] to Titus, chapter 1, verse 12.

Question XXXV. Does the Book of the Just exist? Or, how did it perish?

This Book of the Just does not exist, nor has it existed for a long time, as is clear from Theodoret (question 13) and other ancients. But [a book] of the same title, *Sepher ha-Yashar*, is found today, written by another — by Rabbenu Tam — in which [the matter] is treated learnedly, and not at all in a vulgar manner (Masius being the judge, in the catalogue of his Library), concerning the foundations and mysteries of divine worship. But how that [original Book] perished is uncertain — as Aben Ezra says concerning the Book of Wars, in Numbers 21. To Aben Ezra it seems to have perished, together with many others, through the injury of times and ages — especially since the Jews were so harassed by wars, captivities, and calamities, and dragged off to various shores. Of these [losses] the Rabbis indeed sometimes relate that even many sacred and canonical books, because they were judged less necessary, were burned by Ezra and the teachers of the same age, and other Prophets. But about this I have already treated elsewhere, in the Biblical Prolegomena.

Question XXXVI. Whither, how, and when did the victorious Israelites return from the slaughter of the enemy?

First. A twofold terminus, to which the victorious Israelites returned from the slaughter of the enemy, is noted in the text: the former, Gilgal (verse 15); the latter, Maceda (verse 21). But there is here no little difficulty: how they returned to Gilgal *before* Maceda, since that [Gilgal] was farther off, and how they could do this on the same day? Abulensis answers that the return to Gilgal is here placed *by anticipation* [proleptically], since it [actually] followed afterward, as is narrated at the very end of this chapter [verse 43]. Others say [it is] the same matter, but [explain it] otherwise — namely, that from this verse 15 up to that last [verse], 43, there is a continuous *hyperbaton* [transposition]. To me it seems that Joshua, with all Israel — except a few who had not yet returned, and [who] were still pressing upon the enemy — was already on the return toward Gilgal; but, hearing what

was reported about the hiding-place of the Kings, and the number and dispersion of the remaining enemy, [he] suddenly took another counsel, as is explained in verse 17 and following. And so, while he ordered [them] to pursue the enemy further, he commanded that all should afterward, when the retreat was sounded, assemble at Maceda. And so, on that very day, there was no return to Gilgal, nor was the journey toward [Gilgal] continued on the way; but the nightly halt was near Maceda. And therefore, without [resorting to] anticipation or hyperbaton, I thus interpret verse 15: "Joshua *was returning* with all Israel into the camp [at] Gilgal." Into nearly the same opinion — but otherwise — Masius, not badly, [interprets] thus: "He was resolving to return," as below, [in] verse 21.

Secondly. They returned, moreover, from the slaughter of the enemy *before* the setting of the Sun. For after the halt was made near Maceda, they dragged the captured adversary Kings to Joshua (verses 23, 24), and hanged them (verse 26); and then for the first time the Sun set (verse 27).

Thirdly. The whole army returned to Joshua at Maceda — where the camp then was — in [its] whole number, safe and sound (verse 21). The camp there was sudden [improvised], and chosen for the brief halt of that evening time and night. For otherwise the true camp still always clung at Gilgal, as is clear from what has been said. But it was a great and evident miracle, and a help of God, that in so great a battle against so many Kings and so great a multitude — and in so great a pursuit of the scattered enemy — none at all of the Israelites was missing, neither in the first assault nor thereafter, as [in] Numbers 31, verse 49. And here is added: "And no one dared to mutter against Israel." In Hebrew: "No one moved his tongue against the children of Israel — not even one man"; so far was anyone from daring to throw a dart, brandish a spear, [or] draw a sword. Or, if it please, let the proverb of the Hebrews be taken here, [a dog] being understood — as if it said: so far were the Chananaean enemies from being able to harm the Israelites in anything, that not even a dog could bark or mutter anything against any of them, as [in] Exodus 11, verse 7, [and] Judith 11, verse 15. Origen (homily 12) wrongly thought that it is here said that none of the Israelites themselves muttered. Although…

(col. 1041)

[Although] one may indeed gather from it a good lesson — that all boasting and talk about deeds gloriously done is to be avoided, concerning which [see] St. Bernard (sermon 8 on the Psalm "He who dwells" [Ps. 90/91]) — yet that is not [the sense], as the meaning of this passage has appeared.

Question XXXVII. What did the conquered enemy, and the enemy Kings, do [and] suffer?

First. The conquered enemy fled: they were cut down by a great slaughter, and almost consumed to the point of annihilation; but those who were able to escape entered fortified cities (verse 20). For they were all from the neighboring [places], both cities and locations, as appeared above (question 1 and following).

Secondly. But their five Kings, while they took counsel for themselves by flight, hid themselves in a certain cave or cavern near the city of Maceda (verse 16). But by Joshua's order its mouth was blocked with huge

stones, so that no exit might lie open for them; and lest they should be snatched away by their own [men] — a band being formed and the stones removed — many guards were set [over them], whom our text calls "industrious" — either from someone's marginal annotation (since the Hebrew and Greek call them only "men"), or from some force of the Hebrew word, which sometimes signifies "a man" and "a strong man," and from the combined circumstance of this passage. But afterward, by the order of the same Joshua, they were drawn out from there, [and] led to him (verses 22, 23), [and] trodden under the feet of the princes (verse 24). And this — in the conquered — [was] a token of extreme servitude and ignominy; in the conquerors, of the highest victory and dominion, as both ancient statues and histories indicate. Whence, in Psalm 90[/91:13]: "Thou shalt walk upon the asp and the basilisk, and thou shalt trample the lion and the dragon." And God willed this to be done not for the sake of cruelty, but of justice and wisdom. Of justice, indeed, that He might inflict deserved punishments on the impious; and of wisdom, that He might give courage to the Israelites, and raise [them] to a great hope of certainly obtaining the divine promises. For hence [comes] that exhortation (verse 25): "Do not fear, nor be dismayed; take courage, and be strong: for thus shall the Lord do to all your enemies, against whom you fight." And from this Thomas of Cantimpré (book 2, chapter 53) proves — or rather admonishes — that all vices are to be trodden under by us. But afterward the same Kings were struck and killed by the same Joshua — not by sword or wound, but, as is added, by the gibbet [cross] and the noose. For the five Kings were hanged upon five trees or stakes, as was said above (chapter 8, question 10) concerning the King of Ai. But at length, the Sun having now set, they were taken down from the gibbet (verses 26, 27) — for the cause handed down in the same [commentary], chapter 8, question 11; and their corpses were carried back into the former cave, with huge stones rolled and heaped up against its mouth — not now lest they should get out, but lest they should ever be drawn out by any [of their own people] to more honorable tombs, or by others to greater insult, and [so] be left entirely unburied. [This was done] also for a perpetual monument of so great a matter, [a cave] which, by the clause added to the text (verse 27), is reported to have remained up to its [writer's] own time. See above, chapter 8, question 12.

(col. 1042)

Question XXXVIII. For this victory, did Joshua sing any song?

The Chaldaean Paraphrast [Targum], at the beginning of chapter 1 of the Canticles [Song of Songs], says: "Ten songs were uttered in this age, and this song" (the Song of Songs, namely) "is more praiseworthy than all of them. The **first** song Adam uttered, at the time when his sin was remitted him: and the Sabbath day came, and protected him; he opened his mouth, and said the Psalm of the song of the Sabbath day [Ps. 92]. The **second** song Moses uttered, with the children of Israel, at the time when the Ruler of the age divided for them the reedy sea [the Red Sea]: they all opened their mouth, and all together said a song; for so it is written, 'Then Moses sang, and the children of Israel' [Exod. 15]. The **third** song the children of Israel uttered, at the time when the well of water was given them; for so it is written, 'Then Israel sang' [Num. 21:17]. The **fourth** song the Prophet Moses uttered, when his time came to be dissolved from this age, and he rebuked in it the house of Israel; for so it is written, 'Hear, O heavens, and I will speak' [Deut. 32]. The **fifth** song Joshua, son of Nun, uttered, when he engaged in battle at Gabaon, and the Sun and Moon stood still for him thirty-six hours, and ceased to say [their] song; he opened his mouth and uttered a song; for so it is written, 'Then Joshua sang before the Lord.' The **sixth** song Barak and Deborah uttered, on the day when the Lord delivered Sisera and his army into the hand of the children of Israel; for so it is written, 'And Deborah sang, and Barak, son of Abinoam' [Judges 5]. The **seventh** song Hannah uttered, at the time when a son was given her from before the Lord; for so it is written, 'And Hannah prayed in prophecy, and said' [1 Sam. 2]. The **eighth** song David, King of Israel, uttered, for all the miracles which the Lord did for him: he opened his mouth and uttered a song; for so it is written, 'And David sang in prophecy before the Lord' [2 Sam. 22]. The **ninth** song Solomon, King of Israel, uttered in the prophetic spirit, before the Lord, the Ruler of the whole age [the Song of Songs]. The **tenth** song the children of the captivity shall utter, when they shall have gone

out from their captivity; for it is written, and declared by the hand of the Prophet Isaiah: 'This song shall be to you for joy, as in the night in which the solemnity of the Passover was sanctified, and gladness of heart as of the people who walk, that they may appear before the Lord three times in the year, with the instruments of musicians and the voice of the horn-trumpet, that they may go into the mountain of the Lord, and serve the most strong God of Israel'" [Isa. 30:29].

In this same number of songs all the Rabbis sing in chorus [agree], and especially the author of the *Mekilta*. But I indeed in no way doubt that Joshua, and the whole people [with him], gave the greatest thanks to God. Yet the words of this chapter do not sound forth this song, from which the Rabbis, with that Chaldaean [Targumist], express it. For they are [the words of] verse 12, "Then Joshua spoke," as was shown above (question 17). I now add the words placed here, "Sun, against Gabaon move not" — spoken forth by Joshua *before* the victory, as the Rabbis also seem to speak of that [song] which they attribute to him. But our question is about a Song that was sung *for the sake of the victory already won*. Yet perhaps in the Book of Jashar, or "of the Upright," there existed some notable song of Joshua to God, bound in verse, by which he gave thanks for so many and so great benefits, miracles, and portents in this battle,…

(col. 1043)

…and interwove [in song] the whole series of the history, or its chief points, as is wont to be done in songs of that kind. For these [things] would seem sufficiently consonant both with what was said before about the poetry of this book, and with the custom usual in such a matter.

Question XXXIX. On certain moral [lessons]?

First. Those whom one receives into [one's] faith, fellowship, and protection, one ought to guard diligently and swiftly, when the matter and need demands — as our Joshua did, who procrastinated in nothing, but made the whole night's journey, keeping watch, with his men. In Livy (Decade 1, book 3), when alarmed messengers had come to Rome from Tusculum [reporting] that the Aequi were [as] enemies in the Tusculan territory, the merit of the Tusculan people caused shame at delaying help; both Consuls were at once sent with an army, overcame the enemy, [and] freed the allies.

Second. If, for the sake of bringing help to the *bodies* of allies, our Joshua rightly undertook so much speed, watchfulness, [and] labor, how much ought to be undertaken by all Joshua-like [men], that they may aid the *souls* of [their] neighbors — to free them from the most foul Kings of the Chananaeans (that is, of the evil demons), from [their] assault and siege?

Third. The good author of civil doctrine [Lipsius] (book 5, chapter 15): "In war, I praise foresight in a leader; but cautious and delaying leaders will commit themselves to fortune in no place, except so far as necessity compels. I despise indeed those who do everything fiercely and over-hastily, and [who are] better at despising than at guarding against enemies — though often pleasing to the common crowd, because, to the stupid or barbarous, delay [seems] servile, [and] to execute at once [seems] kingly." These [things] are most true. But [it is] neither fiercely nor over-hastily [that he acts], who postpones his own convenience to necessity, who prefers the safety of [his] allies to his own security and quiet — who, finally, has God as [his] rouser and helper, and consults Him first through prayers, prudent deliberation, counsel, and sedulous circumspection of all things. And in this [sense] all delay is truly servile, but to execute at once is truly kingly. He [acts] not, as Caesar once [said], "I came, I saw, I conquered," but as the most praiseworthy Emperor of our age — when he subdued the Kings and petty Kings of the heretics in the year 1547 — that Charles the Fifth said: "I came, I saw, *God* conquered."

Fourth. In all dangers, even those of war, one must approach God with great confidence, and with earnest prayers. For if it shall be expedient, He will dishearten the enemy with panic terrors, [and] hurl upon them stones of hail from the heavens; He will command at will the elements, and even the heavens themselves, and

the Angels set over the heavens. The histories of Christians are full of celestial commands and helps of this kind. 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 7, verse 10: "And it came to pass, when Samuel was offering the holocaust, [that] the Philistines began battle against Israel; but the Lord thundered with a great crash on that day over the Philistines, and terrified them, and they were cut down by the children of Israel." [It is] well-known, from Eusebius (book 5 of the *History*, chapter 5) [and] Tertullian (in the *Apology*, and *To Scapula*), how a legion of Christians by [their] prayers obtained rain for its army, and lightnings against the enemy —

so that on that account it was surnamed, by the Emperor Antoninus (Gentile though he was), κεραυνοβόλος (*keraunobolos*), "the lightning-hurler" [the Thundering Legion]. How, against the formidable forces of the Persians besieging Nisibis, did St. James, the Bishop of that city, send an immense force of flies and gnats? How, against Attila, when he was besieging Orléans, did St. Aignan the Bishop rouse up thunders and lightnings? How, at the pious supplication of Theodosius, did the Lord do those [things] which Sozomen relates (book 7), and on account of which the Gentile Poet [Claudian] exclaims (book 1, on the third consulship of Honorius):

> *O too-beloved of God! for whom Aeolus pours forth*
>
> *armed storms from [his] caves; for whom the upper air does military service;*
>
> *and the winds come, conspired together, at the [trumpet-]call.*

But in the books of Maccabees (1 Macc. ch. 6; 2 Macc. ch. 10), in the former Anti-Turkish Oration, and in Judith, [there is] more about this.

Fifth. The Sun and Moon — bodies destitute of all reason, sense, and life — at once obey the nod of God. And shall man, distinguished with life, sense, [and] reason, be disobedient to His so many and so luminous admonitions and precepts?

Sixth. The Lord obeys the voice of a man. And will man not obey the words of the Lord? O the pride! O the madness! Nay, let us men rather obey gladly and eagerly even the voice of [other] men, for God's sake. And even now, in the consecration of the [Eucharistic] Sacrament, God seems wholly to obey the voice of a man, as our Osorius explains (volume 4, sermon on the return of Spain from the English war, page 203).

Seventh. The Sun and Moon stood still, so that the Israelites might conquer their enemies. But for us they are even now moved assiduously and perpetually — lest we be conquered by our [enemies] — by a certain beautiful and holy alternation; and afterward, for all eternity, they shall stand still, that they may furnish to the conquerors a most pleasant light and glory, without any danger, labor, or fear (Isaiah 30:26).

Eighth. The Rabbis who say that the Sun sings a solemn song to God each day, and in that manner which I expounded above, teach indeed how good, holy, and useful is the custom of those who, when they hear the clocks striking each hour, praise God with some brief little prayer — whether with the mouth or only with the heart — and say, for example, "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit; as it was in the beginning of the past hour, so now in the beginning of this [hour], and always, and unto the ages of ages, Amen." Or, if perchance one is very busy, let him, with the swiftest lifting of [his] mind to God, say at least this: "And now — [it is] always to be understood — glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit," as he willed it to be in the morning or at other times before. Or indeed any other similar [ejaculation] — as among the more pious Germans that [prayer]: "May God give us a happy hour."

Ninth. The Sun, among the Hebrews, is called *shemesh*; among the Chaldaeans, *shimsha* — so that by its very name it may at once display and show what its nature is, what [its] office, what [its] occupation. For *shamash* is "to minister, to perform a duty, and to serve" (Genesis 14; 1 Kings [1 Samuel] 16; Daniel 7). Whence also, in the new Syriac Testament, *meshamshana* is "a minister [deacon]." Away, then, with all those blind and unhappy [men] — whether Heathen or heretics — who thought the Sun, [or] Phoebus, [to be] God. And away, too, with those among the Philosophers who [hold] that it is moved by God not freely, but

necessarily…

(col. 1045)

…[those who hold] that [the Sun] is moved by God not freely, but by necessity. It is the *minister* of God, and a minister for the use of men. God, most freely, by His own decision, commands that it be moved; and, like a good minister, it at once complies. Does He command it to stand? It, like a most obedient minister, at once stands. Does He command it to shine? It shines (Genesis 1). To withdraw its light? It withdraws it (Matthew 27). To run forward? It runs (Genesis 1). To run backward? It runs back (Isaiah 38). "When you see the Sun rising," says St. Chrysostom (homily to the people of Antioch), "admire the Creator. When you see it hiding itself and vanishing, learn the weakness of [its] nature, and do not adore it as God. For God inserted the demonstration of the weakness of nature not from this [the eclipse] alone, but also commanded all His servants [the heavenly bodies] to obey [men's] commands — so that, if not from their appearance, then from their servitude, you might recognize, and from those who command them might learn, that they are all your fellow-servants." Therefore Joshua says, "Let the Sun stand against Gabaon, and the Moon against the valley of Aijalon." And again the Prophet Isaiah made it go back in the contrary [direction], under King Hezekiah. Let us imitate that Sun. Those great and illustrious Suns of the earth, the Apostles, imitated it — who, at the voice of Christ Jesus, now indeed remained at Jerusalem in Judaea (Acts 1), now ran through and back over the whole circuit of this world and illumined it; and, when the Lord willed, left it in darkness, and as it were in an eclipse of its errors (Acts 16, verse 6).

Tenth. How inconstant is the fortune of kings! The five Kings of the Chananaeans — a little before so powerful, hedged about with so great a retinue, so formidable to the Gabaonites, abounding in such great resources and troops of soldiers — how, in a brief moment of time, are they broken, abandoned, trembling, helpless, and alone? They who, in splendid palaces, on thrones gleaming with gold and bronze, by a mere nod ordered others to be shut up in prisons and darkness — behold, now, miserably fleeing, they seek out a dark cave and hide themselves in it; there, if it were permitted them to remain [safe] from the enemy, they would reckon themselves happy and blessed. Hear the most wholesome chorus in Seneca's *Thyestes* (act 3):

> *You to whom the ruler of sea and earth*
> *has given the great right of death and life,*
> *lay aside [your] puffed-up and swollen looks.*
> *Whatever a lesser [man] dreads from you,*
> *a greater Lord threatens against you.*
> *Every kingdom is under a heavier kingdom.*
> *Whom the rising day has seen in pride,*
> *the setting day has seen laid low.*
> *Let no one trust too much in prosperity;*
> *let no one despair of better things when fallen.*
> *Clotho mingles these with those, and forbids*
> *fortune to stand still: she whirls every fate.*
> *No one has had the gods so favorable*
> *that he could promise himself a tomorrow.*
> *God turns our affairs, hurried along*
> *in a swift eddy.*

See, afterward, how these [kings] were trodden under and hanged.

Eleventh. While one presses a great affair, it is not [the part] of a prudent [man] to delay for the sake of some lesser [matter], and to be held back by it. Joshua heard that the five Kings were in the cave; if he had at once run to them, a great occasion for cutting down the enemy would have slipped away. But he does not [do so]. That [report], indeed,

he hears most gladly; and, lest the chance slip away, he most prudently provides by setting guards [over the cave]; yet he does not prefer a little portion of the victory to the whole, and goes on to press his well-begun [pursuit]. We, most imprudent — when we ought to seek the eternal goods in this world — cling to the perishable and fleeting [things]; an empty human glory holds us back from the divine and solid [one]; slight and deceitful little pleasures [hold us back] from the greatest and truest pleasures of the blessed. Like that ancient Medea, the devil deals with us: he scatters on the way [things] by love of which we are too much seized, that we may be occupied in gathering them, and held back, and fall away from our purpose. Let us therefore think that [word] said to us by our true Joshua (verse 19): "But you, do not stand still, but pursue the enemy," etc.

Twelfth. How happy a panoply [full armor] for men is the help of God! Not even one of the Israelites perished in so great a war, but all returned to the camp with peace and safety. Foolish and silly men seek, against the strokes of swords and guns, amulets — superstitious papers and periapts [charms worn on the body], by the appearance of which the demon sometimes (that he may the more bewitch them) averts some blows and wounds; but afterward, when he holds them wholly ensnared in his nets, he keeps them weighed down with the gravest sins, and brings death upon them — both of the body (the temporal [death] which they wished to flee) and of the soul (the everlasting [one], about which they did not trouble themselves) — as a great supply of examples among soldiers and very many others affords; of which our Del Rio brings forth two (book 2 of the *Magical Disquisitions*, question 21). What is narrated among the Poets — that Achilles, because he had been dipped in the Stygian waters, was invulnerable except in the heel, which drank in the wound and death — has its place in these superstitious and vain men, who arm themselves against swords and gun-barrels with characters [magic signs] and periapts: namely, they immerse themselves in the Stygian waters [and] hand themselves over to the power of the devil; and yet in the heel — that is, at the last time of life — they receive a wound and death. But he whom God guards, to whom He wills to be favorable, can — if it conduces to his salvation and to the glory of God Himself — be wounded in no part of his body, and returns safe and unharmed from every battle. Let such a one say, with confident mind, from Psalm 26 [27]: "The Lord is my light and my salvation: whom shall I fear? The Lord is the protector of my life: of whom shall I be afraid? While the harmful draw near upon me, to eat my flesh — [those] my enemies who trouble me have themselves been weakened and have fallen. If camps stand together against me, my heart shall not fear; if a battle rise up against me, in this will I hope." And from Psalm 36 [37]: "The unjust shall perish together; the remnants of the impious shall perish. But the salvation of the just is from the Lord, and He is their protector in the time of tribulation. And the Lord will help them and free them; and He will rescue them from sinners and will save them, because they have hoped in Him." See the harmony [synopsis], book 1 of Maccabees, chapter 4, folio 644.

Thirteenth. Since our whole life must be a fight against the Chananaeans, the Kings of the lower world, that [thing] must be striven for from God by prayers, even most earnestly: that, when the whole battle has been fought, none of us may be found to have fallen, none be missing, none be mutilated in any member by some sin not healed by penance,…

(col. 1047)

…or be wounded. "You see," says Origen (homily 12), "that he who serves as a soldier under Jesus ought to return unharmed from the battle, and ought nowhere, from the fiery [darts] of the malignant one, to receive a wound — [ought] not to be polluted in heart, not stained in thought; not, through anger, through desire, or through any other occasion whatever, to give place to the demonic wounds."

Fourteenth. But the dogs mutter against us — envious heretics, slanderers; they put forth venomous tongues against us; they fabricate accusations [and] load [us] with lies. This must be borne patiently; and it is scarcely [to be] prayed against — that it not happen — except out of pity for them. For to whom of the saints has this privilege [of immunity] been given? Even Christ the Lord was called "a gluttonous man and a wine-drinker" (Matthew 11, verse 19), and likewise a raiser-up of demons "by Beelzebub" (the same St. Matthew, chapter 12, verse 24), [and] "having a demon" (John 7, verse 20). "Blessed are you," says the Lord, "when men shall have reviled you, and persecuted you, and said all evil against you, lying, for my sake: because your reward is copious in the heavens. For so they persecuted the Prophets who were before you" [Matt. 5:11–12]. Yet these dogs never mutter effectively — so as, namely, to prove what they lie about. They bark and bay, but in vain. Truth can only be pressed [down], not crushed. Psalm 30 [31]: "I have become like a broken vessel, for I have heard the reviling of many dwelling round about. While they came together against me, they took counsel to take my life. But I have hoped in Thee, O Lord; I said, Thou art my God, my lots are in Thy hands. Snatch me from the hand of [my] enemies, and from those who persecute me. Make Thy face to shine upon Thy servant; save me in Thy mercy. O Lord, let me not be confounded, for I have called upon Thee. Let the impious be ashamed, and be brought down to hell; let the deceitful lips be made dumb, which speak iniquity against the just [man], in pride and in abuse."

Fifteenth. The severity of God toward the impious is to be considered. Whenever He ascends His tribunal, all power, splendor, [and] majesty vanish before Him. Kings, by His sentence, are cast down from [their] throne, shut up in prisons, hanged, hidden in the darkest caves, and marked with everlasting ignominy — as you see in the tragedy of these [kings].

Sixteenth. When the saints have received power from God, they sometimes use the greatest authority and severity against the impious — which would be judged, as it were, savage and almost barbarous, were it not done by divine judgment and instinct. For what [is it] for men to tread upon the heels or bodies — nay, the very necks — of other men of the same nature, indeed of Kings? [What is it] to order [them] to be trodden by many? O the supreme power! Concerning this, Psalm 149: "The saints shall exult in glory; they shall rejoice in their beds. The high praises of God [shall be] in their throat, and two-edged swords in their hands: to execute vengeance on the nations, rebukes among the peoples; to bind their Kings in fetters, and their nobles in iron manacles; and that they may execute upon them the judgment that is written: this glory is for all His saints." And therefore, as to the severity of Pope Gregory VII against the Emperor Frederick, what is it that our heretics keep bandying about with such great outcries? See Bellarmine (volume 1, book 4 *On the Roman Pontiff*, chapter 13).

> *[Translator's note: "the Emperor Frederick" as printed; Gregory VII's famous antagonist was the Emperor Henry IV.]*

Seventeenth. Let us also learn to trample our spiritual enemies, and to set [our] feet upon their heads and necks — as is said in Psalm 90 [91:13]: "Thou shalt trample the Lion and the Dragon." "Let us pray," says Origen (homily 12), "that our feet too may be such — so beautiful, so strong — that they may be able to tread upon the necks of [our] enemies, [and] so to tread the head of the serpent that it cannot bite our heel." And afterward: "And would that my Lord Jesus, the Son of God, might grant me this, and bid me trample under foot the spirit of fornication, and tread upon the necks of the spirit of anger and fury, and trample the demon of avarice, trample boastfulness, and crush under foot the spirit of pride; and, when I shall have done these things, [would that I might] attribute the sum of the work done not to myself, but to His cross — following Paul, who says that 'through it the world is crucified to me'" [Gal. 6:14]. It behooves the seed of the woman to crush — and the woman, through her seed, to crush — the head of the infernal serpent (Genesis 3, verse 15).

Question XL. On the allegory of this war

Origen rightly notes (homily 11) that those who — leaving behind [their] old vices and the wicked companions of [their] disgraceful deeds, as [it were] the Chananaeans and Amorites — betake themselves to the true Jesus, at once stir up against themselves the enmities, hatreds, and arms of all. "When the human soul," he says, "has joined itself to the word of God, it ought not to doubt that it will at once have enemies, and that those whom it had before as friends are to be turned into adversaries; and let it hope to suffer this not only from men, but let it know for certain that [foes] from the contrary virtues and spiritual wickednesses [also] threaten it." And so it is, that whoever seeks the friendship of Jesus, let him know that the enmities of many [are his]. "All who wish to live piously in Christ suffer persecution" [2 Tim. 3:12]. And Solomon, too, says similar [things]: "Son," he says, "coming to the service of the Lord, prepare thy soul for temptation" [Sir. 2:1]. Therefore even now [those who pass over to Christ] are assailed; and although [you be] "hewers of wood and carriers of water" — that is, although you be the least in merits in the Church — yet for this very reason, because you belong to Jesus, you will be assailed by the five Kings. But what must the good Gabaonites, now joined to Christ Jesus, do? At once they ought to send messengers to Jesus, [and] beg and importune help from Him. Now these messengers are the good Angels, who offer our prayers to God, as I said on Tobit (chapter 3, questions 7, 8, 9). And the same Origen interprets the five Chananaean Kings as our five senses, which beset and assail us with their allurements. But to me they seem to signify the temptations which more closely seek and attack [our] souls. Of these Kings, then, the first and chief is **Adoni-zedek** ["lord of justice"], King of Jerusalem — that is, that demon-Prince who *feigns* justice and sanctity, makes a show of kindly peace, prates nothing but the sacred word of God, [while] meanwhile he stirs up all the monsters of the vices into arms against us, and calls all the shapes and specters of every crime under [his] standards. Look at the heresy of our time, and the author of the heretics: he is Adoni-zedek; and all his Doctors and masters are Adoni-zedekian captains, trumpeters, and centurions. The second is **Hoham, King of Hebron** — which is interpreted "college, society" (and, as Chytraeus adds, κοινότης, "community"); but *heba* [is interpreted] "tumult,"…

(col. 1049)

…[the second King signifies] those who, in the Churches, in the gatherings of the pious, and in the colleges, stir up dissensions, disturbances, and tumults — the "false brethren," I say, of whom the Apostle complains (2 Corinthians 11, verse 26; and Galatians 2[:4]). The **third** is Piram, that is, "wild"; King of Jarmuth, that is, "of the doctrine of death." This King leads the Legions of the saddest thoughts, which solicit to despair, melancholy, [and] blasphemy. The **fourth**, Japhia, that is, "illuminating," or "illustrious"; King of Lachish, that is, "as it were of one going," or "of one existing for himself" — and it signifies all those allurements which flood the mind with joy and empty gladness, as with some light, and yet at once recede and desert the man; it signifies also [the things] by which one is puffed up with the opinion of some good, gleams with a little vainglory in his own eyes, trusts in himself, and yet at once goes off and vanishes. The **fifth**: Debir, that is, "eloquent," or "oracle"; King of Eglon — which name signifies "globe" and "orb." Does not this King rightly signify the literature of the Gentiles, Poetry, eloquence, [and] Philosophy, which once swept the circuit of the earth with admiration of itself, and still sometimes grazes and disturbs the minds of some? These [Kings], with their innumerable forces, come to besiege the Gabaonites — who have now joined themselves to Christ by a holy covenant, have dismissed [their] depraved associations and habits, and are now received into the sacred ministry of the Lord's temple — and to assail them with various engines and darts of temptation. But, O our good Leader Jesus Christ, do not draw back Thy hands from the help of Thy servants: "Ascend quickly, and free us, and bring aid; for all the Kings of the Amorites, who dwell in the mountains, have gathered against us" [cf. Josh. 10:6] — truly "in the mountains," because they all have [their] seat in pride and pre-eminence, as on certain high mountains, since "the beginning of all sin is pride" (Ecclesiasticus 10, verse 15 [al. 13]). But that good Jesus, [when] invoked, is never wanting to His [own] name [= Savior]: He comes to save those whom the evil demons wish to destroy; He spares no labor, runs up at once and helps, [and] terrifies, routs, puts to flight, [and] tramples the enemy. In His hand are the treasuries

of the hail; on His nod hang the Sun and Moon; the elements obey His command, and all the heavens. "Whom," says the Ecclesiastical hymn, "earth, sea, [and] upper air worship, adore, [and] proclaim, ruling the threefold engine [of the world]; whom the Moon, the Sun, and all things serve through the ages." He terrifies, when by the fear of the infernal and eternal punishments He routs the vices, [and] by threats of greater chastisements restrains the demons. He sends down storms of hail, when He inflicts diseases, wants, [and] calamities upon sinners, or [permits] some to be tormented by demons. Juvenal mocked [this], in Satire 13, who [says]:

> *…if they have begun to suffer the wakeful pain of the side, with fever,*
>
> *they believe that the disease sent upon their bodies [comes]*
>
> *from a hostile divinity. These they think the stones*
>
> *and weapons of the Gods.*

And indeed they are to be mocked, for thinking these the stones and weapons *of [many] Gods*, not of the one God — since in reality they are of this one [God], without whose nod not even the least hair can fall from anyone's head (Matthew 5:36; chapter 10:30; Luke 21:18). The same Lord makes the Sun and Moon stand still, for scattering and trampling the enemy, when,

awaiting our penance, or a greater integrity of life and fervor of charity, He prolongs for us the enjoyment of this life; when He makes the light of the sacred word and of the examples of the saints to be ever before our eyes; when He sets before our souls the rays of His grace, and as it were certain flashes of the divine glory, more and more.

But if we regard not ourselves as individuals, but the whole Church — "We wish," says Origen (in the cited place), "if we can, to show how our Lord Jesus has prolonged the light, even for the destruction of the contrary [hostile] virtues. From the time the Savior came, the end of the world was [already] near. Finally, He Himself said, 'Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven will draw near.' But He held back, and repressed the day of consummation, and forbade it to be present. For God the Father, seeing that the salvation of the nations could be established through Him, says to Him: 'Ask of me, and I will give thee the nations [for] thy inheritance, and thy possession the ends of the earth' [Ps. 2:8]. Until, then, the paternal promise be fulfilled, and the Church grow from the various nations, and the whole fullness of the nations enter in, and then at last all Israel be saved — the day is prolonged, the setting is deferred, and the Sun never sets, but always rises, while in the hearts of believers the Sun of justice pours in the light of truth. But when the measure of believers shall have been filled, and the worse and discolored last age of the [final] generation shall have come — when, with iniquity increasing, the charity of many shall grow cold, and very few shall remain in whom faith may be found — then, at that time, the days shall be shortened." The same Lord, then, both knows and [is able] to extend the day when it is a time of salvation, and to shorten the day when it is a time of tribulation and perdition. But we, while we have the day, and the space of light is prolonged for us, let us walk honestly as in the day, and work the works of light [Rom. 13:13].

But when the Kings of this world die, and are buried in their mausoleums, do they not seem to penetrate and hide themselves in caves? And indeed they will be detained there (Job 3, verse 14), until the true Joshua, [who is] to come, shall call them forth — [those] seen and dead [to His people] — into His sight. For [as] the stones of a necessity which cannot be broken or changed, the Lord here set [both stones] and guards: namely, the dissolution of the human body itself, and [the fact] that the re-gluing and re-animation of its dust is to be done by the power of no creature [but God's]. But when the holy victors of God shall have returned from the hard and troublesome battle of this world, and shall have applied themselves to their leader Jesus, safe and unharmed, those Kings, bound and chained, will be dragged from their caves and sepulchres, set before the Judge, [and] will receive from Jesus Himself the saddest sentence of the uttermost contempt and punishment. And then will be fulfilled much more perfectly that which was cited above from Psalm 149: "They shall

exult," etc. Then those who always looked at high and vain [things] will be hanged on the highest gibbets, from which, however, they will never be taken down, but will be tormented and butchered eternally. And this pertains not only to wicked men — who are the masters and authors of wickedness to others — but also to the demons themselves. For these too will be judged (1 Corinthians 6) and tormented by the fire which is prepared and handed over to them (Matthew 25, verse 41). O how great the misery, contempt, [and] torment of these! O how great [the happiness] of those who followed Jesus [as their] leader, and by His leadership and auspices [trampled] the world, the flesh, the devil, and all the hosts of these…

(col. 1051)

…overcame [the world, the flesh, the devil] — happiness, glory, joy! Contemplating this, St. Jerome wrote (in [his] Epistle) to a certain illustrious [friend] of his: "When the Lord is about to judge, the world will bellow mournfully; tribe will beat [their] breasts to tribe. Kings, once most powerful, will throb with naked flank; Venus will be shown forth with her offspring. Then fiery Jupiter will be led forth, and Plato with his foolish disciples. To Aristotle his arguments will be of no profit. Then you, the rustic and the poor [man], will exult and laugh, and will say: 'Behold my Crucified One; behold the Judge, who, wrapped in swaddling-cloths, wailed in the manger. This is that son of the laborer and the working-woman; this [is He] who, carried in [His] mother's bosom, [as] God fled into Egypt; this [is He] clothed in scarlet, this [is He] crowned with thorns; this [is He called] a magician, [one] having a demon, [and] a Samaritan. Behold the hands, O Jew, which you nailed; behold the side, O Roman, which you pierced. See whether the body be the same — which you said the disciples secretly carried off by night.'" Your love has compelled me to say these things to you, brother, that we may then be among those for whom now the labor is hard. But it will never in any way be permitted [the damned] to go out from that most wretched and most blind cave of hell. Here are the huge stones of eternity, which can be rolled away by no one, nor even moved a tiny bit. St. Jerome, on Isaiah: "Hell is a firm and fortified city," concerning which [is said] in the Psalms [cf. Ps. 59/60:11], "Who will lead me into the fortified city?" — in which the souls of the dead are shut up, and [which] is surrounded by the strongest guards. In hell [there is] no redemption, no exit from it.

> *When once the funereal laws have entered the infernal [regions],*
>
> *the black door is opened to no prayers.*

Whence also the otherwise wanton and amatory Gentile Poet [Anacreon], when he considered the brevity of his life and the everlasting horror of this place, said:

> Διὰ ταῦτ' ἀνασταλύζω, / θαμὰ Τάρταρον δέδοικως· / Ἀΐδεω γάρ ἐστι δεινὸς / μυχός, ἀργαλέη δ' ἐς αὐτὸν / κάθοδος· καὶ γὰρ ἑτοῖμον / καταβάντι μὴ ἀναβῆναι.
>
> *(For this I sob, often dreading Tartarus; for the recess of Hades is terrible, and the descent into it grievous; and it is certain that, for one who has gone down, [there is] no coming up again.)*

THE FIFTH WAR, THE SOUTHERN [WAR]; and the second part of the tenth chapter.

This fifth war is a continuation, and as it were an appendix, of the previous war. Yet, for the sake of greater distinction, it seemed more convenient to expound it separately, and to call it "Southern" — because, in respect of the camp at Gilgal, all the cities and kingdoms which will now be captured by Joshua are, either all or for the greater part, toward the South. Now six cities are enumerated individually; then, summarily, some regions.

The first: the city of Maceda (verse 28), which has [its] name from "burning" or "hearth." It was captured, and its King, citizens, and all the inhabitants utterly destroyed — these, indeed, by the sword, but the King by the gibbet. For that he was slain by the sword, along with the crowd [of citizens], Radak indeed teaches; but this [text, at] verse 38, hands down that he suffered the death of the King of Jericho — who, as was said above, was put on the evil cross. But when was this city captured? "On the same day," says the text. And

Abulensis thus explains it — to whom Arias nearly adheres — that, when the Kings had been hanged, Joshua went on that same day, before the Sun set, to assault this city, and likewise Libnah and Lachish; but [that] he stormed those two former ones on the same day, yet not the third, but prolonged the assault into the following day also, a part of the forces being left there; and into the camp,

the Sun now setting, he returned, and afterward ordered the hanged Kings to be taken down from the crosses. Yet it seems incredible that all these [things] were done on that same day on which the victory over the five Kings was reported. For, **first**, it is probable that three royal cities — fortified by some advantage of place and art, even if struck with the greatest fear on account of the slaughter of the Kings — could not be captured without some [act] of battle being engaged in at the gates and walls, or some conditions of surrender proposed; and in all these [things] some time had to be spent. **Secondly**: moreover, all who were in these cities are said to have been slain and utterly destroyed; and how [was] this done without some longer delay? — especially since the spoils of these cities were not devoted to the anathema [ban], but went to the profit of the Israelites. **Thirdly**: the cities being captured, some garrison had at once to be set [in them]; and so the fortification, strength, position, and supply-routes of the places had in some way to be examined. **Fourthly**: these cities were so far apart that more hours were needed to go round to them. And therefore, after the victory won and the Kings fixed to the cross, the Sun would have had to stand still still longer. And yet the end of its standstill is indicated above (verse 13) [to be] the victory, or the vengeance on the enemy — namely on those who had gathered for that war, but not on all who were in any way enemies; otherwise, the Sun would have had to tarry in the same place until they had subdued all the inhabitants of all Chanaan. **Fifthly**: the text says that all returned from the battle into the camp, which had been placed near Maceda (verse 21); and it goes on to narrate what was further done there in that daylight, and at last adds (verse 27) that the Sun set; and afterward the narration about the storming of the city of Maceda begins. Whence either the order of the narration must be interrupted — which Abulensis and Arias grant without necessity — or it must be confessed that Maceda was captured on the same day *after* the Sun's setting; and that not the whole army, but certain parts of it, were sent — some to Libnah, others to Lachish — to harass them that same evening, and, if it succeeded, to take them, but if not, to surround them with a siege. And this latter [course], as the course of the war and of the victories then was, could have happened — were it not said (verse 29) that Joshua, with all Israel, occupied both Maceda and Libnah. For we see how, in one evening, in one hour or another, the victorious leaders — having sent into the citadels, villages, and various towns the tribunes and some standards of their forces — take all things at once. I would therefore think it more probable that Joshua, content with that far most noble victory, gave that evening time partly to celebrating the praises of God and giving Him thanks, [and] partly to caring for [their] bodies — which, after such great labors endured night and day, was necessary; and that therefore "day" is here said for "the same time," as in the preceding verse 27. For where our [Latin] says "up to the present" — namely, "time" — the Hebrew has "up to this very day," the Greek ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας ["until the present day"]. For so "day" is often taken, both in the Scriptures and in profane books — as:

> *A long day [stretch of time] has taught the lion to obey man.*
>
> *A long day eats away the stones with soft water.*

Cajetan, indeed, thinks it also a marvel that Libnah was captured *not* on the same day on which the five Kings were triumphed over; but [he holds] that this same day…

(col. 1053)

…refers this same "day" not to the deeds [done] above, but to the assault of this city itself, in this sense: that on the same day on which it began to be assaulted, it was stormed; or, to keep his [own] words, "Joshua did not take the city of Maceda on different days." For it is explained [thus]: that he was occupied one single day in taking Maceda — whence also in the Hebrew it is had, "And Joshua took Maceda *on that day*." But since the Hebrew [words] are rather to be translated "on this day," and since it is harsh to interpret "on this day" as

"on one day," I prefer to say "at this time," or "at the same time."

The second [city]: Libnah (verse 29), which is also sometimes written "Libna" and "Lobna," [and] got its name from "whiteness" — just as once in Latium there was "Alba," and now in Hungary "Alba Regalis" [Székesfehérvár], in Transylvania "Alba Iulia" [Gyulafehérvár]. Libnah, below (chapter 21), [is] a priestly [Levitical] city; and, when it had revolted from the Kings of Judah (4 Kings [2 Kings] 8), it was afterward besieged by Sennacherib (4 Kings [2 Kings] 19).

The third: Lachish (verse 31), whose name was set forth above (question 40). How rightly it is explained by Chytraeus as "Ethiopian," let him see [to that] himself. It was no small city of the tribe of Judah (below, chapter 15, verse 39), and excellently fortified by King Rehoboam (2 Chronicles 11); besieged by Sennacherib (2 Chronicles 32; Isaiah 36). But when did Joshua take it? "On the second day," says the text (verse 32) — or, what is exactly the same in the Greek and the Hebrew, "on the second day." After that long solstitial day? After Libnah was captured? Or rather after the camp and the assault [were] brought to it? — which last [view] Radak, Cajetan, Masius, and I assert. For why it was not captured by the first onset, or [on the first] day, the cause is intimated in verse 33: namely, they had resolved to defend themselves fiercely, and were awaiting aid from the King of Gezer — either because they had sought it, or because he had offered it of his own accord; but when he had come, he was at once routed, with [his] whole army, and utterly destroyed by slaughter.

Now Gezer, properly so called, is threefold: **the first**, the Ephraimite [one] (below, chapter 16, verse 3; [and] 3 Kings [1 Kings] 9); **the second**, the Judaic [one] (2 Kings [2 Samuel] 5; 1 Chronicles 14, verse 16, where it is called "Gazara"); **the third**, the Transjordanian [one] (1 Maccabees 5, verse 8, as I expounded there, folio 659; Mark 5, verse 1; and Polybius, book 5). Concerning the first, Eusebius hands down (in the book *On Hebrew Places*) that the discourse here is [about it]: "Gezer," he says, "in the lot of the tribe of Ephraim, [is] a city separated to the Levites; which Jesus [Joshua] himself also stormed, its king being slain. It was afterward built by Solomon; it is now called Gazara, a village at the fourth milestone from Nicopolis, toward the north. But it must be known that Ephraim could not expel the foreigners from it." But it was rather far from Lachish, and the Transjordanian [one] much more so; the second, however, was much nearer. That all these are sometimes called "Gazara" is no wonder; but it is also called "Gadara" or "Gadaris." For Josephus calls the first [so] (book 5 of the *Antiquities*, chapter 1); the second, Strabo (book 16); the third, St. Mark (chapter 5, verse 1) and Polybius (book 5). But that all are distinct from Gaza is clear both from [their] position and from what I said on chapter 10 of the second book of Maccabees (folio 676 and following) — although some Greek Codices read in this place Γαζήρ and Γάζαρα, as is in the Notes of the Seventy. Stephanus says that Gadara was also called Antiochia and Seleucia (but by whom?). And today Gaza is commonly called "Gazera."

The fourth: Eglon (verse 35), concerning which above (question 4 [al. 40]). And Joshua [took] it rather on the same day on which he brought war to it, not on the [day] on which he laid Lachish waste; for these cities are too far apart, Eglon inclining more toward the South.

The fifth: Hebron (verse 36), and with it all the cities which were under it, as [under] a royal city (verse 37).

[Verse] 37. But since we have seen above, near Maceda, the Kings both of Eglon and of Hebron hanged, it must necessarily be said that here their death is repeated — but [their death] wrapped up in the common slaughter of their cities; or certainly, [that] when they had been taken from life, others succeeded them on the spot, whether they were their sons or not.

The sixth: Debir (verse 38). But how both Hebron and Debir are handed down as first captured [only] after these very times (below, chapter 15, verse 14; and Judges 1, verse 20) will be expounded there.

Now, summarily, some *regions* — occupied by Joshua in this same onset of [his] war proceeding most successfully, and drained by the slaughters of [their] Kings and inhabitants — are reviewed in a twofold [manner]. **First** (verse 40): "all the hill-country region, and the southern, and the lowland, and Asedoth [the slopes]." In which words is signified both the *position* and the *quality* of the land, by, as it were, two pairs of oppositions. The former is: "mountainous land, and flat or lowland." The latter: "land dried by the heat of the Sun, and watered by streams of waters." That [land which is] dried, the Seventy, retaining the Hebrew name, call *nageb* [נגב]; our [Latin calls] "southern" — because [regions] which are toward the south, or the Auster, unless they take some moisture from elsewhere, are wont to be parched and dried up by the more vehement heat of the Sun. But that [land] which I said is watered with waters, the Seventy again call by the Hebrew word ἀσηδώθ (*as■d■th*); our [Latin], "Asedoth" (here, [and] below, chapter 12, verses 4 & 8 — where, however, certain books have, by an error, "Aseroth"). Now the common Rabbis of the Jews are wont to interpret this word [as] "outpourings of waters" — partly because in Chaldaean *asad* means "to pour," partly because the Chaldaean Targum renders [it] *mishpach merantha*, as it were "by an outpouring from a higher place," that is, the waters which are wont to burst forth from the mountains. But Elias Levita, in his *Meturgeman*, convicts these of error and ignorance — partly because in Chaldaean it is not *asad* but *sada* [that means] "to pour" (to which, however, in the *hiphil*, an *aleph* is prefixed), partly because the Chaldaean is not wont to use the word *schaphach* for marking the outpouring of waters. "I, therefore," says Masius in this place, "think that the Chaldaean, by the words which he produced, meant to signify those places which are called by the Greeks [by a certain name]: that is, where [a mountain] extends mountains and hills into plains" — elevated not by a jutting-out or outpouring, [and] thus I interpret his words. Which opinion agrees wonderfully with the [present] purpose, and also with that place of Deuteronomy where the same Hebrew word is placed, when it is said *thachat asdoth ha-pisgah*: "From Chinnereth [Genesar] up to the sea of the wilderness, or the lowland sea — the sea, I say, the salt [Dead] sea — under the declivity, or the roots, of Mount Pisgah, toward the East" [Deut. 3:17]. For such places are mostly more cultivated and broader than the rest, because they are watered by the run-off from the mountains. But since *schedah* among the Chaldaeans properly is "the axle of a wheel" (as is clear from the Chaldaean Interpreter, on chapter 7 of the third book of Kings), and Aquila of Pontus interprets the same word as "cut off" (as is noted by my Syriac [text], and also, as I seem to remember, by Jerome) — one will not err, I think, if one supposes that here the word *aschedoth* signifies "valleys" which lie thrown between mountains or hills, either because they in a manner present the appearance of an axle (in that the parts on this side, by the collision of the mountains rising up on both sides, are like the axles of wheels), or rather because they seem made, as it were, by the mountains being cut through. This notion is indeed most fitting also in [the book of] Numbers, where words of this kind are brought forth from the Book of the Wars of the Lord: *ve-eshed ha-nechalim asher natah la-shebeth ■ar* [Num. 21:15]. For here *eshed* seems to be put for some river, which, like a valley, [makes the mountains] rise up on both sides…

(col. 1055)

…[the river's] bank. But who doubts that valleys are rightly opposed to the southern and the dry land — especially in regions otherwise hot? For they are [of] soil [that is] moist and ever broad [well-watered], inasmuch as they receive moisture enough from the mountains, and are not afflicted by long-lasting heat, because of the shadows of the mountains — whence they are called by the poets both "shady" and "verdant," and by the common folk "pleasant."

II. [verse] 41: "All the land from Cadesbarne to Gaza, all the land of Gosen to Gabaon." Now Cadesbarne was, as is clear from the constant usage of Scripture, the farthest boundary of the land of Judaea toward the South — whence the explorers were sent (concerning whom above, book 1, chapter 8). It is called by Herodotus (book 2) *Kadytis*; by the Chaldaean Paraphrast [Targum], *Rekem Gea*, as it were "noble, magnificent, [and] proud rock." For Petra is a very famous city, from which [comes] Arabia Petraea; and

Cades was near to it, as Eusebius witnesses (book *On Places*) — and hence [comes] that sharing of names. But the epithet "Gea," or "Magnificent," is added to distinguish it from a lowlier *Rekem* in the tribe of Benjamin. There is another [Cades], in Naphtali — Cades of the tribe [of Naphtali] (Tobit 1; and Maccabees, book 1, chapter 11 and following).

But Gaza is a most well-known city of Palestine, on the Mediterranean sea, whose twofold etymology St. Jerome indicates (in the *Epitaph of Paula*), interpreting it [as] "power" or "riches." And some, indeed — Stephanus of Byzantium (in the book *On Cities*) — [report] that it was so called "from Jove"; but Mela (book 1 of the *Geography*) hands down that it was so called from the *treasures* [*gaza*] of the Persian kings guarded there. But it is more truly so called from "strength" and "power," since in Hebrew it is written from *hotz* — which is "strong, powerful, robust" — *haza*, or *Gaza*; and, by the roughness of the *heth*, the Hebrew Levita [pronounces it] *Aza*, as Stephanus reports (in the cited place) that it was pronounced in his time by the Syrians. But Curtius (book 4) and Strabo (book 16) relate that it was utterly laid waste and destroyed by Alexander — whence afterward it remained ἔρημος ["a desert"], as is also said in Acts 8, verse 26…

…some would rather have it [the verse] there say "a deserted way." But that Gaza was famous even after Alexander, and before Strabo, is clear from the books of the Maccabees, and the histories of Diodorus Siculus and others — yet it was not exactly the same Gaza. For, the former site being abandoned, the Gazaeans moved their seats a little [away] from the sea, and brought it about that there were, as it were, two Gazas, of which the former [was] deserted — that is, less frequented. That [former one], however, was gradually restored, and called *Maiuma*; but afterward, by Constantius the son of Constantine the Great, [it was called] *Constantia*, as Sozomen explains (book 2). About this [city] Scripture [speaks] often, as below, chapter 15, verse 47; Judges 16:1 & 21; 1 Kings [1 Samuel] chapter 6; 3 Kings [1 Kings]; Jeremiah 25 & 47. St. Jerome (in [the *Life*] of St. Hilarion) shows that the vain god *Marnas* was especially worshipped there — whom Stephanus interprets [as] Jupiter at Gaza.

But *Gosen* was either a city in the mountainous places of Judaea (as below, chapter 15, verse 51), or some rich, grassy, and pasture-bearing place, after the likeness of that which Joseph gave to his brethren in Egypt (Genesis 46), as Arias and the Midrash [hold]; and so in the following chapter [11] it seems to be taken (verse 16), which some here write "Gessen," against the Hebrew, Chaldaean, Greek, and Latin spelling [as] corrected at Rome. And although in the Hebrew the word here and in Genesis 46 is the same, *Gose*, yet there [in Gen. 46] it is written by our Interpreter "Gessen," here "Gosen"; by the Seventy, there γεσέμ, here γεσώμ; and there too, in place of it, is put "the city of heroes [Heroopolis] in the land of Rameses."

Thus, then — his arms having been carried round through the Southern region, and triumphing, as it were, in the noble victories he had won — Joshua returned to the camp at Gilgal, laden, with his whole army, with spoils and all good fortune. And the cause of so great good fortune is to be noted [at] verse 42: "For the Lord God of Israel fought for him" — or, as the Chaldaean Paraphrast renders it, "Because the Lord God of Israel was making war, through His Word, for Israel."

Of the Wars: Caput XI — The Sixth War: The Jabinite [War], or the Northern [War]

Caput XI — The Sixth War: The Jabinite [War], or the Northern [War] (opening)

1. And when Jabin king of Asor had heard [these things], he sent to Jobab king of Madon, and to the King of Semeron, and to the king of Achsaph; **2.** and to the kings of the North, who dwelt in the mountains and in the plain over against the south of Ceneroth, and in the level places also, and [in] the regions of Dor by the sea-side; **3.** to the Canaanite also, on the East and on the West, and the Amorite, and the Hittite, and the Pherezite, and the Jebusite in the mountains; the Hevite too, who dwelt at the foot of Hermon in the land of Maspha. **4.** And they all went out with their troops — a people exceeding many, as the sand which is on the sea-shore; [their] horses also and chariots of an immense multitude. **5.** And all these kings assembled together at the Waters of Merom, to fight against Israel. **6.** And the Lord said to Joshua: Fear them not; for tomorrow, at this same hour, I will deliver all these to be slain in the sight of Israel: thou shalt hamstring their horses, and shalt burn their chariots with fire. **7.** And Joshua came, and all the army with him, against them at the Waters of Merom suddenly, and fell upon them; **8.** and the Lord delivered them into the hands of Israel. And they smote them, and pursued them as far as great Sidon, and the Waters of Maserephoth, and the field of Masphe, which is on the East part thereof. He smote them all, so that he left none of them remaining. **9.** And he did as the Lord had commanded him: he hamstrung their horses, and burned their chariots with fire. **10.** And returning, he presently took Asor, and smote its king with the sword. For Asor of old held the chief place among all these kingdoms. **11.** And he smote all the souls that abode there: he left not in it any remains, but laid [all] waste even to utter destruction, and destroyed the city itself with fire. **12.** And all the cities round about, and their kings, he took, smote, and destroyed, as Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded him. **13.** Except the cities that were situated on hills and on mounds, the rest Israel burned: one only, Asor the best-fortified, [Israel] consumed with flame. **14.** And the children of Israel divided among themselves all the spoil of these cities, and the cattle, all the men being slain. **15.** As the Lord had commanded Moses his servant, so did Moses command Joshua, and he fulfilled all [things]: he passed over nothing of all the commandments, not even one

(col. 1057)

word which the Lord had commanded Moses. **16.** So Joshua took all the mountainous land, and the southern [land], and the land of Gosen, and the plain, and the western region, and the mountain of Israel, and its champaign [lowlands]; **17.** and the part of the mountain that goes up to Seir, as far as Baalgad, through the plain of Libanus, under Mount Hermon: all their Kings he took, smote, and slew. **18.** For a long time Joshua warred against these kings. **19.** There was not a city that delivered itself to the children of Israel, except the Hevite who dwelt in Gabaon: for he took all by war. **20.** For it was the sentence of the Lord that their hearts should be hardened, and [that] they should fight against Israel, and fall, and not merit any clemency, and perish, as the Lord had commanded Moses. **21.** At that time Joshua came, and slew the Enakim from the mountains — Hebron, and Dabir, and Anab, and from all the mountain of Judah and Israel — and destroyed their cities. **22.** He left not any of the stock of Enakim in the land of the children of Israel, except the cities Gaza, and Geth, and Azotus, in which alone they were left. **23.** Joshua therefore took all the Land, as the Lord had spoken to Moses, and delivered it in possession to the children of Israel, according to their portions and tribes; and the Land rested from wars.

COMMENTARY

I call this war the Jabinite, because its chief author and Leader was Jabin, King of Asor; and the Northern, because it stretched into the Northern region of the land of Canaan. And it is described in this ch. 11, of which there are 6 parts. In the first is the warlike preparation of the enemies against the Israelites; for just as above (ch. 10) Adonizedek, King of Jerusalem, joined to himself against the Israelites those same Kings and peoples, so now also Jabin King of Asor, from v. 1 to 4. In the second, the advance of the same enemies to the appointed place of battle (vv. 4 and 5). In the third is the divine confirmation of Joshua, and [his] onset upon the enemies (vv. 6, 7). In the fourth, the victory (vv. 8 and 9). In the fifth, the following-up of the victory — as to the occupation, devastation, and plundering of the various cities and lands (v. 10 to 23). In the sixth is the end of the war (v. 23).

Question I. What [is] Asor, and its King?

In the Northern part of the promised land was the city of Asor, and indeed afterward in the tribe of Nephtali, as is said below (ch. 19, v. 35). Josephus seems to write [that] it was situated above the lake Samachonitis [Semechonitis] (bk. 5, ch. 6); but there he puts for it ἄσωρον [as■ron], which in ch. 4 of Judges (v. 2) is called "Charoseth" [Haroseth]. But here (v. 10) Asor is celebrated for [its] power and dignity, because "of old, among all the kingdoms of Northern Canaan, it held the principate" — or, as in the Hebrew, "it was the head" — not only of the other cities, but of "the other kingdoms," and indeed "of all those"; concerning which afterward in the 70 [LXX]: ἄρχουσα πασῶν τῶν βασιλειῶν τούτων [archousa pas■n t■n basilei■n tout■n, "ruling over all these kingdoms"]. And therefore the Latin Interpreter — or at least, in the margin (whence it crept into the text), some Glossator — called it "the best-fortified [munitissima]." And the Rabbis note (in Bereshith Rabba, ch. 35) [that] this [city] was [one] of the three cities which the Canaanites had chosen for making war on the Israelites. [That] it was situated on a high hill, [the text] shows (v. 13). But Brocardus says [that] it was not far distant from Libanus, and [that it was] only six miles from Caesarea Philippi, and eight from Tyre. Teglath-phalassar [Tiglath-pileser] took it (4 Kings [2 Kings] 15:29); and in its plain Jonathas [Jonathan] obtained a notable victory (1 Macc. 11:67). In the Hebrew it is written, with a rougher letter, "Chatsor" [■atsor] — perhaps because it was constructed of many villages and hamlets, which are called "chetsarim" [■atserim]: as Plutarch relates of Athens (in [the life of] Theseus), [and] Arias Montanus of Arocium in Spain (Judg. 4). Or [so called] because it abounded in many villas and courts [atria]; whence also by Origen (hom. 15) it is expounded [as] "a court [aula]." More softly, the 70 [render it] ἀσώρ [as■r] — since certain Greeks seem to have wished to express the roughness of that letter by saying νασώρ [nas■r], or perhaps rather κασώρ [kas■r], just as in Luke 3 [a name] is called κωσάμ [k■sam, "Cosam"], and elsewhere τεβάκ [tebak]. In the following ch. 12 it is written ἀσώμ [as■m]. And its King [was] called "Jabin" — as [one] who "understands," or "will make [others] understand"; but by the 70, ιαβίς [iabis]. And this [Jabin] is different from that one, concerning whom [in] Judges 4 and Psalm 82[83].

Question II. Which Kings and peoples did King Jabin stir up against the Israelites?

Since Asor was the city ruling over all the kingdoms of the Northern Canaanites (as the 70 said above), Jabin, King of Asor, stirred up and called out all those Kings too to war against the Israelites. But they are enumerated by name, indeed, [as] three; summarily, [as] very many.

The first, Jobab King of Madon — concerning whom Masius candidly notes [that] he has found out nothing. But the 70 read μαρῶν [mar■n], because — as St. Jerome notes (on Isaiah, chs. 8, 38, 41, and 44) — they often interchanged those two letters ד and ר [daleth and resh] on account of their very great similarity. And I point out something similar in 2 Kings [2 Samuel], ch. 21, v. 20, where a giant, who in the Hebrew is called "Madin" or "Mado," is rendered by our Interpreter [as] "lofty [excelsus]."

The second is the King of Semeron; and [it] is commonly understood [to be] Samaria, that most celebrated city, which both gave [its] name to the whole dominion, and was afterward called "Sebaste" by Herod, in honor of Augustus, as Josephus witnesses (bk. 13, ch. 17; bk. 15, ch. 10). But when this book was first written, that city was not yet called by that name, since it was so called from "Schemer" [Shemer], who sold it to Amri [Omri] King of Israel (3 Kings [1 Kings] 16:24). Then, since the 70, in the already-cited 3rd [book] of Kings, call [it] now σεμερῶν [semer■n], now σαμαρείαν [samareian], here and in the following chapter they render [it] Συμοών [Symo■n] — though with a different accent in the following chapter, Συμόων [Symo■n]. Thirdly: the Hebrew, in the following ch. 12, v. 21, calls [it] not precisely "Schimron" or "Semeron," as [in] this ch. 11, but "Schimron meron." On that account it seems [it] must be said, either [that] this Samaria is a different [one], which was much earlier than that other so celebrated [one], and for the sake of signifying that, was called in the following chapter "Semeron meron"; or [that] the name here was put by some later [writer] for the older [name], which perhaps was "Meron." But I incline more to the former.

The third [is] King Acsaph — in the 70, ἀζίφ [aziph] — which some place between Ptolemais and Tyre. Where, however, [it is] not "Acsaph," but "Achziph," or "Ecdippa," as it is called by Ptolemy (Geography, bk. 5),

(col. 1059)

Eusebius (in the book *On Places*) writes [that] it [Achsaph] was at the foot of Mount Tabor, eight miles from Diocaesarea or Sipphoris, in the traces of which stood the village Chasalus. But indeed this city stretched rather toward the North, as appears below (ch. 19); and the same [Eusebius], in the same book, places the village Chasalum in the tribe of Issachar, in that place where the city Achaseluth had been.

The other Kings, summarily [named], are [in] v. 2. *First*: the Kings of the North, "who dwelt in the mountains" — namely of Libanus (concerning whose ridge, above, ch. 1) — as Josephus shows, and [as] is gathered from the situation of the places, and from v. 17 below. But for "the North [Aquilo]," the 70 — not from a corruption of the reading, as Masius reckons, but on purpose, that they might show paraphrastically what was signified — put here, from v. 8, the Kings κατὰ Σιδῶνα τὴν μεγάλην [kata Sid■na t■n megal■n, "toward great Sidon"].

Secondly: the Kings "in the plain over against the south of Ceneroth," or in the southern plain of Ceneroth. For "plain," the 70 retain the Hebrew ἀραβά [araba]. And "Cenereth" — below (ch. 19, v. 35) [it is] a city, so called perhaps from some cithara [harp], which in Hebrew [is] "cinor" [kinnor], by [its] likeness, use, or invention — which afterward, enlarged with buildings by Herod the tetrarch in honor of Tiberius, was called "Tiberias" (concerning which Josephus [treats] many [things], [in] bk. 18, ch. 3; the *Captivity*, ch. 31 and 32; and the Greek *Life*; and, briefly, not long ago, a little book whose inscription [is] "Herod," ch. 20; "the Jews," [Josephus] says, in Eusebius, *Animadversions* 11, p. 170). Scaliger [and others] say they call [it] to have been formerly named רקת [rakkath]; and from which [in] John 6 and 21 [it is] "the Sea of Tiberias" — which [in] Num. 34, Deut. 3 is called "the Sea of Cenereth"; and thence the name γεννησὰρ [genn■sar] and "Genesara," and the lake and "water of Genesar" (1 Macc. 11:67; and Josephus, bk. 3 of the *Captivity*, ch. 32 and 35, in Greek), and "Genesareth" (Mark 6:53; Luke 5:1) — "toward the western part of which," Pliny says (bk. 5, ch. 15), "is the city Tiberias" (although in some of Ptolemy's tables [it is] otherwise). Hence [it is] also called "the land of Genesar" (Matt. 14:34). But "why here in the plural, 'Ceneroth'?" Masius reckons [it] a numeral enallage [change of number] (below, ch. 19). Eusebius (in the book *On Places*) reckons [that] there are two [places called] "Cenereth." But Radak reckons [that] it was done so that here not only the fields adjacent to the lake are signified, but even [those] a little more remote — yet fertile with an equal goodness of soil.

Thirdly: the Kings "in the level places also, and [in] the regions of Dor by the Sea" — or, in the tracts or regions of the city of Dor, on the West. For [that] this means [what] in the Hebrew is "from the sea" was said

in ch. 1. But the corrected Greek codices, as the royal [ones], retaining almost the Hebrew word for "tracts" or "regions," which is "naphoth," say ναφὲθ δώρ [napheth d■r]; for which in the [ordinary] 70 [is], corruptly, φιναὲδ δώρ [phinaed d■r]. And Dor is [the city] which to Stephanus [is] "Dorus," to Ptolemy (bk. 5) "Dora," to Pliny (bk. 5, ch. 19) "Dorum"; at whose ruins — [the ruins] of a city once most powerful — blessed Paula wondered, as St. Jerome writes in her Epitaph.

Fourthly: (v. 3) the Kings of the Canaanites "on the East and West." *Fifthly*: of the Amorites. *Sixthly*: of the Hittites. *Seventhly*: of the Pherezites. *Eighthly*: of the Jebusites "in the mountains." *Ninthly*: of the Hevites, "who dwelt at the foot of Mount Hermon [Germon], in the land of Maspha." And Hermon is twofold: one, of which [is spoken] here, a part of Libanus toward the West, on the authority of Adrichomius; [or] rather toward the East, from v. 8, on the authority of Masius (fol. 213); and it is otherwise called "Baal-Hermon, Sanir; Sirion," or "Sarion and Siron," or "Saren"; in the 70, ἀερμὼν [aerm■n]. The other is by the torrent Kishon [Chison], not far from Mount Gelboe [Gilboa]. And we read "Hermonite Hevites" also [in] Judg. 3:3, so that it may be clear [that] they differ from the "Gabaonite Hevites." Moreover, Maspha — which is interpreted "a watchtower [specula]" — is fourfold. The first, in the tribe of Judah (below, ch. 15, v. 38), of which Radak most ineptly understands this passage. The second, in the tribe of Benjamin (below, ch. 18, v. 26). The third, Moabitic (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 22:3). The fourth, the Lebanese [Maspha], joined to Gilead [Galaaditis] (Gen. 31:49; Judg. 11:29). For here, for the guarding of the region, [there] was some watchtower at the very entrance of Libanus above the Jordan; and of this [is] the discourse here.

Question III. Of how great a number were these enemies against Israel?

From the number of the Kings and peoples counted in the previous question, a not difficult conjecture can be made about the multitude of the enemies. Yet Scripture indicates it in a twofold [way] (v. 4).

First, as to the foot-soldiers: "A people," it says, "exceeding many" — that is, very many, exceedingly many. For that "exceeding [nimis]" is often taken so, as when it is said "God exceedingly praiseworthy" [Ps. 47]; and in Plautus (Amphitryon, act 1): "Legions endowed with exceeding beautiful eyes." And that this multitude of the enemies may be shown the more, a comparison is added: "As the sand which is on the sea-shore." Arias reckons that comparison [to be] a true one — made not by reason of number, and (that I may speak philosophically) not by reason of "discrete quantity," but rather "continuous," as to sight; because, just as on the sea-shore nothing but sand is seen, so [there] nothing but "enemies" would then be seen. For thus he speaks: "The history does not say [that] the multitude of the enemies was comprehended by number, no otherwise than [that] the sea-sand could [not be]; but it says [that] their forces were so dense and thronging, that wherever the place was looked out over, nothing else than a people would be seen, and there was one [uniform] face of the field, covered with men — just as, to those who look out over the sea-shore, all the ground is seen strewn with sand: for nowhere is a portion of meadow, or anything besides sand, discerned; and therefore [Scripture] speaks properly: for it says not 'many men,' but 'a people exceeding many'; nor does it say 'as the sand' [in the sense] that they cannot be numbered wherever they be, but 'as the sand' — that is, as far and wide is spread that sand which is on the sea-shore, whose whole surface is seen strewn with sand by the constant surging of the waves." But indeed the whole force of the comparison lies in the number and multitude. For, *First*: otherwise it would have said better, "as the water of the sea," or "the surface of the deep," or "as the heaven." For as someone said of old, "All was sea [pontus]," so often to those sailing nothing but sea and sky is discerned. *Secondly*: In the Hebrew the comparison is put thus: "as the sand which [is] on the sea-shore for multitude," or "in respect of multitude" — which our [Interpreter] before expressed by "exceeding." *Thirdly*: The Lord uses the same or a similar comparison to show number (Gen. 13:16; ch. 22:17; Jer. 33:22). *Fourthly*: [It] is, of all [these], an exposition about number. But indeed, [is] that comparison one which consorts with truth? For [things] which cannot be done, and in no way numbered, are wont to be compared with the numbering of sand. Lucan (bk. 5)

(col. 1061)

"The measure of the Ocean, the number of the sand, shall not fail." Horace (bk. 1, ode 28): "thee, the measurer of the sea and the land, and of the numberless sand." And the greatest of the Poets [Virgil] (Georgics 2): "—for it profits not to comprehend by number [him] whom, [if] one would wish to know, he would wish likewise to learn how much sand of the Libyan sea is stirred by the West wind." Whence, as though [it were] a work greater than [is possible for] the wit, force, and power of man, that vain Apollo, in Herodotus (bk. 1), boasted of himself: οἶδα ἐγὼ ψάμμου τ᾽ ἀριθμόν, καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης [oida eg■ psammou t' arithmon, kai metra thalass■s, "I know the number of the sand, and the measures of the sea"]. Archimedes indeed once wrote a little book on numbering the sand, which was for that reason called ψαμμίτης [psammit■s, "the Sand-reckoner"]; and its method our Clavius inserts into his commentaries on the sphere. Yet it must be simply confessed [that] the number of the sea's sand can be comprehended by the calculation or knowledge of no man whatever, but of God alone. For Archimedes effects only this much: [that] if some number of the sand be pronounced by someone (even though he not know it to be such), some number can, on such a hypothesis being granted (however false), be established — even if that sand were heaped up and piled to the very heaven. Whence, at length, it must be said [that], to signify the greatest multitude of the enemies, Scripture uses that comparison hyperbolically, as St. Augustine noted (bk. 16, *City [of God]*, ch. 21): "It can seem to pertain to this: 'And I will make thy seed as the sand of the earth' — which was said by that locution which the Greeks call 'hyperbole,' which is indeed tropical, not proper. Yet in what manner [it is used], no one who has learned [scripture] doubts that scripture is wont to use [it], as [it uses] the other tropes. But this trope — that is, mode of speech — occurs when that which is said is far greater than what is signified by that saying. For who does not see how incomparably greater is the number of the sand than can be [the number] of all men from Adam himself to the end of the age? How much more, then, than the seed of Abraham — not only [that] which pertains to the Israelite nation, but also [that] which is, and will be, according to the imitation of faith, in the whole world, among all nations? Which seed, in comparison of the multitude of the impious, is indeed [but] a few; although these few too make their own multitude innumerable, which was signified, according to hyperbole, by the sand of the earth. Indeed, that multitude which is promised to Abraham is innumerable not to God, but to men. But to God, not even the sand of the earth [is innumerable]. Accordingly, because not only the Israelite nation, but the whole seed of Abraham — where there is an express promise — [is] not according to the flesh, but according to the spirit of very many sons, [it] is more fittingly compared to the multitude of the sand: [and] here the promise made of both things can be understood. But we said this for [the reason] that [it] does not evidently appear, because the multitude even of that one nation, which was born according to the flesh from Abraham through his grandson Jacob, grew so much that it almost filled all the parts of the world. And therefore it too could be compared, according to hyperbole, to the multitude of the sand: because this multitude too, alone, is innumerable to man."

Secondly, as to the horsemen and chariots: "horses," says the text, "and chariots of an infinite multitude"; in the Hebrew and Greek, "very many." But both this number [and] the former, Josephus noted signally, saying [that] "there were of armed foot-soldiers 30 myriads — that is, three hundred thousand; of horsemen, a myriad — that is, ten thousand; of chariots, two myriads — that is, twenty thousand" (corruptly, in Zonaras, 30,000 [chariots]). Truly a great multitude, this. But whether he conjectured it, or received it from the ancients, or the annals, or the discourses of men, I have not, for my part, [anything] to say. Certainly neither Masius nor Arias give it credence.

Question IV. Into what place did these enemies assemble?

"They assembled," says v. 5, "all these Kings together at the Waters of Merom, to fight against Israel." That "they assembled [convenerunt]," Masius thinks, can be taken for "they made a pact," or "they were bound by

mutual pacts and pledges among themselves," because the Hebrew word sometimes signifies this, and the Syriac and some Greeks rendered [it] συνέβαλον [synebalon]. But the 70 render [it] συνῆλθον [syn■lthon, "they came together"]; and this is the more usual meaning of the Hebrew word. And although the Latin text too could be explained to Masius's sense — since "pacts" are also called "agreements [conventa]" — yet I prefer to take [it] of an assembling, or the coming-together of all to the appointed place, especially since in the Hebrew is added [that] they set up camp together, thus: "And all these Kings were gathered together, and came, and encamped together at the Waters of Merom." Although it must not be denied [that] by the same word it is hinted that those Kings came together thither by great counsel and various pacts — as was also noted by Arias, and [in] Psalm 2 thus: "The kings of the earth stood up, and the princes assembled together."

Concerning the Waters of Merom there are two [main] opinions. The first, of Eusebius (in the book *On Places*): [that] they are not far from Dothaim [Dothan] — namely, twelve miles from Samaria, toward the North; because there [is] the village Mecha. The second: [that] it is that place of the Jordan which lies between its rise (concerning which above, ch. 3, part 2, q. 3) and the lake of Genezareth (concerning which here, q. 2), and is called by our [writers] "Samechonitis," by the Talmud "Saichonitis." The third opinion Masius attributes to Josephus — as if he reckoned [that] "the Waters of Merom" in this place is not the name of a river or lake, but of a city. And indeed, [speaking] expressly of these Kings, he [Josephus] says: στρατοπεδεύουσι πρὸς βηρώθῃ πόλει Γαλιλαίας τῆς ἄνω, Κεδέσους οὐ πόῤῥω [stratopedeuousi pros B■r■th■ polei Galilaias t■s an■, Kedesous ou porr■], that is: "they set their camp at Beroth, a city of upper Galilee, not far from Cades [Kedesh]." But it is truer, as Arias says, [that] "the Waters of Merom" are not denied by Josephus, but [that] a city named from them is placed beside them, which is called "Berothe," or rather "Merothe" — since in the Hebrew the "Waters of Merom" are called "me Merom." Yet in Benjamin's Itinerary the city Berytus is said to have been formerly called "Beeroth." But whence they were so called — since "Merom" imports "height," and means "from on high" or "from a higher place" — the answer is twofold. The first, of Arias: because this lake is higher than the other, [the] Genesaretic. The second: because it lies in the higher places of Galilee, from the upper part of the Jordan, which is considered from its beginning. And so also (Judg. 5:18) [they] are called "the fields" or "region of Merome." But in the 70 it is read here τὸ ὕδωρ Μαρών [to hyd■r Mar■n]. Whence, perhaps, in like manner, [there is] a city in Ptolemy, in Chalcidice, [called] Μαρωνείας [Mar■neias]. But why the enemies of the Israelites wished to assemble in this place — no one would doubt the cause to be [that] they judged it an opportunity for the battle and victory which they sought. But because, as I said, its name imports a certain "height" and superiority, Arias not badly conjectures [that] a happy omen of victory was here caught at by those superstitious and blind Gentiles.

(col. 1063)

Question V. How, when, and why did the Lord confirm Joshua? (v. 6)

The first mode was [that] which [has been] often noted hitherto — that the Lord addressed Joshua of his own accord, whether through certain species and phantasms impressed on his mind, or through the sonorous voices of some Angel, or [that] the Lord [was] questioned by him through the priest, the oracle of Urim and Thummim being employed. For [that] Joshua consulted the Lord in a matter so arduous, and of so great peril, seems clear from what was said (ch. 9, v. 14).

The second. On the day before the battle to be joined with the enemy, the Lord confirmed Joshua, as appears from the words of v. 6: "Tomorrow, at this same hour, I will deliver all these to be slain in the sight of Israel." For "hour," in the Hebrew [it] is "at this time." For I know not whether at that time the day had yet been divided into 12 parts, which we have called 12 hours. Certainly, in the Hebrew of the Old Testament, the word by which the Rabbis today signify "hour" — namely "Schagah" [sha■ah] — is nowhere found, except in Daniel, and somewhere in the Chaldee text — for example, [in] Canticles 1. Yet our [Interpreter] here

imitated the 70, who render [it] ταύτην τὴν ὥραν [taut■n t■n h■ran, "this hour"]. But of old, "hour" signified in the day, as at night, the certain and fitting time of some diurnal or nocturnal action — as "the hour of dinner, the hour of supper, the hour of sleep" — which is otherwise called by the Latins "tempestas" [a season/time], as in Cicero (*On Laws*): "Let sunset be the last *tempestas* [time-limit]" — which was transferred from the laws of Solon, in which [it is] thus: ὁ ἥλιος ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρῶν ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἔστω [ho h■lios epi t■n hor■n eschat■ h■ra est■, "let the sun upon the mountains [horizons] be the last hour"]. And, alluding to which, in Stobaeus (serm. 1), Musonius names "the first and last hour," when he said of Socrates, [who was] about to die, [that] οὐ προσήκειν τὴν ἐσχάτην ὥραν παρατηρεῖν, εἰ ὅσον ἥλιος ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρῶν, ἀλλ᾽ εὐθαρσῶς τῇ προθεσμίᾳ [ou pros■kein t■n eschat■n h■ran parat■rein… all' euthars■s t■ prothesmia, "that it did not befit [him] to watch the last hour — [to see] whether the sun [were still] upon the mountains — but [to meet it] courageously, at the appointed term"]. And so the Apostle (Rom. 13:11): "it is the hour now for us to rise from sleep." But elsewhere concerning "hour" again, as in Ruth ch. 2, q. 24.

The third. But why the Lord confirmed Joshua, Josephus gives the cause: that so great a multitude of enemies greatly terrified him and the Israelites. For Joshua, forsooth, was a man, [and] the Israelites men; and therefore nothing human [was] alien from them. But because they had experienced divine help and aid, so great and so present, in so many and so great things, Josephus adds [that] God reproved this fear in them — which, however, is not in the text.

Question VI. How, and how far, did Joshua put to flight and cut down this innumerable multitude of enemies?

First. The mode of destroying so innumerable a multitude of enemies is delivered (v. 7) [as] twofold. One [is] the industry, speed, labor, and fighting of Joshua, and of his whole army; and this is signified by these words: "Joshua came, and all the army with him, against the Waters of Merom suddenly, and fell upon them." The other mode is the hand and help of God, which is shown by these words: "And the Lord delivered them into the hands of Israel."

Secondly. A triple terminus is shown (v. 8), up to which the Israelites put to flight and cut down those enemies, [now] cast down and straggling: "As far as," it says, "great Sidon, and the Waters of Maserephoth, and the field of Maspha." The first [terminus]. And Sidon is a well-known city of Phoenicia, on the shore of the Mediterranean sea, under Antilibanus, concerning which above (ch. 1). Josephus (bk. 1, *Antiq.*, ch. 7), in the Greek, says it was named "Sidon" from Sidon, son of the Canaanite, which by the Greeks is called σιδών [sid■n]. But indeed, by the Hebrews themselves it is called "Sidon" or "Tsidon" — both that son of Canaan (Gen. 10:15; 1 Chron. 1:13), and the city itself everywhere — and indeed [named] "from the abundance of hunting [venatio]," as Origen indicates (homily 14), or "from the abundance of fish," as Justin says (bk. 18); and this is quite likely, because in Syriac "thsaiid" is "a hunter" and "a fisher" (Gen. 10, in the Jerusalem Targum; Isaiah 10 and 33; Matt. 4); and even today that city is called "Saiid." But not [so called] because, as Justin adds in the same place, "the Phoenicians call a fish 'Sidon'" — although in Hebrew too, everything which is caught by any hunting on land, in water, [or] in air — nay, all food and provision — is called "tsaid" or "tsid" (above, ch. 9, v. 5; Gen. 10:9; ch. 27:24; Prov. 12:27; Neh. 13:15), and likewise "tsidah" (above, ch. 1; Gen. 42:25). But Stephanus and Eustathius note (on Iliad 7 and the Odyssey) [that] in "Sidon" the second syllable is [both] shortened and lengthened, and its citizens [are] called "Sidones" and "Sidonii," as will appear below from Homer and others. But in the text, why is it called "great"? *First*: not by comparison with another. "I indeed," says Origen (homily 14, cited), "although I have several times lingered in the places of Sidon, have never found there to be two Sidons — one great and another small — as far as pertains to the earthly place." *Secondly*: it is called "great" for various causes. First: by the amplitude of the place. Secondly: by the amenity and beauty of the place. For therefore Dionysius writes: σιδόνα ἀνθεμόεσσαν ναιομένην χαρίεντος ἐφ᾽ ὕδασι Βοστρηνοῦ [sidona anthemoessan naiomen■n charientos eph' hydasi Bostr■nou],

that is, "flowery Sidon," or as Priscian renders [it]: "—and beautiful Sidon, beside which the Bostrenus runs with clear stream." Strabo (bk. 16): Σιδὼν ἐπὶ εὐφυεῖ λιμένι τῆς ἠπείρου τὴν ἵδρυσιν ἔχει [Sid■n epi euphyei limeni t■s ■peirou t■n hidrysin echei, "Sidon has its situation on a well-formed harbor of the mainland"]. *Thirdly*: by antiquity. For although Strabo (bk. 16) does not put Tyre after it [Sidon] by reason of age, and Dionysius in [his] *Periegesis* calls this [Tyre] "Ogygian" — that is, ancient — yet [Sidon] appears more ancient than it [Tyre], from Gen. ch. 10 and 49; and from Homer, who mentions Sidon, but Tyre never; from Posidonius, who, in Strabo (in the cited book), relates it to have existed before the Trojan times; from Pliny (bk. 5, ch. 19), where it is called "Sidon, parent of Boeotian Thebes" — but these Thebes, it is agreed, are most ancient. Nay, clearly (in the cited book) Justin relates "Tyre" [to have been] "built by the Sidonians one year before the Trojan disaster." *Fourthly*: from the exceeding fame of the name. For in Homer's age, indeed, Tyre already existed, as is clear from our Prophets and from the already-cited Justin; but because it was much more obscure than Sidon, therefore he [Homer], as I said, does not mention it. *Fifthly*: by resources and riches. The mother of Eumaeus, in Homer (Odyssey [bk.] 15): ἐκ μὲν Σιδῶνος πολυχάλκου εὔχομαι εἶναι [ek men Sid■nos polychalkou euchomai einai, "I claim to be from Sidon rich in bronze"]. "On account of the purple [dye]," says Eustathius in the same place; but also on account of [its] most gainful commerce, and other [things], concerning which below. *Sixthly*: by [its] various and excellent

(col. 1065)

arts or sciences. Whence Achilles (Iliad, [book] 23) set up, [as] a prize for those who should contend in speed of foot, a silver mixing-bowl [crater], most elaborately wrought, which surpassed by far in beauty all that were anywhere in the lands: ἐπεὶ σιδόνες πολυδαίδαλοι εὖ ἤσκησαν [epei sidones polydaidaloi eu ■sk■san, "since the Sidonians, cunning in craft, had wrought it well"]. For, in the same place, Eustathius says: καλλίτεχνοι καὶ ἐξαίρετοι οἱ σιδόνες, καὶ μὴν καὶ πολύτεχνοι [kallitechnoi kai exairetoi hoi sidones, kai m■n kai polytechnoi, "the Sidonians [are] excellent in art and choice, and indeed skilled in many arts"]. Pliny (bk. 5, ch. 19): "Sidon, craftsman of glass"; and (bk. 36, ch. 26): "Sidon, once noble for its glass-workshops. Indeed it had even devised mirrors [specula]." And, that I may not pursue more: concerning these [things] Strabo (bk. 16): Σιδόνιοι δὲ πολύτεχνοί τινες παραδίδονται καὶ καλλίτεχνοι, καθάπερ καὶ ὁ ποιητὴς δηλοῖ· πρὸς δὲ καὶ φιλόσοφοι περί τε ἀστρονομίαν καὶ ἀριθμητικήν, ἀπὸ τῆς λογιστικῆς ἀρξάμενοι, καὶ τῆς νυκτιπλοΐας· ἐμπορικὸν γὰρ καὶ ναυκληρικὸν ἑκάτερον [Sidonioi de polytechnoi tines paradidontai kai kallitechnoi, kathaper kai ho poi■t■s d■loi; pros de kai philosophoi peri te astronomian kai arithm■tik■n, apo t■s logistik■s arxamenoi, kai t■s nyktiploïas; emporikon gar kai naukl■rikon hekateron, "The Sidonians are handed down [to be] certain [men] skilled in many arts and excellent in art, as the poet too shows; and moreover [they are] philosophers concerning astronomy and arithmetic, having begun from calculation and night-sailing [navigation]; for each [of these] is [a matter both] mercantile and nautical"]. And afterward he enumerates the excellent Sidonian Philosophers — "Moschus," who was before the Trojan times; "Boethus, with whom we philosophized" (he says), "we [studying] the Aristotelian [doctrines]"; and "Diodotus," his brother. Finally Strabo writes (in the cited place) [that] a contest [was], even in his own time, between Sidon and Tyre, [as to] which was the metropolis of the Phoenicians. "Between the two," says St. Willibald in his itinerary [hodoeporicon], "there are six miles."

Second [terminus]. What are called "the Waters of Maserephoth" by our [Interpreter], following Aquila, are by Symmachus rendered "Misrephoth from the sea"; by certain Greeks, μασρεφὼθ μαΐμ [masreph■th maïm]; by the Roman [text of the] 70, μασερῶν [maser■n]; by Masius, "the burning-place [furnace] of the waters"; by others, "the burnings of the waters." For whether the noun here be appellative or proper — since "Saraph" is "to burn" — there is a threefold opinion about it. The first, of the Chaldee Targum and of certain Rabbis: [that] in that place there were ditches and pools, into which the salt waters, drawn off from the sea, would, by the heat of the Sun, congeal into salt and be dried out. The second, of Radak and Pagninus: [that] there were here boilings of hot waters — of which kind there are, in our neighborhood, Wiesbaden, near the

confluence of the Ems; in Belgium, Aachen; in Lorraine, Plombières; in Judaea, Emmaus — as Josephus writes (bk. 18, *Antiq.*, ch. 3, [in the] Greek; and bk. 4, *Captivity*, ch. 2), where he also interprets the very name "Emmaus" [as] λουτρὰ θερμά [loutra therma, "hot baths"], as [if] from the vulgar Hebrew "chamme maiim," or "maia" — that is, "hot water." For as to what Scaliger objects against this etymology (p. 212, in the *Animadversions on Eusebius*), concerning the ending "-us" — what, I pray, is [it]? But waters of this kind were also "Callirrhoë" beyond the Jordan, as the same [Josephus] writes (bk. 17, ch. 8). The third: [that] there were glass-furnaces. For Pliny is [the] author (bk. 36, ch. 26), and Strabo (bk. 16): [that] there was glass-making sand [ὑάλινην, hyalin■n] between Ptolemais and Tyre, which was carried to Sidon and boiled into glass; and [that] the Cendenian marsh, within the roots of Mount Carmel, poured forth the river "Belus," from which [comes] sand of this kind — with which even today the ships of the Venetians are ballasted, so that from it, at Venice, glass is made, with fires continually applied beneath. But either "the waters themselves burn" — and the "first" opinion would fit, if mention of hot waters of this kind were made anywhere in those places, as was said above of other places, from Josephus; or "the waters are burned" — and so the "second" opinion would agree, if anything about salt-pans were read there; or if, by catachresis — as now "clepsydra" [water-clock] is said for "clepsammium" [sand-clock] — by "waters" the sand from the waters were understood, the opinion would be fitting. The third [opinion], which, on account of the cited authors, by no means displeases. For among us too, [it] is said, by a wonderful phrase, "Wasser brennen [to burn water]" for "to press out, by fire, water from certain herbs, flowers, and berries"; and likewise "Branntwein [brandy]," the wine which, by the heat of fire, is likewise distilled from the dregs. And [that] in his own age the most excellent glass was made at Sidon, Benjamin relates (in the cited place).

The *third* terminus, the field of Maspha. The 70: τὰ πεδία μασσώχ [ta pedia mass■ch, "the plains of Massoch"]. But where that field is, is added: "which is on the East part of it [illius]." In the Hebrew [it is] only "toward the East," and in Greek κατ᾽ ἀνατολάς [kat' anatolas]. Yet since our [Interpreter] adds "of it," he seems to have read in the Hebrew a mappik-ed "he" [the letter ה with mappik], "mitzrachah," and to have referred [it] to Maspha. Three parts, therefore, into which the enemies tried to escape by flight, and three termini, up to which the Israelites pressed [them] as they fled, are here shown: the western indeed and northern, "Sidon"; the western and more southern, "Masrephoth"; the eastern, "the field of Maspha," toward the Jordan — as was also signified above (q. 2).

Question VII. What did Joshua do after so great a victory?

Briefly, and as it were summarily, at v. 9, Joshua did "as the Lord had commanded him: he hamstrung their horses, and burned their chariots with fire." Then indeed he happily prosecuted so great a victory, as is thereafter explained (v. 10 and following). But to "hamstring [subnervare]" horses is to cut their feet and legs, or — the sinews of the legs being cut, as if the bonds were loosened — to weaken them utterly and render them useless. For of what use [is] a horse whose legs and feet are either gone, or hamstrung? The Hebrew word means, as it were, "to take away the foundation and root," because the legs of horses are their props and foundations. This the 70 called νευροκοπεῖν [neurokopein, "to cut the sinews"]; Josephus, ἵππους ἀχρήστους ποιεῖν [hippous achr■stous poiein, "to make the horses useless"]; some of the Latins, "to hamstring [suffraginare] horses," and "to hough [subpernare]"; Masius, "to enervate"; our [Interpreter] here, and [in] 2 Kings [2 Samuel] 8:4, [and] 1 Chron. 18:4, always "subnervare" — as Apuleius too speaks (in the Apology, [bk.] 2). But why did Joshua do this? Because the Lord had commanded [it] (above, v. 6). But why did the Lord command [it]? Because he did not wish the Israelites to use horses. For otherwise the enemies' flocks, cattle, and beasts of burden [they] could take for spoil — unless it were commanded otherwise by the Lord, or vowed to him by the Israelites — and indeed they did take [them]: as (Num. 31:32), after the victory of the Midianite battle, there was spoil which the army had taken — 67,000 sheep, 72,000 oxen, 61,000 asses. Since, therefore, the Lord commanded the hamstringing and destruction of the horses, he openly signified [that] it pleased him [that] the Israelites should not use them. In Josephus (bk. 12,

ch. 3, [in the] Greek), the Jews are forbidden not only to eat the flesh of horses, and of wild and tame asses, but even to bring their skins into Jerusalem, and to rear any of them — which, however, concerning tame asses, is openly false, as Origen too teaches in this place (homily 15). St. Jerome, on that [passage] of Psalm 75[76]: "They have slept, who mounted horses": "The Egyptians," he says, "had horses, but they perished. Thence also it is commanded in the law that a Hebrew should not have horses. Finally, Solomon had no horse from Jerusalem or from Judaea, but bought [them] for himself from Egypt." And on that [passage] of Isaiah 2: "His land is filled with horses, and his chariots [are] innumerable": "It is not," he says, "worthy of number [i.e. honorable], which is possessed against the command of God." And on ch. 36,

(col. 1067)

"In that Rabshakeh, wishing to show the fewness of the besieged, promises two thousand horses, of which Hezekiah could not furnish riders — [this] comes not from the weakness of the Jewish people, who lacked the knowledge of riding, but from the observance of the commandments of God, who, through Moses, had commanded concerning the King of Israel: 'He shall not multiply horses to himself' [Deut. 17:16]." St. Basil, on those words of that same Isaiah (ch. 2): "There is no place in scripture," he says, "where we have not observed the saints to shun the use of horses — nay, even [the use] of those which are drawn up in readiness for war, and [of those used] in the other needs of this life." Origen, on this passage (homily 15): "The children of Israel are never related to have used horses; and the law commands nothing about horses, but about asses — inasmuch as [they are] animals which seem to exist for helping the labors of men, and for carrying their burdens; but horses [are] rather for the destruction of men, for this is what is waged through them in battles. [The horse] is taken [as] an animal of wanton motion, and of a proud neck." But in this very opinion about horses, there are some [things] which can be inquired into. And, first indeed, "where in the law was the use of horses forbidden?" For in this place [the horses] are ordered to be hamstrung, and all their use is taken from the Israelites by God's command. But neither is this [a general law] in the law, nor ought one, from a single deed, in a single matter, once commanded or forbidden, straightway to frame a law. We saw above (ch. 6), concerning the spoils of Jericho, [that] nothing of private property was to be taken by anyone [from them] — [is it] therefore [right that] it is nowhere lawful for any of the Israelites ever to take anything from the spoils of enemies? In the Amalekite war, how great an abstinence from all things — how promiscuous a slaughter of every sex and age — was commanded to King Saul (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 15:3)? Was that held [as] a law in all wars? St. Jerome, therefore, signifies (on the cited Isaiah, ch. 36) [that] horses were forbidden to the Israelites [in] Deut. 17; and Ribera thinks the same (on Hosea, ch. 14, n. 10), and [he] who ascribed the marginal scriptures to St. Jerome on Psalm 75, and — nearly in this place — Masius. But there [Deut. 17] it treats definitely of none but the King. And to him [the King] not simply "the use of horses," but the "multitude" [of them] is forbidden — so that, according to that law of the King, it would seem [that] the use of horses is not taken from others, whether that they themselves ride, or that they carry any packs and burdens, or, finally, that they sell [them] to others, if indeed [it] pleased [them]. *Secondly*: "Was the multitude of horses forbidden to others besides Kings?" Because in the law it treats of Kings alone, someone might say [that] the multitude of horses seems to be conceded to others. But it is not. For if that multitude is not conceded [even] to those to whom it would seem most conceded, how much less to others? *Thirdly*: "Since a moderate use of horses was nowhere forbidden to the Israelites, did they at some time use them?" Before the Mosaic law, the Israelites seem to have had horses (Gen. 47:17). But after the promulgation of the law, before the times of Solomon, I read of no use of horses — neither among private [persons], nor among the nobles or Israelite Kings; but in his [Solomon's] time the use began (3 Kings [1 Kings] 4:26; ch. 9:22; ch. 10:25 and following; 2 Chron. 1:16 and following). And thereafter it remained, and greatly prevailed (4 Kings [2 Kings] 3:7; ch. 7:13, 14; 1 Esdras [Ezra] 2:66; 2 Esdras [Neh.] 7:68), so that the Prophets reprehended the multitude and pomp [of them] (Isaiah 2 and 31; Jer. 6:23; Hosea 14:4; Amos 2:15; Zach. 10:5; Ps. 19[20]:8; Ps. 75[76]:7). *Fourthly*: "Did the multiplier of horses [Solomon], that multiplication being permitted, sin?" It is answered [in the commentary on] 3 Kings [1 Kings]. *Fifthly*: "Did his later

imitators sin?" The divine law is not like the human; and therefore it cannot be abrogated or repealed even by the repetition of many — nay, of all — acts, since the right and authority of the supreme lawgiver does not depend on men, however many and united. And therefore, if Solomon sinned, how are these [imitators] excused? *Sixthly*: Since it was lawful to have a moderate number of horses, both for Kings and for private [persons], "why did the Lord will destruction to be brought upon these, captured from the enemy?" *First*: lest the divine glory be diminished. For since the horse is a warlike and combative animal — as [in] Job 39 it is graphically depicted, in almost Virgilian colors (Georgics 3 and Aeneid 4) — if the Israelites used it for wars, they would seem to conquer more by their own work than by God's help. *Secondly*: lest their hope be fixed rather in the steed than in God (Prov. 21:30): "The horse is prepared for the day of battle; but the Lord gives safety." *Thirdly*: lest, if they sold them back to the Canaanites, they should afterward again receive harm from the same. *Fourthly*: for mystical causes. For, *first*, the horse is an arrogant and proud animal; and therefore, when Plato had mounted a horse, he immediately dismounted, lest he become ἱππότυφος [hippotyphos, "horse-vain"], says Laertius. *Secondly*: it is φιλόδοξος [philodoxos, "fond of glory"], and very desirous of empty praise, so that it is wondrously excited even by light chirrupings [poppysmata]: "Keen, and, of himself, about to run for the honors of the palm — yet, if thou urge [him], the horse will go the more strongly." *Thirdly*: [it is] fierce and battle-loving. "Fervent," says Job (ch. 39), "and snorting, he swallows the ground, nor does he reckon that the trumpet sounds its blare. When thou shalt have heard the trumpet" (says the Rabbi), "from afar he smells the battle, the exhortation of the leaders and the shouting of the army." *Fourthly*: it is salacious and lustful. Theophylact (on Acts, ch. 10) and Andreas of Caesarea (on Apoc. 14) [call such men] ἱπποθηλυμανεῖς [hippoth■lymaneis, "mad after mares"]. And concerning the lustful [man], in the Latin Ecclesiasticus (ch. 23:30): "Like a horse-colt he shall be put to flight." *Fifthly*: by some appearance or nobility of its own, it instills in very many too great a love of itself, so that — just as the avaricious [delight] in gold and great treasures — so these madly delight in horses: as [did] that schismatic Patriarch of Constantinople, concerning whom [see] Curopalates. The Lord, therefore, wished to call us away from all pride, zeal for empty glory, ferocity, lust, and the insane love of creatures, by that destruction of the horses, as [it were] by a symbol. Lipsius has embraced many praises of the horse (in his 3rd *Centuria*, epistle 56); but those [things] which pertain here shall be said elsewhere later. See in Origen (homily 15), and in my q. 17 on ch. 6 of Tobit. But if, for these causes, the Israelites ought not to use horses, how [could they] use chariots, which are wont to be drawn by horses — [and those] more numerous and more noble? For the "chariots" which the Lord commanded to be burned (v. 6), and Joshua burned (v. 9), are not any chariots whatever — as wagons [plaustra], coaches [carrucae], [and] the like — but "armed" ones, and heavy with armed men, scythe-bearing, terrible — concerning which I speak in [my commentary on] Judges, ch. 1.

Question VIII. In prosecuting his victory, what cities and kingdoms did Joshua occupy, and either lay waste or preserve?

First. Of the cities, some were on the plain, others on mountains and mounds. Those [on the plain] Joshua "took and burned all"; but these [on the mounds], except one, Asor [Hasor], which

(col. 1069)

taken away by fire, he preserved (v. 10) — where, for "straightway [statim]," in the Hebrew it is said "at this time," or "during that time"; and (v. 13). Whence "best-fortified [munitissima]" is absent in the Hebrew and Greek. Others think another distribution of the cities is hinted at (v. 13). For some allowed themselves to be besieged, and their ramparts and walls to be cast down, before they surrendered; others allowed themselves indeed to be besieged, but did not wait until their ramparts were overthrown, and, while these still stood, surrendered themselves. The former [category] Joshua burned, all [of them]; these [latter], not — by the precept of Deut. 20:10. "And he smote" (v. 11) "all the souls that abode there: he left not in it any remains, but laid all waste even to utter destruction, and destroyed the city itself with fire. And all the cities round

about, and their kings, he took, smote, and destroyed, as Moses the servant of the Lord had commanded him." And (v. 19): "There was not a city that delivered itself to the children of Israel." Certain books read here, "that did not deliver itself." But, first, in the Hebrew it is: "There was not a city that made peace with the children of Israel." Secondly: that exception, of Gabaon alone, which delivered itself and made peace, indicates [that] that other [word], "not," is to be omitted; and likewise the cause which is subjoined: "For he took all by war."

Secondly: "Joshua took" (v. 16) "all the mountainous land, and the southern, and the land of Gesen, and the plain, and the western region, and the mountain of Israel, and its champaign [lowlands]; and the part of the mountain that goes up to Seir as far as Baalgad, through the plain of Libanus, under Mount Hermon: all their kings he took, smote, [and] slew." These [things] are all manifest from what precedes, except that [of] v. 17: "and the part of the mountain that goes up to Seir as far as Baalgad." For because in the Hebrew it is "chalak," Masius accuses the Latin interpreter, who said "part of the mountain [partem montis]." "[It is] indeed little rightly [rendered]," says Masius himself, "for the connection of the sacred words, as they are certainly written." And so he himself renders [it] "from the bare [smooth] mountain [à monte glabro]" — which he holds to be on the southern side of Canaan, and, by antithesis, so called from neighboring "Seir." For "Scheir" [Seir] signifies "hairy [shaggy]," to which "chalak" is plainly opposed — that is, "bare and smooth." It is confirmed, because Symmachus renders [it] λεῖον [leion, "smooth"], and Rashi with Radak place this mountain toward the desert of "Sin." But, first, since "chalak" also signifies "part," I do not see why he accuses our Interpreter, since he does not deny that part to be toward the South and beside Sin — when he adds, as it is also in the Hebrew, this part to be that "which ascended toward the mountain called Seir," or gradually rose toward it. Secondly: If we depart from the signification "part," there is no reason why we should rather interpret "bare mountain" than "easy, pleasant, and least rough mountain," since that word signifies this too — and these significations, apt also for this place, the marginal Calvinian Gallican Bibles (Geneva, year 1588) confess. Thirdly: then nowhere toward the South is any bare mountain read of, opposed to that hairy and shaggy [one]. Fourthly: The 70 rendered τὰ πρὸς τῷ ὄρει ἀπὸ ὄρους χελχά, καὶ ὁ προσβαίνων εἰς σήιρ [ta pros t■ orei apo orous chelcha, kai ho prosbain■n eis s■ir, "the [parts] toward the mountain, from mount Chelcha, and [that which] ascends toward Seir"] — in which words, if "καὶ" [and] were omitted, the Hebrew text would be more nearly touched. Others in Greek rendered the mountain ἀαλάκ [aalak]. The cited Calvinists: "montagne de halak." Fifthly: The Chaldee Targum renders [it] "the divided mountain," or "not joined, nor united." Sixthly: Aquila, "the dividing mountain." Seventhly: There are not lacking [those] who place "Seir" also toward the North, and [that] which gradually advances toward the South, and there, as it were, closes off that whole side of Canaan; and among these is Adrichomius. Since, therefore, our Latin interpretation interprets the Hebrew name in that manner, [so] that it can admit several expositions, and does not bind the sense of scripture to this or that exposition, it is deservedly better than that which binds [it], and sells a thing not sufficiently certain, in the very text, as [if it were] most certain — as the Masian version does, and, after it, the Tremellian and Junian.

Now "Baalgad" is, to some, a part of Antilibanus set over against the Sidonians. "But I," says Masius, "reckon [it] to be a part indeed of Libanus, but toward the East — since Sidon is nearest to the West. For we saw the land of Maspha placed toward the East (v. 8), and [that] it was subject to Mount Hermon (v. 3). Now indeed Baalgad is described [as] neighboring to Hermon, as also [in] ch. 13, v. 5, and ch. 12, v. 7." Benjamin [of Tudela]: "From Laodicea I came in two days," he says, "to Gebal — the same [as] Baghalgad, under Mount Libanus; and it is nearest to that nation which they call HHASSIN [the Assassins], who do not follow the doctrine of the Israelites, but of a certain [man] whom they reckon to be a Prophet; at whose word all [of them go] either into death or into life." But whether that place was so called because it was "the field" and "plain of Gad," as the Chaldee Targum holds (Masius wondering [at it]); or because "Gad [was] as [it were] the Lord"; or for some other cause — I do not determine. By the 70 it is written Βαλγάδ [baalgad].

Question IX. Whether Joshua left no remnants of the Canaanites?

Joshua smote all, "so that he left no remnants of them," says v. 9; and afterward (v. 16) he is said to have occupied "all Canaan"; and again (v. 19), "He took all by war"; (v. 23) "Joshua took all the land." But indeed [that] very many Canaanites, and their cities, and several places, escaped the storm of this Joshuan war, the books of Kings sufficiently teach — in which we read [that] the whole land first came under the dominion of the Israelites under David and Solomon, as I also said above (ch. 1, q. 9); the book of Judges teaches [it] (ch. 1 and 2); this very [book] which is in [our] hands teaches [it], [namely] Joshua (below, ch. 13; ch. 17, v. 12 and following; ch. 18, v. 2 and 3 and following). St. Augustine answers two [things] (q. 17). First: [that] Joshua stormed all [the places] which he stormed, and which he strove to storm. Secondly: [that] he stormed and took all — "not as to the individual [places], but as to the greatest and general parts," for example "the mountainous, the southern, and the like" (v. 16). Masius adds a third: [that] there were no remaining Canaanites who dared then to prosecute and wage war, and who could hinder the partition of the land.

Question X. Why did Joshua do all these things thus?

The cause, in this chapter, is commemorated at least four times. 1. (v. 9): "because the Lord had so commanded Joshua." 2. (v. 12): "so had Moses, the servant of the Lord, commanded Joshua." 3. (v. 15): "as the Lord had commanded

(col. 1071)

Moses his servant, so did Moses command Joshua; he fulfilled all [things]: he passed over nothing of all the commandments, not even one word which the Lord had commanded Moses. 4. (v. 20): because the Lord had so commanded Moses. Finally (v. 23): "As the Lord had spoken to Moses." And hence we learn the notable obedience of two supreme men: of Moses indeed toward God, but of Joshua toward God and Moses. And that [obedience] is not in vain set before us so brightly, so often, and in so many words, and inculcated. But, first indeed, that we may know what made these men so admirable and so pleasing to God — namely, obedience. *Secondly*: that the finger might be pointed at the fountain, whence so many rivers of victories flowed. "The obedient man shall speak of victories" (Prov. 21:28). *Thirdly*: that we may consider [that] Joshua himself, in all these wars, battles, slaughters, devastations, burnings, and destructions, did nothing through inborn savagery or cruelty, nothing through unjust hatred, impotent anger, the accursed hunger for gold, or any other perturbation of mind — as, against his calumniators, the old heretics, St. Augustine (*Against Faustus*, and here, q. 16), Origen, and Theodoret (on this book) admonish more than once, as I shall say elsewhere below more fittingly. *Fourthly*: that the express image of the true Jesus might be set before our eyes — [he] who (Phil. 2:8) "humbled himself, being made obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." *Fifthly*: that in arduous and difficult matters — even in those which lie open to the reprehension and calumny of some — we may closely hold holy obedience. For to how great calumnies were all these works of Joshua exposed — the occupations of others' lands, the devastations of fields, the slayings of the natives, the burnings of cities, the captures, tramplings, [and] crucifixions of Kings? But the obedient man despises petulant tongues, reckons malicious judgments as nothing, [and] wishes the fame of his name to depend on God and on obedience, not on the levity and wickedness of men. *Sixthly*: that we may understand whom [it is right] to obey. Some sometimes dispute [that] they are willing to obey, if God should command anything; but that they can neither bear nor be willing [to bear] the commands of men. "Let us break," they say (Ps. 2:3), "their bonds, and cast their yoke from us." But Joshua obeyed not only God, but Moses too. *Seventhly*: But most of all [it is right] to obey those whom we understand [to be] beloved by God, and instructed and sent by him — of which sort Joshua knew Moses to be, as appeared above (ch. 1, v. 7). But whom can we know, or feign, [to be] more endowed with authority of this kind, than the very Bride of CHRIST JESUS, "the pillar and ground of truth" (1 Tim. 3) — I mean the Catholic Church? — and than [her] supreme Rectors, Masters, and Pontiffs, concerning whom divine promises exist? *Eighthly*: We understand how, [and] how fully and

perfectly, obedience is to be rendered. Of Joshua we have heard: he "fulfilled all [things]: he passed over nothing of all the commandments, not even one word which the Lord had commanded Moses." Farewell to those who, in some one matter, are willing to comply with their superiors, [but] in others shuffle [evade]. Farewell too to the heretics, and to some deceived by heretics, who keep saying [that] they are indeed willing to be compliant sons of the Church in other [respects], but, in the communion of one species [i.e. Communion under one kind], are not willing. Farewell [to those who are], in all the rest, half-obedient, half-alive, half-dead — nay, rather wholly dead.

But what I undertook in the seventh prolegomenon of this book, it is fair [that] I now discharge. Masius, therefore (p. 211), thus philosophizes about these matters: "We are taught, by this most obedient obedience of Joshua, to observe plainly and simply [καὶ ἀφελῶς, kai aphel■s] the divine oracles [that are] also delivered to us in the sacred letters, and explained by the Catholic and Apostolic Church; neither to inquire curiously into them, nor to weigh and measure their reason by our [own] grasp, but, with a humble and reverent mind, to embrace in all ways that doctrine which was delivered by CHRIST to the Church, and thereafter propagated by the Apostles, and other most holy men, the interpreters and ministers of God, in a continuous series as [it were] by hand, all the way down to us — and to follow [it] as the most correct norm and rule. For indeed there is no doubt [that] various affections of mind from time to time came upon Joshua — a man trained in the school of Moses to all gentleness — and all but moved and disturbed [him], in exercising everywhere so rigid a victory, since [he] had to rage through the deaths of every kind of men. And yet, with a firm and obstinate mind, he thought [that] he must pursue that which Moses had prescribed. By this example, therefore, let us compel our own curiosity too — both in all the divine prescriptions, and most of all in those which pertain to the mysteries of our religion — to acquiesce in the Sacrosanct authority, and the Catholic Church; whose authority, as St. Augustine left [it] written, was begun by miracles, nourished by hope, increased by charity, [and] confirmed by antiquity; finally, continued by the perpetual tenor of succession from Peter down to us; and approved by the most beautiful consensus of very many peoples. In the most sincere wisdom of this our mother — as the sacred writers call [her] — let us religiously acquiesce; let us join faith to her words, obey her commands, [and] follow her guidance in every way. So indeed shall we nowhere stray from the right and eternal way of life." And a little after: "It is plainly shown [that] that doctrine, by which God discloses his will to the Church, proceeds indeed from his own divine inspiration, but is delivered and explained to the rest of men through men whom he himself has chosen [as] the certain interpreters and ministers of his counsel and will. Which St. Paul too wrote to the Romans. Rightly, therefore, are they exploded — and most deservedly, first of all, all those fanatic men who, as of old, so in our age too, have given great disturbances in the Church of CHRIST. Then also those who do not fear to enter and profess this divine office, although they are set over it by the authority neither of God nor of the Church, nor are they sufficiently instructed for it by the knowledge of the sacred letters and the exercise of piety. God could, indeed, easily inform the minds of his own, by secret inspiration, with those precepts by which [one] must live piously and agreeably to his will, and [could] rule the life of each, as [it were] by hand, by a heavenly instinct and impulse. But it seemed [good] to the best and wisest parent to use the work of men for that thing — and not [the work] of any men whatever, but of those whom he himself calls, 'as Aaron,' says Paul. For otherwise it could not but be [that] the Church of God would soon be led about through infinite errors, and a confusion of religions would follow — the most pernicious thing of all. For the disposition of mortals is such, that the more inept each is, and the more unfurnished with all good things, [with] the greater license he engages in the function of that divine office. Rightly, therefore, [Scripture] called Moses — through whom God disclosed his commands to Joshua, and his laws — the servant

(col. 1073)

of Jehovah, or of the Lord — they call those sacred words. For [those] who strive to obtrude upon the people, and to persuade [them of], their own fabrications — which they themselves have feigned, accommodated to

the lust of the unskilled — and not the doctrine handed down by the perpetual consensus of the Church, are assuredly to be reckoned servants and slaves in no way of Jehovah (that is, of the true God), but of Satan, and of their own vainglorious ostentation. And this very [thing] the sacred context again shows luminously, when it has: "He omitted no word of all that the Lord had commanded Moses" — for the series of the sentence seemed to demand that it be said: "which Moses commanded Joshua." But [that] the sayings of Moses were the pure meaning of God, this it behooved to be clear and attested.

Question XI. Why did God will all these things to be done thus by Joshua?

He answers (v. 20): "For it had been the sentence of the Lord, that their hearts should be hardened, and [that] they should fight against Israel, and fall, and not merit any clemency, and perish." Concerning which words Abulensis institutes 70 questions — and indeed quite long ones, from 13 up to 84 exclusive; but St. Augustine [only] one, and that very brief, when he bids his Reader go to those [things] which were said about the hardening of Pharaoh. For, the words of this passage being cited (q. 18) from the 70's version, "Thus," he says, "this was said, as of Pharaoh; which [that it] is done justly, by a divine and deep judgment, is by no means to be doubted, when God forsakes, and the enemy possesses. Which is to be taken as [it is] there too." I would use this manner of answering even now, did not Calvin's malice extort something. For here (fol. 47, 48) he holds [that] the Canaanites [were] impelled and compelled by God to receive the Israelites with hostile arms, and sometimes, while [Israel was] at rest, to provoke [them] of their own accord — and that, so that they might be destroyed, because he had destined them to destruction. "God," he says, "who had commanded that pardon be denied to them (the Canaanites), the same impelled them to blind fury, that they might give no place to mercy." And afterward: "God commanded Moses that the nations should be destroyed, which he had destined to destruction, and therefore made the way plain by his decree, when he hardened the reprobate. And so, in the first degree is placed the will of God, that it may stand out as the chief cause." And at length afterward: "To this end God hardens them, that they may turn mercy away from themselves; whence that hardness is also called his [God's] work, because it establishes the effect of his counsel." Now if [those] try to obscure with their fogs a matter so lucid — [they] who feign [that] God looks on from heaven [at] what pleases men, and do not endure [the idea] that the hearts of men are bridled by his secret instinct — what else will they betray but their own impudence? They concede only that God permits; but in this way they suspend his counsel upon the good-pleasure of men. But what [does] the spirit [of scripture say]? That the hardening is from God, that he may cast headlong those whom he wills to destroy.

But I, first, concerning the text, advise [that], for that our [Latin] "For it had been the sentence of the Lord, that their hearts should be hardened," in the Hebrew [it] is "because it was from the Lord, to harden their hearts," or "theirs." For the Hebrew phrase can be rendered in two ways. First, actively — and that again in two ways. First thus, [that] "he [God] should harden their hearts"; but "it was from God" would less rightly precede — yet it would have sufficed [to say], "because God hardened their hearts." Secondly, [that] "he [the Canaanite] should harden his own heart" — because in the Hebrew it is an active infinitive of the conjugation "Piel," namely "lechazzek libbam" [le-■azzeq libbam]. Secondly, passively, [that] "their hearts should be hardened." For this manner of speaking is always true, whoever be the hardener of their hearts — whether [it be] the very [men] whose hearts they are, or some other, or both. For from whosesoever action, at length, the passion [being-acted-upon] arises. And therefore this latter manner of rendering is here somewhat broader, and answers to every author of this hardening. Whence it pleased both our Interpreter, and the 70 themselves — as their [version] indeed has [it], in St. Augustine (in the cited question), this version: "Because it was done, through the Lord, that their heart should be strengthened, so that they should go to meet Israel in battle, that they might be exterminated, so that mercy should not be given them, but that they should be exterminated, as the Lord says to Moses." Yet in the 70 themselves, the verb κατισχῦσαι [katischysai, "to strengthen"] could be taken actively.

But concerning the matter [itself], I say, *first*: [that] the Canaanites were hostile to the Israelites of their own accord and free will. *Secondly*: [that] God willed [that] they be destroyed by the Israelites. *Thirdly*: [that], if they had willed to repent, there could have been place for mercy for them — as was said above in the case of Rahab and the Gabaonites. *Fourthly*: [that] they themselves hardened and obstinated themselves, as the active phrase here (of which a little before) indicates. *Fifthly*: [that] the true and antecedent cause of this hardening and obstinacy is not the active and efficacious will of God, as Calvin holds, but the preceding sins of the Canaanites, concerning which [in] Gen. 15:16. For [he] who, by sinning, has deserted God, deserves indeed to be, in turn, deserted by God — as St. Augustine teaches (in the book *On the Good of Perseverance*, ch. 6) and elsewhere; and [it] is clearly gathered from many [places] of the Scriptures. Rom. 1: "They changed the truth of God into a lie," etc.; "therefore God delivered them up to passions of ignominy." And afterward: "as they did not approve to have God in [their] knowledge, God delivered them up to a reprobate sense." 2 Thess. 2: "Because they received not the charity of the truth, that they might be saved, therefore God sends them the working of error." And someone might suspect [that] these antecedent sins too seem, to Calvin, the primary cause of the hardening — because, when he had said [that] "the will of God is to be placed in the first degree, so that it stand out as the chief cause," he immediately subjoined: "For because their iniquity had come to the full, he resolved to destroy them." As if their iniquity were prior to the divine will of destroying them — the heap of sins prior to the hardening. And if Calvin meant this, he would indeed speak truly; but then, in the hardening of men, the will of God would not hold the first degree, but the forgoing depravity of the men themselves; nor should the chief cause of the hardening be called that same will of God, but the wicked and sinning will of men. In our Canaanites, therefore, this is the order. *First*: by their own choice they sinned gravely. *Secondly*: God therefore willed to punish them, and to remove [them] utterly. *Thirdly*: that this might be done, he gave a precept to Moses. *Fourthly*: Moses gave the same to Joshua. *Fifthly*: When [Israel] entered here into their lands, [Israel] entered with so many and so great miracles and portents, that they [the Canaanites] could — and ought to — have acknowledged the power and divinity of God, and deservedly repented. *Sixthly*: They of their own accord hardened and obdurated their own minds. *Seventhly*: They of their own accord even waged war upon the Israelites.

(col. 1075)

Eighthly: [That] the [Canaanites] did this is said to have been from God: because he permitted them to do [it], and did not take from them the human liberty of [free] choice, nor compel them — like cattle — to will otherwise. And so the penalty, destined and appointed against them by God, was mandated for execution through Joshua. Of which penalty, indeed, the beginning and cause was, first, their own sin and iniquity; then, finally, their contumacy and obstinacy against the Israelites and God. Yet, that all these [things] may be more manifest, I will repeat a few [points] from that disputation about Pharaoh, in Exodus.

Question XII. What is the hardening of the heart?

There are, chiefly, three words in the Scriptures of the Old Testament by which the extreme stubbornness and contumacy of certain men in evil is signified — namely "cibbed," "chizzak," and "hikschah"; to which correspond, among the 70, βαρῦναι [barynai, "to make heavy"] (Exod. 7:15 and 22), κατισχύειν [katischyein, "to prevail, strengthen"] (Exod. 8:22, and κατισχῦσαι, here [in] Joshua 11:20), and σκληρῦναι [skl■rynai, "to harden"] (Exod. 7:22); but in Symmachus, θρασῦναι [thrasynai, "to embolden"]. But the significations of these words in the Hebrew, and the circumstances of the places in which they are set, teach [that] not any aggravation, hardening, and obduration whatever is denoted by them, but a great [one]: by which, namely, *first*, some thing is borne and strives downward in such a way that, even with the greatest effort applied, it cannot be drawn upward, and its weight and fall cannot be checked — like some great rock which rushes to the nether places. *Secondly*: by which some thing is so firmed that it cannot, by many and vehement impulses applied, be moved and bent — like the Marpesian rock, as it is wont to be said. *Thirdly*:

by which some thing so hardens, that, however strongly and forcibly it be pressed, yet it yields nothing — like stone, iron, or some other hard thing. For — that I may speak of this last [sense], because [it is] rather more usual — "induration [hardening]" is a change by which some thing becomes hard. And just as those "bodies" are called "hard" which, if one wishes to handle [them], or to impress anything upon them, do not yield but resist — so also the hearts of men, or "hard minds," are [so] called: [those] which, if anyone wishes to work upon [them], or to impress [anything] on them, do not yield but resist — namely, by calling the mind away from the thoughts which are brought in, or by exciting the will against them, so that it may repudiate them, be unwilling [of them], and turn away. And again, those bodies are reckoned hard which resist not any thing or impression whatever, but a greater and more vehement [one]. For who would call butter hard, if it does not yield to a fly sitting on it? Who [would call] bread hard, if — as soon as thou hast touched [it] with the hand — it does not receive thy fingers? So also "minds" are not held "hard" which do not yield to small or usual persuasions, but [those] which [do not yield] to great, sharp, unusual [ones]. Yet it is to be understood [that] the "hardness of minds" of this kind is twofold: one good, and joined with virtue and praise; the other evil, and connected with vice and infamy. Of the former kind is "good obduration" — when the thing which either a man or a demon wishes to impress on a man's mind, and labors hard [to impress], is evil and base: for example, lust, the accursed hunger for gold, fear, despair, and the like. For, however strongly these strike the mind, to resist is good. And to hardness of this kind he exhorted, who said (Aeneid 1): "Endure, and keep yourselves for prosperous things." And again another: "Persist and harden [thyself]: this labor will one day profit thee." Likewise our [sacred] letters (Deut. 3:1; ch. 12:22; Josh. 1:7; ch. 10:25; Ps. 1; and Ps. 27; Isaiah; Daniel 10) — where our Interpreter usually says "to be strong, to be made robust, to be strengthened," and the like. And contrary to this hardness of minds is "softness [mollities]," [which] is a fault. Of the latter kind is "evil hardness" — when that which is set before the mind, and [for the sake of] which one acts and labors strongly so that it may be impressed [on it], is good and salutary: for example, the acknowledgment of the divine power, penitence for past sins, the ordering of a better life. For these — when they are set forth not in a light, easy, and ordinary manner, but a vehement, great, and extraordinary [one], and yet are not received — [that] is a vicious and detestable hardness, of which Scripture speaks, and which it attributes to Pharaoh and to the Canaanites, whom so many and so great temptations, admonitions, rebukes, chastisements, terrors, miracles, and portents applied within and without did not move. For not all sinners, whether living or dead, are properly, in the manner now expounded, "hard-hearted" and "obstinate." But there can similarly be expounded [as this kind of hardness] "blinding [excaecatio]," "the giving-over to a reprobate sense," and any similar [terms]. See St. Bernard (bk. 1, *On Consideration*, ch. 2).

Question XIII. What are the efficient causes of the hardening?

Calvin — both in this place (as we saw above), and on Exod. ch. 4 and 7, likewise bk. 1 of the *Institutes*, ch. 18, §2 — and also other heretics, concerning whom Bellarmine [treats] (bk. 2, *On the Loss of Grace*, ch. 3 and 4), say [that] the chief, proper, and positive cause "is God himself." Secondly: [that] "Satan [hardens], by the impulse of God," as Calvin speaks in the *Institutes*. It is to be observed, therefore, [that] "a double efficient cause of this hardening is noted in the Scriptures." One is "the man himself" (ch. 8, v. 15): "He made his own heart heavy," "vaiechbed Leb Parhoh," as [it were], "and he hardened the heart of Pharaoh." For in [the conjugation] "Kal" it is as [it were] neuter [intransitive], as indeed it is now pointed. Otherwise, if we read "vaiechazzek Leb, Paroh," it will be, "and Pharaoh hardened [his] heart (namely, his own, at his pleasure)" — [Pharaoh] himself, namely. The 70: ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ [ebarynth■ h■ kardia autou, "his heart was made heavy"]. And (v. 27), in the Hebrew, "vaiechbed Paroh eth libbo" [Pharaoh made his heart heavy]. The 70: ἐβάρυνε [ebaryne, "he made heavy"]. And ch. 7, v. 14, [is] as ch. 8, v. 15 — except that here "maccaph" [the maqqeph hyphen] is not interposed between "Leb" and "Paroh." The 70: κατίσχυσεν ἡ καρδία Φαραώ [katischysen h■ kardia Phara■, "the heart of Pharaoh was strengthened"], as Theodoret explains (q. 12). And (v. 22), as (v. 15) above, the 70: ἐσκληρύνθη ἡ καρδία Φαραώ

[eskl■rynth■ h■ kardia Phara■, "the heart of Pharaoh was hardened"]. So [also] Deut. 2:30; 4 Kings [2 Kings] 7:2; 2 Chron. 30 and 36; Isaiah; Ps. 94[95]; Rom. 2; Heb. 3. The other cause, God (above, ch. 7, v. 3): "aksheh, ἐγὼ σκληρυνῶ τὴν καρδίαν Φαραώ [aksheh, eg■ skl■ryn■ t■n kardian Phara■, 'I will harden the heart of Pharaoh']"; below (ch. 9, v. 12): "vaiechazzek Iehova eth Leb, Paroh" [and Jehovah hardened the heart of Pharaoh]. The 70, in the same words: ἐσκλήρυνε Κύριος τὴν καρδίαν Φαραώ [eskl■ryne Kyrios t■n kardian Phara■, "the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh"]. Rom. 9:18.

(col. 1077)

Question XIV. How is God sometimes said to harden someone, or to be the cause of someone's hardening?

When there are several causes of the same effect, that effect is rightly attributed to each of them, but in different [ways]. But here "the causes of the same hardening" are said [to be] "man and God." Therefore [they must be distinguished]. The manner, then, in which each is a cause of the hardening, is such that "man" is a direct, per se, and proper cause — because of his own accord, and quite freely, he is unwilling to acquiesce in the divine impressions, or, as the text often says, he "does not hear" them; but "God" is only an indirect, improper, and per-accidens cause, because, namely, he permits that hardening. And that in two ways. *First*: by not doing something. Then, by doing something. "By not doing" [something], again in two ways. First: because he does not at once inflict the penalty, but defers [it]. Then: because he does not give the extraordinary and spiritual helps of grace. And so [teach] St. Jerome (Epistle to Hedibia, q. 10); Augustine (Epistle 101; bk. 1 to Simplicianus; Sermon 88 *On the Season*; bk. 1 *Against the Adversary of the Law*, ch. 16); St. Chrysostom (homily 3 on Romans); St. Gregory (*Moralia* 11, ch. 3). "By doing something" also in two ways. First: because God does something which is otherwise good, and is referred by him to good, from which, however, he foresees [that] that man will seize the occasion of hardening — as was said above from Psalm 104[103]. Secondly: because he declares [makes manifest] someone's obstinacy. For sometimes one is said to do [that] which he shows to have been done. So Philastrius (part 3, heresy 76), where he enumerates the heresy of those who attributed the hardening of Pharaoh to God — so that Calvin can glory in those Fathers, as also in those who were called the "Predestinarian" heretics, whom Archbishop Rabanus condemned here at Mainz in a synod, as I narrate (bk. 3 *On Mainz*).

But it is pleasing here to hear the Nicene Anastasius (q. 29) explaining that [text], "I will harden Pharaoh": "It was easy for God," he says, "after [his] disobedience, to bring utter destruction upon him; but, using unspeakable gentleness, he inflicted [only] a moderate chastisement — and that made his heart hard and resisting. For just as the Sun, by the operation of [its] heat, softens wax indeed, but hardens clay: so also, by the gentleness of God, some men indeed are softened, but others are hardened. But because not all believe in the life to come, God here chastises certain evil [men], but honors the pious. For that cause the Apostle named some 'vessels of wrath,' but some 'vessels of mercy' — because, through the former, it is manifest [that] God justly punishes; but through the latter, [that he] takes care of the virtue of the Athletes [of God], and provides for them. For just as physicians cut those who labor under an incurable disease — many being present — teaching [their] disciples the manner of medicine: so also God subjected Pharaoh, on account of [his] disobedience and hardness of heart, to every kind of torments, for the chastisement of the rest. For the Proverbialist [Paroemiastes] says: 'While the wicked man is scourged, the fool becomes wiser [more shrewd].' And the shrewd [man], when he shall have seen the evil [man] severely punished, is himself instructed; but the foolish, passing by, are afflicted with loss; and, the impious falling, the just are struck with dread. But let no one reckon [that] Pharaoh was led [away] by God, so that he might not feel what was being done. But the deferring of the scourges is sometimes a cause that the mind contracts a callus. For when [God] inflicted blows upon him, he [Pharaoh] promised to let the people go; but when [God] remitted the torments to him, he was hardened. For [Scripture] says: 'But Pharaoh, seeing that there was respite, made his heart

heavy, and did not hear what God had spoken.'"

And when St. Bridget had asked God, the supreme Judge (bk. 5, interrogation 13, question 5), "why some are hardened," "I answer," says he [God], "that Pharaoh was hardened: it was his own fault, not mine, because he was unwilling to conform himself to my divine will. For hardening is nothing else but my subtraction of divine grace — which is subtracted for this [reason], that [man] does not attribute to me, God, that good thing which he has [as] free — [namely] his own proper will. As thou wilt be able to understand by an example. Note the example of the fruitful field. There was a man possessing two fields, of which the one remained uncultivated, [while] the other bore fruit at certain seasons. To whom his friend said: 'I wonder,' he said, '[that,] since thou art wise and rich, [thou] cultivatest not thy fields more diligently — or why dost thou not hand [them] over to others to be cultivated?' He answered: 'The one of the fields, however great diligence I show, produces nothing but the worst weeds, which noxious beasts occupy, and [they] defile the place; to which, if I apply fertilizer, it only grows rank by luxuriating; and even if it produces a little grain, more tares [zizania] come up, which I disdain to gather, because I desire no grain but the pure. Therefore it is more advisable to leave such a field uncultivated — because then the beasts do not occupy the place, nor do the beasts hide themselves in the weeds; and although some bitter herb sprouts, it is useful for the sheep, because, having tasted those, they learn not to disdain the sweet. But the other field is disposed according to the temper of the seasons; of which a certain part is stony, and needs fertilizer; another [is] moist, needing heat; another [is] dry, needing moisture. Therefore, according to the quality of the field, I wish to temper my work.' I, therefore, God, am like that man. Now the first field is the free motion of the will, given to man — which moves more against me than for me; and if it does some [things] pleasing to me, yet in more [things] it provokes me, because the will of man and mine do not agree. So also Pharaoh did, who, although from certain signs he knew my power, nonetheless firmed his mind against me, to stand in his malice; therefore he experienced my justice — because [of him] who does not use the least [things] well, it is just that he should not glory in the greatest. But the other field is the obedience of a good mind, and the casting-away of one's own will. Such a mind, if it is dry in devotion, ought to await the rain of my divine grace; if it is stony through impatience and obduration, let it equanimously endure purgation and correction; if it is moist through the wantonness of the flesh, let it embrace abstinence, and be as an animal ready for the will of its possessor — because of such a mind I, God, greatly glory. Therefore, [as to] the fact that some are hardened: this the will of man, contrary to me, does — because, although I will all to be saved, yet it is not accomplished, unless man personally cooperates, conforming his whole will to my will. But why an equal progress and grace is not given to all — this is my hidden judgment: I who know, and dispense to each what is expedient and due to him; who also restrain the endeavor of man, lest he fall more deeply. For many have the talent of grace, who would suffice to work, but refuse. Others abstain from sin from fear of punishment, and because they have not the faculty of sinning, or because sin does not delight them; therefore to some greater gifts are not given — because I, who alone know the minds of men, know [how] to distribute my gifts."

(col. 1079)

But Calvin, in ch. 4 and 7, objects certain [things], and answers some. *He objects, first*: "To act is not to be acted upon [to suffer]; but to harden is to act." I answer, [that] a double "acting" can here be considered: *one*, to which the passion [being-acted-upon] directly corresponds — and thus a man hardens himself, and is hardened by himself. *The second*: [it] is "to be willing not to hinder." And this is a certain willing to permit; and so God is said to harden. *He objects, secondly*: "God wishes to show power, not patience." I answer, both — but patience first, then power, as it is said [in] Rom. 2. *He objects, thirdly*: "Hardening is a certain penalty, which God wishes to inflict." I answer, the penalty is [that] a man is permitted freely to abuse his own will for evil.

But when it is objected to that same Calvin [that], "according to his opinion, God [will] be the author of sin," he really concedes it, even though he denies [it] in word; [and] then immediately betakes himself to showing [that] "God does not sin" — which, although it would rightly be inferred from the prior [premise], yet is not inferred first, but only [this]: that he [God] will be the cause of sin. Whence also, overcome by the evidence of the thing, in ch. 7 he says: "sometimes God permits license to the wicked, that they may pass off the divine works as [if] their own; sometimes he relaxes the reins to the wicked, and no one is thus cast headlong, except [one] who has willed to resist." Finally, "a spirit," he says, "of dizziness [vertigo] seizes those who have been obstinate in their malice."

Question XV. What is the effect of this hardening?

As long as a man is among the living, he never so hardens but that, if he willed to repent, he could still [do so], since general and sufficient helps are always at hand for him — as St. Augustine explains (bk. *On Grace and Predestination*, ch. 14, 15; tract. 13 on John); and this is clear in our Pharaoh, when it is said to him (ch. 8), "if thou wilt let [them] go," etc.; (ch. 9), "dost thou still retain [them]," etc.; and (v. 27), "his heart was made heavy"; and (v. 35); and (ch. 10, v. 3), "how long wilt thou not [submit]?" And therefore that [text] (ch. 9, v. 16), "I have raised thee up, that I may show in thee my strength," is understood either in this way: "I have set thee up [as] King, roused [thee] to such power, snatched [thee] from so many plagues and perils"; or: "Thee, thus hardened of thy own accord, and unwilling to repent, I have connected [directed] to this good end at least — that in thee and through thee my power may be demonstrated." And so [in] Rom. 9. But the certain effects of this hardening are: exclusion from heavenly glory, and the suffering of eternal gehenna.

Question XVI. How long a time did Joshua take to accomplish these wars, and destroy the Enakim?

It is answered (v. 18): "For a long time Joshua warred against these kings." But how great this time was, will be said in the following chapter (q. 3). Here, indeed, from this v. 18 up to the end of this chapter, a certain summary and recapitulation of those [things] is set up which Joshua did, both in the wars and after the wars; and another recapitulation is again subjoined in the following chapter. For the [things] which are here narrated about the slain "Enakim" (v. 21) happened indeed, as the text says, "at that time" — but as to a certain beginning, as will be said afterward, and [in] Judg. 1. And the [things] which, besides, are narrated about the partition of the land (v. 23, and the following chapter, v. 8) will afterward be explained more fully from ch. 13.

Question XVII. What [is] the mystical explanation of this chapter?

Origen pursues the mystical explanation of the wars of this 11th chapter copiously, in his usual way (homily 14 and 15); and he fetches [derives] it almost entirely from the names of the Kings and kingdoms. "The first," he says, "of all — who was also named the author of this war, gathering the rest and inviting [them] to a conspiracy of crime — is named Jabin, who was King of Asor. For he it is who is said also to have called together the rest. But 'Jabin' is interpreted 'sense [understanding],' or 'prudence.' Who, then, is this sense, or prudence, but that one whom the Prophet Isaiah calls 'the great sense'? For he says: 'And I will bring upon [against] the great understanding the prince of the Assyrians' — who said: 'By my [own] strength I will do [it], and by the wisdom of my understanding I will take away the borders of the nations, and will plunder their strength' [Isa. 10:13]. This one, therefore, is he who there indeed is called 'the sense, the great King of the Assyrians'; but here, 'Jabin, sense or prudence.' For indeed the serpent is said to have been in paradise 'more prudent than all the beasts which were upon the earth' [Gen. 3:1]. And the steward of iniquity too is said to have done 'prudently' the [things] which he did [Luke 16:8]. This Jabin, therefore, is King of Asor. But 'Asor' is interpreted 'a court [aula].' Therefore all the earth is the court of this king, who holds the

principate of the whole earth as [it were] the court of one — [that king] who is the devil." To the same form he fits the rest. For the chief author, often, of the war against the Israelites is the prudence of the flesh, and [that] wisdom which, to St. James (Epistle, ch. 3, v. 15), is "earthly, animal [sensual], diabolical." To his camp and standards fly gladly "Jobab," who is expounded by him [Origen as] "foe and enemy," as [if] it were "Aiab" or "Ioab," since it is "willing, or grieving." And the other kings run together, concerning whom above (q. 2) — whence thou wilt correct the errors that are in Origen, as "King Maron Simeon," and the like. But "Cinereth" — although in the same place I expounded [it as] "a cithara [harp]" — yet Origen himself compounds that name from two particles, "ce" and "ner," so that it be "as [it were] a Lamp [Lucerna]"; and he adds this beautiful sentence: "they are, of those who teach the Catholic faith in the Church, and illumine the people of God by the word of truth, burning lamps. But those who teach heretical dogmas out of the testimonies of Holy Scripture by false assertions — for the fact that they read the Scriptures, they seem to kindle lamps; but because they use false assertions, they are not Lamps, but as [it were] Lamps."

(col. 1081)

Of the Wars: Caput XII — [The Kings Conquered on Both Sides of the Jordan]

Caput XII — [The Kings Conquered on Both Sides of the Jordan] (opening)

1. These are the kings whom the children of Israel smote, and possessed their land beyond the Jordan toward the rising of the sun, from the torrent Arnon unto Mount Hermon, and all the eastern region that looks toward the wilderness. **2.** Sehon king of the Amorites, who dwelt in Hesebon, ruled from Aroer, which is situated upon the bank of the torrent Arnon, and of the middle part in the valley, and of half Galaad, as far as the torrent Jaboc, which is the border of the children of Ammon; **3.** and from the wilderness unto the sea of Ceneroth toward the east, and unto the sea of the desert, which is the most salt sea, toward the eastern region by the way that leads to Bethsimoth; and from the southern part that lies under Asedoth, Phasga [Pisgah]. **4.** The border of Og king of Basan, of the remnant of the Raphaim, who dwelt in Astaroth, and in Edrai, and ruled in Mount Hermon, and in Salecha, and in all Basan, unto the borders **5.** of Gessuri and Machati, and of half Galaad: the borders of Sehon king of Hesebon. **6.** Moses the servant of the Lord and the children of Israel smote them; and Moses delivered their land in possession to the Rubenites, and Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasse. **7.** These are the kings of the land whom Joshua and the children of Israel smote beyond the Jordan toward the western region, from Baalgad in the plain of Libanus, unto the mountain, part of which goes up into Seir; and Joshua delivered it in possession to the tribes of Israel, to each their portions, **8.** as well in the mountains as in the plains and the champaign countries. In Asedoth, and in the wilderness, and in the south, was the Hittite and the Amorite, the Canaanite and the Pherezite, the Hevite and the Jebusite. **9.** The king of Jericho, one; the king of Hai, which is on the side of Bethel, one; **10.** the king of Jerusalem, one; the king of Hebron, one; **11.** the king of Jerimoth, one; the king of Lachis, one; **12.** the king of Eglon, one; the king of Gazer, one; **13.** the king of Dabir, one; the king of Gader, one; **14.** the king of Herma, one; the king of Hered, one; **15.** the king of Lebna, one; the king of Odullam, one; **16.** the king of Maceda, one; the king of Bethel, one; **17.** the king of Taphua, one; the king of Opher, one; **18.** the king of Aphec, one; the king of Saron, one; **19.** the king of Madon, one; the king of Asor, one; **20.** the king of Semeron, one; the king of Achsaph, one; **21.** the king of Thenac, one; the king of Mageddo, one; **22.** the king of Cades, one; the king of Jachanan of Carmel, one; **23.** the king of Dor, and of the province of Dor, one; the king of the Nations of Galgal, one; **24.** the king of Thersa, one: all the kings, thirty-one.

COMMENTARY

In this chapter [there] is a recapitulation of the wars which were waged by Moses in the Transjordanian region, up to v. 7; then, [of those] which [were waged] by Joshua in the Cisjordanian [region], from v. 7 to the end of the chapter. Where note, *first*, [that] for that which we said "trans and cis [beyond and on-this-side]," the same preposition in the Hebrew is "heber [■eber]," which our [Interpreter] too always renders "trans [beyond]" (vv. 1 and 7); but the distinction of each bank, or side, is taken from east and west. *Secondly*: "Asedoth" is to be read in the text (v. 8), not "Aseroth." *Thirdly*: "Rex Saron [King Saron]" is read (v. 19), for which, from the Hebrew, by Masius and the Chaldee, is substituted "Rex Lasaron" — which word is indeed in the Hebrew, but so that "La" seems rather to have the force of the article. And therefore not only our uncorrected books [read so], but of the Innovators too, Junius and Tremellius, saying "King Scharonin, one." And Saron is a known plain and place, between Mount Tabor and the lake of Tiberias, praised for [its] exceeding fertility in Isaiah (ch. 33, v. 9). Yet to the same Masius it seems [that] Lasaron was a city not far from Lydda, which in the Acts of the Apostles is called ἀσσάρων [assar■n, "Assaron/Sharon"]. *Fourthly*: In the Hebrew there is also "Rex Sameron meron [King Sameron-meron]" (v. 20) — although it can rightly be said [that] that "meron" in the Hebrew is redundant, and made from the last preceding letters of the name "Simron," an aleph being interposed. For the Jews themselves note in the margin of their Bibles [that] in this

same word "meron" one letter, "vau," is redundant; whereas perhaps that "aleph" which they interposed is more redundant — [and], as I said, that whole word [is redundant], which is therefore omitted in the corrected Latin [texts] too. Yet Josephus (bk. 18, ch. 12) says [that] "meron" was once the proper name of "Samaria." *Fifthly*: From that "Rex Mageddo [King Mageddo], one," seems [to derive] that [word] of the Apocalypse (ch. 16, v. 16), "harmageddon" — as [it were] "har," that is, "mount Mageddo"; or, as the cited Innovators inflect [it], "of Mageddus"; and [it] is expounded τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐκκοπτομένων [to oros t■n ekkoptomen■n], that is, "the mount of the slain [those cut down]," as the 70 signify (Judg. 5 and 7). Lastly, in the names of the Kings [there] is to be observed the fourfold variety which is in the 70, concerning which [it will be treated] more fittingly in the following question.

Question I. How many, and which, Kings were subdued and destroyed by Joshua?

The Hebrew, the Chaldee, and our Latin enumerate thirty-one; but the Greek [enumerates] only 29. For by it [the 70], "King Bethel," who is the 16th, and "King Semron-meron," who is the 23rd, are omitted. Of which thing I discern no cause. But these Kings are numbered [with] the names not of themselves, but of the places over which they ruled being set down; in which, besides the already-indicated variety of number, there is another, very slight, in the order — since "King Cades" [comes, in the Greek,] after "Achsaph," but in the Hebrew and Latin after "Mageddo"; and again another, also small, in "King Opher," when τῆς ἀρώχ [t■s ar■ch] is added; finally another, great indeed, but from the diversity usual in the Scriptures. For thus, among the 70, is ὁ βασιλεύς [ho basileus, "the king (of…)"]

(col. 1083)

[the king] of such-and-such [place]. That the whole variety may be set before the eyes, [here are] the two lists side by side — as [they read] among the 70 (in Greek), and as [they read] in the Hebrew and Latin (a blank in the right-hand column means it agrees with the plain name; ✻ marks a king whom the 70 omit):

| ■ (70) | Among the 70 (Greek) | ■ (Heb./Lat.) | In the Hebrew & Latin | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 1 | τῆς Ιεριχώ | 1 | — [Jericho] | | 2 | γαί | 2 | Hai | | 3 | Ιερουσαλήμ | 3 | — [Jerusalem] | | 4 | χεβρών | 4 | — [Hebron] | | 5 | Ιεριμούθ | 5 | — [Jerimoth] | | 6 | λαχίς | 6 | — [Lachis] | | 7 | αιλάμ | 7 | Eglon | | 8 | γαζέρ | 8 | Gezer | | 9 | δαβίρ | 9 | — [Dabir] | | 10 | γαδέρ | 10 | Geder | | 11 | ερμάθ | 11 | Charmah, alias Horma | | 12 | αδέρ | 12 | Hedar | | 13 | λεβνά | 13 | — [Lebna] | | 14 | ὀδολλάμ (see 26) | 14 | Hedullam | | 15 | ηλάθ | 15 | Makedah | | ✻ | (omitted by the 70) | 16 | King of Bethel | | 16 | ταφού | 17 | Thaphuach | | 17 | ὀφέρ | 18 | Chepher | | 18 | ὀφὲκ τῆς ἀρώχ | 19 | Ephek [see note] | | 19 | ἀσώμ | 20 | Lasaron, or Saron | | 20 | συμόων | 21 | Madon | | 21 | μαμβρώθ | 22 | Chatsor | | ✻ | (omitted by the 70) | 23 | King of Semron Maron | | 22 | ἀζίφ | 24 | Acschaph | | 23 | κεδής | 25 | — | | 24 | ζαχάκ | 26 | Thahenach | | 25 | μαρεδώθ | 27 | Megeddo | | 26 | ἰεκόμ τοῦ χερμέλ | 28 | Iikniaham, toward Carmel | | 27 | ὀδολλάμ τοῦ φεννεαλδώρ | 29 | Dor, in the region or tract of Dor | | 28 | γεὶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας | 30 | King of the Nations of Galilee | | 29 | θερσά | 31 | King Thersa |

[Note on no. 19 (Ephek): it seems Masius read in the Greek τῆς ἀλάκ [t■s alak], and derives [it] from the Hebrew "chelek."]

Question II. Whence [came there] so many Kings?

I have already said elsewhere, in [my commentary on] Tobit (ch. 2, q. 3), [that] Kings of this kind were not of that power, majesty, and amplitude of cities and lands as ours are today; but [that] the Lords of nearly single, somewhat larger cities — especially if certain townships had been joined [to them] — were called "Kings"; most of them, indeed, not so great as certain "Counts and Barons" are today, or certainly not much greater. And [that] this manner of "Kings" existed among certain [peoples] of old, Aristotle shows (*Politics* 3); Strabo (bk. 16): "Aradus," he says, "[was ruled] as each of the Phoenician cities had a King"; Pliny (bk. 6,

ch. 9): "the strategiae or prefectures were once kingdoms," he says; and (ch. 15): "even today 45 Kings of the Ethiopians are reported." Whence Postellus, in his *Cosmography*: "in that infantile, or childish, age, all coveted the name of King." And his disciple Genebrardus (on Ps. 134, n. 10): "those first ages called 'Kings' as many as held the supreme rule in their [own] regions, even though narrowly circumscribed." But why does the same Genebrardus say, in that place, [that] thirty-one "Kings" are recorded [as] finished off by Joshua in one day? Where is this recorded in the Bible? Here indeed we hear of 31 Kings finished off by him — but "not in one day"; nay rather, over a long time, as ch. 11, v. 18 expressly hands down, concerning which [in] the following question. Certainly, that I may return to the name of "King": in the compendium of Josephus Gorionides [Josippon], Judas Maccabaeus is called "King"; and in the same history (ch. 27), the Roman Consuls are called "Kings." Aemilius Probus [Nepos] calls the Ephors of the Carthaginians — who by the Punic word were called "Suffetes," as I shall say in [the book of] Judges — "two Kings." And this nomenclature of "Kings" is now so changed, that Lipsius (Centuria 2, epistle 57) takes it ill [that] one is called by Bembo "King of Urbino, of Mantua," and of similar places, who ought to be called "Duke" or "Petty-king [Regulus]."

Question III. In how many years' space did Joshua reduce all these Canaanite kings, and their kingdoms, under the dominion of the Israelites?

In the previous chapter (q. 16) I said [that] a long time is indeed noted in the text, [but] yet is not defined. It is defined, however, by Josephus (bk. 5, ch. 1) [as] "five-year [quinquennial]"; but by others [as] "seven-year [septennial]." [That the latter] is of the truer reckoning comes out clearly enough from ch. 14 below (v. 10), where, after the end of those wars, when there was discourse about dividing the land, [Caleb] said: "Forty and five years are [passed] since the Lord spoke this word to Moses, when Israel walked through the wilderness: today I am eighty-five years [old]." Behold, Caleb says [that] he is 85 years [old]; and from that time when

(col. 1085)

[and from that time] when he was sent with the others to explore the land, 45 years have flowed by. But he was sent in the second year of the exodus from Egypt, as was said above (bk. 1, ch. 8). Let there be subtracted, therefore, from those 45 years, the 38 years during which — after that two-year [interval] of the exodus from Egypt — they wandered in the wilderness; and there remain 7 years, in which these wars were waged. And this is the opinion of Theodoret (q. 16), Abulensis (ch. 11, before q. 11, and afterward q. 90), Arias, Masius, and of almost all. And this seventh year of the wars falls in the year of the world 2497, or thereabouts.

Question IV. Whether Joshua, at the beginning of these wars, invited the Canaanites to peace and surrender?

Frequent in the commentaries of the Rabbis — but especially in *Tanchuma*, *Ellehhad debarim rabbah* [Devarim Rabbah], and *Misnaioth* [Mishnayot] — is the narration [that] Joshua, as soon as he touched the promised land, sent letters to the peoples, cities, and Kings of the Canaanites, and invited them to peace and surrender, and offered good and equitable conditions to those who should wish to make terms. "But I," says Masius (on ch. 9), "as I cannot fully join faith to that matter concerning public letters, so I would readily believe [that] that which those ancients left written about the offering of peace is not altogether nothing." For indeed equity itself dictates [that] no war seems just unless [first] declared; and this [is] so among all nations always. Nay, Moses himself, the interpreter of God, commands [that], when thou hast approached a city, [thou] not assail it before thou hast offered it peace. And this Ralbag (Levi, son of Gershon), and Kimhi [Radak], and indeed almost the whole crowd of the Jews, reckon is to be understood not only of foreign cities, but also of the Canaanite [ones]. Nor do they think [that] any nation, except the Moabites and

Ammonites, is not to be invited to peace. For concerning these two nations, singular commands of God exist, to this effect: "Thou shalt not seek peace from them, nor that which is expedient for them" [Deut. 23:6].

Question V. Whether the Canaanites, refusing peace and surrender, blocked the wells and springs, lest the use of them be for the Israelites, and did other things of that kind?

The Chaldee Targum affirms [it] outright, in these words (Cant. 3, v. 5): "When the seven peoples heard that the children of Israel were about to possess their land, they rose up together and cut down the trees, and stopped up the fountains of waters, and destroyed their [own] cities, and fled." Yet no indication of this thing appears in the Scriptures. Let the credit [of it] rest with that Chaldee [Targum] — to whom, however, the Jewish Rabbis assent, as they are wont.

Question VI. Whether some Canaanites hid themselves in caves for fear of Joshua, and others fled into other regions — especially Libya and Germany?

In the Lausiac History of Palladius are these words (ch. 106): "In the caves of the Amorites which are in Jericho, which they had once constructed [when] fleeing Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun, who was then laying waste the foreigners, etc." But [that] some fled into other regions, authors by no means to be despised attest. And concerning Libya, thus Evagrius (bk. 4, *Ecclesiastical History*, ch. 18): "Procopius narrates a matter which, down to his own age, remained by no means altered in the records — [a matter] very memorable, however, and almost surpassing all wonder. For thus he writes: [that] the Maurusii [Moors], a nation of Libya, having been cast out of Palestine, migrated into Libya; and [that] these [are] the Gergesites, Jebusites, and the rest of the nations which the sacred oracles record [as] stormed by Joshua the son of Nun. And [that] the matter is so, he takes the argument from an epigram which, written in Phoenician letters, he says he read; and [that] that [epigram] is near a spring, in which place there stand two columns made of white stone, on which are incised these words: WE ARE THEY WHO HAVE FLED FROM THE FACE OF JOSHUA THE ROBBER, THE SON OF NAVE [Nun]." But let us hear the first witness and source [of this] himself — Procopius (bk. 4, *On the Vandal War*): "After," he says, "the Hebrews had returned from Egypt, and had settled in Palestine, Moses, a wise man, who led them on the journey, dies. To whom Jesus [Joshua] son of Nave [Nun] succeeded, who both led the people into Palestine, and — showing valor far above the nature of man — took possession of the region. Whence, overthrowing the nations, he easily gained many cities, and seemed invincible to all. At that time, therefore, the whole maritime region from Sidon unto the borders of Egypt was called Phoenicia; over which one [king] had long ruled, as all attest who have written the ancient history of the Phoenicians. Here dwelt numerous peoples — the Gergesites, Jebusites, and others having [various] names, recorded in the Hebrew volumes; who, when they beheld the invincible army of the newcomers, deserting their ancestral borders, migrated into the neighborhood of Egypt, and there, growing in number and offspring — when they had not found a place commodious enough for so great a multitude — penetrated into Africa, where, dwelling in very many cities, they held all that tract as far as the Pillars of Hercules, using a half-Phoenician tongue and dialect. And they built the town Tingis [Tangier], most fortified by [its] situation, in Numidia, where [there are] two columns of white stone set up near a great spring, on which are incised, in the Phoenician tongue, letters of this kind: 'We are they who flee from the face of Jesus [Joshua] the robber, son of Nave.' These, finally — because none among them are more ancient than they — are said to be the natives of Africa; for which reason a former King of theirs, Antaeus, who wrestled with Hercules in the Palaestra, was called 'son of the earth.'" But the same Procopius adds how afterward the Phoenician Dido came into that same Libya, from those same regions, and founded Carthage. And all these [things] are strongly confirmed from St. Augustine (in the Exposition of the [unfinished] Epistle to the Romans), and other authors, whom I cited (q. 25) above (ch. 2), where I also showed the

affinity of the Hebrew and Punic tongues. Concerning Germany, moreover, Genebrardus (in the Chronology) is indeed a witness — but [one] to whom a foster-son a little more genuinely German would unwillingly lend an ear, because he seems to relate it with some contempt of the nation. There is, then, from among the Jewish Rabbis, Abenezra [Ibn Ezra], and others more ancient than he, concerning whom [it is] thus, on the word "Ascenaz [Ashkenaz]," [in] the German Elias's book *Thisbi*: "On that verse which (Obadiah 1) is 'the Canaanites, as far as Tsarphath [Zarephath],' Rabbi Ibn Ezra wrote [that] he had heard from the mouth of great [men] (Rabbis, namely, or [great] men) [that] the land of Alemania or Germany is [inhabited by] those Canaanites who fled from the face of the children of Israel." And this could [be proved] likewise from the tongue

(col. 1087)

and dialect. For the old Germanic [tongue] agrees, in very many [things], with the Hebrew — and especially with the Chaldee. Two [things], however, are to be noted here. One: [that] the Germans are Gomerians, from Japheth, not from Ham [Cham] — [as] was proved elsewhere (on Gen., ch. 10); so that only to the ancient Gomerians, in the empty and uncultivated lands of Gomerania [Germany], could perhaps some of those Canaanites have come. The other: [that] it seems to be outside the phrase and sense of Scripture to take "Tsarphath" for Gaul [France], [and] "Sepharad" for Iberia or Spain — as Scaliger says (bk. 7, *On the Emendation of Times*, at the end of the Jewish reckoning); but Ribera proves [it] (on ch. 1 of Obadiah, n. 103 and following), and more others [prove it], whom the later Rabbi lately cited (at scruple 4).

(col. 1089)

After the Wars: Caput XIII — [The Land Yet to Be Divided; the Inheritance of Reuben, Gad, and Half Manasseh]

Caput XIII — [The Land Yet to Be Divided; the Inheritance of Reuben, Gad, and Half Manasseh] (opening)

1. Joshua was old, and advanced in age, and the Lord said to him: Thou art grown old, and advanced in age, and a very large land is left, which is not yet divided by lot: **2.** namely, all Galilee, Philisthiim [Philistia], and all Gessuri; **3.** from the troubled river, which waters Egypt, unto the borders of Accaron toward the north: the land of Chanaan, which is divided among the five lords [petty-kings] of the Philisthiim — the Gazites, and Azotians, the Ascalonites, the Gethites, and the Accaronites. **4.** And on the south side are the Hevites, all the land of Chanaan, and Maara of the Sidonians, as far as Apheca and the borders of the Amorite; **5.** and his confines; the country also of Libanus toward the east, from Baalgad under Mount Hermon, until thou enter Emath [Hamath]; **6.** of all that dwell in the mountain from Libanus unto the Waters of Maserephoth, and all the Sidonians. I am he that will destroy them from before the face of the children of Israel. Let [their land] therefore come into the portion of the inheritance of Israel, as I have commanded thee. **7.** And now divide the land in possession to the nine tribes, and to the half tribe of Manasse, **8.** with whom Ruben and Gad have possessed the land, which Moses the servant of the Lord delivered to them beyond the streams of the Jordan, on the eastern side. **9.** From Aroer, which is situated upon the bank of the torrent Arnon, and in the midst of the valley, and all the plains of Medaba, as far as Dibon; **10.** and all the cities of Sehon king of the Amorites, who reigned in Hesebon, unto the borders of the children of Ammon; **11.** and Galaad, and the border of Gessuri and Machati, and all Mount Hermon, and all Basan, as far as Salecha; **12.** all the kingdom of Og in Basan, who reigned in Astaroth and Edrai — he was of the remnant of the Raphaim; and Moses smote them, and destroyed [them]. **13.** And the children of Israel would not destroy Gessuri and Machati; and they have dwelt in the midst of Israel until this present day. **14.** But to the tribe of Levi he gave no possession; but the sacrifices and victims of the Lord God of Israel — that is his inheritance, as [the Lord] spoke to him. **15.** And Moses gave a possession to the tribe of the children of Ruben according to their kindreds. **16.** And their border was from Aroer, which is situated upon the bank of the torrent Arnon, and in the midst of the valley of the same torrent: all the plain that leads to Medaba, **17.** and Hesebon, and all their villages, which are in the plains; Dibon also, and Bamothbaal, and the town of Baalmaon, **18.** and Jassa, and Cedimoth, and Mephaat, **19.** and Cariathaim, and Sabama, and Sarathasar in the mountain of the valley; **20.** Bethphogor, and Asedoth, Phasga, and Bethiesimoth; **21.** and all the cities of the plain, and all the kingdoms of Sehon king of the Amorites, who reigned in Hesebon, whom Moses smote, with the princes of Madian: Hevi, and Recem, and Sur, and Hur, and Rebe, dukes of Sehon, inhabitants of the land. **22.** Balaam also the son of Beor, the soothsayer, the children of Israel slew with the sword, among the rest that were slain. **23.** And the border

(col. 1091)

of the children of Ruben was the river Jordan. This is the possession of the Rubenites by their kindreds, of cities and villages. **24.** And Moses gave to the tribe of Gad and its sons, by their kindreds, a possession, of which this is the division: **25.** The border Jaser, and all the cities of Galaad, and half the land of the children of Ammon, as far as Aroer, which is over against Rabba; **26.** and from Hesebon unto Ramoth, Masphe and Betonim; and from Manaim unto the borders of Dabir; **27.** in the valley also Betharan, and Bethnemra, and Socoth, and Saphon, the rest of the kingdom of Sehon king of Hesebon: the Jordan is its border also, as far as the extremity of the sea of Cenereth, beyond the Jordan on the east side. **28.** This is the possession of the children of Gad by their families, their cities and villages. **29.** He gave also to the half tribe of Manasse, and its sons, according to their kindreds, a possession, **30.** of which this is the beginning: from Manaim, all Basan, and all the kingdoms of Og king of Basan, and all the villages of Jair, which are in Basan, sixty

towns; **31.** and half Galaad, and Astaroth, and Edrai, cities of the kingdom of Og in Basan: to the sons of Machir, the son of Manasse — to the half of the sons of Machir according to their kindreds. **32.** This possession Moses divided in the plains of Moab, beyond the Jordan, over against Jericho, on the east side. **33.** But to the tribe of Levi he gave no possession; because the Lord God of Israel is himself their possession, as he spoke to him.

COMMENTARY

The [things] which, after the wars — and [after] the year of the world 2497 — are handed down in this book, are these three. The first, "the division of the land of Canaan," from ch. 13 to 22. The second, "the dismissal of the Transjordanian tribes," ch. 22. The third, "the last words and deeds of the Leader [Joshua] and the High Priest," from ch. 23 to the end.

FIRST — The division of the sacred land, or of the holy promised land

"Geodaesia" — or, as [it is] called by Pappus, "Geometry" — is, generally, the division of land. But here [it is] not the division of any land whatever, but of the sacred, or promised, land, that is to be treated. And [it is] to be treated in two ways: namely, generally and specially. And generally indeed, its causes and circumstances are to be explained. Of the causes, the first that occurs [is] the matter [the material] — which is nothing else than the very land to be divided; concerning which [are] these questions.

Question I. What [is] this promised land to be divided?

In the first chapter of this book (q. 5 and following), it was expounded what and how great a land was promised to the Israelites by God. Now, therefore, concerning that very [land] it is asked: whether all of it is now to be divided, or only a part of it — and which [part]? *I answer, first*: Not all of it is to be divided, but only a part of it. For the outermost parts of it — as "Coele-Syria," "Phoenice," "Arabia" — by no means come here into the division; but only the inner regions, comprehended by the northern and southern boundaries set down before. *Secondly*: Not even all these inner regions are here divided, but only the Cisjordanian [part]. For already before, Moses himself had divided the Transjordanian [regions] for the two tribes Ruben and Gad, and likewise for the half tribe of Manasse, as is narrated (Num. ch. 32, and [as] is repeated in this ch. 13, from v. 8 to the very end). But there thou wilt observe [that] the Transjordanian [land] is called "Galaad," but the Cisjordanian, "the land of Chanaan"; and here [it is] also repeated in detail what portion was assigned to each — the Rubenite indeed (of the tribe, from v. 16 to 24), the Gadite (from v. 24 to 29), [and that] of the half tribe of Manasse (from v. 29 to 33). *Thirdly*: Not even all the Cisjordanian [land] was now divided, [says] Abulensis (in this chapter, q. 3); but only that part of it which had not hitherto been conquered and subdued. For the other part, which had already come into the power of the Israelites, he reckons had [already] been distributed, because here (v. 2) it is written: "A very large land is left, which is not yet divided by lot." Yet no such former division is anywhere else mentioned; no trace of it exists. For in the cited v. 2, thus in the Hebrew, word for word, it is: "the land remaining is very much, for possessing it by inheritance; and this is the land which remains." For the text calls "remaining" [that] which, up to that time, had not been subdued and occupied; ἡ γῆ καταλελειμμένη [h■ g■ kataleleimmen■, "the land [which is] left"], say the 70. And the Interpreter [Vulgate] calls this "not yet divided" — not because the other part, as occupied, was also [therefore] divided; but because it truly was not yet divided, and was well called "residual [left-over]," not in respect of occupation and possession only, but also of the division which followed after: the whole Cisjordanian promised inheritance, therefore — as much [as was] already occupied as [what was] to be occupied thereafter — was now divided and distributed.

Question III. Of what sort [is] this land to be divided? [so numbered; the print skips Q II]

This question can be treated both simply and comparatively. Simply indeed, [the land] is called "a good land" (Exod., ch. 3, v. 8); and "exceeding good" (Num. 14, v. 7), in the Hebrew — where, by the doubling of that [word], it signifies a goodness altogether great and excellent. And that [goodness] is placed chiefly in three [things]:

(col. 1093)

the healthfulness of the air, the fertility of the places, [and] the multitude of the people. *Healthfulness* is the head [chief] of all the conveniences which are in any region. And if it were lacking, this [land] would not [be] to be desired, nor [would it be] a seat and fatherland to be given by God to a chosen people, but [it] would rather have to be fled and execrated, as [it were] "the mouth of Orcus [hell]" and "Morbonia [Sickness-land]." *Fertility*, moreover, was shown by Joshua and Caleb, when they had performed the office of explorers, and brought thence a huge cluster [of grapes] and other fruits, concerning which [in the first book. But [it] is often indicated by Scripture, when [the land] is called "a land flowing" or "streaming with milk and honey" (Exod. 3:8 and 17; ch. 13:5; Lev. 20:24; Num. 14:8; ch. 16:14; Deut. 6:3; ch. 11:9; ch. 26:9 and 15; ch. 27:3; ch. 31:20; Josh. 5:6; Jer. 11:5; ch. 32:22; Baruch 1:20; Ezekiel 20:6 and 15). For by these words — after the manner of a proverb, as was said (bk. 1, ch. 8, q. 4) — "an affluence of things is signified to the worn-down [needy]"; partly because "milk and honey" are, of all, the first and simplest fruits from brute animals for the nourishment of men; partly because they clearly indicate the goodness of the sky and soil. For the "abundance and savor of milk" — whence [comes it] but from good and rich grass? Josephus says (bk. 2 of the *Captivity*, ch. 4): διὰ πλῆθος πόας ἀγαθῆς, τὰ κτήνη πλέον ἢ παρ᾽ ἄλλοις γαλακτοφόρα [dia pl■thos poas agath■s, ta kt■n■ pleon ■ par' allois galaktophora, "on account of the abundance of good grass, the cattle [are] more milk-bearing than among others"]. The "abundance and excellence of honey" — whence [comes it] but from very many flowers, and places most rich and clean? Let Pliny be seen (bk. 11, ch. 12, 13, 14). Since, then, so much both of milk and of honey is somewhere narrated [to be] — [so much] that it flows of its own accord hither and thither, like rivers — what else but a most blessed [land], and most furnished with all things for living honestly, peacefully, and pleasantly, is signified? And, imitating this, the Poets of the Gentiles said — Horace indeed (Epode 16): "Honey oozes from the hollow oak; from the high mountains the light water leaps down with sounding foot. There the she-goats come unbidden to the milk-pails, and the friendly flock brings back its stretched udders." Virgil (Eclogue): "Now shall the hard oaks sweat dewy honey; the she-goats themselves shall bring home [their] udders distended with milk." Tibullus (Elegy 3, bk. 1): "The oaks themselves gave honey, and of their own accord brought — to meet the careless [herdsmen] — the wealth of the milky udder." Ovid (Metamorphoses 1): "and the yellow honeys dripped from the green oak."

But although, by these words (as I said), the greatest affluence is noted, yet to me those certain new Interpreters do not please, who render "[the] land [as] flowing [affluent] with milk and honey." For [there is] a greater and more expressive signification of a fruitful and good land, if — just as we say "a man flows and streams with sweat" — we say [that] "it [the land] flows and streams with milk and honey," than if [we say it] "is affluent [abounds]." One abounds in wealth and learning who does not [thereby] flow and stream: that flowing indicates an abundance easily obtained, ready-at-hand, common, [and] secure. But always [there is] mention of milk before honey, because the use [of milk] pertains more widely to the sustaining of human life and its felicity. By milk infants, by milk boys, by milk adolescents, men and old men, and the sick and the strong, can be sustained — but not so by honey, although this sweetest and most healthful juice too avails for very many [things]. Hence, in Homer, [they are] ἀμύμονες [amymones], that is, "blameless [innocent]" — those γαλακτοφάγοι [galaktophagoi, "milk-eaters"]. And graphically, in his Canticle, Moses (v. 13 [Deut. 32:13–14]): "He set him (the Israelite people) upon a high land, that he might eat the fruits of the fields, and suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the hardest stone: butter of the herd, and milk of the sheep, with the fat of lambs, and of the rams of the sons of Basan, and goats; with the marrow of wheat; and [that] he might

drink the purest blood of the grape." St. Jerome, on the fifth chapter of Isaiah: "In truth," he says, "nothing [is] richer than the land of promise, if [one considers] not the mountainous and desert parts [alone], but, considering all its breadth, from the river of Egypt as far as the great river Euphrates toward the east, and the Cilician Zephyrium, which overhangs the sea." The same land he says (in the Radicals, and the commentary on Psalm 131, v. 15) [that] Radak called "ham moriiam" — which would be "moriiah," that is, "watered and fruitful with waters." Josephus, in the cited place, first concerning Galilee: "Πᾶσα," he says, "καὶ εὔβοτος, καὶ δένδρεσι παντοίοις κατάφυτος, ὡς ὑπὸ τῆς εὐπαθείας προσκαλέσασθαι καὶ τὸν ἥκιστα γῆς φιλόπονον" [pasa kai eubotos, kai dendresi pantoiois kataphytos, h■s hypo t■s eupatheias proskalesasthai kai ton h■kista g■s philoponon, "[it is] all well-pastured, and planted with all kinds of trees — so that by [its] agreeableness it summons even the least industrious tiller of the soil"]. And comparing it with Perea, he says: ἡ ἑτέρα ὅλη καὶ συνεχής, ὅτι καρπόφορος [h■ hetera hol■ kai synech■s, hoti karpophoros, "the other [Perea, though] wholly [rougher] and unbroken in extent, is [less] fruit-bearing"]. And again: τῇ γε μὲν μαλθακὸν ταύτης, καὶ τὸ πάμφορον, καὶ τὰ πεδία δένδρεσι κατάφυτα ποικίλοις· τὸ πλεῖστον δὲ εἰς ἐλαίαν τε καὶ ἄμπελον καὶ φοινικῶνας ἤσκηται, διαρδομένη χειμάῤῥοις τε τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρῶν, καὶ πηγαῖς ἀεννάοις ἅλις, εἴ ποτε ἐκεῖνοι σειρίῳ φθίνοιεν [t■ ge men malthakon taut■s… "(Perea) has a softer [soil] than this [Galilee], and is all-bearing; and its plains [are] planted with varied trees; but for the most part it is cultivated for the olive, the vine, and palm-groves, being watered by torrents from the mountains, and by ever-flowing springs in abundance, if ever those [torrents] should fail in the Dog-star heat"]. Concerning Samaria then, and Judaea: Ἄμφω ὀρειναὶ καὶ πεδιάδες, εἰς τε γεωργίαν μαλθακαὶ καὶ πολύφοροι· κατάδενδροί τε καὶ ὀπώρας ὀρεινῆς καὶ ἡμέρου μεσταί, γλυκὺ δὲ νᾶμα πᾶν διαφόρως ἐν αὐταῖς [amph■ oreinai kai pediades… "Both [are] mountainous and champaign; and, for tillage, soft [fertile] and much-bearing; well-wooded, and full of mountain and cultivated fruit; and [there is] sweet water, of all sorts, in them"]. Whence that abundance of milk, or γαλακτοφορεία [galaktophoreia, "milk-yield"], concerning which above.

But [he] who, twenty years ago, visited and surveyed that same region for piety's sake, the most illustrious Radziwi■■, [says] (letter 2): "Galilee, at the beginning, [is] rocky and abounding in cliffs, like hollow [Coele-] Syria; but two miles being traversed, so great is the amenity of the situation in this region, that it can with difficulty be described and explained in words. The signal fertility of the soil appears from this — that, although (on account of the incursions of the Arabs) the fields are not cultivated, yet it has produced the greatest force [growth] of the best herbs, especially of rosemary; and the shrubberies everywhere are green with dense [growth]." One could here treat in detail of those [things] which grew there happily — namely of balsam, vines, olives, palms, and the like, which are touched upon in Gen. 43, v. 11, and in the Canticle of Canticles. But too many [things], beyond [our] purpose, would here be heaped up; and of balsam it has already been treated above (ch. 2, q. 4).

To the multitude of the people, therefore, I turn — which was indeed so great that Josephus, in one and the same day, reckons up (bk. 6, ch. 45) the lambs slain at the Passover [as] 25 myriads and 5,600 — that is, in all, two hundred fifty-five thousand and six hundred (not, as in the Latin version of Rufinus, 256,500; bk. 7, ch. 17). Since [there] came together, for the eating of one lamb and the paschal banquet, men — and those whole, pure, and undefiled — 20 at most, but 10 at the least: if by this number, than which [it] could not be smaller, we multiply the aforesaid sum of paschal lambs, there will exist of such men [i.e. heads] twenty-five hundred

(col. 1095)

thousand: moreover, fifty-six thousand [i.e. 2,556,000]; or, if we follow that sum which is now read in Josephus, there will be [of] men 270 myriads — that is (as Rufinus rightly reckons up) two million seven hundred thousand. But what if we add to these the men prohibited from that eating and table by some defect — of gonorrhoea, or leprosy, or something similar? What of the women? What of the little boys? And the

same multitude can be understood from the very many and most crowded cities and villages of that same land. For in the following division great catalogues are woven concerning that matter (ch. 14, 15, and following); and Josephus himself, in the cited place, says [that] in Galilee [there are] πόλεις πυκναί, καὶ τὸ τῶν κωμῶν πλῆθος πανταχῆ πολυάνθρωπον διὰ τὴν εὐθηνίαν [poleis pyknai, kai to t■n k■m■n pl■thos pantach■ polyanthr■pon dia t■n euth■nian, "cities close-set, and the multitude of villages everywhere thickly-peopled, on account of the plenty"]. But this [is spoken] generally, O Josephus: say, prithee, more distinctly — "how many cities and villages [are there] in Galilee?" He answers, in his *Life*: διακόσιαι καὶ τέσσαρες κατὰ τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰσὶ πόλεις καὶ κῶμαι [diakosiai kai tessares kata t■n Galilaian eisi poleis kai k■mai, "two hundred and four are the cities and villages throughout Galilee"]. But again, in such a city or village, how great a throng of men? The same [author] answers, in the cited bk. 3, ch. 4, of the *Captivity*: ἡ ἐλαχίστη πόλις ἢ κώμη ὑπὲρ πεντακισχιλίους πρὸς τοῖς μυρίοις ἔχει οἰκήτορας [h■ elachist■ polis ■ k■m■ hyper pentakischilious pros tois myriois echei oik■toras, "the smallest city or village has above fifteen thousand inhabitants"]. Truly great [is] this multitude, of which (if we omit the larger [places], which comprehend many more thousands) the sum would be three million and sixty thousand. And concerning Samaria and Judaea (same bk. 3, ch. 4): μέγιστον γε μὴν τεκμήριον ἀρετῆς καὶ εὐθηνίας, τὸ πληθύειν ἀνδρῶν ἑκατέραν [megiston ge m■n tekm■rion aret■s kai euth■nias, to pl■thyein andr■n hekateran, "the greatest proof, indeed, of [their] excellence and plenty [is] that each [region] abounds in men"]. And at this time, from the frequent ruins of cities and towns, it appears [that] it was most populous, as the aforesaid illustrious Radziwi■■ says. Now indeed this same question would [remain] to be treated comparatively — but [it is] better to sever [it] off a little [into its own question].

Question III. Compared to other regions, of what sort [is] the same land?

[the print again heads this "III" — it is the comparative treatment of the land's quality]

Josephus institutes a comparison of the Cisjordanian with the Transjordanian region (bk. 3, ch. 4); but of the Cisjordanian [compared] with itself, and with other regions, [in] bk. 5 of the *Antiquities*, ch. 1, where he says [that] the nature of this whole land is such that, if it be compared with any other, it may deservedly be reckoned παντευδαίμων [panteudaim■n], that is, "wholly happy and blessed"; but if [compared] with the places of Jericho and Jerusalem, it may seem as [it were] nothing. But to make understood that comparison of it with other lands, three scriptures especially seem [apt]. The first is Deut. 32, v. 13, where it is called "a high land [excelsa terra]" — not because it surpasses others by the loftiness of [its] places, but because it excels [them] in goodness and fruitfulness. For thus they explain that "loftiness" [by] the [things] which are added: "that he might eat the fruits of the fields, [and] suck honey out of the rock," and the rest. To this [sense] the Seventy Interpreters call us, when they render [it] τὴν ἰσχὺν τῆς γῆς [t■n ischyn t■s g■s], "the force and strength of the land." For [that] which is outstanding and choice in any kind is wont to be called its "force and strength" — as Aquila here calls [it] τὸ ἴσωμα [to is■ma], "the summit and peak." Yet if one should think that a reckoning of height too is had [here], that could be [understood] in two ways: either because [it was] more northerly, or because [it was] more mountainous. In the former way it is not [higher], if it be compared with Syria and Armenia, and other more remote parts. In the latter way it is; but what praise is that? why would Moses proclaim this eulogy of the land? Are not very many other regions most mountainous? — and indeed not most remote from this promised [land]? There are, however, some of the Innovators whom another exposition pleases: [namely] that, because in the Hebrew it is "He carried him on [in] a high land," by these [words] be understood "fortified cities" — not into which, but upon which, God carried the people led out from Egypt. But the Hebrew preposition "hal" [■al] means also "in," as Junius and Tremellius themselves render [it] in the same phrase (1 Kings [1 Samuel] 1:19); and the [things] which are added sufficiently indicate [that] the "terminus toward which" is treated of. But for "the high places of the land," "high land" is rightly rendered — as [in] Isaiah 14:14, "I will ascend above the high places of the cloud," that is, "the high cloud." The other scripture is Ezekiel 20, v. 6, where it is called "excellent [egregia]

among all lands," and below (v. 15) "the chief [praecipua] of all lands," where in the Hebrew the word is "tsebi" — which sometimes signifies a living creature, [that] which, in the genus of deer, is called "a fawn [hinnulus]," or "a roebuck [capreolus], a doe, or a roe" (Deut. 12:21; 14:5; 3 Kings [1 Kings] 4:21; Isaiah 13:14; Prov. 6:5; Cant. 2:9); sometimes "glory," "ornament [decus]," "a thing worthy of desire and love"; and the Hebrews fetch the word from the verb "tsabah," which is "to be lifted up, to swell, and to be puffed up" (Num. 5:21, 22, 27). Because, then, by [their] lightness and running the fawns are wonderfully lifted up over the thickets and mountains, and because they are little by little lifted up and swell, they are called by this name "tsebi." Again, because the [things] which are lifted up over others, and stand out, we are wont to pursue with glory, desire, and love; and because the same thing is wont to lift up, puff up, and make swollen the minds of mortals — therefore the Hebrews affect with the same name "glory" and "ornament," love and desire, or any "glorious" thing — excellent, lovable, desirable (Isaiah 13:19; ch. 23:9; ch. 24:16; ch. 28:1 and 5; and other places, as will be indicated a little after). And [these] are variously rendered, partly by our [Interpreter], partly by the 70. But let it please [me] now to weigh only those scriptures in which [there] is clearly mention of our Israelite land. Therefore [in] 2 Kings [2 Samuel], ch. 1, v. 19: "hatsebi Israel hal bamotcicha" — [in] the Seventy, στήλωσον Ισραήλ [st■l■son Isra■l], [and] Aquila, ἀκρίβασον [akribason]; and its rendering [is] double in the Latin corrected Bibles also. One version, which answers to those Greek [readings]: "Consider, O Israel" (or: "set up and confirm thyself for considering") "for those who are dead, wounded upon thy high places." The other, which comes nearer to the likeness of the versions to be cited below: "The illustrious of Israel are slain upon thy mountains" — that is, "O Israel, the illustrious are slain upon the mountains." And, retaining the Hebrew number [in] the same sense: "The glory, or ornament, O Israel, is wounded [or slain] upon thy mountains." It can also be read: "O illustrious [one] of Israel, [they] are slain upon thy mountains" — that is, "O illustrious and glorious Israelite people, upon thy mountains any of the strong is slain," to which is joined: "How are the strong fallen?" [And] Jeremiah 3, v. 19: "How shall I put thee among the sons, and give thee a desirable land, a noble inheritance of the armies of the nations?" For, for "a noble inheritance of the armies of the nations," in the Hebrew it is "nachelath tsebi, tsiboth goiim" — that is, "an inheritance of glory,

(col. 1097)

a glory of the armies of the nations." In the 70, [it is] κληρονομία θεοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐθνῶν [kl■ronomia theou pantokratoros ethn■n], "an inheritance of the almighty God of the nations" — either because God is the glory of all nations, or because he was giving the inheritance of that land which is the glory, ornament, and adornment of the lands which the nations hold in possession. Daniel 8, v. 9: "there was made a great horn toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the strength [contra fortitudinem]." Here in the Hebrew it is "tsebi"; but it is also rendered by the 70 — in this place — δύναμις [dynamis, "power"], as though they looked to "tseba" or "sebaoth [Sabaoth]," which (Ps. 23, v. 11, and elsewhere) they render τὰς δυνάμεις [tas dynameis, "the powers/hosts"]. Nor [is it] new and unusual that "iod" can be put for "aleph," since both belong to the letters which are called "interchangeable" by the Hebrews. Daniel 11, v. 16: "he shall stand in the illustrious land," which [is] "erets hatsebi"; and the Septuagint retain the very Hebrew word, τοῦ σαβεί [tou sabei]. And below, in the same chapter, v. 41: "he shall enter into the glorious land"; in the 70, "the land τοῦ σαβαείμ [tou sabaeim]." And again, v. 45: "upon the illustrious and holy mountain"; in the Hebrew, "lehar tsebi Kodesch," "on the mountain of ornament, or of the glory of holiness." Since, then, that word "tsebi" is rendered in so many ways, and always signifies "something excellent, illustrious, perhaps glorious, and almost divine," and [since] so expressly, twice in Ezekiel's ch. 20 (as was cited), the "land of Israel" is said to be "the tsebi of the lands" — not of "some" only, but of "all" — of what sort was it? How excellent, how illustrious, and blessed it was!

But three [things] are yet to be seen here. *First*: why its excellence is noted by that name. "Just as the deer," says Radak, "is swifter of foot than the other animals, so the land of Israel is, before others, light and easy for

ripening its fruits, according to the Rabbis." Others think this is [so] from the usage of the Chaldee tongue, in which "tsebi" is called "ornament, pleasantness, glory, and adornment." But (as I said) that [word] is either from the Hebrew verb "tsabah" or from the noun "tsaba"; and why the Israelite region is rightly called "tsebi," the causes have already been indicated above.

Second: how "tsebi" is expounded by the Greeks in this place of Ezekiel. The Septuagint rendered [it] κήριον [k■rion], that is, "honeycomb" — perhaps by a certain allusion to "tsuph," which is "honeycomb." Aquila (says St. Jerome, on Ezekiel 20): "the first edition put 'foundation,' the second 'illustrious.'" Symmachus [put] "religion" (not "region," as Jerome is edited in today's books); Theodotion, "strength [fortitudo]." And why "strength" can be [the] rendering, was said before. But στάσις [stasis] seems to be derived from "iatsah," which is "to stand, to establish"; and (as I said) Symmachus rendered it not "region," but "religion" — because, although στάσις [is] properly "a standing [state]," yet that interpreter Symmachus was establishing [that] the best state of the commonwealth [rests] in the worship and religion of God. For thus the Greek scholia speak of him: "having called [it] στάσις [a standing]…, in that [the land] is dedicated to God for a priesthood." And immediately after the words already cited, St. Jerome himself subjoins [that] that land is so called "because in it is the religion of God, and the temple, and ceremony, and the knowledge of God."

Third: how that comparison with all other lands is to be taken. For some of the other lands do indeed seem more fruitful, more pleasant, more delightful than the Israelite land — or at least to yield to it neither in the temper and healthfulness of the sky, nor in the fertility of fields, gardens, and vineyards, nor in the number and throng of inhabitants. For (that I may omit Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the like) how great [is] the fertility, amenity, [and] multitude of the parts of the New World! And, that I may not pursue the most remote [lands] — how great, in Lithuania, [is] the abundance of milk and honey? how great in Attica and Thessaly, where [is] Tempe? Pliny (bk. 6, ch. 28): "Arabia," he says, "[is] to be put after no nations." And afterward: "the Sabaeans [are] the richest, by the odoriferous fertility of forests, by the mines of gold, of fields, of watered honey and of wax by [their] produce." And, in the end of the whole work, instituting a contest of all lands, "Now," he says, "all the works of nature being finished, [it is fitting] to make a certain distinction of the things themselves. Therefore in the whole world — and toward whatever quarter of the sky the vault [conexity] inclines — the fairest of all, and, by merit, obtaining the principate of things by nature, [is] Italy, the ruler and second parent of the world: by [its] men, women, leaders, soldiers, slaves, by the excellence of arts, [and] by the brightness of talents… Now, by [its] situation, and the healthfulness and temper of the sky, by the easy access of all nations, by [its] harbored shores, by the benign breath of the winds… For it falls out [that] its recurrent position [lies] in the most useful part, and midway between east and west, with abundance of waters, healthfulness of groves, articulations of mountains, innocence of wild animals, fertility of soil, [and] richness of population. Whatever there is which life ought not to lack, nowhere [are there] more excellent crops, wine, oil, fleeces, flax, garments, young bullocks. Not even in horses [do I observe] any home-bred animals to be preferred in the triga [three-horse chariots]. In the mines of gold, silver, bronze, iron, so long as it pleased to work [them], it yielded to none. And now, pregnant in itself, in place of every dowry it pours forth various juices, and the savors of crops and fruits. From it — the fabulous Indies excepted — I would next name Spain, wherever it is bounded by the sea." — [Now,] if Palestine and Judaea have, by Pliny's judgment, neither the first nor the second [place], how [can it be] "the chief of all lands, excellent among all, the foundation, state, strength, ornament, and glory of all"? Certainly, in Bereschith Rabbah (ch. 27), Italy is called "that land whose richness is proclaimed" (in v. 39, Gen. 27): "Behold, in the fatness of the earth shall thy dwelling be" — which our Interpreter joined with what follows, saying, "in the fatness of the earth and in the dew of heaven from above shall thy blessing be." And Elias Levi adds Calabria, saying, "which land [is] very rich, or most fertile."

[There is] a twofold manner of answering. *One*: [that] it too is called "excellent and illustrious" in some one whole genus, and likewise [that] this [genus is] its "glory, ornament, and strength" — [genera] in which,

however, it does not altogether surpass all [lands], but only very many. There would not be many "excellent" men, if [only he] who ought to be prince of all [could be counted] worthy of this name. How many once heard [themselves called] μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν [mega kydos Achai■n, "great glory of the Achaeans"], "the glory of the Romans, the ornament and adornment of the fatherland"? So also the Israelite land could be heaped up with those same encomia — although it did not excel absolutely all lands, but only many, by the endowments which I mentioned before. *The other* [manner]: that we say [that] it excels all regions universally; but [that] the excellence can be weighed either from the sacred and heavenly [things] alone, or from the natural and earthly alone, or from both. The sacred and heavenly only, the before-praised Symmachus weighs [considers] — as both the Greek Scholiast and St. Jerome expounded it. And indeed it is most true [that] the chief dignity of this land — by which it far surpassed all the rest — was the dignity [derived] from the true worship of God, from the august sacred abode [temple] of the same, from the sacrifices, ceremonies, and laws. Yet if we look at the context, [we see that] this [land] is [here] regarded by Ezekiel not

(col. 1099)

[regarded] only [sacredly], we will confess. For God wishes to commemorate his benevolence and signal beneficence toward his people — [namely] that he led [them] into a land flowing with honey and milk, which deservedly was, and was called, the ornament of lands. But if the account of the sacred laws and rites only be had, [then] Mount Sinai, the wilderness itself, every region also, and any place where the tabernacle was, would claim this glory for itself; and since the abundance of milk and honey is joined to this ornament, [it is] sufficiently indicated by that [i.e. by that abundance] that this [ornament comes] from that — that is, from the goodness of the land — as St. Jerome saw and noted, saying: "But according to the letter, [that] the land of Judah is illustrious, and more fertile than all lands, no one will be able to doubt," etc. And this opinion sits closest to the truth: if the Israelite dominion be compared with any other, not in any way whatever, but so [that] the other be of the same quantity, and not of greater; and so [that] all the [things] which the richness of this soil would pour forth be compared, all together heaped up, with the crops and fruits of the other — among which [is] also balsam. For thus this [land] will outweigh all — whatever Pliny may say of his Italy or Spain — to whom, as to Ulysses, his own fatherland, the rugged little nest of Ithaca, is pleasing. But if the natural fertility of the soil alone gives this land the principate of all, what if we understand that same fertility [to be] divinely augmented and amplified? And indeed [it] can be understood, from that [fertility] which the Lord promises every sixth [seventh] year, by the blessing [of] Lev. ch. 25, vv. 20, 21, 22. For, that in that year always [there] should come, for three whole years, an abundance of wheat, wine, and other fruits — "it was a miracle," says Abulensis in that place; and it appeared clearly enough that this happened not by accident, or from some special condition of nature, but solely from the goodness of God. Finally, if to the natural and supernatural excellence of that land, already indicated, be joined that which religion, the temple, the holiness of ceremonies, and other spiritual and divine [things] supply — what [thing] under the sun, in the whole world, [is] better, happier, [more] divine than that land?

Yet three [things] seem to obscure this so great renown of the land. *First*: Famine — which [was] there not rarely (Gen. 12; 26; 47; 42; Ruth 1; 2 Kings [Samuel] 21; 3 Kings [1 Kings] 18; 4 Kings [2 Kings] 4; 1 Macc. 9; Acts 11). *Secondly*: In the city of Jerusalem, the scarcity of wells and springs, and the roughness of the site: "It is the worst province of all," says St. Jerome (on Isaiah, ch. 49), "and is rough with rocky mountains, and suffers the penury of thirst, so that it uses heavenly rains, and consoles the rarity of springs by the building of cisterns." And yet that [city] was the metropolis of that land, the head of the kingdom, τῆς χώρας ὀμφαλός [t■s ch■ras omphalos], that is, "the navel of the whole region," as Josephus says (bk. 4, ch. 4) — nay, [it is] called by Pliny (bk. 5, ch. 14) "by far the most illustrious of the cities of the East." *Thirdly, and lastly*: the present-day sterility of those places. But to dissipate those three [objections is] not laborious. For as to the first: [there is] no such happiness in [any] lands but that it depends on the sky and on

God. If he wills [it] not, all [things] in them are unhappy. But for certain and just causes he sometimes makes unhappy — as men, so also the happiest lands. For either he calls famine and sends it upon them, as [it were] a penalty; or [makes it] as [it were] the light, the material, [and] the occasion of some excellent benefaction and virtue.

As to the second: the parts of this land are not to be regarded singly and in isolation (for among them were rough, thirsty, sterile [places]); but the whole region [is] to be beheld together. And although Jerusalem had a naturally rougher site of this kind, and a scarcity of waters, yet God provided for it abundant and healthful waters — whether from the clouds, or from neighboring places through pipes and channels — as St. Jerome partly indicates in his own words, [and] partly those most artful pools attest, to which the Bridegroom compares the eyes of his Bride (Cant., ch. 7, v. 4): "thy eyes [are] as the fishpools in Hesebon, which are in the gate of the daughter of the multitude." For, for "in Hesebon," one may take the exposition of the Hebrew name — [namely] "in" or "with art [artifice] made" (that is, situated at the gate of the flock [ad portam gregis], by far the most frequented). For from it, one went to the various parts of the city of Jerusalem, and to three new [quarters] like towns; and near it was the largest market, as is understood from Nehemiah (ch. 3, v. 1).

As to the third: Genebrardus (bk. 2, Chronology): "The whole beauty and happiness of the holy land fell together with the temple and the nation" — so that, namely, just as [the land] once held [a state] like a paradise (Gen. 13, v. 10), [so] the Sodomitic soil [was] reduced, by a divine [judgment], into ashes and a condemned sterility (Gen. 19); and the mountains of Gelboe [were] bereft of all dew and rain (2 Kings [2 Samuel] 1, v. 21) — and so now [is] that land. Let Chrysostom be seen (on 1 Thess., homily 5). For although he speaks chiefly of the Sodomitic field, yet — because it takes [its] beginning from Ascalon and Gaza — it can be understood also of other portions in part. "A region," he says, "once εὔφορος [euphoros, 'fruitful'], πασῶν τῶν ἐρήμων ἐρημοτέρα ἔτι νῦν [pas■n t■n er■m■n er■motera eti nyn, 'more desert than all deserts even now']." And indeed Radak (on Psalm 131, v. 15) says [that] this region was, in the temple's honor, watered and fruitful. The temple, therefore, being taken away, deservedly [were] the watering and fruitfulness also taken away. Whence [that] balsam, says the same Genebrardus, "granted to Judaea alone (from Pliny, bk. 12, ch. 26), and never seen elsewhere than at Jericho, was transferred into Egypt. Josephus ben Gorion (bk. 4, ch. 22)." But if one should wish [it] so transferred thence, that it was no longer there afterward, [that] can be refuted even from the cited Pliny himself, when — after the times of the Vespasians — he relates [that] the little balsam-shrubs [were] there planted, tended, and guarded by the public care and expense of the Roman senate. And indeed [that] in his own time it still existed there, St. Jerome shows (on Ezekiel, ch. 27), and St. Gregory in his own [day] (on Cant. 1). Elsewhere too, however, some traces of the old richness and fatness appear — as was indicated above from Radziwi■■.

The third scripture, finally, which seems to indicate a comparison of this land with others, is Psalm 73[74], v. 14: "God has worked salvation in the middle of the earth." Hence some suppose [that] Judaea is situated in the middle of the terrestrial globe; and they explain this in a twofold [way]. *1.* "It was," says P. Salmeron (Prolegomenon 41), "in the fourth climate of the world, and in the middle of the [then-]habitable earth." *2.* "It joins the Orientals," says Genebrardus on that Psalm, "to the Occidentals by the Mediterranean sea; and the Northerns to the Southerns — running through the same sea as far as the Maeotic marsh, very far to the north, and descending most deeply into the south through the Red Sea." By others, however, "the land in whose middle the Lord has worked salvation" [is referred] to Judaea alone,

(col. 1101)

it is restricted. For "μεσαιτάτη δ' ἡ πόλις τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα κεῖται [mesaitat■ d' h■ polis ta Hierosolyma keitai, 'and the city Jerusalem lies most exactly in the middle']," says Josephus (bk. 3, ch. 4), "παρὸ καί τινες οὐκ ἀσκόπως ὀμφαλὸν τὸ ἄστυ τῆς χώρας ἐκάλεσαν [paro kai tines ouk askop■s omphalon to asty t■s ch■ras ekalesan, 'wherefore some, not without reason, have called the town the navel of the region']." By

others, however, that "in the middle of the earth" is thus expounded, so that it be: "God has worked salvation of every kind openly, publicly, before all." For [that] which is most conspicuous, this is sometimes said "to be in the middle." And that exposition seems to fit this text especially — partly because he treats of ancient and past [things], salvations wrought while the people was being led out of Egypt; partly because he at once recounts those [salvations], and shows [that] all — or by far the greatest part of them — befell not in Judaea or the promised land, but outside it and before it, that is, before they entered into it: "Thou hast confirmed the sea in thy strength," and what follows. To this looks that [word] of Ezekiel (ch. 5, v. 5): "This is Jerusalem: I have set her in the midst of the nations, and the countries round about her." Where St. Jerome [says] thus: "That Jerusalem is set in the middle of the world, the Prophet attests by these [words], showing her to be the navel of the earth. For on the parts of the East she is girt by the tract which is called Asia; on the parts of the West, by that which is called Europe; on the Meridian and South, by Libya and Africa; on the North, by the Scythians, Armenia, Persia, and all the nations of Pontus. In the middle, therefore, of the nations she is set — so that, because God was known in Judaea, and his name [was] great in Israel, all the nations round about might follow her examples [i.e. her example]."

Question IIII. How great [is] that same land?

In his *Thisbi*, under the word "פרס" [PRS = parsa], Elias Levita says [that] that land was long four hundred "parsoth" — or, as the Rabbis (on the same testimony) prefer to speak, "parsaoth" — and just as broad. And he cites a Hebrew Poet who, at the end of that "parashah" which is called "Shekalim," teaches [that] to one day's journey correspond ten "parsaoth"; and to one "parsa," four thousand [paces], or [four] miles. The same [thing] David de Pomis repeats in his *Tsemach* [Tsemach David], and others — concerning whom [see] on ch. 1 of the Acts of the Apostles (question 2, on the return of the Apostles from the place of the Lord's Ascension). But *first*, it is to be understood [that] they speak of Italian miles, four of which make one "parsa" — so that a "parsa" is altogether one common and middling German mile; [and] if [it be] a little longer, it consists of five Italian [miles]. And therefore Elias's German Interpreter added: "But in those lands a 'parsah' consists of five miles." One day's journey, therefore, is 40 Italian miles, 10 middling German, 8 longer [German]; and the whole length of the land of Israel [is] of 40 days — of Italian miles, 600; of middling German, 400; of longer, 320; and just as much [is] the breadth. Like [things] concerning the length and breadth of this land [does] R. Bachya hand down (on Deuteronomy, Parashath Re'eh, fol. 205 b). *Secondly*: that counting is fictitious. For, in the common manner of speaking, the breadth of this land — from the Mediterranean sea — is as far as the Jordan. But where this [breadth] is widest, [it is] nowhere [of] 100 German miles, much less 200, 300, or 400 — as all who say they have traversed it confess: of the ancients indeed St. Jerome (in the epistle to Dardanus); of the more recent, Brocardus. And by geographical phrase and reckoning, the space from the sea to the same river is the "length"; and, on the authority of Ptolemy (bk. 5 of the *Geography*), [it is] nowhere of two degrees, nowhere of 30 German miles. For, by way of example: toward the North, the length seems greatest from Sidon to Ina — and yet the longitude of that [place] is 63°33′, of this 68°6′; but toward the South, from Anthedon as far as the Dead Sea — the longitude of that [is] 64°50′, of this 66°50′, or, as [it is] in the Greek, 66°6′. The same reasoning [holds] also in the other dimension, which the Geographers commonly call the "length of the region," [and] the "latitude." For they deny — both those who surveyed that region with their own eyes and feet, and those who explain it geographically — [that] the Rabbis' [reckoning of] that magnitude [is true]. For [the place] which [is] nearest to Antilibanus and toward the North, the highest, is Sidon, of latitude 33°6′; but [the place] which toward the South [is] remotest, is Gaza, [of] 31°46′ — Anthedon, 31°40′ — so that, even if, with Mercator (who corrects the fourth table of Asia), we increase the latitude of Sidon, or of any other city, the whole interval between the two most disjoined [points] would never be [of] 3 degrees, scarcely 2■; never of 45 German miles, scarcely 30. There is added [the fact] that the very starting-point, whence the Rabbis draw their opinion, is most inept. "The spies," they say, "sent by Moses into the land of Canaan returned after 40 days (Num. 13);

therefore the magnitude of that land, as to length and breadth, is 400 parsaoth." O Rabbinic acumen! — as though, forsooth, these [spies] on each single day accomplished ten "parsaoth" by walking, when again and again they had to halt, to turn aside from the way, to climb the mountains, [and] to look out from them. But suppose, moreover, [that] on single days they walked ten "parsaoth" — are all of those [to be] counted in the land of Canaan? [Were there] not some before their entry into it, on the very journey by which they went from the camp toward it? But suppose again [that] all are counted in the land of Canaan — are they not to be counted twice? For in that whole forty-day march they both went thither and returned. For if, say, thou shouldst go from here to Mainz [Moguntia] to Worms [Wormatia] in one day — that is, 7 or 8 of our miles — and return on another, would those cities be distant more than one day's journey, or 7 or 8 miles? But that the Rabbis' fabulous [reckoning of] this magnitude of the Israelite land be not utterly exploded, Genebrardus strove to devise a certain measure (bk. 1, Chronology): "The holy land," he says, "contains four hundred 'parsaoth,' that is, Parasangs or Persian Leagues (Elias, from the Talmudists, in the *Thisbi*). Which I so interpret, that — because it is nearly square, the Transjordanian region being adjoined — each side comprehends about a hundred Persian Leagues. For otherwise it is three times broader than where it is longest. For from Joppa as far as the mountains of Trachonitis, only 60 miles of paces are reckoned — that is, three [days'] journeys, which space is enclosed by the Jordan. But from Lebanon to the river of Egypt, [called] Rhinocorura — or from Dan to Bersabee — 160 [miles]; which distance of lands is accomplished in scarcely 9 [days], nine days." Yet that explanation cannot sufficiently defend the Rabbinic hyperbole. For *first*, he reckons in the Transjordanian region, of which [there] is now no question, since the spies did not then explore it either. *Next*, in the measuring of any region, [it] is quite unusual so to count its four sides,

(col. 1103)

so that from their sum its length and breadth might be known: no one measures out even a house — especially a square one — in that way. *Thirdly*: "since [it is] wider," he says, "by triple than where [it is] longest" — [where] it seems one should read "longer by triple than where [it is] widest." For otherwise the proof which is subjoined — from Joppa and Lebanon — would be discordant; and [Genebrardus] takes this very [Lebanon] for Antilibanus, as appears from the fact that he subjoins [the reckoning] "from Dan." *Fourthly*: even if we should call the Transjordanian region too into the reckoning, not even [then] would the quantity given by the Rabbis be approvable — because the "common length," or "Geographic breadth," cannot be greater than [what] is signified from Ptolemy, and will be signified hereafter from others. For otherwise it would be necessary to include Damascus and Coele-Syria, and besides other [places] either more northerly or more southerly. In the common breadth likewise, or the Geographic length, one would have to run out still far beyond the Jordan to the East. With Genebrardus [there] nearly agrees, both in opinion and in manner of speaking, Arias Montanus (in his *Chaleb*, ch. 2): "The region itself," he says, "is broader by more than triple than where it is longest. For from the sea to the Jordan the utmost [is] a journey of three days; and, in sum, from the port of Joppa to the mountains of Trachonitis [Trojanos montes] sixty miles of paces are counted, and the Jordan flows between about the middle of this space. But from Lebanon to the river of Egypt, [there] is a space scarcely to be crossed in eight journeys put together. And therefore, when the size of the region is treated of entirely, the measure is drawn from the North to the South — that is, from Dan as far as Bersabee, the two places being distant from each other by 160 miles of paces." Let us then hearken to the opinions of others. Guilielmus Postellus, in his *Compendium of Cosmography*, says [that] "the region of the Canaanites in no way equals Cisalpine Gaul, even with its mountainous places [reckoned in]." St. Jerome (in the Epistle to Dardanus), on the common length: "From Dan," he says, "as far as Bersabee, it stretches out in length scarcely a hundred and sixty miles." But he speaks, in his own and the ancient Latins' manner, of Italian miles — of which, if we grant four to one German [mile], the common length of this land will be 40 middling German miles; but if we include five of those Italian [miles] to one German, the same length will be 32 major German miles. But to the breadth St. Jerome proceeds: "From Joppa as far as our little village of Bethlehem there are forty-six miles" — that is, 11½ minor German miles, and 9-and-a-fraction major.

Abulensis (on Num. 13, question 36): "The length of the aforesaid land is 85 or 90 leagues; but the breadth does not reach to 30, or nearly [so]" — as is plain from the writings of those who most diligently reported these [things]. Therefore the whole length of the land of Canaan is not of ten days' journeys. But Brocardus says [that] "that same length is 64 or 66 miles, each of which can be traversed in one hour" — just as today miles are reckoned in Campine [Kempen], as, when they say the village Becam is of two miles, that is, whose length demands a walk of two hours; but the breadth, from the sea to the Jordan, [is] in some place of 16 miles, in some of 18. And this sum of Brocardus's [Christian] Adrichomius praises above all others, and to some extent explains, in the preface to his *Theatre of the Holy Land*. "Let the diligent Reader attend to this," he says: "that of all [authors] I have chiefly followed

Brocardus; and therefore [that] judgment is to be rashly passed by no one — since the miles of Jerome and of others differ very much from this reckoning, which [miles], however, can easily be reduced (by anyone a little more accurate) to consonance with this our description. For how little of skill is it, to accommodate the hour's space to any miles whatever — minimal, middling, [or] maximal?" And a little after: "St. Jerome understands Italian [miles] here, as also in the other places of his Hebraic [writings] — of which about three complete one mile of an hour." But note that "about": for if precisely three Italian miles could be done in one hour, and thou shouldst draw three into Brocardus's 64 or 66 miles of length, there would exist not 160 (as St. Jerome wills) but 192 or 198; but of the breadth, not 46 (as pleased the same St. Jerome) but 48 or 54. Yet the two reckonings, as appears, do not differ by any great labor [i.e. not greatly].

[There] remains yet the explanation of three little questions. *First*: if the land of Canaan was so brief, curtailed, and narrow, how does the Lord here (ch. 13, v. 1) name it "very wide [latissimam]," [and] Exod. 3, v. 8 "spacious [spatiosam]"? I answer: it was "spacious" in respect of the straits and workhouses [ergastula] into which the Israelites were packed in Egypt. *Second*: how could that same land hold so great an abundance of fruits, so great a multitude of men? Arias answers (in the cited place): "All the land, although not so great, yet — because [it is] filled with frequent mountains and valleys, and all these [are] of the highest fertility, yielding to no corner of the [other] lands — is commodious enough for feeding many cities, and towns, and villages almost innumerable; so that, in the manner of speaking of its own Gentile cultivators, it was said 'to flow with milk and honey.' Indeed, where the mountains are fruitful, they — for the one flat land which they cover — render much more of space and of surfaces, and by so much the more, the higher they are. For on all the sides and summits of the mountains themselves there stands out manifold [that] which, on one plain only, would have stood forth singly." Yet in an ingenious disputation, our Villalpandus (bk. 3 of the *Apparatus*, ch. 6) recalled Arias [from this opinion], as it seems to me. *Third*: to promise so tiny a little estate with so many and so great promises — is it worthy enough of God? For since its bounds are so narrowly circumscribed, of how little liberality and magnificence [is] so tiny a gift? This matter moved some to think [that] this land was not properly promised to the Israelites, but rather the heavenly land — the land of the living — of which, [being] already in that earthly land, the royal seer said (Ps. 26, v. 13): "I believe to see the good things in the land of the living." And in proving and explaining this, St. Jerome is wholly [engaged] (in the epistle, now often cited, to Dardanus). "Let them answer me," he says, "who think that this land (which now for us is made the land of promise by CHRIST's passion and resurrection) was possessed by the people of the Jews after it returned from Egypt — how much did it possess? At most from Dan as far as Bersabee, which scarcely stretches out 160 miles in length. Nor does Scripture testify [that] David and Solomon, most powerful kings, held more — except those [lands] which they received into friendship after victory. And this I say, to be silent about the five Palestine cities — Gaza, Ascalon, Geth, Accaron, and Azotum (which, forsooth, were not far off from Judaea) — [and] the Idumaeans too, separated from Jerusalem on the southern quarter by scarcely 75 miles (18■ small German miles); [and] the Arabs and Agarenes, whom they now call Saracens, in the neighborhood of the city Jerusalem. It shames [me] to tell the breadth of the land of promise, lest I give the Gentiles occasion of blasphe[my]…"

(col. 1105)

…lest we seem to have given [the Gentiles] occasion of blaspheming. From Joppa as far as our little village of Bethlehem there are 46 miles (11¼ small German); to which succeeds a vast solitude, full of fierce barbarians. This is, O Judaea, the length and breadth of thy lands: in these thou gloriest; over these thou vauntest thyself, through diverse provinces, to the ignorant. 'Show thy trappings to the crowd! I know thee within, and under the skin' [Persius, *Sat.* 3]." — because, forsooth, he himself had gone round this whole land (as he explains to Domnio and Rogatianus), and was even then dwelling in it. And afterward: "Read thou the book of Joshua and of Judges, and thou wilt understand by how great straits of possessions thou art hemmed in." Behold how the holy Father argues against the Jews — as though, among the unskilled, they blazon an amplitude beyond the true [extent] of the land which they received from God; and he fears lest, its straits being known, the Gentiles should laugh, and speak blasphemously of God himself: "What did so great a promiser give, with so great a gaping [expectation]?" But St. Jerome will [have it] that rather the heavenly land (as I said) was promised to the Patriarchs — concerning which [see] Hebrews 11, vv. 10, 13, 14, 15, 16. And indeed this opinion of the holy Father is most true, if it be rightly and soundly taken. For *first* indeed he always speaks of that land which the Israelites received, and held in very fact, and inhabited, before the times of David and Solomon, who ruled more widely. *Secondly*: he does not deny, as I said, [that] the earthly land was promised to them; but he denies [that] it was so promised that one should stop in it alone — since from it, as from a figure and image, one had to ascend higher, to the land which was primarily signified: to the land, I say, heavenly, and the land of the living. "I do not say this," he says, "in disparagement of the land of Judaea (as the heretic Sycophant lies), nor whereby I would take away the truth of the history — which is the foundation of the spiritual understanding — but that I may shake off the haughtiness of the Jews, who prefer the straits of the Synagogue to the breadth of the Church." *Thirdly*: this heavenly land is partly the Christian Church itself, partly the heavenly dwelling. *Fourthly*: the earthly land was indeed promised to the Jews [as something] larger; but on account of the magnitude of their sins they never possessed all of it. *Fifthly*: that most ample [land] which they possessed in the time of David and Solomon was not so altogether theirs that they held it by inhabiting [it], but was received only into friendship and [made] tributary; nor did they receive it from that divine promise, because that had by their sins already been made void and null. But of these [things] it was disputed before (ch. 1, q. 9). [It is] enough now [that] St. Jerome's mind be understood, and [understood to be] wholly consonant with the truth as to those first three [points]. And therefore [that there] is no occasion for the Gentiles to think or speak ill of God — [and this] rightly. *First*: because not per se, nor primarily, was the terrestrial glebe promised, but the spiritual and heavenly; and that [terrestrial one] indeed as [it were] a figure and type of this; this [heavenly one] as [it were] the thing itself and the truth — as will also be noted below from St. Augustine (on Psalm 34). *Secondly*: because the earthly land too was promised to them [as] larger; but they rendered themselves, by their own fault, unworthy of it. *Thirdly*: that same narrow [land] which was given to the Israelites was in no way unworthy of the promise of the divine majesty — because it was heaped with so many and so great [praises], as many and as great as we heard before; and it could embrace their whole nation, and abundantly and munificently sustain and protect all — so that this gift too was great-

est, and truly Divine. And these [things concern] the proposed *material* of the division; [now] follows concerning the *form*.

Question V. Into what parts was the land divided?

The *form* of the division of the land is no other than the division itself — just as neither of an action nor of an accident is any other form found than the action or accident its very self, unless someone should wish, metaphysically, to speculate too much on its difference from [its] genus. Let us rather now consider that [thing] which is nearer to the foregoing matter: into what parts the land was distributed. Now the distribution

was twofold. The prior, general — namely into those very tribes to which the inheritance, by the Lord's prescription, was indeed to be given, but had not hitherto been given. The posterior, special — the distribution of the portions of those [inheritances] which had been given to each tribe, into families and houses. By the prior division the parts made were nine and a half. Because two whole tribes, Ruben and Gad, with the half of Manasseh, had [already] received an inheritance beyond the Jordan (Num. ch. 32); but the Levitical [tribe] ought not to come into a part of the inheritance (Num. 18, vv. 23, 24; Deut. 10, v. 9; and this ch. 13, v. 14). There remained, therefore, [those] to whom a portion had to be attributed — nine tribes, and the residual half of Manasseh. Now some think these nine parts were altogether equal in space. But from the aspect of the single parts, the contrary at once shines forth. And therefore, with Abulensis, Genebrardus, [and] Arias, it must be said [that] the parts were indeed equal — not in space and amplitude, but only in proportion, which the diverse multitude of the tribes, and likewise the diverse richness of the places, counselled. A comparison, therefore, being made of one tribe to the other tribes as to the multitude of heads, and again of places to places as to richness, parts were assigned to all their tribes [that were] unequal indeed in space, but equal in analogy and equity. And this is [that] which is signified (Num. 35, v. 8): "The cities themselves, which shall be given from the possessions of the children of Israel, from those who have more, more shall be taken away; and [from those] who [have] less, fewer. Each, according to the measure of his inheritance, shall give towns to the Levites." And indeed the Lord had commanded this very thing before (same book, ch. 33, v. 54): "I have given," he says, "to you the land in possession, which you shall divide to yourselves by lot. To the more you shall give the wider [portion], and to the fewer the narrower." And therefore, when Josephus had compared the parts of this land among themselves (bk. 5, ch. 1), he said "τιμητὸν μᾶλλον ἢ μετρητὸν τοὺς κλήρους εἶναι δεῖν [tim■ton mallon ■ metr■ton tous kl■rous einai dein]" — that is, "[that] the lots, or portions, ought to be assessed rather by worth than by measure." And afterward: "Ἰησοῦς κατὰ μέγεθος ἑκάστης τῶν φυλῶν τὴν μέτρησιν ποιησάμενος [I■sous kata megethos hekast■s t■n phyl■n t■n metr■sin poi■samenos]" — that is, "Joshua, having made the measuring according to the size of each of the tribes, made the dividing [dimension] of the land." And again afterward, Josephus, giving the cause why the portion of the tribe of Benjamin was narrowest — "στενότατος ὁ κλῆρος οὗτος διὰ τὴν τῆς γῆς ἀρετήν [stenotatos ho kl■ros houtos dia t■n t■s g■s aret■n]" — this, he says, was done on account of the excellence and fecundity of its soil. Masius, however (p. 280), notes this [portion], as to its inequality of space, in the seven tribes which by the posterior casting-of-lots obtained their part — because he thinks account was had, not of the multitude which then was, but of that which was to be [had in the future]. But [that] this had place also in the prior

(col. 1107)

[division] he [Masius] nevertheless concedes it in. And what the future multitude would be, God alone could foresee; which, unless he had premonstrated [it], some occasion of suspecting injury would have been left to the tribes, when they beheld a larger portion given, at that time, to a small number. But how, in this matter, an error at first crept into the tribe of Juda and Simeon, and was afterward corrected, will be said not long after.

Question VI. Why was the Levitical tribe excluded from the inheritance, and from every portion of the land?

Since Levi was a son of the Patriarch Jacob no less than Judas, Dan, Gad, [and] the others — nay rather, prior to these named [ones] by the prerogative of birth, and, among all twelve, begotten in the third place — what cause could there be, why he did not share the same inheritance with [his] brothers? [Was it] that, as God loved Jacob himself [and] the other brothers, he held this one in hatred, as [he did] Esau (Malachi 1, vv. 2 & 3; Rom. 9, v. 13)? Or [was he] disinherited on account of the harm which he committed in the slaughter of the Shechemites (Gen. 34, v. 25)? And the former indeed we nowhere read; but the latter seems able to be

confirmed from Gen. 49, v. 7: "Cursed [be] their fury (of Simeon and Levi), because [it was] obstinate; and their indignation, because [it was] hard: I will divide them in Jacob, and disperse them in Israel." But by that reasoning, he who was partner of the fault, and is punished by this same penalty of dispersion among [his] brothers — Simeon — ought to have been made disinherited, and not to keep a little portion with the rest of [his] brothers.

Abulensis (Num. 18, question 20) brought forward three causes of this Levitical disinheritance. The *first* is, because [there was] no necessity of any part for it: for from the firstfruits, tithes, sacrifices, and oblations to all the Levites, more than enough of the things necessary for the sustaining of life was at hand. He relates (ch. 37) — R. Eliezer [tells] — how Levi was the tenth of the sons of Israel, beginning from Benjamin; and therefore [was] offered, through St. Michael, to God, that these Levites might serve God on earth as the Angels [do] in heaven; and [that] St. Michael then said [it was] just that a King should feed his own servants; and so gave the oblations and other [things] to the Levites. The *second* cause: because to that same tribe [there was] no usefulness of a portion of that kind. For since the Levites, occupied and detained by the priestly and other sacred functions, could not have ploughed fields, cultivated vines, and done other work of that kind — what [would come] from an unploughed and uncultivated land, of fruits? The *third*: because the division would have been grievous and burdensome to the other tribes, if the Levites had obtained one part too. For that part indeed would have made them equal to all the other tribes (as was indicated in the foregoing question); but the other [endowments], so many and so great, given to them by God, would have constituted them far richer and more powerful than the rest. For the twelve tribes gave to them, from the fruits of the land, the flocks, and the beasts, tithes. Those other [tribes], therefore, retained to themselves each nine tithes [nine-tenths]; but this one Levitical [tribe] received the twelve tithes, and so obtained more than a portion. By three tithe-parts, therefore, this [tribe] already surpassed all the other tribes. Let the firstfruits be added, let the dues of the victims and libations be added, let the vows and oblations be added at last. How great [is] this inequality? how enviable, and scarcely to be borne by the other tribes, [is] the opulence of the Levites? And these [dues] either surpassed or equalled a third portion. For if [those] excluded from inheritance still underwent envy (Num. 16), how greatly would sharers [in it] have blazed [with it]? — From these reasons, the second is little firm. *First*: because, after the temple was fixed and erected, the Levites were freed from a great part of the burdens and businesses — so much [so] that David, King and Prophet, had to impose upon them new occupations, as it were (1 Chron. 23). *Next*: because, granted the Levites were always most busy, and had thoroughly learned even the sacred and the Lord's laws by the greatest labor and study, and taught them to others — yet could they not have cultivated their own fields and vines through bondservants and hirelings? Were not the richer, more powerful, [and] more noble [men] in the other tribes doing that?

But two other reasons are very apt, if indeed these two [things] have already been posited and established: *I.* [that] God willed the revenues of his priesthood and sacred ministry to be so various in kind, [and] so rich; *II.* [that] God willed likewise to confer this whole [dignity] upon the Levitical tribe — and indeed [upon] it alone — of the office and dignity only. But again it can be asked: why did the Lord will these two [things]? And of the former, the reason seems least obscure and hindered. For God's honor and majesty stands the greater among men, if to his worship and priesthood so great and so many resources are dedicated and consecrated. But the cause of the latter is in the secrets of the divine wisdom — even as also [is the cause] why [he willed] to prefer this tribe alone to the others; nay, in it too, why — before Moses — he willed Aaron [to be] the ordinary state and Pontiff, [and] before that one's posterity, the posterity of this one [Aaron] to be Priests. For here nothing else occurs than [that] which we see in fact — that he did it so; and that, as to this sacred function and its dignity and riches, he loved Levi, but the other tribes he held in hatred, that is, put after. The single reason, therefore, of the whole posited question — in which, however, are included also those [reasons] which have already been said — the Lord himself brings forward (Num. 18, v. 20), when he says to Aaron: "In their land (of the children of Israel) you shall possess nothing, nor shall you have a part among them. I [am] your part and inheritance in the midst of the children of Israel" — that is: I, God, am to

you Levites in place of a part and inheritance, which — just as your other brothers were able to receive [it] in the midst of the children of Israel, or in the common partition of the land [so am I]. But I will be to you fields, vineyards, oliveyards, crops, grapes, olives — all things, I say, I will be to you [as] the conveniences and fruits which the land could supply. I, without ploughshare and plough, without digging and trenching, without any labor or care of yours, will bring forth and render to you [such things] as the richest glebe, the most fruitful vine, the most productive olive — [things such as] a vast wilderness, and lavished sweat, could bring forth and render. I [am] the field and the fruit, which needs neither the culture and hand of men, nor the timely and late rains of the clouds, nor the breezes and storms of the East or West winds, nor the heat and influx of the Sun or of any of the heavens. To you, always, and certainly, and abundantly, I will procure and bestow all necessary things. Be of good cheer; in me [be] all [your] hope…

(col. 1109)

…in me fix your hopes. From me all good things flow. That nothing be lacking to you will be my care — nay, even that [there be] much more than to the three other [rest of the] tribes, among whom the dividing of the land will be made, so that [it] may be over and above and redound [to you]. Now the Lord did this, when he transferred into the Levites' right all [the things] which were owed to himself — tithes, firstfruits, victims, oblations — and commanded all these to be handed over rightly and faithfully by so many laws and precepts; by so many exhortations and admonitions he stirred up the pious beneficence of the other tribes toward these [Levites]; by so many either rewards or penalties he sanctioned this his will, and rendered [it] most certain to all. From this same [source it is] noted (Num. ch. 18, v. 21) in these words: "But to the sons of Levi I have given all the tithes in possession, for the ministry wherewith they serve me in the tabernacle of the covenant." And v. 24: "they shall possess nothing else, content with the oblation of the tithes, which I have prepared for their uses and necessaries." And Deuteronomy (v. 8), ch. 18 v. 2, and this book ch. 13 twice (v. 14 & 33), thus: "To the tribe of Levi Joshua gave no possession; but the sacrifices and victim of the Lord God of Israel — that itself is his inheritance, as he spoke to him." And ch. 18 v. 7: "There is not among you a part of the Levites, but the Priesthood of the Lord is their inheritance." See below, ch. 21, q. 3.

But from that disinheritance of Levi, and from its so rich and copious compensation, flows a certain wondrous and delightful consideration of divine providence. For *first*, Jacob, about to die, imprecated — or threatened — upon Simeon and Levi themselves (both for the slaughter of the Shechemites and for the design of killing Joseph, as indeed the Chaldee Paraphrast [Gen. 49] and the Rabbis think) dispersion among [their] brothers: that those whom fury and crime had joined, habitation might tear apart and pull asunder in the promised land — while they should not have one certain portion of land and fixed seat, but their posterity should be scattered, dispersed in several disjoined places, as is had concerning the tribe of Simeon (1 Chron. 4) and concerning Levi in this book below (chs. 19 & 21). But God did not will to take away or change the just imprecation or threatening of the good old man and Patriarch; but, of his immense benignity, he brought it about that this dispersion should indeed be, yet with no disadvantage — nay rather, as to the Levitical tribe, with no small advantage and honor. *Secondly*: that the other [tribes] might pursue the Levitical tribe with charity, and it [pursue] the others [with charity], and [that] all together, with joined works, might apply themselves to the worship and honor of God and to the proper salvation of souls, the same Lord brought [it] about that in spiritual and sacred [matters] the others should depend on the Levites; in corporeal [matters], and the subsidies for leading human life, the Levites themselves [should depend] on the others — as though the Lord should say: Do you wish, O other Israelites, to worship me [as] your God as you ought, to sacrifice to me, to have me propitious? To my Levites [give the things] which are required for food and clothing, which are given to you by me, [and] which are owed to me by you: give all, give abundantly. Do you wish, O Levites, to receive your sustenance from the other Israelites — fat victims, plentiful tithes, rich firstfruits, frequent oblations, and very ample and opulent gifts? Labor at my sacred [rites] strenuously; teach my people my laws and precepts diligently; bind those [people] to yourselves by your religion, doctrine, diligence, and

example: their libe-

rality and munificence — do not blunt [it] by impiety, inertia, idleness, [and] wantonness. By you they [are bound]; by them you are fitted and knit. Their mind is commended to you by me, your body to them. *Thirdly*: [that] which withdrew from the Levites in the partition of the land, that accrued to the other tribes — so that these, [made] as it were richer by that benefit, might be more beneficent toward those same [Levites]. *Fourthly*, finally, a certain form of acting, and of mutually embracing and aiding one another, was described for the Christian people no less than the clergy — which St. Cyril of Alexandria pursues (bk. 13, *On adoration in spirit and in truth*) and St. Jerome (Epistle to Nepotian, *On the life of Clerics*); and something can be seen in Bellarmine (bk. 1, *On Clerics*, chs. 25 & 26). Likewise Paul of Burgos [wrote] concerning himself and his Levite sons, in the Epistle to his son Alphonsus [prefixed] before the additions to Lyranus; [and] St. Ambrose (*On flight from the world*, ch. 2): "He whose portion is God ought to care for nothing but God, lest he be hindered by the burden of another's necessity. For [that] which is bestowed on other offices, this is plucked away from the worship of religion, and from this our office."

Question VII. To what time is the interpretation to be assigned, [of the right] taken away from Levi himself? [the print: "Quando capiendae interpretationis ius ipsi Levi ademptum?" — i.e. to what point is Levi's loss of his right [to a land-portion] to be referred.]

A threefold time is referred [to it] by three [authorities]. The *first*: when Jacob said (Gen. 48, v. 5): "Thy two sons (O Joseph), who were born to thee in the land of Egypt before I came hither to thee, are mine. Ephraim and Manasses, like Ruben and Simeon, shall be reckoned to me." The *second*: when, in the following ch. 49, the same Jacob said: "Cursed [be] their fury (of Simeon and Levi), because [it was] obstinate; and their indignation, because [it was] hard: I will divide them in Jacob, and disperse them in Israel." So thinks Masius (on this ch. 13, and bk. 1 *On Clerics*, ch. 26). [And] Bellarmine: "Jacob," he says, "disinherited his son Levi on account of his sin, as is plain (Gen. 49): 'I will divide,' etc." The *third* time: when the Lord said (Num. 18, v. 20): "In their land (of the children of Israel) you shall possess nothing (O Aaron), nor shall you have a part among them." And this is Abulensis's opinion (on that ch. 18, question 20, and here ch. 14, question 4), to which one must subscribe. For since, *first*, by adoption new sons are admitted into the number of the prior and legitimate sons, the inheritance is not taken from the prior and legitimate [sons] — as is plain from the laws of adoptions — although, on account of the multiplication of sons, each one's portion is diminished somewhat. *Secondly*: but grant [that] the inheritance is taken from the prior children by the adoption of the latter [ones] — [is it taken] from all the prior [ones]? or only from some? If from all, no portion of land should have been ascribed to the other tribes, just as none [was ascribed] to the Levitical. If [only] from some — [from] as many as the new sons ascribed? Two tribes, therefore, would have had to be repelled from the inheritance. But only the Levitical was repelled. *Thirdly*: whether two, or only one, had to be repelled, why the Levitical rather than some [other] of the others? *Fourthly*: in the foregoing question I have already said [that Levi was excluded] on account of the sin, and the injury inflicted on the Shechemites — [but] not deprived of the inheritance, because the same words of Jacob (Gen. 49) are borne against Simeon also, and yet he was not deprived of his portion. How, then, would [Levi] have been deprived

(col. 1111)

Levi? By an equal penalty an equal fault is punished; and the force of the same sentence, pronounced against both, was in Simeon [the same] as [it was] in Levi. [So the Gen. 49 curse cannot be the peculiar ground of Levi's exclusion; hence it dates to Num. 18:20.]

Question VIII. Did Ephraim and Manasseh succeed into the place of the Levites?

The text asserts this expressly in the following ch. 14, v. 4: "The Levites," it says, "received nothing of land among their brothers. But into their place succeeded the sons of Joseph, divided into two tribes, Manasseh and Ephraim." But how did they succeed? For [they succeeded] either into their right, or into their very land. Not into [their] right — because these sons of Joseph received the right of the land to be occupied and divided together with all the sons of Jacob, when they were adopted by this [Jacob] (Gen. 48, v. 5): "Two [sons]," he says, "of thine (O Joseph) are mine. Ephraim and Manasses, like Ruben and Simeon, shall be reckoned to me." But when, with these two — who among Jacob's sons were the first [in rank] — Ephraim and Manasseh are made equal, much more [are they made equal] with the other tribes. And Levi then retained his own right, until the Lord should say (Num. 18, v. 20) [that] in the partition of the land there ought to be no little part for the Levites, as was said in the foregoing question. Nor did they succeed into [their] land either — because the Levites ought to have had it beforehand; but in truth they never had [it]. It is to be known, therefore, *first*, [that] in the Hebrew and Greek text this word "succession" is not had; but in that [text] it is thus: "And to the Levites he gave no inheritance among them" — because there were two sons of Joseph, two tribes, Manasseh and Ephraim. In the Greek thus: "τοῖς Λευίταις οὐκ ἔδωκε κλῆρον ἐν αὐτοῖς, ὅτι ἦσαν οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰωσὴφ δύο φυλαί, Μανασσῆ καὶ Ἐφραίμ [tois Leuitais ouk ed■ke kl■ron en autois, hoti ■san hoi huioi I■s■ph dyo phylai, Manass■ kai Ephraim]" ["to the Levites he gave no lot among them, because the sons of Joseph were two tribes, Manasseh and Ephraim"]. *Secondly*: yet Manasseh and Ephraim are said to have succeeded to Levi himself — not as to right or portion, but as to the number of the twelve tribes and the twelve portions of land. And this, and nothing else, our Interpreter [Vulgate] willed. For, when the text wished to show [that] the whole land [was] divided into twelve parts, just as the sons of Jacob had been twelve, it now says [the division] is to be made by Joshua into nine and a half parts — because a tribe and a half had already received their parts beyond the Jordan; and of the residual tribes, no part was to be given to the Levitical [tribe]. From which fact, when it seemed at once to be inferred [that] only eight and a half tribes remained, to whom the distribution ought to be made, the text answers [that] there were nine and a half: because, to fill up this number, the two sons of Joseph succeeded — namely so, that one of them maintained the father's [Joseph's] place and number, but the other [maintained the place] of Levi himself.

Question IX. Whether the land ought to have been divided into twelve portions, and why?

Abulensis (following ch. 14, q. 4) says this was not necessary. And indeed it was not — if there had not been twelve sons of Jacob, or if some had been disinherited for a just cause and none adopted, or if, finally, more than two had been adopted. But since the sons of Jacob himself were twelve, and only one, Levi, disinherited, and two adopted, it was necessary for the land to be divided into twelve portions. But if it be asked why the Lord willed Jacob himself [to have] twelve sons, to me indeed no cause is discerned besides the mystical: that by those twelve the [twelve] Patriarchs of the Israelite people might be signified, [and] the twelve first Fathers and Masters of the Christian Church — namely, the twelve Apostles. And hence another reason of the duodenary section is drawn: that, namely, it might be premonstrated [that] the globe of the lands [was] to be traversed by twelve, as it were, parts, by the twelve Apostles, and to be imbued and illustrated with the true knowledge of God — [this] division. For, explaining that [passage] which is read in Isaiah ch. 61 among the 70 — "Secondly they shall possess the land" — B. Cyril says: "Once," he says, "Jesus [son of] Nave divided among the Israelites the regions of the nations of the Amorrhites and Idumaeans; but after CHRIST came — of whom that [Jesus] was the type — he divided not only Judaea, but the whole earth, among his ministers; which was the second division after that [former one]. For those very

divine Mystagogues — that is, dispensers of the mysteries, and Doctors — distributed among themselves the regions and cities by the divine suffrage." *Thirdly*, moreover, some bring forward a reason of this same duodenary partition from the nations which, before the Israelites came out of Egypt, were occupying that land, in number. For they gather [that] these were twelve, from Gen. 10, vv. 15, 16, 17, where twelve authors of peoples in that land are indicated — if Canaan their father too be numbered with [his] eleven sons, and the Transjordanian [nation] be reckoned in:

#	Name (Vulgate)	Hebrew form
1	Sidon	—
2	Hetthaeus	Cheth
3	Iebusaeus	Iebusi
4	Amorrhaeus	Emorrhi
5	Gergesaeus	Girgaschi
6	Hevaeus	Chivi
7	Aracaeus	Harki
8	Sinaeus	Sini
9	Aradius	Aruadi
10	Samaraeus	Themari
11	Hamathaeus	Chamathi
12	Canaan himself, the father of these	—

This reasoning, moreover, is confirmed from Deut. 32, v. 8: "When the Most High was dividing the nations, when he was separating the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the peoples according to the number of the children of Israel." The Seventy indeed read "κατ᾽ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ [kat' arithmon angel■n theou]," "according to the number of the angels of God"; and with these [agree] nearly [all] the Greek Fathers — Dionysius the Areopagite (*Celestial Hierarchy*, ch. 9), Origen (bks. 4 & 5 *Against Celsus*, [and] homilies 11 & 28 on Numbers), St. Epiphanius (heresy 51), St. Chrysostom (homily 3 on Colossians), St. Justin (with Trypho), the Author of the *Imperfect Work on Matthew*, Euthymius, Pantaleon *On St. Michael*, [and] some Latins too, as St. Jerome (bk. 2 on Micah, & on Ephesians), St. Gregory (homily 34), Rufinus (in the exposition of the Creed), [and] Novatian (bk. *On the Trinity*, which is falsely ascribed to Tertullian). But with our text agree the Hebrew, the Chaldee, and the Greek of Aquila and Symmachus; and Origen (cited hom. 28 on Numbers) and Justin (in the cited place) make mention of it. And indeed [that] opinion is much clearer and more ready; and it can agree with the 70, if we say [that] those called by them "Angels of God" are "sons of Israel." And why should it not be permitted to say [so], since pious and holy men are called "sons of God" (Gen. 6), and the very "Angels of God" [are called] "pious" too (Job 2 & 4)?

(col. 1113)

…[Job 2 &] 4, [Psalm] 38, [and] Psalm 88 — shall we look [at them]? And if we take these words of truly and properly-called Angelic minds, do not too many and discrepant expositions arise? For some take [it] of the good Angels only, others of the evil (as the author of the *Imperfect Work*); and [of] those who [take it] of the good, some [take it] of all (as the ordinary Gloss, from St. Gregory), others [take] only some — namely, the presidents of regions and nations (as the Areopagite, [and] Euthymius). There is, therefore, in this third reasoning something of probability — which, in a matter of this kind, is to be esteemed enough. Otherwise one cannot conquer a resisting adversary. *First*: because, as I said, the reading and understanding concerning "Angels" and "sons of Israel" is various. *Secondly*: because there are not lacking [those] too who think [that] the division of the nations, as to languages and idioms, is treated of in those [words]. *Thirdly*: [those] who understand [it] of the division of lands and of the sons of Israel expound that [phrase], "according to the number of the children of Israel," again variously. For some simply consider the proportion of the magnitude of this land, and of the multitude of men, which would suffice for taking and enriching the number of the Israelites — [namely] that as many and as great nations were in that land as would be enough for the Israelites, to be afterward received and most benignly kept, whether those [nations] were two, or three, or four, or of any other number — as Aben Ezra interprets concerning the seven peoples (Exod. 3; Deut. 7, v. 1); [and] others can equally explain [it] of the ten (Gen. 15). *Fourthly*: [those] who gather [that] twelve nations (Gen. 10) correspond, as [it were], to the sons of Israel, seem to join the father with his sons not very aptly — for thus one would have to number Jacob too with his own children; and then not twelve, but thirteen, nations would have to make up the number of the children of Israel. *Fifthly*: finally, [it would] not so [much] seem [that] the whole "as" [unit] of this land [was] divided into twelve ounces because those twelve nations had been, as [rather] because the sons of Israel had been twelve — for whose number that definite

number of twelve nations, placed in that land, had once been [set]. And so this third [reasoning] would revolve back to the first; yet it can be severed [from it], because that land can be said [to be] so divided, that [that] which once — when the Lord was distributing the globe of lands among the nations — had been established by him and, as it were, adumbrated, should now in fact be explored and made manifest. But these [things are] enough. [Let us pass] to the efficient cause thereof.

Question X. Who [were] the dividers of the promised land?

The efficient cause of the division was twofold: commanding and executing. The commanding [cause] was partly God, partly Moses. God indeed (Num. 34, vv. 1 & 16; this ch. 13, vv. 1, 2, & 7; ch. 14, v. 2); Moses [indeed] (Num. 32, v. 28; Deut. 31, v. 7). But by executing, God himself too could be constituted [the cause] — so far as [it was] not by a general influx [that] he concurred to this whole action (for so he executes all things in all [things]), but so far as, in a special mode and manner, he directed and accommodately turned the lots, concerning which afterward. But those [causes] which are below him himself, I rather designate by this name [the executing cause]; and these, I say, were twofold. One, and indeed the principal, was Eleazar the Pontiff and Joshua (below ch. 14, v. 1; ch. 21, v. 1; Num. 34, v. 17), where that one [Eleazar], before this one [Joshua], as [it were] the sacred Prince and divider, is perpetually set — though sometimes Joshua also is named alone (as in this ch. 13, vv. 7 & 14; ch. 18, vv. 6, 8, & 10). The other [cause], as [it were] secondary, is twofold — namely, the Phylarchs themselves, or the Princes of the tribes, and their helpers. Concerning whom [see] below (ch. 14, v. 1): "the children of Israel gave the land — Eleazar the Priest, and Joshua son of Nun, and the Princes of the families through the tribes of Israel — dividing all by lot"; and they are called "Princes of the sons through the tribes of Israel," who in the 70 [are] "ἄρχοντες πατριῶν φυλῶν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ [archontes patri■n phyl■n t■n hui■n Isra■l]" ["princes of the fathers'-[houses] of the tribes of the sons of Israel"], in the Hebrew "heads of the fathers of the very tribes of the children of Israel." Again ch. 21, v. 1, where they are called "ἀρχίφυλοι [archiphyloi]" ["tribe-chiefs"]. But more openly, even by name, they are recounted (Num. 34, v. 17): "These are the names of the men who shall divide the land to you":

ELEAZAR the Priest, and JOSHUA son of Nun. And the individual princes from the individual tribes, whose names are these:

#	Tribe	Prince
1	Juda	Caleb son of Jephone
2	Simeon	Samuel son of Ammiud
3	Benjamin	Elidad son of Chaselon
4	the sons of Dan	Bocci son of Iogli
5	Manasseh (of the sons of Joseph)	Haniel son of Ephod
6	Ephraim	Camuel son of Sephtan
7	Zabulon	Elisaphan son of Pharnach
8	Issachar	the Leader [Dux] Phaltiel son of Ozan
9	Aser	Ahiud son of Salomi
10	Nephthali	Phedael son of Ammiud

These are they to whom the Lord had commanded that the children of Israel should divide the land of Canaan. Nor is there anything else to be noted in these words, than [that] the dividers [were] already named from those tribes only to which the land on this side [of] the Jordan [was] to be divided; and [that] in the Hebrew and Greek text, to the tribe of Dan, and to all the others in turn, the title of "Prince" or "Leader" is added — which, because it is easy to understand from v. 18, the Latin [Vulgate] omitted, except in Issachar.

But the helpers of all these were those who — either with them, or without them — were sent to survey and measure out the land. I said "either with them, or without them," because from Abulensis (below ch. 18, q. 3) it can be doubted whether they themselves, or some of them, were the surveyors. But I think they were not. *First*: because Scripture, since the matter was of great moment, would not have kept silent about it. *Secondly*: because Josephus relates (bk. 5, ch. 1) [that] the Israelites were advised by Joshua to choose, from each single tribe, some one man outstanding in virtue, who should be sent to this office. But there would have been no need to choose the Phylarchs, since the Lord had before destined and named them, as [Serarius] was reporting a little before from Num. ch. 34. *Thirdly*: after that measuring, another is afterward described (below ch. 18); and then from each tribe three surveyors were chosen (v. 4 & following). Sent, therefore —

before, first and generally, the province was distributed — for the knowledge and measuring of the whole land, were not the princes and heads of the tribes, but others, whom it seemed [good] to the tribes themselves prudently and opportunely to choose. And although their names are kept silent, yet their virtue is hinted by Josephus, and is truly understood from the thing itself. For since this office required great wisdom, industry, integrity, and holi-

(col. 1115)

[holi-]ness — that so great a matter should be transacted well, accurately, faithfully, without all guile and fraud, and that all should be persuaded [that] it was [so] transacted, and, according to the mind's judgment, the wished-for effect should have come about — whom else but the wisest, most industrious, most upright, and most holy [men], whose authority among all would be great, should we think were sent?

But of number — how many these [surveyors] were — the opinion is threefold. The *first* [is that] of Josephus (in the cited place), indicating [that there] were ten. For since, from ten tribes only, Princes had been set over this business beforehand (Num. 34), and [since] Josephus says one surveyor [was] chosen from each single tribe, the number of surveyors turned out [to be] ten. "Men," he says, "ten were sent." The *second* [is that there] were thirty — namely, three from each of those same ten tribes; for it seems likely [that] in the later measuring (which [was] smaller and repeated) there were not more surveyors and land-measurers than in the former; but in the later [measuring] there were three from seven or ten tribes, that is, 21 or 30 in sum, as Masius holds (below ch. 18). The *third* [is that there] were thirty-six, for altogether the same reason — because no greater number of surveyors should be posited in the later measuring than in the former; but in the later there were 36, as Abulensis says (below, same ch. 18, q. 3). But in the first opinion I more willingly rest. From Josephus, indeed, without cause, I would unwillingly ever depart — [Josephus] whom I know is thus accused by Masius in the place indicated: "Josephus's ἀκρίβεια [akribeia, 'accuracy'] is to be admired, in those matters which are most plainly delivered in the sacred letters. For he writes [that] only ten men were sent to describe the land. And yet [it is] clearer than light, [that] which is said in the sacred words, [that] three from each tribe were sent." But in truth that number of three from each tribe pertains to the later division (below ch. 18). Now Josephus hands down the number of those which pertained to the former. For he confounds and mixes both the measuring and each division. In which — because he plainly contravenes the text — he cannot be excused. Yet meanwhile, from the one [division] he takes this, from the other that; which [things], attributed to one division only, bear a falsehood, but [attributed] to the diverse [ones], the truth — and so [it is] in this number of the sent land-measurers. But these surveyors being sent off, Josephus narrates in the same place [that] certain [men] were joined by Joshua — [men] "τῆς γεωμετρίας ἐπισταμένους … λήσεσθαι διὰ Ἰησοῦ τέχνην [t■s ge■metrias epistamenous … l■sesthai dia I■sou techn■n]" — that is, skilled in geometry, from whom the truth would not escape, by Joshua's art. Approving which [passage] on Ezekiel ch. 43, St. Jerome says: "It is of no small labor to demonstrate to the hearers [that] which thou hast beheld with the eyes of the flesh or with the mind, so that they too may seem to have seen [it] with thee." Wherefore Josephus too writes [that] those who were sent by Jesus [Joshua] son of Nave to describe the land were "Γεωμέτρας [Ge■metras, 'land-surveyors']," and had the art which now is proper to the Philosophers — [namely] Geometry. And in this same manner, when the Romans [undertook] a description of the whole empire — whithersoever it was extended, toward east and west, south and north — Augustus set to work at it, [and] employed men both the best and most expert in Geometry, as Aethicus and Suidas relate, and from them, in the last [part] of his *Apparatus of Annals*, the most Reverend Baronius. But [that there] were not a few skilled in that art among the Israelite people [this] can seem to be gathered from the fact that they came from Egypt, where — on account of the annual inundation of the river Nile, and the muddying of the fields — Geometry was born and grew, as is written by Strabo (bk. 17). Of the ultimate cause, which is the [final] end, it should now be said. But it is said in one word: "Concord [Harmony]." If anyone should wish anything further, that [will be treated], after the circumstances, in question 17 — [where]

it seems it will be more opportune. To these [circumstances], therefore, I gird myself.

Question XI. Where was the division of the land made?

Twofold, as I already touched in the foregoing question, was the partition of the promised land among the tribes. And the prior indeed happened in Galgala [Gilgal] (concerning which [it was] said in chs. 4 & 5), as is clear from ch. 14, v. 6. For when that [division] was to be made, or was just about to be made — "There came," says the text, "the children of Juda to Joshua in Galgala, and Caleb son of Jephone spoke to him." But the place of the later [division] was Shiloh [Silo] (below ch. 18, v. 1 & following) — because, namely, in both [places], in those times, was the Lord's tabernacle: in the former place indeed, earlier; in the later, later. And it was fitting [that] in a sacred place — before, as it were, the very face of God, sitting upon the Cherubim — the parts should be attributed to all the tribes: partly so that the whole partition should be made peaceably, entirely, and holily; partly so that the single [tribes] might reckon their own part [to be] given to them by the Lord, as [it were] by an outstretched hand. For the place has, toward religion and the remembrance of God, no small force to move minds. And therefore also afterward (ch. 19, v. 51), when an end is put to all the lots of all the tribes, so accurate a repetition of this most sacred and most holy place of the divisions is employed — that [that] which had been done should be [made] ratified and fixed unto all posterity, and [that] no one should ever dare to move or disturb the bounds set for any tribe. Now Shiloh is both a mountain, and a city situated upon it, distant from Jerusalem perhaps a three hours' journey, toward the north; whose more accurate description is [in] Judges 21, v. 19, according to our version, and nearly the Greek 70: "Behold, [there] is a solemnity of the Lord in Shiloh, from year to year, which is celebrated from the northern part of [the house of] the Lord God (which is there), toward the rising of the Sun, at that beaten road which from the house of God ascends into Sichem, and on the south [side of] Lebona." I said "nearly, as to the Greek version," because — since in it [there] are not those two words, "situated" and "of the city" — it could in a certain way be drawn into that sense which some wish from the Hebrew: [namely] that [it is] not [a description] of the site of Shiloh, but a [description directed] to the place where the festival (of which mention is there made) [was]; [and] that [it] was described in this manner: "Behold, the festival of the Lord is in Shiloh, from year to year, which is celebrated from the northern part of the Lord God (which is there), toward the rising of the Sun, at that beaten road which from the house of God ascends into Sichem, and on the south [is] Lebona." Now in today's Hebrew Bibles [there] is "Silo" (Gen. 49, v. 10). For [in place of] these words, "until he come, who is to be sent," is read: "until Shiloh come." And R. Joseph thinks [it] to be the name of the said place; and takes the Hebrew word "of coming" as [it] is sometimes attributed to the Sun, so that the sense may be: "until Shiloh set [go down]," that is, "until the end of Shiloh itself come" — and then will come David the King. But for many causes the exposition is quite inept, concerning which [more] in that place [Gen. 49]. But one [point] pertains to here: [that] there it is written with "iod schiloh," but here without it, with "chirek" alone. Which also elsewhere, when that word is put for the place, has been observed. But because by the name of "peace"

(col. 1117)

[peace,] quiet, abundance, and all prosperity the Hebrews signify [by that name], [he] would not be a vain conjecturer who should fetch this very name of Shiloh from the verb "schalah," which is "to be peaceable [pacific]." For thence too is "schaluah," that is, "peace" (Ps. 121, v. 7; Prov. 1, v. 32, & ch. 17, v. 1; Jer. 22, v. 21; Ezek. 16, v. 49; Dan. 11, vv. 21 & 23), [and] elsewhere — perhaps also the Latins' "salve" and "salus [health/salvation]," which exposition (on the Epistle to the Romans, in St. Augustine) P. Valerius the Bishop derived from the Punic and Hebrew. "Salos," which signifies "three," [was] as though secretly insinuated — [namely] that from the Most Holy TRINITY the true salvation is to be expected. But finally to this place Josephus himself (bk. 5, ch. 1) attributes "τὸ κάλλος [to kallos]," that is, beauty and amenity; and [it had] also its own mountainous and steep site [as] a strength, and — against all the injuries of war — quiet and a

fortification. Moreover today it is called "Mount Samuel," and by Brocardus and our Breitenbach, "Rama."

Question XII. In what manner was the division made?

First indeed, surveyors [were] sent by Joshua, who should measure out and describe the land, as I already said above. But in the manner in which these performed their office, two [things are] to be noted. One is, [that] they employed cords [funiculi] for the measure; for hence the part and partition of almost any solid thing is wont, in the Scriptures, to be called "funiculus [cord]" (below ch. 17, vv. 5 & 14; ch. 19, vv. 4 & 29; 2 Sam. 8, vv. 2, 4; 2 Kings 21, v. 13; 1 Chron. 16, v. 17; Amos 7, v. 17). Whence [in] Ps. 77, v. 55, [there is] that most clear word of David concerning this very division of the land: "He cast out (the Lord) from before their face the nations, and by lot divided to them the land in the cord of distribution." For this manner of measuring out fields and lands was then usual in Egypt and the Orient, as Zacharias plainly shows (ch. 2, v. 1): "Behold a man, and in his hand a cord of measurers. And I said: Whither goest thou? And he said to me: To measure Jerusalem, and to see how great is its breadth, and how great its length." [In] Ezek. 40, v. 3, the Angel, about to measure Jerusalem [that is] to be built, bears in his hand a "funiculum [little cord]," or "linen thread," which by the 70 is rendered "σπαρτίον οἰκοδόμων [spartion oikodom■n]," that is, "cord of builders [architects]," or, as in St. Jerome there [it is], "of masons." But who [could furnish] cords so long, and so extended, as would suffice for such spaces of land, so many mountains and valleys, so many cities and villages, so many bendings, obliquities, and windings of places? I think indeed [that] cords of this kind [were] neither made [to go] "through none [of the places]," as it seems to Genebrardus (Chron., p. 36), nor drawn "through all places," but through certain smaller [ones] — from which, by the discipline of Geometry and Optics, a reckoning of all the rest might be made; which reckoning is a certain, as it were, Geometric cord of the mind. And indeed by "one instrument of measuring" [these things] are signified. Synecdochically [there are] also other [instruments], of which kind are the Geometric squares, the metric staves, and any similar [things]. The other [thing to note] is, in what manner — through the region of the Canaanites, the war [being] already declared, begun, waged, and not yet finished or composed — the Jewish surveyors could pass, and search out all things so accurately, and measure [them] with their several cords. The explorers sent by Moses (Num. 14) could dissemble what they were doing, put on another person [disguise], [and] lurk in the mountains and caves. But the work of these [surveyors] could scarcely be done except by daylight, openly, with all beholding. How, then, [were they] not a thousand times slain, [not] taken, [not] at least hindered? It seems to be believed [that] they indeed, attempting [it] as secretly as possible — from the higher places, when [it was] permitted, by scouting; performing other [parts] on foot and counting the paces; and then adjoining all the Geometric subtlety — did execute [that] which had been commanded by Joshua; yet [that] especially a certain latent divine force concurred, by which the minds of the Canaanites, already much broken by [their] slaughters and defeats, were utterly stupefied; and [that] they neither attempted anything about killing, or taking, or hindering these [surveyors]; but on the contrary [that] both the minds of the sending and of the sent Israelites should be confident; [that these surveyors] should dare to bring themselves into the innermost [places] of the Canaanites; [that they] should not fear — even if perchance they were observed, marked, and caught in their measuring work — and [should] hope for and work at the happy execution, at last, of the whole imposed office. Nor was the hope and effort vain. They accomplished the matter; and to their own [people] returned safe and unharmed.

Secondly: after the return of the surveyors, the lots being cast, the partition was made (ch. 14, v. 2; ch. 15, v. 1; ch. 16, v. 1; ch. 17, v. 1; & elsewhere). For thus the Lord had commanded (Num. 34, v. 13); and therefore he himself too, as I said above from Ps. 77, is said to have divided the land to the children of Israel by lot. Of the use, and the goodness or malice, of lots [it was] said largely above (ch. 7, from q. 17 to 22). Now only this is to be said: in what manner that casting-of-lots was made.

In four modes, therefore, is this mode expounded. *First*: by the Talmudists (in *Baba Bathra*, ch. 8) it is said [that there] were two urns, from one of which the single names of the single tribes were drawn, but from the other the little charts [chartulae] of the single portions of the land — so that to each drawn tribe its own drawn territory should at once be attributed; and lest [there] should be anything of suspicion in the drawing, but rather the highest good faith and authority, all [things], they say, were drawn by the hand of Eleazar the Pontiff. *Second*: by Josephus (bk. 5, ch. 1), only one urn is handed down, from which the names were drawn in order of the tribes, so that to those which came out first, it should be permitted first — at once — to choose which of the described portions of the land they wished. *Third*: one urn only, likewise, is received; but so that from it are drawn, not [the names] of the tribes, but the inscriptions and signs of the lands to be divided; while the attribution of these drawn-out [charts] to the single tribes is made from divine warning and indication. But [Serarius] thinks this was looked at and known (ch. 15). [*Fourth*:] Masius [expounds it] by the double prerogative which fell to Jacob's sons by birth. One is, to be born of a free mother, or of a handmaid — so that [those] who [were born] of a free [mother] should all receive the lot before those who [were born] of the handmaids. The other, to be born earlier from this or that [mother] — so that [he] who was first of the free [mother] should receive the first portion drawn from the urn; [he] who [was] second, the second; and so onward. But after these, [he] who [was born] first of a handmaid should take the first [portion] which, after the portions of the free[-born], should come out of the urn; the second, the second; and so the others in order. Yet the same Masius admonishes [it is] to be observed [that] which had already been said by him (on ch. 14): [that] the firstborn Ruben's birth, and prerogative of age and legitimacy, was [transferred] partly to Juda as to the principate

(col. 1119)

…and dominion, partly to Joseph as to the doubled portion of the inheritance, [was] transferred. Whether this be true, I do not now inquire (Abulensis certainly casts doubt [on it], following ch. 14, q. 4); but for me [it is] enough to have explained what rite that author [Masius] judged [was] observed in the casting-of-lots. *Fourthly*, finally, Arias too embraces [the view of] a single Urn, and the drawing-out from it, and a divine judgment for [knowing] the tribe to which each part fell — but he thinks this was done through the Pontiff's Urim and Thummim (concerning which [in] the prior book, ch. 9, q. 23, and following), [and] many [things].

These [are] the four modes of the casting-of-lots in dividing that land — of which [it] pertains almost to chance which [is] the truest. One difficulty, indeed, seems to reside in all [of them]. For all [of them] explain, indeed, which land falls to which tribe — if the land be regarded as to site, but not as to magnitude. For since it was shown above (q. 4) [that] the parts had to be unequal in amplitude, on account of the inequality of the multitude which was in the tribes — how do these modes ascribe a larger portion to a tribe of larger number? In the first, if thou shouldst say [that] God so tempered the lots of the two Urns that this very thing came about, and to the larger tribe the larger part fell — [then], first, it was in vain commanded by God [that] the dividers should have a reckoning of this inequality, since he willed to do the whole thing himself; and then, the parts would have had to be made unequal beforehand; and so, before the lot, [it would] almost [have been] perceived which part [was] to be given to which [tribe]. But the second mode openly makes [it possible] for the power to be given even to the smallest [tribe] — if indeed it came out first — of choosing the largest part. The third [mode does] nothing more than point out which, as to place, would be each one's inheritance. The fourth [is] almost likewise. Two [things], therefore, seem [needing] to be added. *I.* This was permitted by God, and committed to the dividers: [namely] that they should circumscribe each portion with its own bounds, and should enlarge and contract the parts coming out of the Urn according to the multitude or fewness of the tribes. For the cited passage (q. 5) from Num. 35, v. 8, altogether counsels this. *II.* Now the dividers did this either before the lots [were] cast into the urn and drawn from it, or after. Before, indeed, it could be done in this manner: [that there] should be, placed in the sight of all, ten parts which the surveyors had described; but concerning the single parts [there] should be treatment, and by common consent it should

at last be established — if that [part] fell to this or that tribe by lot — that it ought to be so-and-so-great, that is, either as great as the surveyors had defined, or greater or smaller, [namely] according to the number of the tribe to which it fell. If, therefore, some part drawn by lot [were] great, [but] smaller [was that] to which that tribe was entitled, it would already have been established beforehand [that] that [part was] to be pared down, and indeed thus or thus. But if the tribe were larger, it would likewise have been established [that] that lot [was] to be amplified, and indeed by so-and-so-great an accession. But afterward [Post], this equalizing of the proportion could be done in a twofold [way]. *First*: if the dividers, when they had seen the drawn lot, should look at [it] accurately, and by concordant votes afterward conclude [that] to the tribe whose order in obtaining the inheritance it was, it [the lot] either sufficed, or did not suffice, or overflowed; and should either leave it so, or add to it — [or] take from it — as much as seemed [good].

Secondly: if they should ask this very thing from the oracle of Urim and Thummim — so that, just as by the utterance of this oracle it was known which tribe should obtain which lot, so also it should be known how great [a portion] it ought to obtain. And this mode indeed [is] easiest; but whether [it is] also the most fitting, I have not to affirm, before indeed the Simeonite lot (ch. 19) shall have been reached. "As to the rite and manner of the casting-of-lots," says Masius, "I know not whether the sacred history has, not without design, concealed [it] from us everywhere, lest we should superstitiously imitate [it] in our own affairs." Hence, at last, [they] went into possession in that manner, and by those tribes concerning which [more] afterward.

Question XIII. At what time was the division made?

Twofold, as I admonished before, was the division — the Gilgal [Galgalea] and the Shiloh [Siluntina]. In the former, [there is] to be considered the beginning and the end. That it [the Gilgal division] began before the fifth year from the Jordan crossing, and the first entry of the whole people into the land, Josephus does not indeed affirm, but hints. For he will [have it that] in the year

(col. 1121)

[they should] subtract; and so [that there] should remain 39, which — exempted from the 45 residual [years] of Caleb — leave only 6, which can be granted. But the end of that same Gilgal division is fixed by the Rabbis (in the same *Seder Olam*), and by Genebrardus, who assented to them (bk. 1 Chron., p. 35), in the other seventh year — that is, in the 14th year after the Jordan crossing. Now they gather this thus: the Israelites, from that time when they began to fix [their] seat in the promised land, persisted in it 17 solid Jubilees, that is, 850 whole years. But after the last emigration from that land — or after the Nabuchodonosorian destruction of the city of Jerusalem — in the 14th year the eighteenth Jubilee was being kept. For at its beginning Ezekiel said (ch. 40, v. 1): "In the 25th year of our transmigration, in the beginning of the year, on the tenth [day] of the month, [in] the fourteenth year after the city was smitten." [It is] necessary, therefore, [that] the Jubilees began to be counted after the 14th year of the entry into the land; or at least [that] the people, not [yet] settled in the land, [did] not [complete] the full 17 Jubilees, but only 16, and moreover the 46 years of the 17th Jubilee. But I cannot bring my mind to believe [that] a septennium was consumed in that division. For to what [purpose] so much time? [Was it] that the lots should be cast into the urn, and drawn from it? But this could be done in one day, or certainly in not many days. [Was it] that surveyors should be sent, and [that] they should bring back descriptions? But this [was] done before the beginning of the division; nor, if it had not been done, would seven years have had to be posited in that matter. [Was it] for going to the portions, and placing domiciles in them? But since the enemies were routed from those [places] which the first tribes obtained from the earlier casting-of-lots, and [since] the regions which were approached were not so vast, nor so remote from Gilgal — this immigration into new seats could be done in a few weeks or months. But besides — by what [argument] is it gathered from Scripture [that there] was a stay of full Jubilees, or of 850 years, in the promised land? Whence, likewise, is it gathered [that] that year which Ezekiel noted [as] the fifteenth from the Jerusalem destruction was the first of a Jubilee

— and indeed of the eighteenth Jubilee? Into my own opinion, therefore, they rather draw me, who judge [that] an end was imposed on the prior division before the eighth year. But of the posterior division [more] afterward (ch. 18).

Question XIV. Were the Sabbatical and Jubilee years begun from that division of the land?

[In] Leviticus ch. 25, "Sabbaths" not "of days" (which make up the single weeks), but "of years," of a twofold kind, are prescribed. One is, that every seventh year be a Sabbath, and by it the land obtain, as it were, a quiet and cessation from all cultivation of the plough, of digging, of sowing, and of planting; and this is called the "Sabbatical year," the "hebdomatic"; and by the Hebrews (from the remission and relaxation of those [dues] which were held by another) "Schemitah [Shemittah]." And of this [it is treated] in the cited Lev. ch. 25, from v. 2 to 8. The other is, that every year after seven times seven years — that is, [after] 49 years — be likewise a Sabbath. And this is wont to be called in Hebrew "Iubel [Jobel]"; in the 70, "ἀφέσεως σημασία [aphese■s s■masia, 'signification of release']"; in Josephus (bk. 3, ch. 10), "ἰώβηλος [i■b■los]"; by some "Iobelaeus" or "Iubelaeus"; by our Interpreter, and by very many not badly following him, "Iubilaeus [Jubilee]" — concerning which [see] the same place, from v. 8 to the end. About this, however, the first doubt is of the name.

Whether the seventh year itself of the seven annual weeks — that is, the 49th itself — is the Jubilee; or rather [the year] which follows it, the 50th? The opinion [is] threefold. The *first*: [that it is] the 49th. So Hugh Cardinalis (on Lev. ch. 25), Rodolphus Flaviacensis (bk. 18, ch. 13), from the Jews certain Rabbis, and in this time Mercator (*Chronology*, & ch. 1 of the *Method*), Junius and Tremellius on that same chapter, [and] Josephus Scaliger (bk. 5), where [he says] thus: "How greatly both the ancients and the more recent are deceived, who define the Jubilee by the space of 50 completed years, and not 49 — hence it can be observed." And in the seventh book he teaches [that] the Jubilees are to be sought by dividing the ages by 40; and the same he repeats (bk. 3, Isag. p. 282 & following, & especially 289), in the Eusebian Animadversions also (pp. 15, 16, 25, 234, 259); and following him — and therefore soon much praised by him in the Prolegomena of the Isagoge — Sethus Calvisius (ch. 24 of the *Chronological Isagoge*). The *second* opinion: [that] it is the 50th itself. The *third*: Lyranus (on the same Lev. ch. 25) [holds] both opinions [to be] probable. But indeed the second, by the strength of more and better authors and reasons, [is] safer. For thus judged Eusebius (in the *Chronicles*), Cyril (bk. 17 *On adoration*), Bede (sermon 2 on the feast of Pentecost, & bk. 2 *On the tabernacle*, ch. 3), Clement VI (Pontiff), St. Ambrose (on Psalm 50), Cassiodorus (ibid.), Isidore (bk. 4 *Etymol.*, ch. 8), St. Jerome (epist. 127 to Fabiola, mansion 12, & on ch. 5 of Amos), Abulensis (on Lev. 25, q. 6), Cajetan (ibid.), Oleaster (ibid.), Rutilius Benzonius (bk. 1 *On the year of Jubilee*, ch. 1), [and] other Christians who wrote about the Jubilee; and, from the Jews, clearly Josephus (in the cited place). For he says [that] the Lord commanded [that] a Sabbath and rest be given to the land itself, not only in the seventh year, but also "μετὰ ἓξ δ' ὅμως ἐτῶν ἑβδομάδα [meta hex d' hom■s et■n hebdomada]," that is, "after the seventh week of years [post septimam annorum hebdomadem]." But indeed, "after this" — what is [it] but the fiftieth year? And this he subjoins most explicitly: "Ταῦτα πεντήκοντα μέν ἐστιν ἔτη τὰ πάντα [Tauta pent■konta men estin et■ ta panta]," that is, "these are, in all, fifty years [sunt anni omnes quinquaginta]." But when he wished to say, in the same place, [that] in the seventh year [there is] rest for the fields, he did not say "μετὰ ἕβδομον ἔτος [meta hebdomon etos]," that is, "after the seventh year [post septimum annum]," but "δι' ἑβδόμου ἔτους [di' hebdomou etous]," "in the seventh year [in anno septimo]"; just as, likewise, [that] men [are] to keep holiday from daily works, not "μετὰ ἑβδόμην ἡμέραν [meta hebdom■n h■meran]," but "δι' ἑβδόμης ἡμέρας [di' hebdom■s h■meras]," "on the seventh day [die septimo]." And lest any doubt should remain to anyone, he added moreover: "καλεῖται ὑπὸ Ἑβραίων ὁ πεντηκοστὸς ἐνιαυτὸς ἰώβηλος [kaleitai hypo Hebrai■n ho pent■kostos eniautos i■b■los]," that is, "the fiftieth year is called by the Hebrews the Jubilee [Iobelus]." And indeed to this [view] some of the Rabbis too assent, as

Lyranus acknowledges in the place indicated; [and] of the Innovators too, Hugh Broughton (in his *Concentus*, & on ch. 9 of Daniel), where he says [that] the year of the Lord's passion fell in the 28th Jubilee, or in the year 1400 from the division of the land. Otherwise the current year of the 29th Jubilee must be called the 28th, as is manifest, if 1400 years be divided by 49. But let us take the sacred context itself into [our] hands. Lev. 25, v. 8, in Hebrew speaks thus: "And thou shalt number to thee seven sabba-[ths of years…]"

(col. 1123)

[seven sabba]ths (or "weeks"), "of years" (that is), seven years seven times; and there shall be to thee days of seven sabbaths (or weeks) of years — 49 years; and thou shalt cause the trumpet's clangor to pass through in the seventh month, on the tenth [day] of the month, on the day of expiations (or of propitiation) you shall cause the trumpet's clangor to pass through in all your land; and you shall sanctify that fiftieth year." [Lev. 25:8–10, Latin] See how, after 49 years, the sanctification of the fiftieth year is prescribed. Indeed, if the 49th year were the Jubilee, why did he not say [that] it [rather] should be sanctified, than the fiftieth? Does he not say [that], in a week of days, the seventh day [is] to be celebrated, not the eighth? Does he not, in a week of years, likewise sanctify the seventh year, not the eighth? Since, therefore, here plainly the fiftieth itself, not the forty-ninth, is ascribed to rest, [those] are altogether in vain who think any other than the 50th year [to be] the Jubilee. So also afterward (v. 10): "And you shall sanctify that fiftieth year." Some, in Abulensis (cited place), answer — and, with Tremellius, Junius, in the annotation, and likewise Calvisius (ch. 24 Isag., p. 80) — [that] "the fiftieth" is reckoned from the preceding Jubilee inclusively. But this is now to weave a gloss onto the text. And therefore, simply and nakedly, the text stands [with] the common opinion; and [that] this is not explained, but depraved, by that gloss, is proved in a twofold [way]. *First*: because the first Jubilee would not be — nor by Scripture be called or sanctified — "the fiftieth year"; for it would include no preceding Jubilee. *Second*: in the other, later Jubilees, one and the same year would have to be counted twice. For, so that the 49th year of the second Jubilee could be called the fiftieth, the last year of the first Jubilee would have to be counted once, and called the 49th year, and again counted, and called the first of the following Jubilee — so that the 49th of this [second Jubilee] could be called the fiftieth; and so in all the others. But who would bear the same unit to be repeated twice in some continuous number? And [who would bear] some number to be denominated so-and-so-great which is not so-and-so-great — [things] which Arithmetic forbids? Similar is the argumentation from the Thargum. But the Greek in the 70 text is much clearer still:

"Καὶ ἐναριθμήσεις σεαυτῷ ἑπτὰ ἀναπαύσεις ἐτῶν, ἑπτὰ ἔτη ἑπτάκις· καὶ ἔσονταί σοι ἑπτὰ ἑβδομάδες ἐτῶν, ἐννέα καὶ τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη. διαγγελεῖτε σάλπιγγος φωνῇ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ ὑμῶν, ἐν τῷ ἑβδόμῳ, τῇ δεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνός, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ ἱλασμοῦ διαγγελεῖτε σάλπιγγι ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἁγιάσετε τὸ ἔτος, τὸν πεντηκοστὸν ἐνιαυτόν [Kai enarithm■seis seaut■ hepta anapauseis et■n, hepta et■ heptakis; kai esontai soi hepta hebdomades et■n, ennea kai tessarakonta et■. diaggeleite salpingos ph■n■ en pas■ t■ g■ hym■n, en t■ hebdom■, t■ dekat■ tou m■nos, t■ h■mera tou hilasmou diaggeleite salpingi en pas■ t■ g■ hym■n, kai hagiasete to etos, ton pent■koston eniauton]" — "And thou shalt number to thyself seven rests of years, seven years seven times; and there shall be to thee seven weeks of years, forty-nine years. Ye shall proclaim with the sound of the trumpet in all your land, in the seventh [month], on the tenth of the month; on the day of atonement ye shall proclaim with the trumpet in all your land; and ye shall sanctify the year, the fiftieth year." And afterward: "ἀφέσεως σημασία αὕτη· τὸ ἔτος τὸ πεντηκοστόν, ἐνιαυτὸς ἔσται ὑμῖν [aphese■s s■masia haut■; to etos to pent■koston, eniautos estai hymin]" — "this [is] the proclamation of release; the fiftieth year shall be a year for you."

The Latin text, moreover, yields nothing to the foregoing in perspicuity, and always designates the fiftieth [year] (vv. 10 & 11). But another reason too occurs. For [God] seems, by a certain secret counsel of his, to have willed in the weeks of years [that] which [he willed] in the weeks of days. For he willed the seventh day to be [a day] of sacred cessation; he willed, from the Pasch, after seven weeks of days — or after 49 days —

the fiftieth to be sacred (above, Lev. 23, vv. 15 & 16; and the witness today [is] Pentecost, concerning which [in] bk. 1, ch. 4, q. 12 & following). He willed, therefore, after seven weeks of years — or after 49 years — the fiftieth to be consecrated. Besides this: if the Jubilee and the Sabbatical were always the same, [there] would have been no need to prescribe, in that [50th], the [things] which had already been prescribed in this [49th] — namely, that in that year the land should be unploughed and uncultivated. But the Lord prescribes [it] (Lev. 25, vv. 11, 12). Indeed the Rabbis, in the treatise "De schemitah & Iobel," do not repeat, in that [50th], the [things] which they explained in this [Sabbatical] — as is plain from the great book of precepts, in the "Helacoth Schemitah [Hilkhoth Shemittah]," p. 68, col. 2. Nor do I see what could be argued against these [points], except this one — [that] in this way two years of quiet and holiday would be connected in immediate succession. For in a Jubilee, say, first the 49th year would be Sabbatical, or [a year] of holiday, and immediately the following, the fiftieth. But sustenance would be difficult for so great a people, if it should call two whole continuous years away from ploughing, sowing, harvesting, and all cultivation of the soil. And so it will happen at every seventh Jubilee afterward. But with the years interposed between the Sabbatical and the Jubilee — at first only one year of labor and farming will lie between; then two, three, four, five, six. For in the second Jubilee, indeed, the same year which would be the first Jubilee[-year], or fiftieth, would already be the first of the eighth Sabbatical [cycle]. And therefore the 48th year of the second Jubilee would be the fourteenth Sabbatical. Therefore the 49th of the same Jubilee would be laborious [worked]. The following fiftieth [would be] again a holiday and Jubilee. But again the same Jubilee-year would be the third of the now-begun fifteenth Sabbatical [cycle]. Therefore the 47th year of the third Jubilee would be the 21st Sabbatical, and wholly idle [at rest]; but the two following years of the same Jubilee, 48 & 49, [would be] busy [worked]; but the fiftieth again idle. And so onward. But if we say not the 49th, but the 50th, [to be] the Jubilee, always [the year] which is the Jubilee will be Sabbatical — [in the years] 7, 14, 21, 28, 35, 42, 49 — and so perpetually.

For, in the Jubilee-cycle:

| Week | will be Sabbatical [in year] | |---|---| | 1st (Primus) | 7 | | 2nd (Secundus) | 14 | | 3rd (Tertius) | 21 | | 4th (Quartus) | 28 | | 5th (Quintus) | 35 | | 6th (Sextus) | 42 | | 7th (Septimus) | 49 |

These are [the Sabbatical years]. But that difficulty of sustenance is removed by the same ease as in the Sabbatical year. For [he] who promised [that] he would take care of the provision of one holiday year (the Lord, Lev. 25, v. 20), the same can [do it] for two — and indeed wills [to]. And therefore, when Caietanus expounds the just-cited versicle, "understand," he says, "the blessing proportionally for the year of Jubilee — because, in two continuous years, the land then rested."

The other doubt, moreover, is: Whence is it called "Iubilaeus [Jubilee]"? Here [there are] many divisions of opinions, but [they flow] from about two headwaters. Of these, one is [that] of certain Latins — John of Anania, Peter Berchorius, [and] Stephen Notus — [deriving it] from the Latin "iubilare [to jubilate, to shout for joy]." But this too — and "iubilus" and "iubilum" — seems to some to flow from the other headwater (of which [we must] now speak), which is [that] of those who [derive it] from the Hebrew "Io-[bel]"

(col. 1125)

[Io]bel, [from which] they will have "Iubilaeus" derived. These [derivations], moreover, sent onto the fingers [counted up], are found [to be] ten:

I. They say "Iobel" means "trumpet [buccina]" or "tuba." Because, therefore, on the day of propitiation the trumpet was sounded (Lev. 25, v. 9), so that this year should be celebrated, it was for that reason called "Iubilaeus." But [that] that trumpet was "silver," Abulensis (on that chapter, q. 7); "of horn," others: [made] from the horns of larger animals, Ribera (on Hosea 5); nearly from a ram's [horn], the Thargum (which mostly puts "dichra [ram]" for "Iobel"), and Rashi, Lyranus, Vatablus, Pagninus (in the *Thesaurus*), Augustinus Eugubinus (on the last ch. of Num.), Oleaster (on Lev. ch. 26), [and] Torquemada (on penitence,

dist. §, "on Leviticus").

II. Josephus (bk. 3, ch. 10): the name "Iobel" signifies "ἐλευθερία [eleutheria]," that is, "liberty" — because in that year liberty is given to slaves, and to sold fields and possessions. This pleases Theodoret (q. 35 on Lev.), Nazianzen (oration on holy Pentecost), [and] Rupert (bk. 2 on Lev. ch. 41, & on Ezek. 11). Whence Rutilius (bk. 1, ch. 4, *On the Jubilee*): "Thus," he says, "the true derivation seems to me. For openly in the Leviticus text it is expressed by these words: 'This year thou shalt call the fiftieth of remission to all the inhabitants of your land.'"

III. From "Iubal," the inventor of Music (Gen. 4, v. 21): Masius (on Joshua ch. 6).

IV. Eusebius (in the *Chronicles*): "'Iobel,'" he says, "among the Hebrews is called the fiftieth [quinquagenary] year." And "in my judgment," says Rutilius again, "this derivation is undoubtedly also very germane to the text of sacred scripture" (Num., last [ch.], & Lev. 25).

V. Hugh Cardinalis, & St. Bede (bk. *On the tabernacle*), think "Iobel" is "beginning [initium]," and [that] the year is called Jubilee because at its beginning the liberty and remission of various [persons] would begin.

VI. To St. Gregory, "Iobel" is rest and remission itself (bk. 1 on Tobit, ch. 6; homily 24 on the Gospels; bk. 2 on Ezekiel, homs. 17 & 19). A like, and almost germane, interpretation to that [one] which [was] placed in the second place, from Josephus.

VII. St. Bede (homily on Pentecost): "'Iubilaeus,'" he says, "was ordered to be called 'changed [mutatus],' because slaves were changed from captivity into liberty, [and] because possessions, a change being made, returned to their former Lords."

VIII. To Paul John Paulianus, "Iobel" is "great of God," and therefore called Jubilee because it is the Great Year of God, worthier and more excellent than the rest.

IX. "Iobel" seems to Caietanus (on Lev.) to be called rather from the sprouting [germen] of the earth — since "iabal" is "to lead, to bring forth," and "iebul" is the very fruit and germ of the earth (Exod. 31, v. 22; Lev. 26, v. 4; Judg. 6, v. 4; Ps. 66, v. 6; Ps. 77, v. 45; Ps. 84, v. 13; Ezek. 34, v. 27; Habakkuk 3, v. 16). Angelus Pientinus (bk. 3, *On the Jubilee*, ch. 4) [and] Bellarmine (bk. 1, *On indulgences*, ch. 1) assent.

X. The *Concentus* of Broughton: "The word 'iubal,'" he says, "signifies 'a casting-out, or the flowing of a stream.' But 'Iubilaeus' cannot be derived from the Hebrew [word] which is 'ram's horn,' but very fitly from 'iubal' — 'flow,' or 'carrying and leading-down' — because it carries us, as it were, with itself, and leads [us] down to CHRIST's death." Indeed "iubal" is "a stream" (Jer. 17, v. 8), which, by permutation of letters, some think the same as "ubal" (Dan. 8, vv. 2 & 3). So also "iebel" is a stream (Isa. 30, v. 25, & ch. 44, v. 4); likewise "iibla" from Lamentations 3, in Elias's *Methurgeman*; and "iobela" (Job 3), "a leading-down, an outflow." But I have indicated my opinion on these matters above (ch. 6, q. 5).

…and the [things] said there, could already have been enough — were it not not-unpleasant to see all these [things] about the Jubilee here, in a certain synopsis, as it were.

The *third* [is a] doubt: In what month were the Sabbatical and Jubilee year wont to begin? The opinion [is] twofold. The *first* [is that] of Abulensis (on Lev., q. 8): [that] it began in "Nisan," which is for us about March. The *second*: [that] it began in the month "Tisri," which is for us about September — and this [is] truer. *First*: because many more teach thus — of the more ancient, indeed, the Rabbis; of the more recent, [Paul of] Burgos (on Exod. ch. 12, first addition), Pererius (in Genesis, in the disputation on the time of the creation of the world), Rutilius (bk. 1, *On the Jubilee*, ch. 1), [and] Scaliger (in the places cited before). *Second*: because in every Sabbatical year the fruits of two years would perish, or, in the usual manner, would not be gathered and stored. For, since (as was shown above, ch. 3) the crops, grapes, and other fruits ripened earlier in Judaea — so much [so] that on the 16th [day] of Nisan itself a sheaf of ears was already offered to

the Lord (Lev. ch. 23, v. 11) — and since again, in neither the Sabbatical nor the Jubilee year, was it permitted to reap, gather grapes, sow, prune, or do anything similar (Lev. 25, vv. 4, 11, 12): it is clearly perceived [that] in the 6th year either no sowing ought to be done, or, from it, no harvest would be forthcoming in the following 7th year; and since again, in that 7th year, no sowing is done, likewise in the eighth year there could be no harvest; and so the fruits of two whole years would be nothing — against the mind of Scripture (Lev. 25, vv. 21, 22). But when the year is begun in the month of September, both the harvest and the vintage of the 6th year are already gathered in; and therefore only that sowing is hindered which would have had to be reaped in the seventh year. But in the following September — when that 7th year is now finished — [the land] is sown again in the following 8th year, and the harvest is gathered. And the reckoning is equal in the 49th & 50th year: which [50th], while it would be immediately joined to the Sabbatical [49th], would have the provision of three whole years snatched away, in that manner which I just showed [regarding] the two [years].

The *fourth* [is a] doubt: In what year is that seventh month — in which was the Jubilee trumpet-clangor — to be taken (Lev. 25, v. 9)? The opinion [is] likewise twofold. For Abulensis (cited q. 8) believes [it] was in the year which ran before the Jubilee; but others [place it] in the Jubilee year itself — and this [is] more probable. But, from the [things] said in the foregoing doubt, that month, in the Jubilee year, is indeed "the Seventh" in respect of "Nisan" (whence sometimes the beginning of the year is drawn, as I taught on Genesis), but is the first in respect of the Jubilee itself; and it is the September of that year which would begin from the "Nisan" or "January" before the Jubilee's "Nisan" or "January." And so falls [collapses] that [objection] which Abulensis casts up — [that] the Jubilee-clangor [would be] too late, since six solid months of that year would have already passed. For the month, as I said, would be the first, and its day [would be] "the tenth day" — which most fittingly was chosen by God for this trumpet-Jubilee: so that, [on the day] on which the Jews seek from him the pardon of their debts, or of their sins, on that [day] they too should remit to their own brothers the true debts of another's money, restore possessions, [and] bestow liberty; and [so that], whereas the other days [are days] of penitence, sadness, and mourning, in that year [that day] should be [a day] of thanksgiving, joy, and Jubilation. But [as to that] which Lyranus and Abulensis note — [that] great festivals were wont, among certain nations, to be pre-announced with joyful acclamations —

(col. 1127)

…as when, for example, they proclaim "Natale, natale [Christmas, Christmas]," "Pascha, pascha [Easter, Easter]" — indeed I myself experienced [this], as a boy, in the town of St-Romaric, where, after the first vespers of the Dominical Advent, the boys who go into the school pleasantly shout "Noel, Noel"; yet on the very day they shout and sing [it] much more pleasantly and frequently. And so here at Mainz, and everywhere else — although on the day before the celebrated feasts [there] is a great consonance of bells from the towers of the churches, yet [it is] much greater, more joyful, and more festive on the very day of those feasts.

Now finally the fifth [doubt], on account of which the other [doubts] were here raised, let it be a doubt: **Whether the Sabbatical and Jubilee years began from the division of the land?** Some indeed seem to begin them from the first foundation of the world — as Eusebius, who, in the 51st year of Abraham himself, set the beginning of the 41st Jubilee, and adds [that] this is done by him thus, "according to the Hebrews." "And so," he says, "according to their computation, from Adam to the present year there are 200 [years]." It can be added, from the Talmud (tractate Sanhedrin, ch. Helek), [that] which R. Jacob son of Solomon [Rashi] gathers and notes: [that] Elias Rabbi said to Judas the brother of R. Salla the Essene: "The world has not fewer than 85 Jubilees; but in the last Jubilee the son of David comes." And afterward: "R. A[bba] too said to him: Before that Jubilee, do not expect him; from then on, await him." These Hebrews seem to auspicate [begin] the Jubilees from the very foundation of things, because they speak of those [Jubilees] which the world has.

Yet it must be said, *first*, [that] the observation and counting of the Sabbatical and Jubilee years began from the divided land. *First*: because Scripture itself signifies this (cited Lev. ch. 25, v. 2): "When you shall have entered the land which I will give you, let the land sabbatize a Sabbath to the Lord." This is the Sabbatical year. And of the Jubilee likewise is subjoined (v. 8): "Thou shalt also number to thee seven weeks of years." But they entered that land perfectly when they began to possess, distribute, plough, sow, reap, cultivate, and inhabit it. Which happened in the seventh [year] after the first and imperfect entry into that same land, as the foregoing question taught. *Second*: the thing itself confirms it. In the Sabbatical, ploughing and the rest of the cultivation of the land ought to cease. Ploughing and cultivating by the Israelites, therefore, had already begun. In the Jubilee, besides, the sold houses, fields, vineyards, and estates all ought to return to the former Israelite Lords. All these [things], therefore, they ought first to have received, and held by true dominion. *Third*: those who wrote about the Jubilees after Eusebius confess this — Christians and Jews, who [were] nearly [all] named above.

It must be said, *secondly*, [that] both the Sabbatical and the Jubilee [years] are begun by the Rabbis after the second, or posterior, and Shiloh division of the land. For thus their "Seder Olam" (ch. 11) speaks: "The whole multitude of Israel was gathered in Shiloh; and then it was taken up [begun] to number the tithes, the years of remission, [and] the Jubilees." On that account, for those same Rabbis, [it is] necessary [that] the Jubilees and Sabbaticals begin much after the 14th [year] of the coming into Canaan, and [after] the year of the Jordan crossing — but not [in] the 15th, as Genebrardus does (bk. 1 Chron., p. 35), because (as was said in the foregoing question) they refer the Gilgal, or prior, division of the land to the year of their coming into Canaan, the 14th [year] of the entry; and [they teach that] the Shiloh division was instituted some years afterward, [as] this book teaches below (ch. 18). But the Christian Chronologers fix the beginnings of those same years in about the eighth year after that entry — namely, immediately in the first year after the prior partition. And these carry my [own] point [vote], though a very slight and slender one. *First* indeed, because — the possessions being received from God — it was most equitable to begin so to use and enjoy them, that as soon as possible the will of God should be fulfilled, [his] honor increased, [and] worship of every kind begun. But he willed [that], after possession of the land had been reached, the Sabbaticals and Jubilees be begun (Lev. 25). He willed [that] the Israelites, who were pressed by want and servitude, be relieved as soon as possible with conveniences and liberty. He willed [that] the lots and boundaries [pomoeria] of the tribes remain, as soon as possible, divided and unmixed (Num., last chapter). He willed [that] the ceremonies, which he had before prescribed at Sinai, be observed religiously as soon as possible. Why, then, [was there need] of delay and procrastination — since many tribes had great domiciles and estates — for beginning the Sabbaticals and Jubilees? Why would the most solicitous leader Joshua, most loving of divine honor, linger in that business? Why would he not have objected sloth, ingratitude, [and] disobedience to the people for this very cause (below ch. 18), as, for other causes, he objects [it] (v. 3)? *Second*: the giving of firstfruits and tithes then began. For [that] the Levites — who ministered at God's altar — should at once approach their own inheritance, was most consonant to reason; and their inheritance was the firstfruits and tithes (above, qq. 6 & 8). Therefore the reckoning of the Sabbatical and Jubilee years also began at the same time. For what cause [is there], why those [firstfruits and tithes] should begin, [and] these [Sabbaticals and Jubilees] not?

Question XV. How did the Sabbatical and Jubilee years cease to be counted by the Jews?

Of the Sabbaticals — [as to the fact] that they were observed or neglected by the Jews — [there is] mention frequent enough in the Scriptures (Jer. 34, v. 14; 2 Kings 19, v. 29; 1 Macc. 6:53; and in Josephus, bk. 13, ch. 15; bk. 14, ch. 28; as I noted also in the Harmony of the Maccabees). But that the Jubilee years were in use, I nowhere read. Of these Angelus Pientinus takes that [passage] of Isaiah (last [ch.], v. 23): "There shall be Sabbath from Sabbath." But there the discourse is either specifically of the weeks of days — because "month from month" precedes — [and this] to signify that Sabbatism of which [in] Heb. 4, vv. 9 & 10; or generally

[it means] all time of rest, and then indeed the Sabbatical and Jubilee years will be included, but these are not said to have flourished then, but [to be] future. Another brings forward that [word] of the same seer (v. 1, ch. 61): "The Spirit of the Lord [is] upon me, because the Lord has anointed me; to announce to the meek he sent me, that I might heal the contrite of heart, and preach indulgence to the captives, and opening to the shut-in; that I might preach the acceptable year to the Lord." But that the Jubilees were then in use, those words show nothing, since they treat of the future [things] of CHRIST

(col. 1129)

[of CHRIST], in [his] times, as the Lord himself expounded (Luke 4, v. 18). If, however, the Sabbaticals were in use — as [they] were shown to have been in use — why should we not think the same of the Jubilees? The distinction of the tribes remained, indeed, up to the times of the Babylonian captivity; and, in the tribes, the separation of the goods which were proper to the single families. The Jubilees, therefore, ought to have flourished — as is gathered from Num., last [ch.], v. 4. But now the Jews observe neither any Sabbaticals nor any Jubilees; because, forsooth, they possess neither fields, vineyards, meadows, nor any grounds, almost anywhere among the nations; nor is there [now] any old and accurate distinction of tribes and families among them; nor does any necessity or usefulness demand that [there] now be any. For this [distinction] was chiefly required of old, and was diligently observed, so that [it] might be altogether most perspicuous of what tribe and family [was] that excellent promised Seed of Abraham — CHRIST, I say, the Lord; and so [that] the truth of the divine promises and sacred Prophecies might be known and accepted by all. Nevertheless the Jews are wont, even in this time, in their [dealings], sometimes to note the series of the Sabbatical years. For in the Calendar of the Palestinians there were, in this year 1575, [these] words: "And this year is the first of the Schemitah, or of the current week of years, according to the opinion of Rambam [Maimonides] (whose memory [be] in blessing), and of the excellent Masters, and according to the usage of the sons of the land of Israel" — that is, of those Jews who now inhabit Judaea. And therefore, from that year 1575, the Sabbatical was [in] 1581, 1588, 1595, 1602; and will be [in] 1609, 1616; and so onward. But they note this not because they now keep those years [as] holidays, and hold [them] sacred, but that they may show what the course of those [years] is — if indeed they still ought to be observed — and that they may retain the division of the years by 7. And for a like cause they sometimes count the Sabbaticals from the beginning of the world — although, as [was] handed down in the foregoing question, the first Sabbaticals were [only] after the land [was] divided, possessed, and cultivated. And the cause is altogether the same why some fetch the beginning of the Jubilees from the same creation of the world (concerning whom [in] the same foregoing question): namely, that the division of the ages by fifties might be observed — just as some count the indictions too from the time of Christ; and they could, if indeed they wished, [count them] from the first origin of all things, dividing all the years by 15.

But when the two kinds of years began to be omitted can be thus established. *I.* In the destruction of the city of Jerusalem, which was brought by Vespasian and Titus. For so great then was the plundering and devastation of all faculties and possessions, so great the slaughter of all the Jews, [their] captivity, and abstraction from [their] ancestral seats, that no place remained for either the Sabbatical or Jubilee years and their duties. And Mercator embraces this terminus of those years. *II.* Yet the Jews gathered themselves again in the times of Trajan and Hadrian — so much [so] that Dion of Nicaea writes [that], in the regions of Palestine, 580 thousand [men] were slain by the sword, and by famine and flame and disease so great a multitude, that almost all Judaea was scattered. And [that people] — if perhaps not before — was without doubt prostrated [from] the whole hebdomadic ceremony of the Sabbatical and Jubilee years. *III.* In the Jerusalem destruction which Nabuchodonosor brought, and during the whole time of the Babylonian captivity, those same years ceased; but Mercator affirms [that] both were resumed in the seventh year of the liberty restored by Cyrus; and of the hebdomadic [Sabbaticals] it can be proved from 1 Macc. ch. 6, and Josephus (places cited before). But of the Jubilees not likewise — especially since not all the tribes returned

to the fatherland, as I showed at the beginning of [my commentary on] Ezra. Yet because those [tribes] which had returned had again estates and homes, and guarded among themselves the distinction of families — especially the tribe of Juda — [that] both the Jubilees and the Sabbaticals [were] numbered and observed by the Jews up to the times of CHRIST the Lord, and beyond, as far as the last calamities of the Jewish people under Titus and Hadrian, I do not deny. But in Mercator I wonder [that] the Sabbaticals are drawn down as far as these [times], but not the Jubilees; nay, [that] from the Babylonian return only eight Jubilees — which consist of 56 Sabbaticals — are counted, since so many Sabbaticals are still reckoned afterward. For why do these [Sabbaticals] proceed and persist in him [Mercator], [but] those [Jubilees do not]? Scaliger (bk. 7) draws out those ancient Jubilees down to our own times, just as (bk. 5) [he does] the Sabbaticals.

Question XVI. From the division of the land to CHRIST the Lord, how many Sabbaticals and Jubilees were there in sum?

The reckoning of authors [is] discordant. Hugh (in the *Concentus*, & on Daniel 9): from the divided land to the Lord's passion, sets 28 Jubilees, 189 Sabbaticals, or 1400 years. Mercator, from the same beginning to the Babylonian Captivity, counts 123 Sabbaticals, 18 Jubilees, and four years of the beginning 19th [Jubilee]. Then, an interruption of these being made, again from the loosed chains of Babylon to the Roman Captivity, he reports 86 Sabbaticals; and the Jubilees (as I already touched in the foregoing question) he terminates much earlier, so that [there] were only 8 — when, however, if they had gone at an equal pace [with the Sabbaticals], they ought to be 12 full [ones]. But Scaliger commands [that], from the years of the world, first 2499 be cast away [subtracted]; then [that] the remaining [years], up to whatever time — whether of CHRIST the Lord being born, or suffering, or [both] born and suffered — be divided, by Arithmetic division, by 7; and the Sabbatical of that time will be had. But again, [that] all the same remaining years of the world be divided by 49, and likewise the Jubilee year will exist. For example, in the year 1599, [it] was the third year of the current 436th Sabbatical, and the completed tenth year of the current 63rd Jubilee — because the year of the world was 5546. But a wise and firm judgment on these matters depends on many [things] which are agitated with great contention of many [scholars], and have truly difficult explanations — but especially on the number of the years of the world, on the intermission or continuation of the Sabbaticals and Jubilees from the year of the Lord's saving birth, and on many other similar [things], concerning which it is wont to be disputed throughout the whole series of the Bible and of Chronology. But because, to me — ἐν πλάνῃ [en plan■, "though [perhaps] in error"] — the year of the division is the year of the world 2495, the course of the Sabbaticals and Jubilees begins in the year of the world 2496, in whatever

(col. 1131)

[whatever] later year of the world [is] given, let those 2495 be subtracted from the given [year]; and [those years] which remain (if indeed they can [be so divided] — which I say on account of the prior [years], for the first Sabbatical and Jubilee years), let them be divided by 7, and it will be had how-many-th Sabbatical is being transacted at that given time; let the same be divided by 50, and likewise it will be had how-many-th Jubilee runs. Let the example be the Nativity of the Lord, which, in my Chronology, falls in the year of the world 4155. From these I take away 2495; there remain 1660. These being divided by 7, the 237th Sabbatical is found elapsed, and [it was] the first year of the following 238th, when that heavenly and thrice-blessed day of the nascent Savior shone upon men. The same 1660 being divided by 50, the 33rd Jubilee exists [as] past, and the tenth year of the following 34th [is] running.

In the same way thou wilt see [that], in this year of the Lord 1604, there have hitherto been 466 Sabbaticals, and [that] now the first [year] of the following 467th Sabbatical is being transacted; but [that there] have been 65 Jubilees, and [that] the 13th year of the following 66th [Jubilee is] now proceeding. Whence [it is] perspicuous [that], if with the Rabbis Elias and Ase (cited in q. 14) we lead [count] the Jubilees from the beginning of the world, the Messiah, or Christ, has already long since come, according to their opinion —

whether we count the 70 Babylonian years, and the other sevenths of the recovered liberty, or not. But again, if [one] should rather prefer to begin the 85 Jubilees of the same Rabbis from the division of the land, [then he] has indeed not yet come, but will come after 14 Jubilees — that is, 700 years — or after the 2340th year of CHRIST (who truly already long since came). But let them begin from the [creation of the] world, as indeed their words sound. And therefore [it is] to be confessed by the Jews [that] the Messiah — who is still vainly expected by them — came many years before. But the Rabbis — Abarbanel, Bachya, especially the Zohar (col. 210) — note manifold and excellent blessings which fall on the Jubilee, which the "Shekintha [Shekhinah]" concerns — that is, "πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης [pneuma hagi■syn■s]," or "the Spirit of holiness" — because [it] belongs most to CHRIST the Lord (Rom. 1).

Question XVII. For what causes did the Lord will that land to be so divided?

I said (q. 10), concerning the end [final cause] of this division, [that] a little more remained to be said. That now I will pursue. *First*, therefore, the Lord willed to establish a holy concord in his whole people. For [that] which the immense lust of wealth, and the excessive cupidity of extending boundaries — and, that I may say [it] in a word, "MEUM ET TUUM [MINE AND THINE]" — often dissolves and dissipates, even among the most friendly [men]: since [now] all should understand [that] not rashly, or by chance, not by the will and judgment of certain men only, but by an oracle — and, as it were, by the divine hand — his own portion fell to each; and [that] the same [portion was] always a fixed and ratified dwelling, and could not, the Jubilee-cycles forbidding [it], be increased or diminished — [that] which, among them, over the further extending, or the defending, of the bounds, war and discord could be (Deut. 19, v. 14). *Second*: that all envy among these same [people] might be repressed. For [there is] that well-known [word] of Horace:

> *"How comes it, Maecenas, that no one lives content with that lot which either reason has given him, or chance has thrown [upon him]?"*

And that [word] from the crowd:

> *"Always another's goat bears a more distended udder."*

But [he] who has [it] persuaded [to himself] [that] to another indeed [there] is a little something more than to himself, but [that] this [is] most justly, and comes about altogether by the divine nod — what [reason] is [there], why he could envy that one? *Third*: that it might be shown [that] not all goods must necessarily be common among all, but [that] the division of things is approved by God too — as D. Thomas ([Summa] 2a-2ae, on qq. 57, 58) is wont to teach amply. *Fourth*: that of what tribe, nation, [and] house the most longed-for Savior of the world — CHRIST the Lord, the promised Seed of Abraham — should derive his origin, might be far most clear to all, even to those looking [only] moderately. *Fifth*: that a certain image of the heavenly land and inheritance might be set before our eyes, and we might understand it [to be] divided variously. "For in the house of my Father [there] are many mansions," says the Lord (John 14, v. 2). And all the true Israelites will indeed receive their portion and mansion — some [a] greater and [more] splendid [one], namely according to the reckoning of the multitude and magnitude of those [things] which they once did well in the body. "All of us," says the Apostle (2 Cor. 5:10), "must be manifested before the Tribunal of CHRIST, that each may report the proper [deeds] of the body, according as he did, whether good or evil." And Rom. 2, v. 6: "God will render to each according to his works." Origen (on this book, homily 25): "Perhaps, just as God ordered the stars of heaven, and placed them by certain wondrous and ineffable reckonings — and set some of them in the northern axis, others in the parts of the East — so believe [that] those too, who by the resurrection of the dead shall be such [as] the stars of heaven in multitude and brightness (coming, namely, from the seed of Abraham), God will order in the kingdom of heaven according to the order of the stars and of the parts of heaven; and will give to some a lot toward the East, to others toward the West, to others toward the South; and whom he himself knows, he will set toward the North — since indeed many will come from East and West, from the four parts of the world, and will recline with

Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." *Sixth*: But just as, of any of the tribes, not only the portion and inheritance which was given to them, but the very first cause too — on account of which so-and-so-great [a portion] was given to this [tribe] or that, [namely] the multitude, I say, and the greater number — was from God; so also the chief cause, on account of which a greater and happier beatitude exists for one than for another, is the Gift of God. For "to each one of us grace is given according to the measure of the donation of CHRIST" (Eph. 4, v. 7). And his holy charismata "the Spirit divides as he wills" (1 Cor. 12, v. 11). "What is [it]," says Rupert (on Joshua ch. 23), "that — the nations being cast out from before their face (as the psalmist too sings, Ps. 77) — he divided the land to them by lot, in the cord of distribution, except [to signify] that the blessed fatherland (from which the apostate Angels, growing proud, were cast out) — all those mansions, which are many in the Father's house — will be distributed by the grace of God, and not from merits?" For "it is the gift of God, and not from us," says the Apostle (Eph. 2), "lest anyone should glory." Rightly, therefore, was that land divided by lot — in which not man's choice, but God's hidden disposition, does all — because, namely, the grace of God, which no merits preceded, [is] our land of the living, to be hoped for and possessed by us. *Seventh*: that it might be signified [that] all [are] toward

(col. 1133)

[all are] to be called by God to the possession of the heavens — not the Jews only, but the Gentiles too. "If indeed," says Theodoret (q. 15), "those who received possessions on this side [of] the Jordan, Moses divided the land [to them]; but those who obtained parts beyond the Jordan, Joshua [did]. And those indeed who received the inheritance through Moses figure the [type] of the Jews; but those [who received it] through the hand of Joshua represent the Gentiles who believed. But since Israel is the firstborn, [it is] by the hand of Moses [that] the firstborn [tribes] obtained [their] lots — namely Ruben, Gad, Manasseh; who, however, themselves too, as [it were] strenuous soldiers, go before the rest — since indeed [those] who believed from the Jews brought salvation to the Gentiles. Nevertheless [there] were assumed [taken in] also the Jebusites, and Canaanites, and other foreign nations, and they dwelt with Israel." Let homilies 16 & 18 of Origen be read.

Eighth: "The Lord shows," says St. Augustine (discourse 1 on Ps. 34), "that all these [things] pertain to himself — money, wife, sons, and the like; and [that they] are in his own power, not only the eternal [things] which he promised for the future, but also the temporal [things] which he gives on earth to whom he wills, and when he wills — opportunely knowing to whom to give and to whom not to give, like a physician [knowing] the medicines, knowing the sick man's disease better than the sick man himself. So that, therefore, God might show this, he distributed the times of the old and new testament: in the old testament the promises are of earthly things, but in the new, of the kingdom of heaven. Most [things] are precepts of worshipping God and of living rightly. These same [things] are both there and here; but because the promise there seems [to be] one [thing], here another, the command and obedience of the servant is the same — but the reward, as it were, is not the same. For there it was said: You shall receive the land of promise, that you may reign in it, that you may overcome your enemies, that you may not be subjected by them, that all things may abound to you in this land, that you may procreate sons. These are earthly [things] promised — but yet figured [types]."

Ninth: That we may weigh how far the New Testament surpasses the Old, [how far] the Gospel [surpasses] the law of Moses, [how far] CHRIST [surpasses] Moses. For Moses, with his law and testament, sent only two and a half tribes into the possession of the land; but Jesus [sent] nine and a half, and made the Levitical [tribe] too approach the Lord's inheritance and possession. Nor did Moses send those two and a half [tribes] into the possession of the land simply and absolutely, but with a condition — [namely] if, forsooth, thus, after the Canaanite wars were finished, Eleazar the Pontiff and our Jesus [Joshua] should judge [it] (Num. 34, v. 28) — so that these [tribes] seem rather to have placed these tribes too in that possession of the land. Moses, through the law, [blessed] few; but Jesus [Joshua], CHRIST, through the Gospel, blessed very many, from every nation, region, and tongue, with the heavenly goods. And whoever were made safe under the old

law, the salvation of them all hung from the highest Priest according to the order of Melchisedech, and from him whose name is full of salvation — JESUS CHRIST, the Lord and Savior of the world (Acts 4, v. 12; & to the Hebrews ch. 11). And although those two and a half tribes, to which Moses had given a portion, seemed to have held the first [place] in the inheritance to be discerned and taken, yet they did not hold [it]; but they had

to wait until the others should be masters [compotes] of their [own] parts, and only after those [others] to possess [enjoy] their own — because the Gentiles, called to the faith by JESUS CHRIST, surpassed the Jews in alacrity, constancy, and fervor of believing (Matt. 8, vv. 10, 11, 12); nor [were] those [Jews] admitted into the eternal domiciles of the heavens before the same [domiciles] should be entered [by those] who believed from the Gentiles — as the Apostle explains (to Heb. 11), and, from him, Origen [in commenting] on this book (homily 16). And Moses gave only that land which they were already surveying with [their] eyes, treading with [their] feet, [and] which they had, by force and arms, subjoined into their dominion. But Jesus [son of] Nave both divided that [land] which was already discerned by the eyes, traversed by the feet, [and] subdued by war, and [also] that which was not yet seen by all, not yet gone about with the feet, not yet conquered and occupied by arms — so that, as was said before from Augustine, JESUS CHRIST might be perceived [as] the Lord of earthly and heavenly, of perishable and eternal, of present and future goods. And therefore also Moses is read to have employed, in the partition, no oracle, no lot, no dividers with himself, no explorers who should measure out the land. But Jesus [Joshua] employs all these — so that in CHRIST JESUS we may recognize an altogether divine oracle, and divinity itself, and [his] highest benignity toward men, whom — as [he honors] themselves, so also, through their work, very many others — he honors, adorns, and heaps with the greatest merits, [and whom] he takes into partnership of the sacred actions of which he himself is the author and perfecter. For he himself, according to the order of Melchisedech, in eternal priestly power invests others. He sends the Apostles into the whole globe of lands; he constitutes Pastors and Doctors, who should distribute the heavenly gifts to mortals, [who] should call all to the heavenly inheritance, [and who] should prescribe to all — opportunely, and share by share — all [the things] which are to be done. O holy cords, by which the most holy Geometers, sent by CHRIST JESUS, measure out those most ample and most blessed vast-estates of the heavens! O fortunate and joyful lots! O the distributors — to be venerated, and embraced with all love and joy — by whom are distributed those rich fields of the heavens, the vines heavy with nectarous grapes, the trees laden with honeyed fruits, the halls shining with gold, [and] the patrimonies never to perish by any time or chance! *Tenth*, finally: that we might certainly persuade ourselves [that] the true Sabbaticals and Jubilees — in which [is] the redemption of all, the recovery of liberty, the continuation of rest, the restitution to the pristine state (from which we fell through Adam's lapse), and the most blessed felicitation of all — [were] begun from the times of JESUS CHRIST, [and are] to be perpetuated thenceforth unto all eternity. "Come," therefore, "let us exult and jubilate to God our Savior; let us anticipate his face in confession, and in Psalms let us jubilate to him" (Ps. 94[95]).

(col. 1135)

After the Wars: Caput XIV — Concerning the division of the land, in detail [De terrae divisione speciatim]

Caput XIV — Concerning the division of the land, in detail [De terrae divisione speciatim] (opening)

1. This is what the children of Israel possessed in the land of Chanaan, which Eleazar the priest, and Joshua the son of Nun, and the princes of the families by the tribes of Israel, gave to them: **2.** dividing all by lot, as the Lord had commanded by the hand of Moses, to the nine tribes and the half tribe. **3.** For to two tribes and a half Moses had given a possession beyond the Jordan — besides the Levites, who received no land among their brethren; **4.** but into their place succeeded the children of Joseph, divided into two tribes, Manasse and Ephraim: neither did the Levites receive [any] other portion of land, but cities to dwell in, and their suburbs to feed their beasts and cattle. **5.** As the Lord had commanded Moses, so did the children of Israel, and they divided the land. **6.** Then the children of Juda came to Joshua in Galgala, and Caleb the son of Jephone the Cenezite spoke to him: Thou knowest what the Lord spoke to Moses the man of God concerning me and thee in Cadesbarne. **7.** I was forty years old when Moses the servant of the Lord sent me from Cadesbarne to view the land, and I brought him word again as to me seemed true. **8.** But my brethren, who had gone up with me, discouraged the heart of the people; and I nevertheless followed the Lord my God. **9.** And Moses swore in that day, saying: The land which thy foot hath trodden upon shall be thy possession, and thy children's for ever, because thou hast followed the Lord my God. **10.** The Lord therefore hath granted me life, as he promised, until this present day. Forty and five years there are since the Lord spoke this word to Moses, when Israel walked through the wilderness: this day I am eighty-five years old, **11.** as strong as I was at that time when I was sent to view [the land]: the strength of that time continueth in me until this day, as well to fight as to march. **12.** Give me therefore this mountain, which the Lord promised, in thy hearing also, in which are the Enacims, and cities great and fortified: if so be the Lord will be with me, and I shall be able to destroy them, as he promised me. **13.** And Joshua blessed him, and gave him Hebron in possession. **14.** And from that time Hebron belonged to Caleb the son of Jephone the Cenezite, until this present day: because he followed the Lord the God of Israel. **15.** The name of Hebron before was called Cariath-Arbe: Adam, the greatest among the Enacims, was laid there; and the land rested from wars.

COMMENTARY

Where the [things] which pertain to the *general* division of the land [were] modestly touched, in this ch. 14 — the *special* [division] begins at v. 6, which is the division of the single tribes. And first indeed the lot of Juda is explained here, & [in] ch. 15; then the lot of Ephraim, ch. 16; then the lot of Manasse, ch. 17; but finally [that] of the other seven [tribes], chs. 18, 19.

Question I. Why did the Judaic and Josephine tribes cast lots first of all, and receive [their] portion [first]?

The lot of these tribes came out, by the divine nod, before the others. *First*: because, as indeed it seems to Lyranus, these were worthier than the others. *Second*: because, as Abulensis says, the testament of the Patriarch Jacob (ch. 49) had insinuated this very thing. *Third*: because, as it seems to others, these were the first of all [to be] solicitous about receiving the inheritance, and had asked that the partition be instituted. *Fourth*: because, according to Masius, these tribes were of all the fittest [in] that they would be a guard to the camps clinging at Gilgal — on the south [side] indeed Judaea, but on the north the Josephine [tribe]. A *fifth* cause too can be added: [namely] that those two who alone, of so great a number of Israelites, had entered that land — the praised, great, and God-beloved Princes — led their origin from these tribes: from Judaea, Caleb; from the Josephic [tribes], Joshua. So, therefore, the Lord directed and governed the lot-urn, that those

tribes should be sent first into possession to which — for the causes already said — the first [lots] seemed deservedly to be owed; but the last of these causes are all contained in the first, and are, as it were, a certain explanation of it.

Question II. When did Caleb approach Joshua, [as] about to seek the promised territory?

The opinion is twofold. The prior [is] that of Abulensis himself (in this chapter, before question 5, and in the

(col. 1137)

[question 3]: [that] Caleb approached Joshua, to obtain the land promised to him, at that time when the whole tribe of Judah had already cast lots for its inheritance. The posterior [view], of others: [that] he approached before that same tribe cast lots for the inheritance; and this seems more consonant to the text. *First*: because it narrates this petition first, in this chapter, [and] afterward the casting-of-lots of the whole tribe, in the following chapter. *Next*: because the children of Juda are said to have approached Joshua, and from them Caleb alone spoke, and about his own portion only — as if the casting-of-lots had already been announced, and on account of it all the tribes should assemble at once, but especially and first the Judaic [tribe]. [This was] so that, because from it one [man] had a divine promise of an extraordinary portion, as it were, he should receive that before all — lest, the lots being already cast, he himself should take away too much land from that tribe within whose bounds that extraordinary portion lay; but rather [so] that it — to whatever tribe at last the bounds should fall — should augment the Judaic tribe by [its] accession, whether it were contained within its boundary or not. Just as certain parts of the tribes of Manasseh and Dan [were] drawn off by others, yet were portions and members of the whole tribes: so the extraordinary inheritance of Caleb — even if it had been removed further from the Judaic tribe — would yet have pertained to it, and augmented it; just as Abulensis confesses [that], in a special manner, the tribe of Ephraim [was] enlarged by the extraordinary adjunction of its own Sichem (below ch. 17, q. 3). But finally so it seemed to Origen (here, homily 20): "The lot of his portion was given to Caleb," he says, "before his tribe, which is [that] of the children of Juda, received [its lot]."

Question III. Who, and of what sort, [was] the man Caleb?

First, his lineage is shown here (v. 6), when he is called "son of Jephone the Cenezite." But Jephone in the Hebrew is called "Iephunneh"; in the 70, "ἰεφοννῆ [Iephonn■]"; and by the Talmudic Rabbis (in "Themorah," or the tractate concerning the victims in sacrifice not to be changed) the name is handed down [as] not proper, but "appellative [common]": so that "son of Jephone" is nothing else than "son," or "a prudent man," provident, and circumspect; or "son of turning-aside," because he turned himself, and the people, aside from the outcries of the wicked explorers, as in Abulensis (1 Chron. ch. 4, q. 10). Other Hebrews will [have it otherwise]: for "Phanah" is "to look, to look about, to look back," by turning oneself from one [thing] to another. But although Caleb truly was most prudent and most circumspect, and most rightly turned himself, and the people, away from the false complaints of the other explorers — yet that interpretation is absurd; because, since Hebrew proper names nearly [all] signify something of this kind, one might [be able] to deny, as it were, the parents of all, and substitute some quality of theirs, or a eulogy. And in both ways Joshua too would be "son of Jephone," because he both was strong in signal prudence, and had been a partner to Caleb himself in turning [the people] away from the same murmurings of the other explorers. But some willingly grant [that] "Iephone" is a "proper" name; but, as Chytraeus, they say [that] by it is signified that man who otherwise in Scripture is called "Esron" — because (1 Chron. ch. 2, v. 18) it is written, "Caleb son of Esron took a wife." So here, and on 1 Chron. 2, Lyranus, and the ordinary Gloss. But others will [have] Jephone [to be] the "nearest father" of Caleb himself, but so that the "remote father" is Esron himself — that is, grandfather, or great-grandfather, or even great-great-grandfather; and so [that]

Caleb is "son of Esron," that is, "grandson," or "great-grandson," or even "great-great-grandson"; but the nearest son of Jephunneh himself. And so, in this place, Masius and Abulensis (1 Chron. ch. 2, q. 9; ch. 4, q. 10), from which this genealogy is woven:

Caleb is the son of Jephone himself. But Jephone is the son of Cos himself, concerning whom [in] 1 Chron. ch. 4, v. 8. But Cos [is] the son of Ethnan himself, concerning whom in the same [place], v. 7. But Ethnan, in the same [place] (vv. 5 & 7), is the son of Assur. But Assur [is] the son of Bethleem, according to the same Abulensis, in the same [place], at v. 5. And this [Assur is] the son of Ur; and this [Ur] of Caleb, by [his] wife Ephrata (in the same [place], q. 2, and before, 4). But this [Caleb is son] of Esron (before, q. 8); Esron [son] of Phares himself; Phares [son] of Juda himself (1 Chron. 2, v. 1).

But to me it pleases, *first* indeed, [that] that Caleb is not the nearest and immediate son of Esron — because [Esron] descended into Egypt with the great-grandfather Jacob (Gen. 46, v. 12), in which [Egypt] the children of Israel remained 210 years, as is shown [in] Exod. 12: and therefore, the reckoning of that time's human lifespan being had, if Caleb had been born from that [Esron], either by living he would not have reached the exodus from Egypt, or certainly he would have reached [it] laden with very many years — whereas, from this ch. 14 (as will be said afterward), it is clear [that] he was not then [more] than 38 years [old]. It pleases [me] also [that there] are two different Calebs, of whom [there] is mention [in] 1 Chron. chs. 2 & 4; and [that] this [one], of whom [is] here the discourse, [is] the later, the son of Jephone. It pleases [me] also, *thirdly*, [that] his names [be] explained by a tropological sense. For Caleb, or "Celeb," is "a dog" — who signally barked at the wicked malice of the other explorers; and for it [there] is also (1 Chron. ch. 2, v. 9) "Calubi," or, as [it is] in the Hebrew, "Celubai," that is, "my dogs" — because he, in the stead of many, when he saw those wolves, barked, and roused all to wake up, and to beware for themselves of their most foul jaws. To certain others — as to Rupert (bk. 8, *On the divine offices*, ch. 7) — [it] is "as [it were] heart," or "all heart": [Caleb] who did all things from the heart, [who] followed the Lord with his whole heart, to whom [belonged], as the heart, so also the tongue and the hands. And indeed he was also "son of Jephone" on account of [his] prudence, and [his] circumspect turning-aside from the same explorers. But whether Abulensis's whole Genealogy is to be received can be doubted, on account of the little knots which entangle it somewhat; but those [belong] to [the commentary on] Paralipomena [Chronicles]: and it is enough [that] not a little of probability is in it.

But why is the same Caleb called "Cenezite"? The response of the various [authors] is various. For some say [that] "Cenez" was the "stepfather" of Caleb, and [that] this surname [was] received from him; others, [that he was his] "brother" — and indeed older by birth than Caleb himself, because in the following chapter he is called "Cenez." But Radak [says he was his] "grandfather," or great-grandfather; Abulensis, [his] "father," who by another name was called "Cenez." And therefore Masius says he is doubtful whether the text ought not to be so rendered: "son of Jephone the Cenezite [filius Iephone Cenezaei]." The Author of the Questions on Paralipomena will [have] "Cenez" [to] be a certain "place," from which [comes] that nomenclature. I think, *first*, [it is] to be rendered as it is rendered by our [Vulgate]: "Caleb son of Jephone the Cenezite [Cenezaeus]" — not "of the Cenezite [Cenezaei]" — because so the Septuagint led the way for our Interpreter. *Secondly*: if, however, the father be "Cene-[zite]"

(col. 1139)

[Cenezite], and Caleb were called "son of the Cenezite," rightly from him would he be surnamed "Cenezite." *Thirdly*: the two last opinions seem more probable. Because, as to the first, why would the surname be drawn from the stepfather rather than from the father? As to the second, because it would require [that] that Cenezite brother of Caleb had committed incest with his own mother. Othoniel is called the brother of Caleb in the following chapter, & [in] Judg. 1, and the same [is] "son of Cenez" (1 Chron. ch. 4). If, therefore, Cenez is properly the brother of Caleb, and also properly the father of the brother of the same-named Caleb, [then] from Caleb's mother he would have procreated a later brother. Than which what [is] more absurd? But

how Othoniel and Caleb are called brothers, I say [in commenting] on Judg. 1.

II. Caleb's age is noted (v. 10): "Today I am eighty-five years old." From these let 7 be deducted, which were consumed in the wars up to the division of the land; the rest will be 79. From these again let 38 years be taken, in which — after the first exploration of the region, as was shown above — [the people] stuck on the journey from Egypt; there will remain 41. From these finally let 2 years be removed, which, before the sending-out and return of the explorers, had partly elapsed; there will remain 39 years — so that Caleb was born before the 39th year, or in the 40th year, before the exodus from Egypt: which falls into that year in which Moses killed the Egyptian (Acts ch. 7). And the "Midrash Shemoth" (p. 118) & "Bereshith" (p. 115) agree — although R. Bachya, in order impiously to abrogate faith in St. Stephen, feigns [that] Moses left the court [of Pharaoh] in the 13th year of [his] age; but some other Rabbis [say] in the 20th year. But let us now dismiss those impious and lying [men].

III. Caleb's bodily health and strength — [he being] born (as I said) 85 years [before] — are indicated (v. 11): "Thus," he says, "strong, as I was strong at that time when I was sent to explore. The strength of that time perseveres in me until today, as well for fighting as for marching" — that is, for doing anything, for all the duties of life which are wont to be signified in Scripture by "going in" and "going out" (1 Sam. 18, v. 5). But Masius (p. 246): "The Latin did not say fully enough 'for marching [ad gradiendum].'" Nay, he put the genus "gradus [going]," of which the species are "to go in" and "to go out." But illustrious, yet rare, [is] this so green and vigorous old age. Of Marcus Cato Porcius, Livy (decade 4, bk. 9): "He was," he says, "of a mind unconquered by desires, and of rigid innocence: a despiser of favor, of riches. In frugality, in endurance of labor and danger, of a nearly iron body and mind: whom not even old age, which dissolves all things, could break; who, in his 86th year, pleaded a cause, pled for himself and wrote [it], [and] in his 90th year brought Servius Galba to the people's judgment." Ausonius's father, in this same [author] (Idyll 3):

> *"Ninety years, without a staff, with [my] whole body / I have completed, sound in all [my] duties."*

Concerning a certain nation of the Ethiopians, Postellus in [his] Cosmography: "Many," he says, "at 180 years of age, even hire out their labor to the richer [men]." Cicero collects other examples in [his] book *On Old Age*; and recently Camerarius (Century 2, ch. 68); and several others can be added — as, from our Germany, [the fact] that in these days someone [told] me of his great-grandfather's old age prolonged to the year 140, [and] of his grandfather's to 120. But these were [men] of Dillingen. From Poland indeed, [the fact] that D. Stanislaus Krzesanowski of Lwów often commemorated the very long age of his grandfather and father, 155 [years]; and [the fact] that (ch. 91 of the Confession, concerning the ceremonies) the most Reverend and most Illustrious Hosius writes: "In the town of Srensk," he says, "one may see a tomb constructed with a certain memorable work, which Felix of Srensk — Palatine and Prefect of P■ock — set up for his paternal grandfather. He attests, by [words] inscribed on the tomb, [that] this [man] lived 140 years." But besides those pre-flood macrobii [long-livers], and afterward one "Heber," and a few others up to the exploration of the land — Moses (Deut., last [ch.], v. 7) "was 120 years old when he died. His eye was not dimmed, nor were his teeth moved." But that this was given to Moses divinely, by a miracle, can scarcely be doubted; yet in Caleb, was not that lively old age [present] by natural force? For [it] was in many others too (as I said), and even now can be, if to a good constitution of body and good health be added temperance in diet, sobriety, and exercise. "The very failing of strength," says Tullius [Cicero], "is more often effected by the vices of youth than of old age. A lustful and intemperate youth hands over an exhausted body to old age." And afterward: "I think thou hearest, Scipio, [that] thy ancestral guest-friend Masinissa, who today is ninety years old: when he has begun a journey on foot, he by no means mounts a horse; by no rain, no cold, is he induced to be bare-headed; [and that there] is in him the highest dryness of body; and so he performs all the offices and duties of a king. Exercise, therefore, and temperance can — even in old age — preserve something of the pristine strength." [See also] St. Jerome (Epistle to Paul of Concordia), [and] Pliny (bk. 3, Epistle 1, on Spurinna; bk. 7, p. 207, on Quadrantilla). Four or five years ago, when I was crossing the

Vosges, which separates Lorraine from Alsace, and was in the monastery of Senones, the Abbot of that place summoned — from I know not what village of that mountain, which was somewhat far off — a countryman great in age, of more than a hundred years. He came on foot, quickly enough; and, admitted to lunch with the other guests, when he sat down and beheld the table built up with many and richer dishes, he began to speak with himself in a rather low voice (yet so that the sound was heard by all) and, as it were, to murmur. Then the Abbot [said] to him: "What, my Father (so, for reverence's sake, he called the old man), art thou saying? Is anything lacking? Speak more clearly." "This indeed is," answered the old man, "what I say: 'If I had always had so great and such a table, I would not have lived so long.'" But the same [old man], as I was departing — himself about to depart, [and] pointing out [his way], said: "This very day I will go back thither, whence I [came] here this morning." No plague [is] more deadly to the strength of men, no axe more hostile to a longer life, than intemperance — [those] who pursue which become weak, nerveless, pale, trembling, [and] corpse-like before [they are] old. See [my commentary] on Ruth ch. 4, q. 19.

IV. His virtue of mind — what, and how great, it was — these [things] are the proof. *First*: "I reported to him (Moses) what seemed true to me." [He was,] namely, a lover of truth, sincere, and faithful. A liar, a dissembler, and unfaithful to him from whom he received something to be managed, is [he] who declares — in any deliberations, counsels, or responses — [something] other than what seems true to himself. And here [Caleb] is a signal example for the counselors of Princes, the Senators of Commonwealths, the procurators of Lords, actuaries, messengers, and all servants. They often bring great detriment to the public good, who — in zeal for hunting after some advantage or favor — keep silent the truth through flattery:

(col. 1141)

or who, for the sake of fleeing some disadvantage or [someone's] wrath, through cowardice and fear, utter [something] other than what they feel. But because in the Hebrew it is "I reported the matter to Moses, as it was in my heart," the unhappy Rabbis trifle [nonsensically claiming] [that] Caleb reported before Moses not [the things] which he had had in [his] mouth before the querulous and seditious other explorers, but [the things] which [he had kept] secret from them, in [his] heart — as if he were a dissembler and wicked hypocrite, whose tongue differed from [his] heart: a most timid old trickster, who had approved the baseness of [his] companions with [his] mouth, [but] accused [it] in [his] heart — a most criminal impostor, who had fostered, aided, [and] augmented the wickedness of the others on the journey, by nod and word, against the judgment of his mind and soul, [and who] afterward most vehemently attacked, tore, and detested those same [men]. Away with the Machiavellians! The Septuagint render "κατὰ τὸν νοῦν αὐτοῦ [kata ton noun autou]," that is, "according to his own mind" — which [was], namely, the same [as that] of Caleb, so that the truth might be spoken and understood.

Secondly: "My brethren, who went up with me, dissolved the heart of the people; and I nonetheless followed the Lord my God." In a throng of the wicked — when the number of those who act criminally is greater — to keep the mind defiled by no contagion, to cleave to God rather than to men: that indeed is [a mark] of outstanding and excellent virtue, as I taught on Tobias 1. But this is [that] which Caleb narrates about himself; in whose Hebrew speech, for "I followed the Lord God," is read "I fulfilled after the Lord my God" — as also below (v. 14) & [in] Num. 14, v. 24; and it is signified [that he was] not simply [one who] followed the Lord, but [who] fully and perfectly followed. For it is an elliptical phrase, which one may complete thus: "I fulfilled [= accomplished fully] to go after the Lord." The 70: "ἐγὼ προσετέθην ἐπακολουθῆσαι κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ μου [eg■ proseteth■n epakolouth■sai kyri■ t■ the■ mou]" ["I set myself to follow the Lord my God"]. But this [was] already expounded by me (q. 4, bk. 1 of Joshua).

Thirdly: [there] is the testimony of Moses about him (v. 9) and of God (v. 10). If to be praised by a praised man is praise (as one of the ancients said), what [then is it] to be extolled by God's servant, and by God himself, with so excellent a proclamation? For he [Moses] indeed says, "thou hast followed the Lord my God" — fully and perfectly, as above; but he [God] both spoke to Moses about Caleb himself, and guarded

and defended his [Caleb's] survival up to that very time with a singular enclosure of protection. For "my God," in Moses's speech, the 70 put "θεὸν ἡμῶν [theon h■m■n]," that is, "our God," so that he [Moses] may speak as much about himself as about Caleb. And therefore there some Latins, less rightly, have "thy God."

Fourthly: [it is a mark] of a perspicacious and good mind, to behold, acknowledge, [and] profess all the benefits by which one is endowed by God — even those which seem natural, and are scarcely weighed [appreciated] by few. His life, therefore, and his [so] advanced and lively age, Caleb gladly and gratefully ascribes to God (v. 10): "The Lord has granted me life, as he spoke, until the present day." Ecclesiasticus [Sirach] 46, v. 11: "The Lord gave strength to Caleb himself, and even to [his] old age [his] virtue" — or strength — "remained in him." Indeed, in the Scriptures elsewhere, very often, "length of days" is referred [as] received from the Lord himself (Exod. 20:12; Ps. 20:5; Ps. 90:16; Prov. 3:2 & 16; Sirach 23, last v.). For he bestows the body's coagulum [constitution], and "εὐκρασίαν [eukrasian]" [good temperament]; he supplies the necessaries of life; he removes [the things] adverse to health; he calms [us] with a good mind and tranquil conscience; and finally he rouses us to living moderately, wisely, and soberly — from all which [comes] a long, strong, vigorous, and blessed life, as far as this can be in the world.

Fifthly: But in truth one blemish seems to obscure and deform these praises of Caleb — [namely] that he seems to praise, and almost to boast of, himself, when (v. 7) he commemorates the candor of his mind, the truth of his mouth, (v. 8) the constancy of his breast, and [his] full and perfect obedience to the Lord. But truly [there is] no blemish in this matter. For it is lawful, and good, and right to proclaim one's own good deeds and virtues, when necessity or usefulness demands it; and both [are] regarded in respect either of God, or of the man himself proclaiming about himself, or of others. Of God, indeed, when his glory requires [it] — that [the things] which he kindly did for man, and the gifts he gave, be known by others, who therefore may themselves also look up to him, praise, hear, love, and follow [him]. And this, for the Apostle, is "to glory in the Lord" (1 Cor. 1:31; 2 Cor. 7:17). Of the man himself, proclaiming about himself, when he ought to guard his own reputation and it concerns others — so that not only a depraved, but even a meaner and more contemptible opinion about him be removed, and a greater and more august [one] instilled. For thus St. Paul (2 Cor. 10 & 11) discloses about himself very many and the greatest [things], which otherwise would have lain hidden from all mortals. Of "others," finally, in respect [of those] whom we wish to benefit. And so, among disciples, a Master; among sons, a Father; among the younger, an elder — can narrate certain praises of his own, either because authority among those [people] is necessary to him, or because [it] behooves [him] to rouse them to virtue and imitation. So CHRIST the Lord: "Learn from me, for I am meek, and humble of heart" (Matt. 11). "You call me Master and Lord: and you say well, for I am [so]. If then I have washed your feet — [I] the Lord and Master — you also ought to wash one another's feet." So St. Augustine (epistle 68; tract 8 on John; & bk. 50, homily 25). But of these [there is] more in my second "Doxologicon," [the things] which nearly all fit Caleb. For he [Caleb] proclaims the glory of God, when he shows him [to be] the best searcher of the heart, and the most just rewarder of the well-doer (v. 9). For he recites, as it were, the sealed tablets of the divine testimony and of the promised reward, and holds [them] from God himself declaring and attesting [them] — so that he said [he had] fully obeyed the Lord (v. 8). He also guards his own reputation, since otherwise he would seem importunate, ambitious, and injurious to others, if he concealed the cause why he demands a portion for himself before others. He also provides for [the good of] others, to whom [there] would otherwise be cause for crying out against [him], resisting, and suspecting ill of him.

Question IV. What [is] the mountain which Caleb seeks from Joshua?

The "mountain" which Caleb seeks from Joshua (v. 12), [understood] generally. *I.* [It] is the mountain promised to him by God (same v. 12) — that is, the mountainous land, promised also by Moses (v. 9). But because it is thus said, "The land which thy foot has trodden shall be thy possession," the Rabbis think [that]

the land is signified which — on account of the dangers and the horror of the giants dwelling there — no others of the explorers dared to approach, but Caleb alone entered and explored. And they confirm this,

(col. 1143)

because Num. 13:23, in the Hebrew, is thus read: "They went up (the explorers) to the South: and he came into Hebron." For why, they say, is it said in the singular, "HE CAME," and not "THEY CAME," unless because Caleb alone penetrated thither? But this [is] a figment worthy of the Rabbis. For Joshua too was in the number of the explorers — was he so timorous and cowardly that he shrank from the approach to that land? And is [it] not most usual in the Hebrew language, that a singular verb be attributed to a plural [subject], and the speech be made distributive, whose sense is "any of them did this or that"? [As a] verse-example: "The explorers went up to the South, and each of them came to Hebron" — which is equivalent to that which is in our text: "They went up to the south, and they came to Hebron." And if that singular "he came" were to be understood of one only, why would Caleb's name not be added? why would it be understood of this one rather than of Joshua? This is the land promised by Moses's oath (v. 9), where something more seems [to be] in the Hebrew than in our text, namely: "And Moses swore in that day: if not: The land which thy foot has trodden," etc. That "if not" is an aposiopesis, which in the formulas of execrations was indeed expressed in full, but in the narrations of the same is often omitted — either as [being] then known, or as [being] dire and ominous. For in this or a similar way the speech ought to be completed — whether it be affirming (as Gen. 14:22; [or] in the Hebrew [of] ch. 21:23) or negating, as here: "If I do not [do] what I say, may the Lord avert [punish] me; may he smite me with all calamities; may I be devoted to all curses; may I not live; may I not be who I am, [but] be held vain and lying." But our Interpreter [Vulgate] sometimes kept silent that aposiopesis, because he converted [it into] a plain and absolute oath, which [he] who violates is liable to punishment. Now Moses is said to have promised that land [by] swearing — because the oath by which God promised it (Num. 14:20), he [Moses], as [God's] internuncio and legate, proposed to Caleb.

Thirdly: that "mountain" and that land was promised to Caleb by God and Moses, Joshua himself hearing (v. 12). Some think this promise of a particular and definite portion of Canaan was made to Caleb privately — in the tabernacle of God or of Moses, or certainly in some other place secret from the multitude; and because Joshua was very frequently present with Moses, and was conscious [a witness] of almost all his deeds and words, [they think] it was heard by this one [Joshua]; nor yet is this elsewhere handed down in writing. To this opinion — because it has nothing that is discordant — anyone may assent. But I rather assent to Masius, judging [that] the inheritance of a definite and designated place was promised to Caleb openly and publicly, all hearing (and therefore Joshua himself too), by those words of the Lord (Num. 14:24): "My servant Caleb, who, full of another spirit, has followed me, I will lead into this land, which he has gone around: and his seed shall possess it." This land was certainly not all Canaan, which he had traversed with the other explorers. For what [part] would [all Canaan] have been for the whole people? But [rather] a definite part of it, which he had gone over with those same [explorers]. For [as to] what the Jews say — [that] Caleb alone penetrated to this place — the other explorers themselves refute [it], when (Num. 13:29) they cry out, "We saw the stock of Enac there." And indeed, [that] that certain part, where those Enakim were, [was] attributed to him by those words, is gathered also either from the antithesis, or from Caleb's mind and virtue. The antithesis is, [that] the Lord willed that the part which the seditious [spies] most reviled — and from whose inhabitants and cities they snatched the chief material of terror, and the torch of seditions — that [part], since it was the best, be made over to its patron, defender, and vindicator, Caleb. But [a mark] of his mind and virtue [is], [that] he himself demanded that part for himself, and proclaimed himself content and blessed with that one [part] which the others most vaunted [as] horrible, pathless, and inexpugnable. And perhaps to the definition and determination of this part pertain the words which are subjoined there (v. 25): "Since the Amalekite and the Canaanite dwell in the valleys." In Hebrew: "And the Amalekite and the Canaanite dwells in the valley."

Furthermore, the same promise [is in] Deuteronomy 1, v. 36.

Fourthly: [it] is the mountain "in which are the Enakim, and cities great and fortified" (v. 12). The same [things] are said [in] Num. 13:28 & 34. Whence it is gathered [that] the "Henakim" were men of gigantic size, descendants of a certain very famous giant of ancient time, whose name [was] "Henak"; which, since it signifies "torque [neck-chain]," the Rabbis think "Henakim" is an appellative [common] name, by which "the torqued [collared]" are signified — namely, men noble in wealth and power. For these [things] they easily procured by force and rapine, because they prevailed in bodily strength. But, as I said, from "Henak," the first author of their race, they got that appellation — just as from "Heber" the Hebrews, from "Israel" the Israelites, from "Ismael" the Ishmaelites, or "Ismaelim," as they are called [in] Genesis 47.

Fifthly: Now specifically the mountain and place which Caleb asks from Joshua is "Hebron" — concerning which (because [it is] frequent in the Scriptures) [more] amply in the following question.

Question V. What city [is] Hebron? and what [is] in it?

This question already occurred before (ch. 10); but it [is] now to be explained here. And first, the "antiquity" of this city is indicated by Moses (Num. 13:23): "Hebron was founded seven years before Tanis of Egypt." And this indeed — to the Hebrews [who had] stayed so long in Egypt, and had recently gone out from it — was then most well-known; but to us, like other ancient [things] of that kind, [it is] very obscure. For when was the Egyptian "Tanis" (concerning which also Ps. 77) founded? But the "Tanitic mouth of the Nile," and the "Tanitic prefecture" or "Nome," is [named] from it, as Strabo indicates (bk. 17), where he teaches [that] the same city is also called "Sain [Sais]." Namely, since [it] is called "Tsohan [Zoan]" in Hebrew, and the letter "ts" [tsade] is worth "ts," some retained "t," others "s." Pliny (bk. 5, chs. 9 & 10) prefers to call [it] the "Tanite nome" and the "Tanic mouth." And from the same city some, in Abulensis (Num. 13, q. 6), derive the "Titans" — by no, or a very slender, argument. But although the certain year in which either Tanis or Hebron was built be unknown, yet [that] both [were] built not long after the flood will be clear from [the things] which will be subjoined concerning Abraham. Josephus (bk. 4 of the *Captivity*, ch. 31), in the Greek, compares it not with "Tanis" but with "Memphis" — either because the antiquity of this city [Memphis] too was then known, or because he thought the Hebrew word "Tsohan" should be rendered

(col. 1145)

"Memphis" — but I would not believe that, because always the 70 (whom Josephus reads) render "Tanis," and the Chaldee Paraphrast likewise. But Memphis, to those same [70], is [the city] which [is] in Hebrew "Noph," as I said on Isaiah and Jeremiah. But Josephus says Hebron [is] more ancient than that Memphis of his — and indeed so, that at the time when he wrote, 2300 years of this city were counted. But since he wrote after the destruction of Jerusalem, which was finished in the 212th Olympiad, it comes about that — ascending thence to prior times — it [Hebron] seems to have been founded about the 90th year from the flood, as our Pererius rightly disputes (Disputation 5 on Gen. 13).

II. Its first and ancient name was "Cariath Arbe," as [it] is here said (v. 15) & [in] Gen. 23:2, 35[?], 27 — not as in certain Greek [copies], and in the 70 [at] Gen. 23, "ἀρβόκ [arbok]," or here "ἀρβέ [arbe]," as St. Jerome often admonished concerning that former [form] (bk. *On places*). Yet the same 70, [at] Gen. 35, render "πόλιν τοῦ πεδίου [polin tou pediou]" ["the city of the plain"], as if [it] were not "Arbah" but "harbah." But worst [of all], [at] Judg. 1:12, in the same 70 is written "Καριαθαρβοκσεφερ [Kariath-arbok-sepher]" [conflating the two names]. For that "Sepher" is from the city of which mention is made a little after, "Cariath Sepher." But some think [it] named thus because that word signifies "four," and there dwelt of old four pious men — "Abraham, Eschol, Aner, and Mamre" (Gen. 14; thence Abraham pursued and routed the 4 Kings, ibid.); [and] there [are] buried 4 very famous women — "Eva, Sara, Rebecca, Lia"; and just as many most celebrated men — "Adam, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." So the Rabbis,

who heap up several quaternions [groups of four] of this kind in "Bereshith Rabbah." Annius, in the book *On equivocals*, [says that] because it was a "tetrapolis" — that is, so great that it comprehended 4 cities — it is called "Arba." I have seen [one] who interprets "Arba" [as] "reclining [accubitus]," and applies to it, "while the King was in his reclining [couch]." But since [there] is no such signification, let its own author delight himself with it. But to others "Arba" is the proper name of a giant; and that [is] truer. *First*: because at the end of this chapter, in the Hebrew, [it] is clearly enough signified [that] "Arba" is "a great man," as will be explained below. *Second*: because before Abraham, and the other men or women whose quaternions the Rabbis collect, [it] was already of old called "Cariath Arbe" — because (Gen. 13) Abraham fixed [his] tent at Hebron; but before the name of Hebron existed, the ancient name was "Cariath Arbe," here [at the] last verse. *Third*: because [it] is not clear [that] Adam and Eve [were] buried there, as will be discussed afterward. But since "Cariath Arbe" is the same as "the city of Arba," why, and how, is it called "his [Arba's]"? Some answer, [that] this city [was] built by him; others, [that it was] held by [his] dominion and rule, and indeed for a long time. Which is more probable, [it] would be [a task] for an Oedipus to conjecture — although from [the things] following, something (but of a very slender conjecture) seems able to be drawn. Rashi indeed thinks [it] built by "Ham" the son of Noah; Annius, in the book *On equivocals*, [thinks it built] by "Adam."

III. But whence, and when, [it] was called "Hebron," [is] equally obscure. For a long [time now] Jerome (bk. *On the Hebrew places*) thinks the name [was] derived from Caleb's son, who (1 Chron. 2:42) is called "Hebron." But *first*, that Caleb was not — as I said (q. 3) — this Caleb of ours, but earlier than this one. And his sons were in Egypt; they never saw the region of Hebron. From any of them, therefore, why [would] the name [come] for it? *Next*, that Hebron [is] never the immediate, but only the mediate [i.e. remoter], son of the prior Caleb; but the immediate son of Marese himself, as is said in the same place. And although, with Masius, we might think [that] in Paralipomena [Chronicles] the father of Hebron is called [so], as [one] who had dominion in that city — just as "Machir, father of Galaad," is called [so] — yet the reason of the name would not [thereby] be established, because (as I said) Hebron and the others served servitude in Egypt, but did not rule in Hebron. I would prefer [it] to be so called from the "society and friendship" which Abraham entered into with the chief men of that place (Gen. 14:13). For "Cheber," "Chebrah," and "Chebron," [are] in Latin rendered "society and conjunction," as Origen too notes (homilies 17 & 18). And thence afterward certain descendants of the prior Caleb could be called "Hebrons," and at last that [city] come down to the later Caleb. Hence too would that question be very easily solved — about which Masius [speaks] so often — "how in Genesis the word 'Hebron' is read, which [had] not yet [a cause]" in Moses's age (the cause [of] which he and others suppose), as I touched in Prolegomenon 2 of this book.

IV. Many things [were] once done here. For — that I may omit the fables of Annius, in the cited place, saying "Noah was born in this city" — here "Abraham," [as] a sojourner, pitched [his] tabernacle (Gen. 13:18); hence he proceeded against those Kings who were leading away Lot, and much Sodomite booty, and vanquished them (Gen. 14); here "Sara" died (Gen. 23), and gave the beginning to that field-buying, which here — for his own and his family's burial — Abraham bought (same ch. 23:19). Here, like [his] father, "Isaac" dwelt (Gen. 35:27); and afterward "Jacob" himself too (Gen. 37:14). Hither, by Joseph and his brothers, [were] brought the relics of that holy [patriarch], deceased, carried from Egypt (Gen. 49:29 & ch. 50:13). Hither the "Mosaic explorers" came (Num. 13:23). Hence, through Bersabee, into Egypt, "Jacob" proceeded with [his] whole family (Gen. 46). Its King "Joshua" overcame and killed (above ch. 10, and then chs. 11 & 12). This city [was] "once a Sacerdotal [priestly city], and [a city] of fugitives," as St. Jerome says (bk. *On places*), and [as] will be clear below (ch. 20:7). Here, from the enemy's spoils, "David" sent gifts to [his] friends (1 Sam. 30:31); and he himself afterward, by God's command and oracle, came [here] (2 Sam. 2:2). Here the same King reigned 7 years (2 Sam. 5; & 3; 1 Chron. 29). He mourned and buried "Abner" ([in] the same bk. [2 Sam.], ch. 3, v. 32). Hither, ambitious, under the appearance of vows, "Absalom" proceeded; and there — his father living and reigning — he called himself King (same bk., ch. 15). Here, as [it] seems to Baronius (vol. 1 of the Annals), and to our Delrio (in the panegyric of the Visitation), and to others,

"Zacharias," the father of John the Baptist, had [his] domicile and seat. Hither, into the mountains, from Nazareth, the Blessed Virgin ascended, visiting the mother of that Baptist. This city — when the destruction to be brought upon Jerusalem by Titus was now imminent — "Simeon the Gerasene," leader of the factious and of robbers, took and plundered, as [it] is in Josephus (bk. 4 of the *War*, ch. 31). Hither St. Paula ascended, as St. Jerome narrates in [her] Epitaph — where also, before, the mother of Constantine the Great, the truly great Helena, had raised a most splendid church, as Nicephorus reports (bk. 8, ch. 30). Here also an Episcopal see [was established] by the Catholic Latins, after — under the Lorraine Duke "Godfrey" [of Bouillon] — they

(col. 1147)

[after — under the Lorraine Duke Godfrey — they] had recovered the holy land, [the see] was erected, as William of Tyre notes (bk. 20, ch. 3). This [old Hebron] now lies wholly ruined and overthrown; but a new Hebron [was] procreated from it, which is distant from the old [by] a space of about three bowshots: infamous for a "Mosque" of the filthiest Turkish superstitions. And in the same way, that old "holm-oak," or "oak," or "terebinth," which was [there] in Abraham's time (Gen. 35) and [in that] of the historian Josephus — as he himself says (bk. 4 of the *Captivity*, ch. 31) — and still stood even in the age of the Emperor Constantius, procreated from itself a new holm-oak, or oak, or terebinth, from which Brocardus writes [that] he took wood and fruit.

V. But one thing is said [to have been done] at the end of this chapter, concerning which [there] is something of controversy and question. For our text thus speaks: "Adam, the greatest, was laid there among the Enakim." Whence the widespread opinion flowed [arose], [that] here "Adam" the protoplast [first-formed man] was buried. For in the Epitaph of St. Paula, cited before, St. Jerome [says]: "She went up to Chebron. This is Cariath-arbe — that is, the town of four men: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, [and] Adam the great, whom the Hebrews maintain [was] buried there, according to the book of Jesus [Joshua] son of Nave, although most think Caleb [the] fourth, whose memorial is shown at the side." And in the book *On Hebrew places*, under "Arboch": "Corruptly," he says, "in our codices it is written 'Arbach,' whereas in the Hebrew it is read 'Arbee,' that is, 'four,' because there four Patriarchs — Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob — are buried, and Adam the great, as is written in the book of Jesus [Joshua], although some suspect him [to be] buried in the place of Calvary." Abulensis (q. 10 on this 14th chapter): "Adam the greatest, that is, the first man (who is the greatest, since he is the Father and origin of the whole species), was laid among the Enakim — that is, was buried in the city of Hebron, in the land of the giants." And that is the truer and more common sense, which nearly all Catholics hold. But others deny [that] Adam [was] laid in that place — and these [are] partly ancients (as these very ones who, by St. Jerome, are handed down to think him buried on Mount Calvary, and who substitute Caleb [as] the fourth in place of Adam), partly more recent [men] (as, in this place, Caietanus & Masius, and Pererius on Gen. 13, Disputation 5). But there are very many of them who say [he was] buried on Mount Calvary: St. Augustine (sermon 71, *On the season*), St. Cyprian (sermon *On the resurrection of CHRIST*), St. Athanasius (*On the passion of the Savior*), B. Ambrose (bk. 5, Epistle 19), Origen (tract 35 on Matthew), Theophylact (on ch. 19 of John), St. Chrysostom (homily 84 on John), St. Epiphanius (heresy 46), St. Basil (on Isaiah, ch. 5), and St. Jerome himself (in the epistle of Paula to Marcella) — who, however, on Matt. 27, says: "A favorable opinion, and soothing the ear of the people, yet not true." A certain third ingenious opinion lately came forth, which our Delrio explains and adorns (in the 7th Panegyric of the Blessed Virgin), and Villalpandus (in the *Apparatus of the city of Jerusalem*, bk. 1, ch. 9): [namely] that Adam was buried in two places — and first indeed at Cariath-Arbe (as the first, already-cited, opinion says), then on Mount Calvary (as some say in the second opinion) — as Honorius of Autun wrote in [his] Chronicles. For St. Ephrem's teacher, Jacob of Orrhoa [Edessa] — or the Edessene — handed down to memory (as Masius himself refers, [in commenting] on the last chapter of this book) [that] Noah religiously brought the bones of the first father [Adam] into the ark; and after the globe of lands [was] dried from the

deluge of waters, [that] he divided those bones too, with the globe of lands itself, to [his] sons; and [that] to Shem, whom he loved before the rest, he gave the skull [calvaria], and with the skull, that part of the lands which they afterward called Judaea. Villalpandus (in the cited place) relates [that] R. Simeon [the Helbaite] assents.

But if anyone should wish to know what my opinion is, it is [this]: [that] these two questions seem [needing] to be distinguished — "Was Adam buried at Cariath-Arbe? and is that gathered from the words of this 14th chapter?" For [that] Adam was buried at Cariath-Arbe — on account of the authority of certain ancients, and that [authority] supported by a certain tradition (which Abulensis also confirms from the neighboring valley of tears) — "is probable"; yet the text of this 14th chapter does not affirm that burial. For in Hebrew, word for word, it is thus read: "And the name of Hebron anciently was Cariath-arba. This [was] the great man among the Enakim himself." But who [is] "this man," except "Arba," concerning whom the discourse had been? And who [is] "great among the Enakim," except "Arba"? Of the first parent [Adam] no mention had been made; and neither was he among the Enakim, but before all those [Enakim] — nay, before every [one], whatever of men [there] is anywhere. And what fitting reason could be feigned, why Adam's burial should be treated here? Is it [as] Abulensis says, [that] it is treated [here] for this reason, because [it] was not treated elsewhere? But that is [the very thing] which is asked: why [is it] not treated anywhere else, and [is] treated here — and so abruptly? But the Greek in the 70 text departs much from the Hebrew; yet it mentions nothing at all of Adam, or of [his] burial. For in place of the cited words, it renders these other [words] — which are rather frequently brought forward by Eusebius (*On places*): "Μητρόπολις τῶν Ἐνακὶμ αὕτη [M■tropolis t■n Enakim haut■]" ["This [is] the metropolis of the Enakim"]. But the Latin [Vulgate] can admit the same sense which is in the Hebrew. For by "Adam" is not necessarily understood the first of men, but "man" — whether it be taken for the whole human race, or for some [particular] one of men. Just as 2 Sam. 7:19: "This is the law of Adam [= of man], Lord God"; Hosea 11:4: "In the cords of Adam [= of men] I will draw them, in the bonds of charity." Eve herself too is called in the Hebrew (and in the old Greek [copies], and in the Latin) "Adam" (Gen. 5:2): "he called their name Adam." And very often, where our Interpreter renders "man," in the Hebrew is "Adam": as Gen. 1:26, "let us make man to our image and likeness"; ch. 2, v. 5, "There was no man who should till the earth"; ch. 6, v. 1, "When men had begun to multiply upon the earth"; & v. 3, "My spirit shall not remain in man"; v. 4, "the sons of God went in to the daughters of men"; v. 5, "God seeing that much malice of men was on the earth"; v. 6, "it repented him that he had made man"; v. 7, "I will blot out man, whom I created, from the face of the earth, from man even to the beasts." Why should I pursue the other examples, which are very many? But that "he was laid there" is indeed not in the Hebrew word-for-word, but [is supplied] so that [it] may be understood. For "among the Enakim himself" can be equivalent to "he is among the Enakim." But since those [Enakim] are dead, and laid at Hebron, this one too [Arba] is dead among them, and laid at Hebron. It can also be equivalent to "he was among the Enakim." And since of old they were [there], the same Enakim died and were buried at Hebron; and therefore "Arba" [was buried] among them. And so, from that sense which

(col. 1149)

[And so, from that sense which] the Hebrew words suggest to us — namely, [that] "Arba [was], among the Enakim, a certain great man" — the Latin [words] are not discordant. But that Arba is called "great" either in body, or in dignity. If in body, the sense is, [that] among those who, by [their] vast bodily size, surpassed the rest of men, this one was the greatest and most vast. For even among giants, some are greater and more vast than others. If in dignity, the sense is, [that] he had the principate among the Enakim. Whence also [in] the following ch. 15, v. 13, it is said [that] the same Arba is "the father of Enac"; and just as he was the author [founder] of a race horrific by so great a tallness and vastness of bodies, so he also excelled all in the same [qualities], and likewise in authority, power, and dignity. Both greatness — as much of body as of power and dignity — and likewise the founding of the city of Hebron, Toletus attributes to this Arba (on ch. 19 of John,

note 12): "Arbee," he says, "was the name of a man of great body, from whom that city had before received [its] name — as Rome from Romulus, Aelia from Aelius. And thus it seems [it is] to be read: 'Before, [it] was called Cariath Arbe. This [was] the greatest man among the Enakim.'" In Origen [there] is not "he was laid [buried]," but "the greatest among the Enakim himself" — that is, "There was a certain outstanding and excellent man, Arbe, from whom the city received [its] name."

Question VI. Whether Caleb obtained Hebron, which he was seeking from Joshua?

He obtained [it] altogether, and indeed most abundantly. For thus the text has: "And Joshua blessed him, and delivered Hebron to him in possession; and from that [time], Hebron belonged to Caleb son of Jephone the Cenezite, until the present day, because he followed the Lord God of Israel." In which words three [things are] to be noted.

I. "To bless" is threefold: for either the creator blesses the creature, or the creature [blesses] the creator, or the creature [blesses] the creature. The first is always efficacious of some goods in the creature. For hence God always gives those gifts, from which — and on account of which — both the creature itself can be truly and solidly praised, and also [the creature] itself (if indeed it be possessed of intelligence and mind) [can] be roused to praising the author of those gifts, God himself, or at least rouse others [to it]. So Gen. 1:22, 28; ch. 2:3; ch. 5:2; ch. 9:1; ch. 12:2 & 3; and very often elsewhere. *The second*: "To bless" [the creator] is efficacious of nothing in the creator himself, but ascribes to him only the praise and glory which is due, [and] acknowledges, proclaims, [and] celebrates him [as] the author and bestower of all goods (Gen. 14:20; ch. 24:27; Exod. 18:10; Ps. 15:7; Ps. 17:47; Ps. 25:12; Ps. 27:6; and in very many others). *The third*: "To bless" [creature-to-creature] is twofold. For either the creature prays to God [for] some good for the creature — and so Isaac "blessed his sons" (Gen. 27 & 28); Jacob [blessed] King Pharaoh (Gen. 47:7 & 10), and his own sons (Gen. 49:25 & 28); so the Priests bless the people, the sons of Israel (Num. 6:23), by this formula prescribed by God himself: "The Lord bless thee, and keep thee. The Lord show his face to thee, and have mercy on thee. The Lord turn his countenance to thee, and give thee peace." And the effect of this Sacerdotal [priestly] blessing, and the divine promise, is subjoined in these words: "And they (the Priests) shall invoke my name upon the sons of Israel, and I will bless them." Or [secondly] the creature praises the creature — and so even sometimes "the wicked is blessed" (Ps. 10:3), and in the Apostle (Rom. 16:18) "[those who] contrive dissensions and scandals in the Christian Church, by sweet speeches and benedictions, seduce the hearts of the innocent." But Joshua blessed Caleb in one or other, or even in both, of those ways. His outstanding religion and obsequiousness toward God, [his] faith and obedience toward Moses and toward himself [Joshua], [his] greatness of soul in approaching and overcoming dangers, and the whole choir of the very many virtues which were in him, he pursued [praised] with a public and signal laudation; and at the same time he asked of God Almighty, that he would deem him worthy of his own most munificent blessing — and [that], as a certain pledge, as it were, and a divine token of the holy Society [Fellowship] established with him [Joshua] in exploring the land (and preserved in repelling the slanderers [among] the obstinate explorers, and in bearing the threatening insults of the raging people), he [Caleb] should receive "Hebron" — which, by its name (as I said, q. 5), imports "Society" — [and] by the best right obtain and possess [it] with his whole posterity. But that he might possess [it] in fact, [the city] had first to be tamed by war (v. 12). But that handing-over of the inheritance is referred also below (ch. 15:13; Judg. 1:20; 1 Macc. 2:56).

II. By the name of "Hebron" here [is] contained not only the city Hebron itself, but also the wider and more ample neighborhood. Together with Hebron, the city "Debir" [was] also given [at the same time], as will be seen below (ch. 15).

III. [There] is added, "until the present day" — which [day], into what time it fell, is not established. For the author of this book is indeed Joshua; yet he would not speak so of his own time, because [it was] either

present [to him], or certainly next to that day. But who, of the later [men], added particles of this kind — whether Samuel, Ezra, or some other Prophet — "the Rabbis contend, and the case is still before the Judge [sub iudice]." Yet [that] it is not Ezra seems clear from the last verse of the following chapter, where "until the present day the Jebusite is said to dwell at Jerusalem with Juda." For that was not [so] in Ezra's time. See Prolegomenon 2. But how "until the present day" was Hebron Caleb's, since it was afterward given to the Levites and to fugitives [refugees]? There will be below (chs. 20 & 21) a more opportune place for answering.

Question VII. Whether Hebron [was] stormed by Joshua, or by Caleb? And how?

That Hebron [was] taken and stormed by Joshua, ch. 10 of this book asserts (v. 36), thus: "Joshua went up, with all Israel, from Eglon into Hebron, and fought against it, and took it, and smote [it] with the edge of the sword." And concerning the city "Debir" likewise afterward (v. 38): "thence, returning to Debir, he took it, and laid [it] waste." Again, ch. 11, v. 21: "at that time Joshua came, and slew the Enakim from the mountains of Hebron, and Dabir, and Anab, and from every mountain of Juda [and] Israel, and destroyed their cities." But [that] which the fifteenth chapter follows [adds], narrates [that] those giants [were] destroyed by Caleb, and both cities occupied by him, and wrested from the Canaanites (vv. 14, 15, & following). And the same is repeated [in] Judges 1:20. And [these] indeed seem [to differ] among

(col. 1151)

[And these accounts indeed seem] to fight among themselves; but [those] deny [that] they fight — and rightly deny — who acknowledge the Holy Spirit [as] the author and dictator of all these books. But various modes of removing the repugnancy are handed down by those same [authors]. *First*: Lyranus says there were "two Hebrons and two Debirs," of which Joshua took one, but Caleb the other. But others think Hebron and Debir [are each] single, and bring forward these other modes. The first is that of Abulensis himself (ch. 10 of this book, q. 96): [that] it can be said [there] is one Hebron, but of which [there] are two parts — one in the plain, the other on the mountain; of which Joshua stormed the former, but Caleb the latter. The second, again, [is a] mode of Lyranus: [that] Caleb truly and properly took those cities, but [that] Joshua is said to have taken them "by anticipation," because by his grant and authority Caleb took them afterward. For [the things] which are done by lesser Leaders are wont to be attributed to the greatest of all, or the commander of the war. And after perplexing disputations (ch. 11, qq. 84 & 85), Abulensis especially embraces this mode, and [so does] Caietanus (on this ch. 14 & 15), demonstrating [that] these [things] which are here said were said before the Joshuan battles with Hebron (chs. 10 & 11). *Third*: [there] is Masius's mode: [that] the same cities [were] truly and properly taken by both. For [it] happened, after Joshua's victories and life[time], that the remnants of the Canaanites stirred up a defection and rebellion; and so arms [were] taken by Caleb against them, and all their [cities] happily stormed. And hence, what is to be thought "concerning the time of the storming" is nearly understood. For it is twofold: the one, that very [time] in which Joshua finished the earlier wars; the other, after his death. And this latter time indeed is certain from ch. 1 of Judges; but that [earlier time] also [is] certain, if we embrace any of the given modes except the one which posits "anticipation." Yet of those modes, that one cannot please me which "builds up twin Hebrons and Debirs." For in the whole division of the land, only one "Hebron," one "Debir," always occurs; and in the slaughter of the Canaanite Kings (above chs. 9, 10, 11, 12), only one King of Hebron, one King of Debir. In all the other modes [there] is probability, but especially in the penultimate and the last; and let him prefer this last to that penultimate, who shall wish to adhere more to the context, and at the same time to reckon with himself how easily — after those cities [were] subdued by Joshua — some of the Canaanites and Enakim could afterward either creep or burst into them. For although Joshua had destroyed all [the Enakim] whom he had found, yet [there] survived of these, in neighboring Palestine, several, who — an occasion being seized afterward, by

guile or by force — could claim those places for themselves again. For so it is signified (ch. 10:37), and (ch. 11:22) when it is written: "Joshua left not any of the stock of Enacim in the land of the children of Israel, except in the cities Gaza, and Geth, and Azotus, in which alone they were left." But the occasion for those Enakim could have been either that no garrison [was] yet placed in these captured cities, while all the Israelites still clung together in the camp at Gilgal; or that there was some negligence of those [few] left there, or certainly a weakness of forces for resisting those [enemies] rushing in. For various and uncertain [are] the outcomes of garrisons and battles. Certainly, while Caleb here was seeking Hebron, those Enakim were again in it (v. 12), and Caleb was already meditating war against them, and wholly breathing [it] (same v. 12). But [enough] only concerning the question — in which, on account of the "τὸ ἐναντιοφανὲς [to enantiophanes]" [the apparent contradiction] here expounded, Abulensis confesses very much of difficulty (q. 85, ch. 11).

Question VIII. How did Caleb take Hebron?

This is explained by the prolepsis of history in the following chapter (from v. 14 to 21); but rightly and in order, according to the series of time and of events done (ch. 1 of Judges, from v. 10 & 20). But of this city stormed by Caleb, only one [thing] is here touched, which [is] to be explained. "If," says Caleb (v. 12), "perchance the Lord be with me, and I shall be able to destroy them, as he promised me." Behold the man's modesty and religion. From Joshua he seeks a place which the enemies still held — and enemies formidable by the very mass of [their] bodies. Yet he plainly trusts [that] he will rout these, and take that [city] — but relying on divine help and aid. For this is that [phrase] "if the Lord be with me," as was shown [in] ch. 1 of this book, q. 11; but why did he add "perchance [forte]"? Was he doubting? was he doubtful whether God wished to do what he had said or promised? One of the Innovators answers [that] the Hebrews, by the word "ulai [perhaps]," note difficulty simply, "in whatever way, no diffidence agitating [their] minds with disquiet." But it so notes that difficulty, that from it diffidence can simply arise; and although that [diffidence] does not arise, yet some fear is always adjoined, which is wont to be born from the magnitude of the matter, the weakness of one's own forces, and other similar circumstances being considered. So Caleb, if he looked at God's promise, power, and help alone, was touched by no diffidence nor fear at all; but [he had care] when he regarded the difficulty of the matter, and himself — [namely] that it could happen that by some sin of his he might impede God's beneficence, and not attain what God had promised. For divine promises of this kind are wont to be conditioned by certain conditions; which, if they be violated by men, all those [promises] are rendered void and empty, as [in] 2 Sam. 7. Caleb shows, therefore, [that] he has the best hope of a prosperous outcome, on account of the presence and aid of God [who will] help [him]; yet [that] he does not over-trust, nor is wholly empty of all care and fear, since it could happen — by his own or his [men's] fault — [that] God might not be present, [and] these happy promises of his might not come about. Concerning Jerusalem, occupied by David so late, Calvin says (on the following chapter, p. 58): "the softness [sloth] of a long time in a certain way repelled God's blessing." And afterward, concerning the Manassites (p. 68): "they suffocated God's power by their own sloth." But even if that "perchance" were absent, yet that hope or confidence — [needing] to be seasoned with some fear — would be sufficiently signified by the particle "if," as in the 70: "ἐὰν οὖν κύριος μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ᾖ, ἐξολοθρεύσω αὐτοὺς, ὃν τρόπον εἶπέ μοι κύριος [ean oun kyrios met' emou ■, exolothreus■ autous, hon tropon eipe moi kyrios]" — that is: "if then the Lord be with me, I will destroy them, in the manner which the Lord said to me."

(col. 1153)

After the Wars: Caput XV — The portion and dominion of the tribe of Juda [Iudae tribus portio ac ditio]

Caput XV — The portion and dominion of the tribe of Juda [Iudae tribus portio ac ditio] (opening)

1. This, then, was the lot of the children of Juda by their kindreds: From the border of Edom, the desert of Sin southward, and as far as the uttermost part of the southern coast. **2.** Its beginning [was] from the top of the most salt sea, and from the bay thereof that looketh to the south. **3.** And it goeth out toward the ascent of the Scorpion, and passeth on into Sina; and ascendeth into Cadesbarne, and reacheth into Esron, going up to Addar, and compassing Carcaa; **4.** and from thence passing along into Asemona, and reaching the torrent of Egypt: and the bounds thereof shall be the great sea. This shall be the limit of the southern coast. **5.** But on the east side the beginning shall be the most salt sea, even to the end of the Jordan; and [the bounds] toward the north [shall be] from the bay of the sea unto the same river Jordan. **6.** And the border goeth up into Beth-Hagla, and passeth by the north into Beth-Araba: going up to the stone of Boen the son of Ruben, **7.** and tending as far as the borders of Debera, from the valley of Achor, and northward looking toward Galgala, which is over against the ascent of Adommim, on the south side of the torrent; and it passeth the waters that are called the Fountain of the Sun; and the goings-out thereof shall be at the Fountain Rogel. **8.** And it goeth up by the valley of the son of Ennom, on the side of the Jebusite toward the south — this is Jerusalem — and thence raising itself to the top of the mountain which is over against Geennom, to the west, in the summit of the valley of Raphaim northward. **9.** And it passeth on from the top of the mountain unto the fountain of the water of Nephtoa, and reacheth to the towns of mount Ephron; and it bendeth toward Baala, which is Cariath-iarim, that is to say, the city of the woods. **10.** And it compasseth from Baala westward unto mount Seir, and passeth by the side of mount Iarim to the north into Cheslon; and goeth down into Bethsames, and passeth into Thamna; **11.** and reacheth northward to a part of Accaron at the side; and bendeth to Sechrona, and passeth mount Baala; and cometh into Iebneel, and is bounded westward with the great sea. **12.** These are the borders round about of the children of Juda in their kindreds.

13. But to Caleb the son of Jephone he gave a portion in the midst of the children of Juda, as the Lord had commanded him: Cariath-Arbe, [the city] of the father of Enac, which is Hebron. **14.** And Caleb destroyed out of it the three sons of Enac — Sesai, and Ahiman, and Tholmai, of the stock of Enac. **15.** And going up from thence, he came to the inhabitants of Dabir, which before was called Cariath-Sepher, that is to say, the city of letters. **16.** And Caleb said: He that shall smite Cariath-Sepher, and take it, I will give him Axa my daughter to wife. **17.** And Othoniel, the son of Cenez, the younger brother of Caleb, took it; and he gave him Axa his daughter to wife. **18.** And as they were going together, she was moved by her husband to ask a field of her father; and she sighed as she sat on [her] ass. And Caleb [said] to her: What aileth thee? **19.** But she answered: Give me a blessing; thou hast given me a southern and dry land, join to it also a watered [land]. And Caleb gave her the upper and the nether watery ground. **20.** This is the possession of the tribe of the children of Juda by their kindreds.

21. And the cities, from the uttermost parts of the children of Juda, by the borders of Edom to the south, were: Cabseel, and Eder, and Jagur, **22.** and Cina, and Dimona, and Adada, **23.** and Cades, and Asor, and Jethnam, **24.** Ziph, and Telem, and Baloth, **25.** New Asor, and Carioth, Hesron — this is Asor; **26.** Amam, Sama, and Molada, **27.** and Asergadda, and Hassemon, and Bethphelet, **28.** and Hasersual, and Bersabee, and Baziothia, **29.** and Baala, and Jim, and Esem, **30.** and Eltholad, and Cesil, and Harma, **31.** and Siceleg, and Medemena, and Sensenna, **32.** Lebaoth, and Selim, and Aen, and Remmon: all the cities twenty-nine, and their villages. **33.** But in the plains [champaign]: Estaol, and Sarea, and Asena, **34.** and Zanoe, and Aengannim, and Taphua, and Enaim, **35.** and Jerimoth, and Adullam, Socho and Azeca, **36.** and Saraim, and

Adithaim, and Gedera, and Gederothaim: fourteen cities, and their villages. **37.** Sanan, and Hadassa, and Magdalgad, **38.** Delean, and Masepha, and Jecthel, **39.** Lachis, and Bascath, and Eglon, **40.** Chebbon, and Leheman, and Cethlis, **41.** and Gideroth, and Bethdagon, and Naama, and Maceda: sixteen cities, and their villages. **42.** Labana, and Ether, and Asan, **43.** and Jephtha, and Esna, and Nesib, **44.** and Ceila, and Achzib, and Maresa: nine cities, and their villages. **45.** Accaron, with its towns and villages; **46.** from Accaron even to the sea, all [places] that lie toward Azotus, and the villages thereof. **47.** Azotus, with its towns and villages; Gaza, with its towns and villages, even to

(col. 1155)

the torrent of Egypt; and the great sea is its boundary. **48.** And in the mountain: Samir, and Jether, and Socoth, **49.** and Danna, and Cariath-senna — this is Dabir — **50.** Anab, and Istemo, and Anim, **51.** Gosen, and Olon, and Gilo: eleven cities, and their villages. **52.** Arab, and Ruma, and Esaan, **53.** and Janum, and Beth-thaphua, and Apheca, **54.** Athmatha, and Cariath-arbe — this is Hebron — and Sior: nine cities, and their villages. **55.** Maon, and Carmel, and Ziph, and Jota, **56.** Jezrael, and Jucadam, and Zanoe, **57.** Accain, Gabaa, and Thamna: ten cities, and their villages. **58.** Halhul, and Bessur, and Gedor, **59.** Mareth, and Bethanoth, and Eltecon: six cities, and their villages. **60.** Cariath-baal — the same is Cariath-iarim, the city of woods — and Arebba: two cities, and their villages. **61.** In the desert: Betharaba, Meddin, and Sachacha, **62.** and Nebsan, and the city of Salt, and Engaddi: six cities, and their villages. **63.** But the children of Juda could not destroy the Jebusite that dwelt in Jerusalem; and the Jebusite dwelt with the children of Juda in Jerusalem, until this present day.

COMMENTARY

The portion, lot, and dominion of the tribe of Juda is here described in two ways. 1. Generally, from the beginning of this chapter to v. 12. Then specially, from v. 20 to the end. But between the two descriptions is inserted, concerning Caleb, by a prolepsis, a History which happened after Joshua's death, and about which I said [more] was to be said in the foregoing chapter (Judg. 1). And so [there] are three parts of this chapter. In the first, the general description of the Judaic lot. In the second, the proleptic narration concerning Caleb, from v. 12 to v. 20. In the third, the special description of the same lot.

Now that general [description] constitutes the four boundaries of the Judaic dominion. The first is from the South; the second, from the East; the third, from the North; the fourth, from the West. And the first indeed is called (v. 1) "the border of Edom, or Idumaea, the border of the desert of Tsin toward the south; the border of the extremity of Theman" — or, as our [Vulgate] renders, "the uttermost parts of the southern coast." And this first border is regarded by progressing, and drawing (as it were) a certain cord, from the Eastern part to the Western (vv. 2, 3, 4). The second border (v. 5), progressing from South to North, is the whole salt sea, from its Southern border up to the end or mouth of the Jordan flowing into it. The third is regarded by progressing from East to West (v. 6 to v. 12). The fourth — unless we follow Arias in expounding v. 5, of which below — is gathered from the end of v. 12 of this [chapter], and from v. 4. For since the Northern border is extended up to the great sea (which is otherwise called the Mediterranean), [and] the Southern up to the torrent or river of Egypt, [called] Rhinocolura, it comes about that the Western border of the land of Judaea is that part or shore of the interjected Mediterranean sea which is intercepted between those two borders, the Northern and the Southern.

But the special description (v. 20) recounts the chief cities which flourished at that time, and makes a fourfold distinction of them. For some were Southern, concerning which [vv.] 21 to 33. Others, champaign [of the plain], or situated in low and flat [ground], concerning which [vv.] 33 to 37, and again from v. 37 to 48. Others are mountain [cities], concerning which [vv.] 48 to 61. Others, finally, which [are] in more desert and less-inhabited places, concerning which vv. 61 & 62. And to all these [is] woven a little appendix concerning Jerusalem — as a most celebrated and most renowned city, of which mention had been made (v.

8) — (v. 63): how, namely, the Judaic tribe could not take the whole of it, but in it, together with the tribes of Juda, the old Jebusite colonists still remained.

Question I. Whether the investigation of those cities and places be useful

It seems to some vain and useless to put any labor into investigating and expounding the site and names of those cities and places. But these are greatly deceived. For, *first*, [there is] the highest usefulness of Chorography in absolutely every history — as Strabo teaches at the beginning of bk. 1, and, [even] when he is silent, daily experience [teaches it]. "Lest," says Polybius (bk. 5), "the [things] which are said be obscure on account of ignorance of places, the nature and site of them must be declared." And a little after: "Topography is to be despised in no matter at all." Plutarch relates, in [his life of] Nicias, [that] he [Alcibiades] set forth the Topography of Sicily in the semicircles [benches] and workshops of the craftsmen, and so — on account of the opportuneness of the place, that war could be waged against the Carthaginians — stirred up the Athenians. *Second*: [it is] not of nothing [= not purposeless], whatever is placed in the sacred letters by the Holy Spirit. "All Scripture," says the Apostle, "divinely inspired, is useful for teaching, for reproving, for correcting, for instructing in Justice." How [then] would that Scripture which denotes and sets forth places be useless? How would its investigation and contemplation be empty and unfruitful? *Third*: St. Chrysostom (homily on Priscilla and Aquila, at the beginning): "Nothing at all," he says, "in the sacred letters [is] superfluous. Have you not learned [that] both the inscriptions and the names must be diligently sifted in the arcane Scriptures? I indeed think the studious would not even bear [tolerate] that some little word in the sacred letters be contemptuously passed over — even if only names be recounted, or time be numbered, or some brief knowledge come about." In the same sacred Scripture, [the things] which seem small are great — as the same St. Chrysostom shows (homily 1 to the people): "Those who smelt the earth of metals [= ore]," he says, "after they have thrown [it] into the furnace itself, take not only the masses of gold, but also gather the small flakes with much diligence." Similar [things] are read in Origen not rarely, as on this book, homilies 13, 14, 20, 23. *Fourth*: the ancient doctors of the Church judged so much of advantage [to be] placed in this matter, that Eusebius laboriously wrote a most useful book "On the Hebrew places," and St. Jerome rendered it into the Latin tongue (not as, before him, a certain other [had done], scarcely imbued with the first rudiments [of letters]); and Bede followed these afterward, and others. *Fifth*: Nay rather,

(col. 1157)

and the same holy Father [Jerome] resolved to traverse the whole region — and indeed with great care, study, and expense — that he might become master of the fruit which is wont to be perceived from the knowledge of places, as his preface on Paralipomena attests by these words: "Just as those understand the histories of the Greeks better who have seen Athens, and [understand] the third book of Virgil [better, those] who have sailed from the Troad through Leucate and the Acroceraunian [headlands] to Sicily, and thence to the mouths of the Tiber — so [he] will behold the holy Scripture more lucidly who has contemplated Judaea with [his] eyes, and has come to know the memorials of the ancient cities, and the names of places, whether the same or changed." Whence to us too [there] was a care — with the most learned of the Hebrews — to undergo this labor, that we might go around the province which the whole Church of CHRIST resounds. *Sixth*: one may sometimes see some [people] who — whether in schools or in sermons to the people, when mention of Capharnaum, Bethlehem, and the like comes up — blunder, on account of ignorance of places, no otherwise than that [Apion], concerning whom [more] a little after, in q. 8. Prudence, therefore, rejects the opinion of those who judge the scrutiny of places placed in the sacred codices [to be] unfruitful. What — if it is usefully and pleasantly inquired, learned, and handled in what places some things are narrated by Caesar, Livy, and the like (even profane and Gentile [things]) — why not much more those [things] which divine men annotated, and sent into the sacred letters?

Yet I cannot praise Origen's opinion (in the last homily on Numbers, and homily 23 on this book), when he judges so great a usefulness of those places, that he thinks [them] Symbols and figures of similar places in the heavens. And that, on account of nearly three arguments. *First*: the Apostle calls all earthly [things] (Heb. 8:5) "a shadow and copy of the heavenly." *Second*: [there] is "a heavenly Jerusalem, and a heavenly mount Sion" in the same epistle (ch. 12:22). *Third*: Just as [there are] regions of the earth, so also [there] are certain regions of the sky; and the names of the stars [are] the same as [those] on earth, as is handed down in the books of "Enoch." But as in all things, so also in the allegorical and anagogical explanations of the scriptures, [there] ought to be a measure. For what "Samaria" [is there] in heaven? what "Bethaven"? what salt sea? what "hacrabbim" [Akrabbim], or "ascent of the Scorpions"? Nor do his arguments effect anything. For as to the first: "heavenly" [things] are called the spiritual and divine [things] — the mysteries which lead to the heavens — whether they be on earth or in heaven. As to the second: "the heavenly Jerusalem" is the Church, both militant and triumphant. But to deal only with this [heavenly one]: since the whole kingdom of the heavens is [one] Jerusalem, what place [is there] for other places? Would we crowd into one city all the cities, villages, and castles of the 12 tribes? As to the third: I have already said elsewhere, from St. Jerome, [that] the Stars [constellations] [are] disfigured by the infamous names of the Gentiles. For [there are] no she-bears in heaven, [no] rams, bulls, crabs, scorpions, dogs, and little-dogs. And the "books of Enoch" themselves are apocryphal, as I touched on [in commenting on] St. Jude's epistle; and Origen himself does not deny [it], in the cited homily on Numbers. But between those extreme opinions, I see [that] by some, sometimes, the inquiry of times and places in the Scriptures is called useless — not simply, but when it either calls [away] the minds from more useful and more necessary [things], or retards [them] more than is fair; as in schools — if certain books of the Scriptures are to be lectured through in one year — [it] does not seem worth the labor to tarry longer in these [matters], and, [when one is] desirous of thoroughly learning Theology, to fill the minds with measures, or numbers of years, or pictures of places. See below, q. 8.

Question II. What [is] to be noted in the borders of Judaea?

First: the "desert of Sin" (v. 1) is not the same as that into which, in the second month from the departure from Egypt, the children of Israel came (Exod. 16). For although both [are] "σίν [sin]" in Greek, and we call [both] "Sin," yet there is a manifest distinction in the Hebrew, since the one begins with "ts" [tsade], the other with "s" [samech]. And here indeed [it is] first written through "tsade," "Tsin," just as also a little after (v. 3), for "tsena," or in Greek "σενά [sena]," [it] is in Hebrew "Tsinah" — lest anyone here think of Mount Sinai. But that desert "Tsin" seems to have been outside the lot of Judaea, nearest to the southern border of the Asphaltite lake [the Dead Sea]. And this — as some express [it] — they say [means] the border of Juda is contiguous to the land of Edom, and to the sons of Sin.

Second: the "most salt sea" is called in Hebrew "the sea of Salt," or "the salt sea." Yet the Interpreter [Vulgate] uses a superlative, to distinguish this from the other seas, which also are salt — and so [salt] that [they] are sometimes called "Salt," as in Maro [Virgil] (Aeneid 1): "Joyfully they gave the sails, and swept the foam of the salt [sea] with [their] bronze [prows]." But this sea in Judaea [is] much more salt than all the others — concerning which I already said [more], both on Genesis and on this book. Whence yet [it is] to be repeated here, [that] its length, which is from South to North, is handed down by Josephus (bk. 5 of the Antiquities, ch. 5) [as] 580 stadia, [its] breadth 150. And the same is called the "Asphaltite lake." But just as, from "Adria," a certain sea is called "Adriatic," so Beroaldus — of the Innovators — thinks (bk. 3 Chron., ch. 3) [that] this salt sea [was] named from the city of "Salt," concerning which below (v. 62); but the truer cause [is] handed down in Genesis, from the Sodomitic conflagration.

Third: "the tongue of the sea" is wont to be called some bay of it, as [in] Isaiah 11:15. Yet the Septuagint here render [it] "λοφιάν [lophian]" [ridge], and the Thargum "Cepha," that is, "Peter" or "a Rock" — either because the Hebrew word signifies not only waters, but also lands and crags which have a likeness of a

tongue; or because for it they put another [word], which would signify the same border and place by a mark then very notable, and known to all — namely, from some overhanging or neighboring rock.

Fourth: the Meridian and Southern coast the 70 here mostly call "λίβα [liba]," which is the wind from the Southern coast. And the same [70] often here put "κάδης [kad■s]" [Cades], as [in] vv. 1 & 4. And again "Addar" is by the 70 called "σάραβα [saraba]." But that "s" [of "saraba"] seems to have accrued from the intervening preposition "εἰς [eis]" [to]: so that [it] seems [it is] to be read "εἰς ἄραβα [eis araba]" [to Araba], or rather "ἄδαρα [adara]" [Adara].

Fifth: the "Ascent of the Scorpion" is a slope or mountain, in which [there is] either an abundance of Scorpions, or a certain figure and likeness [of one]. Some place it [more to the north] at the extreme southern border of the Asphaltite [lake], as Arias [Montanus does] in [his] "Phaleg," or the map of the whole land of Israel. But that by no means pleases Masius.

(col. 1159)

Sixth: the "torrent of Egypt" is called by some the Nile — but in two ways. *First*: so that that part of it, or mouth, is signified which is at Pelusium. And this does not displease Masius here. *Second*: so that [it] be the river "Rhinocolura," which is also called by another name "Nilus" — either because it is [derived] from it [the Nile] through, as it were, subterranean passages and channels, or because [it is] not very far from it.

Seventh: [the words] "those [things] which look toward the North" (v. 5) have a threefold explanation. The *first* is [that] of Junius: [that] from the Northern border of the Asphaltite [lake] the portion of Judaea is extended through that part of the Jordan river which [extends] thence as far as the lake of Genezareth; and so (below ch. 19:34) he says the borders of the tribe of Nephthali are co-terminous with the borders of Judaea. The *second* is [that] of Arias: [that] the Northern border of Judaea in this place begins from the tongue, namely, of the Mediterranean or western sea, [and goes] up to the eastern [limit], [namely] the same Jordan river. The *third*: [that] it be a repetition of the former middle, and an exegesis, in this manner: "This border, from the Southern Tongue of the same sea toward the Northern angle or part, is the very extremity of the Jordan river, where, namely, it sinks into the Asphaltites." The first extends the borders of Judaea too much, nor [is it] sufficiently consonant to the text. The middle [second] is very easy, as also the third; but that [second] is closer to the Latin text, this [third] to the Hebrew.

Eighth: "Iebneel" (v. 11). "But that [it] is one of the two Jamnias, I nothing doubt," says Masius. For the Greeks are wont often to convert the letter "beth" into their own "mi" [μ]. The same seems [right] to Arias too, here and in [his] "Caleb," where [he treats] of the tribe of Dan; and both [Masius and Arias] will [have it] to be a maritime [coastal] city.

Ninth: "[the border] is concluded by the end of the great sea toward the west." The Interpreter [Vulgate] concluded briefly [that] which in the Hebrew is said with more [words], thus: "And the goings-out of this border were to the sea, or toward the west. And the border of the sea [is] toward the great sea." And this latter clause could be taken thus — as if this border were from the eastern or salt sea to the western, or "great," sea — because, since the somewhat larger gatherings of waters were called "seas" by the Hebrews (Gen. 1:10, and in Pliny bk. 3 ch. 16, [and] Virgil Aeneid 1), and [since] thence, in those places, "the sea of Genezareth" [and] "the salt sea" were [so] named, the Mediterranean would far surpass all [of them] there in magnitude and mass of waters.

Tenth: the "Stone of Boen" (v. 6), or "Even Bohan," is said [to be the stone] "of the son of Ruben." [Is it] because [there] was among the Canaanites some "Ruben"? or rather because — [being] of the Rubenites who were still campaigning under Joshua — that "Bohan" did something illustrious at that stone? this [is] more likely; but the name would then [have been] very recent.

Eleventh: "Galgala" (v. 7) seems to some [to be] different from that in which we fixed the Israelites' camp (above ch. 5). For this [Galgala is] near the slope "Adommin," which (as St. Jerome attests in Paula's Epitaph) was between Jerusalem and Jericho; but those camp-[places were] nearer to Jericho and the Jordan; and these (below ch. 18) are called not "Gilgal," as [in] ch. 5, but "Geliboth."

Twelfth: in these expositions of places, these words frequently occur — "to ascend, to pass over, to tend, to look toward, to go out, to incline, to go around, to descend" — which Arias briefly indicates by one line of this kind:

Segment	Verb
a–b	Transire (to pass over)
b–c	Tendere (to stretch toward)
c–d	Respicere (to look toward)
d–e	Convertere (to turn)
e–f	Circuire (to compass)
f–g	Exire (to go out)

(— i.e. a single undulating line through the points A · B · C · D · E · F · G, tracing the border's course: rising, dipping, and turning from one landmark to the next.)

Add [that], by our Interpreter, "contra [over against]" is quite often taken for "versus [toward]," or "ex adverso," "è regione [opposite]."

Question III. How many Southern cities of Juda were there?

The text answers (v. 32): all the cities [are] 29, and their villages. But if we gather the names which are in the text from v. 21 to this [v.] 32, [there] will seem to be many more cities — and indeed, according to R. Isaiah's reckoning, 36; according to the 70 and our [Vulgate], 37; according to [that] of other Rabbis, 38. This knot in that reckoning the Rabbis try to loose — and Junius, following them — [by saying] that 29 were "of the tribe of Juda," but the others, which are here added, [were] "nine Simeonite [cities]." But since [it is] only of the Judaic tribe [that] here [there] is treatment, and not even a little word of the Simeonite portion is thrown in, is not this response absurd? If someone should recount another's goods, and — denoting all one by one through a reckoning — should pass over some in the true sum, and say [that] it happens for this reason, because they are to be [the goods] of this or that [person], of whom [there] was no mention — would not the reckoner be held unskilled [and] ridiculous? But Abulensis says the Hebrew "text" [is] corrupt, and [that] in it and all the others, for "29" should be put "39." But this plank [is] to be seized only in the utmost shipwreck [= as a last resort]. [It is] rather to be said [that] in the words of the text those words too, "and their villages," are to be regarded. For the cities recounted are indeed only 29; but with them [there are] the rest of their villages — which, [being] indeed larger and more famous, yet not girt with walls, the 70 call "κώμας [k■mas]," the Hebrew text "chaserim," the French "bourgs," the Germans "Flecken" or "Marcken," the Spanish "los corrales," as [is] here noted by the Spaniard Arias.

Question IV. How many cities [were there] in the plains of Judaea?

They are numbered 14 (v. 37), and again 16 (v. 41); and therefore, taken together, all [are] 30. But in that former number, the names placed [in the text] seem to require [that] not 14, but 15 rather, be numbered. R. Isaiah and Rashi answer [that] "Aenam" [Enaim] is to be taken out of the number of the cities, since it is not a city, but a spring near Taphna. But in that way, [it is] not [counted] among

(col. 1161)

the Judaic borders [it] ought to have been numbered, but among the Josephine [Joseph's], as will be clear from the following ch. 16. Radak, therefore, answers otherwise — [as do] Lyranus, and with him Abulensis: [that] two names are here recounted which signify one and the same city, "Gedera" and "Gederothaim" — just as "Asor" is also called "Esron," and "Dabir," "Cariath-Sepher" or "Cariath-senna." But since two names are so distinctly noted, like the rest, why should they not — like the others — be taken for single places? When [there] are two names of the same place, the text is wont to note this very thing, as in "Asor" (v. 25),

and "Debir" (vv. 15 & 49), [and] "Hebron" (vv. 13 & 34). [We] must therefore stand by the response of the foregoing question — [that] some more famous "village" or township was named before, together with the 14 cities. But if thou shouldst ask, why two little subtotals of these cities in the plain were made? — Abulensis answers (in this place, and q. 10) [that there] was some difference of region between them.

Question V. In the mountains, the deserts, and in sum in the whole tribe of Judaea, how many cities?

In the mountains the cities were 11 (v. 51), in the deserts 6 (v. 62). But all the subtotals placed hitherto being brought into one sum, the cities given to the tribe of Judah were 76, together with very many villages, townships, and hamlets. But Calvin says: "there are numbered 113 cities, with towns and villages." But so great a sum never existed — even if we call into the number all the villages and towns which are named in the text. For [they] would be at most 87, as [is] clear from [the things] said.

Question VI. Did any cities later depart from, or accede to, this tribe?

Some departed from it, and indeed in that manner and for that cause which will be explained afterward (ch. 19). Some also acceded [to it] in the progress of time, as "Bethlehem," or "Ephrata" — which, since it already existed of old, one may deservedly wonder [was] here passed over. But Arias thus begins to recount those [places] in his "Caleb":

"[The places] which, after the death of Joshua, are noted [as] commemorated at various times, are: Medemena (and, nearest to it, Memnon's [Hazzab]); and Bethdagon, not far from Iamia; and Gabaath; Ceila, so near [to the border] that Habakkuk the prophet's sepulchre both [cities] claim for themselves; Halul, a village nearest to Hebron; and the valley of Eschol, with [its] torrent; the town Thecora, of which we already spoke; and the vast forests between Jerusalem and Engaddi, and in that territory the lake Asphar; and above Thecua, toward the East, the valley of Ieruel; Beth-anabal; and Aqrabi, in the borders of Judaea toward the East; and Arath, not far from the territory of Cades (whose king Israel once felt [to be] hostile); and in the same place Barath; Arith, in Daroma, a place notable for David's garrison, and next to it Asthemech; and in the territory of Jerusalem, Bethsam, or the village Asain; the Well, or 'the spring of him that seeth me,' between Cades and Arath; Eare, or Bera, or Beroëa, a city between Ascalon, Azotus, and Jerusalem — which gave hiding-places to Jotham the son of Jerubbaal, fleeing the savagery of [his] brother Abimelech; and in the same tract, the village Baaldezel, near Bethsemes, or the city of the Sun; Berat-Bethur; and Bezech of the Palestinians, or Bezedim; and the city Challis; and the rock Ethan, whence Samson was let down against the Philistines; and near the rock, the place Ebezinthia; and the village Phatura, not far from Gaza; and Sephir, near Ascalon; Befferon, afterward [called] Bethsura, a garrison of the Jerusalemites, situated in the mountains at the valley of Rephaim; Bethacaris, signifying in Syriac 'the house of the vineyards,' between Befferon and Jerusalem — the same, corruptly, Bedus-Carith; and Bergazura; and the castle Dessan, to the North of the city; and the village Carnea, ten miles distant from Jerusalem. In the territory of Gerara, Beer-Dan (in the same [place] Gerara is called a metropolis), and Gurbaal, and that great valley of Gerar itself, and Jacob's wells, many in that valley. Between Jerusalem and Jericho, Bethagan, by which Zedechias sought flight into the desert; and the village Lacabus, in the territory of Jerusalem; and Salem, over against the rising [east] of Jerusalem, in that very tract and the neighborhood of Jerusalem; Bethania, a village toward the South of the Mount of Olives, two miles distant from the city; and alongside the village Bethphage — between which and the city is the hill of the mountain; and the Tower of the flock, or Geder, not far from Bethlehem-Ephratha — once the monument of the crime of Reuben, committed against the chastity of [his] paternal house. Here the Angel announced to the shepherds [that] Christ was born; in the same region [is] the place Rama, between Techoa and Hebron; Gebrata, the place which was allotted the sepulchre of Rachel. But in the territory of Hebron [is] Luza, and a region once of the Canaanites, where

Hagar of Abraham is said to have been settled. And the city Malatha, and Maseroth, where once David hid in caves; in the same place [is] Siphemoth; and Abel-Misraim, that is, 'the mourning of the Egyptians.' And Asedoth, or Asdoth, a place: in that region the Enakim were, whose remnants remained in Gad and Asdod. Toward the Southern borders, Petra, an ancient city — other than the Arabs' Petra, on the border of Egypt. Param, a desert, looked, in the circuit of the mountains Maon and Carmel, toward the South. There are also other places of lesser note, yet celebrated either by [some] commemoration, or by the monument of a deed done in them — as Bethsalisa, in the Tamnitic region; and Bozor, a torrent toward the South of Siceleg. After Cariathiarim [are] the camps of Dan toward Jerusalem, whose name is also Bethmaacha. Nobe too was a city ascribed to the Priests, between Ramath of Benjamin and Joppa — which witnessed Saul's cruelty against the Priests. In the territory of Maresa [there] was the valley Zaphatha, by others called Sephala from [its] lowness, the same also called the valley Rophaim; in the same valley [is] the city Adiada. Near Bethsames, the place of the Philistines' camps was indicated by the name Aphech. Ebenhazer, 'the stone of help,' [was] so called near Bethur. Around the sea of Salt [is] Sohar, or Sebor, which Lot, fleeing the Sodomitic conflagration, sought. Next to it, toward the North, was Nimrim, or Benamrim; and in the mountains of Juda, which ascend to Seir, as far as Baalgad, was a mountain called 'Lenaeus [of Bacchus]'; Casphim, a most fortified city, above Iabnia toward the east, in the tribe of Dan; and in the western border of the same tribe, Eleutheropolis — which we think was once called Eltola — notable by the notation of the Hieronymian itinerary; in the same tribe of Dan, toward the East, toward Jerusalem, was Malatha."

St. Jerome (on Micah ch. 5): "We read," he says, "according to the LXX Interpreters only, in [the book of] Jesus [Joshua] Nave — where the cities and towns of the tribe of Juda are described — among the rest, this also [is] written: Theca, and Ephratha (this is Bethlehem), and Phagor, and Aetham, and Culon, and Tami, and Soris, and Carem, and Gallim, and Bether, and Monacho — 11 cities, and their little-villages. Which is found neither in the Hebrew, nor in any other Interpreter; and whether concerning

(col. 1163)

…and whether [these cities] were erased from the old books by the malice of the Jews — lest CHRIST should seem to have arisen from the tribe of Juda — or [whether they were] added by the 70: by no means clearly knowing [which], we know nothing certain."

Question VII. To what tribe did Jerusalem belong, and why could the Jebusites not be expelled from it?

It will be said partly [in] ch. 18, partly [in commenting on] Judg. 1:2. See Villalpandus in the *Apparatus of the city* (bk. 1, ch. 15, p. 61).

Question VIII. Why are the single or several places of the tribe of Juda not handled [in detail] here?

Since, as was said above (q. 1), the usefulness of Sacred Topography is great, someone may deservedly ask why a more accurate and longer treatment of the places — whether of single [ones], or certainly of the chief and many [ones] — is not here instituted [by me]. Various [men] have various causes; and everyone knows where his own shoe pinches him. To him who was once called "the cymbal of the world" — Apion — Josephus objects (in bk. 2 against him) "ignorance of Geography." But Calvin says this same cause [is] his own, why in the explanation of these [places] he is "an infant, and altogether nothing." "Already," he says (p. 55), "I premised before (I think, p. 49) [that] in delineating the site of places and sifting [their] names I would not be careful — partly because I confess [that] I am not practiced in Topographic science; partly because, of [this] great labor, only a slender fruit would return to the Readers." But concerning the fruit, [it was] treated in q. 1. But this ignorance of Geography [is] indeed base for that teacher who despises all the ancients before

himself; and it is by so much more shameful for Calvin than for Apion, by how much more he is today looked up to by so many, is preferred before all, [and] is perpetually called "the most learned Interpreter, κατ᾽ ἐξοχὴν [kat' exoch■n, 'par excellence']." But although other much greater and more necessary [things] repel him from the interpretation of the sacred letters — especially a bad mind, arrogance, [his] zeal of dissension and of Ecclesiastical dissection — yet [there] repels [him] too, and keeps [him] off with both hands, no small ignorance, which [was] condemned by that program [inscription] of Plato, and utterly excluded from the sacred threshold of those schools: "μηδεὶς ἀγεωμέτρητος εἰσίτω [m■deis age■metr■tos eisit■]" ["Let no one ignorant of geometry enter"]. But others — that they may not tarry on these [matters] — a useful hastening toward certain other more-useful [things] moves, as I touched also in q. 1. But me, from these [matters], at this time, [that] especially calls away, [which is] that I now see at hand those authors by whom excellent work [is] bestowed in digging out, explaining, delineating, and depicting these [places]. For besides the commentaries of the ancients — Eusebius, Pamphilus, and the Interpreter St. Jerome, and Bede — on the sacred places, there exists the most diligent Masius, Arias Montanus (both in the commentary on this book, and in the before-cited books "Caleb" & "Phaleg"), Christian Adrichomius in the "Theatre of the Holy Land," [and] P. Alphonsus Salmeron (prolegomenon 41). These [things] being accomplished by these [men] — shall I rightly do [them again]? To these [authors], in the following tribes and chapters too, go, good Reader — go with lucky foot!

After the Wars: Caput XVI — Concerning the Portions of the two Josephine tribes, and specifically of the Ephraimite [portion] thereof [De Iosephinarum tribuum duarum Portionibus, & singulatim de ipsius Ephraimica]

Caput XVI — Concerning the Portions of the two Josephine tribes, and specifically of the Ephraimite [portion] thereof [De Iosephinarum tribuum duarum Portionibus, & singulatim de ipsius Ephraimica] (opening)

1. And the lot of the children of Joseph fell from the Jordan, over against Jericho and the waters thereof, on the east: the wilderness which goeth up from Jericho to the mountain of Bethel; **2.** and goeth out from Bethel to Luza; and passeth the border of Archi, to Ataroth, **3.** and goeth down westward, by the border of Jephleti, unto the borders of Beth-horon the nether, and to Gazer; and the countries of it are ended by the great sea; **4.** and Manasses and Ephraim, the children of Joseph, possessed it. **5.** And the border of the children of Ephraim was according to their kindreds; and their possession, toward the east, was Ataroth-addar, unto Beth-horon the upper. **6.** And the confines go out unto the sea; but Machmethath looketh to the north, and goeth round the borders eastward into Thanath-selo, and passeth along, on the east side, to Janoe. **7.** And it goeth down from Janoe into Ataroth and Naaratha, and cometh to Jericho, and goeth out to the Jordan. **8.** From Taphua it passeth on toward the sea into the valley of reeds, and the goings-out thereof are at the most salt sea. This is the possession of the tribe of the children of Ephraim by their families. **9.** And there were cities set apart for the children of Ephraim in the midst of the possession of the children of Manasse, and their villages. **10.** And the children of Ephraim slew not the Chanaanite who dwelt in Gazer; and the Chanaanite dwelt in the midst of Ephraim, until this day, [as] a tributary.

(col. 1165)

COMMENTARY

From Genesis 49, and from other [things] here before mentioned, it is established [that] the two sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasse, were adopted by Jacob into the number of his [own] sons — so that both of them should approach the inheritance no otherwise than the other sons of Jacob, and should be reckoned not so much [as] his grandsons as [his] sons; and [so that] both should be heads of [their] posterity, or of their tribes, like the other sons and Patriarchs — whereas otherwise they would have been only one head, if they had succeeded only [to] their own Father Joseph, who, like the rest of the brothers, was one. The portions, therefore, of these two tribes — propagated from those two [sons] — in the promised land, are described in these two chapters, and indeed in a twofold [way]. First, generally, in the first four verses of ch. 16. Then singly [in detail], in the remaining verses of each chapter — but so that [at] ch. 16, v. 4, Ephraim's lot is completed, [and at] ch. 17, Manasse's. And generally indeed the Southern limit of the soil and dominion of both tribes together is shown, by progressing from east to west — namely, from that part of the Jordan which [is] near Jericho, and is directly opposite it, up to the Mediterranean sea; by drawing thence, to here, a cord or line through those Jericho-waters afterward celebrated by Elisha's miracle (2 Kings ch. 2), through the wilderness — which wilderness (as [pleases] the Chaldee), or lot (as pleases Arias more), or line, ascends to Mount Bethel, between Bethel and Luza, through Archi-ataroth (which the Chaldee, dividing the word, partitions into two places), beside Iephleh, and through Beth-horon the nether, and the city Gazer. Then the border in which that line ends is that very "great sea" concerning which [was treated in] the foregoing chapter, question 2. But in the singular [detailed] description of the parts, these [things] can be noted.

I. This particular portion between those two Josephine tribes seems to Masius not [to have been] made before the other tribes received by lot their own several possessions. To Abulensis (q. 2) and others, [it] seems

otherwise. And Masius himself subjoins: "but [it] is of no great importance whether they divided the inheritance privately among themselves at once, or afterward, which in common they had received by one lot, as I said."

II. Two "Beth-horon" cities are here indicated in that tribe of Ephraim — the nether, which [is] more southern and more western (v. 3), and the upper, which [is] more northern and more eastern (v. 5).

III. Of the same Ephraimite tribe is indicated: *1.* The breadth, from south to north (v. 5), and its space between the line which passes through the southern Ataroth-addar, and the line which [passes] through the northern Beth-horon the upper. But that "it avails against [contra] the east" [means] "toward the east": so two famous cities on the eastern side of this [tribe] are signified — but one southern, the other northern, as I said. *2.* The northern breadth is indicated, from east to west, in a threefold [way]. For first [there] is placed, as a certain common border, the named city Beth-horon the upper; and from it [one] proceeds (v. 6) toward the west, so that the confines or borders end in the Mediterranean sea — the city Machmethah, however, being left and, as it were, secluded toward the north. Then from the same Beth-horon the border goes round (or is bent back), and that begun northern cord proceeds toward the east, into six eastern cities — of which the last, and most eastern, is Jericho — until [one] has come to the Jordan itself (v. 7). Thirdly: [it] is completed, or rather explained, in v. 8, where from Beth-horon the upper the line had been indicated toward the west. For this [line] proceeds through Thaphna and the valley of reeds, up to the same Mediterranean sea.

IV. In that description of the northern breadth [there] are, in the Latin books indeed, two errors. One (v. 6): "circuit terminos [it goes round the borders]," for "circuit terminus [the border goes round]." The other (v. 8), into which verse crept that [word] "most-salt [salsissimum]." And both those corrections are perceived from the Hebrew and Greek.

V. For "valley of reeds," or [a valley] which abounds in reeds, some render "the river or torrent of the reed [Canna]" — because the Hebrew word "nachal" signifies both "valley" and "torrent," as it is rendered in both ways (following ch. 17, v. 9). But when it is called "a reedy valley," [it is] likewise [that] which is signified by some to abound [in reeds]. Masius depicts this torrent; and others think the same [is] that torrent "Carith," near which Elias hid (1 Kings 17). But others [think it is] that which, in Judith ch. 7, in the Greek copies, is called "Machmour," as I noted it in that place (p. 289) — as if [it] were a black torrent or river, of which kind those waters generally are, in which (or from which) [grow] the reed-beds. For [they] are mostly stagnant, muddy, and torpid, so that for that reason [it] seems less rightly rendered "river." But the Seventy — "χελκανά [chelkana]," the first syllable of the former name being omitted — retained the Hebrew words, and, as it were, put [it as] either one city, or some one place.

VI. "Separated cities" (v. 9). In the Hebrew [they] are called "cities of separations," and [are] expounded in two ways: *1.* Cities which separate the Manassites from the Ephraimites — and so by Tremellius and Junius [they] are rendered "boundary cities." *2.* Cities which are set apart — and this [is] better, not only on account of the Latin text, but the Greek too, in which [it is] "αἱ πόλεις αἱ ἀφωρισμέναι [hai poleis hai aph■rismenai]" ["the cities that are set apart"]. And why [should the] boundary or border cities [be] placed rather in the Manassite tribe than in the Ephraimite itself? For the boundary of each is a [common] boundary. But "separated" is said in two ways — either, namely, because [they were] separately designated to the Ephraimites (as Masius renders [it]), or [because they are those] which are disjoined from the already-enumerated cities of the Ephraimites — and so Arias: "This reading," he says, "has an annotation, or emphasis," and indicates — besides those cities which had fallen to the Ephraimites in [their] own region, divided [off] from [their] Manassite brothers — certain others [that were], even then, handed over to them by a diligent and accurate consignment, with [their] hamlets and villages. And the same sense is Masius's in the commentary — which Caietanus too embraces: "Understand," he says, "that some cities of Ephraim were in the midst of Manasse not as to ownership, but as to site. For [they] were not taken away from Manasse and given to Ephraim, but [they] are described [as] situated between the borders of Manasse on this side and that"

— as seems to be made manifest in the following chapter. The same seemed [right] also to Lyranus, whom Abulensis rejects by no reasoning — [Abulensis] bringing forward this opinion, which [is] less probable: [that] the cities of Ephraim were surrounded by the Manassite tribe, namely as to the northern and eastern side. But in that way all the interior tribes are surrounded by some other [tribe]; nor is [it] explained why those cities were called [cities] "of separations."

VII. Of the Ephraimite tribe, in [the matter of] killing — or expelling, and destroying — the Canaanites (as the Hebrew and Greek text have, v. 10): either the counsel [policy], or else — against Exod. ch. 23:32, [and] Deut. 7:2 — the sin, is again explained,

(col. 1167)

…will be explained again (Judg. 1:29). And something similar is inserted by the 70 (below, ch. 19, before v. 49) — before they treat of the Joshuan [Dan's] portion, [namely, that] they had crossed over to the Lesem [Laish] expedition; and that [the 70] explains concerning exorcists, and more [fully to] the Christians: Origen (homily 24). But [as to that] which is here added, "until this day," [it] already occurred above rather often. Here only [it is] to be noted [that] the 70 in a certain way indicate that day [to] have been in Solomon's time. Whence one might not ineptly gather, either [that] this book [was] written at that time, or rather — as [was] touched [in] prolegomenon 2 — [that] these little additions [were] then made. So indeed they [the 70 have it]: "καὶ κατῴκει ὁ Χαναναῖος ἐν τῷ Ἐφραὶμ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, ἕως ἀνέβη Φαραὼ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν Γαζέρ, καὶ ἐνέπρησεν αὐτὴν ἐν πυρί, καὶ τοὺς Χαναναίους καὶ τοὺς Φερεζαίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Γαζὲρ ἐξεκέντησαν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὴν Φαραὼ ἐν φερνῇ τῇ θυγατρὶ αὐτοῦ" [kai kat■kei ho Chananaios en t■ Ephraim he■s t■s h■meras taut■s, he■s aneb■ Phara■ basileus Aigyptou, kai elaben aut■n Gazer, kai enepr■sen aut■n en pyri, kai tous Chananaious kai tous Pherezaious tous katoikountas en Gazer exekent■san, kai ed■ken aut■n Phara■ en phern■ t■ thygatri autou] — ["and the Canaanite dwelt in Ephraim until this day, until Pharaoh, king of Egypt, went up and took it, [namely] Gazer, and burned it with fire; and they slew the Canaanites and the Pherezites dwelling in Gazer; and Pharaoh gave it [as] a dowry to his daughter"]. [= 1 Kings 9:16.] And this is [that] which Origen touches in homily 22.

After the Wars: Caput XVII — Concerning the Portion of the tribe of Manasse [De Manassae tribus Portione]

Caput XVII — Concerning the Portion of the tribe of Manasse [De Manassae tribus Portione] (opening)

1. And the lot fell to the tribe of Manasse (for he is the firstborn of Joseph): to Machir, the firstborn of Manasse, the father of Galaad, who was a warlike man, and had the possession of Galaad and Basan; **2.** and to the rest of the children of Manasse according to their families — to the children of Abiezer, and the children of Helec, and the children of Israel, and the children of Seche, and the children of Hepher, and the children of Semida: these are the male children of Manasse the son of Joseph, by their kindreds. **3.** But to Salphaad, the son of Hepher, the son of Galaad, the son of Machir, the son of Manasse, there were no sons, but only daughters, whose names are these: Maala, and Noa, and Hegla, and Melcha, and Thersa. **4.** And they came in the presence of Eleazar the priest, and of Joshua the son of Nun, and of the princes, saying: The Lord commanded by the hand of Moses that a possession should be given us in the midst of our brethren. And he gave them, according to the commandment of the Lord, a possession in the midst of the brethren of their father. **5.** And there fell ten portions to Manasse, besides the land of Galaad and Basan beyond the Jordan. **6.** For the daughters of Manasse possessed an inheritance in the midst of his sons. And the land of Galaad fell to the lot of the [rest of the] sons of Manasse that remained. **7.** And the border of Manasse was from Aser, [to] Machmethath, which looketh toward Sichem; and it goeth out to the right hand, by the inhabitants of the Fountain of Taphua. **8.** For the land of Taphua had fallen to the lot of Manasse, [but Taphua itself] is by the borders of Manasse, [belonging to] the children of Ephraim. **9.** And the border goeth down to the valley of reeds, to the south of the torrent of the cities of Ephraim, which are in the midst of the cities of Manasse: the border of Manasse is on the north of the torrent, and the going-out thereof reacheth to the sea; **10.** so that the possession of Ephraim is on the south, and that of Manasse on the north, and the sea is the border of both; and they are joined together in the tribe of Aser on the north, and in the tribe of Issachar on the east. **11.** And the inheritance of Manasse [reached] into Issachar and into Aser: Bethsan and its villages, and Jeblaam with its villages, and the inhabitants of Dor with their towns; the inhabitants also of Endor with their villages; and likewise the inhabitants of Thenac with their villages, and the inhabitants of Mageddo with their villages, and the third part of the city of Nopheth. **12.** Neither could the children of Manasse overthrow these cities, but the Chanaanite began to dwell in his land. **13.** But after the children of Israel were grown strong, they subdued the Chanaanites, and made them their tributaries, and they did not slay them. **14.** And the children of Joseph spoke to Joshua, and said: Why hast thou given me [but] one lot and one portion to possess, whereas I am of so great a multitude, and the Lord hath blessed me? **15.** And Joshua said to them: If thou be a great people, go up into the woodland, and cut down room for thyself in the land of the Pherezite and the Raphaim, because the possession of Mount Ephraim is too narrow for thee. **16.** And the children of Joseph answered him: We cannot go up to the mountains, for the Chanaanites that dwell in the low lands — in which are situated Bethsan with its towns, and Jezrael possessing the midst of the valley — have chariots of iron. **17.** And Joshua said to the house of Joseph, to Ephraim and Manasse: Thou art a great people, and of great strength; thou shalt not have one lot only, **18.** but thou shalt pass to the mountain, and shalt cut down, and clear thyself room to dwell in; and thou mayest proceed farther, when thou hast overthrown the Chanaanite — who, as thou sayest, has iron chariots, and is very strong.

COMMENTARY

Four parts of this chapter seem [to be]. In the first, it is explained to which heads of the Manassite families the Cisjordanian inheritance of this tribe was given, from v. 1 to 7. In the second, by what borders that inheritance is circumscribed, to v. 12. In the third, how the Manassites behaved toward the Canaanites (vv.

12 & 13). In the fourth, a certain complaint of the same [Joseph tribes] is set forth before Joshua, concerning which from v. 14 to the end. In the first

(col. 1169)

In the first [part] these [things] can be noted. *1.* The inheritance of this tribe was given to Manassites of two kinds. Some were beyond the Jordan — concerning whom above (ch. 13), and here briefly, when it is said (v. 1) [that] Machir, and his firstborn Galaad, a very warlike man, occupied there the land Galaaditis of his own name, and likewise Basan. Others [were] on this side [of] the Jordan, in Canaan; and these were [named] from v. 2 — from his [Machir's] grandsons, the sons of [his] sons, who [were] six males — namely of Abiezer, Chelek, Esriel, Sechem, Chepher, and Schemida. But because the son of the penultimate [Chepher] was the only Salphaad, and to this one [there were] no male sons, but five daughters (v. 3), it comes about that in place of one Chepher are placed the portions of those daughters — which [portion], although (in respect of both [their] father and grandfather) it was, like [that] of those others, single, yet because, according to their number, it was afterward divided into five parts, [therefore] all the parts of the Cisjordanian Manassites together are said (v. 5) [to be] ten: of which five [were] given to the sons of Abiezer, Chelek, Esriel, Sechem, and Semida, but five to the daughters of Salphaad, who [were] the same granddaughters of Chepher. But these five [daughters' portions] joined together obtained no more than [the equivalent of] one of the former five [portions]. And this is the truest and readiest exposition of those ten cords [portions] which are mentioned (v. 5) — [rather] than [the one] which R. Isaiah (to the "ten fictitious hipparchies [divisions]," to [persons] long since dead) [and] other Rabbis (in *Baba Bathra*, ch. 8) very ineptly drew.

2. But why [it] was said immediately (v. 1), "(for he, Manasse, is the firstborn of Joseph)" — the cause [is] (says Masius), I think, that the Reader may observe [that], by that casting of the lot, Jacob's judgment [was] excellently confirmed (Gen. 48:14). But that one [Masius] renders the Hebrew particle "ci [ki]" as "autem [but/now]," whereas [it is] rather a causal mark, and means "because," "for," as our [Vulgate] and the 70 render; but Junius and Tremellius render "because," and say [it] is added so that [there] be a reason why two portions are attributed to Manasse by the law [of] Deut. 21:17. Not [that] which is read (Gen. 48:18 & following), [that] Ephraim [was] preferred before Manasse — this [is] not to be referred to a transfer of the primogeniture [birthright], but to the prophetic blessing of the offspring. But that [is said] against the opinion of all, and by [a forced] interpretation, as is taught there. Better, therefore, is [it] answered by Arias, [that] this was now said for this reason — that two wonderful [things] might be signified in this tribe. One is, that it was so populous, and so widely scattered both on this side and beyond the Jordan. The other, that after Ephraim, it becomes master of this its Cisjordanian part. For the cause of both is, that Manasse was the firstborn of Joseph (who had been called "a growing [son]" by [his] father Jacob, Gen. 49:22), and that nonetheless Ephraim [was] preferred before him by the same Jacob (Gen. 48:16 & 19). And this exposition too — as to the former [point] — the cited Masius praises.

3. But the history of those Salphaadite [daughters], to which [reference] is here made, is [in] Num. 27 & 36.

In the second part these [things] too can be noted. *1.* The text describes the eastern limit of this tribe (v. 7), by proceeding from the northern part, toward the south, from the city Aser as far as the city Machmatha — which was directly opposite to the city Sichem, yet a little more southern than that [Sichem]. But [that] "Aser" [is] taken for a city, not for a tribe — Arias and Masius rightly judge, although Radak took [it] for the tribe. *2.* But from the city Machmatha, toward the right [south], proceeding to the west, or to the Mediterranean sea (vv. 7, 9 & 10), [there] occurs the fountain of Taphua (v. 7), and the valley of reeds, concerning which [in] the foregoing chapter; and so the southern limit of this tribe is had [to be] the same, namely, which was the northern [limit] of the Ephraimite tribe. But the text admonishes (v. 8) [that] the city Taphua belonged to the Ephraimites, but its land or territory, with its townships and villages, to the Manassites. For the cord or line which, from the south, encircled either that valley or that reedy torrent, gave [it] to the Manassites themselves — [yet] the cities which lay adjacent to this valley or torrent (on the

southern side) [were] of these [Ephraimites]. For this the Hebrew signifies (v. 9), which in the Latin [is] thus to be understood: "The border of the valley of reeds descends to the south," or [to] the southern side of the torrent itself; "and it is the border of those cities which, although they be in the midst [of the Manasseh cities], yet are of Ephraim itself." So that, word for word, [it] can be rendered more clearly: "those cities are of the Ephraimites, in the midst of the cities of Manasse." *3.* The western limit of each tribe is in some way indicated (v. 10), from south to north. For the side of the Mediterranean sea bounds each; and each is, in some way, co-terminous [with] the Aserite tribe, at Mount Carmel, near the city Dor. I said "in some way," because the Ephraimite lot does not reach there by itself, but only through its brother-tribe the Manassite, since both are Josephine. *4.* Each, in a like manner, reaches from the eastern part to the Issacharite tribe (same v. 10). *5.* The Manassite tribe itself had, in the two already-named co-terminous tribes, some 7 cities and villages — namely: 1. Bethsam, which [is] also Scythopolis; 2. Jeblaam; 3. Dor; 4. Endor; 5. Thenac; 6. Mageddo; 7. Nepheth — but "tertiated," or its third part, as [it is] in our text, and in the Greek 70, "τὸ τρίτον τῆς Μαφετά [to triton t■s Mapheta]" [the third part of Mapheta], or rather "ναφετά [naphetá]." Masius, however, here (& above ch. 11) thinks [it] is not a city, but a tract and region — so that, [with] the interpreter Arias who subscribed to him, for "the third part of the city" [it] should be written, from the Hebrew, "the trinity or triplicity of Nepheth," or of the region. Symmachus renders [it] "three shores of the Phoenician sea." I adhere to our Interpreter and the 70, since [there] is nothing firm from elsewhere. Abulensis, however, will [have it] that this [was] of the Manassites' inheritance not in those tribes, but [held] beside those tribes — p. 79. *6.* In these verses, these [things] are almost all [said] by prolepsis, concerning these cities, and the northern borders of the Manassites.

In the third part, [things] are narrated — also "προληπτικῶς [prol■ptik■s, 'by anticipation']" — [that] which [is] to be said [in commenting on] Judg. 1:27, just as above (ch. 16, last v.). In the commentary on that place, Masius would seem to graze somewhat certain Catholic dogmas, were he not perspicuously discerned [to be] rather noting and reprehending the vices of morals.

In the fourth part, finally, these [things are] to be noted. *1.* [That] the Manassites alone complained, Radak and certain other Jews think; but [that], together with them, [there] were the Ephraimites [too], not only do our Interpreters teach — Abulensis, Arias, Masius — but the whole context itself, especially v. 17. *2.* [That] these tribes complained immediately after the attempted — but not completed — expulsion of the Canaanites, R. Moses of Gerona [Nachmanides] thinks. But since [it] was done only after Joshua's death (as was said in the upper part of the chapter), [it is] to be judged [that] that narration concerning the Canaanites not expelled [was] placed there by prolepsis. For while Joshua [was] living and surviving, those [Canaanites] would never have been tolerated by that greatest [leader], even with tribute and levy. But Masius thinks [that], after the casting-of-lots of the other tribes (concerning which [in] the following chapter) [was] made, this complaint [was] raised. But I would think [it was] rather before; and [that] this very [complaint] was Joshua's occasion of rebuking the sloth of all the tribes (next chapter). For [it] seems [that] first Ephraim and Manasse [were] placed in their possession; then [they] dwelt in it for some while; [and] then at last [they] came to Joshua, complaining about their straits. *3.* [That] which I said of Joshua, and [which] the text says, I think — [with] Abulensis — [is] to be taken by Synecdoche. For [that] they laid down the complaint not before Joshua alone, but before Eleazar too, and the princes set over this division. *4.* They complained [that] the possession of [but] one tribe [was] given to them — not because both Josephine tribes were reckoned for only one, nor because [they were] enclosed by single borders [as] one tribe, as it were,

(col. 1171)

circumscribed; nor, finally, because the portions attributed to them (as [those] of one tribe) [were] narrow — but because both together now obtained no more, in the [otherwise] ample portions given (empty, quiet, and freed from the old Canaanites), than if they were one tribe, or than would suffice for one tribe — as [is] manifest from Joshua's own answers. *5.* By "mountain" (v. 18) some understand a single mountain — and

that, either of Gelboe (as R. Isaiah), or [of] Ephraim; others understand, generally, the mountainous region. And so our interpreter (v. 16), Masius, [and] Abulensis. For the Josephine tribes, like the Judaic, were mountainous. *6.* The Hebrew text (as [in] vv. 16 & 18) seems very intricate. And therefore both the Rabbis and our expositors try variously to disentangle it and render it plain. Our Interpreter indeed did not [do] this felicitously — [rather, while] rendering word for word, in whom that [phrase], "and thou mayest proceed farther," expresses [that] which in the Hebrew is: "And the goings-out of it shall be thine, [namely] of the mountain or of the forest." *7.* Concerning the Raphaim, Abulensis discourses here (q. 4). But [about those] dispersed elsewhere, and about the iron and scythed chariots, [it] will be said [on] Judg. ch. 1.

8. Here the nature of querulous [complaining] men [is] to be observed. *[1.]* For [they] generally lay the blame of the matter of which they complain upon others, when it cleaves in themselves — and indeed sometimes with some pretext of piety, so that they may show a just cause of complaining for themselves. "A people — I am many," say these, "or I am of a great multitude, and the Lord has greatly blessed me, so that I am of so great and so illustrious a number." *2.* [They] exaggerate their merits. *3.* All the evils which seem to them to be, they augment: as these [augment] the straits of the land, and the strength and armor of the Canaanites. *9.* All [these things] Joshua turns back against complainers of this kind, so that — [even] from the [things] which they say — they may be led away from crying out, and be of a more equitable mind. *10.* The same true Joshua, CHRIST JESUS, both does [this] now with us, and will do [it] one day in the final judgment. For someone is vexed, and says — either before his superiors, or in his heart: "I am such-and-such, so-and-so-great; I ought to be honored thus and thus by these and those; I ought to enjoy these and those conveniences; these and those privileges ought to be granted to me." [But Christ answers:] "If thou art such-and-such, so-and-so-great, why dost thou not do this and that? why dost thou not use thy talents? why hast thou grown so torpid? why hast thou not put them out at interest?" (Matt. 25). *11.* God does not will to give all [things] to the idle: the hand [is] also to be applied to the work; the mountains [are] to be ascended; the groves [are] to be cleared; the forest [is] to be cut down; the house [is] to be built; the Raphaim [are] to be attacked; the enemies' scythes, swords, and all terrors [are] to be undergone and overcome — as Origen beautifully teaches here (homily 22), who, among other [things, says] thus: "Let us cleanse the forest which is in us; and — cutting down from our very selves the useless and unfruitful trees — let us make there new-cleared fields, which we always renew, and from which we may take fruit thirtyfold, and sixtyfold, and a hundredfold." These [things] correspond to the former: [as to] cutting down the unfruitful trees, these [are] the commands which the Lord Jesus describes to us in the Gospels (Matt. 3). And how is it not true, that the shadow preceded, and the truth followed? *12.* Excellent is Joshua's faith, who — relying on God's promises — promises the Josephites [that] it certainly will be, that they will possess the whole region, if they but strive a little with the forces and opportunities which the Lord gave them. *13.* Outstanding too [is] the same [Joshua's] integrity and severity, who — although he was of the tribe of Ephraim — yet stopped [his] ears to the complaints of his [own] tribesmen, [and] yielded nothing to them. Nay, [he] even gravely and seriously rebukes and chastises them — but so, again, prudently and moderately, that he showed them both [that] their complaints [were] unjust, and [showed them] likewise the easiness of satisfying [their] wishes and desires.

After the Wars: Caput XVIII — Concerning the second division of the land among the seven remaining tribes; and specifically of the Benjaminite portion [De secunda terrae in septem residuas tribus divisione: ac speciatim de Beniaminia portione]

Caput XVIII — Concerning the second division of the land among the seven remaining tribes; and specifically of the Benjaminite portion [De secunda terrae in septem residuas tribus divisione: ac speciatim de Beniaminia portione] (opening)

1. And all the children of Israel assembled together in Silo, and there they set up the tabernacle of the testimony; and the land was subdued before them. **2.** But there remained seven tribes of the children of Israel, which as yet had not received their possessions. **3.** And Joshua said to them: How long are you slack with indolence, and go not in to possess the land which the Lord the God of your fathers hath given you? **4.** Choose of every tribe three men, that I may send them, and they may go about and compass the land, and mark it out according to the number of each multitude, and bring back to me what they have marked out. **5.** Divide to yourselves the land into seven parts: let Juda be in his bounds on the south side, and the house of Joseph on the north. **6.** Mark out the land in the midst between these into seven parts; and you shall come hither to me, that I may cast lots for you here before the Lord your God. **7.** For there is no part among you for the Levites, but the priesthood of the Lord is their inheritance. And Gad and Ruben, and the half tribe of Manasse, had already received their possessions beyond the Jordan on the east side, which Moses the servant of the Lord gave them. **8.** And when the men were risen up, to go to mark out the land, Joshua commanded them, saying: Go round the land, and mark it out, and return to me, that I may cast lots for you here before the Lord in Silo. **9.** So they went; and surveying it, divided it into seven parts, writing [them] down in a book. And they returned to Joshua, to the camp in Silo. **10.** And he cast lots before the Lord in Silo, and divided the land to the children of Israel into seven parts. **11.** And the first lot came up [for] the children of Benjamin, by their families, that they should possess the land between the children of Juda and the children of Joseph. **12.** And their border northward was from the Jordan: going along by the side of Jericho on the north side, and thence going up westward to the mountains, and reaching to the wilderness of Bethaven, **13.** and passing along southward by Luza, which is Bethel; and it goeth down into Ataroth-addar, to the mountain which is on the south of the nether Beth-horon. **14.** And it bendeth, going round toward

(col. 1173)

the sea, at the south of the mountain which looketh toward Beth-horon to the southwest; and the outgoings thereof are into Cariath-baal, which is called also Cariath-iarim, a city of the children of Juda. This is [their] coast toward the sea, westward. **15.** But on the south side the border goeth out from part of Cariath-iarim toward the sea, and cometh as far as the fountain of the waters of Nephtoa. **16.** And it goeth down to that part of the mountain which looketh toward the valley of the children of Ennom, and is over against the north quarter, in the furthermost part of the valley of Raphaim. And it goeth down into Geennom (that is, the valley of Ennom) by the side of the Jebusite to the south, and cometh to the fountain of Rogel, **17.** passing thence to the north, and going out to Ensemes, that is to say, the fountain of the sun; **18.** and it passeth along as far as the hills that are over against [the ascent of] Adommim; and it goeth down to Abenboen, that is, the stone of Boen the son of Ruben; and it passeth on the north side to the champaign countries, and goeth down into the plain; **19.** and it passeth by Beth-hagla to the north; and the outgoings thereof are toward the north bay of the most salt sea, at the south end of the Jordan, **20.** which is its border on the east side. This is the possession of

the children of Benjamin, by their borders round about, and their families. **21.** And their cities were: Jericho, and Beth-hagla, and Vale-Casis, **22.** Beth-araba, and Samaraim, and Bethel, **23.** and Avim, and Aphara, and Ophera, **24.** the town Emona, and Ophni, and Gabee: twelve cities, and their villages. **25.** Gabaon, and Rama, and Beroth, **26.** and Mesphe, and Caphara, and Amosa, **27.** and Recem, Jarephel, and Tharela, **28.** and Sela, Eleph, and Jebus (which is Jerusalem), Gabaath, and Cariath: fourteen cities, and their villages. This is the possession of the children of Benjamin, according to their families.

COMMENTARY

The parts of the chapter [are] nearly four. In the first, the manner of the assembly of the whole people at Shiloh is described (v. 1). In the second, the choosing and sending-out of the land-surveyors (from v. 2 to 10). In the third, the casting-of-lots (v. 10). In the fourth, the description of the Benjaminite lot (from v. 11 to the end). But in that assembly two [things] were chiefly treated. One, which pertained nearly and directly to religion — namely, concerning the moving of the Lord's tabernacle. The other, which [pertained] to the polity, and the public usefulness of the people — concerning the drawing of the lots of the remaining inheritances. Happy the people in which this order of things flourishes — that the divine [things] be cared for first, [and] the human [things] afterward. "Seek," said the Lord (Matt. 6, v. 33), "first the kingdom of God, and his justice, and all these [things] shall be added to you." That most learned [man] of the Romans, Varro, relates (in Gellius, bk. 14, ch. 7) [that], in the Roman senate, [matters] of the divine were always treated before [those] of the human, and sacrifice [was] made to the Gods first. Excellently — if this religion had been applied to God, not to Demons. For otherwise the blessed life cannot be acquired, nor justice obtained, as St. Augustine shows (bk. 2 *On the City of God*, ch. 21): "There is no true justice," he says, "except in that Commonwealth whose founder and ruler is CHRIST." See also Pliny's Panegyric.

Question I. What, and where, [is] Shiloh?

This question was, for the most part, expounded before (ch. 13, q. 11); nor would anything now [need] to be added, were it not [that] Rashi says the city of Shiloh is in the Benjaminite dominion. For [it is] certain, from Ps. 77, [that it] was in the Ephraimite [territory]; and no reason can be brought forward by him except this one, very futile [one]. In this ch. 18 the tabernacle is placed at Shiloh, and in the same chapter the Benjaminite lot is described; [therefore, he argues,] that [Shiloh] is to be placed among the cities of this [tribe]. But the consequence is denied — which indeed is null. Because, first, the assembly was announced at Shiloh, and in it [it was] decreed that the other remaining inheritances should be allotted by lot; but the Benjaminite lot came out of the urn first of all — therefore [it] is here described first. If the tribe of Zabulon, or of Aser, had come out in the first place, [it] would certainly be described first. Would Shiloh [then be] in that [tribe] on that account? But in the Ephraimite tribe (ch. 16) this [Shiloh] is not recounted. [True,] but [that is] because not all the cities are recounted in all the tribes, as was also said above. And since in this chapter the Benjaminite lot is explained, [and there is] no place for Shiloh in it, [it] is enough [to say] that it was comprehended within the southern Ephraimite border. In the 70 [it] is written "Σηλώ [S■l■]," as [it were] "Selo."

Question II. What assembly [was] held by Joshua at Shiloh, and what [was] decreed in it?

Arias rightly admonishes [that] to that council, announced by Joshua, all came together who sustained the person [role] of the whole people: namely, the Pontiff, the priests, the Nobles, the Elders (or the 72) who made up that Sanhedrin — established by Moses on Jethro's counsel — and, finally, the heads of the families, any chief [men]. But this whole [thing] is gathered rather from the circumstance of the matter than from the single word "Kahal" (which Arias and Montanus press), since that [word] is taken also of a seditious tumult and concourse (Exod. 32:1; Num. 16:4 & 18). But, word for word, for "all the children of Israel were

congregated," in the Hebrew [it] is "the whole council, or the entire assembly, of the children of Israel was congregated" — as [in] Exod. 35:1, in the 70, "ἐξεκκλησίασε πᾶσαν συναγωγὴν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ [exekkl■siase pasan synag■g■n hui■n Isra■l]" ["he assembled the whole congregation of the children of Israel"]. But what was done in that council, or assembly, I said above (point 1), in the argument [introduction] of this ch. 18.

(col. 1175)

Question III. What [is] "the tabernacle of testimony"?

Only the meaning of this name [is] to be explained here. For concerning the tabernacle itself otherwise, and its parts, and all [its] causes, I had discourse enough on Exodus. Some, therefore, think [it] should rather be rendered "tabernacle of assembly [conventus]." Because in Hebrew the word "mohed" is from "iahad" — [and] forsooth [because] to this tabernacle the Israelite people is wont to assemble, for the sake of hearing God, worshipping [him], [and] placating [him] by sacrifices and prayers. So Masius, Arias, and others. This interpretation can be admitted, especially since this root seems to be indicated [in] Exod. 29:42 & ch. 30:35. Yet I prefer to it the old and usual [rendering], that [it] be called "tabernacle of the testimony." *First*: because so the 70 interpret [it], "σκηνὴν τοῦ μαρτυρίου [sk■n■n tou martyriou]" ["tent of the testimony"]. *Secondly*: because the verb "iahad" seems to take the signification of the cognate verb "houd." For that [is] very usual among the Hebrews in these forms of words. And indeed men assemble for this reason — that they may either receive, or give forth, a public testification, as it were (and otherwise, indeed, in other ways). But to God's tent and house they approach for this reason: that they may publicly profess their faith, and their religion toward their God, [and that] they may again and again receive from him grace, felicity, and either the effect, or the testimonies, of [his] promises. *Thirdly*: since "mohed" signifies also a certain, appointed, and festal time, if [one] were free to depart from the usual interpretation, why could [it] not also be rendered "festal tabernacle," or "[tabernacle] of the festal time"? For at such a time [people] flowed together to it especially, and indeed from all sides, three times in the year. *Fourthly*: in the cited places of Exodus, we can maintain the indicated signification of "testimony" — as if God should say [that] this tabernacle is called from "testimony," because in it he wished to testify and speak to the Israelites, or to testify while he spoke to them. And [it] is confirmed, because [it is] better said [that] "God testifies there," or is present for testifying, than "[that he] is congregated." For [one] single [person] does not seem to "assemble" or "be congregated." *Fifthly*: [it] also seems to be rightly called from "testimony," because in it was the "ark of the testimony," and in the ark of the testimony [were] the "tables [tablets]"; and this is intimated [in] Exod. 31:7, where [that] which our [Vulgate] says, "tabernacle of the covenant, and ark of the testimony," the Hebrew text says "tabernacle of mohed, and ark of Laheduth"; but the "tables" themselves are called "[tables] of the testimony," or "heduth." And [see] Exod. 31, last v.; & ch. 32, v. 15; & ch. 34, v. 29.

Question IV. Whether at Shiloh, first of all in the land of Canaan, Moses's tabernacle was fixed?

The Rabbis, in those first times, sew together [posit] a twofold tabernacle: one, the true [one], which Moses described (Exod. ch. 25) and Beseleel, with his partner Ooliab, made (Exod. 31); the other, which "was made to the imitation and likeness of this [one]." They say, therefore, [that] that true, prior tabernacle of theirs was not erected at Gilgal, but only a later [one], like to that prior [one]; but [that] now, at Shiloh, [it was] erected first of all. But others, in the "Seder," maintain [that] not even at Shiloh was that [true one] erected, but a little shrine, built up with stone walls, which was covered with sails [curtains] and the feet [bases] of tents. But [that] the true tabernacle was raised both at Gilgal and at Shiloh — not some replica of it — [is] to be pronounced firmly, against those Jews. *First*: because, in the wilderness stations, that true Mosaic [one] was set up, as the book of Numbers (from ch. 9) always teaches, and the Rabbis themselves confess [it]: why,

then, not at Gilgal and Shiloh? *Secondly*: of a second and imitative tabernacle, in the Mosaic and Joshuan times, [there] is nowhere any mention — no indication, [not] even the least. *Thirdly*: where, when, and by whom would that [replica] have been made? *Fourthly*: the Rabbis' conjectures are two, but very slight. The former: [in] Deuteronomy ch. 12, vv. 8, 9, 10, the tabernacle is said [to be] erected [only] when, in Canaan-land, [there] should be rest and peace from the enemies. So it is — but this is understood of that erection which should be firm and constant, namely, when [there] should be no longer any need to set out, and to impose the tabernacle on the Levitical shoulders. Otherwise, if [it] were to be placed in no place or time unless — the enemies being subdued — rest and security had been obtained for the Israelite people, [then] it ought never to have been placed even in the desert. Yet [it] was placed [even there], as I said above — so much so that it was therefore called by some "ζευγηφορεύμενος ναός [zeug■phoreumenos naos]" ["a yoke-borne temple"], and by Josephus (bk. 3 of the Antiquities, ch. 5), in the title, [it] is said to "μεταφερομένου ναοῦ οὐδὲν διαφέρειν [metapheromenou naou ouden diapherein]," that is, "to differ in nothing from a movable and portable temple." And as to what pertains to Shiloh: here, at once in the beginning of the chapter, "the land [is] subdued, and the enemies crushed" [are] handed down; and the same [was] signified several times before, when the tabernacle clung at Gilgal (ch. 14:15; ch. 11:23). *Secondly*: the Shiloh tabernacle is called sometimes "the House of God" (1 Sam. 1:23), but sometimes "a tent" (Ps. 77:60), and indeed "linen [Linteatum]" (2 Sam. 7:2). It consisted, therefore, of a stone structure and linens [curtains]. As if, forsooth, [it] could not be a dwelling, whether it consist of stones, or of wood or clay — nay, even of curtains and skins! What? Does not the name "House [Domus]" extend very widely among the Hebrews? Are not gloves, boots, and very many other [things] of that kind called "House" by them? Although, therefore, the tabernacle were built of linens and soft-leathers alone, [it] was rightly called "the House of God." But I said [that], in those first times of Moses and Joshua, [there] is to be thought [to have been] none [other] which was not the true and Mosaic tabernacle — because afterward the temple itself [was] built by Solomon to the likeness of that [tabernacle], and [was] often marked with the name of "tabernacle" (Ezra 7:15; Jer. 10:10; Ezek. 37:17, & ch. 41; Amos 9:11). And the discourse is of the common and public tabernacle of the nation — [a point] which I note on account of the private tabernacle of Moses outside the camp (Exod. 33).

Question V. Whether at Shiloh the tabernacle stood under the open sky, or in some house?

Abulensis asserts (in this ch. 18, q. 1) [that] the tabernacle [was] placed at Shiloh in some great house — just as afterward at Jerusalem in the Solomonic temple. For otherwise, by rains,

(col. 1177)

[…continued from col. 1176.] winds, and the other injuries of the air, [it] would have been exposed [to them]. But [that it was] rather under the open sky, enclosed in no house, is truer. *First*: because thus, in the wilderness, [it] had been for almost all the thirty-nine years, and again at Gilgal for several years — concerning which above, and again below. *Secondly*: because, by [its] whole construction, and by the skins (which Trebellius, I think, calls "tent-[cloths]"), [it] was sufficiently fortified against all the force of rains, winds, and the other storms. *Thirdly*: so [it was] still in David's time, when he deliberated about building the temple (2 Sam. 7:2). For he said to Nathan the Prophet: "Dost thou see that I dwell in a house of cedar, and the ark of God is placed in the midst of skins [curtains]?" *Fourthly*: of a house and roof, by which the tabernacle might either be contained or be covered, [there is] nowhere any mention — as I argued (q. 4) also against the Jews. *Fifthly*: that house [would have been] either ancient, or newly built recently for that use. If ancient, [then] the most sacred shrine of God would have had to be enclosed by the profane structure of a Canaanite man, [and] protected against the storms by a profane roof. Would God will this? would he bear [it]? When this tabernacle of God was not yet made, Moses had erected another for himself (Exod. 33); and because the people was defiled with sin, he willed [it] to be cut off from the enclosure of the camp — but far

from them, easily to a thousand cubits (as is gathered from the analogy of Num. 35:5) — to be set apart. How, then, would the Lord have willed — in the profane lodging of a Gentile man and a profane Canaanite — to stay not for one or another day, or year, but constantly to dwell and remain for very many [years]? But if the house was new, [it] was built either before the tabernacle was brought there, or afterward. Whichever [it] be, [it is] only wonderful [that] there is, in the whole of scripture, silence about so great, and so new and religious, a building. So accurately, so one-by-one, all [the things] which pertained to the roof, sides, and bases of this tabernacle had the Lord once prescribed [and] Moses described (Exod. ch. 25): how [is there] nowhere any idea, trace, [or] outline of this [other] shrine? Under the open sky, therefore, the tabernacle stood at Shiloh, not in any house.

Question VI. Why [was] the tabernacle taken away from Gilgal, and transferred to Shiloh?

Gilgal was, as it were, in the first vestibule of Canaan. In it [Gilgal], for the Israelite people, [there] was not a domicile, but a lodging: a camp-station, not a fixed stay. Since, therefore, the Canaanite [portion] of the region itself had been for the most part occupied, and the Israelite tribes had already taken their principal fixed seats, [it] was fair [to proceed]: from that first entrance and vestibule to advance to the interior [parts] of the land, and to enter its very inner-sanctuaries — so that by that sacred domicile, and by the august presence of the Deity, the whole [land] might be imprinted [and] sanctified; [that] the region might be blessed; [that there] might be a happier access from all the tribes, on every side, to the altar and the oracle; [and] so that [the tabernacle] might not seem to be afraid in that farthest corner of the land, [nor] not to dare to enter this land, and, as it were, to be looking out for flight. But grant this [much] — [that] the tabernacle ought to have gone out from Gilgal, [why] rather [to] Shiloh than to other places (which, as is clear from ch. 15 & 16 & 17, many and various, were not lacking) was [it] taken away? [It is] best answered [that] this was done because the Lord chose this place. For so [it is] written [in] Deuteronomy ch. 12, v. 5: "To the place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes, that he may put his name there and dwell in it, you shall come, and shall offer in that place holocausts and victims." And the like again, v. 11. For although at Shiloh, as I said above, there had been assemblies, and in them a decree had been made that the tabernacle should be transferred there from Gilgal, nevertheless that happened by no means without consulting God's oracle and receiving a response. For in a matter so great and such — about which Moses had, so much before [and] so seriously, given indication (Deut. ch. 12) — [it] could not be [done] without the Lords [the leaders] interrogating [God], especially [since they had been] taught by their own harm (above, ch. 9, v. 14). And indeed [it] was easy for the high priest — with the Urim & Thummim, which were at the ark in Gilgal still — on account of the small distance of the place, [to make] the going and return.

Yet the reasons by which that place might be chosen before others appear several. *First*: because it was apt, and beautiful — above, ch. 13, q. 11. *Second*: because [it] was also safe, and that by nature — since [it] was more elevated, and by the surrounding of very strong tribes: since from the south [there] was Judah, [on another] side, from the north, Manasseh, [and] on all sides the Ephraimite [tribe]. *Third*: to the tribe of Joshua the leader himself, was it not fair that this first blessing, as it were, and dignity be granted? *Fourth*: Shiloh was distant from Jerusalem scarcely a space of three hours. Since, therefore, the tabernacle was at last to come here, and in it — a most noble shrine being raised — [it] should thenceforth always remain, [it] was being done most opportunely, that [it] should approach nearer to the city [Jerusalem], and subsist in a neighboring place for just so long, while that city was thoroughly subdued and purged from the Canaanites. *Fifth*: because, truly, as [was] said [in] the same q. 11, ch. 13, "Shiloh" signifies rest and welfare [salvation], [it was] rightly [done] by Joshua — who is also, by that other name of his, the "author of welfare [salvation]" — [that], after the rest and welfare obtained from the enemies, the domicile of the Savior God was placed as a Gymnasium [training-school] of peace and welfare, in a welfare-giving and peaceful city. And thus a type of the heavenly tabernacle was shown to us, and of his seat, which the Lord wishes [to be] in our hearts. For

these [things] ought to be Shiloh-like [Siluntina] — that is, quiet, peaceful, salutary — so that neither in us may there be hatreds, enmities, and the deadly plagues of souls, nor may any occasion be omitted of procuring peace and tranquility, both public and private among [our] neighbors, and likewise the true and everlasting welfare of those [same neighbors]. *Sixth & last*: from the individual cities or places into which the tabernacle was not brought, some reasons can be sought [for asking why not there]. For example, if someone, with Abulensis (q. 1), should ask: why not into Joshua's city Thamnath-sare? [It] can be said, because [it] had not yet been given to Joshua himself. Why not Hebron? why not Taphua? why not [some] other [place]? But the general [reason], as I said, [is] the best and most certain reason: because, for that time, God chose Shiloh itself.

(col. 1179)

Question VII. At what time [was] the tabernacle transferred to Shiloh?

After the wars, and after — as I was saying in the previous question — the tranquility and welfare [were] obtained, the tabernacle was moved from Gilgal and fixed at Shiloh. For this [is what] these words of the first verse signify: "and the land was subject [subdued] to them [before them]." But of these [words there] is a twofold interpretation among the Latins. One, as it were negative, of Abulensis himself: "the land did not resist them" — no one was now preparing force and arms against them. But the other, affirmative: "the land was subdued to the Israelites" — synecdochically, namely, [subdued] as to a great part. And so the 70: "ἡ γῆ ἐκρατήθη ὑπ' αὐτῶν [h■ g■ ekrat■th■ hyp' aut■n]" ["the land was mastered by them"]. But Ralbag and other Jews, and Arias Montanus — because in the Hebrew, word for word, [it] is "and the land subdued before them," or "to their faces" — interpret [it] thus: the land which they had vanquished, and subdued by wars, was now before the Israelites' eyes, nearer than at Gilgal; [they] beheld it more, because [they] now held and inhabited its interior [parts]. And from this exposition Cajetan does not shrink — although, because [it] does not suit the Latin text, he does not dare to approve it. "Whether [it] be signified also," he says, "that the land acquired was in the sight of those dwelling at Shiloh, I do not dare to affirm." But I, for my part, confess [that] the subdued land was in the sight of the Shilonites; yet [that] this is not signified by the cited words, I dare to affirm — relying on our [version] and on the cited version of the 70 themselves; relying also on the Hebrew words, which admit that version and sense very well; relying, finally, on this asseveration of Masius: "I would say, doubting nothing, [that] this [is] plainly that which has now once and again been mentioned: 'But the land was resting from war.'" But because Cajetan, in that exposition, renders "the land acquired," I have a great suspicion [that] the Jew whose help he used confused "nik besah" — which is in the text — with "nik nesah," which is "acquired." But into what year from the crossing of the Jordan did this so-great rest, and this transfer, fall? The fourteenth is reckoned by the Rabbis; and Masius almost assents to them — not on account of their reasoning (which, as I said at ch. 13, q. 13, is null), but because the rebuke of Joshua the leader, in this place (v. 3), "How long will you be slack with indolence?", indicates [that] several years [had] now elapsed since the prior Gilgal division. And those words, indeed, show a rather long cessation and delay; yet [it] is not precisely gathered from them whether there were more years than seven, or fewer. Let us grant this, therefore, to the almost-unanimous authority and opinion of all: that we should think the Shilonian transfer of the tabernacle was made in the fourteenth year from the crossing of the Jordan.

Question VIII. How long did the tabernacle remain at Shiloh?

[That it] remained three hundred sixty-nine years, the Jews say in the "Seder," ch. 11; a little fewer, Masius. Yet a distinction [is] to be applied. If [the question is] what was in the tabernacle — [if] the ark be regarded — [it] can be answered [that] precisely this [ark] remained at Shiloh in the tabernacle up to those times of Heli [Eli] the Pontiff, in which, [being] carried out thence by the Israelites, and captured by the Philistines, and foully carried off into Philistia, [it] was taken away (1 Sam. ch. 4). But if the tabernacle itself — which,

like a shrine, contained that [ark] and many other [things] — be inspected, that indeed remained at Shiloh a little longer than the ark, but so that, after Heli's death (Samuel being still alive), [it] was transported to Nobe [Nob]. For Heli, dying, left the tabernacle at Shiloh (1 Sam. 4); and afterward, in the time of Saul and David, when Samuel was still among the living (1 Sam. 27, v. 3), the same tabernacle is found in the city Nobe, [in] the same book, 1 Sam. ch. 21. Nor is Samuel ever read to have sacrificed at Shiloh, but at Maspha, Ramatha, [and] Bethleem (1 Sam. 7, 8, 16). But in what year [it] was carried thither, [it] is nowhere said definitely. But how many years from the first placing of it at Shiloh, up to the said exportation of the ark and the transportation of the tabernacle itself, [are] to be reckoned, depends on various years, partly of Joshua, partly of the Judges, which [are] explained in another place. Let it now be enough [to grant] that those 369 years which the Rabbis number are not fewer.

Question IX. Why did the tabernacle afterward emigrate [depart] from Shiloh?

In three places the Scripture plainly explains the cause why [the tabernacle] forsook Shiloh. In the first, generally, [it] says [that there] had been sins, and the wickedness and improbity of the Israelite people (Jer. 7, v. 12): "Go," says the Lord, "to my place in Shiloh, where my name dwelt; and see what I did to it for the malice of my people Israel." In the second, the general cause is put [as] the same; but specifically one kind of sin, and that indeed the gravest, [is] touched [upon] — idolatry (Psalm 77, v. 56): "And they tempted and provoked the most high God, and kept not his testimonies; and they turned away, and kept not the covenant; just as their fathers, [they] were turned into a perverse purpose. They stirred him to anger on their hills, and provoked him to jealousy with their graven images. And he rejected the tabernacle [of] Shiloh, his tabernacle, where he dwelt among men." In the third place, another kind of sin — which clung to certain priests — is noted (1 Sam. ch. 2, 3, & 4), where I explain this very [thing] at greater length. Some other [reasons] can [be sought] from the place into which — after the brief sojourn and pilgrimage at Nobe — the tabernacle emigrated (2 Chron. 1): namely, from the tribe of Juda, that is, from Jerusalem, from Mount Sion, from the city of David. And all these [the Psalm] intimated, and comprehended [them] under the one [heading] of God's benevolence and election — the same Psalm 77, v. 67 & following: "The Lord rejected the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim," for the aforesaid causes, "but he chose the tribe of Juda, Mount Sion, which he loved; and he built, like [that] of unicorns, his sanctuary in the land [earth], which he founded unto the ages." St. Jerome, in the Epitaph of Paula: "Why should I relate Shiloh, in which the altar, [now] destroyed, is today shown?" And in [commenting on] Sophonias [Zephaniah] ch. 1: "Shiloh was the tabernacle, and the ark of the Lord. Scarcely the foundations of the altar are shown." But here we discern [that] in the sanctity of places, temples, and other similar things, confidence [is] not so to be placed that we may sin licentiously, [or that] we may believe [our] sins will go unpunished, or [that] God's worship [is] so bound to certain sacred buildings, cities, and places that, from them, to our penalty, with great

(col. 1181)

[…continued from col. 1180.] increase of the divine glory, with the benefit of other nations, and with our own conspicuous disgrace and detriment, [his worship] cannot be transferred away.

Question X. Whether, together with the tabernacle, the camp of the Israelites [was] transferred to Shiloh from Gilgal?

Masius somewhat doubts [it], but so that he rather affirms [it] — and rightly. For [it] is affirmed by Josephus (bk. 5 of the Antiquities), the Jewish Rabbis, Abulensis, [and] Cajetan. And the reasons which, above (q. 6), proved the tabernacle's transfer, the same [reasons] nearly also establish the transposition of the camp. And than these words of v. 9, "They returned to Joshua into the camp [at] Shiloh," what [is] clearer? [It] happened that the rather long stay of the camp at Gilgal, which had been [the case] hitherto, seems to have given no small occasion to the indolence and torpor which is reproved by Joshua in this chapter (v. 3): because the

place was very pleasant, and full of various conveniences, and almost of delights — as is clear from those [things] which I said elsewhere about the Jericho territory (ch. 2, q.; ch. 13, q. 2 & 3). Then the Israelites had so built, procured, and arranged everything for themselves there, that they might live peacefully, securely, and pleasantly in that same place; and they delighted in that camp as [in] a city in which they ought to dwell perpetually. Most prudently, therefore, the commander Joshua decided [that] this handle [occasion] of the sloth and sluggishness by which [they] were wasting away [was] to be cut off, and the place [was] to be changed. And from a sterile and dry soil, plants are transplanted into [one] more rich and more juicy, so that they may bring more fruit — but in men the contrary change [is] often better.

Question XI. Whether, the tabernacle being transferred to Shiloh and the camp being fixed in that same place, the observance of the Mosaic ceremonies and of the whole law began?

Many [things] indeed of the ceremonies, and of the whole law which Moses had brought from the Lord, had begun to be observed at Gilgal. For among these, circumcision and the Pasch began, as we saw above (ch. 5). Nor [is it] to be doubted that sacrifices — either daily, or very many which the Israelites offered of their own accord — were made. In the first division of the land too, the Sabbatical and Jubilee years began. Perhaps also in the wilderness, when the tabernacle clung fixed somewhere, some victims [were] at times sacrificed. But at Shiloh, the tabernacle being once established, all [things] began to be brought into use and custom — even [those] from which [they] had abstained up to this [point] of time — and [they] began [to observe them] out of obligation. Which [thing] Abulensis writes briefly and clearly, thus, in this place (q. 1): "It is to be considered that at this time, when the tabernacle was fixed in Shiloh, the ceremonial [precepts] of the old testament began to bind. For before the Israelites entered into the land of Canaan, they were not bound to any ceremonial [observances], as is clear [from] Deut. 12, where it is said that in the desert each one did what seemed right to himself; but after they should pass into the possession which the Lord was about to give them, they ought not so to do. Likewise, after they entered into the land of Canaan, they were not immediately bound to the observance, but after peace [was] obtained, the enemies [being] vanquished, as is clear from the aforecited chapter. Likewise, granted that peace were given from the enemies, [they] still were not bound to the ceremonies immediately; but first a place was to be assigned for sacrifice, and then daily and votive and spontaneous sacrifices could be made, and oblations and the other ceremonies which pertained to the sanctuary might be observed. Even then the festivities could be observed. For all the feasts had some ceremony of sacrifices, and without them there was not a full observance of the law, as is handed down in the same ch. 12 of Deut." Thus far the Tostatus [Abulensis].

Question XII. Why [was] the casting-of-lots of the land, begun at Gilgal, interrupted?

It is altogether wonderful how — [the thing] which, God commanding, Joshua obeying, [and] the people applauding, had been begun at Gilgal seven years before — the casting-of-lots of the Canaanite land (above, ch. 13 & following) advanced no further than three tribes, but was intermitted, and was interrupted for so great a time. Whether was Joshua the leader, or Eleazar the Pontiff, unwilling to proceed in casting lots? Or was the lot unwilling to come forth further, and the Lord impeded it? Or did the Israelite people itself, and its Princes, ask that it cease and rest for a while? This [last] I, for my part, think — not any of the former [options]. For how would those men — such, and so great — of themselves, without any cause, so suddenly, so beyond all the expectation of all, desert and omit that which, with God as author, they had proclaimed and were already carrying out? How would God — who was the author of the casting-of-lots, who had roused the aging leader Joshua, who had directed the first lots so well, and so congruently to the vow and prophecy of the Patriarch Jacob (Gen. 49) — so suddenly, in the very crisis of the matter, abandon and dissipate so

public, so solemn and religious an action, [being] offended by no one's fault of which [anything] is established? [It is] rather to be believed [that there] was something in the people itself which loosed [broke off] the begun course of the lot. But what that was — as far as I have observed — has not been committed to the Canonical letters [Scriptures]. Yet [it] may perhaps be permitted to conjecture something. For, *first*, it seems [that] a suspicion occurred to some, as if the surveyors who were once sent had measured the whole land either with less good faith, or at least with less skill. For therefore, in this place, many more surveyors [Geometers] from each tribe seem to be prescribed by Joshua, so expressly, to go [and] measure the land. So indeed [it is] that, whereas for measuring the whole land ten had once seemed enough — as [was] reported from Josephus (ch. 13, q. 10) — now, for the part of the same land which [was] remaining, twice as many are sent, as another question will explain not long after. Moreover, to certain more sharp-eyed [persons] — as, in a great multitude, some are always found — the portion of the tribe of Juda now seemed excessive (which the outcome also confirmed afterward, ch. 19). From these suspicions or judgments of certain [persons], therefore, [there] began in the people some murmurings, and then open talk about the casting-of-lots being intermitted for a while, until everything should be more diligently explored and described. *Secondly*: it could also have happened that, when [they] had gone to the inheritance

(col. 1183)

[…continued from col. 1182.] had gone to the inheritance when three tribes [had already done so], the remaining [tribes] might wish their own lots to be deferred for a while, until they should see how [it] turned out for those others. *Thirdly*: [they] had [it] well, and almost softly [comfortably], in the Gilgal camp, as I also touched [upon] above. To other places, therefore — less known, and less charming and pleasant — the remaining tribes did not wish to withdraw. For here the love of certain conveniences, to which we have grown accustomed, [is] so fixed in most men that, as [if by] a prudent and cautious [person], [it] is commended by a jocular distich:

> *"If in some seat you sit, and the seat be comfortable for you,*
>
> *in that seat sit, and from that seat do not recede."*

By the gravest labors in Egypt, and by the hardest servitude, the Israelites had been worn down; yet from it [they] could [only] with difficulty be led away and torn away. But after the departure, how often did they look back? and turn back [their] eyes, and almost [their] very feet? How querulously and vehemently did they demand its fish, the pots of flesh-meat, the cucumbers, the onions, and the other [things]? Utterly, even by small and cheap [things] whose habit delights us, are we drawn in — by "conveniences," though not rarely truly inconveniences. *Fourthly*: fear, too, of the Canaanites — who were not yet destroyed — slowed their minds; and since two [things] fought in them, the desire of new lands and the fear of the Canaanites, this [fear] conquered that [desire], and restrained the impetus of all toward entering upon new possessions. And for a similar cause, the Lord did not lead the Israelites — [having] gone out from Egypt — by the way of the land of the Philistines, which is near, "reckoning lest perhaps it might repent them, if they should see wars rising up against them, and [lest] they return into Egypt" (Exod. 13, v. 17). *Fifthly*: but the fount and origin of this fear was a [too-]weak and slack faith in them. For if they had trusted in God and in his promises, as was [fitting], they would have dreaded nothing of the Canaanites' arms — especially [being] raised up by so many, and so favorable and wonderful, battles as they had waged hitherto. And here we see, as it were, a certain mirror of our human infirmity and viciousness: [we] who, when we have begun some good [things] with great and eager spirit, yet a little afterward languish, grow numb, and by the least trifles — and indeed often [by trifles] feigned by some false suspicion, and exceedingly pernicious — are broken, impeded, and bound. To certain pious actions, to the zeal of virtue and perfection, to religion, [and] to the heavenly inheritance, the divine lot calls us. We see [that] the most blessed heaven-dwellers have gone before us on the same way — some even known to us, friends, intimates; we have perhaps begun to hold the same journey with them too, to obtain the best state of life, to exercise virtue with an inflamed spirit — and lo, suddenly,

all at once, we come to a standstill, we freeze up, [and] we linger more willingly in the Gilgal of this world. But why? Let each one descend into himself: he will assuredly perceive [they are] the vainest and most foolish delays.

Question XIII. How [was] the second division of the land undertaken and completed?

First, by Joshua's notable and vehement speech, the Israelites who had not yet gone to [their] inheritance [were] roused; then, by these, surveyors of the region [were] chosen and sent out by him; finally, attention [was] given to the casting-of-lots. But that speech embraces a reproof worthy of the people's fault and of the commander's gravity (v. 3), with the adjunct of the manner of accomplishing that to which he exhorted (v. 4 & following). The reproof is: "How long are you slack with indolence, and go not in to possess the land which the Lord the God of your fathers hath given you?" Not through Joshua, not through God, not through any other cause, did it stand [come about] that all the tribes should [fail to] go to the promised inheritance, but through the indolence alone of those [tribes] which had as yet received nothing. This [indolence], therefore, Joshua tries to remove from them. *First*: by the reproach of that vice, when he says they languish with indolence. And that is expressed by one Hebrew participle, "mithrappim." Which, because [it] is in "hithpael," signifies a vicious and voluntarily-undertaken indolence — because they had given themselves wholly to slothful idleness and sluggishness. For the verb "raphah" otherwise signifies "to remit," "to relax"; and in the passive, "to be slackened," lazy and idle — or, as here the 70, "ἐκλύεσθαι [eklyesthai]" ["to be enfeebled, to faint"]. Whence also Pharaoh (Exod. 5:8), angry at the Israelites still serving [him], said "Nirpim hem," that is, "they are idle [vacant]," as our [Vulgate] renders; "σχολάζουσι [scholazousi]," or "they are at leisure," say the 70. And v. 17, "nirpim atthen nirpim": "You are slack, or lazy" — "lazy," [says] our [Vulgate] — "you are at leisure in idleness"; the 70, "σχολάζετε, σχολασταὶ ἐστέ [scholazete, scholastai este]" ["you are idle, you are idlers"]. But "mithrapim," by the force of that conjugation, are those who make themselves lazy, who give themselves over to indolence, and willingly and gladly waste away in it. Than which, what [is] baser? Whom would such a disgrace not shame? Who would not wish at once to remove and shake off from himself so great a dishonor? But least of all did it befit [them] to be lazy — the descendants of that most diligent and most vigilant shepherd [Jacob], who, concerning himself (Gen. 31, v. 40), professes most un-mendaciously: "Day and night I was burned by heat and by frost, and sleep fled from my eyes; and thus for 20 years I served" — [he] who so sedulously, intensely, and strenuously wrestled with a certain divine form (Gen. 32) that he received thence the name "Israel" (v. 27). Now, *secondly*: the divine help was at hand, so that, if they had been willing to strive and labor a little, they could very conveniently have advanced and entered into the offered possession. For neither would God — who had promised, and who had so happily led them hitherto, [and] had enriched [them] with the greatest victories and spoils — have failed [them] in the final act. *Thirdly*: the long duration of the time ought to have thrown a blush [of shame] upon them, and roused them from so great a lethargy; and therefore the good Commander says "how long?" That [Cicero], against Catiline: "How long, pray, will you abuse our patience?"; and our Solomon (Prov. 1:22): "How long, O little ones, do you love childishness?"; and ch. 6:9: "How long, O sluggard, wilt thou sleep? when wilt thou rise out of thy sleep?" Num. 14:11 [has "how long"] twice, and yet with another word [in] v. 27. But [he] would act very prudently who, from this very speech, should perceive himself to be addressed and roused by the true Joshua, CHRIST the Lord — just as, truly, each one of us is addressed and roused very often, when, bound by the fetters of the aforesaid [vice], and lulled as if by a Lethean cup of torpor and indolence, we prefer the Gilgal-camp of this world to the felicity of the heavenly inheritance. And this, "knowing the time," says the Apostle (Rom. 13:11), "because [it] is now the hour for us to rise from sleep." Furthermore, the best manner of shaking off this sloth, and of making the division, is that — as new

(col. 1185)

[…continued from col. 1184.] and more, surveyors be sent into the remaining land, who may survey everything with [their] eyes, refer [it] into tables and books, and finally announce [it] to Joshua. But how many they were, I said (at ch. 13, q. 10) [is] ambiguous. For by some [they] are numbered 30, but by others 21; and the context seems rather to approve the reckoning of these [latter]. For since Joshua, in this place, addresses not all the 12 tribes, but only the seven which were as yet without a portion of their own, [it] pertains assuredly to those alone — that [phrase] of v. 4: "Choose from each tribe three men." But [as to] what is subjoined after those same words, "according to the number of each multitude" — in Hebrew, "to the mouth of their inheritance," or "according to their inheritance" — that is, [it means] that those measurers should so describe the land that the division may be made as excellently as possible by the dividers, according to that which will be owed to each, so that the individual tribes may receive an equal inheritance in proportion to their multitude, as [was] expounded at ch. 13, q. 5. And this the 70 manifestly declare by their version: "καθὰ δεήσει διελεῖν αὐτήν [katha de■sei dielein aut■n]" ["as it shall be needful to divide it"]. But the commander also admonishes (v. 5) [that] this new description should touch nothing [of] those tribes to which [an] inheritance [was] already attributed, but [that] these, as they are placed, should remain in their [own] seats: Judah on the southern side of the whole land, [the tribes] of Manasseh and of Ephraim on the northern. Which "northern" side is of that kind [so called] not in respect of the whole promised land, but in respect of the tribe of Judah, or of the land which this [tribe] had obtained by lot. But these three words, "the middle [land] between these," are redundant, as is clear from the Hebrew. To which I would add the Greek too, were it not [that] it omits here not only these words, but also some others; but I suspect [that] in the Latin [it] was written: "Describe among yourselves the other land into seven parts." For otherwise the remaining land — which was to be described and divided into seven parts — was not the middle [land] among the three tribes Judah, Ephraim, and Manasseh; but, when Joshua had said [that] these [tribes] were to be left in their [own] places, he subjoined [that] the measurers should describe among themselves the "other," or remaining, "land" into seven parts. But Arias thinks these words of the fifth and sixth verse are said to those who were Senators, and the chiefs and dividers of the tribes. But a simpler exposition would be, if we should say [that] these [words] are said to the seven tribes which he had begun to address, [and] which ought to describe and divide the remaining land — not indeed by themselves, but through their [own] measurers and dividers. But, because [he] had mentioned only seven parts, he therefore admonishes [that] this is done because, for the Levites (v. 7), [their] part was from elsewhere — which [was] expounded at ch. 13, q. 9 — and [because] to the two and a half tribes their parts had already been assigned beyond the Jordan. But how the journey could be safe among the Canaanites for the surveyors setting out, [was] said in the same ch. 13, q. 12 — although, in this second mission, something else too could have concurred: [namely] that Joshua, or the Senate and the Jewish people, gave letters to the cities and Magistrates of the Canaanites, by which [they] asked that these [surveyors] be safe and secure; and [that] those [Canaanites], either out of fear, did not dare to refuse, or, for the sake of earning [their] favor and benevolence, were unwilling [to]. But in that peregrination, and work of measuring, Josephus affirms (bk. 5, ch. 3) [that] almost seven months were spent, saying [that] in the seventh month they returned to Joshua [at] Shiloh. The other [matters] which pertain here to the lots sent and drawn [were] all brought forward at ch. 13. But among these latter [tribes], the Benjaminite [lot] came out [first]; concerning which, by [my] customary manner, it follows that I touch briefly on a few [points].

Question XIV. What [are] the limits [borders] and cities of the Benjaminite tribe?

That [tribe] which, among the more sluggish and remaining seven tribes, first received [its] inheritance by lot, was the Benjaminite tribe. For this is what is said [in] v. 11: "The first lot came up [for] the children of Benjamin." [It] came up, I say, from the urn of lots — not, however (as [was] thought by Lyra), "from the Jordan." But the limits are described for this tribe. *First*: the Northern [limits] (v. 12), where [they] stretch from the Jordan — not, as in the other tribes before, up to the Mediterranean sea itself (which, however,

Josephus asserted, bk. 5, ch. 3) — but up to Ataroth-addar. *Secondly*: the Western [limits] (v. 14), from the already-mentioned city Ataroth-addar up to the Judaean city Cariath-baal, which is also called by another name "Cariath-jearim." And this [is in] v. 14 and 15: "over against the sea" — that is, from the region of the sea, or from the maritime and western side — as, at the end of this verse, certain books, for the sake of explanation, add. "Over against the south-west [Africus]" — that is, toward the south-west, or toward the South, as the Hebrew has [it]. *Thirdly*: the Southern [borders are] the same which, [in] ch. 15, were the Northern [borders] for the tribe of Judah — but here [they] are marked in the contrary manner, namely from the west to the east: from the city, I say, Cariath-jearim, up to the Tongue, or Bay, of the Jordan, where [it] flows into the salt sea (v. 15, 16, 17, 18, & 19) — where the Northern limit is [that] of the same sea, [and] the Southern limit [is that] of the Jordan itself; and likewise the extreme of the Southern limit of the Benjamites [is] on the western side. *Fourthly*: the Eastern limits are from that extreme, ascending from the South toward the North — but not far — up to the eastern beginning of the Ephraimite tribe, concerning which above (ch. 16). But this is not today in the Latin text; yet [it] would be, if — as perhaps [it was] once read — v. 19 [ran] thus: "Which is the limit of that Southern [border], and the Jordan bounds it on the east." For these words seem to have fallen out: "Southern, and the Jordan bounds it." For so speaks the Hebrew text, and also the 70 themselves: "ταῦτα τὰ ὅρια ὅτι ἀπὸ λιβὸς, καὶ ὁ Ἰορδάνης ὁριεῖ ἀπὸ μέρους ἀνατολῶν [tauta ta horia hoti apo libos, kai ho Iordan■s horiei apo merous anatol■n]" ["these [are] the borders — [namely] that, from the south-west; and the Jordan shall bound [it] from the part [side] of the east"].

Furthermore, the cities of the same tribe are numbered 26, comprehended in two little sums [subtotals]: of which one contains 12 (v. 25), the other 14 (v. 28). But what the cause is of distinguishing these subtotals [was] said in general in [treating] the tribe of Judah (ch. 15); and with this general answer Abulensis is content in this place too. But [it is] to be noted, *first*, [that] either some of those cities have also other names, or not all the cities of this tribe [are] here recounted — since below (ch. 21) two [cities], which are thus passed over in silence, are to be named. And indeed, in the catalogues of the other tribes too, certain [cities] are seen [to be] passed over — either because [they] were then less renowned, or for some other cause. *2.* The mountain which looks toward the valley of the children of Hinnom (v. 16) is thought by some to be "Hachladema," which in Acts 1 is called "Aceldama"; by others, another [mountain], from those which were several around Jerusalem (Ps. 124:2). And [some think] this to be [the mountain] on which (1 Kings 11:7) [Solomon], with womanish madness, built the insane shrine of Chamos [Chemosh]

(col. 1187)

[…continued from col. 1186.] built the insane shrine of Chemosh; and [this mountain], which (2 Kings 23) is called "the mount of offense," Masius thinks [to be the same]. *3.* The same place — [treating] of the mountain and of the "valley of the children of Hinnom" — the 70 thus rendered: "καὶ καταβήσεται τὰ ὅρια ἐπὶ μέρους τοῦτο ὅ ἐστι κατὰ πρόσωπον νάπης Σοννάμ [kai katab■setai ta horia epi merous touto ho esti kata pros■pon nap■s Sonnam]" ["and the border shall go down to this part, which is over against the wooded-vale of Sonnam"]. Where, after "μέρους [merous, 'part']," [a word] seems — on account of a certain similarity with it — to have been omitted: "ὄρους [orous, 'of the mountain']." But why they call the "valley of the children of Hinnom" "νάπην Σοννάμ [nap■n Sonnam]," I see no cause other than why they call that valley "νάπην [nap■n, 'a wooded vale']." For thus either a wooded mountain or valley, or [one] dark and devoid of light, is wont to be called by the Greeks — from the privative particle "νη [n■]" and "φάος [phaos]," that is, "light," as if "νηφάος [n■phaos]" or "νήφως [n■ph■s]," as the Grammarians discourse concerning the name "νάπη [nap■, 'wooded-vale']" of the same notion and origin. But "Σοννάμ [Sonnam]" is for "ἐννάμ [ennam]," that is, "hinnom" — the letter sigma [being] carried over, as often elsewhere, from the end of the preceding word. Which [valley] otherwise, in the same v. 16, is called "gehinnom," [and] by the same 70 is written "γαίεννα [gaienna]" — which word comes closest to the Latin [derived] from the same valley, namely, to "gehenna." *4.* Because, in that same place, the interpretation of "gehinnom" itself is

added by [the phrase] "that is," this general admonition is set down by Arias: "The Reader is to be admonished [that] all those words which are marked by an expository phrase ('that is') are either indicated thus by the Latin Interpreter for the sake of explanation, or [that they] have crept into the context from the margin." There is certainly a like account of that usual phrase, "Which is interpreted [translated]." But this admonition has place rather in the Old than in the New Testament — as [in] Gen. 30:35, ch. 32:2, ch. 47:27; but not [in] Rom. 9:8, 1 Cor. 1:18 (although in the Greek here [it] is only "σῳζομένοις ἡμῖν [s■zomenois h■min, 'to us who are being saved']"). So Judg. 1:35, "which is interpreted 'earthen'"; and ch. 12:6, ch. 15:17; Matt. [1:34?]; but not Matt. 1:23, Mark 5:42, ch. 15:22 & 34, John 1:38, 41, 42, ch. 9:7, Acts 4:36.

5. But for "tumuli [mounds]" (v. 17), in the Hebrew [they] are "geliloth"; and in the Latin translation [they] are retained [untranslated] by Masius and others, but by the 70 [rendered] "γαλιλώθ [galil■th]." And the same Masius, in [his] commentary, thinks [it] to be "Galgala" — but different from those [Gilgals] in which the Israelite camp was for so long — and [that] those are the [places] which (Judg. 3:19) are called "Galgal." Others [identify] the same from ch. 15:7, and below, ch. 22:13. But since that Hebrew word is derived from rolling and heaping-up, [it] is rightly sometimes rendered "mounds," and [sometimes] "shores" (as Masius will [have it at] ch. 13:2), but sometimes [it] is retained [untranslated] — as is done here by the cited authors, and by our Interpreter [in] that ch. 13:2, where [it] is called "Galilaea." *6.* "Jerusalem" here (v. 28) is placed in the tribe of Benjamin, but before, in the tribe of Judah (ch. 15:8 & 63). Namely, [it] belonged to both tribes — but synecdochically. For one part, which [was] more northern, pertained to Benjamin; the other, which [was] more southern, to Judah. And [there] are [those] who think these two parts [were] two small, very-close towns, marked with one and the same name, yet girt with different walls — or certainly with single [walls], common and the same, besides those [walls] which were proper to each. But concerning this, something was hinted before, [at] ch. 10, q. 2. But Abulensis here (q. 10) prefers [to say] either [that], by the exchange of another city, the Benjamites yielded this city to the Jews [Judahites], or rather [that], by smallness of spirit and despair — since [they] distrusted [that] the Jebusites could ever be expelled by them. But I prefer the answer which is Lyra's: that Jerusalem belonged, by right and by possession, to the two tribes, according to [its] two different parts. *7.* This Benjaminite portion would seem cramped, were it not established from the aforesaid [that] those narrownesses [are] compensated by the greatest fertility.

After the Wars: Caput XIX — Concerning the portions of the remaining six tribes, and of Joshua himself [De reliquarum sex tribuum, ipsiusque Iosue portionibus]

Caput XIX — Concerning the portions of the remaining six tribes, and of Joshua himself [De reliquarum sex tribuum, ipsiusque Iosue portionibus] (opening)

1. And the second lot came forth for the children of Simeon by their kindreds: and their inheritance was **2.** in the midst of the possession of the children of Juda: Bersabee and Sabee and Molada, **3.** and Hasersual, Bala and Asem, **4.** and Eltholad, Bethul and Harma, **5.** and Siceleg and Bethmarchaboth and Hasersusa, **6.** and Bethlebaoth and Sarohen: thirteen cities, and their villages. **7.** Ain and Remmon, and Athar and Asan: four cities, and their villages: **8.** all the villages round about these cities as far as Baalath Beer Ramath to the south quarter. This is the inheritance of the children of Simeon according to their kindreds, **9.** in the possession and lot of the children of Juda: because it was too great; and therefore the children of Simeon had their possession in the midst of the inheritance of the children of Juda. **10.** And the third lot fell to the children of Zabulon by their kindreds: and the border of their possession was unto Sarid. **11.** And it went up from the sea and from Merala, and came to Debbaseth, as far as the torrent which is over against Jeconam. **12.** And it returneth from Sared eastward to the borders of Ceseleththabor: and it goeth out to Dabereth, and ascendeth toward Japhie. **13.** And it passeth along from thence to the east side of Gethhepher and Thacasin: and goeth out to Remmon, Amthar and Noa. **14.** And it turneth about to the north of Hanathon: and the outgoings thereof are the valley of Jephtahel, **15.** and Cateth and Naalol, and Semeron, and Jedala, and Bethlehem: twelve cities, and their villages. **16.** This is the inheritance of the tribe of the children of Zabulon by their kindreds, the cities and their villages. **17.** The fourth lot came out to Issachar by their kindreds. **18.** And his inheritance was Jezrael and Casaloth and Sunem, **19.** and Hepharaim and Seon, and Anaharath, **20.** and Rabboth and Cesion, Abes, **21.** and Rameth, and Engannim, and Enhadda and Bethpheses. **22.** And the border thereof cometh to Thabor and Sehesima and Bethsames: and the outgoings thereof shall be at the Jordan: [sixteen] cities

(col. 1189)

[…lemma continued from col. 1188.] sixteen cities, and their villages. **23.** This is the possession of the children of Issachar by their kindreds, the cities and their villages. **24.** And the fifth lot fell to the tribe of the children of Aser by their kindreds: **25.** and their border was Halcath and Chali and Beten and Axaph, **26.** and Elmelech and Amaad and Messal: and it reacheth to Carmel by the sea, and Sihor and Labanath, **27.** and it returneth towards the east to Bethdagon: and passeth along to Zabulon and to the valley of Jephthael towards the north, to Bethemec and Nehiel. And it goeth out to the left side of Cabul, **28.** and to Abran and Rohob and Hamon and Cana, as far as the great Sidon. **29.** And it returneth to Horma to the strong city of Tyre, and to Hosa: and the outgoings thereof shall be at the sea, from the portion [cord] of Achziba: **30.** and Amma and Aphec and Rohob: twenty-two cities, and their villages. **31.** This is the possession of the children of Aser by their kindreds, and the cities and their villages. **32.** The sixth lot came out to the sons of Nephtali by their families: **33.** and the border began from Heleph and Elon to Saananim, and Adami, which is Neceb, and Jebnael even to Lecum: and their outgoings unto the Jordan: **34.** and the border returneth westward to Azanotthabor, and goeth out from thence to Hucuca, and passeth along to Zabulon southward, and to Aser westward, and to Juda upon the Jordan toward the rising of the sun. **35.** And the strong cities are Assedim, Ser, and Emath, and Reccath and Cenereth, **36.** and Edema and Arama, Asor, **37.** and Cedes and Edrai, Enhasor, **38.** and Jeron and Magdalel, Horem and Bethanath and Bethsames: nineteen cities, and their villages. **39.** This is the possession of the tribe of the children of Nephtali by their kindreds, the cities and their villages. **40.** The seventh lot came out to the tribe of the children of Dan by their families: **41.** and the

border of their possession was Sara and Esthaol, and Hirsemes, that is, the city of the sun. **42.** Selebin and Aialon and Jethela, **43.** Elon and Themna and Acron, **44.** Elthece, Gebbethon and Balaath, **45.** and Jud and Bane and Barach and Gethremmon: **46.** and Meiarcon and Arecon, with the border that looketh toward Joppe, **47.** and is terminated there. And the children of Dan went up and fought against Lesem, and took it: and they smote it with the edge of the sword, and possessed it, and dwelt in it, calling the name of it Lesem Dan, by the name of Dan their father. **48.** This is the possession of the tribe of the children of Dan by their kindreds, the cities and their villages. **49.** And when he had made an end of dividing the land by lot to each one by their tribes, the children of Israel gave a possession to Josue the son of Nun in the midst of them, **50.** according to the commandment of the Lord, the city which he asked for, Thamnath Saraa in mount Ephraim: and he built up the city, and dwelt in it. **51.** These are the possessions which Eleazar the priest, and Josue the son of Nun, and the princes of the families and of the tribes of the children of Israel, distributed by lot in Silo, before the Lord at the door of the tabernacle of testimony: and they divided the land.

Question I. What [are] the limits [borders] and cities of the Simeonic tribe?

The second lot, among the oft-mentioned remaining seven tribes, fell to the Simeonic tribe; and [it] attributed to it [its] inheritance within the very portion of the Judaic tribe. And therefore here [its] limits are not described (in respect of the four quarters of the world) in the manner of the other tribes about which [we have treated] hitherto; but only [it] is said [that] this inheritance was "in the midst of the possession of the children of Juda" — so that those Judaic limits can in some way be held [to be] Simeonic also, just as, namely, the same boundaries can be reckoned [those] of a part and of the whole. Yet that "in the midst" — which the 70 too had said, "ἀναμέσον κλήρου υἱῶν Ἰούδα [anameson kl■rou hui■n Iouda]" ["in the midst of the lot of the children of Judah"], and (v. 9) "ἐν μέσῳ [en mes■]" ["in the midst"] — does not so signify a middle of situation, as if this Simeonic tribe existed precisely in the middle place of Judaea, and as it were in its very center; but [it means] that [it is] within that [portion], among its boundaries. For the portion of the Simeonites was, otherwise, in the farthest part of the Judaic portion, toward the West and the South. Its cities are indicated (v. 6) [as] thirteen, and moreover (v. 7) four — in all seventeen. Whence [it] follows [that] there is only one and the same city of which two names are set down (v. 2): "Beersabee & Sabee." And therefore (1 Chron. 4) only one of them is set down — the former, namely [Beersabee] — which is also more renowned, [being] more worn by greater use, and placed here in the prior place, because there Abraham struck a covenant with Abimelech at the well, and gave him, for the sake of attesting friendship, seven chosen [lambs]. From all these things [come] these names to that city, since "beer" signifies "a well," but "sabee" either "an oath" or "seven." But because around those cities there was a great frequency of hamlets and villages, [it] is therefore said, with a mark of universality (v. 8): "all the hamlets round about those cities." But here [there] is a certain not-unworthy-of-notice admonition of Radak himself — namely, [that] the proper names of men and places, set in various places, often vary by one or even another letter. For, for example, [the place] which here (v. 3) [is] "Balaa" is called (1 Chron. 4:29) in the Latin indeed by the same name, but in the Hebrew "Bilha"; and above (ch. 15:29) "Baala"; (Num. 1:14) "Deuel," (ch. 2:14) "Rehuel."

Question II. By what right or manner [was] the Simeonic portion placed within the Judaean tribe?

Rashi says this was done not by that solemn lot by which the Lord gave the tribes [their] inheritance, but by a certain private [lot] which all the tribes themselves, among themselves, cast by agreement. For he will [have it] that, from

(col. 1191)

[…continued from col. 1190.] For he will [have it] that, from Jacob's testament (Gen. 49), on account of the crime committed against the Shechemites, both Levi and Simeon [were] disinherited; but [that], since for that

one [Levi it] was provided by God, while this one [Simeon] would remain without any share of inheritance, the other tribes — having pity on him — cast a lot [to see] which of all [of them] would receive him into its possession, and would sprinkle [bestow] on him one little ounce, as it were, of inheritance; and [that] this lot fell upon the tribe of Judah. But the Rabbi [Rashi] here contradicts the text entirely. For the solemn and public lot, which was cast at Shiloh before the ark of the Lord, is described; and from it [it] is said [that] "the lot of the children of Simeon came forth, and indeed the second." How [is it] "second," except in respect of a first? and how [is it] "second in respect of a first," unless the same kind of lot [was] observed? How, likewise, [is] the lot of Zabulon afterward "third" (v. 10), except in respect of this second one? And so of all the rest. And what reason, what sign or seal of that "private" lot, can be brought forward? Indeed, by those tablets of his testament, Jacob excluded neither Levi nor Simeon from obtaining an inheritance — as [was] expounded (ch. 13, q. 6 & 7) concerning the Levitic tribe — but only said (Gen. 49:7): "I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel." Which [prophecy], even if the Simeonic [tribe] has now obtained an inheritance by lot like the other tribes, we nevertheless see [to be] most aptly fulfilled, in that [it] is placed within the boundaries of another tribe, in another's lodging, as it were.

Question III. Why [was] the Simeonic [portion] placed within the bounds of the Judaic [tribe] rather than of any other tribe whatsoever?

The text answers (v. 9): "This is the inheritance of the children of Simeon according to their kindreds, in the possession and cord [portion] of the children of Juda, because it was greater [too large]." For "in the possession and cord," in the Hebrew [it] is "from the cord," that is, according to the 70, "ἀπὸ τοῦ κλήρου τοῦ Ἰούδα [apo tou kl■rou tou Iouda]" ["from the lot of Judah"]. But this possession of Judah, when [it] is called "greater," with what other [possession] is [it] compared? Is [it] with the Simeonic [portion] itself? But in the same way [Judah] ought to have received the Benjaminite [tribe] into [its] part and bosom, as it were, as its own — because this [Judah] was greater than it too; and again, [it ought] similarly to have admitted any other smaller [tribe] into a share of its own lot. [It is] to be said [that] the tribe of Judah is compared to itself, and was greater than would suit it [i.e. larger than it needed]; and so a particle [was] cut off from it, which would furnish a seat for the Simeonic tribe. Word for word in the Hebrew [it] is: "because the portion of the children of Judah was much [too much], or great, beyond them" — namely, beyond the children of Judah — that is, greater than was necessary for them, [greater] than was owed to them. And so the 70: "ὅτι ἐγενήθη ἡ μερὶς υἱῶν Ἰούδα μείζων ἢ αὐτῶν [hoti egen■th■ h■ meris hui■n Iouda meiz■n ■ aut■n]" ["because the portion of the children of Judah became greater than they [could use]"].

Question IV. Whether by an error of the lot, or in what other manner, [was] the Judaic tribe's portion greater than would suit [it]?

At ch. 15, q. 9, Tostatus says: "Perhaps someone can say [that] God permitted an error in those lots, as he not rarely permits [one] in everyday dividing-lots." But [as to] by whom this was said, he brings forth no one. Nor indeed can anyone be wise who would dare to impute any error to these lots — commanded by God for dividing the land, and so greatly praised and commended (Num. 26 & 34, & above, ch. 13). But the "manner" by which, by the Judaic tribe, an inheritance greater than fair was received — another, twofold, [explanation] is brought forward. One [manner], from Lyra: [that] the land given to the Judaic tribe was twofold — one, namely, as a proper inheritance, from the oracle of the divine lot; the other, as a beneficiary accession [addition], from the benevolent grant of the whole people. For [he says] there were, in the neighborhood of the Judaic borders, some Canaanite nations, whose land — if [Judah] could occupy it and dislodge them — was given to it; and [that] the Simeonites [were] admitted into this [land], not into the field of [Judah's] proper portion, and [were] kindly received by the Jews. And this opinion the same Lyra praises, as [the best] of all expositors, as it were. But Abulensis, at q. 2 here, deservedly hisses it off [rejects it]. For, clearer than

clear, the context asserts (v. 1 & 9) [that] a home [Lar] was given to the Simeonites "in the midst of the inheritance and cord of the Jews." But "inheritance" and "cord" — what [do they] denote except a proper and measured-out portion? And lest anyone wonder [that] the inheritance and cord of these [Judahites was] too much diminished and straitened by so many thousands of new colonists received [into it], the cause — as we saw — is immediately subjoined: namely, that that very inheritance and cord of the Jews had been much greater and more spread-out than it ought [to be]. Another "manner," therefore, is brought forward by the same Abulensis: [that] the lot — which assigned to each tribe its region and site — did not err, but the dividers themselves [erred], who assigned to each tribe the extent [amplitude], in the region and site shown by the lot, according to the multitude of that tribe. For these [dividers], at that first beginning of the division, [are supposed] to have considered the magnitude of the Judaic tribe (which surpassed all the others by several thousands — Num. 2:3 & ch. 26:22), and to have thought [that] all the tribes were to dwell most spaciously, and [that] there was space abundantly enough in the promised land for that spaciousness and every convenience. But afterward, in the second division — some years having now elapsed — a greater knowledge of the places having been gained (through the people itself, and the surveyors sent a second time, and those more [in number]), the error was detected; and so, from the over-ample portion of the Judaic tribe, something was plucked and cut off — namely, as much as would then suffice for the Simeonic tribe. For although, in the second year from the departure out of Egypt, [there] were numbered in that [tribe] 59,300 (Num. 2:13), yet in the last year [there] were in the same [tribe] only 22,200 (Num. 26:14). This error can be better understood from those [things] which [were] disputed at ch. 13, q. 12, where [the thing] which was asked — "Whether through Urim & Thummim the extent of the borders was assigned to each tribe?" — appears [that it] is to be denied. For just as [God] governing the lots, so [also] God answering through Urim & Thummim, could by no means err. But this error of the dividing chiefs — whether [it] was born from the error of the earlier surveyors (which some unskillfulness or negligence begot), or indeed from their very own inconsideration and carelessness alone — I do not define. Either could have happened. For almost all the beginnings of human affairs are wont to be crude, imperfect, and unskilled — as [is] noted by Aristotle in the Dialectics; and indeed, in the sciences, arts, and all crafts, [it] can be noted by anyone and seen daily. But this error can furnish us [with] great lessons of wisdom. For we see, first, the weakness of our human reason, and [that it is] blind

(col. 1193)

[…continued from col. 1192.] and blindness — which, even in earthly things that can be perceived by the eyes, and touched by hands and feet, so greatly grows dim, so easily goes astray, [and] so rashly decides something. *Secondly*: we see, in sacred and good things, [that] when certain divine and human [elements] — connected and intertwined — concur among themselves, [we are] always to apply to the divine [ones] the most certain and most firm faith; but to these [human ones], not an equally certain and firm [faith], but only a human [faith], which admits something of opinion and doubt — unless perchance it were established to us from elsewhere [that] those human [elements] are divinely propped up and governed. Here the divine [element] was the lot: [there] was no error in it, or from it, in the site of the places where the individual tribes ought to settle. To [it] was added the human deliberation and judgment of the men dividing: to this [human element], no divine power, no supernatural and special aid or concurrence, had been promised. [It] therefore slipped, and pronounced less prudently and accurately concerning the Judaic borders. Thus in that [instance] in which our Innovators [Protestants] so greatly exult — and in which that traitorous Calvinist, the Chancellor of Saxony, while he paid the penalty from his own Lutheran Prince on account of [his] Calvinist tricks, placed [his] hope, [his] anchor, and all his defense (as [is] handed down to memory by the Lutherans themselves) in [this] syllogism: "Whoever shall have believed and been baptized shall be saved. I, Nicolaus Crellius, believe, and am baptized. Therefore [I shall be saved]." The [major] proposition is divine (Mark 16:16); the assumption [minor premise] is human. But let us proceed. *Thirdly*: when the error of the dividers [was] made manifest, they willingly corrected it. They did not cry out [that] their esteem [was] diminished,

[that] some disgrace [was] branded on them, [that] they [were] called into contempt; nor did they wish pertinaciously to maintain, and [hold] fixed, that which had been decreed by them [after] the surveyors [were] heard; but, the error [being] discovered, [they willed] rather [that] their own judgment be rescinded, [that] the parts of the inheritances be made otherwise, and [that] their division be corrected publicly and openly. And yet [they] were princely men, distinguished phylarchs [tribal chiefs], given and named by God himself for the office of dividing, as we saw above (ch. 13, q. 10). Great, indeed, was the modesty of these [men], great the virtue and prudence. To err and to slip is [the mark] of a man; [but] not to return to the way — when one has noticed [that one is] erring — and not to rise again, when one may, after a fall, is [the mark] of a log or a stone, indeed more than of a beast. "[It] is not," says Seneca (bk. 4 *On Benefits*, ch. 38), "levity [inconstancy] to depart from an acknowledged and condemned error. And [it] must be ingenuously confessed: 'I thought otherwise, I was deceived.' But this is a proud perseverance of folly — [namely] that what I once said, of whatever sort it is, should be fixed and ratified. It is not base to change [one's] counsel along with the matter [as circumstances change]." But I treated of this elsewhere, when I dealt with the useful and wise return of heretics to the Catholic Church. Let the same Seneca be seen (bk. 2 *On Anger*), Tertullian (*On Modesty* ch. 1), St. Ambrose (Epistle 3), St. Augustine (*On the Words of the Apostle*, sermon 22, ch. 10; the book *Against the Epistle of the Foundation* ch. 2; the book *On the Usefulness of Believing* ch. 1, 2, & 3), St. Chrysostom (homily 46 to the people). Now, *fourthly*: [that] its possessions are diminished, [that] it is enclosed within narrower bounds, [that] no small part of its inheritance is given to others — the whole tribe of Judah bears [this] with moderation. How splendid [is] this! [That] a brother [should] not yield to [his] brother a little house, a little field, a little dish, a single footstep, or some little trifle — how many lawsuits, oftentimes, [arise] among them? what forensic [court] battles? what bitter hatreds? Truly these [of Judah] are the sons of Abraham — who so willingly yielded the land which [Lot] might choose (Gen. 13). They did not complain [that] their possession [was] snatched from them, [that] they [were] reduced into a strait, [that] they [were] despoiled of a right already given and acquired; but, when [they] saw the dividers themselves confess their error, and apply a correction and measure to the prior division, imitating their modesty, they preferred [that], with justice and equity, a part of their inheritance be taken from them, rather than [that it] be left whole, with the injury and detriment of the other tribes. It is doggish [canine] to admit no one into a share of the goods which have fallen to one — as [in] that common, noteworthy little verse: "While a dog gnaws a bone, [even] the companion whom it loves, it hates." But, on the contrary, among men to whom humanity [kindness] is dear, all things of friends [are] common.

Question V. Whether the Jews [Judahites] received the Simeonites into their lot unwillingly and grievingly?

Now this indeed [is] to be denied. But nevertheless Rashi, Rashbal, and some other Rabbis murmur against [it]; and [what] they themselves would do, they say the Judaic tribe did — [namely, that] it bore the Simeonites (as guests, lodgers, and sharers-of-the-portion) very grudgingly and grievingly. But lest they seem to say nothing — as indeed they say nothing — they try to prove it from this: that the Jews afterward, when they prevailed in strength under King David, drove the Simeonites out of these seats, and forced [them] to rush off elsewhere (1 Chron. 4:39). But that force, exaction, and expulsion is nowhere either read or found. There [it] is only narrated how [the Simeonites] sought out other seats for themselves too, and extended their borders more widely — not by abandoning [their] old possessions in Judaea, but by adjoining new [ones] to them, both in Gador and in Seir. And perhaps those same lands, together with the little Judaic portion, had been attributed to them by the dividers at this very time of the casting-of-lots; but [they] could not then conquer and obtain them; and so [they] kept themselves within the Judaic soil, until a greater hope of obtaining them should shine forth. But [they] began to obtain [them] not in David's time, but in Hezekiah's — that is, more than three hundred years after David. For in that ch. 4, bk. 1 of Chronicles, v. 41, [it] is thus written concerning the Simeonites: "These came, whom above we described by name, in the days of

Hezekiah King of Juda," and the rest. But [as to] what is said (v. 31) concerning the same: "These [were] their cities unto King David" — [it] does not have this meaning, as if in David's time all those cities ceased to be theirs; but [it means] that, about that time, David received one of them — namely Siceleg [Ziklag] — from Achis the Philistine King, and adjoined [it] to the Judaean cities themselves (1 Sam. 27). But that [Ziklag] was, as to right, [part] of the Simeonites' portion — although perhaps [they] had never yet actually settled in it, or, if [they] had settled [there] before, [they] had certainly lost [it] afterward in some war. And so the Author of the Questions on Chronicles, and Abulensis (1 Chron. 4, q. 24), explain that place — where [Abulensis] contends sharply against Lyra, [faulting him] because, since the nets of the aforesaid Rabbis had ensnared him there, he fables [that] the Jews asked of King Saul that he eject the Simeonites from their tribe; but [that] David's [—], who was a Jew,

(col. 1195)

[…continued from col. 1194.] did not refuse [the Simeonites], out of hatred; but [that] David, when he had taken the scepter [become king], immediately assented to the demands of his tribesmen, and expelled those [Simeonites]. For these are old-wives' trifles, propped up neither by testimony nor by any reason. This only could be inquired: whether David rightly added to the Judaic tribe a city which was of Simeonic right, [and] did not restore [it] to the Simeonites? But — with the Reader's kind leave — let [this] be a postponement [of the matter] to [the commentary on] 1 Samuel ch. 27.

Question VI. Of what limits [borders] and cities does the tribe of Zabulon consist?

The third [lot], in the latter division, fell to the tribe of Zabulon; whose limits are delineated in the text — or rather, sketched [outlined] — in this order and manner. The *western limit* (v. 11), proceeding from the South toward the North, is from the city "Sarid" as far as the torrent — [the torrent] which is over against the city "Jeconam." But this torrent, Masius reckons, is the "Belus," in which [is] that which by Strabo (bk. 16) is called "ὕαλῖτις ἄμμος [hyalitis ammos]" ["glassy sand"] — that is, sand, from which glass is made, in which the Sidonians, and other neighboring [peoples], greatly excelled (as Strabo narrates in the same place); so much so that, in those parts, a certain very rich tyrant, Firmus, is said to have faced [lined] a house with glass squares [panels] — bitumen and other cements [being] inserted — as Vopiscus the Syracusan [relates] in his Life. "The river Pagida, or Belus," says Pliny (bk. 5, ch. 19), "mingling sands fertile of glass with [its] small shore." The *southern limit*, proceeding from the West toward the East, is from "Sarid" as far as the city "Remmon" (v. 12 & 13), where after Remmon [there] are set "Amthar & Noa"; but these [two] now seem to constitute the *eastern* limit, from the South to the North, from Remmon to Noa; and lastly [there] is the *northern* limit, from the East to the West, from Noa as far as the torrent (of which above), namely into the valley "Jephthael," as far as the Mediterranean sea. Thus Arias and Masius elicit and determine these limits, more or less, from this chapter; others otherwise — as Adrichomius; and of the ancients, Josephus extends them as far as the sea of Genesareth [Gennesaret], toward the East, so that the eastern limit is that sea. "I," says Masius, "cannot approve this, because [there] is no mention either of the Jordan or of Genesara in the text. For truly [the writer], who described [it], would not have left so noble a limit unmentioned." Yet various causes [move] writers to speak sometimes in this manner rather than in another; and therefore I would not reject Josephus's opinion by this one argument alone, [the one] drawn from negation and silence — especially since [the text] pointed out that sea or lake [as] very near, by way of "Japhia" & "Remmon." And [there is] a little land interposed between these cities and that sea, which is said [to have been] allotted to another tribe.

But twelve cities of Zabulon are handed down (v. 15); yet in the text [there] seem to be recounted many more, namely:

| # | In the text (Vulgate) | |---|---| | 1 | Sarid | | 2 | Meralaa | | 3 | Debbaeth | | 4 | Jeconam | | 5 | Ceseleth Thabor | | 6 | Dabereth | | 7 | Japhia | | 8 | Gethepher | | 9 | Ethacasim (as [it] is to be read in the Latin) | | 10 | Remmon | | 11 | Amthar | | 12 | Noa (or Nea) | | 13 | Hanathon | | 14 | Jephthael | | 15 | Cateth | | 16 | Naalol | | 17 | Semeron | | 17 | Jadala *[so numbered in the original]* | | 19 | Bethlehem (but different from the one in Judaea) |

And in the Hebrew [there] seems to be added, further, (v. 11) twice "Phaga." For this name our [Interpreter] rendered the first [time] "it reacheth [pervenit]," just as also below (v. 22, 26, & 34), twice. Then, since here — after "Debbaseth" — [it] is repeated in the Hebrew, [our Interpreter] understood the same, and continued [it] by "as far as [usque]." But in the 70, these cities are numbered [as] twenty:

| # | In the 70 (LXX) | |---|---| | 1 | ἐσεδεκγωλά [esedekg■la] | | 2 | μαγελδά [mageldá] | | 3 | βαιθάρεβα [baitharéba] | | 4 | ἰεκμάν [iekmán] | | 5 | σεδδούκ [seddoúk] | | 6 | βαθσαμύς [bathsamýs] | | 7 | χασελωθαίθ [chasel■tháith] | | 8 | δαβειρώθ [dabeir■th] | | 9 | ψαγγαί [psangaí] | | 10 | γεβερέ [geberé] | | 11 | κατασέμ [katasém] | | 12 | ῥεμμωνάα [rhemm■náa] | | 13 | μαθαρεοζά [matharéoza] | | 14 | ἀμώθ [am■th] | | 15 | γαιφαήλ [gaipha■l] | | 16 | κατανάθ [katanáth] | | 17 | ναβάαλ [nabáal] | | 18 | συμοών [symo■n] | | 19 | ἰεριχώ [ierich■] | | 20 | βαιθμάν [baithmán] |

[It is] to be said, *first*, [that] certain cities are here enumerated which are *beside*, not *within*, the Zabulonian limits. For "Dabereth" below (expressly, ch. 21) is said to be of the Issacharite tribe, and is given from it to the Levites. And concerning "Hanathon" (v. 14) [it] can be doubted whether, to the North, [it] is included within the same limits, or [is] left outside. *Secondly*: concerning certain Hebrew words [it] is doubtful whether [they] are proper names of places, or whether their common [generic] meaning is to be taken. And this indeed [was] the view of our Interpreter concerning "Phaga"; [and] of Symmachus, the Chaldee Paraphrast, Rashi, Radak, & Masius concerning "Amthar" (whom Arias therefore also praises). And again, our Interpreter sufficiently expressed, by "the East" or "the eastern quarter," that which (v. 12 & 13) in the Hebrew is "cedmah, mitzrachah schemesch"; but thence, as [if] a proper name, "βαθσαμύς [bathsamýs]" or "βαιθσαμύς [baithsamýs]" [was] formed in the 70. *Thirdly*: [it] is to be held, that also — which was said at ch. 15, and again afterward — [that] sometimes the more renowned townships and villages are named, which nevertheless are outside the number of the cities. *Fourthly*: all confess [that], in the Greek, names of this kind [are] either corrupted by the copyists, or deliberately left in Hebrew [form] by the 70 themselves, and, as it were, obscured. *Fifthly*: as in the other tribes before, the nomenclature of not always all the cities

(col. 1197)

[…continued from col. 1196.] [the nomenclature] of all the cities [is] not always made [i.e. not all cities are always named]; so neither in Zabulon. For a city of it was the renowned "Cetron" (Judg. 1:30), and yet [it is] here omitted. *Sixthly*: if all these names were compared one-by-one among themselves, [some] would be found which differ indeed in sound, but [are] the same in meaning — as "Bethlehem" & "βαιθμάν [baithmán]" (for that [first] is "house of bread," this [second] "house of manna," or "house of the best bread," and as it were heavenly); "ἐσεδίκ [esedík]" & "σεδδίκ [seddík]"; [some] would also be found whose sound and letters [are] changed — as "ἰεριχώ [ierich■]" for "ἰεδδικώ [ieddik■]," "συμοών [symo■n]" for "σεμερών [semer■n]," "ναβαάλ [nabáal]" for "νααλάλ [naalál]"; [and] others which [are] briefly compounded from several [words] — as "γαιφαήλ [gaipha■l]" from the Hebrew "γεί [gei]" or "γαί [gai]" [valley], "ἰφδάχ [iphdách]," [and] "ήλ [■l]," that is, "the valley of Jephthael." And the same [is] the account of the other names, [which are] to be examined, in the other tribes too. But [it] is enough to have pointed a finger, as it were, at these [matters]. For a more accurate disquisition of all these [things] is deliberately left to those Topographers whom I praised before. Two [things] here would remain to be asked. *First*: "How, in Jacob's testament, is Zabulon said [to be] about to extend as far as Sidon — and yet [there is] here no mention of Sidon?" *Second*: "Why did Zabulon obtain [his] lot before Issachar, [although] born the younger from the same Lia [Leah]?" (Gen. 30:18 & 20, and again ch. 35:25). And this latter indeed seems too obscure for the divine secret to be unraveled — [a difficulty] preserved not only here, but in Jacob's testament itself

(Gen. 49:13 & 14). But that [first point] is plain enough. For although no mention of "Sidon" is here made, yet its borders are so bounded that [it] easily appears [that] that tribe was neighboring to Sidon, and [that it] could set out to that city, by land and sea, most conveniently and expeditiously, do business there, and seek huge gain. And therefore Moses said (Deut. 33:18): "Rejoice, Zabulon, in thy going out" — [the tribe] which, namely, will be for thee most opportune [suited] for traveling, sailing, and trading; just as, on the contrary, Issachar — about to take great pleasure from his quiet and leisure in [his] tents — is added [paired with him], concerning whom [something] is now to be said.

Question VII. What limits [borders] and cities the Issacharite tribe had?

The fourth lot gave [its] portion to the Issacharite tribe. Its limits: the first, the *Southern*, is shown by six cities, which run from the West to the East (v. 18 & 19). The second, the *Western*, from the South to the North, by five cities (v. 20). The third, the *Northern*, by five other cities (v. 21 & 22), where, to those cities, the Jordan is appended as, as it were, the extreme limit in the East. But Masius doubts whether the *western* limit of those Issacharites reached the Mediterranean sea, since not even the name of this [sea] is here set down. But since Mount "Carmel" belongs to this tribe (on Josephus's authority), and [it] nearly overhangs the sea (below, v. 26), why should we not think [that] this tribe reached as far as that [sea]? In the same tribe [there] were 16 cities (v. 22), among which [is] easily the chief of all, "Jezrael" [Jezreel] — concerning whose valley [I spoke] above (ch. 17:16), and from which [comes] that great and most-fertile "plain of Esdrelon," concerning which (Judith 1) I spoke [on] p. 233. And indeed, from the fertility and notable fruitfulness which [the land] brings forth when seed [is] cast [in], the name "Jezrael" seems [to be] built up. For "Zera" is "seed," and "el" [is] "God." But [the things] which are great and excellent, those are said in the Scriptures to be "of God" — as "the mountains of God." But "Sion" (v. 19) in the Hebrew is written "Sion" — yet with different letters than the Jerusalem Mount "Sion."

Question VIII. For the Aserite tribe, what borders? what cities?

The fifth lot sent [assigned] the Aserite tribe into [its] inheritance; whose borders are described. First, the *Western*, in a certain part, from the North to the South, by a measuring-cord drawn [stretched] (v. 25). Then the *Southern*, from the East to the West (v. 27). Thirdly, the *Eastern*, from the South to the North (v. 28). Fourthly, the *Northern*, from the East to the West, [in] the same v. 28 — because those two limits, the eastern and the northern, are explained together, as [if] by one circuit [turning]. But at last, more perfectly, the *western* limit is shown (v. 29): from Sidon (concerning which, ch. 11) as far as "Aczib" — where the same limit [was] begun before — and thence as far as "Rohob," which (Judg. 1) by the 70 is called "ἔρεώ [ere■]." So indeed Arias and Masius [have it]; but if we consult the tables of Adrichomius and the common pictures [maps], these limits can scarcely be applied, in the order already stated, to the cities [that are] barely named in the text, so that rather some cities seem heaped together from everywhere, by which — even if not by straight lines — in some manner the borders of this tribe are defined. But the cities recounted [are] 22 (v. 29), where "Acziba" is, which by other writers — as by Pliny (bk. 5, ch. 19) — is called "Ecdippa," "at the ninth milestone [from] Ptolemais for those going to Tyre," says St. Jerome (*On Places*); and some think this [is] signified [in] Gen. 38:5 in the Hebrew, when [it] is said [that] Judah was in "Cezib" when his Canaanite wife bore him a son, Selam. And so, more or less, [render] the 70 — except that they render [it that] she [was] there, and bore her sons in that place: "αὐτὴ ἦν ἐν χασβί, ἡνίκα ἔτεκεν αὐτούς [aut■ ■n en chasbi, h■nika eteken autous]" ["she was in Chasbi when she bore them"]. But our Interpreter, considering [that] in the word "Cazab" there is a force of lying and frustrating [deceiving], translated: "she ceased to bear any more." Again (v. 26), from "Sihor" & "Labanah," very nearly all [commentators] wish the copulative particle "&" [to be] removed, because [it] is not in the Hebrew; yet [it] is also read in the 70 — but with the former name corrupted, thus: "τῷ σιὼν καὶ λαβανάθ [t■ si■n kai labanath]." But [those] who read simply "Sihor Labanaah" bring forward various explanations of it. *The first*: [that so is called] Ptolemais, which [was]

formerly "Ace," says Pliny in the same place; or "haco," as [it] is in the Hebrew (Judg. 1:31) — concerning which [see] in the Harmony of the Maccabees, p. 660; but I [have said] more in the Century to the Germans, epistle 36 [of] Lipsius. *The second*: [that it] is the river which above (q. 6) we called "glass-bearing." For since "Schichor" is wont, in Scripture, to signify the Nile, this river seems similar to it in blackness, because [it is] nearly always turbid with mud and earth — because [it] is very shallow, and yet, in Josephus, nearly a hundred cubits wide. But [the parts] which are deeper, the same [are] clearer, as the word "mischoah" indicates (Ezekiel 34:18). Now "Libnath," among the Hebrews, signifies "Crystal." But this river carries down glass-[sand], as the Nile [carries down] mud [and] sand — so that [it] seems "a certain little crystalline, or crystal-bearing, Nile," says Masius. *The third*: [that] "Sihor" indeed is a river, but [that] "Libnath" is "white"

(col. 1199)

[…continued from col. 1198.] but [that] "Libnath" is a "white" promontory, which Pliny — in the cited place — hands down [as] situated next to that same river and to the city Ptolemais. And therefore here [too] no mention of a city is made, because [it] is sufficiently signified by the promontory, or by this river. Concerning "Chabul" (v. 28), I [have] spoken [at] 1 Kings ch. 19:13. "Cana" in the same verse is to be understood [as] "the greater" — for that [other is] "the lesser," in which the Lord made wine out of water (John 2). "Abran" in that place is written by some "Hebron"; and [it] can be so written — yet the Hebrew letters [are] other than in Hebron, Caleb's city, concerning which above (ch. 14). But since "Sidon," and its offspring "Tyre," are ascribed to this Aserite tribe, [there] is a little dissertation [question] whether [the tribe] in fact ever possessed these cities? And most deny [it]. [They] are called "great and fortified cities," because [they] were such both by nature and by art. And only to signify this, the Interpreter used a superlative (v. 29).

Question IX. For the Nephtalite tribe, what borders, and what cities, were decreed?

The sixth lot fell to the Nephtalite tribe, and decreed to it [its] inheritance, around which [are its] borders. *1.* The *Eastern*, which is shown from the North toward the South by cities (v. 35). But since these [cities] are situated nearly along the Jordan, [it] comes about that the Jordan itself — from its own rising and source, as far as [where] it flows into the sea of Genesareth — is rightly called the *Eastern* limit. Masius would gladly add to it also the shore of this sea itself, as far as the city Tiberias — but without any authority, unless one please to grant him Abulensis, when, at v. 34 of this chapter, he says [that] "in the junction [overlapping] of the lot of Issachar, the lot of Nephtali reaches as far as the place where the lot of Judah is joined to the Jordan." But [Abulensis] speaks very obscurely, and indeed against Josephus — whom (q. 6) I said ascribes these spaces to the Zabulonite tribe. Nor is the city "Lakkoum" or "Leccum" placed beyond the mouth [outlet] by which the Jordan is poured into the Genesaritic lake. *2.* The *Southern* limit is from the East to the West (v. 34) — the same, namely, which was the Northern limit for the Zabulonites; but here [it is] indicated by two cities which are in the Nephtalite tribe itself. *3.* The *Western* limit is [that] which was the eastern [limit] of the Aserites, [in] the same v. 34; where [as to] what is added, "And in Juda at the Jordan toward the rising of the sun," [it] has a twofold exposition. One: [that] the Nephtalite tribe is co-terminous with Judah, on [its] eastern side, and that indeed immediately [directly]. And this conflicts with those [things] which the text said above, when [it] asserted [that] the tribe of Benjamin reaches as far as the Jordan (ch. 18:12 & 20), likewise the tribe of Manasseh (ch. 16) & Ephraim (ch. 17). The other exposition is, that the Nephtalite [tribe] is co-terminous with the Judaic tribe mediately [indirectly] — which again is said in two ways. *First*: [so] that [the part] of the river Jordan which is intercepted [lies] between each tribe is very small, and therefore — by that common dictum of the Philosophers, which the Jurisconsults [lawyers] also hold — those tribes seem to differ [be distant] from each other [by] nothing. And thus that small [portion] of the intercepted Jordan would indeed be attributed to the already-named tribes — Benjaminite, Manassite, &

Ephraimite — but the whole Genesaritic side would, in that manner, be granted to the Nephtalite tribe; which [is] denied. *Secondly*: [so] that the Jordan indeed [lies] much interposed between Judaea and the tribe Nephtali, and that [this space] is held by the Zabulonite, Issacharite, and other already-mentioned tribes — but [that the two are] joined by an easy and convenient [access], either by navigation through the Jordan's channel, or by a journey along its shore; and [so that] the Nephtalite [tribe] becomes, in a manner, neighboring and allied to the Judaic tribe. And although Masius gives the sea of Genesareth to this Nephtalite [tribe], yet in this way he explains that place, twice, [on] pp. 297, 298 — and Montanus following him. For the text seems to wish to indicate [that] this Nephtalite tribe is indeed the farthest toward the North, yet enjoys every advantage, from this — that [it] had an easy and ready road to almost all the tribes, and [that it] would rejoice in all the conveniences and opportunities of men, through friendly and brotherly commerce. *4.* The *Northern* limit is not so much expressed in the text as hinted [at] (v. 33): "Lebanon," or "Anti-Lebanon." Yet [there] are not lacking [those] who extend this limit farther, so that in it [there] be included also "Damascus, Abila, Chalcis, Palmyra, Emesa," and other most-noble cities toward the Euphrates (concerning which [see] Zosimus in [the Life of] "Aurelian"). But truly the enclosure [territory] of this tribe would have been much larger than [that] of Judah — which their multitudes, compared among themselves, utterly refuse [reject] (Num. 26). For the Jews [of Judah] were seventy-six thousand five hundred (v. 22); but the Nephtalites [were] forty-five thousand four hundred (v. 50).

Furthermore, in this tribe [there] were 19 cities (v. 38). But more will seem [to be there], if the proper names in the text are gathered, and [if] those [cautions] are not observed which, once and again before, I gave concerning numbers and names of this kind. Certainly "Saanim" (v. 33) for some is a city; for others [it] is an appellative [common] noun, which the Chaldee [paraphrast] (Judg. 4:11) interprets "a stagnant and watery plain." The Greeks indeed (for in the 70 [it] is "βεσεμιΐν [besemiïn]") [render it as] "resting [ones]," as [if] they would say [that] this and the prior name "Elon" [mean] "the oak of the resting"; Masius [renders it] "wandering and migrating [ones]," so that there was an oak-grove of theirs [of the migrants] there. But "Adami," in the same verse, seems to some to be the same as [the place] which [comes] a little after, "Edemah" (v. 35); and again the same with that which was placed at "Sarthan" (ch. 3:6). But then the Nephtalite lot would have to be extended beyond the sea of Genesareth to the South; or certainly "Sarthan" [would have to be] dragged beyond the same sea to the North; and therefore [Masius] more cautiously makes those [to be] different cities, and even quite separated in place — [so does] Adrichomius. But "Neceb," since the Hebrew "ha" is prefixed to it, some render "toward the South"; but Masius follows our Interpreter, so that [it] be a mark which signifies [that] "Neceb" and "Adami" are the same. For "Ser" (v. 35), the 70 read "Sor," because [they] translated [it] "Tyre." In the same place, "Cenereth" is thought, by Masius and Arias, to be a city, from which — on account of [its] nearness, by some change of letters — the sea [is] called "Genesareth." But this could be true, if [what] some say [is right]: [that] "Tiberias" was called "Cinereth"; but not if this [Cinereth] be one [and the same] Nephtalite [city]. "Hemath" is said by St. Jerome (on the Prophet Amos) [to be] "twofold": "the greater," which is Antioch; and "the lesser," which is Epiphania. But Masius adds a "third," and makes "Rebla," or "Reblata," twofold. Of these [there is] frequent mention in the Scriptures: Num. 13:22, 2 Kings 23:33, Jer. 49, Zech. 9.

(col. 1201)

Question X. By what limits [was] the Danite portion contained? what cities did [it] contain?

The seventh and last lot of the latter casting-of-lots placed the Danite [tribe] among the tribes [settled] in its inheritance; whose limits are here explained no otherwise than by an enumeration of some cities, which, however, do not hold any one order; but from which [it is] plain enough, [that] the greatest part of the Danite portion was enclosed within the Judaic limits — namely, for the same cause for which [it] was said above

(this ch., q. 1, 2 & 3) [that] the Simeonic tribe [was] placed within the same [limits]. But this Danite [portion] is placed on the western Judaic limits, so that [it] is more northern than the Simeonic. And so the northern borders of the Simeonites are the southern [borders] of the Danites. But toward the North, outside the Judaic borders, on the same western side, the same Danite tribe runs out a little beyond "Joppe," as v. 46 clearly indicates. Especially since [there] are added — [words] which, for the sake of explanation, [were] admitted into the Latin text — these words: "And [it] is terminated at the very end." But therefore here [one] must part from Josephus, who (ch. 3, bk. 5) extends the borders of the Danites as far as the city "Dora." For this too the interposed cords [portions] of the Ephraimites and Manassites prevent. But no sum [total] of the cities is here set up; but if we number those which are in the Latin text, from v. 41 to 47, [there] will be found 18. I said "in the Latin text." *First*: because in the Hebrew, "Benebarac" (v. 45) seems to be one [word]; and likewise in the 70, "βαναιβακάτ [banaibakát]" for "βαναιβαράκ [banaibarák]." *Secondly*: because in the same 70 no more than 15 or 16 are read, in which [that] which in the Hebrew is called "hirsemes" — and in the same Latin is rendered "city of the sun" — is translated "πόλις [polis, 'city']," or rather "πόλις σαμμάυς [polis sammaus]," by interpreting the former part and retaining the latter Hebrew [part]. "Joppe" in Hebrew is called "Iaphoh," just as [it is] also today "Iapha." But [it] happened, after some time of this given lot and portion, that the Danites deemed themselves circumscribed by too-narrow limits — not because the allotted soil [glebe] was not long and broad, but because [they] had not yet occupied the whole of it. They decided, therefore, [that] they must burst out from their [own] straits, and seek new seats elsewhere. Which [thing] is here indeed briefly touched [upon] (v. 47), but [is] narrated and explained more fully [in] Judg. ch. 18. Here let only this be inspected: besides that [clause] (v. 47), "The children of Dan went up," in the Hebrew, before this, [there] is: "And the border of the children of Dan went out from them [ex ipsis], or [ab] from, or [prae] beyond, them." And the sense of the sacred words, says Masius, is this: "The Danites of old emigrated outside themselves — that is, outside that inheritance in which they had been placed by the divine lot — and [they] in fact went forth to seek other possessions." Yet another sense of the same words can [be]. [Is it] this, namely? "The border of the children of Dan came out smaller than would suffice for them." For this the Hebraism "ab" or "prae ipsis" can mean — that is, "beyond what would suit them," namely as to [their] occupation and possession, [which was] impeded by the Canaanites. Otherwise the portion whose right [was] in their [hands] was ample enough. For so, also, this manner of speaking seems to be taken (Num. 16:8): "Is it a small [thing] for you, that the God of Israel has separated you?" — that is, "Is it less than [would] suit you?" — just as also above, in this chapter, q. 3.

Question XI. Which [inheritance], and where, did the Commander Joshua receive?

The Commander and leader Joshua received a single city, which he should thenceforth hold by hereditary right (v. 50). That [city] had a twofold name. One, here, "Thamnath Saara," in Hebrew "Thimnath Serach"; in the 70, "θαμνασαράχ [thamnasarách]." The other (Judg. 2:9), in the Hebrew "Thimnath Cheres"; in the 70, "θαμναθαρές [thamnatharés]"; and, on account of [their] similarity, or on account of [its] greater clarity, in the Latin [it] is "Thamnath-Sare." But because each name is composed of two [elements], a various meaning can be accommodated to each from these. For "Thamnath" is either "likeness and image," as also "Themounath" [is] either "a numbering [enumeration]," from the verb "manach" — from which, by the Arabic article "al" prefixed, [comes] "Almanach," a table or booklet, in which the motions and effects of the sun and of the other stars are numbered and set forth; or, as "Theman," [it] is the southern region; or, finally, "perfection," from "Tham." But "Sarach" signifies either "superfluous," "overflowing," as [if] luxuriating; or "failing, withering, and stinking." But "Cheres" indicates either "the sun," or "a potsherd," or "a dry brick." All the other interpretations are indicated by others; but this one [is] from Arias: "To this city, from the region's quarter, [came] the name 'Thamna,' that is, 'Southern'; but from the strong-smell of the trees, and the sterility of the soil, the surname 'zzarahh' seems to have been made." But [it] was in the tribe of Ephraim —

which was the same, Joshua's own, tribe — and indeed on the mountain which (v. 50), just as [in] Judg. 2:9, is called "Mount Ephraim." But since [there] were several mountains in the same tribe, this was "Mount Gaas" (Judg. 2 & the last ch. of this book, v. 30; 2 Sam. 23:30) — that is, "the mountain of storm, commotion, and tempest" — on whose northern side the same Joshua is handed down [to have been] afterward buried. But the city at that time was rather mean, and altogether badly built — or certainly at that time [so] ruined, that [it] was like a heap of stones, and a corpse of a city. And therefore [Joshua] had need to build it [up], and to render [it] more convenient for dwelling (v. 50). But afterward [it] was so renowned that, in the time of St. Jerome — as he testifies in the book *On Hebrew Places* — [it] still survived, and in it the tomb of Joshua was shown; and indeed a notable [one], as is added by the same [Jerome], where he treats of "Gaas." Moreover, when the Romans had divided all Judaea into ten Toparchies, one [was] named from this [city] "Thamnitica" — with Pliny as witness (bk. 5, ch. 14). Yet the place was rough, and nearly horrid [wild], [and] existed [so] not only in ancient [times] but [also] in St. Jerome's age: "Much," says he, concerning Paula, in her Epitaph, "did she wonder that the distributor of the possessions had chosen for himself the mountainous and rough [parts]." [That] an image of the sun was placed here — on account of the sun delayed and held back by Joshua in the battle (above, ch. 10:13) — some have wretchedly committed to writing; of whom, if the trust [were] certain, [it] would be probable [that] from thence the name "Thamnatares" [was] later derived. [It] seems to be confused, in the book *On Places*, with "Themna," the Danite city, here (v. 43) — from which also, by Chytraeus, [comes] the "Thamnitica" prefecture.

(col. 1203)

Question XII. When and how did Joshua receive that inheritance?

Both of these [matters], these words of the text (v. 49) fix before our eyes: "And when he had completed dividing the land by lot, to each by their tribes, the children of Israel gave a possession to Joshua the son of Nun in the midst of themselves, according to the command of the Lord." The time, therefore, was after the completed division of all the tribes. But when [the division] was completed, [is] to be reckoned in the same way in which the completion of the former [division] was stated at ch. 13, q. 13 — in the same year, I say, in which [it] was begun. The manner, moreover, was [this]. *First*: that Joshua entered upon that inheritance not by his own will and power, but by the grant and gift of all the Israelites. *Secondly*: that they granted and gave this to him not of their own accord and by mere liberality, but by God's command and order — or, as [it] is in the Hebrew, "by the mouth of God." *Thirdly*: that the option [choice] of choosing whatever place and city he wished was made to Joshua; but he himself chose and selected that mountain and city. But when, and where, did the Lord command anything concerning some inheritance — outside the [usual] order — to be conferred and given to Joshua? The answer [is] twofold. One, of Masius: [that] in this very latter division, an oracle [was] given by God to the Pontiff Eleazar, that Joshua should choose a place, and [that] the Israelites should give to him the place chosen by him. The other: [that] this command [came] from God when Caleb and Joshua resisted the factious [seditious] spies. But this very [point] is asserted in three ways. For some will [have it] prescribed [in] Num. 14 — as, in this place, Abulensis; others [place it] above (ch. 14), when Caleb said to Joshua himself (v. 6): "Thou knowest what the Lord spoke to Moses the man of God concerning me, and thee, in Cadesbarne" — and so, in this place, Arias; others, finally, [say it was] first written here, and nowhere else. Cajetan's words are: "Just as [those things] which were said concerning Caleb's inheritance are not written in the books of Moses, so [also] a divine word of this kind for Joshua's inheritance is not written in the same books, but is here first written." And concerning Caleb indeed [it was] said above (ch. 14, q. 4); but concerning Joshua [it] seems [to have been] prescribed by God when [it was] prescribed concerning that Caleb. For why would [Joshua] have been passed over? Why [would] no earthly reward, as to him [Caleb], [have been] decreed for him too? Yet concerning the same Joshua [it] does not seem [to be] written, except above (ch. 14), and here (v. 49).

Question XIII. What did the leader Joshua display in the love, the petition [requesting], the building, and the inhabiting of this his inheritance?

Deservedly indeed, most blessed Paula, didst thou marvel at this special [portion] of Joshua. For which of us, if the choice were given, would not choose the best, the most fertile, and the most pleasant place? Who would not demand the most ample, most fortified, most beautiful, and most flourishing city? Who, when he surpassed all others in princedom, authority, and dignity, would bear with an even mind [that] the last place in some distribution be given to himself? Who would prefer to receive from others — as [if] by entreaty and begging — that which he could seize by his own right and power? And perhaps to our ambition, greed, and audacity, [there] would not be lacking [pretexts] which, under some appearance of good, would cover and defend it. For "all prefer that [things] go well for themselves rather than for another"; and Charity begins from itself; and [it] seems fair, that those who are set over others should likewise, for [the sake of] reverence and majesty, excel [others] in wealth and estates; [and that,] for the relaxation of the greatest cares by which [they] are held fast, they should obtain all the most pleasant and most smiling [things]. So indeed [do] we — souls bent-down, and wholly fixed to the ground — feel and speak. But the leader Joshua [acted otherwise].

I. Indeed, he displayed an outstanding, and altogether divine, virtue of his spirit, when — [after] so many and so great deeds done, so many and so great victories won, sitting so [long] at the helm, [and] having attained so great glory and dignity — he nevertheless, in that division, bore himself so modestly and humbly: he does not pounce upon the richest of the acquired lands, he does not seize the most fertile of fields and vineyards, [nor] pluck first the greatest, most-fortified, most-built-up of cities; but he chooses a place altogether very small, mean, rough, ruinous — or rather demolished; and [that place] he does not claim for himself by his own authority, but asks [it] from all the Israelites — and indeed in the very last place, when [provision] had already been made sufficiently for all the others.

II. He showed what all [those] to whom the reins of governing others [are] committed ought deservedly to imitate and do. It behooves them to seek first the public usefulness, not their own private [advantage], and to have this as the one, first, and most-ancient care of all — that [things] go well for those over whom they are set: that [the people] be preserved in the worship of God and [in] religion; [that] they obtain their rights, resources, and goods justly and quietly; then afterward let [the rulers] have regard — if they wish — for their own conveniences; [and] in the last place let them put their own pleasures, delights, and gratifications, [even] moderate ones. Well known, in the wise Aesop, is the "lion's division" [lion's share]; well known [is] the difference of a "Tyrant and a Prince [legitimate ruler]," which is somewhat sketched [in] 1 Samuel ch. 8.

III. He also showed [to] us — all private [persons too] — how great a moderation, abstinence, and frugality [it] becomes [us] to pursue among ourselves, in all [our] life, in daily fellowship, and in the company of [our] equals. For if that Prince — and so great a Prince, renowned for so many triumphs and so many miracles — proved himself so moderate among [his] inferiors, what ought deservedly to be done by us among [our] equals? [Is it] not most fair to yield to others, to anticipate [outdo] them in honor, gladly to grant [them] the first [places], [and] to bear ourselves as the last in all [things]? This Joshuan admonition and example can hold good even in the least things — [whether] if [it is a matter of] going forward, [or] of speaking, [or] of eating from the same dish. For why should I wish always to be first? why should I always seize all the best [things], and snatch [them] before everyone? But since Origen very opportunely and sweetly treats those three lessons in homily 24 on this place, it will be worth our while to lend an ear for a little to his discourse. "The text declares how great a meekness Jesus [Joshua] has, who was worthy to bear the name of our Lord JESUS and Savior. He [it] is who gave an inheritance to all the sons of Juda: what did he give

(col. 1205)

[…Origen's homily, continued from col. 1204:] what did he give [to] Ephraim, and to the half-tribe of Manasseh. He [it is who] gave to that magnificent Caleb, son of Jephone, [his] inheritance; he [it is who] sent

three [men] through each tribe, who should traverse the whole land, and describe [it] in a book, and return, and show [it]; he [it is who] sent lots to all, and reserved himself among the last. Why, thinkest thou, did he wish to be the last of all? Without doubt, that he might be the first of all. And neither did he himself presume [to take his] inheritance by lot, but received [it] from the people; and to him the people gives the inheritance, from whom he himself had received [theirs]. For so it is written: 'And the children of Israel gave a lot [portion] to the son of Nun.' But these [things] also befell them figuratively [as types], which were set before us as a pattern, that we too may keep that precept which this [Joshua] fulfilled in deed — [the precept] which is spoken: 'The greater thou art, the more humble thyself in all things; and thou shalt find grace before the Lord.' And again, [that] which is written: 'If they have made thee a ruler, be not lifted up, but be among them as one of them.' See, therefore, how he was the leader of the people — he who had led them into the holy land, into the land of promise; he was the successor of Moses, and [yet] he does not permit himself to take [his] lot of land, but — the leader of the people — waits to receive a little portion from the people." Thus Origen; in whom observe also this, against the Innovators [Protestants] — how greatly, among the ancients, the book "Ecclesiasticus" [Sirach] was in esteem — a passage of which, from ch. 32, [is] cited in certain Latin books, [though] somewhat obscured by the heaping-up of several translations.

IV. Joshua displayed, in his own self, a most beautiful figure [type] of the true JESUS, our Lord and Savior. Although he was King of kings and Lord of lords, he chose the form of a servant (Phil. 2); despised, and the last [most abject] of men (Isa. 53). What else is this world than "Thamnath-sarach," in which [is] such superfluity, decay, and stench; in which the Son of God took on the likeness of our sin, the image of our luxuriating flesh, the fullest measure of our mortality? Nor here did he choose for himself the strong, the opulent, the sublime, the splendid; but "Bethlehem," a stable, a manger, likewise a poor little carpenter, [and] a poor little virgin betrothed to him — for whom [there] was no place in the inn. He was on Mount "Gaas" [storm] — he who came not to send peace, but a sword, against impiety and all its ministers and satellites; who received so many and so great storms of poverty, persecutions, insults, torments, and finally of the most bitter death. In the midst of Ephraim and of his [own] tribesmen, he dwelt — he who was made "Emmanuel," that is, "God with us"; who stood in the midst of us, and was reckoned as [if] one from the common crowd.

We can also, by reason of the twofold name which (as [was] said) belonged to Joshua's city, set up, as it were, a twofold seat of our JESUS: one, old, fallen, and overthrown — the "Synagogue" of the Jews; the other, restored and built and fortified by Joshua himself — the "Christian Church," which [is] now to be called not "Thamnath-sarach" but "Thamnath-heres"; in which [is] not that old superfluity, and the strong-smell and reek of carnal sacrifices, but the excellent image of the Sun of Justice, shining far and wide. And truly our hearts also — in which [there was] once a most-luxuriant superfluity of all sins, and a most-foul stench of lusts boiling up and shaking off all measure — were [a very] "Thamnath-sarach"; but our JESUS cut away all excess, drove off all stench, and founded anew a city, that he might dwell in that very [city]. Concerning which Origen, in the cited discourse, [speaks] thus: "Since we are accustomed to refer to our Lord and Savior those [things] which are written concerning Joshua, perhaps this whole people of ours too gives some part to my Lord JESUS, and assigns, as it were, a certain place for his dwelling. But lest what is said seem to be injurious, let us inquire how we, his servants, give him a place of dwelling. I, if I could become good, would give a place to the Son of God in me; and the place received from me, in my soul, the Lord Jesus would build [up], and adorn, and make in it unconquerable walls and lofty towers, and would build in me a dwelling — if I should deserve [it] — worthy of himself and the Father; and so would adorn my soul, and make it capable of his wisdom and knowledge, and of all holiness; so much [so], that he would even make God the Father enter with him, and make a dwelling in it, and even sup, with such a soul, [on] foods which he himself would give. And that we may deserve to attain this, let us prepare in ourselves a clean heart, [into] which, clean, [he] may gladly and gratefully deign to enter — the lodging of our heart — [he] to whom is the dominion and glory unto the ages of ages." And [in] homily 26: "Who, thinkest thou, in the whole people, are so acceptable to God, [that] they are worthy to be chosen for this — that JESUS should

deign to receive a place in them, to build, and to dwell [there]? Or perhaps not even individuals can be capable of this, but the whole people — and the entire Church together — can scarcely be capable, that it may receive into itself the Lord JESUS, and [that] he may dwell in it. Let us see, therefore, what [is] this place in which JESUS ought to dwell. 'On the mountain,' [he] says, 'of Ephraim' — that is, on a fruitful mountain. Which, thinkest thou, are in us the fruitful mountains, in which JESUS may dwell? Those, assuredly, in which [there] are the fruits of the spirit — joy, peace, patience, Charity. These, then, are the fruitful mountains, which bring forth the fruit of CHRIST, and are always lofty in mind and hope. And although [there] can be few such, yet if [there] be even [a] few, the Lord God dwelling in them — [he] who is the true light — will send the rays of his light even upon all the rest, whom he will have judged not chiefly worthy of his dwelling-place." But whatever place our JESUS will deign to build and inhabit, that — even if [it] be the least, most contemptible, weakest, and most obscure — he will make the greatest, most glorious, strongest, and most illustrious. "O," says St. Bernard (sermon 1 *On the Vigil of the Nativity*), "Bethlehem, [thou] little [one] — but now magnified by the Lord. He magnified thee, who was made in thee little out of great. Rejoice, Bethlehem, and through all thy streets let a festive 'Alleluia' today be sung. What city, if it should hear, would not envy thee that most precious stable, and the glory of that manger? For in the whole earth thy name is now renowned, and all generations call thee blessed. Everywhere glorious [things] are said of thee, O city of God; everywhere [it] is sung, 'for a man is born in her, and the most High himself hath founded her.' Everywhere, I say, [it] is preached, everywhere [it] is cried aloud, that Jesus Christ the Son of God is born in Bethlehem of Juda." Many other [things are] in the same place, and [in] sermon 3 on the Lord's Nativity, which can pertain here. But [it] is better to beseech JESUS, that he deign to make us citizens of his city, partakers of [his] mountain, [and] sharers of [his] inheritance, in this and the future age. Amen.

(col. 1207)

After the Wars: Caput XX

Caput XX (opening)

1. And the Lord spoke to Josue, saying: Speak to the children of Israel, and say to them: **2.** Appoint cities of refuge, of which I spoke to you by the hand of Moses, **3.** that whosoever shall kill a person unawares may flee to them, and may escape the wrath of [his] neighbor, who is the avenger of blood: **4.** when he shall flee to one of these cities, he shall stand before the gate of the city, and shall speak to the ancients of that city those [things] which prove him innocent: and so shall they receive him, and give him a place to dwell in. **5.** And when the avenger of blood shall pursue him, they shall not deliver him into his hands, because he killed his neighbor unawares, nor is proved to have been his enemy two or three days before. **6.** And he shall dwell in that city, until he stand before judgment, giving an account of his deed, and [until] the high priest, who shall be at that time, die: then shall the manslayer return, and go into his own city and house, from which he had fled. **7.** And they appointed Cedes in Galilee, of mount Nephtali, and Sichem in mount Ephraim, and Cariath-Arbe, the same is Hebron, in the mountain of Juda. **8.** And beyond the Jordan, toward the east side of Jericho, they appointed Bosor, which is situate in the plain wilderness, of the tribe of Ruben, and Ramoth in Galaad, of the tribe of Gad, and Gaulon in Basan, of the tribe of Manasse. **9.** These were cities appointed for all the children of Israel, and for the strangers that dwelt among them: that whosoever had killed a person unawares might flee to them, and not die in [by] the hand of the kinsman, coveting to revenge the blood that was shed, until he should stand before the people, to lay open his cause.

COMMENTARY

The cities of refuge are appointed in this chapter. For, first, the Lord commands Joshua himself to see to it that this now be done, as Moses had once announced and described [it was] to be done (Num. 35, from v. 14 to the end of that chapter; Deut. 19; Exod. 21:13). Then, when Joshua had obeyed the Lord, and had referred the whole matter to the people, straightway (v. 7) the cities of refuge are named.

Question I. What [are] the cities of refuge?

[They] are called cities of refuge or of flight [confugium], to which those who fled were safe and secure from some impending danger. And of this kind [there] are now, and of old (as [will] appear below) [there] were, not only cities, but also other places, which were called "asyla" [asylums/sanctuaries]. [This is] because — from "συλᾶν [sylan]" (not, however, as [was] thought by Covarruvias, bk. 2 of the *Variae Resolutiones*, ch. 20, & by Ludovicus Vives, on St. Augustine's *City [of God]*, bk. 1, ch. 34, [from] "συρᾶν [syran]": for [as to] what Servius says, bk. 2 of the Aeneid, [that] "ἄσυλον [asylon]" [is] as [if] "ἄσυρον [asyron]," from "σύρειν [syrein]") — among the Greeks [συλᾶν] is "to seize [rob], to despoil, and to violate," and the same "a" [alpha] is a mark of privation [the alpha-privative], [so that] places of this kind protect and defend someone, lest he can be seized, despoiled, or violated by anyone. For just as the natural places of each thing preserve it, by a certain natural force (Aristotle being witness), so asylums [preserve] those who flee to them, by a certain moral force and right, which is called [the right] "τῆς ἀσυλίας [t■s asylias]" ["of inviolability"]. Ovid, bk. 3 of the *Fasti*:

> *"When Romulus had surrounded a grove with a high rock,*
>
> *'Whoever thou art, flee hither,' he said, 'thou shalt be safe.'"*

And concerning the same [thing], Virgil, bk. 7 of the Aeneid:

> *"Hence [he shows] the huge grove, which fierce Romulus made an asylum,*
>
> *and shows, under a cold rock, the Lupercal."*

And so of asylums speak Cicero in the Verrines, Livy bk. 1, Lactantius bk. 2 ch. 7, [and] others. Moreover, hence also, in Euripides, [it] is called "ἄσυλος γῆ [asylos g■]" ["inviolable land"]; in the Author of 2 Maccabees ch. 4, "ἄσυλος τόπος [asylos topos]" ["an inviolable place"]; in Synesius, Epistle 58, "ἄσυλος τράπεζα [asylos trapeza]" ["an inviolable table"]; in Philostratus, "ἄσυλος αἰδώς [asylos aid■s]" ["inviolable reverence"] — that is, inviolable, and in no way to be despoiled, nor to be harassed by any plunderer — [whether] land, place, table, [or] statue. And therefore [there] are several kinds of asylums; and these cities of refuge make up one [kind] of them, which in the 70 [are] "αἱ πόλεις τοῦ φυγαδευτηρίου [hai poleis tou phygadeut■riou]" ["the cities of the place-of-refuge"], "τῶν φυγαδευτηρίων [t■n phygadeut■ri■n]," "εἰς φυγαδευτήριον [eis phygadeut■rion]"; and simply "φυγαδευτήρια [phygadeut■ria]" ["places-of-refuge"], "φυγαδεῖον [phygadeion]" (Num. 35). But in Hebrew, "hare miklat," that is, "cities of retention or of reception." For "Miklat" is said by some properly to signify a collecting [gathering] or a retaining; and in those cities the manslayers had to contain [keep] themselves. To others, the same word means "contraction [a drawing-together]," from Lev. 22:23; but into those cities the manslayers were drawn together [gathered], for the sake of refuge.

Question II. Whom, among the Israelites, did the cities of refuge protect, and why?

Not for all who had betaken themselves into these cities was the refuge safe and secure, but only for those whom the Lord had commanded [to be] safe there. And these were [those] upon whom that [clause] of the text of this chapter (v. 3) falls: "Whosoever shall kill a soul unawares." Often in the Scriptures, by Synecdoche, "soul" is put for "man"; and "striking [percussio]" not for any kind of beating or wounding, but for slaughter and homicide. For so [a] man "makes souls" (Gen. 17:5 — i.e. persons); [a soul] is blotted out and perishes

(col. 1209)

[…continued from col. 1208.] the soul is blotted out and perishes from the people (Gen. 17:14; Lev. 8:20). And the name of "striking [percussio]" extends broadly indeed (Exod. 21); yet from the circumstance itself [it] can be understood, when [it is] either unto death, or short of death — as in this place, so that no other sense is available. But because (v. 3) "the avenger of blood" is added, we understand slaughter — or certainly a striking of such a kind that, even if death had not yet [actually] followed from it, nevertheless death seems near and certain. And this [is] less ambiguous in the Hebrew text, where the striker is called "rothseach," that is, "one who kills." And so, among the Latins, "percussor [striker]" is also used [to mean] a murderer — and indeed even a hired [assassin], but by a milder name, as Cicero said [in the speech] for Roscius of Ameria; in whom (bk. 4, to Atticus) "to strike the mind" is to cast in fear, just as, in Lucretius (bk. 1), "The hope of praise has struck the heart with a sharp thyrsus [goad]" — that is, rouses, urges, [and] goads [it]. Yet not for every striker was flight into these cities safe, but [only] for him who struck "unawares" — or, as [it] is in the Hebrew, "by error and without knowledge." For hence [it] comes, that he struck involuntarily, or "ἀκουσίως [akousi■s]," as [it] is in the 70. Therefore no access [was] here, no security [was] granted to voluntary [deliberate] homicides, none to those who had committed adultery, inflicted rape, [or] perpetrated any other crime. For to all these, due punishments [were] appointed, from which neither a city, nor a place, nor any other thing, could snatch [them] away by [right of] asylum. Exod. 21:12 & 14: "If any man kill his neighbor on set purpose, and by lying in wait [for him], thou shalt take him away from my altar, that he may die." And Num. 35, v. 16 to 22. But what if someone had killed a person voluntarily [deliberately] — yet [while] defending himself, and repelling force by force? Him the cities of refuge received; and from them, [he] could depart whither he pleased, after he had been absolved by the judgments [sentences] of the Judges. So [says] Tostatus, q. 5. For privileges are to be extended [broadly interpreted]. But if anyone committed a slaughter in the cities of refuge themselves, he did not enjoy that refuge. The same Tostatus, q. 19, 20, 22, 25. But cities

of this kind were granted [for these ends]: *First*: that [there] might be some help and protection for innocence. *Secondly*: that the Lord might make provision [for showing] how seriously homicide was to be inquired into and punished. *Thirdly*: that the matter [fuel] of the anger, grief, and vengeance of the kinsmen of him who was slain might be withdrawn. *Fourthly*: that the occasion of new quarrels or slaughters might be taken away. *Fifthly*: that [it] might be a figure [type] of penance [repentance].

Question III. How, and against whom, did the asylum-cities protect a refugee?

When someone had killed another [while] unknowing, imprudent, and involuntary, [it] was necessary for this [killer], if he wished to preserve his [own] life, to betake himself to [his] feet [flee], and straightway to flee to one of those cities; because, by divine permission, [it] was lawful for the kinsmen of him who had been slain to kill [the one] who had committed the slaughter — wherever they might find him, whether in cities, or in fields, roads, and mountains, outside these asylum-cities. So Num. 35:26: "If the slayer (the involuntary [one], of whom [there] is discourse there) be found outside the bounds of the cities which are assigned to the exiles, and be killed by him who is the avenger of blood, he who kills him shall be without blame." But in those words [it] can be asked: "Is he to be reckoned outside the bounds of those cities, who shall have been outside their walls [moenia]?" or [is it] rather the pomoerium [precinct], and the whole domain of the city — or, as we commonly say, the whole territory enclosed within the city's boundary? And from the context [it] is clear [that] the "bounds and limit" are called the "walls." And so also [in] Deut. 19:5 & 6. Now then. *Secondly*: when the slayer had approached one of those cities, he had to stop at the more frequented gate of the city, where, among the ancient Israelites, was the tribunal and session of the Judges; and there [he had] to narrate the circumstance of the slaughter committed, and to show his innocence; and so he was received into that city. And there he was free and exempt [safe] for the time, until his case should be more carefully examined — his accusers [being] heard, and his own defense [being] weighed. For this one [thing] had to be clearly ascertained: whether in that homicide he had truly been unknowing, imprudent, involuntary, and innocent; or whether he said this falsely, [and] brought [it] forward for his own defense. But Oleaster seems to have hallucinated [erred] (ch. 35), when he says (p. 85b): "I would think [that] the case [was] stated before this [man] went to the city of refuge." For how could he quickly take [to] flight, and escape the anger of the avenger? — to which [view] the text, too, clearly enough protests. But [there] is a question: where did this more careful examination take place? Whether in the same city of refuge, or in another? Two opinions. The former, of Masius and Montanus, [holds] that it took place in the same city of refuge. *First*: because [in] Deut. 19:11 & 12, if anyone were a guilty and deliberate striker, he was demanded back, from the Asylum-city, by the senate [council] of that city in which the slaughter was committed. Therefore he must have been judged in the asylum-city, and found [to be] such [guilty]. *Secondly*: the cities of refuge were the same [as the cities] of the Levites, as will be clear [in] the following chapter. And this seems to have been done for this reason — that capital judgments might be made with greater scrupulousness and justice. The latter opinion is [that] of the Rabbis, in the Talmudic tractate "On Striking" [Makkoth] ch. 2, and of the Christians agreeing with these — Lyra and Abulensis, before [at] q. 15 — [namely] that the more careful examination took place in that city where the lethal blow [was] inflicted; because [in] Num. 35:25 [it] is said: "After the examination of the whole case, the innocent [one] shall be freed from the hand of the avenger, and [he] is led back, by sentence, into the city into which he had fled." He seems, therefore, to have been led to the tribunal of another city, and there accused [and] excused; and at last, his innocence [being] ascertained, [to have been] wholly absolved, and led back into the safe station of refuge. Each opinion is probable, but in the former [there is] greater probability. *First*: because [it] would have been very troublesome to lead a man, whose innocence [was] to be examined, out from one city into another, and from this [one] back into that same [first one]. *Secondly*: [it] would also have been dangerous for the innocent [man], since — although he [were] hedged about and guarded by attendants — ambushes could have been laid for him by the relatives of the slain [man], and so the wretched [man] be killed. *Thirdly*: because this would have been to distrust the

wisdom, justice, and virtue of those who presided over the judgments in the city of refuge — which [would be] both grievous to them, and little consonant with the Jewish institutions, especially since those [judges] were all from the Levites, as [was] indicated above. *Fourthly*: because that [passage] about the leading-back into the city of refuge (Num. 35) is very conveniently explained [as being] about a leading-back not from any other city, but from the place of judgment — from the city gate, where (as I said) the judgments were exercised. For so also, in everyday speech, we say [that] "the accused are led back into custody," when [from]

(col. 1211)

[…continued from col. 1210.] when, from the tribunal and the benches of the Judges — which are otherwise in the same city — [they] are led back again into prison. *Fifthly*: because the passage [in] Deut. 19, to prove [that] the one who is condemned of voluntary slaughter was condemned in the city of refuge, is much clearer than that [passage in] Num. 35, [which serves] to prove [the examination to be] in another city. For this [latter] has the single word "of returning" or "of coming back," and that, moreover, has [been] already expounded. But that [former passage, Deut. 19] says [that the guilty man] is sent into the city of refuge, [to be fetched] by the elders of the other city, who demand back the source [the fugitive]; and [that] he is received by these [elders], and given into the hands of the accusers and avengers, that he may be punished. Nor can this passage be otherwise expounded. *Sixthly*: because here (v. 9) [they] are called in Hebrew the cities "hammohedah" — that is, as the old Latins speak, "cities of assembly, cities of judgment." And in reference to this, [they] are called by our interpreter "appointed cities"; by the 70, "αἱ πόλεις αἱ ἐπίκλητοι [hai poleis hai epikl■toi]" ["the convoked cities"]. *Seventhly*: finally, because [in] Num. 35, in the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin text, [it] is sufficiently signified [that] he who had fled to some urban asylum ought to be judged there, as quickly as possible, and indeed by that careful judgment, so that [he] be either condemned of the guilt or absolved. For since [the discourse] there is about the cities of refuge, and [since they] are closed to every voluntary striker, [the case] about the involuntary [one] is immediately subjoined (v. 23 & 24): "But if by chance, without hatred and enmities, he shall have done any of these [things], and this shall have been proved in the hearing of the people, and the question [shall have been] ventilated [debated] between the striker and the kinsman of the blood, the innocent [one] shall be freed from the hand of the avenger, and [he] shall be led back (from the place of judgment), by the sentence of the judge, into the city into which he had fled." And hence [it] is clear [that] refugees of this kind were safe in those cities — first, indeed, against the kinsmen of the slain man, and the angry avengers; then, against the judges of the other cities also.

Question IV. How long did the same cities of refuge protect a refugee?

The time [is] to be distinguished. For, before the careful examination of the case, all who had not been openly and manifestly voluntary [deliberate] homicides, and who had in some way proved their innocence to the city of refuge, [the city] received — and [those] received [it] protected — until the whole case should be more diligently and fully adjudicated. But in this adjudication the refugee himself was pronounced either guilty or innocent. If "guilty," he was owed [handed over] for punishment to that city to which the slaughter pertained, as [was] said in the previous question, from Deut. 19:11 & 12. If "innocent," he was indeed absolved; but nevertheless [he] could not yet return to his former city and his own home — because, although [a verdict] had now been pronounced concerning his innocence, nevertheless, by divine concession, up to a certain time (which was defined [to last] up to the death of the high priest), he could still be killed by the kindred of the man whom he had slain by chance, wherever at last he might be caught, outside the city of refuge. For after such a refugee's absolution, and the sentence passed concerning his innocence, [he] is not dismissed from the city of refuge, but [rather] is led back into it from the tribunals, and there [he] is commanded to remain until the death of the high priest (Num. 35:25). And straightway [it] is added (v. 26, 27, 28): "If the slayer be found outside the bounds of the cities which are assigned to the exiles, and be killed

by him who is the avenger of blood, he who kills him shall be without blame. For the fugitive ought to have resided in the city until the death of the high priest. But after he is dead, the manslayer shall return into his own land." For then [after the high priest's death] [it] was in no way permitted to the kinsmen of the slain man to kill that slayer, whom the death of the high priest had freed from the city of refuge and from exile. But in two ways can the death of the high priest — as [that] of any other [person] too — be considered: namely, in respect of the agent and of the patient [the one acting and the one acted upon]. (In the former way [it] seems to be initiated, in the latter to be finished.) But just as, in natural [things], from the end of motion and change [it] is established what each thing is, and of what sort, or how great, or where [it is], so in moral [things], from the outcome of actions [it] is decided of what kind each thing is to be reckoned — as is clear in striking [percussio], which, if it brings death, is reckoned "homicide"; but if otherwise, only "a beating" or "a wounding," as the jurisprudents note in the explanation of the Aquilian law. Therefore the death of the high priest is to be regarded in respect of him who died; and from this [it] comes about, that if someone had killed that [high priest] by chance, he [the killer] could return from exile not by his [that high priest's] death, but by [that] of the following high priest — because the end [outcome] of that [first] death pertains already to the following Pontificate, which (in the old testament) came to someone immediately, not (as among us) by election and votes, but by hereditary right; so that, by reason of this right [of succession], there was never any lack of a high priest, [and] the seat was never vacant — even if some [interval] of time flowed between for his consecration and anointing. Let Tostatus be seen, q. 17 & 18 here, and Num. ch. 20. But why, after the manslayer's innocence [was] ascertained and acquitted, he still had to be an exile — the cause is laid upon the hardness of the Jews. For since [they] were of a stubborn mind, and very eager for vengeance, and therefore [were] greatly goaded by the death of their [kinsmen], God indulged them in this: that for some time the manslayer — even [though] innocent — should be separated and away from their eyes. Tostatus, q. 15 & 23.

Question V. Why did the death of the high priest free the exiles from the cities of refuge, and from [their] exiles [banishments]?

Both the Rabbis of the Jews and the masters [teachers] of the Christians bring forward various causes. For, *first*, R. Omer says [that] the high priest is the minister, celebrator, and propagator of the divine glory; but [that] the manslayer obstructs and obscures that same divine glory; and therefore [that] not until the high priest [is] taken away can he [the manslayer] return into [his] fatherland. *Secondly*: R. Mair says [that] the high priest, by his prayers and sacrifices, procures life and safety for the whole people; but [that] this same [life and safety] is attacked and diminished by homicides; therefore, while he [the high priest] survives, the return to their own hearths is cut off for them [the manslayers]. *Thirdly*: Rashi and the Talmudists (tractate "On Striking" [Makkoth] ch. 2) [hold] that the high priest's office was placed in this — that he should always propitiate the heavenly Deity, and avert all sad mishaps from the Israelites. [They say] therefore [that] not even a fortuitous homicide ought to have happened, if he [the high priest] had been diligent in his office. Rightly, therefore, [is] the fault expiated by his death,

(col. 1213)

[…continued from col. 1212.] which [fault] had been committed by his negligence. *Fourthly*: R. Isaac Aeramaeus thinks (in the book *On the Binding of Isaac*) [that], since the cities of refuge were Levitical, all [of them] were subject to the high priest; and therefore [that] those who dwelt in them, [being] subject to that same high priest, served [him] in a manner. And [it was] punishment enough paid by the innocent exiles, if [they] had served one high priest; but [they] ought not [to have] served a second [one] also. *Fifthly*: Rambam (bk. 3 of the *Moreh Nebuchim* [Guide for the Perplexed], ch. 40) says [it] was fitting that, since the high priest's death affected all Israel with the deepest mourning, [people] would cease to mourn any slain [person] whatsoever — and therefore [that] any others whatever [would cease] to pursue his slaughter with vengeance. For just as a lesser light is obscured by a greater, so too lesser [sorrows] are darkened by greater

shadows of sadness, and nearly done away. But because the words of this Rabbi beautifully demonstrate the authority of the high priest among those ancient Israelites, I will transcribe them. "The cause," he says, "why he who committed homicide unknowingly and by error [must] go into exile, is, that the mind of him who prepares to avenge the blood may be pacified, in the meantime, while [he] does not see the one who committed the slaughter, [being] removed from [his] sight. But the return of that exile into [his] fatherland depends on the death of that man who excels all the rest in dignity, and is loved most highly by all the Israelites; and therefore [it] is fitting that, by his sorrowful death, all the grief be assuaged which the kinsman-avenger of the blood had drawn [imbibed] from the slaughter of his own kinsman. For such is the condition of men, that he who is affected by some bitterer evil, if he sees [that] either an equal, or even a greater, [evil] has befallen another, [then] begins now to grieve less over his own." *Sixthly*: [it] pleases some [to say] that this is given to the favor [grace] of the new high priest, who succeeds the dead [one] — that, just as [he] approaches anew to propitiate God for men, so also [he] should in fact confer a new benefit and salvation on the men who need them, and who seem the more worthy of them. *Seventhly*: Oleaster, on ch. 25 of Num. (p. 84): "The high priest, as God's vicar, played the part of divine justice, by which God demands vengeance from men. And when he died, the adverse party seemed extinguished, which sought retribution on God's behalf; and therefore then [the exile] was wholly absolved." *Eighthly*: the same [Oleaster] afterward (p. 85): "The Lord wished to show how greatly a priest ought to abhor homicides — even involuntary [ones]." *Ninthly*: similarly, "how [greatly] a perpetrated homicide pollutes a man — so that [he] can by no means be where the Lord's Priest is." Thus Oleaster. *Tenthly*: Masius thinks [that], in this whole matter, this was aimed at — that the Jews might be deterred from homicide as much as possible; and that therefore the manslayer — although imprudent and involuntary — had, as [one] polluted with human blood, to be contained within the lurking-places of the asylums, and to be kept off (like an expiation [piaculum]) from the assembly of men, at least for so long as he survived — [the high priest] whom (as the chief Interpreter of God on earth, and in a manner shadowing-forth the person of his divine Majesty, and altogether the "ἀρχηγὸν [arch■gon]" [author] and chief of all religion, piety, [and] holiness, and ever maintaining the stability of the Commonwealth by the sublime throne of his office) that [manslayer], by the savagery of that deed of his, most gravely of all offended.

These [things] are said, and not altogether incongruously — although some [explanations] are more fitting to some [persons]. Yet the true and proper [cause], and the chief of all, seems to me [to be] this: that the lurking-place and exile of those manslayers was prolonged up to the death of the high priest, and [that] by that very [death] all straightway returned into [their] fatherland — in order that that true liberty might be signified which was won for us through the death of JESUS CHRIST. For he [Christ] is the true high priest (Hebrews 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, & 10); and by those manslayers are signified sinners of every kind. For these, before his death, no access into the heavenly fatherland — from which, cast out in Adam, we all were exiles — lay open; and after his death, immediately — [Christ] himself going before — [it is permitted] to all to migrate back thither, whoever betake themselves to the cities of refuge; [to all,] I say, who receive themselves [take refuge] into the Catholic Church of CHRIST, which contains many particular churches in every region of the globe; [those] who commit themselves to the power and patronage of CHRIST, of the Levites, and of the Priests; [who] do not depart from them; [who] do not despise their right and protection; [who] nowhere wander outside their enclosures and walls. To all these — whether [they] were in limbo, or in purgatory, or on earth, when CHRIST, the Lord our high priest, was dying; or [whether they] were to be [born] afterward, in all the ages — true liberty, a return into the heavenly dwelling, and eternal salvation [was] given. And because the same high priest henceforth always remains, and never dies any more, and receives no successor (although he has a vicar on earth), [then] from no other [source] can or ought a liberation from the penalties of our sins, a restitution into the most blessed houses of heaven, [and] eternal security, be expected. Masius calls this interpretation "anagogic"; Tostatus (q. 23), partly "literal," partly "allegorical." "Nor, however," he says, "would one deviate much, if [one] should utterly affirm it [to be] literal." Nay, [one] would not deviate

at all, but would rather have kept to the most correct way of expounding, who affirmed [it] utterly literal. For in those [things] which are signs of some [other] things, either the whole account [reason] is wont to be sought from the mere will of him who instituted those signs, or from the similitude and analogy of the things signified. But in signs divinely instituted — because God does nothing rashly and inconsiderately — some analogical reason of this kind always presents itself; and [that reason], while [it] can be found and discerned, is deservedly called "literal and primary." For, for example, why the bones of the paschal lamb ought not to be broken — what other proper and literal reason [is there], than that signification [fulfilled] in CHRIST the Lord, brought forth by St. John (ch. 19:36): "A bone of him you shall not break"? Now, *secondly*: in none of the other causes can the mind rest; but this [one] so explains the question, that nothing which could rightly be objected is present, [and] nothing, which might besides be asked, remains over. *Thirdly*: unless this typical significance had been chiefly regarded, that law concerning the exile and the return [postliminium] of manslayers would seem little just; because, for an equal innocence or [an equal] guilt, [there] would not be an equal punishment or preservation. For if two [men] had committed an equal slaughter unawares — one 20 years before, the other today — and tomorrow or the day after the high priest should die, [then] for both the return into [their] fatherland will be free equally quickly; and that [first] one would have been punished with an exile of 20 years, but this [second] one — in the same case — [with] only a one-day or two-day [exile]. And what [kind of] equity [is] that? *Fourthly*: the law would also have been dangerous — and indeed deadly to the high priest himself; but to others, enticing to evil. For [some] would have wished [for] the high priest's death, and perhaps some would have contrived [plotted] [it], that they might as quickly as possible be done with their [own] ostracism [banishment], and return to their own [people]. For, for this very cause, we see [it] forbidden by canon law, lest "expectatives" [expectancies] of a certain Ecclesiastical benefice

(col. 1215)

[…continued from col. 1214.] there be an expectancy [of such a benefice]; and greed sometimes invites [men] to parricides, and to feigned tears over inheritances. But these [things] could either be done or tolerated on account of the sacred Type of greater moment, and its signification — but not on account of any other cause of lesser moment. *Fifthly*: since St. Ambrose (in the book *On the Flight of the World* [De fuga saeculi], ch. 2), in imitation of Philo (in the book *On fugitives* [De profugis]), had set down four questions concerning these cities of refuge — and indeed this [one], which is [now] treated, in the last place — he answers it thus: "A fourth [question] remains, as [Scripture] says: 'because up to that time that manslayer will be in the city of refuge, until the high priest die.' In which [matter], according to the letter, the interpretation sticks [is at a loss]. First, the flight itself [is] perhaps defined more by chance than by the equity of any examination; then, in equal cases, [there is] an unequal outcome. For it could happen that, after that manslayer's flight, the high priest might die the next day. But what [certain] opinion [can there be] under [such] uncertainty? Therefore, because the letter sticks, let us seek the spiritual [senses]. Who is that high priest, except the Son of God, the Word of God — whose advocacy for us we have with the Father, [and] who is without share [free] of all voluntary and accidental offenses?" But Philo, in the cited place, says thus: "This is our opinion: [that] this high priest is not a man, but the Word of God — which is free [exempt] from all sins, not only voluntary [ones], but also involuntary [ones]. For Moses denies that this [Word] — whether [considered] through the Father [as] intellect, or through the mother [as] the faculty of perceiving — is contaminated: for this reason, as I think, because [it] obtained immortal and most-pure parents: [its] Father, God, who is the Father of all things; but [its] Mother, Wisdom, through whom whatever is — [though] it was not before — came forth into light; and therefore its head is anointed with oil: [its] princedom [headship], I say, shines round about with a splendid light, so that [it] is deservedly thought [to be] clad with garments. For [that is] the most ancient [garment] of it. Which [Word] is clothed with the world as [with] a garment; for [it] is clothed with earth, water, air, fire, and the rest which have [their] origin from these." And not much after: "It is not foreign to natural law [right], [that] the death of the high priest [is] prescribed [as] the term of exile for the fugitives. For as long as this most holy living Word survives in the soul, [it] is not possible for it [the

soul] to be turned, of its own accord, to the worse. For [it] is free from all sin, and by its own nature shrinks from it. But if [it] should die — not that it [itself] perishes, but [that it] is disjoined from our soul — immediately a return is given to the involuntary sins. For if, while it [was] present, [the sins] were in exile in us, [then] after its departure [they] will altogether return. For this surpassing honor is shown by nature to the unpolluted high priest — that, while he is present, the error of the mind has no place. Therefore [it] is to be sought with all [our] prayers, that the high priest may live in the soul — [who is] at once judge and reprover, who, before the tribunal of the mind, is impartial toward the persons of the accused." *Sixthly*: to this [typical interpretation] especially calls us [the fact] that, [in] Num. 35:25, to the death of this high priest is added: "whom God — or at least someone — anointed with holy oil." For although this could be said in order to signify the death of a high priest — [one] who was high priest not merely by right and inheritance, but who, besides, having been inaugurated and anointed with sacred ceremonies, had received the perfection of the Pontifical power — nevertheless this very [phrase] seems clearly to introduce a mention of the mercy and gentleness by which the exiles will be freed, and to signify him whom "God anointed above his fellows" (Ps. 44:8), and who, from [his] most-holy anointing, obtained the sacred name of "Christ" [the Anointed]; whom I pray [that] he may, from the unhappy exile of either this world or of purgatory, bring me back to the fatherland, the soil of eternal felicity, as swiftly as possible. AMEN.

Question VI. How many cities of refuge, and of what kind?

Six cities of asylum are named in this ch. 20. But if at some time the borders of the Israelites should be extended farther, many think — as [is] indicated [at] Num. 35, before q. 7, in q. 8 & 11, [and by] Tostatus — that others were to be added to these, so that all [together] should be nine; because [in] Deut. 19:8 [it] is written: "But when the Lord thy God shall have enlarged thy borders, as he swore to thy fathers, and shall have given thee all the land which he promised them (yet [only] if thou keep his commandments, and do [the things] which I command thee this day, that thou love the Lord thy God, and walk in his way at all times) thou shalt add to thyself three other cities, and shalt double the number of the three aforesaid cities, that innocent blood may not be shed in the midst of the land which the Lord thy God will give thee to possess, lest thou be guilty of blood." But others deny any such addition of other cities. *First*: because [it] is nowhere read [to have been] done. *Secondly*: because the borders of the Israelites were never so enlarged that they dwelt, tribe by tribe, outside the trans- and cis-Jordanian region divided and given by Moses and Joshua, as [was] said [at] ch. 1, q. 9. *Thirdly*: because the cited passage of Deuteronomy does not compel us to [think] three cities [were] to be added. For Moses was speaking beyond the Jordan; and [he said] that in Canaan, when the Jordan should have been crossed, three cities of refuge [were] to be appointed (same ch. 19:2). But afterward he commanded [that] three others [were] to be added to these three, when the Lord should have enlarged the borders for the Israelites — that is, when [they] should hold not only those parts in which [they] were then dwelling beyond the Jordan, but [when], the Jordan [being] crossed, [they] should also have occupied the kingdoms of Canaan, and in that manner enlarged their borders. And that exposition is confirmed, because in that same place [there] is a little sum [subtotal] of those cities, and — [even] where the borders should also have been extended — only six cities are numbered. "Thou shalt add," he says, "these other cities, and shalt double the number of the three aforesaid cities" — so that, to the three cities of refuge in Canaan, three others are commanded to be added; and this is here mentioned for this reason, because Moses had already treated of these three on the other side of the Jordan (Deut. ch. 4:41); now he treats of three others, and [so] indicates all [of them] together, finally, [as] six. "It is not," says Abulensis in the cited question, "difficult to say [that] all the cities of refuge were only six — unless the common opinion were to the contrary, which is reasonable enough." Rambam (vol. 4, tractate *On Kings & Wars*, ch. 11) seriously affirms [that] three other [cities] were never added to these six. "[It was] never done," he says; "nor did the blessed God command anything in vain." Yet he does not deny that in the Messiah's time more [were] to be added. Perhaps this little disagreement could be briefly settled thus: [that] the cities of refuge were never

more than six — as this 20th chapter, and Num. 35, explains — yet [that they] would have been nine, if [the Israelites] had most perfectly obtained the whole land owed to them, and had not, by sinning, straitened their [own] estates for themselves, as [was] expounded [at] q. 9, ch. 1. For therefore, [in] Deut. ch. 19:8, [the condition] seems [to be] so seriously added: "yet [only] if thou keep the commandments," and the rest. And truly, if [they] could have obtained and inhabited the whole of that land divinely promised to them, by fullest right, why there [would] those of them who, besides

(col. 1217)

[…continued from col. 1216.] besides [their] intention and will, had shed some blood — why would [their] innocence and safety have been neglected and despised? Why would [there] have existed no asylums described and fixed [there], as in the other occupied parts of the land? Those, therefore, who reckon nine cities of refuge say what *could* have been; but those [who reckon] only six, what *was*. And so [does] Scripture [testify], and so St. Ambrose (ch. 2 *On the Flight of the World*): "Not idly does the number of six cities seem [to be] prescribed here — neither of more, nor of fewer." (But how Arias gives 48 asylums to the Israelites will be said [in] the following chapter.)

2. But of these six cities, three, as I said, were beyond the Jordan, and three others on this side [cis]:

| Side of the Jordan | # | City | Tribe | |---|---|---|---| | On this side [cis] (v. 7) | 1 | Cedes | Nephtali | | | 2 | Sichem | Ephraim | | | 3 | Hebron | Juda | | Beyond [trans] (v. 8) | 1 | Bosor | Ruben | | | 2 | Ramoth | Galaad | | | 3 | Gaulon | Manasseh |

(Of *Sichem*: whether this [is], with Jerome & Eusebius, twofold [two distinct places]; or whether, with Masius — here Toletus, ch. 4 — or with John [the Evangelist], [it] is one and the same, was said in [commenting on] Genesis. Of *Bosor*: [it] alone [was] in a flat, but open and conspicuous, place.)

3. All [were] distant by an equal space (Deut. 19:3 & 7). I said "all," so that not only the Cisjordanian [cities] [should be compared] among themselves, but [should] also be compared with the Transjordanian [ones] — so that [it] might be permitted, for those who had by chance slain someone on this side [of] the Jordan, to flee to the neighboring Transjordanian [city]. And thence that question is resolved: why in the Cisjordanian dominion — which, because [it] was larger than the Transjordanian, [one might expect to have more] — [there were] not more cities decreed for refuge than in the Transjordanian, as Tostatus rightly admonishes in the cited question; and so three equal thirds of the Cisjordanian land were reckoned, in which [there] were three asylums (Deut. ch. 19:2); [and] what was left over pertained to the Transjordanian [side]. *4.* Almost all those cities were on mountains, so that [they] might be seen from afar, and — like lighthouses [Pharoses] — seem both to invite to themselves the fleeing involuntary manslayers, and (lest [the fugitives] should go astray, or — by asking about the way — betray or hand over themselves) [seem] to direct them. *5.* Roads too had to be prepared and conveniently paved to them, lest [there] be anything which might obstruct their flight and safety (Deut. 19:3). Nay, [they] even say — Oleaster (Num. 35, p. 85) & the Rabbis — [that there] were, at the forks and crossroads, pillars [cippi] or posts, on which [there] was written "Miklot," that is, "refuge," so that the way to it might be shown. *6.* Finally, all those cities were Levitical — but of this afterward. *7.* Flight to these was granted not only to those who were Israelites by race and birth, but also to newcomers [advenae] and foreigners [peregrini] (Num. 35:15). Some think the "newcomers" are those who had been converted to Judaism, [and] the "foreigners," those not converted; but that is not probable. *First*: because God, among the Jews, when they possessed [the land], was unwilling [that] Gentiles be tolerated, unless perhaps they should serve [in] servitude. How, then, would he establish a law concerning [persons] of this kind — who had not embraced Judaism — and endow them with a privilege? *Secondly*: the Hebrew words "Ger" & "thoschab" can be distinguished otherwise — so that each [word] signifies him who had come over from a foreign nation to the Israelitic religion, but "ger" [signifies] him who had come over now for the first time, or at least not so long ago; while "Thoschab" [signifies] him who had come over long ago, and [had]

now dwelt for a long time among the Israelites, as Radak explains. And so are to be taken the Greek words of the 70: "ὁ προσήλυτος, καὶ ὁ πάροικος [ho pros■lytos, kai ho paroikos]" ["the proselyte, and the resident-alien"]. And this same [thing] is signified here (v. 9), when the word "ger" alone is put, which [word] alone generically denotes a foreigner and newcomer — whether he [arrived] just now, or arrived long ago. (See ch. 15 of the book *On Herod*.) But [there] is added, "who sojourns, or who dwells among you": in the 70, "ὁ προσήλυτος, ὁ προσκείμενος ἐν αὐτοῖς [ho pros■lytos, ho proskeimenos en autois]" ["the proselyte, the one adjoined among them"]. The Rabbis, in Oleaster at the cited place, add other [things] — but little certain, and perhaps fabricated: namely, that those [cities] ought to be populous; [that] the manslayer had to be set to some craft, whereby he might be nourished; and then, if he were a student of the law, [that] he ought not to be deserted by his Rabbi or Master and Teacher; [and] if he himself were a Rabbi, [that] the whole school ought to come there with him; but [that], on the road, [there were] always two or three wise [men] joined to the fleeing manslayer as companions of the way; [and that] the mothers of the high priests sent gifts to exiles of this kind, lest they [the exiles], by their own prayers, hasten the death of those high priests. But let us leave these pleasant [tales] to the Rabbis themselves — [such] as [the claim] that [it] was not permitted, in these cities, to make or sell any weapons, ropes, or nets.

Question VII. Whether the City of the Sanctuary, or the Sanctuary itself, was an Asylum?

That [it] was not, Tostatus affirms here (q. 6 & 7), and [on] Num. 35 (q. 11). But Covarruvias thinks otherwise (ch. 20, conclusion 2, bk. 2 of the *Variae Resolutiones*), [and] Gregorius Tholosanus (bk. 3 *On the Commonwealth*, ch. 22). But in few [words], the matter seems [to be] thus to be determined. *First*: nowhere [is it] expressly written, that for anyone [there] is refuge at the city of the sanctuary, or [at] the sanctuary and altar. *Secondly*: [that] the city of the sanctuary was a refuge for anyone, cannot be gathered even from the Scriptures. *Thirdly*: [that] at the altar itself [there] was a refuge, can be gathered from the Scriptures. *First*: because [in] Exod. 21:14 [it] is written: "If any man kill his neighbor on set purpose, and by lying in wait, thou shalt take him away from my altar, that he may die." But if [there] had been no refuge for anyone at the altar, why would the guilty manslayer be commanded to be taken away from it? Why would [the law] provide [guard] rather concerning the guilty [one] than the innocent, since this [guilty one] too could be killed outside the place of refuge? Or, if an innocent manslayer had betaken himself to the altar, and held onto it, could he be led away and dragged from it? That exception concerning liers-in-wait and others guilty of voluntary homicide seems, indeed,

(col. 1219)

[…continued from col. 1218.] [to show] that for others [there] was some refuge there [at the altar]. *Secondly*: Joab fled into the tabernacle of the Lord, and took hold of the horn of the altar (1 Kings 2:28). And this he seems to have done because it was customary. And when Banaias had been commanded by King Solomon to kill him, this [Banaias] did not dare to do [his] will in that place — for the same cause, as [it] seems (v. 30). But because that [Joab] was a voluntary [deliberate] homicide, and a wicked lier-in-wait, the asylum could not profit him, by the Lord's already-cited law (Exod. 21). For Solomon said (v. 31): "Kill him, and bury him, and thou shalt remove the innocent blood which has been shed by Joab, from me and from the house of my father. And the Lord shall return his blood upon his [own] head: because he slew two just men, better than himself, and killed them with the sword, my father David not knowing [it]." Banaias therefore went up (v. 34), and, falling upon him, killed him. *Thirdly*: that some were formerly accustomed to flee to the same [altar] is shown, in Abulensis (ch. 3 of Joshua, q. 16), [by] R. Salomon [Rashi], when he says [that] "even priests liable to death could be torn away from the horns of the Lord's altar, and killed." *Fourthly*: Demetrius the King, in order to join to himself the goodwill of the Jews, says (1 Macc. ch. 10): "Whosoever shall flee into the temple which is at Jerusalem, and into all its borders — [being] liable to the King in any matter — let

them be released." Why does a foreign-born King grant and enlarge this privilege for the Israelites, unless because he knew [that] this was of ancient custom among them, and that this same [thing] was most desired by them? *Fifthly*: since the Gentiles held this honor for the altars of [their] vain Gods (as will be said below), who would think [that] the Lord wished [there] to be less of honor and privilege for his [own] altar? Nay, from these [things it] seems [that], not only in [cases of] slaughter, but also in the crimes of other misdeeds, some asylum-right at the Lord's altar was received by custom and use. Which, however, let the Reader accept or reject at his own discretion.

Question VIII. Whether among Christians [there] are also any asylums? and which [are] they?

All [sacred places] among Christians are asylums. And among these, the chief place is held by the most-sacred Altars, and Churches dedicated [and] consecrated to the divine worship, in which the divine offices are performed — as is clear from nearly the whole title of the Decretals "On the immunities of Churches," especially the chapter "Cum Ecclesia," the chapter "Inter alia," from [Causa] 17, q. 4; from the 5th book of the Capitularies; from the Council of Mainz I (ch. 39), of Tribur (ch. 20), of Lerida (ch. 8), of Toledo XII — [all] cited in that question; from St. Chrysostom's oration against Eutropius (concerning whom [see] Suidas, and Nicephorus, bk. 13, ch. 14); [from] St. Augustine (epistle 187; bk. 1 of the *City [of God]*, chs. 1, 3, & 4); from the history of the Patriarch Tarasius; from Victor of Africa (bk. 2, *On the African Persecution*). Finally, from the Civil-law title "Concerning those who flee to the Church," especially the law "Pateant," bk. 1 of the Code, title 12. In the next place are Churches dedicated indeed to divine worship, and in which the divine mysteries are now performed, but not yet consecrated ([Decretals] ch. "Ecclesia," On the immunity of Churches). Some of the experts in Canon law add a Church which [is] dedicated to divine worship, and built by the bishop's assent, but as yet neither consecrated, nor initiated by any performance of the divine Mysteries. In the fourth place are the "cemeteries": and [these] were formerly spaces marked out around the mother [parish] Church to [a distance of] 40 paces (ch. "Sicut antiquitus," [Causa] 17, q. 4). In the fifth place, the Archdeacon and others add, in the Canon ("Definiunt," same q. 4), the "hospitals" [hospices] which were erected by the bishop's authority. Sixthly, the same Archdeacon (in ch. "Quaesitum," [Causa] 13, q. 2) thinks [that] the "most-sacred Eucharist," when [it] is carried by a priest — whether to a sick [person], or in some procession — grants asylum and immunity even to him who flees to it outside the Church. "If the altar was an asylum," says Gregorius Tholosanus (bk. 33 of the *Syntagma*, ch. 21), "much more will [it] also be [one] of the Lord's body. For from it the altar is sanctified; and [that] which sanctifies [is] greater and worthier than [that] which has been made holy." And among the Ethnics [pagans], if anyone were led [away] to be flogged, and he had fallen down as a suppliant at the feet of the Flamen Dialis [Jupiter's priest], [then] on that day [it] was a sin to flog [him], as Gellius writes (bk. 10, ch. 15). And moreover, if anyone were led to death, and a Vestal virgin chanced to meet him, he escaped the punishment. Seventhly, the "Monasteries" [Coenobia], all religious [houses] and Ecclesiastical [ones] — but especially, in some places, the houses of the Metropolitans, or of the Cathedral Canons. But just as, in the first of those asylums, the opinion of all is concordant, so in the others [there] is dissent and some dispute — which, lest I be carried outside the choir [off-topic], I gladly pass over. Let [these] be seen in the cited places [of] Gregorius & Covarruvias; and likewise Anastasius Germonius (bk. 1 *On the immunities of sacred [places]*, ch. 15; bk. 3, ch. 16; & elsewhere).

Question IX. What [is] the difference between the asylums of the Old Testament and of the New?

Between the asylums of the Old and the New Testament, [there] occurs chiefly a fourfold difference. *First*: [there] are more among the Christians than [there] were among the Jews. For how many temples [are there],

to omit the rest, in one somewhat larger city? How many in the villages, citadels, and farmsteads of some little domain? *Second*: refuge is [available] for more misdeeds at the Churches of CHRIST than at the ancient cities of refuge. For to these [cities] [it] was permitted to flee only in the one case of homicide — and [that] involuntary; but to those [Churches, one may flee] in almost every crime and danger. I say "almost," because the [Decretal] ch. "Inter alia" (in the *Liber Extra*, On the immunity of Churches) denies immunity and security, in the asylums of the temples, to nocturnal ravagers of fields, to public robbers, and to waylayers of roads. And by the same loss and detriment of [the right of] asylum are affected [deprived] the ravishers of virgins, traitors, the sacrilegious, blasphemers, heretics, apostates, Jews, and as many as offend in the asylums themselves — as the before-cited Interpreters of law explain at greater length, especially Covarruvias. *Third*: the Christian immunity avails for more [purposes] than the Jewish [one]. For that [Jewish immunity] protected refugees only against the avengers and pursuers of blood — but not against the judges. But the Christian [immunity protects] even against these [judges] — so that these [judges] cannot drag away from the asylum those who have betaken themselves to it, and snatch [them] off to the tribunal and the hearing of the case.

(col. 1221)

[…continued from col. 1220.] *Fourth*: the refuge and immunity of the Old Testament was granted and prescribed by God himself; but the Christian [one] [was granted] by men only — but [men] endowed with authority, whether Ecclesiastical or political, such as Pontiffs, Emperors, and Kings — as Covarruvias rightly proves in the cited place, and Abulensis here (q. 7), where he censures those Jurisconsults who, from the [fact] that in the Old Testament [it] was commanded by God, think [that] by the same [God it] was commanded in the New [Testament] likewise. For truly, through CHRIST our Lord and Savior, all the laws of the Old Testament [were] abrogated — [all] which nature itself did not implant and fix in the minds of men (of which kind the moral [laws] in the Decalogue are). But the others, which pertained to ceremonies and to judgments [judicial laws], [were] all abolished (Acts 15; Rom. 3; Gal. 2, 3, 4, 5); nor do [they] now have any force, except [such] as the Christian Magistrates may perhaps have given to them, for some certain usefulness and cause, by their [own] right and authority.

Question X. Whether among the Israelites, and [among] Christians, asylums of this kind [were] rightly instituted?

If we look either, in the Old Testament, to God, who instituted those [asylums], or, in the New, to the wisdom and authority of those who decreed the same, [then] beyond all doubt [it] will be [certain that] all [were] most rightly instituted. But what is asked is chiefly this: whether [there] are any reasons on account of which some not-imprudent [person] may judge these [to have been] rightly done. But these are found [to be] twofold: for some [are], as it were, *general*, [and] others [are] *particular*.

Of the former kind is [this], that in this way great honor seems to be paid to the Deity [Numen]. *First*: because his supreme majesty is shown, in that his places and houses are held so most-sacred, that — even if a detriment has been brought upon men, and [even if] either private or public good demands punishments — nevertheless, out of reverence for him, [if] anyone who has taken refuge be in them, no one dares to drag him out thence, [or] to violate or touch [him] there. *Secondly*: his mercy and kindness are proclaimed, in that he so embraces those who have betaken themselves to him, [and] have given themselves into his protection, that no one can harm them. *Thirdly*: the veneration owed to him by us is signified, in that, for his sake, and on account of his name, we suffer [allow] to be safe and unharmed those whom [it] would otherwise be lawful to take out of the midst [to kill], and perhaps to slaughter with exquisite [refined] tortures. *Fourthly*: his glory and greatness are celebrated, in that, in his name, [there] is such reverence even for inanimate altars, buildings, and places, that those who have entrusted their safety to them [are] harmed by no one — although perhaps [there] were a just cause, and power [to do so] were not lacking. *Fifthly*: provision is made for the

innocence of many; a certain, as it were, bridle is cast upon the aroused anger and fury of certain [persons]; [and] time [is] granted — both to him who flees, for repentance, and to the others who pursue him, and demand [him] for death, for riper counsel and [for] moderation. *Sixthly*: a certain greater and more splendid opinion concerning divine things is procured for the multitude of men, when they see [that there] is so much of help and protection for wretched mortals in altars, temples, and religious buildings.

But the *particular* reasons seem to be these. *1.* [It] was permitted to the Jews, that the avengers could inflict death upon the manslayers anywhere, both before and after the judicial sentence concerning their innocence. [It was] fair, therefore, that some places be granted to them [the manslayers], in which [they] might at least be safe. *2.* Among the Christians [there] is no such permission, either before or after the Judges' sentence; nevertheless, so that the too-ardent spirit and too-furious anger of certain [persons] — while they pursue those whom they think wicked — may be restrained, and [so] that [there] may be a notable and public testimony of Christian gentleness and moderation, the asylums [were] well instituted. *3.* [It] would have disgraced the Israelites of old, and [it] disgraces the Christians, [that] more of honor be shown by the Gentiles to [their] most-false Gods — and sometimes to certain mortal Princes — than by those [Israelites and Christians] to the true and supreme God. But those [false] Gods of theirs, and even [mere] mannikins — certain princes — the Gentiles worshipped exceedingly with the immunity of asylums, as Agesilaus shows in Aemilius Probus [Cornelius Nepos] and in Xenophon; Euripides in the *Suppliants*; Virgil (Aeneid 1 & 6); Parthenius (ch. 9, "On Eros"). A witness concerning the "temple and altar of the Ephesian Diana" [is] Cicero against Verres, [and] Justin (bk. 28); Strabo (bk. 14), concerning "the temple of Venus"; Plautus, in the *Rudens* (act 3, sc. 3) & the *Mostellaria* (act 5, sc. 1), concerning the "altar of Mercy"; Pausanias (bk. 1, in the *Attica*); Theophilus, in the Paraphrase of the Institutes, §1 "On justice and law"; Statius, *Thebaid*, book 12:

> *"In the midst of the city [there] was an Altar of the Gods, granted to none of the powerful;*
>
> *[there] gentle Clemency placed [her] seat."*

Concerning the "temple of Thebes," Pausanias in the *Corinthiaca*; concerning "Minerva," the same [Pausanias] in the *Attica* & *Laconica*, and concerning "Pallas Chalcioecus" [Athena of the Bronze House] in the same place. And Diodorus (bk. 2), concerning "the [temple] of Apollo of Delos"; Livy (bk. 36), concerning "[that] of Jupiter"; Strabo (bk. 12), concerning "[that] of Hercules"; Herodotus (bk. 2), concerning "[that] of Neptune"; Pausanias in the *Achaica*. So also the standards [ensigns] of the camps were asylums. "[It was dangerous] especially for Plancus," says Tacitus (bk. 1), "whom [his] dignity had hindered from fleeing, nor [was there] any other refuge for [him in his] peril than the camp of the first legion. There, embracing the standards and the eagle, he guarded himself by [their] religion [sanctity]." So too "the house of the Flamen Dialis," in Gellius (bk. 10, ch. 15). So too "the statue of the Princes [Emperors]," in Philostratus, and [in] Ulpian from Labeo, in the law "What a fugitive is," [under] the aedilician edict, in the title of the Pandects "Concerning those who flee to the statues." Let Alexander ab Alexandro (bk. 3, ch. 20) be seen, with Tiraquellus. Indeed, St. Augustine writes [that] the glory of God, and of CHRIST, is thence greatly illustrated even among the Gentiles — because, by the barbarian Goths, when Rome [was] captured, [all] as many as had betaken themselves to the Christians' temples were [kept] safe and sound. "Romulus and Remus," he says (bk. 1 *On the City of God*, ch. 34), "are reported to have established an Asylum, to which whosoever fled would be free from all harm — [they] seeking to augment the multitude of the city [that was] to be created. A wonderful example, in honor of CHRIST, preceded [this]. The overthrowers of the city [the Goths] established this [same thing] which the founders had established before. But what [was it] great, if those [founders] did [this] so that the number of their [own] citizens might be supplied, [compared with] what these [Goths] did, so that the multitude of their [own] enemies might be preserved?" And (ch. 1): "The shrines of the Martyrs, and the basilicas of the Apostles, in that devastation of the city, received [both] their own and strangers [who] fled to them. Up to this [point] the bloody enemy raged; there the fury of the slayer received [its] limit; thither [refugees] were led by pitying enemies, who had spared [them] even outside those

places, lest they run into those [other enemies] who had not a like mercy. Who [enemies], however — [though] themselves savage elsewhere, and raging in hostile manner

(col. 1223)

[…Augustine's quote, continued from col. 1222:] after they came to those places where [it] had been forbidden [to do] what elsewhere the right of war would have allowed, [then] the whole license of striking was reined in, and the desire of taking captive was broken." And truly, [even] if [there] were no other usefulness, this one is surely most notable — [that], through the religion [sanctity] of asylums of this kind, in wars — if not altogether always, yet for the most part and very often — the enemies' sword-points are blunted; and [that] the right hands which revel [bacchanate] in slaughter and blood elsewhere, here grow mild, and, as [if] broken and weakened, languish. But [for more], if indeed [your] spirit so inclines — consult Azorius (bk. 8 of the *Moral Institutions*, ch. 9, part 2).

Question XI. Whether, against the Asylums of the Christians, Masius spoke prudently enough in this place?

Concerning the asylums of the Christians, Masius wrote thus in this place (p. 302), so that to some [he] seems to speak heretically. His words are: "Posterity — partly from desire of glory and proud arrogance, that [it] might amplify its own majesty; others, by an imprudent opinion of religion — established the right 'τῆς ἀσυλίας [t■s asylias]' [of inviolability] at statues, at any temples whatever, at the very cemeteries, at the Bishops [their persons], and I know not where else — [everywhere]. And those asylums, so numerous, would perhaps have some appearance of greater mercy, if [they] had been instituted for the sake of the safety of innocent men. But [the fact] that [they] protect men liable to any disgraceful act — nay, [men] covered over with all crimes — that certainly seems to me [to be] by far most unworthy, and more consonant with Romulus's institution than with these laws of God. But Innocent [III] excepts public robbers and nocturnal ravagers of fields; namely, so that no one else — however wicked — who has only fled to the asylums [that lie] everywhere at hand, can be given up to punishment. But though [he] has committed a grave and impious crime, [yet] let [him] have impunity in [his] body, at least. Too little clemently, forsooth, was [it] said by God: 'if anyone kills his neighbor on purpose, thou shalt tear him away from my altar, that he may die.' Better, indeed, in the Commonwealth — as [people] are now surely disposed — is the sanction [ordinance] of Justinian, [the] *Authentica* 'On the mandates of the Prince,' §. And [it is] not [too little clement] where [it] decrees [that] wicked homicides, adulterers, [and] ravishers of virgins [are] to be dragged from the asylums, and visited with punishments. For who would bear with an even mind [that] God himself be set up [as] the patron and defender of homicide — than which [he] detests no misdeed more? or [that] Princes, whose duty [it] was to restrain criminals with the penalties of death, be the harborers and protectors of criminals? Certainly the matter cries out, [that] those too-indulgent lawgivers, while [they] aimed at the praise of clemency from the impunity of crimes, have exposed all the best and most innocent men to the lust of evildoers; since [there] is no greater enticement to sinning than the hope of impunity — so that now those disgraceful acts, at which nature itself ought to shudder, by the assiduity and habit of sinning, scarcely seem [to be] grave; and [that], by [reason of] the license of offending [granted] by these same [asylums], many think [they] need not even hasten to the asylums, even if [they] have sinned most atrociously; and [that] in vain could Tiberius seem — if he should return from the underworld to [imperial] power — [as one who was] going to take away all asylums." These [things], and still more besides, Masius [says]; who seems to me, from hatred of crimes and zeal for justice, to say some [things] not prudently and cautiously enough — yet to say nothing at all heretically.

The former [appears] in this: *1.* That he judges the institutors of asylums all [to have acted] rashly enough, while [he] indicates [that], in instituting them, no end and cause [was] set forth from those good [reasons] about which [I spoke] in the previous question, but either glory's desire alone, or superstition — or, as he

himself says, "an imprudent opinion of religion." *2.* That he calls "an imprudent opinion of religion" [that] which is most prudent, and strengthened by the best reasons. *3.* That he seems to deny [that they were] instituted also for the sake of the safety of innocent men — whereas, among others, this [is] also one cause of them, although not the only [one]. *4.* That he so unfavorably interprets and censures Innocent III — as if, besides [the] two kinds of criminals, [Innocent] wished no other criminal to be given up to punishment — whereas nevertheless [Innocent] numbers those three kinds in the chapter "Inter alia, On the immunity of Churches," and does not deny the others which I touched [on] above (q. 9). *5.* That he so exaggerates the impunity of crimes, as if it were altogether established through the Christians' asylums — whereas nevertheless it belongs only to those who dwell in the asylums, and [only] as long as [they] dwell [there]; which [itself] is also a certain punishment, although a milder [one]. *6.* That, while asylums are established [as] other, and otherwise, than the Lord once established [them], he interprets [it] unfavorably — as if God be accused of lesser clemency, or [as if] the founders of asylums wished to seem more clement thereby — whereas God provided only for the state and condition of the Jews, nor then prescribed either laws or privileges for the Christians; and to no founder of asylums did so great an accusation against God, or [a thought] contrary to God, or [any such] thought, come into [his] mind. *7.* That he says [that] God and princes are set up, by the asylum-rulers, [as] patrons and protectors either of homicide or of other crimes. Far be it! But [they] are reckoned [to be] patrons and protectors — [patrons] of the wretched, and indeed of those fleeing to them, and openly begging aid from them, and acknowledging their power and authority — for a good end. *8.* That [the things] which are the vices or abuses of certain men, he wrongly and perversely turns [back] upon the asylums, and their religion [sanctity]. *9.* Finally, that he seems to affirm [that] the political sanction of Justinian [is] better than the canonical sanctions.

But the latter [point] — namely, that [he] nevertheless does not speak heretically — is proved [thus]: *1.* Because he does not deny the Ecclesiastical authority, but only disapproves of a certain act [exercise] of this authority. But [one] is not forthwith a heretic, who thinks [that] the application of the most-sacred authority to this or that particular [case] [is] less correct. (See the chapter [on] "some dispensation, absolution, excommunication.") *2.* He seems to wish to censure the abuse of asylums, not the use. For those words of his mean this: "as [people] are now surely disposed. And many think [they] need not even hasten to the asylums, even if [they] have sinned most atrociously." *3.* According to the variety of times and places, [it] can happen that, in such a matter, certain abuses and excessive licenses creep in; and then [it] would seem good to diminish somewhat an immunity of this kind — as even Covarruvias confesses (cited place, n. 4), [and] Gregorius (bk. 13 *On the Commonwealth*, ch. 23, which is entitled "The abuse of immunity, or of the Asylums of the Church, and [its] remedies"); Oleaster on Num. 35 (the note "for the reform of morals," p. 85); [and] Tostatus (in this chapter, q. 12), where [Tostatus] explains Masius's mind, more or less, when he says: "Very many crimes are committed under the pretext of the Church's immunity. For some, enjoying the immunity of [their clerical] orders, others [enjoying] the immunity of places, commit horrible misdeeds." And yet the same Masius keeps himself within [due] measure, when he subjoins: "Nor, however, do I say this in order to detract from or tear at the Ecclesiastical liberty. For [it] was reasonable enough, that the immunity of the Churches be greater

(col. 1225)

[…Masius's words, continued from col. 1224:] of our [Churches] than [that] of the cities in the Old Testament; because the state of our Church is more perfect than [that] of the Old Testament." And from this abuse were born those restrictions of immunities in England of old — Polydore [Vergil] (bk. 1 of the *English History*) [being] witness — and likewise in France, as Rebuffus writes (in the proem of the Royal Constitutions, gloss 5, n. 40), [and] Gregorius (cited place, n. 11), & Covarruvias (n. 17).

Question XII. What [is] the mystical explanation of the cities of refuge?

The mystical explanation of the cities of refuge is handed down [as] manifold. For by some, all the cities are considered [as] in this life; by some, three in this life, and three in the other. And in the former [view], St. Ambrose can be praised [as] the standard-bearer, who, in the book *On the Flight of the World*, ch. 2: "The law teaches," he says, "[that] the world [is] to be fled, [and] God [is] to be followed. For what else does [it] teach, when [it] says: 'you shall appoint for yourselves cities for refuge; and [they] shall be refuges for you, whither every manslayer may flee, who shall have struck a soul unawares'?" And afterward he thus explains those six cities, so that [they] are:

1. As [it were] a metropolis [mother-city], "the Knowledge of the Word," and a manner of living according to his image. 2. The Consideration of the divine operation, by which the world was created. 3. The Contemplation of the Royal power, and of the eternal majesty. 4. The beholding of the divine Propitiation. 5. The contemplation of the divine Law, which prescribed what [is] to be done. 6. The portion of the law which prescribes what [is] not to be done.

St. Ambrose, namely, imitated (as I was saying, q. 5) Philo, who, in the book "περὶ φυγάδων [peri phygad■n]" ["On fugitives"], in the second of the four questions which he set down concerning these cities of refuge — where [are] these six cities —:

1. ὁ θεῖος λόγος [ho theios logos — the divine Word]. And this [is] not only a city, but also a metropolis. 2. ἡ τοῦ λέγοντος θεοῦ ποιητικὴ δύναμις [h■ tou legontos theou poi■tik■ dynamis — the creative power of the speaking God]. 3. ἡ βασιλικὴ δύναμις [h■ basilik■ dynamis — the royal power]. 4. ἡ ἵλεως δύναμις [h■ hile■s dynamis — the propitious (merciful) power]. 5. ἡ νομοθετικὴ δύναμις ἡ προστάττουσα ἃ δεῖ [h■ nomothetik■ dynamis h■ prostattousa ha dei — the legislative power which commands what [one] ought [to do]]. 6. ἡ νομοθετικὴ δύναμις ἡ ἀπαγορεύουσα ἃ μὴ δεῖ [h■ nomothetik■ dynamis h■ apagoreuousa ha m■ dei — the legislative power which forbids what [one] ought not [to do]].

And the same Philo subjoins [that] all these [powers] are signified also in the ark of God. Some, in the ordinary gloss of this place, name six remedies of sins: before baptism indeed — as [if] before the crossing of the Jordan — "the faith of the parents," "the oblation made to God," and "circumcision"; but after baptism, "fasting," "prayer," and "almsgiving"; or also the three parts of penance: "contrition," "confession," and "satisfaction." One could take the three kinds of life which were before CHRIST, and [the three] which [were] after. For [the life] was either "only contemplative," or "only active," or "both together." And the first is, in the plain, "Bosor," excellently fortified against the spiritual enemies. The second: [it] is "Ramoth," lofty through the exercise of good works. The third: "Gaulon," which indicates a transmigration [passing-over] — namely, from contemplation to action, and from action to contemplation. And again [in the other triad] the first is "Cedes," at rest in the zeal of one's own sanctity. The second, "Sichem," submitting the shoulders to labor and action; the third, "Chebron" [Hebron], a social life, associating contemplation with action, leisure with business, [and] one's own sanctity and welfare with another's. And if you take the distinctions of men before CHRIST, [there] were [those] who, besides the good and holy manner of common life (instituted from God's precepts), imposed on themselves, of their own accord, certain [other] pious and good [things] — such as the "Prophets," and of the "Pharisees" any [that were] upright, and the "Essenes" (concerning whom [see] in the *Triharesium* [my treatise on the three Jewish sects]). But after CHRIST [there] are the "Anchorites," "Cenobites," and "men of the Society of Jesus." But [those] who think [of] some cities in this world [age], others in the other [age] — beyond the Jordan, that is, after death and the day of judgment — these now, from Eph. 4, "One God, one faith, one baptism," seek three refuges; and afterward, the three persons of the most-sacred Trinity themselves, or the "clear vision," "blessed fruition," and "eternal possession" of the divine majesty. What if also the three receptacles after death — in which [there] are not eternal joys or torments, as in heaven and hell, [but] from which [there] is a migration to the heavenly fatherland, and to [things that are] as [if] to a certain natural felicity — be understood [as] the "limbo of the Fathers," "purgatory," and the "abode of infants"? What if [there be] three differences in the purgatorial places —

lowest, highest, and middle, or distinguished in some other way whatever? He thinks [of] a city of refuge who says (Job 14): "Who will grant me this, that thou mayest protect me in hell, and hide me, until thy fury pass away, and appoint me a time wherein thou wilt remember me?" But let [it] be enough [to say that], by these [cities], a refuge of penance, after sins, is signified — which [refuge] can be found sixfold in various ways, so that someone may be safe from God's wrath, and, through the death of JESUS CHRIST, the High Priest, may escape to the heavenly fatherland (as was treated above, q. 5). And to these [mystical senses] can be usefully and conveniently applied [the things] which [were] said about the conditions of those cities (q. 6) — especially [those] which were said about their conspicuousness, about the roads leading to those cities most surely and most clearly, and the like.

(col. 1227)

After the Wars: Caput XXI

Caput XXI (opening)

1. And the princes of the families of Levi came to Eleazar the priest, and to Josue the son of Nun, and to the princes of the kindreds of every tribe of the children of Israel: **2.** and they spoke to them in Silo in the land of Chanaan, and said: The Lord commanded by the hand of Moses, that cities should be given us to dwell in, and their suburbs to feed our cattle. **3.** And the children of Israel gave out of their possessions, according to the commandment of the Lord, cities and their suburbs. **4.** And the lot came out for the family of Caath, of the children of Aaron the priest, out of the tribes of Juda, and of Simeon, and of Benjamin, thirteen cities. **5.** And to the rest of the children of Caath, that is, to the Levites who remained, out of the tribes of Ephraim, and of Dan, and of the half tribe of Manasses, ten cities. **6.** And the lot came out to the children of Gerson, that they should take of the tribes of Issachar and of Aser and of Nephtali, and of the half tribe of Manasses in Basan, thirteen cities in number. **7.** And to the sons of Merari by their kindreds, out of the tribes of Ruben and of Gad and of Zabulon, twelve cities. **8.** And the children of Israel gave to the Levites the cities and their suburbs, as the Lord commanded by the hand of Moses, giving to every one by lot. **9.** Out of the tribes of the children of Juda and of Simeon Josue gave cities: whose names are these. **10.** To the sons of Aaron, of the families of Caath of the race of Levi (for the first lot came out for them), **11.** [he gave] the city of Arbe the father of Enac, which is called Hebron, in the mountain of Juda, and the suburbs thereof round about. **12.** But the fields and the villages thereof he had given to Caleb the son of Jephone for his possession. **13.** He gave therefore to the children of Aaron the priest, Hebron a city of refuge, and the suburbs thereof; and Lobna with the suburbs thereof, **14.** and Jether, and Estemo, **15.** and Holon, and Dabir, **16.** and Ain, and Jeta, and Bethsames, with their suburbs: nine cities out of two tribes, as hath been said. **17.** And out of the tribe of the children of Benjamin, Gabaon, and Gabae, **18.** and Anathoth, and Almon, with their suburbs: four cities. **19.** All the cities together of the children of Aaron the priest were thirteen, with their suburbs. **20.** And to the rest of the families of the children of Caath, of the race of Levi, was given this possession: **21.** Of the tribe of Ephraim, the cities of refuge, Sichem with its suburbs in mount Ephraim, and Gazer, **22.** and Cibsaim, and Beth-horon, with their suburbs: four cities. **23.** And of the tribe of Dan, Eltheco and Gabathon, **24.** and Aialon, and Gethremmon, with their suburbs: four cities. **25.** And of the half tribe of Manasses, Thanach and Gethremmon, with their suburbs: two cities. **26.** All the cities were ten, with their suburbs, which were given to the children of Caath, of the inferior degree. **27.** To the children of Gerson also, of the race of Levi, [he gave] out of the half tribe of Manasses, cities of refuge, Gaulon in Basan, and Bosra, with their suburbs: two cities. **28.** And of the tribe of Issachar, Cesion, and Dabereth, **29.** and Jaramoth, and Engannim, with their suburbs: four cities. **30.** And of the tribe of Aser, Masal and Abdon, **31.** and Helcath, and Rohob, with their suburbs: four cities. **32.** Of the tribe also of Nephtali, the cities of refuge, Cedes in Galilee, and Hammoth Dor, and Carthan, with their suburbs: three cities. **33.** All the cities of the families of Gerson were thirteen, with their suburbs. **34.** And to the children of Merari, Levites of the inferior degree, by their families, were given, of the tribe of Zabulon, Jecnam and Cartha, **35.** and Damna and Naalol: four cities with their suburbs. **36.** Of the tribe of Ruben, beyond the Jordan over against Jericho, cities of refuge: Bosor in the wilderness, Misor, and Jaser, and Jethson, and Mephaath: four cities with their suburbs. **37.** Of the tribe of Gad, the cities of refuge: Ramoth in Galaad, and Manaim, and Hesebon, and Jazer: four cities with their suburbs. **38.** All the cities of the children of Merari, by their families and kindreds, were twelve. **39.** So all the cities of the Levites within the possession of the children of Israel were forty-eight, **40.** with their suburbs, each distributed by the families. **41.** And the Lord God gave to Israel all the land that he had sworn to give to their fathers: and they possessed it, and dwelt in it. **42.** And he gave them peace from all nations round about: and none of their enemies durst stand against them, but were brought under their dominion. **43.** Not so much as one word, which he had promised to perform unto them, was made void, but all came to pass.

(col. 1229)

COMMENTARY

Two parts of this chapter can be constituted. The former refers [to] the cities given to the Levites, up to v. 41. The latter [contains] the general conclusion of the whole division, from v. 41 to the end.

Question I. Why [were] cities given to the Levites?

The Levites were without share of inheritance, as [was] said above (ch. 13, q. 6), and therefore had received no part of the region. Yet [it] was necessary [for] them to remain in the same region with the other tribes. [It] was necessary, therefore, [that] either they should dwell perpetually under the open sky and in tents, or [that they] should inhabit roofed [buildings] and houses. That [first] did not seem consonant [fitting] to God; because [it] is [the way] of men either traveling [as sojourners] — as [was] done hitherto in the wilderness and [at] the departure from Egypt — or of [men] wandering, and leading a rustic and uncultivated life, such as [are] shepherds, Arabs, and Scythians roaming about, and often brigandaging. But to the Levites neither [of these] was suitable. For both the journey and the sojourning in the promised land [had] now [reached its] end; and they [were] the most polished and most learned of all, since [they] were the ministers of God, and the Interpreters of all sacred [things], acolytes, and prelates. Nor indeed, while the other Israelites [were] resting and inhabiting houses, did [it] befit these [Levites] to hold [only] tents, [and] to have no houses, as a rule — because, forsooth, [they] would have seemed unlike the others, and, among them, as [if] strangers, and more contemptible. I said "as a rule," because if some should embrace — of their own accord, not from necessity — that very kind of dwelling and life (such as the "Cinaeans" [Kenites] & "Rechabites," concerning whom [see] Judg. 4, Jer. 35, & in my *Triharesium*), their piety, modesty, and virtue would indeed be praiseworthy — but [it is] not to be imposed on all, straightway from the beginning. For God is wont to deal more humanely with men: nor to command all difficult and arduous [things], although [they] be sometimes good and useful; but [he] leaves those [things] to the choice of those who are more excellent in [their] spirits, and greater followers of virtue. For just as Masters who have very many servants commit not all [duties] to all, but the more-eminent and more-refined duties to the more-eminent and more-cultivated [servants]. But if to inhabit houses was, in general, more becoming for the Levites, [then] they ought therefore either to build new [ones] themselves, or to receive old [ones] and [ones] already built — and that, either by purchase or by gift. New [ones] they could not build, because [there] was for them no place, no estate, no mountain or valley, where [they] might build. But to buy old houses, already built, from the other Israelites, would have been base: for since God was giving them [the other tribes] so great a dominion — so many and so great houses and cities — was [it] fitting [that] none [of these] be given by these [tribes] to the ministers and priests of God himself? Or would [it] not have been most avaricious and most ungrateful [for] those [tribes] — out of so many [possessions], and [ones] so liberally and munificently given by God — to bestow nothing on those who should administer his sacred [rites] and ceremonies? Nay, God too — who was so kind toward the rest of the Israelites, and, so to speak, lavish — could not forget his [own] Ministers. And this same care of God for his Ministers, and [his] love of them, brought [it] about that [he] commanded cities — not huts, hamlets, and villages — to be given to them. But [it] is established [that] this manner [arrangement], for [one] dwelling, [is], first, safer; and then also (in men's opinion, indeed) more honorable and more splendid.

Question II. How [were] cities given to the Levites?

The beginning of this chapter indicates [that] the cities [were] given to them as the Levites' [own] portion. Where first [it] is asked, "what [need there] was [for] these to request them" — since, as they themselves say (v. 2), and [as] is clear from Num. 35, the Lord had commanded [that] these be given to them? Masius seems to answer [that they] did not request [them], but [that], by presenting themselves, [they] simply set forth

God's commands. But this very [act] too was a certain kind of petition. But Calvin answers: "It is probable [that they] were neglected, until [they] should plead their [own] case. For [it] is wont to happen thus — while each one is intent on caring for his own [affairs] — that [one] forgets [one's] brothers. Certainly [it] was shameful [for] the people's ear to be tweaked, and [for them] to be recalled to memory of what God had clearly commanded concerning the Levites. But, unless [the Levites] had demanded a dwelling, [there] was danger lest [they] lie [out] under the open sky." But this man [Calvin] accuses not only the tribes of the Jews universally, but also both [their] princes and all [their] wise [men], and especially those who had been set over the division by God, and Eleazar the Pontiff himself, and the commander Joshua. But who would believe [that they] were so intent on caring for their own [affairs] that [they] would forget [their] brothers? who would believe [that they] approached the lot so rashly, that — without any order of affairs to be done — [they] stood before the Lord? and [that they] did not first determine [that] the whole land [was] first to be divided among the 12 tribes, and [that] then, afterward, provision [was] to be made concerning cities for the Levites? So great an imprudence, rashness, and forgetfulness does not befit such great men. Nay, even if they [the people] had been intent only on caring for their own [affairs], yet Eleazar could not have done that without that care concerning all the Levites. For his dwelling, convenience, and all [his] fruit [benefit] was so utterly joined with the habitation, convenience, and fruit of the [other] Levites, that concerning those, without these, there could be no thought for anyone. [There are], therefore, other causes of this petition. *One*: since those [cities] which were to be assigned to the Levites had to be plucked from the cities of the individual tribes, [it] was first necessary [that] these be given to them in the last place (for the other tribes could not give them before [they themselves] had received [them]). Then modesty and equity admonished the Levites, that [what] the other tribes were going to give them liberally, [they] should request [it] modestly, as [if] a favor. *The other*: because, although Joshua, although Eleazar, although all the dividers remembered very well God's command concerning those cities, and wished [it] to be fulfilled as quickly and as fully as possible, nevertheless [they] became much more eager by that petition and admonition of the Levites —

> *"Keen, and of himself bound to run to the palm [and its] honors —*
>
> *yet, if thou urge [him] on, the horse will go the more strongly."*

(col. 1231)

[…continued from col. 1230.] And two useful lessons return hence to us. *One*: that if something is to be given to us by someone, [it] neither shame nor irk us to request it. [There] are so [many] — even in the religious institutes of life — [who are], toward [their] prelates and superiors, peevish and disdainful, so that [they] straightway say: "This one and that one knows [that] this is owed to me by him; [knows] that I need this and that; [knows] that it is God's will to give [it] to me — if he does not wish to give [it], let him omit [it]." But hark, O good [man], God also wishes thee to produce acts of modesty and humility. He wishes thee to deal humanely with men, and to summon forth and incite their beneficence by thy requests — even if [it] were most ready [of itself]. Why art thou so uncouth and rustic? Look at these Levites: gaze at their Princes. [They] approach, very modestly, the Princes of the division, the Tribunes, Eleazar, & Joshua; [they] cite the divine command; and [they] beseech cities and suburbs for themselves. *The other*: [there] are, on the contrary, others, from whom, if something be requested — and indeed of such a kind that [they] could neither refuse [it], nor indeed would [wish to] — [they] bear it grudgingly, and straightway say: "Thou art too anxious for me, [my good] man. Thou admonishest [one who is already] mindful. Cease to interrupt me: I know well enough what, and when, this [is] to be done by me. I have no need of a monitor." Those [men] wish to seem to do all [things] of their own accord; to need no one's admonitions or prayers for doing good. Which is a certain hidden pride — which the Phylarchs [tribal chiefs], Pontiff Eleazar, & commander Joshua, [when] asked by the Levites, blunt [rebuke] by [their] silence and example. "And the children of Israel," says the text (v. 3), "gave out of their possessions, according to the command of the Lord, cities and their suburbs." [It] is asked, besides:

"Whether these cities were given to the Levites by lot?" Tostatus (Num. 35, q. 5) seems to deny [it]: "It is to be answered," he says, "[that] the cities given to the Levites were not given by lot — because then it could have happened [that] some cities would have been given to them at the extremity [edge], or in separated places; but [they] were given by election [choice], namely [in] that those who were of some tribe chose, from their own cities, some [cities] which [they] would give to the Levites." But [that] a lot did intervene, this chapter teaches clearly (v. 4, 6, & 10); nor does that diligent writer deny every [kind of] lot. For [it is] to be observed [that there] were five matters to be asked and determined in this business: *First*: how many cities [were] to be given to the Levites themselves? *Secondly*: how many out of each tribe. *Thirdly*: which [cities] out of each tribe likewise? *Fourthly*: how many to each part [division] of the Levites? *Fifthly*: which [cities] to each such part of the Levites? But to the *First* question no lot was to be applied, because the Lord had expressly settled it (Num. 35:6 & 7). Nor to the *Second*, because the Lord had committed that to the prudence and judgment of the dividers, in the same place (v. 8), when [he] said: "From those who have more, more [cities] shall be taken away, and [from those who have] less, fewer. Each shall give towns to the Levites according to the measure of their inheritance." To the *Third*, the cited author [Tostatus] thinks a lot could not be applied, because certain spaces [suburbs] around the cities had to be given together with the cities. Those cities, therefore, were to be chosen out of the individual tribes which had such suburbs within their [own] tribes — but not those which, situated at the extreme borders and lines of them, had no suburb of their own. But if the lot had pronounced which cities were to be given from each tribe, [it] could have designated some one, or some [several], of those extreme [border] cities. But truly, [since] God — who was then the author and moderator of the lots — could best have guarded against whatever of this was [an] inconvenience, so that in that third controversy the lot could also have been [the] judgment [i.e. could itself have decided]. To the *Fourth*, human prudence [was] sufficient — the dividers carefully examining what [was] the multitude, state, and condition of each Levitic division, as [was] said concerning the other tribes (ch. 13, q. 12). To the *Fifth*, a lot [was] altogether applied, as the before-cited verses indicate, and [as] Tostatus confesses in the cited place, and in this chapter (q. 4, 5, & 6). But [those] who were sent [as] envoys by the Levites to the dividers, and to Eleazar, and to Joshua, for the sake of this petition — Masius thinks they were twelve, namely four from each of their [three] clans. Yet this cannot be proved from elsewhere — but neither [can it] be disproved.

Question III. How many cities in all [were] given to all the Levites?

The number of cities to be given, as I was saying in the previous question, the Lord predetermined (Num. 35:6 & 7); and so many were given in this chapter — not more, not fewer. "All the cities of the Levites," says v. 39, "within the possession of the children of Israel, were forty-eight." In which number this seems, of all [things], most worthy of admiration: "how a tribe which was, in number, nearly the least of all, received so many cities" — and indeed [cities] which were double, triple, sometimes even quadruple more [numerous] than [those] of certain other tribes. For the Levites [were] numbered, in their last census (Num. 26:62), [as] twenty-three thousand males — and that, [with] boys also reckoned in, nay even little infants who had lived now one [single] month; so that in each of their cities [there] could scarcely be four hundred men. Now the Aserite tribe had only 22 cities (above, ch. 19:30); the Nephtalite 19; the Danite still fewer (same place, v. 40 & following). And yet — to be silent about the other tribes — in that same census, [with] infants and boys up to the twentieth year excluded, the Aserites [numbered] 53,400 (there, v. 47); the Nephtalites 45,400 (same, v. 50); the Simeonites 22,200 (v. 14); the Issacharites 64,300 (v. 25); the Danites 64,400 (v. 44). [It is] a wonder, therefore, [that] to the Levites — who (as we said above) [were] so few — so many cities [were] attributed, and indeed more than to the tribes [which were] their [own] heirs. But chiefly two causes are noted. One is [that] which [was] also touched above (ch. 14, q. 9): the wondrous benignity [of God] toward the ministers of God, and the prelates of his sacred [rites], whom [he] most abundantly heaps with the things necessary for food and clothing — so that [they] be held by no too-troublesome care of these things, and [may] devote themselves wholly, most diligently, to his worship, ceremonies, and service; which [is]

assuredly most just. And this cause — concerning the abundant supply of the things necessary for life — Philo often and expressly pursues; but especially in the book *On fugitives*, bk. 2 *On monarchy*, and the book *On the honors of the Priests*. For just as other mortals — in order to procure the necessaries of life — plow, build, sail, [work as] smiths, or do other works: so [it befits] the Priests, and [those] devoted to the divine worship, to administer the sacred [rites], to celebrate God with praises, [and to offer] prayers for themselves and

(col. 1233)

[…continued from col. 1232.] for the people, to learn thoroughly his law, and to teach others. To clothing, moreover, habitation [a dwelling] belongs. For a house is a certain, as it were, looser garment, which girds and covers us and ours. But the other cause is, that to the other tribes, besides cities, [there] were also given hamlets, and more villages, of which the Levites received none (Abulensis, q. 9, Num. 35). Some add also a third cause: that not all [the cities] were enumerated in the foregoing catalogues of cities which pertained to the individual tribes. But this, although true, satisfies little the admiration and the proposed question. For [it is] not to be thought, although some cities be omitted, [that] many [were] omitted — certainly not as many, or nearly as many, as [those which] were enumerated. But even if we should say [that] as many [were] omitted, and double the number by the imposed cities, [it] will still not come near to the sum of the Levitic cities. For in the Aserite tribe [there] would be only 44; in the Nephtalite 38; in the Simeonite 34; the Issacharite 32; in the Danite, fewer. And therefore that first cause — truly the first and highest of all — which, against all the Calvinist and Lutheran sacrilegious harpies, [I] am pleased to confirm by the one testimony of [a] Calvinist himself, Adrian Saravia. "God," he says (bk. 2, ch. 14), "in his law, besides tithes and oblations, commanded [that] cities, and the precincts of cities and towns, be given to the Priests and Levites — over which [cities] they had no less authority than the rest of the tribes [had] over the cities and fields which had fallen to them by lot. The Gospel [being] received, our Savior nowhere forbade [that] the ministers of the Gospel possess fields and possessions, by public authority, in the same manner — or [that things] to be possessed be given to them; nor did [he] wish [that], in a Commonwealth which had received the Gospel, [they] be of a worse condition than the Levites and Priests had been of old in Israel. Since the ministers of the Churches must live in the city [state], those aids are necessary to them which civil society needs, and [which] procure authority and favor with the common people — of which kind are wisdom and riches. Whoever despises one of these cannot abide in the city with dignity. The Wise [man] noted this in his Ecclesiastes (ch. 7, v. 11 & 12): 'Good is wisdom,' he says, 'with an inheritance, and [it] is a profit to them that see the sun; because in the shadow of wisdom, and in the shadow of silver [money], man resteth.'" Thus he [Saravia], who (ch. 4), whence he says, "the impiety and ingratitude of certain Magistrates is worthy of greater reproach, who, while [they] wish to seem to favor the Christian religion, defraud the ministers of [their] due honor, and not only bestow nothing of their own, but [even] convert whatever was once destined for pious uses into profane [ones]." And [Saravia] proceeds further to dispute against the avarice, stinginess, impiety, and sacrileges of those Magistrates of his [party] and [their] fellows; and to answer their petty reasonings — trimmed [contrived] for the applause of the people, and [as] a veil for avarice.

Question IV. How many, and which, cities [were] given to the chief families of the Levites?

The chief families and divisions of the Levites are reckoned in three ways. *First*: according to the flesh [lineage], namely so that [there] be as many as were the sons of Levi himself; and so [there] are only three families — [those] of the Gersonites, Caathites, and Merarites (Exod. 6:16, & elsewhere often). *Secondly*: according to the office and duty which was discharged by them in the worship of God; and so [there are] two divisions — namely, of the Priests and of the non-Priests. The former are wont to be called, from the first Priest (and parent and begetter of all the rest), "Aaronites"; but the others retain the common name of

"Levites." *Thirdly*: according to both — namely, both lineage and office. For that second family, of the Caathites, embraces all the Priests, and besides [them] other Levites, who had not been begotten from Aaron, but either from his brother Moses, or from the paternal-uncles of both — Isaar [Izhar], Hebron, & Oziel [Uzziel]. For these three, with Amram (the father of Aaron and Moses), were the sons of Caath himself, grandsons of Levi himself (Exod. 6:18). And in this manner [there] are here constituted four divisions of the Levites: the first, [that] of the Caathite Priests; the second, [that] of the Caathite non-Priests; the third, [that] of the Gersonites; the fourth, [that] of the Merarites. And to the first division indeed [there] were given 13 cities (v. 4): of which [there] were 9 from the tribe of Judah and of Simeon, [and] the remaining 4 from the tribe of Benjamin. And [it] was indeed admirable [that] so many cities [were] attributed to so few Priests. For — as I was saying [in] ch. 5, part 2, q. 1 — at the crossing of the Jordan [they] were not much more than 24; and after those 14 years, even if we multiply all those [24] fourteen times over, [there] still could not be four hundred Priests in that division of the land. And if [one] should wish to divide 400 by 13, we shall find [that] fewer than 31 Priests could be placed in each and every one of the cities. Admirable likewise [is] that the lot so fell out, that to the Priests there fell those cities which were nearest to the tabernacle and temple, [and] to the very future royal city and metropolis of the whole people. Then, [so] that the Levites might more conveniently contract marriages with the Judaic tribe — as Theodoret admonishes [at] q. 18 in this place: "For these tribes," he says, "the Lord permitted to be mingled, because he who was to be born from the tribe of Juda was called not only King, but also Pontiff [Priest]."

To the second division, of the Caathites, [there] were given 10 cities, from the tribes of Ephraim, Dan, & cis-Jordanian Manasses (v. 5). To the third division, 13 [cities], from the tribes of Issachar, Aser, Nephtali, & trans-Jordanian Manasses (v. 6). To the fourth division, 12 [cities], from the tribes of Ruben, Gad, Zabulon (v. 7). In sum, 48 — of which [these are] the names:

| # | City | | # | City | |---|---|---|---|---|---| | 1 | Hebron (v. 11) | | 11 | Gabae | | 2 | Lobna (v. 13) | | 12 | Anathoth | | 3 | Jether | | 13 | Almon | | 4 | Esthemoa | | 14 | Sichem (v. 21) | | 5 | Holon | | 15 | Gazer | | 6 | Dabir | | 16 | Cibsaim | | 7 | Ain | | 17 | Bethoron | | 8 | Jeta | | 18 | Eltheco | | 9 | Bethsames | | 19 | Gabathon | | 10 | Gabaon (v. 17) | | 20 | Aialon |

(col. 1235)

[…the list of the 48 Levitical cities, continued from col. 1234:]

| # | City | | # | City | |---|---|---|---|---|---| | 21 | Gethremmon | | 35 | Hammothdor | | 22 | Thanach | | 36 | Carthan | | 23 | Gethremmon | | 37 | Iecnan (v. 34) | | 24 | Gaulon (v. 27) | | 38 | Cartha | | 25 | Bosra (v. 27) | | 39 | Danna | | 26 | Cesion | | 40 | Naalol | | 27 | Dabereth | | 41 | Ramoth (v. 36) | | 28 | Iaramoth | | 42 | Manaim | | 29 | Engannim | | 43 | Hesebon | | 30 | Masal | | 44 | Iazer [Gk. ἐωτόρ, *e■tór*] | | 31 | Abdon | | 45 | Bosor (v. 37) [Gk. μισώ, *mis■*] | | 32 | Helcath | | 46 | Iaser (Heb. Iachsa) [Gk. Ιαζήρ, *Iaz■r*] | | 33 | Rohob | | 47 | Iethson / Ascedemoth [Gk. δεκμών, *dekm■n*] | | 34 | Cedes (v. 32) | | 48 | Mephaath [Gk. μαφά, *maphá*] |

But concerning those last four [cities], doubts arise. *The first*: from which Scripture they are sourced — for the Hebrew text of the Masoretes does not have them, and these [Jews] praise the more ancient copies, which lack those same [cities]. But [they] are in our [Latin] text, in the Greek 70, in the Chaldee, and in other very ancient Hebrew copies — as not only Tostatus (between q. 8 & 9) and Masius, from our [side], but also from the Jews, Radak confesses in this place, who also professes himself an eye-witness. And truly, unless [they] be added, [then] first, cities would not have been given to the Levites by all the tribes, since the Rubenite [tribe] would be omitted. But that [is] against the express command of God (Num. 26), against the assertion of v. 3 of this chapter ("The children of Israel gave out of their possessions, according to the command of the Lord"), [and] against the history [in] 1 Chron. 6:78 & 79. Secondly: the cities of the Merarites would not have been 12, as [the text] says in this chapter (v. 38), but only 8. Thirdly: finally, the cities of the Levites would not all be 48, but only 44 — against the conclusion of the previous question. And hence [it] is clear,

first, [that] which [was] asserted in the Biblical Prolegomena — [that] the Hebrew Masoretic bibles, which are today boasted by the Jews [to be] most-correct, are incorrect and corrupted. [It] is clear, secondly, [that] these cities, in the Latin edition, [were] not simply expressed from the Greek 70 translation (as Masius asserts and Montanus praises), but from the old Hebrew text, which — as Abulensis rightly says in the cited place — was extant in our Interpreter's [Jerome's] time. [It] is clear also, thirdly, [from] 1 Chron. 6, [that] those [cities are] present here. For hence, if [they] had been absent, the whole history and reckoning of this chapter would waver, as [was] indicated a little before. And truly, the different names of this chapter and that [1 Chron. 6] show the diversity not of the cities (as will be said a little after), but of the text — so that those [names] cannot be [considered] translated hither from Chronicles.

The second doubt. In our [Latin] text and in the Greek 70, among those four cities, "Misor" is placed [as a fifth], and so the cities become five, and the sums of the numbers overflow. For thus [there] would be 5 cities from the Rubenite tribe (against v. 37); 13 cities of the Merarites (against v. 38); 49 cities of the Levites (against v. 39). [It is] to be said, first, [that] this name crept into the Latin text altogether from the margin of some [who], from the 70, had noted "τὴν μισώ [t■n mis■]," as [it] is now published in the Roman [editions], or rather "τὴν μισὼρ [t■n mis■r]," as [it] is in our text; and [it] is confirmed from the signification, concerning which [we speak] now. Secondly: [that] "Misor" is not a new city [distinct] from "Bosor," but [that] by this word [it] is signified [that] "Bosor" is situated in a plain — as [was] said in the previous chapter, q. 6. For in Hebrew "misor" or "mischor" is "a plain," as above (ch. 13), thrice (v. 9, 18, 20); and clearly, above (ch. 20, the penultimate verse), that [city] is said to be "bammidbar bammischor," that is, "in the wilderness, in the plain." And [it] is confirmed from the Greek text itself, where [it is] thus: "βοσὸρ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, τὴν μισὼρ [bosor t■n en t■ er■m■, t■n mis■r]" ["Bosor, the [one] in the wilderness, the Misor (the plain)"]. For [it is] to be observed [that], in the numbering of the other three adjoined cities, "ke [καὶ]" — that is, "&" [and] — is prefixed, so that [they] be signified [as] distinct. But "Misor" is so connected with "Bosor" that the sense is: "Bosor, which is in the desert, which [is] in the plain" — or, "and which is in the level [ground]."

The third doubt. In Latin and Greek "Iazer" is here named, which in the Hebrew copies does not exist. I answer: either [it] is the same as that which — here, and [in] 1 Chron. 6:29 — is called "Cademoth"; or certainly [it] is the same which, duplicated in the Latin (not in the Greek 70 nomenclature), is called "Iethson," [and] in Chronicles "Iassa" or "Iadesa." And then in the Latin a city would be lacking, which in the Hebrew here, and in Chronicles, is "Cademoth" or "Cedemoch," in the Greek "δεκμών [dekm■n]" — namely, by a metathesis [transposition] of letters, for "κεδμὼν [kedm■n]" or "κεδμώθ [kedm■th]"; nay, from the nearby v. 36, in place of "Cademoth," a new [city], "Iazer," migrated hither.

The fourth doubt is: whether those four cities are to be numbered in the last place? In the better Hebrew copies, and in the Roman Latin correction, "Ruben" himself is placed before "Gad" — that is, a transposition of verses 36, 37 takes place; and so, after these four cities, the others are numbered, which [are] here placed before:

#	City
1	Ramoth
2	Manaim
3	Hesebon
4	Iazer

And hence [it] appears [that] a wound [was] inflicted upon this text from some [source] — both in the Latin and Greek [copies], as [well as] in the Hebrew — which hitherto [has] not [been] sufficiently healed.

The fifth doubt: why "Jerusalem" is not among those [cities]? Namely, because [it] was still held by the Jebusites; because [it] belonged to different tribes; and because in it, too, [there] could be a place for them [the Levites] to dwell — as will be said in the following question.

The sixth and last doubt: why do certain names differ from those [names] placed before, in [the catalogues of] the tribes? [This has been] answered often.

Question V. Whether the Levites dwelt in other cities [too]?

Not only in these given cities, but in others too, could the Levites dwell — in three ways. *First*: in that city where [there] was [the place] of sacred

(col. 1237)

[…continued from col. 1236.] [rites], the altar of holocausts, and the tabernacle itself, or the temple. *Secondly*: if any houses [were] given to them elsewhere by the Israelites, by oblation or vow. *Thirdly*: if [they] should wish to rent some [other] house in another city, and to dwell there. For certainly [that] the Levites were in other cities by some of those manners, the Scriptures not rarely show — even those [passages] which prescribe that the triennial tithes be eaten with them (Deut. 10 [recte 14], 17, & afterward often). The Jews bring forward also two causes why other cities [were] inhabited by them. One: that they might be present at all the Magistracies and judgments. "Ἑκάστῃ ἀρχῇ [ekast■ arch■]" ["to each magistracy"], says Josephus (bk. 4, ch. 8), "δύο ἄνδρες ὑπηρέται διδόσθωσαν ἐκ τῆς τῶν Λευιτῶν φυλῆς [dyo andres hyp■retai didosth■san ek t■s t■n Leuit■n phyl■s]" ["let two men [as] attendants be given from the tribe of the Levites"]. The other: because, at the beginning, [they] could not possess some of their [own] cities, which were still held by the Canaanites, [and so] others [were] given to them in their stead on loan. And hence the Rabbis, in the Talmud (tractate "On blows" [Makkoth], ch. 2), untie that knot: how not a few names of the Levitic cities here [are] other than [those] in 1 Chron. 6. For here are handed down the cities which were theirs by the right of donation; but there [in Chron.], [those which were theirs] either by the right of donation or of loan. "Cedes," they say, "while [it] remained a long time in the power of the enemies, the Levites had, in its stead, the neighboring Gamala." And Masius: "If [it] is true, what I said the Hebrew Doctors opine, perhaps the Levites dwelt in Hucoc, since [they] could not obtain their neighboring Helcath." And hence again [it] appears how great a convenience and spaciousness of dwelling [was] granted to the Levites, who could have a domicile not only in their own, but even in others' cities.

Question VI. How large, and of what kind, [were] those cities of the Levites?

First: the cities were of almost every size: some great, others small. For certainly great was Hebron, Dabir, Gabaon, Ramoth, [and] others. *II.* [There] were many illustrious and renowned in fame, as [those] already mentioned; others [were] more obscure. *III.* [They] were so of the [property] right of the Levites, that [they] were not only usufructuaries, but true Owners. For [in] Lev. 25:33 we read [it] written: "The houses of the Levites, which are in the cities, can always be redeemed; if [they] be redeemed, in the jubilee [they] shall return to [their] owners — because the houses of the cities of the Levites are, among the children of Israel, for [as] their possessions." *IV.* [They] were situated not in some one part of the Canaanite dominion, but far and wide — scattered through absolutely all the parts and tribes, on this side and beyond the Jordan; and that, by the most wise counsel and will of God. *First*: that [they] might be everywhere the Interpreters and Masters of the divine law, who should instruct the whole people, admonish [it], [and] keep [it] in [its] duty — [being], as [it were], its Pedagogues (Deut. ch. 23, v. 10 [recte 33:10]), especially in the Hebrew, where [it is] thus: "they teach ([the Levites]) thy judgments to Jacob himself, and thy Law to Israel." And in the 70: "Δηλώσουσι τὰ δικαιώματά σου τῷ Ἰακὼβ, καὶ τὸν νόμον σου τῷ Ἰσραήλ [D■l■sousi ta dikai■mata sou t■ Iak■b, kai ton nomon sou t■ Isra■l]" ["They shall declare thy judgments to Jacob, and thy law to Israel"]. *Secondly*: [it] is pleasing to God that, in various places, Schools of wisdom, assemblies of the wise, and colleges of religious men should flourish. But what else were the cities of the Levites? *Thirdly*: [it] pertains to God's glory, that [there] be as many as possible of his ministers, in as many places as possible. For just as not only in the palace and hall are the King's ministers, so too [there were] not only in the city of the tabernacle or temple the Priests and other Levites. *Fourthly*: lest [the Levites], drawn apart from one another, grow accustomed to the common vices and morals of others. *Fifthly*: that, joined, and enclosed as [it were] in certain monasteries or colleges, [they] might rouse themselves — and more, one another — to a life worthy

of their order and rank. *Sixthly*: thus the worship of God — which flourished chiefly in one city and place — seemed more to belong to all the tribes, because its ministers [were] in all these [cities]. *Seventhly*: thus [they] could more easily receive from the people the necessaries which pertained to life — both [those] owed and [those] spontaneous. Nor does Abulensis's disputation here (q. 4) refute these [reasons].

V. The same cities were furnished with certain suburban spaces [pastures], as will be explained below. In the number of them were six — the cities of refuge, concerning which [in] the previous chapter. *First*: that a greater benevolence and authority toward God's ministers might be procured among all, from whose cities [there] was so much of protection and safety (Abulensis, q. 7, Num. 35). Then, that where the best and wisest Doctors and judges [were], there [the people] might dwell, who could be freed by their judgment, instructed by [their] company, and made better. This, and several other causes, St. Ambrose brings forward (bk. *On the Flight of the World*, ch. 2, & bk. 2 *On Cain & Abel*, ch. 4): "The cities of the Levites," he says, "Moses signified [as] redeemers [redemptresses]; because he who flees to them — [to] the soul in which the Word of God dwells (which [soul] is fortified and walled like a city) — acquires for himself perpetual liberty. For just as, in the cities of the Levites, [there] was a remission of penalties — so that, if anyone had fled to them who had committed a non-voluntary slaying of a man, [it was] permitted to no one to kill him, [provided he was] placed only within the cities — so [one] who repents of his own sin (which [he] committed either imprudently or unwillingly), if [he] cleave to the dwelling of the Levites, and think [he] must not depart from these teachers who dispense God's commands, the law itself frees him from all penalty and punishment of the committed misdeed. Nor think [it] absurd, that the criminal dwell together with the pious, the stained with the consecrated: for they who are polluted by some contagion of offenses have need to be purified. And in a manner, [the] cause concurs by a different kind. For just as the Levite — cut off from worldly pleasures — is an exile from guilt; so the one guilty of blood is a fugitive from [his] fatherland. But this is the difference: that the latter deserts his own [people] by necessity, on account of fear of the law; but the minister of God renounces the fellowships of human passions, and cuts himself off from a certain bond of the carnal enticement, on account of the pursuits of virtue. That too is not far from the truth: that this [minister] too, as it were, lays certain hands upon himself, so that [he] may kill the pleasures of his [own] body, and work a certain destruction of his [own] flesh. For Moses killed the Egyptian, and became a fugitive from the land of Egypt, that [he] might avoid its tyrant. But [he] would not have killed that Egyptian man before, unless [he] had first slain in himself the Egyptian of spiritual wickedness, and renounced the luxury of royal honors — esteeming the reproach of CHRIST [as] a greater patrimony than the treasures of Egypt. Which [reproach] seems, to the foolish, [to be] a reproach; but to us, that reproach of the Lord's cross is the power of God and wisdom. To [this] is added, that [there] are in God two chief kinds of powers: one by which [he] remits, the other by which [he] avenges. Sins are remitted through the Word of God, of which the Levite is the interpreter — and indeed the executor; [they] are remitted also through the office of the Priest, and the sacred ministry; [they] are also punished through men, as through judges, who use [their] power for a time: as the Apostle teaches, saying,

(col. 1239)

[…Ambrose's quote, continued from col. 1238:] "[Wilt thou] not fear the power? Do good, and thou shalt have praise from it. For [it] is God's minister to thee for good. But if thou do evil, fear. For not without cause does [it] bear the sword. For [it] is God's minister — a Judge, unto wrath, for him who does evil" (Rom. 13:3–4). Sins are punished also through peoples [nations], as we read: because often the people of the Jews was subjected to foreigners (roused by God's command), on account of the offense of the Divine Majesty. Nor indeed is he who has committed some homicide unwillingly outside the ministry. For the law says of him: "Because God delivered him into his hands" (Exod. 21:13). His hands, therefore, in the manner of an instrument, furnished [their] ministry to the divine vengeance. The Levite, therefore, is the minister of remission [forgiveness]; but the striker — who, however, committed homicide not of set purpose, but beside

[his] will — [is] the minister of the divine vengeance.

But two little questions still remain. *One*: whether all the other cities of the Levites too were asylums? "All [of them]," says Arias, "were also Sacred, and dedicated to receiving and protecting innocent manslayers — although those six, by a singular prerogative, were [specifically] called asylums." I, however, would not dare to assert this, because I see [it] asserted neither by Scripture, nor by any suitable authors. And indeed, what cause would [there] be, why so great a matter — so necessary and useful to the innocent, [and] so honorable to the whole tribe of the Levites — would nowhere be found [mentioned], not even by one little word? *The other*: whether the six cities [were] decreed for refuge before all [those] others [were] given to the Levites? Or [were] the 48 first given to the Levites, and [then] only afterward [were] six set apart from them for refuge? Two opinions. The former says the cities of refuge [were] constituted first; the latter, afterward. That [former] is Masius's, at the beginning of this chapter; but this [latter] is Josephus's (bk. 5, ch. 1) & Abulensis's (Num. 35), where the text clearly first decrees to the Levites 48 cities [two out of fifty], [and] then, from those, chooses six which may be for the refuge of fugitives. And if we follow this, [it] will necessarily have to be confessed [that] the narrations of this and the previous chapter [are] transposed. But that [is] easier to believe in Num. (in the one ch. 35) — that there a transposition of one period [sentence] or another [was] made, rather than [a transposition] of whole chapters here; especially since, even in the Hebrew text, [there] is nothing which opposes this transposition; but here [in ch. 20] [there] is the beginning of ch. 20, which commands that the twelve tribes themselves give cities of refuge. But if [the tribes] had already given these [refuge-cities], together with the other [forty-two], to the Levites before, [then] not those [twelve] tribes, but the Levitic [tribe] alone, ought to have given them.

Question VII. What, and for what, [were] the spaces around those cities given to the Levites?

Together with the already-enumerated cities, [there] were — by the Lord's prescription — spaces around them attributed to the Levites. These [spaces], here and elsewhere, are always called in Hebrew the "migraschim" of those cities — that is, [the spaces] which [are] placed outside them, and, as [it were], cast farther out, expelled, and extended. In the 70, here sometimes "τὰ περισπόρια αὐτῶν [ta perispória aut■n]" ["their surrounding-sowing-lands"]; but sometimes "τὰ ἀφορισμένα αὐτῶν, τὰ ὅμορα & προάστεια [ta aph■rismena aut■n, ta homora & proasteia]" ["their set-apart [lands], the bordering [lands] & the suburbs"]; but somewhere "τὰ ἀφορίσματα αὐτῶν, τὰ συγκυροῦντα, τὰ περιπόλια [ta aphorismata aut■n, ta synkyrounta, ta peripolia]" ["their separated [portions], the adjoining [lands], the surrounding-districts"]. But by all these [terms] are signified the spaces adhering to the cities themselves — the circum-sown [lands], or sowing-[lands]; the separated or set-apart [lands]; the co-bordering, suburban, and circum-urban [lands], or amburbial [= around-the-city]. But the Rabbis in the Talmud (tractate "Eruvin," ch. 5) will [have it that] those [spaces were] given [extending] "to four limits" [in four directions]. The first [purpose] is, that in them sheep, oxen, [and] beasts of burden could be pastured. The second, lest the pleasantness of suburban gardens and orchards be lacking to the Levites. The third, that space might also suffice for that walking-about which [was] permitted on the sabbaths [the sabbath day's journey]. The fourth, that [there] be not lacking places which might serve for carrying out and discharging the various filth from the city. But out of these four, the scripture hands down only the first end and use (Num. 35:3): "Let the Levites themselves abide in the towns, and let the suburbs be for the cattle and beasts of burden." And here (v. 2) the Levites themselves say: "The Lord commanded by the hand of Moses that cities be given to us to dwell in, and their suburbs to feed [our] beasts of burden." Whence Abulensis writes (Num. 35, q. 3) [that], if [there] had perhaps been anything previously in these spaces which were given — of cultivated fields, vineyards, gardens, [or] arboreta — that [was] to be wholly converted into pastures. And Arias (on ch. 14): "Nowhere do we read of another use than of habitation within, and of domestic and cattle-rearing matters outside the city." And the other ends which are brought forward either were not necessary, or indeed could be supplied from elsewhere. For, *first*, [the

first-fruits etc.] supplied to the Levites fruit, and every kind of produce — even vegetables — from the first-fruits, the tithes, [and] the voluntary oblations (Matt. 23:23, where the Lord says [that] these [things], though small and minute, ought not to have been omitted). But because [there] seems to have been nothing of command concerning cumin, dill, and similar herbs and vegetables — and even if any such [things] were offered in the temple, they could not conveniently be brought into the Levitic cities; and truly because [there] is a great, and almost necessary, use of pot-herbs and herbs in the household, and [because it] is fitting [that] those things, sometimes also (on account of the sick), be by no means stale — [therefore] I would not think gardens [were] to be denied to the Levites; and indeed also, that [they] might somewhat relax [their] minds, wearied at times, with better pursuits. But [these gardens] could be within the cities, in the very grounds of the dwellings, as we see everywhere. But the walking-about could be had also in the pastures; nor, I think, would [it] ever have been denied in the roads, fields, and mountains of the neighboring tribes too. Finally, for the filth, a place could not be lacking — either in the cities, or in the pastures themselves. For the excremental [refuse] was either stored in sewers and consumed by the subterranean channels of waters or rains or others, or, by the very long duration of time, was turned into earth. But if, outside, in the spaces of the pastures, pits were made for receiving them, [there] the grass grew more luxuriantly, and more pleasant to the cattle — and [so too] the size and pleasantness of the trees — as Philo explains (bk. 2 *On Monarchy*), where he gives the causes why a grove was absent from the temple. But the other urban filth — such as some rubble and soot — is easily scattered and trodden down somewhere. Therefore [there] was only one, or at least the chief, end of those suburbs: pasturage.

Question VIII. How great [large were] the suburbs of the Levitic cities?

A great cross [difficulty] here, for both Jewish and Christian Interpreters. For [in] Num. 35:4 a size of cubits is attributed to those suburbs,

(col. 1241)

[…continued from col. 1240.] or of a thousand paces: "Which (suburbs), [reaching] from the walls of the cities outward, round about, [shall be] a thousand paces" (Num. 35:4). But in the next v. 5, the same size is said [to be] of two thousand cubits: "Toward the east [there] shall be two thousand cubits; and toward the south, likewise, [there] shall be two thousand; toward the sea too, which looks to the West, the same measure shall be; and the northern quarter shall be bounded by an equal limit" (Num. 35:5). In what way do these [two] agree? [There is] an almost eightfold endeavor of authors in establishing the consonance.

First: the 70 seem to hint [that there] is an error in the Hebrew — because, just as in the latter place, so [also] in the former, they always attribute to these suburbs "δισχιλίους πήχεις [dischilious p■cheis]" ["two thousand cubits"], twice a thousand cubits. But since the Hebrew copies all agree, and the Latin text follows them, and all the books (with all the Interpreters) [agree] — the Septuagint interpretation [is] indeed to be praised, [they] who, without any ambiguity, rendered the very [true] sense (as will appear below); nevertheless [one] must not desist, [but] rather let the true concord be sought in the Hebrew and Latin text.

Secondly: therefore, [there] are — in Lyra (Num. 35) — some Latins who observe that, in the Latin text, "paces" [are] put in the former verse, [and] "cubits" in the latter; and [they] say [that] two thousand of these [cubits] are not more than 1000 paces — because in a cubit [there] are two feet, [and] in a pace four; and so, by either manner of speaking, [there] are given to the suburbs four thousand feet. But, *first*: in the Hebrew, one [and] the same word is in both verses, which properly signifies "a cubit" — although [it] may not badly be taken for "a pace," which is equal to it. *Then*: to a pace are wont to be attributed not four but five feet, as [is] known from the common verses recited in the rudiments of the Sphere and of Geography: "Five feet make a pace," etc.

Thirdly: therefore Abulensis (Num. 35, q. 6) says [that] in the Latin text "a pace" is put in the former place, as [if] an explanation — [namely] that in it [the pace] are contained two cubits; and so [that] 1000 paces are 2000 cubits. But lest the same [Abulensis] be refuted by the already-cited verses, he distinguishes "a pace," and says [it] is the space either which is interposed only between foot and foot, or both this and that [space] which is placed under a man's foot, or feet. And in either way the pace is twofold. For [it] is either "standing [static]" or "ambulatory [walking]." In the former way, the "standing" [pace] has two feet; in the latter, four. For between the feet of a standing man, no more than a two-foot space is intercepted; and if to this be added [the space] which is under each foot of the same standing [man], [there] results a four-foot space. But the "ambulatory" [pace], in the former way, has three feet — because then the steps are wont to be enlarged; but in the latter way [it] has four, when motion and continuous walking is taken [into account]. For thus only that [part] of the space is taken which is under one foot, not under two — because thus only one foot presses the ground and cleaves to it; but the other, [being] lifted, when [it] falls back to the ground, occupies the space which pertains to the following pace. But the same ambulatory pace has five feet, when — both feet [being] fixed on the ground — the space both which [is] between the two, and [which is] under each, is taken. And the cited verses speak of the ambulatory pace of this latter kind; our Interpreter, in this place, [speaks] of the ambulatory [pace] of the former kind. That explanation is easy; and therefore [it was] also once briefly noted by me in [the work] *The Joshuan Priests* (ch. 5, num. 59); but [it] does not yet remove absolutely every scruple. *First*: because authors would have to be cited who used these standing and ambulatory paces in this way. For how else shall we believe [that] our Interpreter spoke about "a pace" in this way? *Secondly*: in that way the variety of the Hebrew text is not explained, where [there] is properly no mention of paces, but of cubits only.

Fourthly: others distinguish [kinds of] cubits. For the geometric cubits are either "sacred" or "common," and those [sacred] [are] double the size of these [common]. Since, therefore, the discourse had been first about the sacred [cubits], those are afterward explained by the common [ones], and therefore [are] doubled. For thus the sacred shekels are double the size of the common [ones]; and [a] mention of that kind of sacred cubits seems [to be found] (1 Kings 6:2, & ch. 7:15). But, *first*: by what sign could [it] be gathered [that] the text speaks now of sacred, now of common [cubits]? *Secondly*: [it] would have to be proved [that] the use of sacred cubits [pertains] to the measurements of bare plots of land — and not only to the measurements of buildings and structures.

Fifthly: R. Salomon [Rashi] & the Talmudists (in the place indicated in the previous question) say [that] properly the "migraschim" and suburbs are the places nearest to the cities, which served only for walking-about, washing, and the recreation of men; and [that] these [were] only 1000 cubits. But [they say that], besides these, [there] were again other spaces contiguous to these, which — [being] more remote from the city — extended [another] thousand cubits; and [that] in these [it] was possible to plow, to sow, and to plant vineyards; and therefore [that] those spaces, joined to the former, [were] truly of 2000 cubits in every quarter of the land. This fiction Abulensis and Paul of Burgos disapprove — and deservedly. For [they] are, as [it] appeared from the previous question, all these [things] empty [vain] — since pastures alone were given to the Levites.

Sixthly: Rabbi Nehemias [Nehemannus] will [have it] that, around each city, a square is to be taken, whose individual sides are of 500 cubits. But how, hence, are the spaces drawn out from the very walls of the ramparts [to] 1000 cubits? For the whole square indeed is of 2000 cubits [in perimeter]; but the spaces are not 2000 cubits toward the East, nor toward the West, nor toward the other parts.

Seventhly: Paul of Burgos, in [his] "addition" (on ch. 35 of Num.), describes a similar square around the cities, but whose individual sides are of 2000 cubits; and [that], from the walls of the cities, as [if] from a center, the spaces are of 1000 cubits. And he says the former verse treats of these 1000 [cubits]; [and] the latter [verse treats] of the 2000 cubits of the individual sides, which are extended toward all quarters. This

pleases Arias Montanus, in ch. 14 of this book; but he adds three [points]. *First*: [that] a square of this kind exists only when the city would occupy no space, and when from it — as [if] from a point, devoid of all magnitude — lines of 1000 cubits would be drawn in every direction. *Secondly*: but when the city is posited to obtain some magnitude — as [it] truly always obtains — lines of 1000 cubits can indeed be drawn from it in every direction; but from these no square will result. For as much as [is] given to the city's magnitude, so much assuredly will be subtracted from the square. As if, for example,

(col. 1243)

[…continued from col. 1242.] if the city were square, whose individual sides were 100 cubits long, 400 cubits will be lacking from the sides of that greater square — that is, four little squares, whose individual sides are 100 cubits. *Third* [point of Arias]: he gathers [that] that measure of the squares is here indicated, from the phrase which is used in the latter verse in Hebrew. For since in the former verse [it] had been simply said [that] "the suburbs, from the wall or rampart of the city, and toward the outer part, ought to be 1000 cubits, round about," in the latter [verse it] is not said [that] 2000 cubits ought to be numbered, but "twice a thousand in the cubit." But that phrase is wont to be used when two sides of a square are signified — [sides] which individually have that set number, [and] the four sides [have] the quadrupled number. And therefore "twice a thousand in the cubit" here signifies [that] a square [is] to be made whose individual sides are 2000 cubits, [and] all [sides together] 8000. So elsewhere "six in the cubit," that is, a square whose each side is 6 cubits, [and] the whole 24. And concerning that phrase the same author [Arias] refers the Reader to his "Thubalcain," and the book "On fabrics [structures]" in the sacred Apparatus of the Bibles — where, however, I see no solid proof. Yet [it] is an ingenious and erudite explanation.

Eighthly, and lastly: Masius (in ch. 14) bids [that], from the city's wall toward the east, and the other quarters, lines of a thousand cubits be drawn. Two such opposite lines are of two thousand cubits; and from the extremity of the one to the extremity of the other — the city-space, which is in their middle, [being] passed over — [there] are two thousand cubits. And therefore, if you place yourself on the city wall, [and] look at the suburbs in whatever direction, [they] will be of 1000 cubits; and conversely, if, placed at the extremity of the suburbs, you look only as far as the very walls of the city. But if, standing at one extremity of the same suburbs, you turn [your] eyes to the other extremity, [they] will be — the city always (as I said) [being] omitted — two thousand cubits, from whatever to whatever opposite quarter the view and measurement is made [in] this manner.

[Compass-rose diagram.] *A round city is drawn at the center, with four wall-points on its circumference and four outer (suburb-edge) points at the ends of the four cardinal lines:*

| *Quarter* | *City-wall point* | *Outer (suburb) point* |

|---|---|---|

| *North — Septentrio (top)* | *E* | *C* |

| *South — Meridies (bottom)* | *F* | *D* |

| *East — Oriens (left)* | *g* | *A* |

| *West — Occidens (right)* | *H* | *B* |

The explanation (keyed to the figure):

1. The city is [the square] "e·f·g·h." 2. From the wall of the city "g" toward the east as far as "a," [there] are 1000 cubits. Similarly toward the west, from the wall "h" as far as "b"; likewise from "f" as far as "d," and from "e" as far as "c." And so, from the wall, the suburbs are of 1000 cubits, as v. 4 says. 3. But from "a" as far as "b" [there] are 2000 cubits — the city-space "d·g" [being] omitted. So from "c" to "d," "e·f" [being] omitted; and the reverse. And so, in every quarter, v. 5 numbers 2000 cubits.

This exposition certainly seems most consonant with the text — since in the former verse (4) [it] is so expressly said "from the wall," but in the latter [verse] the measurement of the suburbs is made "from quarter to quarter"; and in that [latter verse] [it] is even added, "[that] the cities are in the middle of those quarters" — as if [it] clearly admonished [that] their interior space [is] by no means to be numbered, but only its exterior amburbial [around-the-city] spaces, proceeding from one side to the opposite other — that is, from East to West, from North to South, and the reverse. Nor does that exposition fit only if the city be round, but also if [it be] in any way figured and angular — three-cornered, four-cornered, five-cornered, and so on — provided [that] from each side of the wall, toward the four quarters of the world, the lines are said [to be] perpendicular; according to which the measurement is wont to be made by the Mathematicians, as our [commentary] on the 1st chapter "of the Sphere" teaches — [and] Clavius, from Ptolemy's book "On the analemma." But then, whatever figure the city's walls have, the [outer suburb-]walls too obtain the same [figure], being described by equal perpendiculars.

[Shape-figures.] *A row of figures illustrates the same for cities of various shapes — a triangle, a square, a diamond [rotated square], a pentagon, and a hexagon — each with perpendicular lines radiating outward from the middle of every side (and a small mark for the city at the center), so that the surrounding suburb-boundary repeats the city's own figure.*

Question IX. Whether, in the cities given to the Levites, [there] was any right left — after the giving — to the tribes, or to the tribesmen who had given them?

[There] are two opinions. To some [it] seems [that] the *direct* dominion (as the Jurisconsults speak) of the Levitic cities remained always in the power of either the tribes or the tribesmen who had given them; but [that] only the *use* and habitation of them was granted to the Levites. Others say [that] the Levites were absolute Owners. By applying one distinction, the dispute seems able to be settled. In the cities, besides the houses and their habitation, [there] are certain public and private conveniences

(col. 1245)

[…continued from col. 1244.] For [there] are Magistracies, dignities, honors. [There] are sometimes tolls, taxes, [and] some profitable transactions which the opportunity of the place supplies — by reason of fields, vineyards, olive-groves, rivers, metals [mines], and other such [things]. The Levites, therefore: *First*: as to the houses, and their use and fruit, [they] were absolute owners in every way — because, like the rest of the Jews, [they] could sell these; and yet, before those [others], [they could], whenever [it] pleased, redeem them, by God's privilege (Lev. 25:32): "The houses of the Levites, which are in the cities, can always be redeemed, because the houses of the Levites are, among the children of Israel, for [as] possessions." *Secondly*: of the suburbs too the Levites were absolute Owners, if [compared] in relation to men — because in them [they] depended on no [human] man; but if [the matter] be referred to God, [they] were forbidden to sell those [suburbs] (Lev. 25:33): "Let the suburbs of the Levites not be sold, because [it] is an everlasting possession." *Thirdly*: the administration of the Magistracies, and the public honors and dignities of the same [cities], belonged, in those cities, to the Levites. This is understood from the life [work] of the historian Josephus, and from reason. For [it] was not fitting that, in these sacred cities — which were [those] of the Priests and of God's ministers — the Commonwealth [government] should be in the power of any others, and [that] the members indeed be sacred, but the head profane. *Fourthly*: concerning the other conveniences which — [being] joined with the nature and opportunity of the place — cultivation, labor, and industry could bring forth and supply, Tostatus [speaks] thus briefly (Num. 35, q. 2): "When some city was given to the Levites, the fields and country[-lands] of that city were not given, because the cities were given for dwelling only, and not simply [absolutely]. But [it] is said, that if in those cities [there] were any revenues — such as of tolls, or of other kinds — [they] did not pertain to the Levites, but to the tribe which had given such a city; even if within the city [there] were any stone-quarries, or gold-mines, or mines of other metals, or the like —

those did not pertain to the Levites, but to those who had given the city. Also the whole territory of each city — of vineyards, fields, and vine-plots — did not pertain to the Levites, but to those giving the city, except the 1000 paces around the city on each side." Thus he [Tostatus]. And in that way Caleb — concerning whom here (v. 11 & 12) — gave to the Levites Hebron, which he had received into his [own] dominion (above, ch. 14), as to the city, and the suburbs adjacent to it; and Joshua approved and confirmed that donation by his [own] judgment, [and that] of the dividers; whence [Caleb] is also said to have "donated" that [Hebron]. But the fields, and the villages or hamlets, and the villages which pertained to Hebron, the same Caleb retained for himself, by the law of this donation. And because Joshua, with the whole Sanhedrin of the dividers, likewise approved and confirmed this very [thing], [Joshua] is said to have given these fields and villages to Caleb (v. 12). Yet [it] could be asked: "whether the Levites could in no way possess immovable goods [real estate]?" That [they] could not, St. Cyril thinks (bk. 13 *On Adoration*). But [that they] could, Abulensis proves (Lev. 27, q. 67), and I indicated [it] (ch. 5 of *The Joshuan Priests*, num. 60) — where the example of Josephus could have been added, who, although he was a Priest, nevertheless writes in [his] *Life* [that] he had fields in the Jerusalem countryside, and received others afterward from Titus in the great plain (bk. 5 of the *Jewish War*, ch. 15).

Question X. Whether in the Levitic cities, besides the Levites, no one dwelt?

Someone can dwell in some city in many ways. For either [he] is a part of the city [a citizen], or not; and if not, [he] is either a slave, or free. And if free, [he] is either a native or a newcomer; or [he] stays only for a certain time and, as it were, lodges [as a traveler], as guests and foreigners are wont [to do]; or [he] abides constantly in the same place, and fixes [his] seat, as the inquilini [resident-tenants] do. *First*: therefore [it] is certain [that] guests and foreigners, who passed through these cities, could have a lodging here. For what city [is] so barbarous [as to] deny this? *Then* [it] is certain [that], in some of the Levites' cities, [those] dwelt who had fled [there] for the cause of homicide — concerning whom [it was] treated [in] this and the previous chapter. *Thirdly*: [it] is certain [that] in all cities and towns [there] must be various craftsmen, who prepare and make the various [things] for the necessary uses of men — such as bakers, butchers, cooks, shoemakers, tailors, barbers, day- and night-guards of the gates and walls, masons, carpenters, smiths, [and] others: as [was] wisely shown by Aristotle (bk. 7 of the Politics), [and] Plato (bk. 2 *On the Commonwealth*); and truly also by our Ecclesiasticus, who (ch. 36, from v. 26), when [he] had praised farmers, smiths, architects, potters, and (by the likeness of these) other manual craftsmen, subjoined (v. 35): "All these have trusted in their hands, and each one is wise in his [own] art. Without all these a city is not built" (Sir. 38:36–39). If the Levites, therefore, could not perform these duties by themselves, other inhabitants were necessary. If [they] could, [there] was no need of others. But whether [they] could, or not, [there] was also, in their cities, a place and dwelling for others. For, as [it] appeared above (q. 9) from Lev. 25, [it] was lawful for them to sell their houses to others. But as to the works or crafts above mentioned, [it] was permitted to the Levites to practice not a few [of them] by themselves. For what forbade [them] to keep the watches of the gates and walls — since [it] was lawful for them to be present at battles, to join combat with the enemy, and to fight it out with the sword, as we see in the history of the Maccabees, and [in] Exod. 32:26 & following? And did [they] not, in the temple, act as cooks, bakers, and butchers? (Matt. 12:5; Mark 2:26.) But in the smith's art, architecture, and other similar [arts], what [is there] either sordid or illiberal [unbecoming]? Rabbi Gamaliel, son of Rabbi Judah the prince, said (ch. 2 of the book *Pirke Avoth* [Sayings of the Fathers]): "Beautiful is the study of the law with a craft adjoined. For the labor of each induces a forgetfulness of sin" — so that, namely, to sin [one] neither desires, nor [does it] come into [one's] mind. "The Greeks," says St. Augustine (in the book *On the work of Monks*, ch. 13), "had shoemakers much honored among themselves" — among whom indeed was "Menedemus," who, as Muretus observes (bk. 11 of the *Antiquae Lectiones*, ch. 11), was a "σκηνογράφος [sk■nographos]" ["a scene-painter"]. What of our Paul? Was [he] not most learned, and most knowing of the Mosaic law? And yet [he] was a "σκηνορράφος [sk■norraphos]" ["a tent-maker"], as St. Luke shows (Acts

18:3). St. Chrysostom (on 1 Cor., homily 20 & 24; homily 5 to

(col. 1247)

[…continued from col. 1246.] to the people; the homily on St. Paul) — or "σκυτοτόμος [skytotomos]" ["a cobbler / leather-cutter"], as [Paul] is called by the same [Chrysostom] (on 2 Tim. 2, homily 5). The Levites, therefore, could join to the studies of the divine law, and to the sacred functions of the temple, some sedentary and manual arts. Yet two [things] seem [true] to me in this matter. *One*: [that] if the Levites had practiced these works of the hands, [they] practiced [them] neither assiduously, nor for gain, nor mercenarily. For assiduity [constant practice] would have hindered the more liberal and more sacred thoughts of the mind, and the necessary administration of the sacred [rites]; but the greed of much gain and wages [would have hindered] their authority. *The other*: [that] the same [Levites] did not [actually] touch [practice] these crafts. *1.* Because I have hitherto been able to hear or read no one who asserts otherwise. *2.* We read of no works of this kind done by them outside the temple. *3.* [Otherwise] they themselves would have built Solomon's temple — if not the whole, at least in the greatest part. *4.* In the return from Babylon, when [there] was a greater need of workmen, and [a greater] poverty of the people — when the restoration and building of the temple was urged most by the Prophets, Haggai & Zechariah — if the Levites were architects and masons, stone-cutters and builders, why did [they] not put [their] hand to the work? why did [they] not build the new temple? why did [they] not relieve, by [their] greatest expense and labor, the distressed people [just] returned from the Babylonian prison? *5.* [There] would have been no need [for] so great a care to be undertaken concerning them by God — [that] he should so often, and so seriously, command the people concerning them, [that] faithfully and abundantly to them the first-fruits, tithes, and the best, most-ample, most-frequent oblations be given, [and that there] should never be a forgetting of them; [that] they be called even into a participation of the triennial tithes; [that] in almost all ways [they] be maintained, liberally and amply, by the people (if indeed [the people] wished to be grateful and religious toward God). For by [their] hand and art [they] could have sustained their own life, [and] driven away want and poverty. *6.* Finally, although these arts are not really unworthy of a man — even a free, polished, learned, and sacred [one] — in themselves, yet, in the judgment of men, [they] are held [to be] rather illiberal [unbecoming], meaner, and more contemptible; and the "βάναυσοι χειροτέχναι [banausoi cheirotechnai]" ["vulgar manual-workers, mechanics"] are wont to be despised — as in Dionysius of Halicarnassus on the Romans (bk. 2), in Aelian (bk. 1 of the *Various History*, num. 1, concerning Alcibiades), in Heraclides on the Thespians, in Horapollo (bk. 1, ch. 38), and others on other [matters]. And therefore, if those ministers of God had been occupied and engaged in these [arts], [something] would have been detracted — in the [eyes] of very many — from their authority, from the excellence of the divine worship, [and] from the majesty of God himself, among the rude and unskilled common crowd, [and] among others too who are not much wiser than this [crowd], of whom [there] is everywhere a great nation [multitude]. That vileness of mechanical arts of this kind Ecclesiasticus seems to describe, after the words cited a little before, when, concerning the [otherwise] necessary craftsmen, he subjoins: "And [they] shall not dwell [in high places], nor walk about, and [they] shall not leap over into the Church [assembly]; upon the seat of the Judge [they] shall not sit; and the covenant of judgment [they] shall not understand; nor shall [they] make open [manifest] discipline and judgment; and in parables [they] shall not be found" (Sir. 38:37–39). *7.* We know, finally, what the Priests of the idols did, and in what place [esteem] [they] were among their [own people]. For, for example, those [priests] among the Egyptians — "φιλοσοφίαν [philosophian]," says Strabo (bk. 17), "ἄσκουν καὶ ἀστρονομίαν, ὁμιληταὶ τῶν βασιλέων [askoun kai astronomian, homil■tai t■n basile■n]" ["[they] practiced philosophy and astronomy, [being] associates of the kings"]; and [they] were nourished not by the works of a craftsman and of the hands, but by royal and public expenditures (Gen. 47:22). We know, besides, how scoffing, bitter, [and] slanderous [against] the Jews those same Gentiles were — as, of the Romans, Tacitus, Martial, Juvenal; of the Greeks and Egyptians, Strabo (bk. 16), Manetho, Chaeremon, Lysimachus, and, most troublesome of all, Apion (against whom Josephus fights in two books, in the former of which [are] those [matters]). If the mystae

[initiates] and priests of the Jews had been from the common crowd of cobblers, patchers, stone-cutters, shepherds, and cowherds — how [much] would [the Gentiles] have derided the sacred [rites] of the Jews? how petulantly would [they] have despised the Deity of the Jews, and mocked the whole nation? Yet [they] never objected anything of this kind — nay rather, [they] always spoke amply and magnificently of their [the Jews'] Priests and Levites. And truly, if any of the Levites were perhaps excluded — on account of some bodily defect — from the ministry of the sacred [rites], for [their] whole life, the Lord did not command [that] they be assigned to common works of this kind, or seek [their] livelihood through them; but [he] willed [that] they too be sustained from the sacred revenues (Lev. 21:17 & following). [It is] therefore to be thought [that there] were others, whose work the Priests and Levites used, in their cities, for the necessity of works of this kind — whether those [others] were slaves, or other Israelites. And of these, at the beginning of this donation and habitation, [it] behooved [there] to be a very great number — even for this cause alone, that the sum [total] of Priests was then a very small number. Our [fellow] Gretser moreover (bk. 2 of the *Considerations*, counsel 11): "I pass over [in silence]," he says, "[that they] had their own cities, and in them Magistracies, to which PERHAPS, from all Israel, for the sake of obtaining justice, [people] either went of their own accord, or were summoned." But "PERHAPS" [was] prudently added. For this cannot be proved; and [it] seems [to be] rather disproved by Josephus (bk. 4, last ch.) — when (as [was] said above, q. 5) [Josephus] adjoins Levites to the Judges and Magistrates, but in all cities; and [when he] remands some weightier [matters] to Jerusalem, to the examination and tribunal of the Pontiff, [the] Prophet, and the Senate [Sanhedrin].

(col. 1249)

After the Wars: Caput XXII

Caput XXII (opening)

1. At the same time Josue called the Rubenites, and the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasses, **2.** and said to them: You have done all that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded you: you have also obeyed me in all things, **3.** neither have you left your brethren this long time, until this present day, keeping the commandment of the Lord your God. **4.** Therefore, since the Lord your God hath given your brethren rest and peace, as he promised: return, and go to your dwellings, and to the land of your possession, which Moses the servant of the Lord gave you beyond the Jordan: **5.** yet so that you observe attentively, and in work fulfil the commandment and the law which Moses the servant of the Lord commanded you: that you love the Lord your God, and walk in all his ways, and keep all his commandments, and cleave to him, and serve him with all your heart, and with all your soul. **6.** And Josue blessed them, and sent them away, and they returned to their dwellings. **7.** Now to half the tribe of Manasses, Moses had given a possession in Basan: and therefore to the half that remained, Josue gave a lot among the rest of their brethren beyond the Jordan to the west. And when he sent them away to their dwellings, and had blessed them, **8.** he said to them: With much substance and riches you return to your settlements, with silver and gold, brass and iron, and variety of raiment: divide the prey of your enemies with your brethren. **9.** So the children of Ruben, and the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasses returned, and parted from the children of Israel in Silo, which is in Chanaan, to go into Galaad the land of their possession, which they had obtained according to the commandment of the Lord by the hand of Moses. **10.** And when they were come to the banks of the Jordan, in the land of Chanaan, they built an altar immensely great near the Jordan. **11.** And when the children of Israel had heard of it, and certain messengers had brought them an account that the children of Ruben, and of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasses had built an altar in the land of Chanaan, upon the banks of the Jordan, over against the children of Israel: **12.** they all assembled in Silo, to go up and fight against them. **13.** And in the mean time they sent to them into the land of Galaad, Phinees the son of Eleazar the priest, **14.** and ten princes with him, one of every tribe. **15.** Who came to the children of Ruben, and of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasses, into the land of Galaad, and said to them: **16.** Thus saith all the people of the Lord: What meaneth this transgression? Why have you forsaken the Lord the God of Israel, building a sacrilegious altar, and departing from the worship of him? **17.** Is it a small thing to you that you sinned with Beelphegor, and the stain of that crime remaineth in us to this day? and many of the people perished. **18.** And you have forsaken the Lord to-day, and to-morrow his wrath will rage against all Israel. **19.** But if you think the land of your possession to be unclean, pass over to the land wherein is the tabernacle of the Lord, and dwell among us: only depart not from the Lord, and from our society, by building an altar beside the altar of the Lord our God. **20.** Did not Achan the son of Zare transgress the commandment of the Lord, and his wrath lay upon all the people of Israel? And he was but one man; and would to God he alone had perished in his wickedness. **21.** And the children of Ruben, and of Gad, and of the half tribe of Manasses answered the princes of the embassage of Israel: **22.** The Lord the most mighty God, the Lord the most mighty God, he knoweth, and Israel also shall understand: If with the design of transgression we have set up this altar, let him not save us, but punish us immediately: **23.** and if we did it with that mind, that we might lay upon it holocausts, and sacrifice, and victims of peace offerings, let him require and judge: **24.** and not rather with this thought and design, that we should say: To-morrow your children will say to our children: What have you to do with the Lord the God of Israel? **25.** The Lord hath put the river Jordan for a border between us and you, O ye children of Ruben, and ye children of Gad: and therefore you have no part in the Lord. And by this occasion your children shall turn away our children from the fear of the Lord. We therefore thought it best, **26.** and said: Let us build us an altar, not for holocausts, nor to offer victims, **27.** but for a testimony between us and you, and our posterity and yours, that we may serve the Lord, and that we may have a right to offer both holocausts, and victims, and sacrifices of peace offerings: and that your children to-morrow may not say to our children: You have no part in the Lord. **28.**

And if they will say so, they shall answer them: Behold the altar of the Lord, which our fathers made, not for holocausts, nor for sacrifice, but for a testimony between us and you. **29.** God keep us from any such wickedness that we should revolt from the Lord, and leave off following his steps,

(col. 1251)

[…lemma continued from col. 1250:] by building an altar to offer holocausts, and sacrifices, and victims, beside the altar of the Lord our God, which is built before his tabernacle. **30.** And when Phinees the priest, and the princes of the embassage of Israel, who were with him, had heard this, they were satisfied: and they received the words of the children of Ruben, and of Gad, and of the half tribe of Manasses most gladly. **31.** And Phinees the priest, the son of Eleazar, said to them: Now we know that the Lord is with us, because you are not guilty of this transgression, and you have delivered the children of Israel from the hand of the Lord. **32.** And he returned with the princes, from the children of Ruben and Gad, out of the land of Galaad, of the confines of Chanaan, to the children of Israel, and brought them word again. **33.** And the saying pleased all that heard it. And the children of Israel praised God, and they no longer said that they would go up against them, and fight, and destroy the land of their possession. **34.** And the children of Ruben, and the children of Gad called the altar which they had built, "Our testimony, that the Lord himself is God."

COMMENTARY

Of those [things] which Joshua did after the Canaanite wars, the second is the dismissal [sending-home] of the Transjordanian tribes, which is described in this chapter so that [it] chiefly embraces four [things]. *1.* [There] is Joshua's final speech to those [tribes] about to depart. *2.* The altar built by the same [tribes], now departing, at the bank of the Jordan. *3.* The suspicion born from it, and the holding of an assembly [comitia]. *4.* The embassy to those [tribes], and its happy outcome.

Question I. What, and how, did Joshua speak to the Transjordanian tribes [as they were] about to depart?

First: he notably praised them (v. 2); and indeed in a fourfold way. *(1.)* That [they] had been obedient to Moses. *(2.)* That [they had been obedient] to himself, and that in all things. [There] are some who obey one of [their] superiors, [but] not the others; [who] revere the first [ones, but] despise [their] successors; [who] observe the highest [ones, but] esteem the lower [ones] as nothing. But to the Transjordanian tribes Joshua says: "You have done all that Moses the servant of the Lord commanded you; you have also obeyed me in all things." That [is] a great praise, because in every well-mannered Commonwealth, and assembly of men, obedience [is] a great virtue — which, as [was] wisely said by Aeschylus, [is] "εὐπραγίας μήτηρ, γυνὴ σωτῆρος [eupragias m■t■r, gyn■ s■t■ros]," that is, "[it] is the mother of good-fortune [prosperity], but the wife of the Preserver [Savior]." And therefore, in that formerly most-noble Spartan city, the whole education of boys and youths was directed — with Plutarch, in the Life of Lycurgus, [as] witness — to obeying, enduring, and conquering; and they so obeyed the Paedonomus [boy-governor] "ὥστε τὴν παιδείαν εἶναι μελέτην εὐπειθείας [h■ste t■n paideian einai melet■n eupeitheias]," that is, "so that the whole discipline of the children was," says Plutarch, "an exercise of obedience." *(3.)* That [they] had rendered faithful service to their brethren in acquiring their land and inheritance; nor had [they] left them hitherto in any peril or danger. And that [is] the more splendid, [by] how much greater was the time of this service and aid. For therefore the text says (v. 3) "a long time," or, as [it] is in the Hebrew, "these many days." And [these] were, as [is] clear from the aforesaid, 14 years. Many [things] could have called away these tribes from the aid of [their] brethren: namely, the dangers of perils, the longing for their own inheritance, the care of [their] household, [and] especially the very length of time. Nevertheless, [those tribes] endured and persevered on foreign soil, for the benefit of others, estranged from their own affairs, for so many years. Let us learn how, and how constantly, [it] behooves [us] to help [our] neighbors. *(4.)* That

[they] kept God's commandments. Namely, [he] who keeps charity, fulfills the law; [he] who does his duty toward [his] superiors and equals, [he] also satisfies God.

Then, Joshua gave them the power [permission] of departing into their [own] inheritance (v. 4) — because their service [was] now not necessary to the Israelites, since God had given these [latter] rest and peace, as he had once promised them. That rest was indeed not yet perfect, and completed in all respects, since very many of the Canaanites remained; yet [it] was so begun that, if the Israelites had wished, and were [to be] admitted a little further, [they] could utterly destroy those [Canaanites] with no trouble. *Thirdly*: Joshua gave them excellent precepts for the life to be led thereafter (v. 5). For [it] is not enough to live well for some certain time, [or] even for several years; but in all [one's] life always, up to death, [one] must persist in the same straight path. Nor is [it] enough, in one place, and in the sight of [one's] superiors, to cultivate [one's] duty, and to live praiseworthily; but everywhere — even beyond the Jordan, and far from the eyes of those who are set over us — the same course [is] always to be held. *Fourthly*: he blessed the same [tribes] (v. 6 & 8), namely praying [for] very many good [things] for them from God the Best and Greatest. And this indeed he did by himself, as Commander and Prophet; but without doubt he did this also through Eleazar the Pontiff. For then many Eucharistic [thanksgiving] and peace[-offering] sacrifices [were] indeed offered to God; and peace and prosperity [were] asked for these [tribes] from God. Yet [there] are [those] who think [that], in v. 8, "to bless" is "to be numbered" [i.e. to attend with benefits]. *Fifthly*: he recalls to the memory of the same tribes the greatest benefits of God toward them — [they] who, while [they] had rendered [their] due duty to [their] brethren, were enriched with rich spoils. Nothing indeed was owed to them — [they] had already obtained their lot (and [one] good and splendid) beyond the Jordan; [they] had done only that which [it] behooved them to do, and [that] which had been set down [as a condition] in the grant of the region given to them (Num. 32). Nevertheless, such is the goodness of God toward men, that [he] never allows the duties which [men] must necessarily do to be void and without some reward — sometimes even a temporal [one]. Hence the tribesmen of the Transjordanian tribes, laden with gold, silver, brass, iron, and much raiment, now return to their homes

(col. 1253)

[…now return to their homes,] verse 8. And this ought by right to arouse our spirits — [us] who, in the wars against the Turks, and against the ruin of the Church and the destruction of all Catholics, contend with heretics [who are] conspired [for all this] and now raising their most hostile standards — [that] we Christians bring aid to one another: and not only in those [matters] which are carried on by hand and sword, but also in those which [are carried on] by mind and learning, by prayers and pens. *Sixthly*: he admonished these [tribes] (v. 8) to divide the spoil with their remaining fellow-tribesmen — those who had stayed at home, and had cultivated the cities and fields — concerning whom [see] ch. 1, part 2, in [the treatment] of the appointed portion of the People, q. 2.

But [there] is a question here: *Whether that division of spoil was imposed by Joshua as a precept [command], or rather as a counsel [advice]?* [There] is a twofold opinion. To one [party] the latter [counsel] is pleasing; to others the former [precept], as to Masius here, and Abulensis. And indeed *first*, if we look at the text, [it] seems a precept, because [it] is said "Chilku" [חלקו], that is, "Divide [ye]." Which Junius and Tremellius translate far too mildly: "Be partakers of the spoil of your enemies with your brethren." And this they seem to do in order that they may make the opinion of their master Calvin — who here wants [it to be] only a counsel — more probable. *Secondly*: Num. 31:27 — a precept was also given [there] for the spoil to be divided, on another occasion, between the warriors and the Israelites. And indeed those who had stayed at home also incurred some peril of war, since [they] had been left in garrison of the land, as [is] said [in] the q. 2 cited. But [it] is objected from 1 Kings [1 Sam.] 30 [that] the law of dividing spoil in this manner began in David's time. Abulensis answers here (q. 6, and Num. 31, before q. 9), and Masius in this place, [that it] began — not simply [absolutely], but as to this: that the portion should be equal for those who had taken part

in the battle and [for] those who had remained with the baggage — since in the time of both Moses and Joshua, at this very moment, only some [portion], though not an equal [one], had been given. And thus Joshua dismissed those tribes, graced [affectas] with praises, spoils, blessings, precepts, and admonitions. Hence [it] is to be wished by us, and truly to be striven after, that wherever we shall turn aside and tarry, we may obtain testimony, goodwill, and benediction of this kind from our superiors. But [there] is also an illustrious example here set before superiors themselves in Joshua: that [they should] follow with singular goodwill and praise those who have borne themselves well, [should] heap upon them prayers and blessings, [and should] strengthen [them] with precepts and exhortations. [There] are indeed some [who are] so morose, [so] difficult, or ineptly scrupulous, that [they] are afraid to praise anyone — especially if [he] be an inferior, and present. "Lest," they say, "that man be puffed up with pride and vain glory." Precisely as if [they] were unwilling to set food and drink before the same [man], lest [he] stuff and gorge himself with more [than is right]. True praise — as Tostatus shows here (q. 1) — is good and useful.

[There] are, moreover, precepts to be observed which Joshua gave. *1.* That [they] attend most diligently, and keep [guard over] themselves. *2.* That [they] carry out, and fulfill in work, the commandment and the law which Moses had given. *3.* That [they] love the Lord God. *4.* That [they] walk in his ways — and indeed in all [of them]. *5.* That [they] observe his precepts. *6.* That [they] cleave to him. *7.* That [they] serve him: and that indeed "with all [their] heart, and with all [their] soul."

Finally, the manner of dismissing these tribes is indicated at the very beginning of the chapter, when [it] is said that Joshua called them. [They] did not, therefore, desert the standards, nor depart from their station of their own accord [prematurely], nor importunately demand their discharge and dismissal; but, with a moderate and even mind — even though the division of the whole dominion [territory] had [now] been made, and all, or at least many, had already entered into their [own] possessions — [they] waited until [they] should be called by Joshua, and by him most honorably dismissed. An example which, in warfare, in the bringing of aid, [and] in all of life, [is] to be observed: that we not rush off anywhere without the command of our Commanders. But both the manner of this departure, and Joshua's speech to the departing [tribes], [it] seems most fitting [to be able] to hear from Josephus himself (bk. 5, ch. 1):

> *"Since God, the Father and Lord of the Hebrew race, has both given [us] to possess this land, and has promised [that] he will altogether preserve it for us [as] possessed, while you [for your part], at his bidding, have shown yourselves ready and eager for all [things] at [our] asking — [it] is fitting that you now, since nothing difficult remains besides, obtain [your] rest. Yet we are in this confidence concerning the eagerness of your spirits (for* φειδοῖ *[pheidoi, "with thrift"] one must read, as appears from Rufinus,* πειθοῖ *[peithoi, "with persuasion, trust"]), that, should it again hereafter be necessary to us, [you will be] unwearying, and in no way hesitant toward all [the troubles] that shall press upon [us]; nor will [you] be too slow [to come to the aid of] those by whom [you] have now been served through [these] labors and troubles. Let thanks therefore be [given] to you, on account of the perils which you have endured with us. And, retaining this good disposition not only now, but always, be mindful of [your] friends. And ponder in your mind the good [things] that are present to you from these [friends], and that you have put off enjoying those very [things] which are at hand for you, for our sake: and [then] at length [you] will have judged [yourselves] worthy to be made partakers of these [goods], when you shall have labored for those [things] in which, by God's goodwill, we are now established. (For* ποιήσαντες *[poi■santes, "having done"] one must read* πονήσαντες *[pon■santes, "having toiled"].) And to those [goods] which already were, a vast heap of good [things] has been added out of the labors which you have borne with us: and so [you] will carry back home both much spoil, and gold, and silver. And — [what] is more than these — [you will carry back] all goodwill from us, and a mind ready for all [things] that shall be wished for, and in turn [shall be] required [of us]. For [you] have not departed from those [things] which Moses had foretold, as though despising him after [he] had gone from among men: nor is [there] anything on account of which we should not give you thanks. Joyful, therefore, we dismiss you to [your] lots and inheritances, and exhort [you] to reckon [that there] is no end [limit] to that bond [of kinship] which is between us: nor think [that], because this river lies between [us], we are others, and not Hebrews. For [we] are all Abrahamides [children of Abraham] — both [we] who dwell here, and [you] who [dwell] there. [There] is one God, who brought both our forefathers and yours into life: whose worship, and discipline of living — which [he] established through Moses — [it] behooves*

[us] to take care of, applying all caution, so that, while we persist in these [things], [he] may show himself kindly to us, and a helper; and lest, while [we] turn aside to the imitation of other nations, [he] turn himself away from our race." These [things] Joshua said. And at once [he] saluted individually those indeed who were of any dignity; but the whole multitude of them [he] saluted in common, and remained in his [own] place: but the people led them forth [escorted them] — not without tears: and scarcely were [they] parted one from another.

Question II. How did [they] depart, and [how, as they] departed, did the Transjordanian tribes raise up an altar on the way?

The Transjordanians, dismissed by their Commander Joshua with a most honorable sending-away, whence also

(col. 1255)

[…were dismissed with a most honorable sending-away, whence also] whither they went, the text explains (v. 9) thus: *"And the children of Ruben, and the children of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasses returned, and departed from the children of Israel out of Silo, which is in Chanaan, to enter Galaad, the land of their possession, which they had obtained according to the commandment of the Lord by the hand of Moses"* — that is, "through Moses." For a thousand times in the Scriptures, [for] something "to be done in the hand of" someone, is [for it] "to be done through him." The command was the Lord's, but the ministry was Moses's: the one [is], as Josephus says (bk. 4, ch. 8), στρατηγός [strat■gos, "commander, general"], the other ὑποστράτηγος [hypostrat■gos, "sub-commander, lieutenant"]: the one [the] Lord [Master], the other [the] servant — as [is] so often said in this chapter (vv. 2, 4, & 5), concerning which [see] ch. 1, q. 2.

"Galaad" is taken in Scripture in two ways. *First*, particularly [specifically] — and that [in] three [ways]. *1.* For a mountain, concerning which [see] Gen. 31:48; Jer. 8 & 22. *2.* For a city at almost the very foot of that mountain, concerning which Num. 32:39. *3.* For the little region which stretches from that mountain all the way to the Jordan, and is called "Galaaditis," concerning which Josephus (bk. 1 of the *Antiquities*, ch. 27). [It] is taken, *secondly*, generally — for this whole little region, and together for the whole land of the Moabites and Amorites, which Kings Sehon and Og once held: and thus here these three tribes are said to have entered "Galaad, the land of their possession" (also v. 14).

But while [they] were journeying thither, [they] built in the very way an altar, concerning which two [things] are related (v. 10). *1.* Where — "at the mounds [banks] of the Jordan" [ad tumulos Iordanis], that is, among the ramparts [aggeres] or mounds which, cast in [their] way, checked the flowing-down waters of the Jordan, concerning which above, ch. 18. In the Seventy [LXX] here, and a little before (v. 11), [it] is γαλααδ [galaad] — a Hebrew word indeed, but corrupt, [standing] for γαλιλώθ [galil■th], or γαλααλώθ [galaal■th], as [it] is in the Royal Bibles [the Antwerp Polyglot]; for which word Symmachus said τὰ ὅρια [ta horia], that is, "limits [boundaries]," and "bounds," as above in [the comment on] Hebr. [i.e. Joshua] ch. 13, v. 2. Josephus [has] ὑπὲρ τῆς ὄχθης [hyper t■s ochth■s], "on the bank of the Jordan." But some think — and Sederholam suggests (ch. 11), and Josephus himself (bk. 5, ch. 1) — [that] those mounds, and consequently the altar built on them, were on the other bank of the Jordan, toward the East; but [it] is otherwise. For therefore [it] is added (v. 10) "in the land of Chanaan," and (v. 14) in Hebrew "in the crossing" [in transitu], or "on the side [flank] of the children of Israel" — as Arias [Montanus], Masius, Adrichomius, Abulensis (q. 7 & 12), and others recognize. *2.* Of what kind was this altar? "Of immense" — says our text — "size." For a great, and very lofty, magnitude is signified by the Hebrew phrase, which says "that the altar was great to behold"; just as the Greek also says βωμὸν μέγαν τοῦ ἰδεῖν [b■mon megan tou idein, "an altar great to behold"].

[It] was great. In the Lord's tabernacle [there] was the altar of holocausts (Exod. 27), where its magnitude is reckoned by the larger cubits, as Arias explains in [his] *Tubalcain* and [his] book *On the sacred fabrics [furnishings]*; yet because such an epithet is never attributed to it [the Mosaic altar], [it] appears [that] this

[altar of the tribes] was greater than that: and because [it] was raised among the mounds [banks], [it was] much more conspicuous. And these are the stones concerning which Gregory Nazianzen [speaks] in the *Apologeticus*, when he says: *"To us [there] is no limit set of teaching and learning — just as [there was] to those tribes [for whom there were] those stones: formerly to these [tribes] who were beyond the Jordan, and to these who were on this side of the Jordan."* Where, when the Scholiast Gabriel Eugubinus had understood those [to be] the stones concerning which above (ch. 4), yet did not see [it] to square sufficiently, [he] added: *"Let him solve [it], who can."*

Question III. Did the Transjordanians act rightly in erecting that altar?

When the Transjordanian Israelites had erected the altar, rumor at once reports it to the Cisjordanian [west-of-Jordan] Israelites (v. 11); and among these [latter] an opinion straightway arose [that] the matter was evil and impious: and therefore also a suspicion sprang up [that] the Transjordanians were contriving an apostasy from the true worship of God (vv. 12, 16, 17, 18, 19). The reason was [that] it was God's precept that, in the Israelite people, and in [its] whole region — as much beyond as on this side of the Jordan — [there] should be only one place of sacred [rites], one altar of sacrifices (Exod. 20 & 24; Lev. 17:8 & 9; Deut. 12:5, 11, 13). Josephus (bk. 4 of the *Archaeology*, ch. 8): ἱερὰ πόλις ἔστω μία τῆς χαναναίων γῆς ἐν τῷ καλλίστῳ καὶ δι' ἀρετὴν ἐπιφανεῖ· καὶ νεὼς εἷς ἐν ταύτῃ ἔστω, καὶ βωμὸς εἷς ἐκ λίθων μὴ κατειργασμένων [hiera polis est■ mia t■s chananai■n g■s en t■ kallist■ kai di' aret■n epiphanei; kai ne■s heis en taut■ est■, kai b■mos heis ek lith■n m■ kateirgasmen■n, "Let there be one holy city in the land of the Canaanites, in the fairest [spot] and conspicuous for [its] excellence; and let there be one temple in it, and one altar of stones not wrought [by tool]"]. And [in] bk. 2 *Against Apion*: … θεοῦ θεραπείας οὗτος ὁσιώτατος, εἷς ναὸς ἑνὸς θεοῦ· φίλον γὰρ ἀεὶ παντὶ τὸ ὅμοιον [… theou therapeias houtos hosi■tatos, heis naos henos theou; philon gar aei panti to homoion, "… this [is] the most holy manner of the worship of God: one temple of one God; for the like is ever dear to every like"]. And most elegantly Philo, near the beginning of bk. 2 *On Monarchy*:

> Ἐδεῖ ἡμᾶς ἀνθρώπων μὴ ἀνακόψαι φορὰς τὰς εἰς εὐσέβειαν συντελούντων, καὶ θυσίαις βουλομένων ἢ ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβαίνουσιν ἀγαθοῖς εὐχαριστεῖν, ἢ ἐφ' οἷς ἂν ἁμάρτωσι συγγνώμην καὶ παραίτησιν αἰτεῖσθαι. Προενόησε δὲ ὡς … πολλαχόθι ἐν τῷ *[κόσμῳ]* πολλὰ κατασκευασθήσεται ἱερά, δικαιώσας, ἐπειδὴ εἷς ἐστι θεός, καὶ ἱερὸν εἶναι μόνον. *[Edei h■mas anthr■p■n m■ anakopsai phoras tas eis eusebeian syntelount■n … "[He willed] that we should not check the impulses of men as [they] press toward piety and wish, by sacrifices, either to give thanks for the good [things] that befall [them], or to seek pardon and deprecation for [the things] in which [they] may have sinned. But [God] provided beforehand against [there being], in many places [throughout the world], many temples built — judging [it] right, since God is one, [that] the temple also be one."]*

When, therefore, these Transjordanians had erected a second altar, and in another place than where the true altar and tabernacle of God was, [they] seemed guilty of apostasy and impiety (vv. 11, 16, 19) — as though this had been done by them ἐπὶ νεωτερισμῷ, καὶ ξενικῶν εἰσαγωγῇ θεῶν [epi ne■terism■, kai xenik■n eisag■g■ the■n, "for [the sake of] revolt [innovation], and the introduction of foreign gods"], as Josephus says.

An assembly [comitia], therefore, was held at Silo (v. 12), in which this whole matter — so new, and so unusual and suspect — might be debated. But to those [deliberations] the Cisjordanians seem to have come of their own accord, and uninvited: because, the instant [they] had heard about the new altar, [they] judged [that] the crime must be avenged, and the apostates utterly destroyed and rooted out; nor [that it] must be waited until [they] should be summoned; but [that there] must be a hastening, of their own accord, to Silo, to the house of God, to the High Priest, to the Commander Joshua, and a taking-care that, by the judgment of those [men] and of the whole people, the common evil be removed. In which matter their zeal [is] to be praised, nor [is] the suspicion greatly to be censured.

For although — as will afterward appear — [it] was false, yet [there] was cause for suspecting: and [they] did not so indulge the suspicion [as] not to refer it to the superiors, and to the common council. And indeed, in matters which touch the whole Commonwealth and divine religion, [it] is blameworthy rather for us to be slow and slow-paced [spissigrados] than to speed up, to hasten, and to run. For haste and running — which does not exclude counsel and deliberation — is especially wont to forestall and avert dangers, nor can [it] be called headlong and rash. For to this pertains the whole [matter treated] from Deut. ch. 13, and what I said against Filidinus in the preface, and in bk. 1, ch. 2. "Dry [things]," says Seneca (bk. 2, Epist. 18), "and [things] easy to catch [fire], nurse even a spark, [right] up into a conflagration." "Much more swiftly," says Peter the Venerable (bk. 1, Epist. 2), "do increments [of growth] attend upon the worst [things] than upon the best." Far more easily and more fruitfully does the devil's cockle [tares], than God's wheat, spread itself in his field.

(col. 1257)

In the assembly [comitia], indeed, three [things] were decreed — chiefly by the authority and judgment of the Pontiff [Eleazar] and of Joshua, as Josephus notes (bk. 5, ch. 1). *First*: that inquiry be made — not whether [they] had set up an altar (for that was established [certain]) — but to what end [they] had built it: whether for idolatry, and injury to God, or for some other cause. *Second*: if for idolatry and injury to God, [that] effort be made [that] they be recalled as quickly as possible from that nefarious defection and crime, by admonition, reproof, [and] rebuke. *Third*: if by these [means] their impious mind should be bent in no way, but [they] should persist obstinately in the impiety [they had] undertaken, [that] an atrocious and internecine war be undertaken against them: and that [it] be straightway declared to them, and, [once] declared, be waged. And that these three [things] might be done most conveniently and best, [it] was also decreed that a legation be sent to them, which would either do or announce all these [things]. [Men] chosen, therefore, for it [the legation] from the whole of Israel on this side of the Jordan — in the first place indeed, from the sacred order of the Levites and Priests, the priest Phinees (v. 13), son of the Pontiff Eleazar, grandson of Aaron, a man most distinguished in wisdom, holiness, zeal, and eloquence. And moreover [he was] most highly commended by the testimony and the signal office of the everlasting priesthood [given him], ever since that time when [he] had transfixed, [as they were] fornicating together, the Midianite woman Cozbi and the Israelite Zambri [Zimri] (Num. 25). Then, with him [were chosen] from the ten Cisjordanian tribes — [those] which were strongest in prudence and highest authority — ten princes [χιλίαρχοι [chiliarchoi, "commanders of a thousand"], in the Seventy; so here in the Hebrew below, v. 30], whose names are unknown (vv. 14 & 30). These, therefore, having set out across the Jordan, discharged the office of the legation laid [upon them] diligently [strenuously]: but in the first place [he] who was its prince and head, the priest Phinees. He was the mouth of all: through him all the others spoke (vv. 15 & 16).

Of this [assembly] — both in Josephus and in this our chapter — gathered to the Transjordanians, and collected in a kind of Senate and assembly [comitium], which Josephus calls ἐκκλησίαν [ekkl■sian, "assembly"], a speech is extant. In it indeed, that [his] authority may be the greater for [what] he is about to say, Phinees shows [the following]. *First*: [that he speaks] in the name, by the will, and by the authority of the whole public [body] of the people, by whom [he] had been sent with [his] colleagues (v. 16): "Thus commands all the people of the Lord" — where [there] is great force in [the fact] that [he] calls his people "the people of the Lord"; namely, as [it were], [a people] constant in the worship of God — from which these [tribes] seemed to have departed — and firmly cleaving to him: and likewise, in that [word] "all." For "people," in Hebrew, [there] is "hedah" [עדה], that is, "Church [assembly]," "congregation" [coetus] — συναγωγή [synag■g■], as [it] is in the Seventy. *Secondly*: [he] comes at once to the matter itself, and joins the two first heads of the legation — namely, by inquiring [investigating] to what end at last the altar was built by them, and by admonishing them. He inquires, indeed, subtly [craftily], while [he] casts up, as [though] certain, the [charge] which [he] inquires about (vv. 16 & 17). For thus the Transjordanians were the

more stirred up, so that, [if] what was objected were false, [they] might utterly deny [it], and might explain with what mind that [altar] had been built. "A sacrilegious altar" the Interpreter [Vulgate] calls [it], [that] which in Hebrew is called "an altar for defecting [falling away]," or "for apostatizing from God": in the Seventy, βωμὸς τοῦ ἀποστάτας γενέσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου [b■mos tou apostatas genesthai apo tou kyriou, "an altar for becoming apostates from the Lord"].

[He] admonishes, indeed, in a threefold way. *First*: by threatening the vast wrath and vengeance of God — which may invade both all [together] and suddenly — and [he makes] this certain by the example of the sin committed in [the matter of] the idol Peor, or Baalphegor (Num. 25), whose so great destruction and ruin was [such], that very many of the people fell: and although the Lord here attests himself [to have been] propitiated by the zeal of Phinees [who was] speaking — nevertheless that sin was not yet wholly expiated (v. 17), where [it is] to be read "up to the present day the stain of this crime remains in us," which in Hebrew is said "not yet have we purified ourselves from that crime" [nondum nos ipsos purificavimus ab eo scelere]: in the Seventy, οὐκ ἐκαθαρίσθημεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἁμαρτήματος Φογώρ [ouk ekatharisth■men ap' autou tou hamart■matos Phog■r, "we have not been cleansed from that sin of Phogor (Peor)"]. Not because some still cherished [loved] that sin, as Ralbag [Gersonides] says, nor because its infamy alone survived: but because, on account of it, penalties were still being exacted, day by day, from very many. For [it is] certain [that], the sin [being] pardoned, and the eternal penalty remitted, temporal penalties [are] not rarely still to be paid — as [in] Num. 14:20 [and] 2 Kings [2 Sam.] 12. "The fault," says St. Augustine on John, "would be thought small, if it were ended together with [its] penalty." Let this pronouncement of Phinees be observed, therefore, against the Novators [innovators] of our time, [who] think [that], after the pardon of some sin has been obtained, no further penalties of it are to be feared. *Secondly*: Phinees meets a certain tacit objection (v. 19). "Perhaps you forge [cuditis] a new worship for yourselves, because [you] think your land — [given] to God — [to be] as it were unclean, since [he] fixed [his] tabernacle not among you, but among us. But [it] is not unclean: and if [you] think [it] such, leave it: migrate to us. We will yield to you a part of our portion most willingly, provided [you] desist from that impiety." O the splendid virtue of those Israelites, who — in order to call others away from error and crime, [to] lead [them] across to God, [and] make [them] come to [their] senses — deprive themselves of their own inheritance, [and] of their own accord invite [their] neighbors into participation and communion of it! Woe to those wretched, greedy, and sordid Euclios [misers], who, lest [they] should have to give anything to [those] returning from heresy to the Catholic Church, prefer [that] those [people] be not led away from it [heresy], not called forth, not received! *Thirdly*: on account of the one offense of Achan, the whole people was afflicted with grievous slaughter and disgrace (above, ch. 7); what [is] now to be [expected] with so great a multitude sinning against God? "Would that he alone had perished in his crime" (v. 20). What is wished [for] here — as if in Hebrew [it] had formerly been written not "lo" [לא, "not"] but "lo" [לו, "to him / O that"] — is today affirmed in the Hebrew thus: "not one," or "not alone, did [he] perish in his crime": but with him exceedingly [too] many. In the Seventy, however, the contrary would seem to be asserted — οὗτος εἷς αὐτὸς ἀπέθανεν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ ἁμαρτίᾳ [houtos heis autos apethanen t■ heautou hamartia] — unless [it] be read interrogatively. "Did this one man himself die in his own sin?" — q.d. [as if to say]: "No, but with him others also."

These [things] having been argued out by Phinees, the Transjordanians answered (v. 21) [that] the suspicion with which the Cisjordanians had labored was false. First, therefore (vv. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28), [they] attest God [as] καρδιογνώστην [kardiogn■st■n, "knower of hearts"], with an imprecation, [that they are] utterly estranged from all apostasy: and [that it was] with this mind and intent [that they had] erected that altar — not that [they] might make any sacrifices on it, but that it might be a symbol, a monument, and a witness of their religion toward the true God, of their concord with the other Israelites, and of [their] brotherly fellowship in the sacrosanct worship of the Deity. [They declare] that [they] had indeed feared lest the posterity of the Cisjordanian Israelites, seeing themselves and their descendants separated from the Transjordanians by the river Jordan, should bar [the latter] from their sacred [rites] also, and so give [them]

some occasion of idolatry, and of a most foul departure from God. And so

(col. 1259)

[…and so to] all these [things], as most truly, so also most gravely, the Transjordanians replied: and just as the Legates' speech had been thoroughly pathetic [moving] and ardent, so also is the response of these [men]. The outcome of which was [such] as — [once] the truth was laid open — [it] had to be among good men. For, these [things] having been heard, Phinees the priest, *and the princes of the legation of Israel, who were with him* — says the text (v. 30) — *were appeased [placated]: and the words of the children of Ruben, and of Gad, and of the half tribe of Manasses they received most willingly*; or, as [it] is in the Hebrew, *this whole [thing] was good in their sight*, or *it was good in their eyes* — in the Seventy, ἤρεσεν αὐτοῖς [■resen autois, "it was pleasing to them"]. Therefore Phinees, wholly glad, exultant, and giving as [it were] a vast applause, said (v. 31): *Now we know that the Lord is with us, because you are not estranged from him by this prevarication [transgression], and you have delivered the children of Israel from the hand of the Lord* — [the hand] which, namely, would have inflicted a most grievous penalty and calamity, had these [tribes] fallen away from his worship and law. And when those Cisjordanians, returned to Silo, had reported the same [things] (v. 32), *the saying pleased all that heard [it]* (v. 33), *and the children of Israel praised God*. And the same [thing] the Transjordanians, freed from that suspicion, did not by word only, but also by deed. When (v. 34) they imposed a name upon the altar, [a name] which signified both [that] they themselves persevered in the true worship of God, and what the true use of that altar ought to be. For they called this altar *"Testimony," because they attest the Lord to be God*, or [that] he is God and Lord whom the Transjordanians worship and venerate, and not indeed any other. For therefore the Seventy say "ὁ Θεὸς θεῶν" [ho Theos the■n, "God of gods"]. And therefore, when Peter of Blois (Epist. 106) calls that altar "sacrilegious," [he is] either to be understood as to the first suspicion, or — as [was] noted there by its editor — [his] memory slipped, especially since [he] subjoins [that], on account of it, "the wrath of God flowed out universally upon the people." Which, however, did not happen.

But from this whole history, besides [the things] which [are] already interspersed, we learn [the following]. *1*. If heresies and scandals arise, [one] must withstand them at once, at [their] beginnings. For often *the medicine is prepared too late, when the ills have grown strong through long delays*. "Succor [me], I beg," says Tullius [Cicero] to Atticus, "while it is [at its] ἀκμή [akm■, 'critical point, prime']." Pelagius the Pontiff writes to Narses the Patrician, as [it] is had [in] the chapter *De Liguribus* (23, q. 5): "The Fathers established this specially: that if any Ecclesiastical person, to whom [one] is subject, should resist, or should gather [a flock] apart, or should erect another altar — or should make a schism — let that [person] be excommunicated and condemned."

2. [One] must act zealously and prudently with those who seem to err; and first indeed [one] must strive by doctrine and instruction, by admonition and by thoroughly frightening [them], that [they] may return to the way. But then, if [they] be unwilling, force [is] to be applied — which St. Augustine (Epist. 50) greatly approves and commends. *3.* Because this altar — not a true altar, but [one] which had the type and form of the true altar, as Origen says (homily 3 on this book) — was [built], we learn [that] images and statues can be made, which may preserve the memory of Christ the Lord, of the saints, and of divine things, [may] kindle faith, [and may] take away forgetfulness. This, in this place, the Catholic Masius, and the Lutheran Chytraeus, note against the Calvinists; and in the name of the latter [Chytraeus] and of his whole conventicle, the words are these: *"The image-fighters [iconomachi] speciously, in their theatre, accuse the Churches of these regions [on the ground] that, against the express prohibition of the first and second* precept, *they tolerate images and statues in their temples."* To these — as to the Rubenite Legates — we reply: [that] images are not to be adored nor worshiped, nor is any adoration or worship of them to be tolerated in our temples: but [that] *pictures of the passion and the resurrection of CHRIST, and of the holy Martyrs, [are] to be retained as, as it were, embellishments and monuments of [the sacred] histories; by which we are stirred*

up, in our [own] measure, to true piety, faith, constancy, and the other virtues of the saints, to be imitated. [There is] an end [purpose] of images [established] in the word of God — [it] is by no means prohibited. And this, in the preface to our [confrère] Vazquez's books *On Adoration* edited here, I showed at [greater] length. But we have Calvin here confessing: "These," he says, "were works of impiety, which [things] had indeed been refuted: yet [they] do not seem to have been in every part free from fault, because the law forbids [one] to erect any statues whatever." But the excuse is easy: no other statues are condemned, except those which look to representing God. Meanwhile, to erect a heap of stones (much more a single stone or [piece of] wood) in place of a trophy — either for a testimony of a miracle, or for the memory of a signal grace of God — nowhere has the law prohibited. Otherwise both Joshua, and after him some holy Judges and Kings, would have defiled themselves with a profane novelty. But [that] indeed some worship and veneration too — which, however, is not divine and latreutic [latria] — can be applied to these [images] (which, with that Calvin, the Lutheran [Chytraeus] does not want): the argument is the pillar [titulus] which Jacob erected (Gen. 28:18). For [it] was a statue [pillar], as there Calvin, and his disciples Tremellius and Junius, translate: and Jacob applied to it a religious ceremony of anointing, as the same [men] note in [their] annotations. For when [they] had translated *"Jacob set up the stones for a statue [pillar], and poured oil upon the top of it,"* [they] subjoin, *"[as] a sign, namely, of consecration — [a sign] not devised by him, but received from [his] father too, and divinely instituted. This ceremony thereafter, under the Law, was in use in the consecrations of things and persons, by God's command (Exod. 29)."* And the same Calvin likewise: *"This ceremony was an appendage of divine worship. For external rites do not make true worshipers of God, but are only supports [adminicula] of piety."*

Fourthly: since I have fallen upon that Calvin, [it] pleases [me] to note something else from him here. *"Not lightly,"* he says, *"did the tribes Ruben, Gad, and Manasses sin, in that — the high priest [being] passed over, [and] the brethren unconsulted — [they] undertook a new thing: then, in that the very form of the testimony [altar] could be drawn to the wrong [sinister] side."* But if both this was so grave a sin, how [is there] so great a silence in the text about each [of them]? How does Phinees reject neither? How, after [they] had answered him about the purpose of their altar, does that [Calvin] not press [the point that] the authority of the High Priest [was] violated — [nor] the residual appearance of their deed, which would [still] be liable to suspicions and rumors? Neither, in truth, was a sin, or [it was] altogether very slight. For nowhere was [it] prohibited, that no one might do what he judged good, without consulting the high priest. Nowhere [was there] a precept that whole tribes, if [they] wished to set up spontaneously some testimony of divine benefits toward themselves, should refer that to all the other tribes. This very [thing] was lawful to private persons and individuals — as we saw of Jacob, and as that Calvin himself has confessed concerning Joshua, and others after him, Judges and Kings. How, therefore, would [it] not have been lawful to whole tribes? And indeed [they acted] with deliberation, and great

(col. 1261)

[And indeed, with deliberation and great] counsel this altar [was] erected by them, [as] is clearly shown in this very chapter, from v. 23 to 29. Nor does [it] matter [that it] could have been drawn [twisted] to the wrong [sinister] side. For what cannot be twisted? What good [thing] is done by Catholics, which the Lutherans [and] Calvinists do not interpret most wrongly? Wittily [does] that Plautine Callicles [speak] in the *Trinummus*:

> **Lest I admit a fault, I am [my] own steward over my own breast [I keep my own conscience];*
>
> *suspicion is lodged in another's breast.* And again,*
>
> **It is and is not in my hand [power], Megaronides —*
>
> *that they not say [things], is not [in my power]; but that, with good cause, they not say [them], that is.**

But [as to the charge] that [Calvin] says these tribes bound themselves by so grave a crime — because, the high priest [being] passed over, [they] erected an altar — what, at last, and how great, is [Calvin's] own crime, who — the high priest [being] passed over, despised, and mocked — has overturned and disturbed so many most ancient temples and altars of God? who has raised up so many new dogmas and errors [as] it were altars and hearths of impiety? who has sundered, drawn away, [and] torn away himself and all his [followers] from the tabernacle of God, and from the true altar — from the Catholic Church, I say, and from the sacred [rites] and communion of all Christian brethren? I remember, too, [having] read a certain letter [written] to Grynaeus, by Calvin's own hand, in which [he said] he had written on some controversies which look to the faith, nor [had he] wished to consult his other Sacramentarian brethren, those symmystae [fellow-initiates], about those [matters], lest their counsel should be hindered. But just as that Calvin too much accuses those Transjordanians, so too much does Moncaeus [excuse them], when (bk. 1 *On Aaron*, ch. 12, p. 133) [he] writes [that] they wished to have a true altar: so that on it — outside the three prescribed solemnities of the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, on which [feasts] all had to go to the tabernacle — they might be able to sacrifice: lest [they] always have to set out so far, for the sake of sacrifice. But this excuse is rather a grave accusation. *First*, indeed, [they] would not have opened the true cause of their counsel and deed to Phinees the Pontiff, and to the other legates. *Then*, nowhere else, even outside those three feasts, was [it] ordinarily lawful to sacrifice. *Thirdly*: those same Transjordanians would have been exceedingly negligent and slothful in the divine worship — [they] who, when (with that good and religious mind, as Moncaeus wants) [they] had erected the altar, yet, in [the case] where [it] was lawful, and especially [so] at the beginning and dedication [when] it behooved [them], would have made no Sacrifice as yet. For if [they] had done this, [they] would already have utterly refuted, by the very deed, their own previously-set-down response and purgation.

But *Fifthly*: we learn, when some suspicion about certain friends has arisen in some matter, [that] we should go to them, question [them], [and] admonish [them] — as, [in] the *Trinummus* cited a little before, a certain prudent old man [says]:

> **To chastise a friend for a deserved fault*
>
> *is a thankless deed, yet, in [its] season, useful*
>
> *and profitable.**

Sixthly: when by friends we are admonished, chastised, [or] rebuked, [it] is not to be borne ill, but to be received evenly [calmly] and amicably. And if indeed we are innocent, [our] innocence is to be set forth to our Rubenites, Gadites, and Manassites [i.e. to our critics]: suspicion is to be separated from us in a good manner, and to be snatched away from others. Nay — to the friend who, [out of concern] for admonishing and rebuking us, is fearful and hesitant, [it] is of a good man to add courage, as [did] that old Callicles:

> **If you know [that] I have done anything ignorantly or wickedly,*
>
> *[and] if you do not accuse [me] of it, you yourself ought to be rebuked, I know.**

Seventhly: when we have heard the excuse and innocence of friends, let us easily believe [it] and acquiesce: let us not imitate those harsh and implacable [men], who, if [they] have ever been exasperated and offended, can be appeased by no defense, but always have [something] which [they] malignantly and unfairly carp at. Let us rather imitate those ten tribes, and their legates: and, if [it] please, that old man who had come of set purpose to [his] friend, [resolved] to rebuke him sharply with many words. For when [he] had understood [that the things] which [had been done] by him were not perverse, but rightly done:

> *"Pausa [Stop]," he says, *"you have conquered your chastiser.*
>
> *You have shut up [my] tongue. There is nothing I might answer."**

Eighthly: Bishops and Ecclesiastics all have in Phinees a splendid example, which [it] is fitting to follow: that [men] be recalled from new and depraved opinions in religion to the old and ancient piety. [One] must go to those same [men]: [one] must converse with them: nothing [is] to be feared: expeditions [are] to be undertaken: rivers [are] to be crossed: sermons [are] to be held [preached]: their favor [is] to be set after the public utility, and [their] private [favor] after the eternal salvation of those same [people] — as I also touched [on, in] ch. 6 of the *Joshuan Priests*, num. 70.

Ninthly: if, finally, anyone should wish for something allegorical, Origen [is] at hand, who, in [his] last homily on this book, teaches [that] [it] is signified [that] the ancient Israelites — who are denoted by the firstborn Ruben, Gad, [and] Manasse — did not have a true altar on which true victims might be offered, [and by which] sins might be truly taken away; but [that] these [things] are among JESUS, and among Christians. But so, that by one faith, one Church, one salvation, both peoples may be joined, and may become one flock, and [under] one shepherd — those former just [ones], and those who now are Christians. But when [Origen] here says [that] the Jewish altar was not a true altar, but a form and figure of the future and true altar, [he] does not deny that which above, from homily 3, was said — [namely] that the altar of the three tribes was a type and image of the true [altar], which was in the tabernacle. For that Rubenite [altar] was a type of the Siloan [altar], and this Siloan [one] of the Christian [altar]: and the Siloan [altar] is called "true" as to the victims and rites then flourishing, but "shadowy" and "imaginary" as to the truth and effect, which now is, at CHRIST's time.

(col. 1263)

After the Wars: Caput XXIII

Caput XXIII (opening)

1. And when a long time was passed, after that the Lord had given peace to Israel, all the nations round about being subdued, and Josue being now old, and far advanced in years, **2.** Josue called for all Israel, and for the elders, and for the princes, and for the judges, and for the masters, and said to them: I am old, and far advanced in years: **3.** And you see all that the Lord your God hath done to all the nations round about, how he himself hath fought for you: **4.** And now since he hath divided to you by lot all the land, from the east of the Jordan unto the great sea, and many nations yet remain: **5.** The Lord your God will destroy them, and take them away from before your face, and you shall possess the land as he hath promised you. **6.** Only take courage, and be careful to observe all things that are written in the book of the law of Moses: and turn not aside from them neither to the right hand nor to the left: **7.** Lest after that you are come in among the Gentiles, who will remain among you, you should swear by the name of their gods, and serve them, and adore them: **8.** But cleave ye unto the Lord your God: as you have done until this day. **9.** And then the Lord God will take away before your eyes nations that are great and very strong, and no man shall be able to resist you. **10.** One of you shall chase a thousand men of the enemies: because the Lord your God himself will fight for you, as he hath promised. **11.** This only take care of with all diligence, that you love the Lord your God. **12.** But if you will embrace the errors of these nations that dwell among you, and make marriages with them, and join friendships: **13.** Know ye for a certainty that the Lord your God will not destroy them before your face, but they shall be a pit and a snare in your way, and a stumblingblock at your side, and stakes in your eyes, till he take you away and destroy you from off this excellent land, which he hath given you. **14.** Behold this day I am going into the way of all the earth, and you shall know with all your mind that of all the words which the Lord promised to perform for you, not one hath failed. **15.** Therefore as he hath fulfilled in deed what he promised, and all things prosperous have come: so will he bring upon you all the evils he hath threatened, till he take you away and destroy you from off this excellent land, which he hath given you, **16.** when you shall have transgressed the covenant of the Lord your God, which he hath made with you, and shall have served strange gods, and adored them: then shall the indignation of the Lord rise up quickly and speedily against you, and you shall be taken away from this excellent land, which he hath delivered to you.

COMMENTARY

The last part of this book, the last words and deeds of Joshua the Leader occupy. His words are such as are wont to be [the words] of dying superiors to [their] subjects, [and] of parents to [their] children. For since they, [being] now about to depart from this world and about to approach the tribunal of the supreme Judge, then say those [things] which [they] understand [to be] most right, best, and most useful to those whom [they] love — hence [it] is also provided [arranged] by nature, that by those to whom [they] are said, admonitions [monita] of that kind are kept [in] memory most of all: and, if indeed those [persons] be prudent, obedient, and least degenerate, [they] are carried into execution most efficaciously. Therefore Joshua, [being] about to die, and truly dying, holds a twofold speech to his Israelites — of which one [is] written out in this chapter, the other in the following. And this [one] indeed seems to Masius to have been held at Silo; but to the Rabbis Ralbag [Gersonides] and Raschi [Rashi], at Thamnathsare [Timnath-serah], which was his [Joshua's] own city and inheritance (above, ch. 19:50); and that will appear more probable [rather] in the following chapter, q. 1. Since, therefore, rest from the enemies had now been granted by God, and Joshua himself, worn out with age, perceived death to be near him — whether by nature, or [with] God also teaching [him] — he called all Israel to himself: not indeed every individual out of it, but as many as [he] could; those certainly who bore the person [represented the whole body] of the whole people, and on whom all the others depended — as were the Princes and Senators of the tribes themselves, concerning whose names, set down here (v. 2), I spoke above (ch. 3): which are four in the Hebrew — *Zekenim*, *Raschim*, *Schophetim*,

Schoterim; in the Greek, γερουσία [gerousia, "council of elders, senate"], ἄρχοντες [archontes, "rulers"], δικασταί [dikastai, "judges"], γραμματεῖς [grammateis, "scribes"]; in our text [the Vulgate], "the elders [maiores natu], Princes, leaders [duces], [and] Masters [Magistri]."

In the speech, moreover: *First*, [Joshua] shows the cause of this gathering, and at the same time — for [the things] which [he] is about to say — begets attention, faith [trust], and authority (v. 3), when [he] says: "I am old, and of advanced age." *Then* at once, both seriously and constantly, [he] exhorts [them] to one thing only — namely, to the love, fear, and worship of God — from v. 3 to the end of the chapter. But [he] does this same [thing] in various [ways]. *First*: [he] recalls God's greatest and very many benefits toward them — both past and present, and (if indeed [they] be willing) soon to come (vv. 3, 4, & 5). But the Hebrew text has a somewhat obscure transposition of words in v. 4, and the Latin [has] a fault [mendum], in which [it] is read "he divided" [divisit], instead of "I divided [/ have allotted]" [divisi]. For Joshua speaks of himself in the first person: in Hebrew *Hippalthi*, in Greek in the Seventy ἐπέρριφα [eperripha, "I cast [the lot] / allotted"]. And a twofold sense can be made. One — [that] Joshua may say [that] he cast down and conquered those Canaanite nations; and so the Seventy seem to hint, when, after that ἐπέρριφα, [they] subjoin ἐξωλόθρευσα [ex■lothreusa, "I utterly destroyed"] — unless this has perhaps been inserted from some other text. The other — [that he] may say [that] he caused the lot to fall, or, as our Interpreter [the Vulgate] rightly says, [that] he divided the land by lot — partly [the land] which [stretches] from the Western side of the Jordan all the way to the Western [shore] of the great or Mediterranean [sea]

(col. 1265)

[…partly the land which stretches from the Western side of the Jordan all the way to the Western shore of the great or] Mediterranean [sea] — [land] already occupied and possessed; partly [the land] which [is] still to be occupied and possessed, in which many nations still remain, which, however — [with] God also [acting] hereafter, unless these [nations] by some sin of their own set an obstacle and hindrance to him — will shortly be destroyed and dispersed. But [Joshua] indicates [that] these promises are to be received with the condition which I have appended, [a condition] which is thereafter annexed [in] the exhortations [of] v. 6 and following, especially vv. 9, 10.

Secondly: Therefore Joshua exhorts the Israelites to a notable greatness and constancy of soul (v. 6); to the accurate observation of the divine law (vv. 6, 7); [and] to the shunning of all familiarity and intercourse with the Canaanites (v. 7). For in that [phrase] "Lest after that you are come in," a negative precept is included — "Enter not to those nations which remain among you." And this "to enter" can be taken, from the force of the Hebrew verb, either specially, of the familiarity and bond [necessitudo] which is contracted by marriage — as may be gathered from v. 12 — or rather generally, of all familiarity and intercourse. For that [familiarity] is by far the most dangerous, from which [there is] often a most foul contagion of the gravest vices and crimes; among which [vices] here three are enumerated in the Latin: "to swear in the name of strange Gods, to serve them, [and] to adore them." But in the Hebrew [there] are four, and [they] can be taken in the manner of prohibitions. *First*: "Thou shalt not make mention of the name of the Gods of those nations." *Second*: "Thou shalt not swear by them." *Third*: "Thou shalt not serve them." *Fourth*: "Thou shalt not adore them." But by "to swear in the name of their Gods," the Latin interpreter [Vulgate] has comprehended the two former. For either, generally, by that first precept, the memory and mention of their Gods is forbidden, or [specifically] the honorable memory and mention. Not [the former], because Scripture itself too, in detesting them, makes mention of them, and not infrequently sets down their name. Honorable memory, moreover, is made through swearing — [an oath] which either we ourselves impose on others, or we conceive [for] ourselves. And both these are understood in the Latin "to swear." And by those who add all these four [prohibitions], [the phrase] is translated by some thus: "Thou shalt not adjure" — or, "Thou shalt not make those nations swear by their Gods" (as Exod. 23:13, Deut. 12:3), because in the hiphil [there] is the Hebrew verb of swearing [the causative, "make to swear"]. But the first [verb] too, of "making mention," is in the

hiphil also: and therefore [it] can also be taken thus: that [they] should not make those nations usurp [take up] the memory and the names of their Gods.

Pious Jews indeed were wont, of old, scarcely — or not except with detestation — to name those Gods, just as [are] even now the present-day [Jews], who, when [they] wish to name heretics, even in writing, prefix peace and pardon [amnesty] by that Symbolic little mark [notula] of brevity of theirs, חס [i.e. חס ושלום], that is, "Chas ve Schalom," that is, "Spare [us], and let there be peace." Which [practice] is to be observed by those who have always in [their] mouth "By Hercules" [Mehercule], "By Castor" [Mecastor], "the day of the Sun" [Sunday], "of the Moon" [Monday], and the like — concerning which [see] the *Mineralia*, bk. 1, ch. 6. [Joshua] moreover exhorts [them] to adhere constantly and intimately to God (v. 9), and the blessings by which all may be enticed [he] adjoins in the same [place] (vv. 9 & 10). To which [duty] our [confrère] Ribadeneira also invites Christian Princes (bk. 1 *Against Machiavelli*, ch. 7). Again, in truth, [Joshua] incites [them] to love God most studiously (v. 11), where "This only take most diligent care" is worth [means]: "Attend greatly with your minds: Keep this very sedulously with your minds, that [you] love the Lord your God." Lastly, [he] dehorts [them] from all friendship and intercourse with the Canaanites (v. 12), where in Hebrew [it] is: "If, by turning away, you turn yourselves away" (which happens by adhering to the errors of the nations) "and shall have adhered to the remnant of those nations which have been left among you or with you" — which happens by all intercourse, but especially by that which happens through marriages [connubia] and affinities, and therefore is here named expressly — "then," in truth, [he] threatens all evils; and in place of the blessings which hitherto the Lord has by the thing itself bestowed, [he] denounces all curses to be poured out by the same [Lord] (vv. 15 & 16). But among these [there are] two [that are] especially terrible.

The former (v. 13): namely, [that it] will come to pass [that] these very nations, which in some part still remain — with whom the Israelites will wish to join affinities, friendships, and intercourse, [the nations] which by his aid and help the Lord was about to exterminate utterly and quickly — shall be to the Israelites themselves "for a pit and a snare, for a stumbling-block at [their] side, [and] for stakes of [their] eyes." For "pit" [fovea] in the Hebrew is "pach" [פח], that is, "a snare"; and in the same way in the Seventy, παγίς [pagis, "snare"]. But by the addition of one letter, our [Vulgate] seems to have read "pachath" [פחת], that is, "a pit." "A snare" [laqueus] is, in this place, that especially by which the feet are entangled, implicated, and impeded; and therefore by the Seventy [it] is rendered σκάνδαλα [skandala, "stumbling-blocks, traps"], and by some into "a little snare" [tendicula], [and] by Masius into "a net." [That] which our [Vulgate] called "a stumbling-block" [offendiculum], the Seventy render ἥλους [h■lous], "nails" [clavi] — which, when [they] are rather long and are applied for pricking and mangling the body, are wont to be called "goads" [stimuli]; and by these especially the sides [are] wont to be bored through and pricked. For to this [point] look those Plautine [verses], "a crop of goads" [stimulorum seges] (*Aulularia*, act 1):

> *If today, by Hercules, I shall take a cudgel, or a goad, in [my] hand,*
>
> *I will make that tortoise-pace of yours a big [one]. (the same [play].)*
>
> *Against goads, [hot] plates, crosses, and fetters,*
>
> *racks, chains, prisons, foot-blocks, shackles, [and] collars —*
>
> *a treasure-box of goads! (Asinaria, act 1.)*
>
> *O butcher's sieve, which I believe [I] shall become!*
>
> *So shall the goads bore you through, gibbet-borne, along the ways. (Mostellaria, act 1.)*
>
> *Would that now a goad were in my hand for me,*
>
> *with which I might grind down those sides of yours, which have grown hard with blows. (Asinaria, act 2.)*

Although the Hebrew word can also be taken for a smooth rod [staff], or a most troublesome scourge [flagrum], by which the sides would be beaten — [as in] Ecclesiasticus 30:12, and ch. 42:6. And to those scourges Roboam opposed "Scorpions," which were sharper (3 Kings [1 Kings] 12:11). For ταῖς πλευραῖς [tais pleurais], in the Seventy, πλευραῖς [pleurais, "in the sides, ribs"] is to be read, Masius thinks — or at least τῶν πλευρῶν [t■n pleur■n, "of the sides, ribs"] is a word to be taken in a broad sense. "Stakes" [sudes], in truth, can also be rendered "Thorns" [Spinae]; [in] the Seventy, into βολίδας [bolidas, "darts, missiles"]. The Chaldean [Targum], on account of some significance of the Hebrew words, said, in place of "scourges," "troops taking up arms"; and in place of "thorns," "an army which, like shields, would gird [surround] the Israelites — not for protecting, but for harming and dispersing." The same [reading, is at] Num. 33 [and] Deut. 7, where Arias refers [this] to the crafty counsels of the Canaanites, [their] insidious frauds, hidden arts, and deadly arms.

The other curse is in the last words (v. 16): "Quickly and speedily shall the wrath of the Lord rise up against you, and you shall be taken away from this excellent land, which he hath delivered to you." Where [there] are several arguments of terror. *First*: "the wrath of the Lord." *Second*: "quickly and speedily." Although in Hebrew [there] is a single word, yet its intense swiftness is here rightly signified by the doubled adverb — of which [two], Masius refers the one to the unforeseen inflicting of the penalty and the suddenness [brevity] of the wrath, the other to the most swift speed of execution. In the Seventy, that very [thing] is lacking. *Third*: "you shall be taken away." In Hebrew, "you shall perish." *Fourth*: "from this [land]," which [you] now possess. [It is] miserable to be despoiled of goods which are even present, and to which [one] has come by much labor, long time, [and] great longing. *Fifth*: "excellent" [optima]. In Hebrew, "good." But as

(col. 1267)

[But that] the excellence of the land, which [has been] hitherto set forth, may be better perceived, our [author] uses the superlative. *Sixth*: "which God hath delivered to you": so that to be despoiled of so great a benefit of God [is] miserable, [and] to lose it by one's own fault and sin [is] most ungrateful and most wicked. In these [words], therefore, lie hidden nearly those [things] which many admire in the Virgilian verses (Eclogue 1):

> *Shall an impious soldier possess these fallows, [so] well-tilled?*
>
> *a barbarian these crops? See to what [pass] discord has brought*
>
> *[our] wretched citizens! for whom have we sown [our] fields!*

God [is] to be prayed [to], that we be not liable to evils of this kind. [As for] him who speaks familiarly with the enemies [of God], converses blandly [with them], [and] feasts pleasantly and merrily [with them] — [that] his gullet be bound fast by a noose [is] most just. [As for] him who recedes from the way of God, [and] betakes himself to the assembly of the impious, [and] runs forth to disgraceful deeds — [that] his feet be entangled, bound, and ensnared by eternal fetters [is] fitting. [As for] him who does not depart from the side of wicked companions and of the masters of wickedness, [but] wholly cleaves to lasciviousness and improbity — why [should it] not [be] most just [that] both his sides be bored through and lacerated by goads? [As for] him who abuses [his] eyes for petulance, lust, [and] vanity, who beholds earthly [things] more gladly than divine, who looks upon and admires the outer appearance and form of the impious more than the inner grace and beauty of the pious — is [it] not most fitting [that] both his lights [eyes] be pricked with thorns and made bloody? God gave us the true faith, the holy Church, [and] that heavenly land, best and most blessed: but unless we take heed, unless we be grateful and pious toward him, and avoid most diligently all the crimes which can kindle his wrath, [then] quickly indeed and swiftly [shall] we be taken away from it, and [shall] be driven headlong into everlasting exile. But [let it] be far [from us], [let it] be far! Let me hear Jesus: let me follow Jesus promising good [things]: let me fear [him] threatening evil [things]: and let me watch and correct myself.

After the Wars: Caput XXIV

Caput XXIV (opening)

1. And Josue gathered together all the tribes of Israel in Sichem, and called for the ancients, and the princes, and the judges, and the masters: and they stood in the sight of the Lord: **2.** And he spoke thus to the people: Thus saith the Lord the God of Israel: Your fathers dwelt of old on the other side of the river, Thare the father of Abraham, and Nachor: and they served strange gods. **3.** And I took your father Abraham from the borders of Mesopotamia: and brought him into the land of Chanaan: and I multiplied his seed, **4.** and gave him Isaac: and to him again I gave Jacob and Esau. And I gave to Esau mount Seir for his possession: but Jacob and his children went down into Egypt. **5.** And I sent Moses and Aaron, and I struck Egypt with many signs and wonders. **6.** And I brought you and your fathers out of Egypt, and you came to the sea: and the Egyptians pursued your fathers with chariots and horsemen, as far as the Red Sea. **7.** And the children of Israel cried to the Lord: and he put darkness between you and the Egyptians, and brought the sea upon them, and covered them. Your eyes saw all that I did in Egypt, and you dwelt in the wilderness a long time: **8.** and I brought you into the land of the Amorrhite, who dwelt beyond the Jordan. And when they fought against you, I delivered them into your hands, and you possessed their land, and slew them. **9.** And Balac the son of Sephor king of Moab arose and fought against Israel. And he sent and called for Balaam the son of Beor, to curse you: **10.** and I would not hear him, but on the contrary I blessed you by him, and I delivered you out of his hand. **11.** And you passed over the Jordan, and you came to Jericho. And the men of that city fought against you, the Amorrhite, and the Pherezite, and the Chanaanite, and the Hethite, and the Gergesite, and the Hevite, and the Jebusite: and I delivered them into your hands. **12.** And I sent before you hornets: and I drove them out from their places, the two kings of the Amorrhites, not with thy sword nor with thy bow. **13.** And I gave you a land, in which you had not laboured, and cities to dwell in which you built not, vineyards and oliveyards, which you planted not. **14.** Now therefore fear the Lord, and serve him with a perfect and most sincere heart: and put away the gods which your fathers served in Mesopotamia and in Egypt, and serve the Lord. **15.** But if it seem evil to you to serve the Lord, you have your choice: choose this day that which pleaseth you, whom you would rather serve, whether the gods which your fathers served in Mesopotamia, or the gods of the Amorrhites, in whose land you dwell: but as for me and my house we will serve the Lord. **16.** And the people answered, and said: God forbid we should leave the Lord, and serve strange gods. **17.** The Lord our God he brought us and our fathers out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage: and did very great signs in our sight, and preserved us in all the way by which we journeyed, and among all the people through whom we passed. **18.** And he hath cast out all the nations, the Amorrhite the inhabitant of the land into which we are come. Therefore we will serve the Lord, for he is our God. **19.** And Josue said to the people: You will not be able to serve the Lord: for he is a holy God, and mighty and jealous, and will not forgive your wickedness and sins. **20.** If you leave the Lord, and serve strange gods, he will turn, and

(col. 1269)

[…he will turn, and] will afflict you, and will destroy you after all the good he hath done you. **21.** And the people said to Josue: No, it shall not be so as thou sayest, but we will serve the Lord. **22.** And Josue said to the people: You are witnesses, that you yourselves have chosen you the Lord to serve him. And they answered: We are witnesses. **23.** Now therefore, said he, put away strange gods from among you, and incline your hearts to the Lord the God of Israel. **24.** And the people said to Josue: We will serve the Lord our God, and we will be obedient to his commandments. **25.** Josue therefore on that day made a covenant, and set before the people commandments and judgments in Sichem. **26.** And he wrote all these things in the volume of the law of the Lord: and he took a great stone, and set it under the oak that was in the sanctuary of the Lord. **27.** And he said to all the people: Behold this stone shall be a testimony unto you, that it hath heard all the words of the Lord, which he hath spoken to you: lest perhaps hereafter you will deny it, and lie to the

Lord your God. **28.** And he sent the people away every one to their own possession, **29.** and after these things Josue the son of Nun the servant of the Lord died, being a hundred and ten years old: **30.** and they buried him in the border of his possession in Thamnathsare, which is situate in mount Ephraim, on the north side of mount Gaas. **31.** And Israel served the Lord all the days of Josue, and of the ancients that lived a long time after Josue, and that had known all the works of the Lord which he had done in Israel. **32.** And the bones of Joseph which the children of Israel had taken out of Egypt, they buried in Sichem, in that part of the field which Jacob had bought of the sons of Hemor the father of Sichem, for a hundred young sheep, and it was in the possession of the sons of Joseph. **33.** Eleazar also the son of Aaron died: and they buried him in Gabaath that belongeth to Phinees his son, which was given him in mount Ephraim.

COMMENTARY

In this last chapter of this book are related the last [things] of Joshua — partly words, partly deeds — together with some [deeds] of certain others. For the frequent responses of the people to his words are set down; and at the same time, together with his death, the death of the Pontiff Eleazar is set forth, and [the things] which followed upon each, as will appear. [Joshua] called the Israelites, moreover — as also [in] the preceding chapter — and held to them a speech, [a] goodly long [one] and uninterrupted, from v. 2 to v. 16. And in it [he] does this one thing: that in the Sacrosanct worship of God, and [in] true religion, and [in] the observation of his precepts, all the Israelites may thereafter persist most constantly. And to this end, *first*: [he] instituted an illustrious enumeration of God's benefits, traced back from [as early as] the heroic times of Abraham, all the way to v. 14. *Then* [he] concludes [with] that which [was] especially his aim: that [they] worship God, serve him alone, [and] spurn all other gods (vv. 14 & 15) — concerning which [there is] a beautiful [passage of] St. Antony [Anthony], in [his] Life, apud St. Athanasius. And those benefits indeed, and their history, are all set forth in Genesis, Exodus, and the other books, and in this Joshuan [book] itself too — especially [those] which [are at] vv. 11 & 13. Yet a few little questions remain here.

Question I. Where [was it] that Joshua, [as] Commander, held this last gathering of the people, and [his] last words to it?

The doctors have gone into two opinions. For to some these [things] seem to have been said at Silo [Shiloh], but to others in Sichem [Shechem]; and each [opinion] indeed is supported by the text. For thus the Seventy have (v. 1): Καὶ συνήγαγεν Ἰησοῦς πάσας τὰς φυλὰς Ἰσραὴλ εἰς σηλώ [Kai syn■gagen I■sous pasas tas phylas Isra■l eis S■l■, "And Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel to Shiloh"]: and below again (v. 25): Ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ νόμον καὶ κρίσιν ἐν σηλώ [Ed■ken aut■ nomon kai krisin en S■l■, "he gave him law and judgment in Shiloh"]: and this reading and opinion B. Augustine followed (q. 27 on Joshua). But the Hebrew text, the Chaldean [Targum], and our Latin [have] (v. 1): "Joshua gathered all the tribes of Israel in Sichem." And so too some Greeks read εἰς συχέμ [eis Sychem, "to Shechem"], as the annotation on the Seventy notes. Yet either opinion can be deemed true. For indeed, while we depart from Joshua's city and dwelling [Timnath-serah], no place occurs [that is] more convenient, none more holy, and — for all [the things] which were now to be said and done — [none] more apt [than Shiloh]. And these words proclaim, as [it were] with a voice uttered [from] Silo [Shiloh], (v. 1): "and they stood in the sight of the Lord" — [they] who, namely, had gathered at Joshua's summons; or, as [it] is in the Hebrew: "they set themselves before the Lord" — which, in the Septuagint, is itself attributed to Joshua, because by his summons and command [they] thus stood: ἔστησεν αὐτοὺς ἀπέναντι τοῦ Θεοῦ [est■sen autous apenanti tou Theou, "he set them before God"]. And again, that [passage] (v. 26): "He took a great stone, and set it under the oak, which was in the sanctuary of the Lord, and said to all the people: Behold this stone shall be to you for a testimony." But since the Hebrew and Latin text names Sichem [Shechem] so expressly, [this] is not to be denied, but [is] so to be explained: that, in these texts, "Sichem" is named — not the city Sichem itself, but the Sichemite field [territory], in which Silo [Shiloh] was. For so, below in this chapter (v. 32), Joseph's bones are said [to be]

buried "in Sichem," when nevertheless [they] were situated not in the city, but in the city's field — as there [it] is subjoined to them: "in the part of the field which Jacob had bought of the sons of Hemor." And, that [there] may be no doubt that this field was outside the city, let Gen. 33:18 and the following [verse] be read. Nor are similar modes of speaking lacking in profane writers — which the Jurisconsults also note, when [they] exclude [a person's suburban estate] from [his] being said to be "at Rome" [Romae esse]. In both [places], therefore, that gathering took place, and so [were spoken] the Joshuan words; but at Silo properly [strictly], at Sichem broadly. And hence [it] appears [that] the preceding gathering was held rather in Joshua's city than at Silo — unless one should wish [there to be] one and the same speech [for] the preceding and this chapter, and one and the same assembly [comitia]. But how inept would the splitting of those chapters be? how perturbed [confused] the narration of things? how absurd the inculcation [repetition] of those same chapters? Yet [that there] was one gathering, but held on different days, and indeed in the city of Sichem itself, Caietanus [Cajetan] holds. For hence [he reasons that] their faces [were] turned toward the forefront of the tabernacle [that was] absent and fixed at Silo

(col. 1271)

[…their faces, turned toward the forefront of the Silo tabernacle, all turned that] direction; and so [they are said] to be called [summoned] here as standing in the Lord's sight. But Masius thinks [that] the tabernacle [was] brought from Silo into Sichem. But [those things] which I said [are] more certain, and more congruent with the text.

Question II. Whether the ancestors of the Israelites, whom Joshua led into the land of promise, were idolaters in Mesopotamia and Egypt?

Concerning the ancestors of those Israelites, for the sake of greater perspicuity, I shall speak in order. *First*, therefore: the ancestors of these [Israelites] older than Abraham's father, grandfather, [or] great-grandfather were not idolaters. Noah indeed followed God with the true worship, and [so did] Sem, Arphaxad, Sale [Salah], Heber, and Phaleg [Peleg]. And of the first [ones] indeed [it is] certain; but of the later [ones] not likewise. For [it] is not sufficiently established when, in this very stock [line], impiety began — [impiety] which the recent destruction and deluge of the whole world ought by right to have prevented. *Secondly*: Abraham's grandfather Nachor [Nahor], and this [man's] son — the former's father — Thare [Terah], were idolaters. Expressly [diserte] the second verse names these two among idolaters — so that, up to this [point], the true worship of one God seems to have stood in that lineage [prosapia]. For why [should] these [men's] fathers Sarug [Serug], Reu, or others [rather] be named? And for this cause I said before, "older than the great-grandfather or great-great-grandfather." And the Jews confess this very [thing] yearly in that Paschal little prayer which is in their booklet *Haggadah*, and in Rambam [Maimonides] (Tome 1, at the end of the tract *Zemanim*, fol. 249b); and that little prayer begins *Mihthechillah*, that is, "from the beginning"; and in it this testimony of Joshua is cited, which is generally repeated here a little below (v. 14). *Thirdly*: Abraham himself, when [he] was younger in age, was also an idolater with these his parents. This indeed Abulensis denies (here, q. 6), [as do] Caietanus [Cajetan] and the Carthusian [Denis]: but I declared this [in] Genesis ch. 11; and the Rabbis in the *Talmud* affirm [it], where [they] discourse of *Avodah Zarah* [strange worship]; and [that] he worshiped the stars, Rambam says (bk. 1, *Helacah* [Hilchot] 4, ch. 1; and bk. 3, *Helacah* 1, ch. 8, p. 247b); R. Godolias [Gedaliah] in *Schalscheleth* [Shalshelet], fol. 8; Philo, bk. περὶ ἀποικίας [peri apoikias, "On Migration"]; St. Ephrem, sermon 2 on penitence; the *Recognitions* of Clement, bk. 1; and very many others, and especially the more recent [ones] cited by Alphonsus Mendoza (*Controversies*). *7.* [A] Positive [point]: although, at the end of the question, [he] leaves to the Readers the choice of either opinion. And indeed [there] are [those] who think [that] for that reason the same Abraham [was] called by the Apostle "ungodly" [ἀσεβῆ, aseb■] (Rom. 4:5), when [he] said: *"And to him that worketh not, but believeth in him who justifieth the ungodly, his faith is reputed to justice." Fourthly*: In Mesopotamia, or beyond the river

Euphrates, this impiety was committed, as [is clear] in vv. 2 & 14. *Fifthly*: Whether in Egypt [there] were any of the Israelites contaminated by the same crime, St. Epiphanius seems to deny or doubt (bk. 1, after the beginning) — unless [he] wishes to deny [it] generally of all. For of some [there] is no place for denying or doubting. "Take away," says our Joshua (v. 14), "the Gods whom your fathers served in Mesopotamia, and in Egypt." Ezechiel 20:7 & 8, the Lord says: "Defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt. And provoking me, they turned [their back], and would not hear me. Every one did not cast away the abominations of his eyes, neither did they forsake the idols of Egypt." And this Rambam confesses in the cited place, and in the cited Talmudic tract, [and] other Rabbis, and in the beginning of his *Cabala* [Kabbalah], R. Abraham Levita: "From the death," he says, "of Joseph, up to the time when false Prophets of the children of Ephraim and Galaad rose up in Egypt, seducing Israel, [who] were slain — a hundred [and] ten years." D. Hieronymus [Jerome] on Galatians 3: "After the idolatry, to which [they] were enslaved in Egypt, so that [they] forgot the God of their fathers," etc. And on the cited chapter of Ezekiel, and at the same time Theodoret: and here the same [one] on Jeremiah ch. 7; Cyril, bk. 11 *On Adoration*, or *On the priests*. And to this matter R. Abraham applies that [passage] of Psalm 105 [104]: "Our fathers in Egypt understood not thy wonders." *Sixthly*: Some too were idolaters after the Egyptian departure [exodus], in the desert. Which would scarcely seem credible, unless beyond all exception the ancestors asserted [it] — Amos the Prophet (ch. 5:25, 26) and St. Stephen (Acts 7:42).

Question III. Whether also, in Joshua's own time, [there] were still any Israelites [who were] idolaters?

To denying this contributes very much the extraordinary religion, piety, and industry of so great a Commander, Joshua, who would by no means have allowed that to be [so]. [There] accedes the testimony of this chapter (v. 31): "Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua." Yet to affirming this same [thing] these words impel (v. 14): "Take away the Gods whom your fathers served"; and (v. 23): "Now take away the strange Gods from the midst of you." Either [view] can be probably thought, and the negation pleases more the Jew Ralbag [Gersonides], and our Caietanus [Cajetan], and especially St. Augustine (here, q. 29): in whose words [there] are several arguments for that opinion. *First*: [They] are not to be believed to have had hitherto any images of the nations, since above (ch. 22:2 & 3; ch. 23:3 & 4 & 8) [the text] most greatly proclaimed their obedience. *Second*: Or if [they] did have [them], [would they] follow those set-forth [proposals]? *Third*: Since vengeance was so taken upon them, because one of them had made a theft of [from] the anathema [the devoted thing — Achan]. *Fourth*: Finally, Jacob said (Gen. 35:2) this to those who had gone out with him from Mesopotamia, where thus idols were worshiped — as also Rachel stole the paternal [idols] (Gen. 31:19). But after that admonition of Jacob [they] gave [up] what [idols] they had. Whence [it] appeared [that] this [was] so said to them, because he who had said [it] knew [that] they had [them]. But now, after this admonition of Joshua, son of Nun, no one brought forth any such [thing]. And this last [point] can be confirmed by another example. For when Saul had said (1 Kings [1 Sam.] 7:3): "Take away the strange Gods from the midst of you," at once [it] is subjoined (v. 4): "The children of Israel therefore took away the Baalim and the Astaroth, and served the Lord only." But nothing similar [was] here done by the Israelites. We saw besides (ch. 22) how all the tribes of the Cisjordanian Israelites blazed up [in anger], and, snatching up arms, were prepared to invade [their] brethren, because [they] suspected [them] to have raised an altar of impiety. How, therefore, would they themselves still venerate the most vain idols of the Gods? But if, in Moses's time, when the people was dwelling in the wilderness, [there] were idols, and shrine-carriages [thensae] and tabernacles of idols, [made] by that [people]

(col. 1273)

[…idols, and shrine-carriages and tabernacles of idols were made,] by that people — as I touched [on] at the end of the previous question — carried about and worshiped, what wonder if also under Joshua's command?

Or did the most prudent and most sharp-eyed Commander, Joshua, say so absolutely in vain (v. 23): "Now take away the strange Gods"? Why did [he] not say: "Now take away the strange Gods, if you have any? if perhaps [there] are [any] among you"? The cited Ralbag [Gersonides] and B. Augustine respond [that] "by strange Gods" [there] are here understood depraved — or at least false — thoughts, while even the true God is thought [to be] such as [he] is not. The holy Prophet (Augustine's words are these) *"perceived [that there] were, in their hearts, thoughts about God [that were] estranged from God, and [he] admonished [that] these very [thoughts] be taken away. For whosoever thinks God [to be] such as God is not, carries about in [his] thought an alien and false God in every way."* But since the phrase always elsewhere commands the removal and extermination of idols — as we saw [from] Gen. 35 and 1 Kings [1 Sam.] 7 — why would [it] here import something else? Why would [it] be taken properly [literally] elsewhere, [but] improperly here? Certainly no cause urges [us] to depart from the proper and usual notion of the words. And although "strange Gods" are all thoughts about God which form and behold him otherwise than [he] is — [so that] nearly all the impious will have false Gods in their mind — do not all [men] see him "in a mirror and in an enigma [riddle]," but not as [he] is (1 Cor. 13)? "Who is [there]," says Augustine himself in this place, "who thinks God [to be] such as [he] is?" Through a mystical sense, therefore, vain phantasms of that kind can indeed be called "false Gods," yet not truly and according to the letter.

Yet concord between these discordant opinions seems able to be established, if [it] be said: *1.* [That there] was then no public and open worship of any idol in the Israelite people. For this nearly all the arguments [so far] adduced prove. *2.* [That] Joshua does not affirm [that there] are false Gods among the people; but, since [he] was the people's Leader and Commander, and wished to admonish them of [their] duty, [he] feared lest perhaps some Gods still lay hid among some [persons]: and so, [he] admonished of what [it was] permitted to him, as to a Prince, to fear and suspect. *3.* [That it] is sufficiently likely [that there] were some — though very few — who still retained certain idols, and secretly worshiped [them]. For in a great multitude, even of the best and most holy [people], some wicked and worthless [ones] are always found. And these [points] nearly make up the arguments of the second opinion. *4.* [That] Joshua found out about those [idolaters] by no indication, divine or human. Otherwise indeed [he] would without doubt have animadverted [acted] against them most gravely, as so great a wickedness deserved. Nor do those [things] which Masius said at v. 22 greatly dissonate from these. But Caietanus [Cajetan] indeed proposes both [opinions] — he proposes the first opinion at v. 14; but [he] rather approves that which refers [it] to that removal of the Gods, as appears from [the things] which [he] wrote at v. 23.

Question IV. Whether the Lord [truly] sent hornets, before the Israelites, upon their enemies?

Our Interpreter [the Vulgate] turned [translated] the word "crabrones" [hornets] (v. 12). That [word], in Hebrew, is "Tsirhah" [צרעה], which signifies a multitude either of wasps, or of gadflies [oestra], or of hornets: namely, of obscene and most vile flying [insects], which — as "Radak" [David Kimhi] & "Raschi" [Rashi] say — fly into the eyes of men, and bite them, and wound [them] with poured-out poison: the Seventy call [them] here τὴν σφηκίαν [t■n sph■kian, "the wasp-swarm"], elsewhere σφῆκας [sph■kas, "wasps"] & σφηκίας [sph■kias]. And such swarms of flying little-beasts God once promised (Exod. 23:28, Deut. 7:20) [that] he would send before the Israelite forces, and [that it] would most greatly harm and weaken the enemies [for] them. And [that] God stood by his promises, Joshua here narrates (v. 12). But the Doctors inquire: whether these hornets are to be taken properly [literally], or metaphorically? St. Augustine (on Exodus, q. 93, and here, q. 27) understands the hornets metaphorically — because [we] nowhere read [that] true [ones] were sent divinely: "neither," he says, "in Moses's times, nor under Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun, nor under the Judges, nor under the Kings." Yet, with the good leave of so great a Doctor, others take [them as] true [literal] hornets — as Arias [Montanus], Masius, [and] Caietan. For *first*: it is the rule of St. Augustine himself [that] the propriety [literal sense] of words is to be kept in the Scriptures, when nothing absurd

[results]. But what [is] absurd, if we say [that] swarms of those little-beasts were sent divinely upon the Canaanites? What [is] not rather wonderful, and worthy of God's power and majesty? *Secondly*: By the metaphorical hornets St. Augustine understands universally whatever strikes terror, and [that] very [fear] — sent from God — invading and torturing the minds of the enemies. "The wasp," he says, "those [are] the stings of fear, perhaps, to be understood, by which the aforesaid nations were agitated, so that [they] gave way to the children of Israel." And specially, here (q. 27), the same [one] expounds those wasps in two ways. *First*: [that they] were rumors, flying before [them], about the coming of the Israelites — by which the Canaanites were most vehemently pricked and tortured — as appeared above, in Rahab's speech (ch. 2:11). *Secondly*: [that they] were Demons, or hidden aerial spirits, which, in Ps. 77 [78], [Scripture] calls "through evil Angels." But the text cited before, which looks a little more diligently [carefully], sees [that] those [things] are joined to the hornets which drive away the metaphorical [sense] and retain the true [literal]. Exod. 23:26, the Lord first says: "I will send my terror [fear] into thy forerunning," or "before thee, and I will slay all the people" — or "I will confound, [I will] thoroughly terrify," and, as the Seventy render [it], ἐκστήσω [ekst■s■, "I will throw into consternation"]; "I will strike dead [exanimabo]." But then, after — as [it were] the mode by which [it] would come to pass that this [should be], so that our Latin could be explained, or rather as the Hebrew and Greek indicate more clearly — [something] greater and more prodigious is subjoined: "And I will make all thy enemies turn [their] backs before thee, sending hornets first, which shall drive out the Hevite and the Canaanite." But in the Hebrew and Greek [it] is clearer, as I said: "And I will send hornets before thee." Deut. 7:20, when Moses had said the wonders which the Lord had done for the Israelites in Egypt, he adds [that] he would still do other [things] for them, among the nations to which [they] are about to come — for example, [that] into these [nations], before their arrival, [he] would send hornets. But in Egypt, [were there] not terrors, [were there] not malignant [spirits], which tortured the minds of the Egyptians with fear — [were there not such] spirits? But *thirdly*: this whole matter can be settled by even one passage — Wisdom 12:8. For when the sage had said [that] the Canaanites — on account of the gravest [crimes], with which [they] were most contaminated, [crimes] punished most gravely by God, and [who were] destroyed by the hands of the Israelites (v. 6) — [he] adjoined: "but these too, as [being] men, thou didst spare, and didst send the forerunners [antecessores] of thy army, wasps, that they might little by little exterminate them." Behold, besides the swords of the Israelites, [there] was something else which [was to] exterminate the enemies, and indeed little by little. But that forerunning fear [would] not

(col. 1275)

[…but that forerunning fear did] not [do this]. For [it] destroyed none of those [enemies], nor destroyed [them] little by little. But [it] seized all at once: all at once [it] smote, broke, and dissolved [them] — as is clear from the nature of fear, and from Rahab's narration above (ch. 2). But [the sage] adds [things] which most clearly indicate true hornets — other [things, in] Wisdom vv. 9 & 10: *"Not because [thou wast] powerless to subject the impious to the just in war, or by cruel beasts, or by a harsh word to exterminate [them]: but, judging by parts [little by little], thou gavest place for repentance."* In these words [the sage] gives the cause why the Lord willed to send ahead wasps or hornets — forerunners [prodromoi], as the Greek text here calls [them] — of the Israelite army. And for that cause [it] falls not upon tropical [metaphorical] and improper [hornets], but upon true and proper [literal] hornets. For since these little-animals are most minute and most vile, someone might perhaps say: could not God have done other [things], greater and more terrible, against the Canaanites? could [he] not, in war, and by the sword of his people, cut those [enemies] off? [could he] not send upon them bears, wolves, lions, and other savage and monstrous beasts? [could he] not — by some hard word, or, as [it] is in the Greek, ἀποτόμῳ [apotom■, "cutting, severe"], that is, "cutting and vibrating," and penetrating the innermost marrows and "drying up" [desiccating] by a word — by [his] command and nod take those [enemies] utterly away from the midst? "By [his] command," he [the sage] says, [he] "could [do] these [things], who is omnipotent, [could do] all [things]: but [he] preferred to use the work of most tiny and most abject little-beasts, that little by little, and by parts, gradually and minutely" —

for this is that "by parts" of v. 10 (in the Greek κατὰ βραχύ [kata brachy, "little by little"], as [in] v. 8; & κατ' ὀλίγον [kat' oligon, "by a little"], v. 2) — "he might judge those nations, or exercise [his] judgment upon them, [and] rout them; and that for them, by that tardiness, and that slow and long-lasting torture, [he] might give place and occasion of repentance," as [in] Romans 2:4. And that again, because, although [they] were most grave sinners, nevertheless [they] were men, whom [he] might in some way spare, and [to whom he might] attribute something — even in [their] very punishments — of mercy and of mildness, the compassionate and merciful Lord deems [it] just (v. 8): "not being ignorant" (because v. 10) "their nation is wicked" (or [their] birth and conception [is] πονηρὰ γένεσις [pon■ra genesis, "an evil origin"], as [in] Ps. 50:7), "and their natural malice": ἔμφυτος πονηρία [emphytos pon■ria, "inborn wickedness"], that is, native and inborn, on account of the depravation of nature [that is] the companion of original sin, and the propensity to evil (Gen. 6:5).

If the hornets here were "warlike rumors" and guardian[-spirits] [tutores], would not these very [things] have pertained to [the realm of] war — [war] which we nevertheless saw [is] set in opposition to them? And why would [they] be compared with savage and monstrous beasts? Ought not the sage to have added also minute and vile little-beasts to these — like frogs, locusts, and sciniphs [gnats], since the Lord once vexed the Egyptians with these too (Exod. 8, 9, 10)? and could not fears also be compared with these? And would not these [hornets, if literal] have at once overrun all the Canaanites, at once fought them, at once — as [it were] in one column formed — struck and lacerated [them]? As for [the view] that [they are] to be referred also to malign spirits, [consider] this besides: if by "hornets" those [spirits] were signified, [it] would not rightly have been said by the sage (v. 9): "Not because [he] was powerless." For [it] seems [to be] of greater power to use demons as ministers than wasps and stinging little-animals — nay, than men, beasts, and words, however harsh and thundering. [It is] therefore sufficiently manifest, I think, [that] true hornets, by God's command, flew ahead upon the Canaanites before the Israelites' approach to them. And therefore St. Augustine, departing somewhat from his prior opinion — or at least relaxing [it] — modestly says in this place: *"Unless perhaps someone say [that] not all [the things] which were done are written down: and [that] this too [was] done visibly, so that [one] may wish to understand [them as] true wasps."* On the contrary, however, when Junius and Tremellius wished [there to be] only metaphorical wasps, [they] dared very immodestly and boldly to insert that very [thing] into the text itself (Exod. 23:28), [where they] translate thus: "I will send, I say, my terror, as [it were] a hornet, before thee." In which matter [they] have as adversary not only [the things] which I have said hitherto, but also their own Master Calvin here, and Camerarius (Century 2, ch. 13). But like to this plague of wasps seems that [plague] which the most holy Bishop James [Jacob] of Nisibis, by his prayers, sent upon the forces, horses, and Elephants of the Persians besieging Nisibis — as [it] is in Theodoret, in the *History of the [Holy] Fathers*, ch. 1. But perhaps, as soon as the Israelites began to go out from Egypt, this scourge began to rage upon the Canaanites, so that — as [has been] said — [they] might be gradually and little by little finished off and extirpated.

Question V. Whether Joshua made to the Israelites a true option [choice] of serving God or the [false] gods?

[It] is clearly said (v. 15): "the option is given you: Choose this day what pleases [you]." But *1.*: that word "option" is not in the Hebrew and Greek, yet the thing itself is [there]. *2.*: And by that thing, and by that very [word] which is in all the texts — [namely] by the word "choosing" [eligendi] — is signified indeed the liberty of human free-will, by which [they] could choose and elect either of the two: yet in no way did Joshua will, or could rightly will, that [they] should choose the servitude of the [false] Gods. For that [is] utterly contrary to both the laws of God and of nature. *3.*: Yet Joshua so spoke, that [he] might more vehemently and more efficaciously bring them to choosing the worship of God, and constantly defending [it]. For when, between two [things], an option is given — of which one [is] the best, and so [best] that [it] is agreed to be of such a kind, but the other [is] the worst and most absurd, and [when] that [it] is so [is] evident — [then] the

exhortation is most ardent, by which, as [it were], a certain necessity is imposed on men endowed with reason, [impelling them] to embrace that very [thing] whose goodness is so great and so well-known, and to flee and detest by every means that contrary great evil — as Abulensis rightly observes (q. 11): as if I should say: "Do you wish to lead [your] life utterly lawless, and after the manner of cattle, or after the manner of men, by good and honest laws? One or the other [must] be done by you, O mortals, so that [you] may either enjoy eternal beatitude in heaven, or be slaughtered, day and night, by eternal torments among those below [in hell]. The option is given you: choose whichever [you will]." And in this manner too of exhorting, Elias the Prophet used [it] (3 Kings [1 Kings] 18:21); Ecclesiasticus 15:18; nay, even Pilate, when [he] cried out to those most wicked and most blind [men] (Matt. 26:17 [recte 27:17]): "Whom will you [that] I release to you, Barabbas, or JESUS, who is called CHRIST?" and (v. 21): "Whom of the two will you [that] I release?" Yet so great then, in Israel, was the blindness, senselessness [vecordia], and insanity so great, that Pilate profited nothing, but [that] notorious murderer, rather than the most innocent Saviour and Messiah — [than] JESUS, I say, [who is] CHRIST — was chosen. But these Israelites [chose] far more wisely with Joshua (vv. 16, 17, 18).

(col. 1277)

Question VI. How did [Joshua] say (v. 19) to the Israelites [who were] choosing God: "You will not be able to serve the Lord"?

[It] cannot come to pass that servants cannot serve [their] Creator, and men [their] Lord. For that [man] would be a Tyrant, who should command these [servants that] which [they] could not do; [and] Joshua would be insane, who should give an option of things which cannot be done — nay, [who should] admonish and exhort to those [impossible things]. All Interpreters, therefore, deny [that] that [saying] which Joshua says — "You will not be able to serve" — is to be taken absolutely, but [only] in a modified [modificate] and restricted [way]. But the modification and restriction is handed down by many [as] manifold. *First*: by S. Augustine (here, q. 28): "You will not be able [to serve], by your [own] strength, without God's help and mercy." *Second*: by the same [one] in the same place: "You will not be able [to serve] perfectly, and without any offense." *Third*: by Abulensis (q. 12): "You will not be able [to serve] with impunity, without divine wrath and penalty." *Fourth*: by the same [one] in the same place: "You will not be able [to serve] easily; but only with [great] difficulty" — in that mode, namely, by which Aristotle (Physics bk. 3, ch. 3, text 34) says [that] something infinite [can] "with difficulty, or scarcely, be finished" and crossed through. *Fifth*: by Caietanus [Cajetan]: "You will not be able [to serve] constantly and for long." *Sixth*: by others: "You will not be able [to serve] together with the worship of idols."

[It] seems to me [that] this negation — "You will not be able to serve the Lord" — is a most vehement exhortation to serving him. For [those] who see [that] some [persons] wish something, and desire [that] they wish it still more, are wont to say to them: "You will not be able to do, to have, [or] to obtain this." For by this mode of speaking, [it] is not simply denied [that] they are able [to do] that; but some mode and condition is understood, which he who so speaks understands, and which is either known or cared about by him to whom [it] is spoken. For example: let [there] be a Commander who wishes to sharpen and stir up more certain soldiers who are about to undertake some [enterprise]; [he] first sets before them their [own] fewness, the difficulty of the matter, [and] the magnitude of the dangers which are about to befall: and then [he] says: "You will not be able [to accomplish] that which you have undertaken — [namely] to conquer the enemy — unless you put on great courage, [and] are prepared to endure the greatest labors and perils, and hold [it] decreed and fixed in [your] mind either to fall or to conquer. But if indeed you are of so generous a spirit and so excellent a virtue, you will certainly accomplish that which you are revolving in [your] mind; and [that] you may be such, and may straightway undertake the business, I vehemently wish, exhort, and — by God, and by all [things] dear to you — beseech [you]." What [of] those soldiers here? Will [they] despond in spirit

from that first negation of the Commander? Do [they] not understand [that it] is not an absolute and precise negation, but [one that] rather requires certain conditions? And will [they] not at once accept these? Will [they] not be the more incited, that [they] may undertake the virtue, endurance, and excellence of spirit to which the good Leader hinted [to] them? [that they] may rush bravely into all labors and dangers? and not acquiesce before [they] have rendered that matter accomplished? So indeed Joshua, when [he] had seen the Israelites choosing God before all [false] gods, and had been affected with great joy on account of that election, nevertheless wished to render them, in that matter, still more inflamed, more diligent, and more persevering. He knew their [disposition], especially prone to vices and to idolatry, [their] over-headlong nature. [He] knew the depraved custom of certain [people] — of complaining and murmuring in adversities, of running riot in favorable and prosperous [times], and of forgetting divine [things]. [He] knew [that] many occasions, enticements, and frauds — [tending] toward all-kinds-of sins and toward the desertion of God — would befall them from the remaining Canaanites, from the surrounding idolatrous nations, and from the devil and the flesh. For all these [things], how most fortified and most attentive Joshua wishes [them] to be — so that [they] may strive to overcome these [things] thereafter; [so] that [they] may most studiously and most strongly turn aside all occasions of sins, incitements to idolatry, [and] the stocks and seeds of wickedness; [so] that [they] may suffer themselves to be led away by no matter from God and from his most holy worship, but in it — with divine grace and help — may persist and persevere most eagerly, most constantly, and most perfectly, as far as is lawful for mortals. And [so] that [he] may excite in them this desire, ardor, and impetus; [so] that [he] may instigate [them, having been] admonished [of] the depravity of [their] secretly and covertly concealed viciousness, to the keeping of themselves thereafter and to a serious care [of themselves]; [so] that [they] may be made most prompt, and most willing and voluntary, toward the worship of that same God — all difficulties also considered — now [he] says: "You will not be able to serve the Lord" — namely, as [it] behooves: purely, chastely, wholly, long, and constantly — unless [you] henceforth beware, and with [your] mind cultivate his laws and ceremonies with the greatest [care].

And this can also be understood from the reasons [arguments], four [in number], which [Joshua] joins to this his saying. *First*: "For God [is] holy." [He] wishes, therefore, to be worshiped in a holy manner, [and] purely and chastely. And in Hebrew [it] is in the plural: "elohim cedoschim" [אלהים קדשים], that is, "God very holy," "most holy," or precisely — and without any addition — "holy," as [it] is in our Interpreter [Vulgate], and [in] the Seventy: ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἅγιός ἐστι [hoti ho Theos hagios esti, "because God is holy"]; as [in] Jeremiah 10:10: "the living God," in Hebrew "the living [ones]" [plural]. *Second*: "And [he] is a strong emulator [jealous]" — or "zealot" [zelotes], as in the Seventy: ζηλώσας [z■l■sas, "being jealous, zealous"]. Nothing, therefore, [is] to be admitted against him which is at all more grave, and which overturns his sacred [rites] and religion. *Third*: From the effect of this divine zeal. "Nor will [he] forgive your wickednesses and sins" — which, as I said, overturn his worship, [and] are great scandals, [and] offend him more gravely, as follows (v. 20). *Fourth*: "If you leave the Lord, and serve strange Gods, [he] will turn, and will afflict you, and will overthrow [you] after [he] has bestowed good [things]." Lest, therefore, any of these evils befall you — which [God] forbid! — and because [you] have such a God, serve [him], serve him, O Israelites, with [your] whole heart, and [your] whole soul, most religiously, most accurately, [and] most perseveringly. In this way the people understood [it]: and therefore [it] responded [that] [it] would so do, and promised [it] (vv. 21, 22, 24).

Question VII. How did Joshua strike [make] a covenant with the Israelites?

Joshua struck [made] a covenant with the people, as [it] is narrated (v. 25). But about the manner, some [things] are straightway expressed, and others are inquired into. [The things] which are expressed are four. *First*: [He] set before the people precepts and judgments in Sichem. Caietanus [Cajetan] thinks these precepts and judgments [were] handed down in the previous chapter, and thence gathers [that] one and the same [gathering] of this

(col. 1279)

[…gathers that] one and the same [occasion] of this and of the previous speech [is the case]. But the inference [collectio] is weak. For these two names [precepts and judgments] can be so expounded that, by this chapter too, [there] are contained in them the matters subjoined [to them]. For what [is] the whole exhortation of this chapter, but [an exhortation] to observing God's precepts and judgments? Then all the other Interpreters say [that] here [it] is only said generally what was done, but not individually which precepts and judgments were set forth. Radak [David Kimhi], moreover, takes "to set forth" [proponere] for "monuments, to commit to memory"; and then [he] thinks the Hebrew "lo" [לו] superfluous — that is, "to them [ipsis]" — just as elsewhere I noted "to go to himself" for "simply to go." But this exposition is repugnant to the Seventy, and to the Latin text, and to other Rabbis. For to these, "to set forth" is "to recite." For [they] say [that] Joshua, in imitation of the dying Moses, publicly recited the chapters [heads] of the law — all [of them], or the principal [ones]. "Which indeed," says Masius, "is credible." Yet [Masius] himself prefers [that] "to set forth" here be "to impose," so that the sense be: that, in the conditions of the covenant, this [was] imposed by Joshua on the Israelites — that [they] should keep the statutes and judgments of the law. But how "statutes" and "judgments" differ, the same [one] teaches from R. Moses Albo. But of these elsewhere.

Second: "He wrote also all these words in the volume of the law of the Lord" (v. 26) — that is, this covenant, and these admonitions and stipulations made by Joshua hitherto, and the responses and attestations by the people itself — [he wrote these] into that book of the law which Moses had once written: and [he recorded them] either beside the ark of the covenant, as [it] seems to Masius, or in the [ark] itself, as [it seems] to very many others. But whether [he] wrote [it] by himself, or through others, I have nothing to say. But to the Novators Junius and Tremellius only [it] pleases — what [is] a wonder — [that it] be attributed to the Priests of the tribe [of Levi], so that [they] say: "Joshua commanded [that] the Priests should record [it] in the book of the law of God (Deut. 31:26), which [book] they kept with them [penes se], and preserved, deposited in the sanctuary, before Jehovah." So [think] those enemies of the Priests.

Third: "And he took a great stone, and set it under the oak, which was in the sanctuary of the Lord" (v. 26). For "he set" [posuit] [it] is, in Hebrew, "he erected, he set up" [erexit, statuit] — so that [it] may even have been a statue [pillar], and so seems to be so called (Judges 9:9) — of great magnitude indeed, but of a formless figure and shape, rude and unpolished, as the question [q. 30] indicates. S. Augustine [notes] nothing except that some inscription about that covenant seems to have been incised on it, as its end [purpose] declares — concerning which [there is more] not much after; and the Chaldean Paraphrast [Targum] expressly affirms this. But [as to] what [sort] that oak [was] "in the sanctuary of the Lord," and how the stone [was] erected under it here? The Hebrew name for "oak" — "ala" [אלה], or "ela," & "allon" [אלון] — is wont to be expounded variously. *First*: by Raschi [Rashi] here — not "a tree," but "a threshold" [limen] — without cause, and against all [others]. *Second*: by others, "a tree"; but that [word] is also turned [translated], [in] the Seventy, τερέμινθος [terebinthos, "terebinth"], that is — as also, [in] q. 30, S. Augustine reads [it] — "terebinth"; by others, "holm-oak, pine, fir, elm, chestnut." But [it] is indeed true, [that] which [is] noted by certain Rabbis: [that] the names of stones, trees, and beasts in the Hebrew tongue are either not accurately known, or polysemous [of many meanings]. Rightly, thereupon, our Interpreter [Vulgate] calls [it] "terebinth" (Gen. 35:4), and thereupon "oak" [here], as Masius shows. And this oak is asserted by the Rabbis and Christians [to be] the same in number [= the identical tree] under which, in the Sichemite field, Abraham sat, when [he] first came into the land of Chanaan — where [there was] also an altar — after [he] had heard the Lord appearing [to him], and promising that land, and had built [it] (Gen. 12:7); and under which Jacob buried the idols (Gen. 35:4). But [as to whether] this tree was "in the sanctuary of the Lord" — as [was said] — [there] is not one exposition. *First*, indeed, some take "sanctuary" [sacrarium] improperly, for a sacred place: namely, where [something] was sacrificed to God, and [where] something was done in [the matter of]

his worship and honor. And so Masius & Caietanus [Cajetan] call the place of this oak a "sanctuary," because, as I have already said, Abraham had once erected an altar there, and Jacob had condemned the Gods into darkness and buried [them there]; or [they take "sanctuary"] for a place where [there] would be a newly-erected altar, yet without a tabernacle — which was at Silo [Shiloh]. Others, in truth, take "sanctuary" properly, but at first so that [it] was Sichem [Shechem], [to which] the tabernacle [was] translated at the time of the assembly [comitia], and [so that] this oak was comprehended in its court [atrium] then: and so Abulensis (q. 19). Others [say that] the tabernacle, as I said above, remained at Silo, and expound this place in two ways. For [some] Rabbis say [that] their preposition "be" [בְּ] is taken for "beside [iuxta]" — so that this oak stood not precisely in the sanctuary, but near [prope] it, in the Sichemite field. Others, in truth, prefer [that] this tree was in the court of the Siloan tabernacle itself; and both this — with those [things] which [were] said about the place of this gathering (q. 1) — would cohere. But [it] is objected: [that it] was forbidden (Deut. 16:21) "lest a grove [lucus] and any tree be planted beside the Lord's altar." Some respond [that it] was indeed not lawful to plant [a tree], but, if [it] had already once been planted, [it] could have been left [standing]. But Abulensis rightly rejects that: [that it] was against the end [purpose] of the law — which was, lest [there] be any occasion or appearance of idolatry, since the Gentiles were wont to have a certain divine honor for groves and trees, or to worship nefarious Gods through arbors of this kind. But for that end, [it was] not only [not lawful] to plant [one], but [it was] not even lawful to leave [standing] the trees — which [Abulensis] also proves by reasons adjoined [in] Philo, bk. 2 *On Monarchy*: so that, on that account, [he] who recently (bk. 1 *On the [golden] calf*, ch. 11) said [there] was a grove here — the learned man Moncaeus — is in no way to be heard. Abulensis himself, therefore, responds [that it] was not lawful [for the tree] to be left, if indeed the tabernacle were to be fixed there for long; but if [it] were applied there only for some few days, [it] was lawful. And so indeed [it] was now done in Sichem. But when the tabernacle was placed somewhere, all that cleanness and sanctity which the Lord required was to be employed — even if [it] had to stay there for only one day. Then [to the objection that it] was denied above [that] a translation of the tabernacle to Sichem was made: I respond, therefore, [that] the standing [status] of one or another tree in the subdial [open-air] and open court of the tabernacle is not forbidden — especially if [it] had already been there before, and its use [purpose] is agreed [to be] right and simple [innocent]. For [as to] what Abulensis objects — [that] in the text [it is] "every forbidden tree" — I respond [that it is] not forbidden as [though] a member distinct from the grove: but [that it forbids] every [tree] which is part of a grove — or "a grove out of every tree" [lucum ex omni arbore] — as, from the Hebrew and Greek, the Latin is rightly understood. For all [these authorities] speak by apposition, which is best resolved into "a grove out of any kind of trees." But one or another tree [a single tree] is not a grove. And [it] could, most fittingly [of all], [that] this so-aged oak — ennobled by so many and so great things, by so many and so great Patriarchs — be left [standing], since by its very aspect [sight it leads] to the true religion of God, and [to the memory] of those Saints

(col. 1281)

[…and might excite the imitation] of those Saints.

Fourth: Joshua said (v. 27) to all the people: "Behold this stone shall be to you for a testimony, that it hath heard all the words of the Lord which he hath spoken to you." For so [it is] rightly corrected in the Latin Roman Bibles [the Clementine Vulgate], since certain copies had "which you have heard" [quod audieritis]. For the booksellers [librarii] of those copies shuddered to attribute hearing to a stone. But by the Hebrew and the Greek Seventy [it] is attributed [to the stone], and the stone is said to have heard all the words of the Lord. Which, however, is explained by all through a trope [figure of speech] — but variously. *(1)* As to the effect, as if [he] should say: this stone so attests all [the things] which the Lord has spoken, as if, in the manner of witnesses, [it] had heard those [words] with its [own] ears; and this the Chaldean paraphrast [Targum] means when [he] translates: "Behold this stone shall be to us, as [it were] two stone tables of the covenant. For we make it for a testimony. For the words which are inscribed on it report all the words which

the Lord has spoken to us." *(2)* So that "to hear" is "to obey"; and therefore not of the Israelites, but of God, the stone here is said to have heard the words. For all creatures obey God at [his] nod. So nearly [thinks] Caietanus [Cajetan]. *(3)* So that, through prosopopoeia [personification], hearing is attributed to the stone, for showing the magnitude of the matter — as Theodoret observes (q. 19), just as [in] Isaiah 1[:2]: "Hear, O heavens," and Deut. 32:1: "Hear, O ye heavens, [the things] which I speak, let the earth hear the words of my mouth." But here the end [purpose] of this stone, or statue [pillar], [was] namely to attest perpetually, and to bring back into the memory of all, the compact [pactio] of this covenant.

But this [passage] has great emphasis, which the Novators [Junius] and Tremellius removed from its [proper] place, out of their zeal for novelty, when [they] translated: "This stone itself was present [interfuit], attesting all the discourses of Joshua, by which [he] spoke with us." But beautifully and truly here (q. 30) St. Augustine notes four [things] through anagogy. *First*: [that] by that stone is signified CHRIST the Lord, who is "the corner stone" [lapis angularis] (1 Peter 2; Psalm 117), "the spiritual rock" [petra spiritalis] (Exod. 17:1; 1 Corinthians 10). And this anagogy of the Holy Father R. Moses Nehemannus [Nachmanides] also notes and embraces — which [is] greatly to be observed. *Second*: [that] against the unbelieving Jews this stone cries out; and therefore also Joshua said to those [Jews]: "Lest perhaps hereafter you deny [it], and lie to our God." *Third*: [that], since already once Moses had struck a covenant with the Israelite people (Exod. 24), by this now iteration and renewal of the covenant — instituted by Joshua — is signified the new testament, which the true Jesus sanctioned: [that] by Moses [it is] established [to have been] so done, when [he] struck that first covenant, of which now the renewal is treated (Exod. 24). Nevertheless, by Moses [there] were there 12 erected stones; by Joshua only one: because those [12] signified the 12 tribes, which made peace with the Lord, but this [one] denotes the Lord, who makes peace with the tribes. Nor far from here were those other 12 stones which (ch. 8) are said [to have been] set up by Joshua, when [it was] sacrificed between the mountains Garizim and Hebal [Gerizim and Ebal]. And if [it] please to pursue the anagogy shown by St. Augustine — is not the one corner stone CHRIST JESUS? Is not [there] one highest and most solid rock, on which all the other lesser [stones] lean? Nay, in the [new] testament [there] was not need of so many symbols and figures as in the old Mosaic [one], since there all [things] were types, shadows, and images of [things] to come in the time of CHRIST the Lord. But, all these [things] being finished, the assembly [comitia] [was] dissolved: and Joshua sent the people away, each into his [own] possession (v. 28). *Fourth* [of Augustine's anagogy]: [that] by the terebinth or oak tree is signified the wood of the holy cross, under which — through humility — and on which Christ the Lord (the stone already named) was erected. Yet [it] is not hence gathered that the Lord's cross was [made] of terebinth or oak, as our Gretser proves at length against Chacón [Ciacconius] (bk. 1 *On the Cross*, ch. 6). And these [things] about that Joshuan covenant the text relates expressly.

Other [things], in truth, are inquired by Abulensis (q. 13 & 14). But briefly thus Masius: "It is most likely [that] here no solemn rite was omitted, so that the covenant might be in all ways most holy. And because by this compact [the people] was again, as [it were], initiated into the sacred religion, [it is likely that] not only was [there] sacrificing, but also — as [by] a certain bond — [that] partly the altar of God (as [it were] God himself), partly the people, was sprinkled with the blood of the victim by a solemn rite, as [it] is established [to have been] so done by Moses, when [he] struck that first covenant, of which now the renewal is treated (Exod. 24)." Nevertheless, by Moses [there] were there 12 erected stones; by Joshua only one.

Question VIII. When did Joshua die?

The times can be considered [as] various. *First*: for [it] can be asked: how long after the assembly and this covenant [was] ratified did [he] live? And Masius responds: "[It] is credible [that] he did not live long after that assembly, but a little after, having returned home, departed from life — just as also, after a last speech of this kind, Moses suddenly departed." *Then* [it] can be asked: in what year of his age did [he] meet death? And

the sacred text itself responds (v. 29) [that he] was 110 years [old]. In which age also Joseph was, when [he] died (Gen. 50:25). Whence, on this passage, *Bereschith Rabbah* [Genesis Rabbah] (fol. 115, col. 3) notes six pairs [of persons] for whom the age of living [was] equal:

1. Rebecca & Cahath [Kohath]. 2. Levi & Hamram [Amram]. 3. Joseph & Joshua. 4. Samuel & Salomo [Solomon]. 5. Moses, & Hillel the elder. 6. Iuchanan ben Zochai [Yohanan ben Zakkai], & R. Akiba.

[It] can, *thirdly*, be asked: in what [year] of his principate [rule] [he] died, or in what year after the crossing of the Jordan? And of this [there] are nearly as many opinions as [there are] hours of the day. The *First*, of Scaliger (in the *Elenchus* of Paraeus, p. 29): "Not only," he says, "how many years Joshua presided over the people is unknown, but also how much of the years flowed between, from the beginning of the book of Joshua to the end." The *Second* opinion defines no certain time, but [says that], however many years those finally were, [it] says those are contained in the 40 years which are wont to be ascribed to the Judge Othoniel [Othniel] first. So [think] certain [authors] cited in Abulensis (in the Prologue to Judges, q. 9; and the same [one] in the same place, q. 21); Ribera (bk. 1 *On the temple*, ch. 1); a certain Clement Schubert (in [his] book *On chronological scruples*, ch. 4). *Other* opinions define a certain time. The *Third*, therefore — which [is] that of Adrichomius, in both [his] Chronicle[s] — is [that] after the death of Moses and the crossing of the Jordan, only 7 years [are] given to Joshua. The *Fourth*, of Mercator (in [his] *Chronology*), [gives] eight or nine. The *Fifth*, of Caietanus [Cajetan], & Arias here, & Canus (bk. 11, ch. 5, at the 11th argument), [gives] ten. The *Sixth*, of Rambam [Maimonides] (bk. 2 *Moreh Nebuchim* [Guide of the Perplexed], ch. 32), [gives] fourteen. The *Seventh*, of V. Bede, Lucidus, & Hugh Broughton, in their agreement, [gives] seventeen. The *Eighth*, of Genebrardus, &

(col. 1283)

[…The *Eighth*, of Genebrardus] & Chytraeus (in his *Onomasticon*), eighteen. The *Ninth*, of Josephus (at the end of a chapter, bk. 5), twenty-five. The *Tenth*, of Ralbag [Gersonides] (on ch. 11 of Judges), of Eusebius, of Sulpicius [Severus], of St. Theophilus (bk. 3), of D. Augustine (bk. 18 *City [of God]*, ch. 11), of Nicephorus of Constantinople, [and] of George Syncellus — who also says this is held from unwritten [agraphos] custom and tradition — [give] twenty-seven. The *Eleventh*, of Sederholam [Seder Olam] (ch. 12), & Radak [David Kimhi], & R. Abraham Zacuth (in [his] book *Iuchasin* [Yuhasin], fol. 10), of R. Godolias [Gedaliah] (in his *Catena* [Shalshelet], fol. 14 & 97), and also of Masius himself (ch. 11, 18, 24), [give] twenty-eight. The *Twelfth*, of Eupolemus (apud Eusebius, bk. 9 of the *Preparation* [Praeparatio Evangelica]), thirty.

Now, of all those opinions, which [is] the truest? Indeed, from those [things] which [were] established above about the years of the division of the land — [years] prior and posterior — [it] appears [that], of those opinions which (except for some [one] by no means to be disapproved — [the confession of ignorance]) establish something definite, the first four or five [are] to be rejected. But of the rest — all [of them] examined before the [book of] Judges, and the times [once] firmly established — [it] cannot certainly be pronounced. Await, therefore, a little while, [O] good Reader, and [wait] a little — either in the following [book], or in [the books of] Kings [3 Kings]: [the matter] is deferred. "Small conveniences have [i.e. come with] great delay."

But the month and day of [his] death is recorded in the Calendar of the Hebrews [as] Nisan, the 26th day — so that, namely, after Moses, who departed from life in the preceding month, called Adar, Joshua should follow: and indeed also because, in this very month Nisan, the true Joshua, CHRIST the Lord, was once about to die.

Question IX. Where, and with what mourning [planctu], was Joshua buried?

The sacred text points out, as [it were] with an intent finger, the place of Joshua's burial (v. 30). "They buried him," [it] says, "the Israelites, in the borders of his possession in Thamnathsare [Timnath-serah], which is situated in Mount Ephraim, on the north side of Mount Gaas" — for which [Gaas] the Seventy corruptly have "Mount Galaad"; and for "Thammathsare" [it] is sometimes — and rightly — Θαμνασαράχ [Thamnasarach], sometimes — and wrongly — Θαμνάσαχαρ [Thamnasachar], as above (ch. 19); and occasionally by another name, Θαμναθαρές [Thamnathares], as [in] Judges ch. 1, for "Thamnachares" or "Thamnacheres." At the beginning of *Midras Ruth* [Ruth Rabbah] (fol. 40, col. 2), R. Barachias says: "We have gone through the whole Scripture, and found no place whose name is Gabaas [Gaas]." And he adds [that] this name [was] imposed on that place, because there [the people] rioted [tumultuati sunt], so that by no benefit or piety [would] they requite Joshua himself, who had distributed the land to them.

But mourning [planctus] and lamentation for great men, [lasting] several days, was wont to be made among the Jews — as for Jacob (Gen. 50), for Aaron (Num. 20), [and] for Moses (Deut. 24 [recte 34:8]). For these two [Aaron and Moses, there were] 30 whole days of mourning [each]. What, then, [was] done for our Joshua? [It is] likely [it was] done no less. Yet about this nothing at all is handed down in writing. And therefore St. Jerome (Epist. to Fabiola, *On the 42 Mansions*, mansion 34): "Aaron is mourned; JESUS is not mourned. In the Law [there is] a descent to hell; in the Gospel, a transmigration to paradise." And to Paula, on the death of Blesilla: "I cannot," he says, "sufficiently praise the mysteries of Scripture, and admire the divine sense in words [even if] simple: what [does] this mean — [that] Moses is mourned, and JESUS [Joshua] son of Nun, a holy man, is reported [as] buried, and yet is not written to have been wept [over]? Namely, [because] that [case] which [is] in Moses — that is, in the old law — under Adam's sin all were held by the sentence [elogio], and, descending to hell, [the dead] were accompanied by following tears, according to the Apostle, who says (Rom. 5): 'And death reigned from Adam even unto Moses, even over those who had not sinned.' But in JESUS — that is, in the Gospel — through whom paradise is opened, [the dead] are accompanied to death by joys; and the Jews, weeping and with bare feet, wallowing in ashes, lie upon sackcloth. And, lest anything be lacking to [their] superstition, from the most vain rite of the Pharisees, [they] first take food of lentils — showing, namely, by what [sort of] dish [they] lost [their] birthright. But deservedly: because, not believing in the resurrection of the Lord, [they] are prepared for the coming of Antichrist. But we, who have put on CHRIST, and have been made — according to the Apostle (2 Peter 2 [recte 1 Peter 2:9]) — a royal and priestly race, ought not to be saddened over the dead." These [things] St. [Jerome said]; to which the mourning-rites of our present-day Jews too lend credence — [they] who, at the funerals of their [own], here at Mainz [Moguntia], fill the sand (when, from the neighborhood where they wash their corpses, they go out from a hut [tugurium]) with wailings and feigned tears; and [they] make a small part of their own garments, around the neck, to be cut off a little by a Rabbi, and a little afterward [they] themselves pluck and tear [it] by hand.

Question X. What [kind of] sepulchre [had] the Leader Joshua? and were the stone knives buried with him in this [sepulchre]?

Of the sepulchre I have nothing else to write than what St. Jerome wrote in Paula's Epitaph [Epistle]: [that] it existed even in his own time, and indeed [was] still in great esteem and honor. "The sepulchres," he says, "of Jesus [Joshua] son of Nun, and of Eleazar son of Aaron the Priest, in Mount Ephraim, Paula venerated from the [opposite] region — of whom the one is buried in Thamnathsare, on the north side of Mount Gaas; the other in Gabaa [Gibeah] of Phinees his son." Brocardus [Burchard], in [his] *Description of the Holy Land*: "In the cave," he says, "of the Leopards' mountain, a certain cave of 26 feet is devoutly frequented by the Saracens, because [they] think Joshua [is] buried there."

But [it is] narrated [that] into that same sepulchre were buried the stone knives, with which (above, ch. 5) we said the circumcision [was] made by him [Joshua] at Gilgal — [the text] here narrating this (v. 30) thus: ἐκεῖ

ἔθηκαν μετ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ μνῆμα, εἰς ὃ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐκεῖ, τὰς μαχαίρας τὰς πετρίνας, ἐν αἷς περιέτεμεν υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ ἐν Γαλγάλοις, ὅτε ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, καθὰ συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς κύριος· καὶ ἐκεῖ εἰσιν ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας [ekei eth■kan met' autou eis to mn■ma, eis ho ethapsan auton ekei, tas machairas tas petrinas, en hais perietemen huious Isra■l en Galgalois, hote ex■gagen autous ex Aigyptou, katha synetaxen autois kyrios; kai ekei eisin he■s t■s s■meron h■meras, "There they placed with him, in the tomb into which they buried him there, the stone knives with which he circumcised the sons of Israel in Gilgal, when he led them out of Egypt, as the Lord commanded them: and there they are unto this present day"]. But these little swords [gladioli] or knives [the text] had already before (ch. 21) written [as] preserved by Joshua himself in his [own] city, Thamnathsare. Where, therefore, are [those] who think [that] the things and relics of the Saints [are] guarded so iniquitously [unworthily]? But the mystical exposition of these stone knives is in Origen, [his] last homily. Certainly, indeed, since by them [he] understands nearly the word of God, [it] appears with how great love and honor the true Jesus follows [prosecutes] those [objects which are] even the true and holy instruments of doctrine — as [he follows] the sacred books, and much more those [men] who use these instruments piously and skillfully.

Question XI. What [was] the epitaph of Joshua?

Eulogies [elogia], which may be as [it were] illustrious Epitaphs, I find three. The *First*, in Josephus

(col. 1285)

[…The *First*, in Josephus,] bk. 5, ch. 1, near the end: Ἰησοῦς ἀνὴρ μήτε συνέσεως ὢν ἐνδεής, μήτε τοῦ τὰ νοηθέντα πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐξενεγκεῖν ἄτερος, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀμφοτέραις ἄκρος· πρὸς δὲ τὰ ἔργα καὶ τοὺς κινδύνους εὔψυχος καὶ μεγαλότολμος, πρυτανεῦσαί τε τὰ κατὰ τὴν εἰρήνην δεξιώτατος, καὶ πρὸς ἅπαντα καιρὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς ἡρμοσμένος [I■sous an■r m■te synese■s ■n ende■s, m■te tou ta no■thenta pros tous pollous exenenkein ateros, all' en amphoterais akros…, "Joshua, a man neither lacking in understanding, nor without skill in bringing forth [his] thoughts to the multitude, but supreme in both; and toward deeds and dangers [he was] stout-hearted and of great daring, most dexterous to administer the affairs of peace, and fitted to every occasion of virtue"].

The *Second*, in Ecclesiasticus ch. 46: "Valiant in war [was] Jesus [Joshua] son of Nave, the successor of Moses in the Prophets [prophecies], who was great according to his name, [exceeding great] in the salvation of the elect of God, to overthrow the rebelling enemies, that he might obtain the inheritance of Israel" (that is, that he might make Israel obtain the promised inheritance, and might establish [Israel] in it). "How great glory did he gain, when he lifted up his hands, and threw spears [rhomphaeas] against the cities? Who before him so withstood? For the Lord himself brought the enemies [to him]. Was not the sun stopped in his anger (or by his hand), and one day made as two? He called upon the most High Sovereign, when the enemies assailed [him] on every side; and the great and holy God heard him by hailstones of exceeding great force. He made an assault against the hostile nation, and in the descent [or, descending] he destroyed the adversaries; that the nations might know his [the Lord's] power, because it is not easy to fight against God. And he followed close behind the Mighty One" (that is, [he] pursued the enemy, himself following the Leader-God, or the Angel, concerning whom Josh. ch. 6 — "the mighty [one]") "and in the days of Moses he did [a work of] mercy, he and Caleb son of Jephone, to stand against the enemy" (or, as [it] is in other books, "before the Church [assembly]") "and to hinder the [Israelite] nation from sins, and to break the murmur of malice" (or, the wicked and criminal murmuring). "And these two, [being] appointed, were delivered from peril, out of the number of six hundred thousand footmen, to bring them into the inheritance, into the land which floweth with milk and honey" (Sir. 46:1–10).

The *Third* is this very [eulogy] (ch. ult. [= 24], v. 29): [in] words indeed most brief, yet in the weight of things, and in dignity, greatest — "IOSVE [Joshua] SON OF NUN, SERVANT OF THE LORD." But this [was] explained above (ch. 1, q. 2). And to this can be added [that] which here, a little after, is added (v. 31),

and is repeated [in] Judges 2:7: "Israel served the Lord all the days of Joshua." What greater praise of that Prince, King, and Commander, than that — in his time, [in his] principate, reign, and command — the peoples should serve the Lord? Happy, and truly great before God and men, and thrice and four times great, [are those] to whom this most noble eulogy can apply. These [are] the truest Philosophers, by whom reigning [as kings] both Plato and Aristotle said [there would be] a blessed Commonwealth — as from that [passage] Tullius [Cicero] also mentions, in [his] Epistle to [his] brother Quintus; who, also, [in] bk. 1, Epistle to Lentulus: "These [things] are written divinely by our Plato: such as the Princes in a Commonwealth are, such the rest of the citizens are wont to be."

Question XII. What other monuments [exist] to the perpetual memory of Joshua?

The Rabbis of the Jews record two other monuments. The *One* is, [that there] was placed over the sepulchre of Joshua an image — or rather a statue — of the Sun, by which the memory of that admirable solar institution [the sun standing still], obtained from God by Joshua himself (concerning which above, ch. 9), might be made famous into all posterity. And this Masius judges probable — so that [he] thinks [that] thence the Joshuan city Thamnathsarach [Timnath-serah], by letters transposed, was named [that] which (Judges 2:10) is called, entirely and rightly, "Thamnath-cheres" [Timnath-heres], that is, "the city of the Sun." And Caietanus [Cajetan], on ch. 2 of Judges: "The city," he says, "which before was called 'the prohibition of the remnant' [prohibitio residui] (I know not from what event [it was] named), was, after [its] rebuilding, [called] by Joshua 'the prohibition of the Sun' [prohibitio Solis], in memory of the Sun prohibited [stopped] by Joshua, lest it should go forward. For 'Thimnath' signifies prohibition; 'Serach,' the remnant; and 'cheres,' in truth, the Sun."

The *Other* [monument is], [that] when Joshua was buried in Mount Ephraim, an earthquake occurred: and from that, the mountain [was] called "Gaas," that is, [the mountain] of commotion and trembling. For the word "Gahas" signifies to be moved and to tremble. This [tale is] most vain and old-wives' [anilis] to Masius: but, without argument, and from no cause, to deny [it], is perhaps rather vain and old-wifely [itself]. For [that] this could happen, and was done, the ancients assert, who wrote the Midras, or explanation of the book of Ruth, in old times, and who [wrote] the Seder Olam: nor is [there] anything which is repugnant [to it] — nay, this is very apt for signifying the death and burial of the true JESUS CHRIST the Lord. For in this [death], "the earth was moved, and the rocks were rent" (Matt. 27:51 [the text prints ch. 26]).

But to these two, Gregory of Tours adds two others (bk. 1 of the *Miracles*, ch. 18). *First*: "There are," he says, "at the city Lewida, warm waters, in which Jesus [Joshua] son of Nave was wont to wash: where likewise lepers are cleansed. And it is 12 miles from Jericho." *Second*: "Near Jericho [there] are trees which produce wools [lanae]. For [the tree] exhibits apples in the manner of gourds, having hard shells round about, but within [they] are full of wool. And of these, indeed, [men] say [that] garments were wont to be made for Jesus [Joshua] son of Nave. But today too such [trees] exhibit wools, [some] of which — brought by certain [persons] — we have seen, and have admired either the whiteness or the fineness of them." [Gregory] also mentions, in the following chapter, these Lewida waters — which perhaps are those to which Herod the Tyrant, sick and worn out with phthiriasis [lice-disease] and wasting, went, [as] Josephus narrates (bk. 17, ch. 8): …μον ἠράσθη· περάσας Ἰορδάνην, θερμοῖς τοῖς κατὰ Καλλιρρόην αὐτὸν παρεδίδου, ἅπερ σὺν τῇ … ἀρετῇ, καὶ πότιμά ἐστι […perasas Iordan■n, thermois tois kata Kallirro■n auton paredidou…, "… having crossed the Jordan, he gave himself over to the warm [springs] at Callirrhoe, which — besides [their] virtue [healing power] — are also potable"].

Question XIII. Whether Joshua waged any war with the Kings of Armenia, Persia, and Media?

Wonderful [things], in his *Iuchasin* [Yuhasin] book (fol. 154 & 155), R. Abraham Zacuth recites, and from it [so does] R. Godolias [Gedaliah] in [his] *Schalscheleth* [Shalshelet], or his *Catena* (fol. 96b & 97). Which [things], because [they are] pleasant, and unheard-of to Latin ears, I shall strive to translate out of the Hebrew; and afterward, to inquire whether [they are] sufficiently consonant with the truth. Thus, therefore, [it] is there written:

Samuel Scholem said: "I found and saw, in the book of the Chronicles of the Cuthaeans, or Samaritans, a narration which they themselves saw in a certain Midras [Midrash], or Explication, of the Jews. It is of this kind. When Joshua had subdued the land of Israel, and had slain one-and-thirty Kings, [it] happened that, of those [kings], to one certain King there was a son, a King of lesser Armenia, who was named Scholach [Shobach]. And this [one] stood up, and gathered the Kings of the Persians and of the Medes, [to the] number [of] 45. And these took with them Japheth the giant, or that most robust [man], who was wont to brandish [his] spear against many; and likewise [they] gathered an army [as numerous] as the sand which is on the sea-shore: and [they] sent a letter to Joshua, of which this is the copy: 'From the distinguished and fortunate gathering of the Persians and Medes, to thee, O Joshua son of Nun, greeting. Thou …

(col. 1287)

[…art] of the evening [i.e., thy day wanes]. We have learned what [things] thou didst against our kinsmen, whom thou didst slaughter in the devastations of our palaces, and sparedst none, from the boy to the old man: thou didst slay the Fathers with the sword, and all their famous cities. And therefore hear this, and know: [that] we, from this day, are about to come to thee within thirty [days], [and] also to lay hold of thee, in the borders of thy inheritance, in Mount Ephraim. We are 45 strong Kings: and to each of us [there are] 60,000 strong [men], who [are] all equipped with darts and arms, holding the sword, and skilled in the art of war. In our aid also is Japheth the giant, of whom [we] have made mention before. Therefore be prepared: and prepare arms for thyself: and say not, 'I shall do [it] afterward.' Because against thee we come quickly, quickly."

But they handed over this letter to a certain prudent and wise messenger; who went off, and found Joshua sitting on his royal throne, with the whole people standing around him. And Joshua commanded that [messenger] to be brought into his sight; to whom, however, [he] did not attend, until [he] had put an end to [the business of] judging the affairs of the Israelites. But then [he] received that writing from the messenger's hand, and read it in the house of God, in fasting, weeping, and mourning. And [he] kept it in his [own] house, until the festal day of Pentecost, which was then nearest, had passed. For [he] did not wish, at that time, to create any trouble for the people; but, as I was saying, [he] meanwhile kept that letter with himself: and when the feast of Pentecost had elapsed, [he] assembled the whole gathering of the people, and, with it listening, read through that letter, and said: "Behold, how many battles have I fought hitherto? and how many Kings have I conquered? Yet none of them disturbed me. But now, in this case, dread [pavor] and trembling invade me." When those men had heard these [things], and had been affected with grief, the reins of all wavered [all were shaken]; [their] knees were knocked one against another; [they] cast down [their] heads to the ground, and said to Joshua: "As we obeyed Moses, so also will we obey thee, O Prince. Take the volume [scroll], put the finger [to it], and write in that manner and style by which men are wont [to write], and answer to those [enemies] who hate us — namely, with wicked and contumacious words, which [are] harsh, or, as [it were], like wormwood [absinthium], bitter." Joshua answered them: "Stand still, and I will take care that you hear the form [formula] of the letter which I have composed for them: and if [it] seem right to you, I will send [it] to them." And all the people said: "Open thy mouth, and let thy words become illustrious." Then [he] read, and said:

"In the name of the God of Israel, who weakens the proud strong [ones], afflicts the impious [and] contumacious with death, scatters the guilty sinners [who are] confederate, [and] joins [again] the scattered just and holy [ones] — the God of Gods himself, and Lord of Lords, the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob:

the Lord, a man of war [a warrior]. From me, Joshua, [this is] the word of God; and from the holy Church [assembly], the elect, and the blessed gathering of Israel, [the] sons of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob — to a harmful people, to their deadly gathering, who worship idols, and adore vain [things]: [there is] no salvation [for you]. God said: Know that [you] have done ill, because [you] have roused a sleeping lion, and awakened the lion. For [he] will be made bloody, or will grow red, to give the sword into their hand. I, I have kept watch in justice, to render upon your head your [own] recompense. And what [reason is there for] you to come into the holy place? and will you come, and contaminate the famed land? Prepare yourselves, and go not out from your place, because within one week of days I shall come to you, and will destroy the strong, and flight shall perish for you [there shall be no escape]. Behold, you glory that you are 45 Kings, and that of each of you [there] are sixty thousand strong [men]. But I shall not glory that Kings of the earth are with us, but [that] the exalted Angels [are] — of whom one overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah; one brought on the deluge; one divided the earth into 70 Peoples [nations]. And the people which [is] with me is 60,000 in the strength of strong [men]. And these crossed the sea and the dry land: and before them God went across by night, and by day in a pillar of cloud, and a pillar of fire. And out of these, twelve thousand chosen [men] slew five Kings of Madian, and killed Baalam [Balaam] son of Behor [Beor], and all the males: and none of them was left remaining. But a certain Priest, whose name [is] Phinees, holds sonorous trumpets in [his] hand, and with them [he] sounds [the clang]; [and] straightway [he] compels all our enemies to fall [headlong]. Have [you] not heard about Pharaoh and all his multitude? [They] were fixed [stuck] in the sea, and we crossed over as [if] on dry land. Was [it] not announced to you what we did to Amalech [Amalek] and his people? Have [you] not seen what [things] we inflicted on Scon [Sihon] and Hogo [Og], the two Kings of the Amorites? And if that robust Japheth [is] with you, with us [is] the most robust of the robust, exalted above every exalted [one]."

And the sons of Israel heard these words, and stood in their station: and Joshua dismissed that messenger into his [own] land. He indeed came to those by whom [he] had been sent, and reported to them what [he] had seen: namely, the order [arrangement] of the People, and the description of Joshua's stature, which was of five cubits; and how [he], clothed with hyacinth and purple, had on [his] head a royal crown, on which the name of God was inscribed. When [they] had heard those [things], [they] fell to the ground, and said: "What is this, which we have done? We have surrounded ourselves with all this evil."

Afterward Joshua rose up with 12 thousand in the strength of strong [men], and within six days set out against them. And when Schobach himself saw the order [array] of the army, [he] greatly wondered: his mother was a witch [malefica], Naga, who said to them: "Fear not. Because within seven iron walls I will enclose those Israelites, so that [they] may not know the place where [they] are." And she made her incantations and conjuring-tricks [praestigiae], and shut them in within seven walls. When Joshua saw this, [he] cried out with his heart to the Lord, and took counsel in his mind, and wrote to Ianiach [Janiah], of the tribe of Ruben, who was King over the two tribes and [the] one half-tribe which [were] across the Jordan — that [he] should come with his forces, and should bring the Priest Phinees, who should hold the trumpets of the clang [clangor] in [his] hand. But there came to Joshua, about evening time, one dove [columba]; and Joshua tied under its wing this [letter] which [he] had written. And the dove rose up, and went off to Ianiach; who, when [he] had seen it, laid hold of it by the wing, and received the letter: and, it [having been] read, [he] rose up in his place, and raised a great outcry, and, riding on his horse, cried out in all his camps: "The sword to the Lord!" And from every part [they] gathered to him, and [he] sent [them forth], and called [the host] Prince. But both set out together. And when Sobachi's [Schobach's] mother saw those forces, [she] said to her son: "I have seen a star ascending from the East: and [there] is no wisdom, nor counsel in my wisdom, because I am compelled [to keep my] strength away from before that star [I cannot prevail against it]." And when her son Sobach had heard this, [he] was greatly angered, and ordered her to be cast down from the wall. But Ianiach came, and drew up [his] battle-line against Sobach, and killed him. And Phinees also came, to clang with the trumpets: and in that very clangor the walls were broken, or opened up — first one, then all

the others. And [they] went out (the Israelites, namely, who before had been enclosed within the walls by Magic), and slew all those who hated them — up to me, the one, who survived them [and] was left remaining, and escaped. But Samuel Scholem said: "And I found a sign of this matter in the verse: 'Until the Lord give rest to your brethren, as [he gave] also to you' [Josh 1:15]." The end.

But if, from this end, we draw the beginning of that [second part] which I set forth in the second place [whether true], these [things] will indeed always seem wonderful: but [such] as pertain rather to Jewish *Hagadoth* [Haggadot — legendary lore] and the feigned fables of the Rabbis. For, *first*: who [is] that one [man], who records himself to have escaped safe out of so many thousands? and to whom

(col. 1289)

[…and to whom] does he record [it]? *Secondly*: Who [were] the so many and so great Kings of the Medes and Persians at that time? Whence [was there] so great concord and society among them? *Thirdly*: How, to a war so grave, [raised] so quickly, against a nation which had come not long before into those Canaanite shores, did one King of Armenia — and indeed of lesser [Armenia] — stir up so many? *Fourthly*: Why did [the tale] omit the King of greater Armenia? Why did it rouse no Western King or people? *Fifthly*: But [there is] too great a Lethe [oblivion] poured into the letter of those Kings: since the King of lesser Armenia himself is by no means mentioned in it, but only the Kings of the Medes and Persians [are] recorded. And yet [it] is he who was stirring up the war; who had sought the aid of others; to whom the others were present only as auxiliaries. *Sixthly*: In that expedition Joshua is described [as] nearly too arrogant and over-confident, since [he] both led so few thousands with him against 2,700,000, and suffered himself to be so easily shut in. *Seventhly*: Too great a force is attributed to magical discipline and impiety, when [it is said that] so easily 12,000 of the Israelites are shut in by walls, like sheep [in] a sheepfold [caulis]. Who [ever] read [or] heard [that] so great a power was granted to any Magi in any war? What camps, forces, and battle-lines of men would be safe, if [magical] tricks [praestigiae] availed so much? Who would not rather wish for magi, than soldiers and Leaders, for victory? *Eighthly*: Joshua would have been [made] much inferior to his [own] Moses. For that [Moses] indeed withstood the Magi of Pharaoh in all [things] most successfully (Exod. ch. 7, 8). But this [Joshua] would have been conquered even by one little woman [muliercula], and would have been shut up, with all his forces, in an iron prison. *Ninthly*: But even if [there] were seven times seven iron and brazen walls, by which the Israelites were circumscribed and wholly encompassed — would not twelve thousand men, and those strong, robust, and vigorous, impeded by no manacles, bound by no fetters and the rest, have been able to overthrow those [walls], to cast [them] down, and to pour [them] out? *Tenthly*: In bk. 1 of Paralipomenon [1 Chronicles], ch. 5, the Rubenite lineage is described. But in it [there is] no Ianiah [Janiah]. *Eleventhly*: From the very phrases of the letters, too, one might perhaps not wrongly gather [that] this is a fabricated [commentitia] narration. For not a few [phrases], out of books which are later than those Joshuan times, seem ready [at hand] — as "lupus vespertinus" [evening wolf] from Jeremiah 5:6, Habakkuk 1:8, Sophonias [Zephaniah] 3:3; [as] Psalm 103:20; "verba instar absynthii amara" [words bitter like wormwood] from Proverbs 5 (as [is] noted, s.v. *gid*, in Elias the Tishbite [Elijah Levita's *Tishbi*]); "perire fugam ab aliquo" [that flight should perish for someone] from Psalm 141:5.

But with this weapon of words I do not fight: that [point] I should rather [wish] to be regarded [in] the *Twelfth* place — [namely, that] it would not have come to pass that so admirable a history [would] not have been related in Joshua's book, or at least in some part of the divine volume, if nothing in it erred from the truth. But [as to the fact] that Samuel Scholem says [that] he found an argument and sign of this [matter] in a verse whose words are these, "Until the Lord give rest" [Josh 1:15] — [that] is a sign entirely worthy of Rabbinic acumen. For those [Rabbis] are wont to carve out, most ingeniously indeed, whatever dreams [somnia] they please, out of some *pasuk* [פסוק] or verse of Scripture. [For] what [is] this inference, if indeed [it be one]? "In Joshua ch. 1, v. 15, in Hebrew [it] is said, 'Hadescher ianiach Adonai' etc., that is, 'until the Lord make you rest'" [quousque quiescere vos faciat Dominus]. Therefore [there] was someone by the name

Ianiach [Janiah]! and he indeed a Rubenite, and a Prince: and [one] who should snatch Joshua himself and his forces out of the greatest peril: and that by the marvelous flying of a dove, and its indication. These are the *logi* [λόγοι, "sayings"] of the Haggadic [Hagadothaei] Rabbis: which, however — for the sake both of truth and of pleasant delight — I wished to lay open and shake out [excutere].

Question XIV. Whether Joshua left children, or was celibate [coelebs]?

We heard (ch. 6, qq. 45 & 49) how certain of the Rabbis fabled [that] Rahab the harlot [was] led [in marriage] to Joshua as a wife. But [it] is indeed altogether to be said [that] Joshua left no children, but remained celibate [his] whole life. For so teach St. Ignatius (in [his] Epistle to the Philadelphians), St. Jerome (bk. 1 *Against Jovinian*), D. Chrysostom (sermon *On the Martyrs*); and [it] is read in the Roman Breviary (on the 6th day within the octave of All Saints, lesson 5), [and] others. And if [he] had ever had any children, or a wife, how would Scripture have passed over that in silence? Why — [Scripture] which recounts the marriages, spouse, sons, [and] grandsons of Moses, of Caleb, of Eleazar the Pontiff, and of so many and equal others, and [their] offspring — [would it be] so entirely infant and mute concerning Joshua's marriage and progeny? [Scripture] recounts his ancestors, as we saw (bk. 1, ch. 1): why would [it] affect [touch] his descendants with not even one word? But [he] indeed entirely lacked these: devoid of marriage, [he] led [his] whole life wholly celibate. In this too [he was a figure] of the true JESUS — who never took a wife, and, by his counsel and exhortation, called away innumerable [persons] from a wife [to be] Eunuchs (Matthew 19) — so that [he] might present to us a most beautiful type and figure.

But because this passage is now treated by the cited D. Jerome venerably and usefully, and because [it] contains, as [it were], a certain Epitome and exegesis [exposition] of this book, I shall not be loath to transcribe here a good many [more] of his words. "I shall cross over," he says, "to Jesus [Joshua] son of Nave, who before was called Ause [Oshea] — or, as [it] is more rightly had in the Hebrew, Osee [Hoshea] — that is, 'Saviour.' For he, according to the Epistle of Jude, saved and led out the people of Israel from Egypt, and brought [them] into the land of promise. This Jesus [Joshua], as soon as [he] came to the Jordan, the waters of nuptials [aquae nuptiarum], which always had flowed in the law, were dried up and stood [still]: and with dry and bare feet the whole people crossed over, [and] came into Galgala [Gilgal], and there [was] circumcised a second time. Which [thing], if we take [it] according to the letter, [it] cannot stand at all. For if we had a double foreskin, or if the cut-off skin were born again, [then] rightly a second circumcision would have place. But now this is signified: [that] JESUS, with the knife of the Gospel, circumcised the people which had come through the desert; and [he] circumcised [it] with a stone knife [cultro petrino]: so that [that] which, in Moses's [successor, the] son [of Nun], was prefigured before in a few, might, under the leadership of Jesus, be fulfilled in all. But the foreskins themselves [were] heaped together into one heap, and buried and covered with earth; and the reproach of Egypt [was] taken away; and the name of the place Galgala — which is interpreted 'revelation' — [these] show [this]: [that] while the people walked in the foreskin through the desert, its eyes were blinded. Let us see also the consequences [what follows]. After the circumcision of the Gospel, and the consecration of the twelve stones, in the place of revelation straightway the Pasch [Passover] is celebrated; its lamb is immolated; and the holy land [terra sancta] is fed with foods. Jesus goes out; [there] meets him the Prince of the army [militia], holding a sword — that is, either showing himself [ready] to fight for the circumcised people, or cutting apart the glue [glutinum] of nuptials. Just as [it] had been commanded to Moses, so to this [one] too [it] is commanded:

(col. 1291)

[…so to this one too it is commanded:] 'Loose [put off] thy shoe. For the place in which thou standest is holy ground.' Because so was the Lord's army armed with priestly trumpets, as [it were] for Evangelical preaching, under the type of Jericho, [and] the world is overthrown. And — that I may pass over infinite [things] (for [it] is not now my purpose to open all the mysteries of the Old Testament) — the five Kings who

before reigned in the land of promise, and resisted the Evangelical army, are conquered, Jesus fighting [as superior]. This I think [is] clear to the understanding: [that], before the Lord led out his people from Egypt, and circumcised it, sight, smell, taste, hearing, and touch reigned; and [that] by these, as [it were] princes, all [things] were subjected. Whom Jesus [Joshua], fleeing to the cave of the body, and entering the dark place — that is, the body itself — slew, so that through that [body] [they] might be killed, through which before [they] reigned. But now [it] is time that we raise the banner of Jesus's chastity. Moses is written to have had a wife. But Moses — both our Lord, and the Apostle — interpret [as] the law: 'They have Moses and the Prophets,' etc. 'From Adam even unto Moses sin reigned, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam' [Rom. 5:14]: and there is no doubt [that], in both testaments, Moses signifies the law. As, therefore, we read [that] Moses — that is, the law — had a wife: show me [that] Jesus [Joshua] son of Nave had either a wife or sons. If thou canst show [it], I will confess myself conquered.

'And certainly [Joshua] received a most beautiful place in the land of Judea, in the division; and [he] dies not in the twentieth [vicenario] number — which in the Scriptures is always ill-omened, in which Jacob served, and Joseph was sold, and which Esau loves, receiving in it certain gifts — but in the tenth, concerning whose praise we have often spoken: and [he] is buried in Thamnathsareth [Timnath-serah], that is, in a most perfect Principate, or in the number of the new covering, so that [it] might signify the flocks of virgins, covered by the Saviour's aid, in Mount Ephraim — that is, in the fruit-bearing mountain — [and] on the North of Mount Gaas, which is interpreted "commotion." For Mount Sion [is at] the sides of the North, the city of the great King [Ps. 48:2–3], which [is] always set [opposed] to envy, and, through the several temptations, says: "But my feet were almost moved" [Ps. 73:2]. And when, in Jesus's [Joshua's] burial, the book which is called by his name is completed, again, in the volume of Judges, [he] is described [as] living, as [it were], and rising again [resurgens]; and, under a recapitulation [ἀνακεφαλαιώσει, anakephalai■sei], his works are proclaimed, and [it] is read: "Jesus [Joshua] dismissed the people, and the children of Israel went off, each one into his [own] inheritance, that [they] might possess the land. And the people served the Lord all the days of Jesus," etc. And straightway [it] is subjoined: "And Jesus [Joshua] son of Nave, the servant of the Lord, died, a hundred [and] ten years [old]. Moreover Moses saw only the land of promise, and could not enter [it]: and [he] died in the land of Moab, and the Lord buried him in the valley of the land of Moab, over against the house of Phegor [Peor]: and no man knew his sepulchre unto this day." Let us compare the burial of both. Moses dies in the land of Moab; Jesus [Joshua] in the land of Judea. That [Moses] is buried in the valley, over against the house of Phegor, which is interpreted "ignominy" (for properly, in the Hebrew tongue, Phegor is called "Priapus"); this [Joshua], here, in Mount Ephraim, on the North of Mount Gaas. And in simple words [there] is always a more august [secret] sense of the divine Scriptures: because among the Jews glory was in births, and in parturitions, and [she was] accursed [and] barren who had no seed in Israel: and blessed [was he] whose seed was in Sion, and [whose] household [were] in Jerusalem, and [who] was placed in the greatest blessing: "Thy wife [is] as a fruitful vine on the sides of thy house: thy sons as new olive-plants round about thy table" [Ps. 128:3]. Therefore his [Moses's] sepulchre is described [as] placed in the valley, over against the house of Idols — which is consecrated to lust. But we, who serve under Jesus the Leader, unto the present day know not where Moses is buried. For we contend [against] Phegor, and all his ignominy: knowing that [those] who are in the flesh cannot please God [Rom. 8:8]. And the Lord, before the deluge too, had said: "My Spirit shall not remain in those men, because [they] are flesh" [Gen. 6:3]. Wherefore also Moses, dying, is mourned by the people; but Israel [i.e. Joshua], as [it were] about to live, is not mourned. For nuptials are ended in death; virginity, after death, begins to be crowned.'

Nay, Joshua himself, in the Talmudic Tract *Pesachim* (ch. 10, fol. 116b), says: "Lo Zacithi leben" [זכיתי לבן לא], that is, "I was not worthy of a son": and therefore [he] is always called "son" — as [was] already noted (bk. 1, ch. 1, q. 8). And that Talmudic passage R. Abraham Zacuth cites and approves (*Iuchasin* [Yuhasin], fol. 10). But the same [thing], and R. Godolias [Gedaliah] in [his] *Schalscheleth* [Shalshelet] (fol. 14 & 19), out of the first chapter of *Megilla* [Megillah], affirm — [that] Joshua had no sons, yet some daughters, from

whom were afterward born eight Prophets: namely, Jeremiah; Chelcias [Hilkiah], Machsia [Maaseiah], Chanamel [Hanamel], Salum [Shallum], Baruch, Ezechiel [Ezekiel]; and, according to some, [there was] also from her the Prophetess Holda [Huldah], concerning whom [see] also 4 Kings [2 Kings] 22:14. But indeed Joshua's stemma [genealogy] is closed in him [himself] (bk. 1 of Paralipomenon [1 Chronicles], ch. 7): and, just as no son is given to him, so also no daughter. Nor can the Rabbis prove [that] the named Prophets, or the Prophetess, drew [their] origin from him. Nay, just as, from Paralipomenon, [they] confirm [that] no son [was] born to him, so also [they] ought to confirm [that] no daughter [was] born to him.

Question XV. Whether Joshua escaped the teeth of heretics?

[Though he was] victor of so many nations and Kings, [he] could by no means escape the most foul tongues and teeth of heretics. For those [heretics] dared to call him cruel and bloodthirsty [sanguinarius]. But [he] is vindicated from so signal a contumely even by the eulogy of this chapter alone. For [he] was the servant of God, and, in the slaughters which [he] waged, [he] was only the administrator [minister] of God — as [was] said above several times — and [they] can be seen [arrayed] against their petulant calumnies: St. Augustine (q. 19 on this book, and bk. 22 *Against Faustus*, ch. 78, 79); Theodoret (on ch. 8, or 9, & 10 of this book); Origen (homilies 10, 11, 12, 13).

Question XVI. When were Joseph's bones buried?

From the [things] said [in] Genesis 40:24 [recte 50:24], [it] is clear [that] Joseph, dying, bound the Israelites by an oath, [so] that [they] should one day transport his bones out of Egypt, where [he] was dying, into [the land of] Chanaan. And [that] this was done accurately [faithfully], we saw attested (Exod. 13:19). Those sacred bones of the most holy Patriarch, therefore, [are] narrated [as] committed to the earth under the end of this chapter [v. 32]. But Masius thinks this [was] done before the division [sortitio] of the land itself — namely, when, at the mountains Hebal and Garizim [Ebal and Gerizim], the covenant [was] entered by the people with God (above, ch. 8). Others prefer [it was] after the division — namely, when the land [was] now at peace, and Sichem [Shechem], [freed] from all

(col. 1293)

[…and Sichem,] free from all attack of the enemy. But according to that former opinion [Masius's], this narration would not be placed in its [proper] place here, but [would be inserted] only by occasion of the death and sepulchres of Joshua and Eleazar, concerning which a little after. According to the latter [opinion], [it] is still to be asked: whether [the bones] were buried before Joshua's death, or after? And this latter the very order of the text signifies.

Question XVII. Where were Joseph's bones buried?

"In the part," says the text (v. 32), "of the field which Jacob had bought of the sons of Hemor the father of Sichem for a hundred young sheep: and it was in the possession of the sons of Joseph." In which words five [things] are to be noted. *First*: Where Jacob bought that field. In Genesis [it] is expressed distinctly (ch. 33:18 & 19): "He crossed over to Salem, a city of the Sichemites [Shechemites], which is in the land of Chanaan, after [he] returned from Mesopotamia of Syria: and [he] dwelt near the town. And [he] bought a part of the field, in which [he] had fixed [his] tents, from the sons of Hemor the father of Sichem, for a hundred lambs [agnis]." And the same [thing] [was] again signified afterward (Gen. 48:22), where [it] is also given to Joseph as a special possession [peculium] by that [Jacob]; as [it] is also repeated by B. John in the Gospel (ch. 4:5).

Second: [the fact] that [the things] which here are called "a hundred young sheep," and [in] Genesis ch. 33 [are called] "a hundred lambs," can be taken in two ways. *First*: so that sheep were truly given for the field.

[There] was once a usual exchange [barter] of things, as I said in the questions *On Buying* [De Emptione] (in [part] 2.2, disputation *On Justice*). For also [in] Proverbs 27:26, in the Hebrew, [there] is "an exchange of the field [for] rams"; but in the Latin, "Hadi" (they are) "the price of the field." This opinion Villalpandus defends (bk. 2 *Apparatus*, ch. 25, p. 388 & following). *Second*: so that by those sheep money is understood: and this St. Stephen (Acts 7:16) seems to confirm, saying: "This sepulchre [was] bought for a price of silver" — that is, with silver coins, which could be collected either from a hundred sheep sold (for so the moneys which had been received for sheep and asses are called by Plautus, "sheep and asses," as Muretus expounds — bk. 9 *Varied Readings* [Variae Lectiones], ch. 15). In the *Truculentus*: "I promptly carried these mina-sheep into the city, in this purse [crumena]." And elsewhere: "I would beat the asses, if perhaps [they] should begin to cry out here from the purse" — or [the coins] which were called "sheep." For [it] was very usual that a name of this kind [should] be imposed on coins, either because [they] have such a figure and image, or for some other cause. For thus [there] were coins [called] "oxen" [boves], concerning which, in the Life of Theseus, Plutarch said δεκάβοιον [dekaboion, "ten-ox"] & ἑκατόμβοιον [hekatomboion, "hundred-ox"] — as also [is] observed, in [his] *Discourse on Coins*, by Sebastian Eizzus: "Noctua" [owl]. Whence that [saying] of the Proverb, "the owl flies": πῶλοι [p■loi, "colts, foals"], or "foals," among the Corinthians: χελῶναι [chel■nai, "tortoises"], "Testudines," concerning which above (ch. 5, q. 44), among the Peloponnesians. Whence that [saying], proceeding — Caelius [Rhodiginus] being witness (bk. 10, ch. 2): ταὶ ἀρεταὶ καὶ ταὶ σοφίαν νικῶντι χελῶναι [tai aretai kai tai sophian nik■nti chel■nai], that is, "tortoises overcome virtue and wisdom." And a Lacedaemonian coin [was] called, by Eupolis, "Callichelonus" [fair-tortoise], aptly accommodated to the cross-bearing coin by our Gretser (tome 3 *On the Cross*, bk. 1, ch. 23). And hence ἀγνυσθαι, ὠνεῖσθαι, καὶ πωλεῖν [agnysthai, ■neisthai, kai p■lein, "to ___, to buy, and to sell"] — namely, from sheep, asses, and foals, as Muretus shows (bk. 10 *Varied Readings*, ch. 3). κόραι [korai, "maidens, girls"] [were coins] among the Athenians; finally, "sheep," as Pliny clearly attests (bk. 18, ch. 13). And Servius first signified brass [bronze money] by the effigy of oxen and sheep. Pierius (bk. 10, p. 76): "That," he says, "[it] is sufficiently established [that] brass [money] was first marked [signatum] by the sign of cattle, by Servius King of the Romans: whence Varro also — as [it] is in [= apud] Marcellus — said [that] one sheep [was] called a 'multa' [fine], when [he], being cited, neither answered nor, roused, was [stirred]. But 'Vnum' [One] he said in the masculine gender, either because [he] understood [it as] money [nummum], or in imitation of Homer." And afterward: "Very many interpret πρόβατον [probaton, 'sheep'] [as] quasi [it] is called πρόβασις [probasis], because [it] signifies the opulence of those things which [men] use for [their] living. But that we may persist in the sheep[-matter] (for broad [latum] is the word τῶν προβάτων [t■n probat■n, 'of sheep']) — where Hesiod says μαρναμένοις μήλων ἕνεκ' Οἰδιπόδαο [marnamenois m■l■n henek' Oidipodao, 'fighting for the flocks of Oedipus'], the interpreters say μήλων ἕνεκα [m■l■n heneka, 'for the sake of flocks'] is to be understood of dominion and riches, because the princes of old were wont to lead a pastoral life. Indeed the ancients held sheep in so great honor, that [they] thought wealth came [to be] from them only; and the Jurisconsults relate [that] 'pecunia' [money] and 'peculium' [property] [are] thence named: and therefore [it is] feigned [that] sheep once had golden wool. Hence, when Hercules, out of [his] African victory, had driven off nothing but sheep, [he] is said to have carried off golden apples [aurea mala] with him: for μῆλον [m■lon] means a sheep, and by that locution 'apples' is usurped [the same word means both]." Among the Gauls and Brabantines [Brabanters], coins were called "mutones," that is, "rams" [arietes] — in French "moutons" — as [is] to be seen in the *History of the Miracle of the V[enerable] Sacrament* of Brussels (ch. 1 & 10), in Thomas of Cantimpré [Cantapratensis] (bk. 1, ch. 20), in René Choppin (bk. 2 *On the demesne*, sect. 7), [and] in Gregory of Toulouse [Tholosanus] (bk. 32 *Syntagma*, ch. 2, num. 22). And in German, "Berna," as [is] to be seen in [= apud] Freyher [Freher] (bk. 3 *On monetary matters*, ch. 3, p. 42, from the Empress Adelheid's ordinance for the monastery of Salfeld, and [from] Aeneas Sylvius, *Bohemia*, ch. 58); and [it] is rendered by M. Abbas Argenti under the year 1448; and [by] Fabricius (*Saxon Origins*, bk. 6, fol. 663): "Vrsus" [Bear], because the coin [is] distinguished by the sign of a bear; and thence "Batziones" — Freher, in the same place, p. 43. And therefore

"young sheep" can rightly be taken here in this place [as] the name of sheep-lambs, or of τῶν ἀμνάδων [t■n amnad■n, "of the ewe-lambs"]; and, in Hebrew, "Keschitah" — as also [in] Job 42:11. And so Masius & Arias take [it].

Third: Yet that [point] too can be observed: [that] the Hebrew "Keschitah" has a certain allusion to a bow [arcus] — concerning which [see], in this matter, Jacob [in] Gen. 48:22. For "Kescheth" is a bow; but [there is] another letter "t" at the end [i.e. "Keschitah" vs. "Kescheth"].

Fourth: This field is said [to have been] bought not [by] Jacob, but [by] Abraham (Acts 7:16). Not a few judge — as, in this place, Masius, and, [in] Genesis, Eugubinus [Steuchus] and Lipomanus — [that] "Abraham" [is] there to be deleted; and that either the name "Jacob" [is] to be restored, or [that nothing] is to be restored, since from [what precedes], ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ [apo tou koinou, "from the common (context)"], [it] is clearly enough understood. But when certain booksellers [copyists] did not advert [to this], and remembered [that] the field [was] bought by Abraham in Genesis, but did not remember [that it was bought] by Jacob, [they] inserted "Abraham" into the text. But indeed Abraham bought [the field] not from the sons of Hemor, nor in Sichem, but from the sons of Heth, or from Ephron, at Hebron (Gen. 23). For so St. Jerome too, in the book *On the best kind of interpreting*, writes [that], on Matthew 13:35 [the text prints ch. 3], "Isaiah" crept in [irrepsisse] for "Asaph"; and, concerning "Zacharias" for "Jeremias," many likewise assert [it] (Matthew 27:9). Nor yet [is] this fault [mendum] recent, since the Syriac text has the name "Abraham" in that passage of Acts; and this same difficulty St. Jerome touches [in] Epistle 101, nor yet does [he] dissolve [resolve] [it], but [promises he] will dissolve [it] elsewhere

(col. 1295)

[…elsewhere he will dissolve it;] but where [he] has [actually] dissolved [it], [it] does not appear. [There] accedes also the corrected edition of the Bibles [the Clementine Vulgate], which even now has retained that of the name [i.e. kept "Abraham"]. Others, therefore, want "Abraham" [to be] put for a grandson or for "Jacob" — [Jacob] who, in imitation of Abraham, had bought that Sichemite field. Others say other [things], as I noted on Acts 7. But [it] can briefly be said: [that] Abraham bought this place not in himself, but in his grandson, and [that] to him [Abraham] the purchase [is] attributed, because [he] made the beginning of buying something in Chanaan — in which [land he] had not had even a step of foot for many years (the same ch. 7, Acts v. 5).

Fifth: Hemor [Emor], in our Latin text, in the same Acts (ch. 7:16), is said [to be] "son of Sichem." But [he was] not the son, but the father (Gen. 34). And indeed, in the Greek, & Syriac, & Arabic [it] is not said "son." But in the Greek, indeed, [it] is thus: παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ τοῦ Σιχέμ [para t■n hui■n Emmor tou Sichem, "from the sons of Hemor of Sichem"]. But in the Syriac and Arabic, [there] is only "from the sons of Chamur [Hemor]" — no mention of Sichem being made. But the Greek phrase Ἐμμὸρ τοῦ Σιχέμ [Emm■r tou Sichem] is expounded in a threefold way. *First*: so that [it] be an epexegesis [explanatory apposition] — "from the sons of Hemor," namely "of Sichem." *Second*: by Junius, construing that passage so that [it] be a Hebraism; and the name of "Prince" is understood, in this manner: "from the sons of Chamur [Hemor], the Prince of Sichem." But then, in the Greek, [it] ought to be, not τοῦ [tou], but τῆς [t■s]. *Third*: by others, so that [it] be understood as "Father." For by this manner of speaking the writers sometimes imply the name of the parent — as Herodotus in [his] *Clio*: Ἄδρηστος ὁ Γορδίεω τοῦ Μίδεω [Adr■stos ho Gordie■ tou Mide■], that is, "Adrastus grandson of Gordias, who was father of Midas." Again, in [his] *Thalia*: Κῦρος ὁ Καμβύσεω [Kyros ho Kambyse■], "Cyrus [son] of Cambyses the father." And Luke 24:10: Μαρία Ἰακώβου [Maria Iak■bou], "Mary the mother of James" — as, in that passage, the Syriac distinctly sets [it] down, and St. Mark (ch. 15:40). But if we retain "son," [it] must be said [that] Sichem [Shechem] was indeed the son of Hemor, but [that] to him [Hemor] there was afterward a son whom [he] called, by his own father's name, also "Sichem" — and [that] from this later Sichem Jacob bought the field; as [in] Genesis ch. 11, "Nachor" [Nahor] is twofold: one the father of Thare [Terah] and grandfather of Abraham; the other the son

of Thare, and brother of Abraham.

This text, moreover, D. Jerome illustrates (in [his] *Traditions on Genesis* [Quaestiones Hebraicae]) in few indeed but apt words, when [he] says: "In that place of the Sichemites [Shechemites] Joseph is buried: and his mausoleum is seen there even today."

Question XVIII. Whether, with Joseph, more other Patriarchs [were] buried at Shechem?

Junius denies [that] other Patriarchs [were] buried with Joseph in the Sichemite field (on Acts 7); and his opinion can be confirmed from Josephus, who, when [he] had narrated the death of the Patriarchs (bk. 2 *Antiquities*, ch. 4), at length subjoins: τὰ τούτων μὲν τὰ σώματα κομίσαντες μετὰ χρόνον, αὐτῶν οἱ ἀπόγονοι, καὶ οἱ παῖδες ἔθαψαν ἐν Χεβρῶνι [ta tout■n men ta s■mata komisantes meta chronon, aut■n hoi apogonoi, kai hoi paides ethapsan en Chebr■ni, "but the bodies of these [Patriarchs], their descendants and children, having carried [them] after a time, buried in Hebron"]. But *first*, among us Christians, of much greater authority is St. Stephen, who (Acts 7:15) says: "Jacob went down into Egypt, and died, he and our fathers. And [they] were translated into Sichem [Shechem], and [were] placed in the sepulchre which [Abraham] bought for a price of silver from the sons of Hemor [the] son of Sichem." *Second*: D. Jerome, in the Epitaph of Paula: "Thence (from Sichem), turning aside, Paula saw the sepulchres of the twelve Patriarchs." What [is] clearer? And concerning this, against his [own] Junius, Beza says (on Acts 7): "D. Jerome [is] an eye-witness, to whom faith [is] rather to be given than to Josephus." *Third*: Yet Josephus can be [so] explained that [he] disagrees in nothing from St. Stephen, and [from] the divine Jerome. For [he] subjoins in the same place [that], after the burial of those Patriarchs in Hebron, Joseph's bones [were] buried. [It] could therefore come to pass [that], at first, the bones of the other Patriarchs were entombed at Hebron, but afterward [were] translated to Sichem. The words of that [Josephus], which are annexed to the cited [passage], are: τὰ δὲ Ἰωσήπου ὀστᾶ ὕστερον, ὅτε μετανέστησαν ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου οἱ Ἑβραῖοι, εἰς τὴν Χαναναίαν ἐκόμισαν· οὕτως γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Ἰώσηπος ἐξώρκισε [ta de I■s■pou osta hysteron, hote metanest■san ek t■s Aigyptou hoi Hebraioi, eis t■n Chananaian ekomisan; hout■s gar autos ho I■s■pos ex■rkise, "but Joseph's bones later, when the Hebrews migrated out of Egypt, they carried into Canaan; for so Joseph himself had adjured [them]"]. *Fourth*: On the contrary, Junius wants [it that] Jacob's body — which is distinctly written (Gen. 50) [to have been] buried at Hebron — [was] first deported to Sichem, and thence afterward to Hebron: because in the Syriac and Arabic [it] is μετετέθη εἰς Σιχέμ, καὶ ἐτέθη ἐν μνημείῳ [meteteth■ eis Sichem, kai eteth■ en mn■mei■, "he was transferred to Shechem, and placed in a tomb"]. But unless this single [reading] be referred to the bones of those [patriarchs, the codex] is rather to be called faulty [mendosus] than [that] an absurd thing — against the express text of Genesis — be admitted. *Fifth*: Finally, Beza thus confutes his [own] Junius: "*First*: if 'from the sons of Hemor' [παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἐμμὸρ, à filiis Emor] you construe not with the verb ἠγόρασατο [■gorasato, 'he bought'] — 'bought' — but with the verb ἐτέθη [eteth■, 'was placed'] — 'was placed' — the transposition [traiectio] would be exceedingly harsh. Then, whence can [it] be clear [that] the threshing-floor of Athad [Atad] — situated at the very crossing of the Jordan (for there [they] first halted, who were conducting Jacob's funeral) — is Sichem? And even if [it] is Sichem, why would Stephen have preferred to name the sons of Chamur [Hemor], rather than either to report the name of Sichem, or to employ the relative ἐκεῖθεν [ekeithen, 'thence'], 'from that place'? But if, even this [phrase] 'from the sons of Emmor' we wish so to construe, nothing hinders [that], just as [we say] of Joseph, so also [we] may say [that] the bones of his remaining brothers too were together deported to Sichem — which afterward [were] translated by the sons of Emmor, that is, from the Sichemite territory, to [the field of] Ephron [at Hebron], with only Joseph's bones left at Sichem. And in this way, [there would] indeed [have] been at Sichem cenotaphs [empty tombs], concerning which Jerome treats: but in the cave of Hebron [were] the true sepulchres of the Patriarchs, concerning which the historian Josephus writes in the cited place."

Question XIX. How, and why, were Joseph's bones transferred to Shechem?

That Joseph's bones were in an ark [arca], and [were] honorably carried by certain bearers [baiuli], some relate: but [it] is asked (ch. 3 of this book; Abulensis, q. 10): did those bearers contract any legal uncleanness [immunditia]? And [Abulensis] answers [that they] did contract [it]. But [the bones] were translated because, as I said, Joseph himself, dying, had adjured the Israelites (Gen. 50). And [he] adjured for various causes, concerning which [it was] said elsewhere — not because [those] who were buried in that land would rise first, as, among R. Jacob, in [his] *alkath rocel*, the Jews trifle [nugantur]; but on account of the promise concerning entering the land of Chanaan, [to be fulfilled] for showing the certitude of divine [promises]; and on account of the mysteries — of CHRIST's nativity and passion — to be [fulfilled] in that land.

But why Joseph was buried in Sichem — the cause Radak [David Kimhi] assigns [to be] Joseph's precept and will, because [he] had chosen that place of burial for himself, and had commanded [it]. But other Rabbis, in the Talmud (tract. *Sotah*), say [it was] done because there [in Shechem, on the way] into Egypt, [he] had been sold by [his] brothers. But [he] had rather been sold from Dothan [Dothaim] (Gen. 37:17). Either, therefore, the former cause [is] to be held; or [it is] to be thought [that] it seemed to the Israelites [that] that place of burial [was] most convenient, which was given to him [Joseph] specially by [his] parent

(col. 1297)

[…which had been given to him specially by [his] parent as] an estate [praedium]. But [as to] why other [patriarchs] too [were] entombed and buried in that same place — the cause perhaps is, so that the monuments of the Fathers of all the tribes might be beheld; and [so that those] who had received from Joseph [their] life, and the supports of life, and a place of habitation, in Egypt, might also receive from him a place of burial [when] dead. Perhaps too account was had of the tabernacle, which was in the same field nearby. For, since [they] could not be [buried] in it — because a certain contamination [would arise] from the dead — [they] were at least situated nearest [to it]: just as even today [there] is burial of saints, [and] of other great men, sometimes in temples [churches] — as [is] to be seen in St. Augustine (bk. *On the care for the dead* [De cura pro mortuis gerenda]), & in several councils.

Question XX. How died, & where [was] buried, Eleazar the Pontiff?

The last words of this book, in the Latin & Hebrew, are: "Eleazar also son of Aaron died: and they buried him in Gabaath of Phinees his son, which was given to him in Mount Ephraim." "[It is] credible," says Masius, "[that] the Commander [Joshua] and the Pontiff [Eleazar], since in all [their] life [they] had been most closely joined, departed from it [life] at nearly the same time: but [that], for the order of the history, the Pontiff [is placed] later." And of old, indeed, Aaron the Pontiff died before Moses; now, after Joshua, Eleazar the Pontiff dies — so that [it] might be signified [that] the Jewish priesthood, the old [one], perished either with the observation of the Mosaic law, or even a little before [it]; but [that] the Christian priesthood and pontificate remains after CHRIST's death, and [that] other priests always straightway succeed [one another]; and [that] this priesthood [is] not to be taken away, until the true JESUS return to judgment.

But concerning the sepulchre we heard before (q. 10) [from] St. Jerome. It was Gabaath (which the 70 retain as [it were] a proper name — but [with] the last letter faulty, γάβαρ [gabaar]; others turn [it] "in the hill" [in colle]) of Phinees. But since [there] was an inheritance of the priests, as [was] said above (ch. 21), in the tribes of Juda, Simeon, & Benjamin — how did Phinees take a hill in Ephraim? The text answers [that] it was given to him. But three [things] are asked. *First*: To whom was that hill given — to Phinees? or to Eleazar? For mention [is] made of both; and to either the pronoun "to him" [illi] can be accommodated. Masius answers [that it] was given to Eleazar: but D. Jerome, in the Epitaph of Paula, signifies [it was] given to Phinees. *Second*: Why [was it] given to either? *First*: So that the Pontiff might be near the Commander, since the latter depended most greatly on the mouth and prescript of the former (Num. 27; & shown above several

times). *Second*: So that the High Pontiff might also be near God's tabernacle. *Third*: If the hill was given to Eleazar, why is [it] called "the hill of Phinees" or "Gabaath"? Masius answers: because, at that time at which this narration was being written, [it] was called "the hill of Phinees" — namely, because [Phinees] was then dwelling in it, and because Eleazar had not dwelt in it long, since [he] had received it after the division of the land.

Question XXI. Who wrote the end of this book? and what [is] added to it by the 70 [LXX]?

Just as not Moses, but some other pious & holy Prophet, wrote [the things] which, concerning his [Moses's] death, were said there at the end of Deuteronomy: so [it] is to be said in this place [that] Joshua did not write, but another, or some others [wrote] afterward, [the things] which are in this last chapter, from v. 29 to the end. But I said, in the Prolegomenon, [that it] is asserted by the Thalmudists [that] this was partly Eleazar, partly Phinees. But to this [the end of] the Hebrew & Latin text, the 70 [LXX] add these [things]: Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ λαβόντες οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν κιβωτὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ περιεφέροσαν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς· καὶ Φινεὲς ἱεράτευσεν ἀντὶ Ἐλεάζαρ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ἕως ἀπέθανε· καὶ κατωρύγη ἐν Γαβαὰρ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ· οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ [ἐλάτρευσαν] τὴν Ἀστάρτην καὶ Ἀσταρώθ, καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν τῶν κύκλῳ αὐτῶν· καὶ παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς κύριος εἰς χεῖρας Ἐγλὼν τῷ βασιλεῖ Μωάβ, καὶ ἐκυρίευσεν αὐτῶν ἔτη δέκα ὀκτώ [en ekein■ t■ h■mera labontes hoi huioi Isra■l t■n kib■ton tou Theou periepherosan en heautois; kai Phinees hierateusen anti Eleazar tou patros autou he■s apethane; kai kat■ryg■ en Gabaar t■ heautou; hoi de huioi Isra■l (elatreusan) t■n Astart■n kai Astar■th, kai tous theous t■n ethn■n t■n kykl■ aut■n; kai pared■ken autous kyrios eis cheiras Egl■n t■ basilei M■ab, kai ekyrieusen aut■n et■ deka okt■, "In that day the children of Israel, having taken the ark of God, carried it about among themselves; and Phinees exercised the priesthood in place of Eleazar his father, until he died; and he was buried in Gabaar, his own [place]. But the children of Israel [served] Astarte, and Astaroth, and the gods of the nations round about them; and the Lord delivered them into the hands of Eglon the king of Moab, and he ruled over them eighteen years"]. But these [things are] in the following book, Judges (ch. 2 & 3); which, however, [are] in the 70 [LXX], as the Syriac Interpreter also notes, Masius [being] witness.

> *Glory [be] to the Father, & to the Son, & to the Holy Spirit; as [it] was in the beginning, & [is] now & always, & unto the ages of ages. Amen.*

[— Here ends Nicolaus Serarius's Commentary on Joshua *(Iosue, ab utero ad ipsum usque tumulum). End of Caput XXIV; end of the commentary.]*

Front Matter

Index of Subjects

Index Rerum et Verborum

A translation of Serarius's alphabetical subject-index (the Index praecipuarum rerum quae his duobus Iosuae tomis continentur*, "Index of the principal topics contained in these two Joshua tomes"). Each entry keeps the original Latin headword in brackets; the original alphabetical order (by the Latin headword) is preserved. References are remapped to this English edition — "Vol I/II p. N" — with Serarius's original printed column number given in parentheses. "& seqq." = and the following [columns]; "ibid." = the same reference.*

A

- **Abraham** [Abraham] — how, in the Acts of the Apostles, he is said to have bought the field for a price of silver, etc. — [Vol II p. 496 (col. 1294)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/350-question-xvi-when-were-joseph-s-bones-buried/#col-1294) - **Abstinence and frugality** [Abstinentia & frugalitas] — how Joshua teaches them to us — [Vol II p. 420 (col. 1203)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/302-question-xi-which-inheritance-and-where-did-the-commande/#col-1203) - **Human actions** [Actiones humanae] — are commanded and taken in a moral manner — [Vol I p. 389 (col. 407)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/259-question-xi-what-did-joshua-say-to-the-priests-and-wheth/#col-407) - **Adam**, the first parent of the human race [Adam] — where he is buried — [Vol II p. 375 (col. 1148)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/261-question-v-what-city-is-hebron-and-what-is-in-it/#col-1148) - **Addereth** (the mantle) [Addereth] — what, and what kind of, garment it was — [Vol II p. 107 (col. 827)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/072-question-iii-what-did-achan-commit/#col-827) - **Adolescents** [Adolescentes] — imbibe the manners of those whose company they keep — [Vol I p. 110 (col. 103)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/069-question-ii-marg-in-what-did-joshua-minister-to-moses/#col-103), [Vol I p. 111 (col. 104)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/070-question-iii-marg-why-was-this-that-joshua-was-moses-s-m/#col-104) - **Adoration**, various [kinds] [Adoratio varia] — [Vol I p. 690 (col. 695)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 690 (col. 696)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Adrian Saravia** the Calvinist [Adrianus Saravia] — his opinion against the sacrilegious — [Vol II p. 444 (col. 1233)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/321-question-iii-how-many-cities-in-all-were-given-to-all-th/#col-1233) - **Egyptians** [Aegyptii] — whether some, joined to the Israelites, came into the promised land — [Vol II p. 44 (col. 752 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/018-question-x-whether-the-warriors-excepted-the-rest-of-the/#col-752) - **Emulation** [Aemulatio] — the disciples' [emulation] for Christ is better than Joshua's for Moses — [Vol I p. 149 (col. 145)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/104-question-vii-marg-was-the-emulation-of-the-disciples-of-/#col-145) - **Eternity** [Aeternitas] — sometimes signifies a long time — [Vol I p. 471 (col. 491)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Hagar** the handmaid [Agar] — a type of the Old [Testament]; Sara the freewoman, of the New Testament — [Vol I p. 113 (col. 107)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/071-question-iv-marg-to-what-mountain-did-joshua-go-with-mos/#col-107) - **Paschal lambs** [Agni paschales] — how many were slain each year — [Vol II p. 330 (col.

1094)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/240-question-iii-of-what-sort-is-this-land-to-be-divided-so-/#col-1094) - **Altar erected by the Lord** [Altare à Domino erectum] — why it is [so] called ("The Lord is my exaltation") — [Vol I p. 94 (col. 86)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/060-question-xxiii-marg-of-those-things-which-moses-did-afte/#col-86) - **Altar** [Altare] — the true altar among Jesus and Christians; the typical [one] among the Jews — [Vol II p. 462 (col. 1256)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/331-question-ii-how-did-they-depart-and-how-as-they-departed/#col-1256) - **Amalekites** [Amalecitae] — sometimes called Idumeans — [Vol I p. 71 (col. 61)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/036-question-xix-whether-at-least-anything-can-be-denominate/#col-61) - **St. Amianus** [S. Amianus] — roused thunder and lightning against Attila — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1044)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1044) - **Friends** [Amici] — when a friend's good excuse has been heard, we ought to acquiesce — [Vol II p. 462 (col. 1256)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/331-question-ii-how-did-they-depart-and-how-as-they-departed/#col-1256) - **Friends** [Amici] — the salvation of friends [is] twofold: begun and perfected — [Vol II p. 91 (col. 808)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/054-question-xlvi-for-what-causes-was-rahab-preserved-with-a/#col-808) - **Anathema and Cherem** [Anathema & Cherem] — what [they are] — [Vol II p. 50 (col. 759)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/026-question-xviii-concerning-the-anathematizing-of-the-city/#col-759); how manifold — [Vol II p. 76 (col. 790 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/040-question-xxxii-but-how-does-the-jericho-week-septenary-f/#col-790) - **The Angel Michael** [Angelus Michaël] — to the Novators, is truly Christ the Lord — [Vol I p. 629 (col. 647)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 631 (col. 648)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); [these are] refuted — [Vol I p. 623 (col. 641 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Angels** [Angeli] — whether [they are] to be adored — [Vol I p. 692 (col. 700)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Angels** [Angeli] — evil [angels] are subject to the good — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1008)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/187-question-xv-whether-evil-angels-can-make-the-sun-and-moo/#col-1008) - **Angels** [Angeli] — by their work the walls of Jericho were cast down — [Vol II p. 52 (col. 761)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/028-question-xx-whether-the-walls-of-jericho-fell-upon-the-s/#col-761) - **Angels** [Angeli] — by the work of good [angels] the hail was made — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1001)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/184-question-xii-whence-were-these-stones-sent-by-whom-were-/#col-1001) - **Angels** [Angeli] — their offices concerning the bodies of the heavens and their motion — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1007 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/187-question-xv-whether-evil-angels-can-make-the-sun-and-moo/#col-1007); likewise — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1015)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/191-question-xix-what-did-the-other-efficient-cause-namely-g/#col-1015) - **Angels** [Angeli] — the most excellent of all was the first to sin against God — [Vol I p. 657 (col. 668)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); he is commonly called Lucifer — [Vol I p. 659 (col. 670)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Angels** [Angeli] — the supreme of the angels after Lucifer's fall is St. Michael — [Vol I p. 663 (col. 673 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Souls** [Animae] — that we may help souls, no labor is to be refused — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1043)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1043) - **Sabbatical year** [Annus Sabbathicus] — [Vol II p. 359 (col. 1127 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/252-question-xiv-were-the-sabbatical-and-jubilee-years-begun/#col-1127) -

Apostles [Apostoli] — figured by Joshua's twelve stones — [Vol I p. 477 (col. 497)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Warm waters** at the city of Lewida [Aquae calidae] — [Vol II p. 483 (col. 1280)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/341-question-vii-how-did-joshua-strike-make-a-covenant-with-/#col-1280) - **Ark of the Lord** [Arca Domini] — to be honored with a splendid retinue — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 769)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-769) - **Ark** [Arca] — in what ways it was carried by the priests — [Vol I p. 408 (col. 426)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/269-question-v-how-wide-and-how-deep-is-the-jordan/#col-426) - **Ark** [Arca] — four times the priests carried it out of [their usual] order — [Vol I p. 388 (col. 404 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/257-question-ix-what-did-the-leader-joshua-say-to-the-people/#col-404) - **Ark** [Arca] — the priests alone carried it (Joshua, chapter 3) — [Vol I p. 388 (col. 404)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/257-question-ix-what-did-the-leader-joshua-say-to-the-people/#col-404) - **Ark** [Arca] — the multitude is bidden to follow the preceding ark — [Vol I p. 389 (col. 406)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/258-question-x-what-was-the-cause-of-the-sanctification-proc/#col-406) - **Ark** [Arca] — how great the distance was between the ark and the people — [Vol I p. 389 (col. 407)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/259-question-xi-what-did-joshua-say-to-the-priests-and-wheth/#col-407); and the causes of that distance — [Vol I p. 393 (col. 410)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/261-question-xiii-what-did-the-lord-say-to-the-same-joshua-a/#col-410) - **Ark** [Arca] — what it is to adore before the ark of the Lord — [Vol II p. 124 (col. 850)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/081-question-xii-what-having-learned-of-the-slaughter-and-fl/#col-850) - **Sand of the sea** [Arena maris] — who can number it — [Vol II p. 306 (col. 1061)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/216-question-iii-of-how-great-a-number-were-these-enemies-ag/#col-1061) - **Arms** [Arma] — whether anyone may lawfully take up arms against others, even the wicked — [Vol II p. 17 (col. 720)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-720) - **Asylum** (sanctuary) [Asylum] — what it is, and whence [it is] named — [Vol II p. 422 (col. 1205 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/304-question-xiii-what-did-the-leader-joshua-display-in-the-/#col-1205) - **Avallon** [Avallo] — its walls suddenly collapsed, Robert King of the Franks praying — [Vol II p. 52 (col. 762)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/028-question-xx-whether-the-walls-of-jericho-fell-upon-the-s/#col-762) - **Misers** [Avari] — nearly all are consigned to Pluto['s realm] — [Vol II p. 118 (col. 841)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/076-question-vii-in-what-manner-was-achan-led-to-these-theft/#col-841) - **"To hear" for "to obey"** [Audire pro obedire] — usual in the Hebrew text — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1013)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/190-question-xviii-whether-joshua-rightly-asked-and-commande/#col-1013) - **Gold** [Aurum] — the weight of gold is tenfold the price of silver — [Vol II p. 115 (col. 838)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/075-question-vi-what-and-how-much-of-gold-did-achan-steal/#col-838) - **Gold, silver, and gems** [Aurum, argentum & gemmae] — among some nations [there is] scarcely any price [for them] — [Vol II p. 118 (col. 841)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/076-question-vii-in-what-manner-was-achan-led-to-these-theft/#col-841) - **Unleavened bread** [Azymus panis] — is truly bread — [Vol I p. 591 (col. 610)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 591 (col. 611)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Unleavened bread** [Azymus panis] — whether [it is] healthful — [Vol I p. 591 (col. 611)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Unleavened bread** [Azymus panis] — why prescribed by God, four causes — [Vol I p. 593 (col. 612)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); when the Israelites began to use it — [Vol I p. 606 (col. 624)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) -

Days of unleavened bread [Azymorum dies] — which, and how many, they are — [Vol I p. 595 (col. 615 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Days of unleavened bread** [Azymorum dies] — the seventh day, why called "collecta" (the assembly) — [Vol I p. 600 (col. 618)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); concerning the sacrifices of those days — [Vol I p. 603 (col. 621)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470)

B

- **Babylonian and Assyrian Kings** [Babylonii & Assyrii Reges] — with the empire, put off their private names — [Vol I p. 35 (col. 23)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/021-question-iv-what-in-general-is-the-cause-of-changing-nam/#col-23) - **Balsam** in the land of Palestine [Balsamon] — [Vol II p. 336 (col. 1100)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/241-question-iii-compared-to-other-regions-of-what-sort-is-t/#col-1100) - **Balsam** [Balsamum] — regions fertile in balsam — [Vol I p. 318 (col. 326)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/211-question-iii-who-then-were-these-same-spies/#col-326) - **War** [Bellum] — the ancient method of waging war has become obsolete, and why — [Vol II p. 232 (col. 978)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-978) - **War** [Bellum] — the precepts of warfare are to be sought from the divine writings — [Vol II p. 24 (col. 728)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/006-question-iii-against-the-just-arms-of-the-israelites-did/#col-728), [Vol II p. 26 (col. 729)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-729) - **War-cries** of the Germans and other peoples [Bellicae vociferationes] — [Vol II p. 47 (col. 755)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/021-question-xiii-whether-joshua-enjoined-this-order-of-goin/#col-755) - **War undertaken with God as its author** [Bellum Deo authore susceptum] — cannot be unjust — [Vol II p. 19 (col. 721)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-721), [Vol II p. 19 (col. 722)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-722) - **War of Christians against the Turks** [Bellum Christianorum contra Turcas] — who have disapproved [of it] — [Vol II p. 24 (col. 727)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/006-question-iii-against-the-just-arms-of-the-israelites-did/#col-727) - **Amalekite war against the Israelites** [Bellum Amaleciticum] — its causes — [Vol I p. 73 (col. 64)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/040-question-iii-marg-what-was-the-place-of-this-war/#col-64) - **War** [Bellum] — why, in war, things lacking reason (or even life) are sometimes destroyed — [Vol I p. 475 (col. 495)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Wars against the Canaanites** [Bella contra Chananaeos] — how many there were — [Vol II p. 16 (col. 718)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/003-the-wars-opening/#col-718); who have said these were unjust — [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-719) & [Vol II p. 17 (col. 719)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-719) - **Wars** [Bella] — whether they can sometimes be unjust on both sides — [Vol II p. 20 (col. 723)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-723) - **Spiritual wars** [Bella spiritualia] — are never lacking in this life — [Vol II p. 26 (col. 730)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-730); how the divine writings exhort us to them — [Vol II p. 27 (col. 731)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-731) - **To**

bless [Benedicere] — is threefold — [Vol II p. 377 (col. 1149 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/261-question-v-what-city-is-hebron-and-what-is-in-it/#col-1149) - **Bethania** [Bethania] — whether the same as Bethabara — [Vol I p. 430 (col. 449)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/284-question-v-how-were-those-same-12-stones-set-up-in-the-j/#col-449) - **Vernacular version of the Bible** [Bibliorum vernacula versio] — not entirely abolished by the Council of Trent — [Vol I p. 285 (col. 293)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/193-question-xii-in-what-manner-does-the-lord-confirm-the-sa/#col-293), [Vol I p. 287 (col. 294)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/193-question-xii-in-what-manner-does-the-lord-confirm-the-sa/#col-293) - **Bruttii** [Brutii] — their grave punishment among the Romans — [Vol II p. 228 (col. 973)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/159-question-xiii-in-so-great-a-readiness-to-believe-the-gab/#col-973)

C

- **Kabbalah of the Rabbis** [Cabala Rabbinorum] — [Vol I p. 238 (col. 240)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/165-question-ii-marg-whether-joshua-the-successor-received-t/#col-240), [Vol I p. 239 (col. 241)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/165-question-ii-marg-whether-joshua-the-successor-received-t/#col-241) - **Caleb** [Caleb] — why he is called the Kenezite — [Vol II p. 368 (col. 1138)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/258-question-ii-when-did-caleb-approach-joshua-as-about-to-s/#col-1138), [Vol II p. 368 (col. 1139)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/259-question-iii-who-and-of-what-sort-was-the-man-caleb/#col-1139) - **Caleb and Joshua** [Caleb & Iosue] — opposed the seditious speech of the [other] spies — [Vol I p. 164 (col. 162)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/112-question-v-marg-ought-joshua-to-have-opposed-the-same-ex/#col-161); why nevertheless no mention is made of Joshua — [Vol I p. 277 (col. 285)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/193-question-xii-in-what-manner-does-the-lord-confirm-the-sa/#col-285) - **Caleb** [Caleb] — whether he had greater zeal than Joshua, [it] is debated — [Vol I p. 172 (col. 171)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/117-question-x-marg-how-did-the-lord-approve-and-commend-the/#col-171) - **Caleb's virtues** [Calebis virtutes] — [Vol II p. 378 (col. 1152)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/263-question-vii-whether-hebron-was-stormed-by-joshua-or-by-/#col-1152) - **Two Calebs** [Calebi duo] — one the son of Jephone, the other of Esron — [Vol I p. 98 (col. 90)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/062-question-xxvi-marg-is-scaliger-s-version-and-explanation/#col-90) - **Calvin** [Calvinus] — rashly reproves the disciples of the Lord — [Vol I p. 148 (col. 144)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/103-question-vi-marg-was-joshua-s-emulation-for-moses-a-good/#col-144), [Vol I p. 149 (col. 145)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/104-question-vii-marg-was-the-emulation-of-the-disciples-of-/#col-145) - **Calvin** [Calvini iudicium] — his judgment about Joshua, and censure of him — [Vol II p. 184 (col. 919)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/118-caput-viii-the-second-war-of-ai-bellum-ii-haiense-openin/#col-919), [Vol II p. 194 (col. 931)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-931), [Vol II p. 223 (col. 968)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/153-question-vii-whether-the-gabaonites-embraced-the-true-re/#col-968); about the Transjordanian tribes — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1254)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1254); his malice or blindness — [Vol II p. 315 (col. 1072)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/223-question-x-why-did-joshua-do-all-these-things-thus/#col-1072); his ignorance in topography — [Vol II p. 388 (col. 1163)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/271-question-vi-did-any-cities-later-depart-from-or-accede-t/#col-1163); he

condemns himself by his own opinion — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1254 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1254) - **Calvinists** [Calvinistae] — prefer to apply themselves to Dutch treasons and brigandage rather than to the war against the Turk — [Vol II p. 24 (col. 728)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/006-question-iii-against-the-just-arms-of-the-israelites-did/#col-728) - **Calvinists** [Calvinistarum insania] — the madness of those who say this conclusion is weak: "God commanded this, therefore it is just" — [Vol II p. 20 (col. 723)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-723) - **Ten canticles** [Cantica decem] — uttered in this age — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1042)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/209-question-xxxvii-what-did-the-conquered-enemy-and-the-ene/#col-1042) - **Capuchins** [Capucini] — regard poverty and simplicity even in [their] altars — [Vol II p. 205 (col. 946)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/133-question-xv-on-which-mountain-was-the-altar-and-on-this-/#col-946) - **Cariath-arbe** [Cariatharbe] — the same as Hebron, whence it got its name — [Vol II p. 373 (col. 1145)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/261-question-v-what-city-is-hebron-and-what-is-in-it/#col-1145) - **"Flesh"** [Caro] — its various notions [meanings] — [Vol I p. 179 (col. 179)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/121-caput-ix-opening/#col-179) - **Charles V** [Carolus Quintus] — how clement toward rebels — [Vol II p. 235 (col. 981)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/167-question-xxi-whether-many-gabaonites-were-slain-by-king-/#col-981) - **Canaanites** [Chananaei] — whether they could justly resist the invading Israelites — [Vol II p. 24 (col. 727)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/006-question-iii-against-the-just-arms-of-the-israelites-did/#col-727) - **Christ** [Christus] — called "a cluster [of grapes]" by the Rabbis — [Vol I p. 159 (col. 156)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/110-question-ii-marg-did-two-men-carry-that-cluster-on-a-pol/#col-156), [Vol I p. 160 (col. 157)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/110-question-ii-marg-did-two-men-carry-that-cluster-on-a-pol/#col-157) - **Christ** [Christus] — came into these lands to bring destruction on the unclean world and the devil — [Vol II p. 72 (col. 785)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/038-question-xxx-at-what-hour-of-the-seventh-day-was-jericho/#col-785), [Vol II p. 72 (col. 786 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/038-question-xxx-at-what-hour-of-the-seventh-day-was-jericho/#col-786) - **Christ** [Christus sacerdos] — a priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek — [Vol II p. 364 (col. 1134)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/255-question-xvii-for-what-causes-did-the-lord-will-that-lan/#col-1134); he endows others with such priestly power — [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/255-question-xvii-for-what-causes-did-the-lord-will-that-lan/#col-1134) - **Life of Christ the Lord** [Christi Domini vita] — divided into nearly seven five-year periods — [Vol II p. 72 (col. 786)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/038-question-xxx-at-what-hour-of-the-seventh-day-was-jericho/#col-786); likewise into seven circuits — [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/038-question-xxx-at-what-hour-of-the-seventh-day-was-jericho/#col-786) & seqq. - **A Christian** [Christianus] — ought above all to fight for his altars and sacred things — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 770)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-770) - **Christians** [Christiani] — how they ought to bring mutual aid to one another — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1253)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1253) - **Cidon** (a place) [Cidon] — what it is — [Vol II p. 195 (col. 933)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/123-question-v-by-what-signal-roused-did-the-ambush-take-the/#col-933) - **Circumcision** [Circumcisio] — its various acceptations — [Vol I p. 483 (col. 504)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Circumcision** [Circumcisio] — how long [it was] intermitted in the wilderness — [Vol I p. 487 (col. 509)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470);

and its causes — [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) & seqq. - **Circumcision** [Circumcisio] — resumed by the Israelites after the crossing of the Jordan, why — [Vol I p. 493 (col. 515)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Circumcision** [Circumcisio] — how performed by Joshua — [Vol I p. 499 (col. 520)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Circumcision** [Circumcisio] — performed with stone knives — [Vol I p. 499 (col. 521)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Circumcision** [Circumcisio] — how [it is] to be observed mystically — [Vol I p. 512 (col. 535)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Knife of circumcision**, mystically [Circumcisionis culter] — [Vol I p. 505 (col. 526)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The circumcised** [Circumcisi] — why they feel the most intense pain on the third day of circumcision — [Vol I p. 511 (col. 533)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The circumcised after the crossing of the Jordan** [Circumcisorum numerus] — their number — [Vol I p. 499 (col. 521)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 501 (col. 522)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); the time, the place — [Vol I p. 503 (col. 525)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Shout of the Israelites** [Clamor Israelitarum] — what it signified — [Vol II p. 64 (col. 775)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/035-question-xxvii-why-along-with-the-trumpet-clangor-was-no/#col-775) - **Shout alone, however great** [Clamor] — whether any mass [structure] can be cast down by it — [Vol II p. 55 (col. 766)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/030-question-xxii-whether-the-sound-of-the-trumpets-and-the-/#col-766) - **Shouts in war** [Clamores in bello] — why soldiers are wont to raise them — [Vol II p. 49 (col. 757)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/024-question-xvi-to-what-end-was-this-shout/#col-757) - **Clergy and people** [Clerus & populus] — how they ought to agree together — [Vol II p. 344 (col. 1109)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/244-question-vi-why-was-the-levitical-tribe-excluded-from-th/#col-1109) - **"Heaven"** [Coelum] — the name used for "air" — [Vol II p. 355 (col. 1123)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/252-question-xiv-were-the-sabbatical-and-jubilee-years-begun/#col-1123) - **The heavens** [Coeli] — when their motion ceases, whether all lower [things] cease — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1030)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/197-question-xxv-whether-so-long-a-day-has-never-been-afterw/#col-1030), [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1031)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/199-question-xxvii-from-the-rest-of-the-sun-and-moon-did-a-r/#col-1031); what [kind of] harmony is theirs — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1003)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/185-question-xiii-whether-in-this-battle-the-sun-and-moon-st/#col-1003) - **Thoughts** [Cogitationes] — of what kind men are wont to confirm themselves in wickedness — [Vol II p. 143 (col. 871)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/092-question-xxiii-how-with-the-occasion-of-a-night-interven/#col-871) - **Concupiscence** [Concupiscentia] — the first step toward the fall — [Vol II p. 117 (col. 839)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/076-question-vii-in-what-manner-was-achan-led-to-these-theft/#col-839) - **Sacramental confession** [Confessio sacramentalis] — [Vol II p. 144 (col. 874)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/093-question-xxiv-achan-once-betrayed-by-the-lot-how-did-jos/#col-874), [Vol II p. 146 (col.

875)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/094-question-xxv-how-by-the-confession-of-his-sin-could-acha/#col-875) - **Confession** [Confessio] — its various modes — [Vol II p. 143 (col. 872 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/092-question-xxiii-how-with-the-occasion-of-a-night-interven/#col-872) - **Counselors of Princes, and Senators** [Consiliarii] — ought to imitate the example of Caleb — [Vol II p. 368 (col. 1140)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/259-question-iii-who-and-of-what-sort-was-the-man-caleb/#col-1140) - **Constancy in good things** [Constantia] — is commended — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 770)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-770) - **Copernicus** [Copernici sententia] — his opinion on the mobility of the earth [is] not to be defended — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1005)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/186-question-xiv-whether-the-sun-and-moon-can-stand-still-na/#col-1005) - **Heart of man** [Cor] — how it can be turned into stone — [Vol II p. 124 (col. 849)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/081-question-xii-what-having-learned-of-the-slaughter-and-fl/#col-849) - **Hardening of the heart** [Cordis induratio] — what it is — [Vol II p. 318 (col. 1075)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/224-question-xi-why-did-god-will-all-these-things-to-be-done/#col-1075); what its causes [are] — [Vol II p. 318 (col. 1076 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/224-question-xi-why-did-god-will-all-these-things-to-be-done/#col-1076) - **Ram's horns** [Cornua arietina] — customarily sounded in the Jubilee — [Vol II p. 35 (col. 741)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/012-question-iv-of-what-kind-were-the-trumpets-of-the-seven-/#col-741), [Vol II p. 35 (col. 742)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/012-question-iv-of-what-kind-were-the-trumpets-of-the-seven-/#col-742) - **Figure of the cross** [Crucis figura] — represented the letter Tau — [Vol II p. 197 (col. 936)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-936); how great its infamy [was] of old — [Vol II p. 199 (col. 937)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/128-question-x-the-king-of-ai-in-what-manner-and-why-was-he-/#col-937) - **Stone knives** [Cultri lapidei] — buried with Joshua — [Vol II p. 481 (col. 1278)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/339-question-v-whether-joshua-made-to-the-israelites-a-true-/#col-1278); and what is understood by them — [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/339-question-v-whether-joshua-made-to-the-israelites-a-true-/#col-1278) - **The divine worship** [Cultus divinus] — it is just that all be present at it — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 769)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-769) - **Delay** [Cunctatio] — whether [it is] to be praised in a Leader rather than speed — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1055 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/212-question-xl-on-the-allegory-of-this-war/#col-1055) - **Desire** [Cupiditas] — how harmful [it is], unless bridled — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 770)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-770) - **Cumin, dill, and the like** [Cyminum] — whether there is any precept concerning them — [Vol II p. 450 (col. 1240)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/324-question-vi-how-large-and-of-what-kind-were-those-cities/#col-1240)

D

- **The demon as a merchant** [Daemon mercator] — [Vol II p. 26 (col. 730)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-730) - **Demons** [Daemones] — to them it is a bitter punishment if we never comply with their wishes — [Vol II p. 44 (col. 751)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/018-question-x-whether-the-warriors-excepted-the-rest-of-the/#col-751) - **David Chytraeus** [Davidis Chytraei sententia] — his opinion against the sacrilegious — [Vol II p. 173 (col. 907)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/111-question-xlii-whom-can-achan-s-punishment-terrify/#col-907); likewise

against the iconoclasts — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1254)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1254) - **God** [Deus] — why he deigns to answer even about human and perishable matters — [Vol I p. 224 (col. 226)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/153-question-xxxiii-marg-about-what-matters-did-the-lord-res/#col-226) - **God** [Deus] — spoke to Joshua first after Moses's death, and why — [Vol I p. 241 (col. 243)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/165-question-ii-marg-whether-joshua-the-successor-received-t/#col-243) - **God "of spirits and of all flesh"** [Deus spirituum] — how [he] is [so] called — [Vol I p. 177 (col. 177 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/121-caput-ix-opening/#col-177) - **God** [Deus] — speaks to men in various ways — [Vol I p. 253 (col. 257)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/178-prolegomenon-vii-who-are-the-interpreters-commentators-o/#col-256) - **God** [Deus] — why he willed the Israelites to cross into the land of Chanaan — [Vol I p. 296 (col. 304)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/199-question-v-what-is-to-be-learned-from-this-preparation/#col-303) - **God** [Deus] — confirms Joshua by twelve arguments — [Vol I p. 274 (col. 280 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/193-question-xii-in-what-manner-does-the-lord-confirm-the-sa/#col-279) - **God** [Deus] — why he is called "living" — [Vol I p. 403 (col. 421)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/268-question-iv-how-far-does-the-jordan-flow-and-where-does-/#col-421) - **God** [Deus] — chooses certain of the most despised things in the world for the best [ends] — [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/268-question-iv-how-far-does-the-jordan-flow-and-where-does-/#col-421) - **A man** [Dei servus] — can be called a servant of God, naturally and morally — [Vol I p. 253 (col. 258)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/178-prolegomenon-vii-who-are-the-interpreters-commentators-o/#col-256) - **God's grace** [Dei gratia] — one must cooperate with it — [Vol I p. 298 (col. 306)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/202-question-ii-of-what-did-joshua-warn-the-same-tribes/#col-305) - **God's kindness** [Dei benignitas] — toward a man hoping for repentance — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 770)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-770) - **God's help** [Dei auxilium] — a happy panoply [full armor] for men — [Vol II p. 295 (col. 1046)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/#col-1046) - **God's worship** [Dei cultus] — certain things once serving impiety are rightly converted into it — [Vol II p. 82 (col. 797)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/047-question-xxxix-why-was-so-dire-an-anathema-inflicted-upo/#col-797), [Vol II p. 82 (col. 798)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/047-question-xxxix-why-was-so-dire-an-anathema-inflicted-upo/#col-798) - **To serve God** [Deo servire] — is to reign — [Vol I p. 260 (col. 265)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/184-question-iii-marg-why-is-moses-so-often-affected-with-gi/#col-265) - **To God** [Deo] — all our precious things ought to be dedicated and to serve [him] — [Vol II p. 82 (col. 798)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/047-question-xxxix-why-was-so-dire-an-anathema-inflicted-upo/#col-798), [Vol II p. 84 (col. 799)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/048-question-xl-why-were-the-metals-excepted-from-this-anath/#col-799) - **To God** [ad Deum] — one must flee even in the dangers of war — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1044)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1044); examples of aid obtained from him — [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1044) - **By God** [à Deo] — how it is said to have been [done], that the Canaanites resisted the Israelites — [Vol II p. 316 (col. 1074)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/223-question-x-why-did-joshua-do-all-these-things-thus/#col-1074) - **Days of the week** [Dies feriarum] — rather to be called by the name of "feriae" [feast-days] — [Vol II p. 74 (col. 787)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/040-question-xxxii-but-how-does-the-jericho-week-septenary-f/#col-787) - **The day** [Dies] — how Christ prolonged it for us — [Vol II p. 295 (col. 1046)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/#col-1046) - **On what day** of the third month Joshua ascended Mount Sinai [Dies Sinai] — [Vol I p. 117 (col.

112)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/073-question-vi-marg-when-did-the-same-joshua-ascend-the-mou/#col-112) - **One devoted to public curses** [Diris devotus] — among the Romans of old, to what penalty he was subject — [Vol II p. 77 (col. 791)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/041-question-xxxiii-what-is-anathema-and-cherem/#col-791) - **Public inns** [Diversoria] — among the Greeks today, none — [Vol II p. 218 (col. 961)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/149-question-iii-what-was-the-cunning-of-the-gabaonites-for-/#col-961) - **Divine [things]** [Divina] — first to be cared for and sought — [Vol II p. 396 (col. 1174)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/276-caput-xviii-concerning-the-second-division-of-the-land-a/#col-1174) - **The divine power** [Divina virtus] — how it strengthened Joshua and the people — [Vol II p. 365 (col. 1032)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/199-question-xxvii-from-the-rest-of-the-sun-and-moon-did-a-r/#col-1032) - **Masters' courtesy** [Dominorum comitas] — toward good servants, commended — [Vol I p. 112 (col. 105)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/070-question-iii-marg-why-was-this-that-joshua-was-moses-s-m/#col-105) - **Gifts and talents** [Dona & talenta] — their various kinds signified by metals — [Vol II p. 85 (col. 801)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/049-question-xli-whether-besides-those-four-kinds-of-metals-/#col-801) - **Druids in Gaul** [Druydae] — their custom of excommunicating — [Vol II p. 77 (col. 791)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/041-question-xxxiii-what-is-anathema-and-cherem/#col-791) - **Two kinds of men** [Duo genera] — who are saved — [Vol II p. 212 (col. 953)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/145-question-xxvii-what-is-the-allegory-of-this-ceremony/#col-953) - **Twelve sons of Jacob** [Duodecim filii Iacob] — why God willed [there to] be — [Vol II p. 345 (col. 1112)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/245-question-vii-to-what-time-is-the-interpretation-to-be-as/#col-1112), [Vol II p. 347 (col. 1113)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/247-question-ix-whether-the-land-ought-to-have-been-divided-/#col-1113) - **Persons of double name** [Duplex nomen] — several mentioned in Scripture (bk. 1, ch. 1) — [Vol I p. 20 (col. 6)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/007-caput-i-opening/#col-7)

E

- **The Church** [Ecclesia] — how it spiritually has women, infants, etc. — [Vol II p. 213 (col. 955)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/145-question-xxvii-what-is-the-allegory-of-this-ceremony/#col-955) - **The Church's teaching** [Ecclesiae doctrina] — how one ought to receive it — [Vol II p. 315 (col. 1072)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/223-question-x-why-did-joshua-do-all-these-things-thus/#col-1072) - **The Catholic Church of God** [Ecclesia Catholica] — men of every kind can have a place in it — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 770)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-770) - **Churches of Christians** [Ecclesiae] — whether it is lawful for them to have treasures — [Vol II p. 85 (col. 802)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/049-question-xli-whether-besides-those-four-kinds-of-metals-/#col-802) - **Elijah's melota** (sheepskin mantle), and the garments of the Prophets [Eliae melota] — [Vol II p. 107 (col. 828)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/072-question-iii-what-did-achan-commit/#col-828) - **Ephraim the Patriarch** [Ephraim] — son of Joseph, defended [as one] of Joshua's ancestors — [Vol I p. 20 (col. 7)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/007-caput-i-opening/#col-7) - **Phinees** [Phinees] — set forth as an example to Bishops and Ecclesiastics — [Vol II p. 462 (col. 1256)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/331-question-ii-how-did-they-depart-and-how-as-they-departed/#col-1256) - **The epitaphs of Joshua** [Epitaphia Iosuae] — [Vol II p. 481 (col. 1278)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/339-question-v-whether-joshua-made-to-the-israelites-a-true-/#col-1278) - **To hamstring horses** [Equos subnervare] — what it is — [Vol II p. 309 (col. 1066)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/219-question-vi-how-and-how-far-did-joshua-put-to-flight-and/#col-1066); whether it was lawful for the Jews to have them — [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/219-question-vi-how-and-how-far-did-joshua-put-to-flight-and/#col-1066) & seqq. - **If anyone seems to err** [Errare] — what is to be done to him — [Vol II p. 460 (col.

1253)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1253) - **The Essenes** [Esseni] — [when] excommunicated, usually consumed by a miserable death — [Vol II p. 77 (col. 791)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/041-question-xxxiii-what-is-anathema-and-cherem/#col-791) - **The Eucharist** [Eucharistia] — called of old ἄναιμος & ἀναίμακτος θυσία [anaimos kai anaimaktos thysia, "a bloodless and unbloody sacrifice"] — [Vol II p. 205 (col. 946)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/133-question-xv-on-which-mountain-was-the-altar-and-on-this-/#col-946) - **The Sacrament of the Eucharist** [Eucharistiae Sacramentum] — not unfittingly carried about in processions — [Vol II p. 57 (col. 767)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/031-question-xxiii-how-did-the-israelites-enter-the-city-and/#col-767) - **Spies** [Exploratores] — who [they are] mystically — [Vol I p. 175 (col. 174)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/119-question-xii-marg-what-did-joshua-signify-in-this-explor/#col-174), [Vol I p. 176 (col. 175)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/119-question-xii-marg-what-did-joshua-signify-in-this-explor/#col-175) - **Spies** [Exploratores] — how sent by Joshua — [Vol I p. 324 (col. 341)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/218-question-iii-was-rahab-a-harlot/#col-341), [Vol I p. 325 (col. 342)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/218-question-iii-was-rahab-a-harlot/#col-342) - **Spies** [Exploratores] — more probably sent to Jericho in the month of April — [Vol I p. 320 (col. 329)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/212-question-v-when-were-the-spies-sent/#col-329) - **Spies** [Exploratores] — Christ sends [them] in two ways — [Vol I p. 324 (col. 341)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/218-question-iii-was-rahab-a-harlot/#col-341), [Vol I p. 325 (col. 342)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/218-question-iii-was-rahab-a-harlot/#col-342) - **The usefulness of spies** [Exploratorum utilitas] — [Vol I p. 311 (col. 319)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/208-commentary-opening/#col-319), [Vol I p. 312 (col. 320)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/208-commentary-opening/#col-319) - **The names of the spies sent by Joshua** [Exploratorum nomina] — uncertain — [Vol I p. 313 (col. 322)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/210-question-ii-how-many-were-these-spies/#col-322) - **The spies' speech** [Exploratorum oratio] — after [their] return from the promised land, explained — [Vol I p. 160 (col. 157 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/110-question-ii-marg-did-two-men-carry-that-cluster-on-a-pol/#col-157) - **The extension of the hands** [Extensio manuum] — a figure of the cross — [Vol I p. 84 (col. 75)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/051-question-xiv-marg-why-when-moses-s-hands-were-lifted-up-/#col-75) - **Hezekiah's solar regression** [Ezechiae solaris regressus] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1026 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/196-question-xxiv-whether-so-long-a-day-had-never-been-befor/#col-1026), [Vol II p. 365 (col. 1033)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/201-question-xxix-whether-it-is-a-greater-miracle-for-the-su/#col-1033)

F

- **Familiarity with the impious** [Familiaritas cum impiis] — harmful — [Vol II p. 462 (col. 1256)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/331-question-ii-how-did-they-depart-and-how-as-they-departed/#col-1256) - **Faith (a pledge)** [Fides] — whether to be kept with criminals — [Vol II p. 188 (col. 925)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-925) - **Faith in miracles** [Fides miraculorum] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1010)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/188-question-xvi-whether-any-one-of-the-good-angels-could-st/#col-1010) - **The excellent faith of Joshua and the Israelite people** [Fides Iosuae] — [Vol II p. 64 (col. 775)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/035-question-xxvii-why-along-with-the-trumpet-clangor-was-no/#col-775) - **Covenants** [Foedera] — what ceremonies some are wont to employ in ratifying them — [Vol II p. 222 (col. 966)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-966) - **The women preserved with Rahab** [Foeminae cum Raab] — purified with water — [Vol II p. 97 (col. 816)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/062-question-liv-are-the-builders-the-masons-and-the-workmen/#col-816) -

Women and children [Foeminae & pueri] — sometimes spared in wars, sometimes not — [Vol II p. 79 (col. 793)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/044-question-xxxvi-could-all-the-mothers-virgins-and-girls-o/#col-793) - **A perennial spring of water at Jerusalem** [Fons perennis] — [Vol II p. 232 (col. 978)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-978) - **St. Francis** [S. Franciscus] — his affection for the most holy name of Jesus — [Vol I p. 55 (col. 44)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-44), [Vol I p. 56 (col. 45)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-45) - **Francis Junius** [Franciscus Iunius] — his curse against the Pontiff and true Christians — [Vol II p. 24 (col. 728)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/006-question-iii-against-the-just-arms-of-the-israelites-did/#col-728) - **Achan's theft** [Furtum Achanis] — of what value it was — [Vol II p. 113 (col. 836)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/074-question-v-what-and-how-much-silver-did-achan-steal/#col-836)

G

- **Gibeon** [Gabaon] — its name and site — [Vol II p. 216 (col. 959)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/147-question-i-what-city-is-gabaon-and-where/#col-959), [Vol II p. 216 (col. 960)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/147-question-i-what-city-is-gabaon-and-where/#col-960) - **The fraud of the Gibeonites** [Gabaonitarum fraus] — whether it was a sin — [Vol II p. 218 (col. 962)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/149-question-iii-what-was-the-cunning-of-the-gabaonites-for-/#col-962), [Vol II p. 220 (col. 963)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-963) - **The Gibeonites** [Gabaonitae] — called (1 Chron. 2) "Men of Cozeba," that is, "of lying" — [Vol II p. 222 (col. 965)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-965); repelled from marriage with the Israelites, by the opinion of the Rabbis — [Vol II p. 228 (col. 974)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/159-question-xiii-in-so-great-a-readiness-to-believe-the-gab/#col-974); who [are] designated by them — [Vol II p. 237 (col. 984)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/168-question-xxii-from-these-gabaonite-matters-what-is-there/#col-984) - **Galilee** [Galilaea] — how many cities and villages it had — [Vol II p. 332 (col. 1095)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/240-question-iii-of-what-sort-is-this-land-to-be-divided-so-/#col-1095) - **The Germans** [Germani] — whence [they are] sprung — [Vol II p. 326 (col. 1086)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/234-question-iii-in-how-many-years-space-did-joshua-reduce-a/#col-1086) - **The Gethites** [Gethaei] — invaded Ephraim's sons, not the contrary — [Vol I p. 23 (col. 10)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/009-question-ii-whether-the-first-nine-named-are-properly-ca/#col-10) - **Giants** [Gigantes] — [Vol II p. 375 (col. 1148)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/261-question-v-what-city-is-hebron-and-what-is-in-it/#col-1148) - **Desire of glory** [Gloriae cupiditas] — some [is] innate in all — [Vol II p. 102 (col. 821)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/068-question-lx-how-great-was-joshua-s-glory-and-what-was-it/#col-821) - **True glory** [Gloria vera] — what it is — [Vol II p. 102 (col. 821)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/068-question-lx-how-great-was-joshua-s-glory-and-what-was-it/#col-821) - **Glory** [Gloria] — an indifferent good [adiaphoron] — [Vol II p. 102 (col. 822)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/068-question-lx-how-great-was-joshua-s-glory-and-what-was-it/#col-822) - **To give glory to God** [Gloriam Deo tribuere] — what it is, and in how many ways it is done — [Vol II p. 144 (col. 874 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/093-question-xxiv-achan-once-betrayed-by-the-lot-how-did-jos/#col-874) - **Hail of memorable size** [Grando] — [Vol II p. 216 (col. 959)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/147-question-i-what-city-is-gabaon-and-where/#col-959) - **Gratian**

mistakenly cited St. Gregory for Origen [Gratianus per errorem citavit S. Gregorium pro Origene] — [Vol II p. 24 (col. 728)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/006-question-iii-against-the-just-arms-of-the-israelites-did/#col-728) - **The office of a ruler** [Gubernatoris munus] — [Vol I p. 270 (col. 277)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/192-question-xi-why-does-the-lord-so-often-confirm-joshua-hi/#col-277), [Vol I p. 272 (col. 278)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/192-question-xi-why-does-the-lord-so-often-confirm-joshua-hi/#col-277)

H

- **Hacan** [Hacan] — a certain writer of the laws and rites of the Karaites and Sadducees — [Vol II p. 188 (col. 925)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-925) - **Heresies and scandals** [Haereses & scandala] — must be immediately met and withstood — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1253)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1253) - **Heretics** [Haeretici] — how they slip from one error into another — [Vol II p. 239 (col. 988)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/171-the-fourth-war-namely-the-second-gabaonite-war-or-the-ad/#col-988) - **The ringleaders of heretics** [Haereticorum antesignani] — are rebuilders of Jericho — [Vol II p. 99 (col. 817)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/066-question-lviii-was-any-of-the-jews-so-bold-that-against-/#col-817) - **Ai** [Hai] — was a figure of this world, conquered by Christ — [Vol II p. 199 (col. 938)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/128-question-x-the-king-of-ai-in-what-manner-and-why-was-he-/#col-938) - **What "Haurim" is** [Haurim] — [Vol I p. 204 (col. 204)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/142-question-xxii-marg-how-ought-joshua-to-stand-before-the-/#col-204), [Vol I p. 205 (col. 205)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/143-question-xxiii-marg-what-at-least-universally-and-confus/#col-205); see Urim - **Hiel** [Hiel] — the rebuilder of Jericho — [Vol II p. 97 (col. 816)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/062-question-liv-are-the-builders-the-masons-and-the-workmen/#col-816), [Vol II p. 99 (col. 817)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/066-question-lviii-was-any-of-the-jews-so-bold-that-against-/#col-817) - **Jericho** [Hiericho] — mystically designates the world and the soul of the sinner — [Vol I p. 325 (col. 342)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/218-question-iii-was-rahab-a-harlot/#col-342), [Vol I p. 325 (col. 343)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/219-question-iv-when-the-spies-came-was-rahab-still-exercisi/#col-343) - **Jericho** [Hiericho] — of what thing it is a type — [Vol II p. 66 (col. 777)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/#col-777); likewise [Vol II p. 81 (col. 796)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/045-question-xxxvii-were-infants-boys-and-decrepit-old-men-r/#col-796) - **The circuit of Jericho** [Hierichuntis ambitus] — how many stadia it comprised — [Vol II p. 71 (col. 784)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/037-question-xxix-of-these-seven-days-which-was-the-first-an/#col-784), [Vol II p. 72 (col. 785)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/038-question-xxx-at-what-hour-of-the-seventh-day-was-jericho/#col-785) - **The Jericho of this world** [Hierichuntem huius mundi] — what kind of men destroyed it — [Vol II p. 42 (col. 749)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/016-question-viii-why-did-the-lord-will-that-in-the-siege-of/#col-749) - **The city of Jericho** [Hierichuntinam urbem] — whether the spies entered it by a miracle — [Vol I p. 325 (col. 343)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/219-question-iv-when-the-spies-came-was-rahab-still-exercisi/#col-343), [Vol I p. 328 (col. 344)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/220-question-v-of-what-kind-was-this-same-rahab-a-harlot-whe/#col-344) - **The terror of the people of Jericho** [Hierichuntinorum terror] — was both supernatural and natural — [Vol

I p. 353 (col. 371)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/237-question-xxiii-by-what-way-did-the-spies-go-straight-fro/#col-371) - **A cheerful spirit** [Hilaris animus] — makes all gifts more pleasing — [Vol II p. 37 (col. 744)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/012-question-iv-of-what-kind-were-the-trumpets-of-the-seven-/#col-744) - **The hour** [Hora] — whether it was in use in Joshua's time — [Vol II p. 308 (col. 1063)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/217-question-iv-into-what-place-did-these-enemies-assemble/#col-1063) - **Horeb** [Horeb] — the mountain onto which Moses ascended — [Vol I p. 76 (col. 67)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/044-question-vii-marg-why-was-joshua-bidden-by-moses-to-choo/#col-67) - **When the clock strikes** [Horologio sonante] — whom it befits to pray something — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1044)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1044) - **Suppliant enemies** [Hostes supplicantes] — surrendering themselves, are to be heard — [Vol II p. 235 (col. 982)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/167-question-xxi-whether-many-gabaonites-were-slain-by-king-/#col-982) - **Spiritual enemies** [Hostes spirituales] — are to be trodden down — [Vol II p. 295 (col. 1048)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/#col-1048) - **Hur** [Hur] — husband of Miriam the sister of Moses, grandson of Hezron — [Vol I p. 79 (col. 70)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/047-question-x-marg-who-ascended-with-moses-who-were-they-an/#col-70) - **Hyperbole** [Hyperbole] — customary in the sacred Scriptures — [Vol II p. 306 (col. 1061)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/216-question-iii-of-how-great-a-number-were-these-enemies-ag/#col-1061) - **Hypocrisy and dissimulation** [Hypocrisis & simulatio] — to be avoided — [Vol II p. 237 (col. 983)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/168-question-xxii-from-these-gabaonite-matters-what-is-there/#col-983) - **Hypocrites** [Hypocritae] — are rightly said to be signified by tin and brass — [Vol II p. 84 (col. 800)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/048-question-xl-why-were-the-metals-excepted-from-this-anath/#col-800)

I

- **Janiah** [Ianiach] — a leader of the tribe of Reuben, invented by the Rabbis — [Vol II p. 486 (col. 1283)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/342-question-viii-when-did-joshua-die/#col-1283) - **Idolatry** [Idololatria] — when it began among the Jews — [Vol II p. 471 (col. 1266)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/333-caput-xxiii-opening/#col-1266); and who were afterward polluted by it — [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/333-caput-xxiii-opening/#col-1266) - **The name of "idols"** [Idolorum nomen] — what Joshua understood by it (ch. 24) — [Vol II p. 471 (col. 1266 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/333-caput-xxiii-opening/#col-1266) - **Jehoshua** [Iehosua] — the same to the Hebrews as "Jesua" — [Vol I p. 41 (col. 29)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/023-question-vi-when-was-this-change-of-the-name-made/#col-29) - **"Jehusech"** [Iehusech] — Osiander ineptly coined this word for "Jesus" — [Vol I p. 43 (col. 31)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/027-question-x-whether-iosue-and-iesus-are-one-and-the-same-/#col-31) - **Jerusalem** [Ierusalem] — by what names, and whence, it was called — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 999 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/180-question-ix-whether-the-terror-cast-upon-the-enemies-was/#col-999) - **Jesus Christ** [Iesus Christus] — was the minister of circumcision — [Vol I p. 112 (col. 105)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/070-question-iii-marg-why-was-this-that-joshua-was-moses-s-m/#col-105) - **Jesus Christ** [Iesus Christus] — our truest leader and Commander — [Vol II p. 27 (col. 732)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-732), [Vol II p. 29 (col. 733)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-733); how he divides the land — [Vol II p. 365 (col. 1034)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/201-question-xxix-whether-it-is-a-greater-miracle-for-the-su/#col-1034) - **"Jesus" derived from** ἰᾶσθαι [Iesus ab ἰᾶσθαι] — why some derive it so — [Vol I p. 45 (col. 33)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/027-question-x-whether-iosue-and-iesus-are-one-and-the-same-/#col-33) -

ἰάω [ἰάω] — sometimes signifies "salvation" to the Hebrews — [Vol I p. 45 (col. 33)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/027-question-x-whether-iosue-and-iesus-are-one-and-the-same-/#col-33) - **The name "Jesus," how formed from the Hebrew** [Iesu nomen ex Hebraeo] — [Vol I p. 45 (col. 33)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/027-question-x-whether-iosue-and-iesus-are-one-and-the-same-/#col-33), [Vol I p. 46 (col. 34)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/028-question-xi-how-out-of-the-hebrew-was-the-name-jesus-mad/#col-34) - **The name "Jesus" above every name (Phil. 2)** [Iesu nomen super omne nomen] — how to be understood — [Vol I p. 46 (col. 34)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/028-question-xi-how-out-of-the-hebrew-was-the-name-jesus-mad/#col-34); from the Fathers — [Vol I p. 47 (col. 36)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/029-question-xii-whether-this-name-jesus-is-the-highest-abov/#col-36) - **The name "Jesus" celebrated annually by Clement VII on 15 January** [Iesu nomen à Clemente VII] — [Vol I p. 47 (col. 35)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/029-question-xii-whether-this-name-jesus-is-the-highest-abov/#col-35) - **The name "Jesus" prefigured in Joshua** [Iesu nomen praesignatum Iosue] — and Jesus the son of Josedec — [Vol I p. 47 (col. 36)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/029-question-xii-whether-this-name-jesus-is-the-highest-abov/#col-36) - **The efficacy of the name of Jesus** [Iesu nominis efficacia] — for salvation [Vol I p. 47 (col. 36)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/029-question-xii-whether-this-name-jesus-is-the-highest-abov/#col-36); for curing bodily illnesses, for driving out demons [Vol I p. 48 (col. 37)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/029-question-xii-whether-this-name-jesus-is-the-highest-abov/#col-37), [Vol I p. 49 (col. 38)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/030-question-xiii-how-efficacious-is-this-same-most-august-n/#col-38); for miracles, [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/030-question-xiii-how-efficacious-is-this-same-most-august-n/#col-39); for the solace of souls — [Vol I p. 50 (col. 39)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/030-question-xiii-how-efficacious-is-this-same-most-august-n/#col-39) - **The name "Jesus" more excellent than all amulets** [Iesu nomen amuletis praestantius] — [Vol I p. 52 (col. 41)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/030-question-xiii-how-efficacious-is-this-same-most-august-n/#col-41) - **The name "Jesus"** [Iesu nomen] — the arguments of its attackers are answered — [Vol I p. 58 (col. 47)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-47) - **The Calvinists reproved** [Iesu nomen non reverentes Calviniani] — who do not revere the name "Jesus" — [Vol I p. 59 (col. 48)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-48) - **The veneration of the name of Jesus** [Iesu nominis veneratio] — whether it is improper [Vol I p. 61 (col. 50)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/033-question-xvi-how-the-name-is-to-be-venerated-iosue/#col-50); its excellence — [Vol I p. 62 (col. 51)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/034-question-xvii-how-excellent-above-the-rest-this-name-is/#col-51), [Vol I p. 63 (col. 52)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/034-question-xvii-how-excellent-above-the-rest-this-name-is/#col-52) - **The name "Jesus" signifies God and man** [Iesus nomen Deum & hominem significat] — [Vol I p. 54 (col. 43)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-43), [Vol I p. 55 (col. 44)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-44) - **The name "Jesus" performs miracles ex opere operato** [Iesu nomen miracula peragit] — [Vol I p. 57 (col. 46)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-46) - ΙΗΣΟΥΣ **contains [the number] 888** [ΙΗΣΟΥΣ nomen continet] — [Vol I p. 54 (col. 43)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-43) -

ΙΗΣΟΥΣ**, the anagram** σὺ ἦ ὗις **("thou art [the] son") in Auratus** [ΙΗΣΟΥΣ anagramma] — [Vol I p. 55 (col. 44)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-44) - **Jesuans or Jesuits** [Iesuani vel Iesuitae] — certain people are rightly so called — [Vol I p. 64 (col. 54)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/035-question-xviii-whether-anyone-can-be-called-jesus-or-jos/#col-54) - **Images and statues** [Imagines ac statuae] — for what reasons they may be made and retained — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1253 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1253) - **The just punishments** [Improborum... iustae poenae] — of the wicked, the stubborn, and the foolish — [Vol II p. 468 (col. 1261)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/332-question-iii-did-the-transjordanians-act-rightly-in-erec/#col-1261) - **Infants and children** [Infantibus & pueris] — are to be spared in war — [Vol II p. 81 (col. 796)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/045-question-xxxvii-were-infants-boys-and-decrepit-old-men-r/#col-796) - **A mirror of human weakness** [Infirmitatis humanae speculum] — [Vol II p. 402 (col. 1181)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/285-question-ix-why-did-the-tabernacle-afterward-emigrate-de/#col-1181) - **All iniquity shuns the light** [Iniquitas omnis lucifuga est] — [Vol II p. 118 (col. 842)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/076-question-vii-in-what-manner-was-achan-led-to-these-theft/#col-842) - **Man's disobedience toward God** [Inobedientia hominis erga Deum] — how grave and unworthy — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1044)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1044) - **Ambushes** [Insidiae] — whether they properly belong in war, and whether it is lawful to use them — [Vol II p. 184 (col. 919 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/118-caput-viii-the-second-war-of-ai-bellum-ii-haiense-openin/#col-919) - **"Jobel" and "Jubilee"** [Iobel & Iubilaeus] — whence it is named, and what it is — [Vol II p. 37 (col. 743 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/012-question-iv-of-what-kind-were-the-trumpets-of-the-seven-/#col-743); likewise [Vol II p. 355 (col. 1124 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/252-question-xiv-were-the-sabbatical-and-jubilee-years-begun/#col-1124) - **The Hebrew letter Yod** [Iod] — its various functions — [Vol I p. 38 (col. 26)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/022-question-v-why-specifically-was-the-change-of-joshua-s-n/#col-26) - **The Jordan** [Iordanis] — its origin and etymology — [Vol I p. 408 (col. 427)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/269-question-v-how-wide-and-how-deep-is-the-jordan/#col-427), [Vol I p. 410 (col. 428)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/270-question-vi-in-what-manner-was-the-jordan-divided/#col-428) - **The Jordan** [Iordanis] — its boundary [Vol I p. 410 (col. 429)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/271-question-vii-by-what-efficient-cause-was-the-jordan-divi/#col-429); its breadth, depth — [Vol I p. 412 (col. 430)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/271-question-vii-by-what-efficient-cause-was-the-jordan-divi/#col-430) - **The Jordan** [Iordanis] — why it floods at harvest time — [Vol I p. 414 (col. 433 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/272-question-viii-from-that-efficient-cause-what-came-to-be-/#col-433) - **The division of the Jordan** [Iordanis divisio] — [Vol I p. 418 (col. 436)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/273-question-ix-the-jordan-being-divided-in-what-manner-did-/#col-436); its causes [Vol I p. 421 (col. 440 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/275-question-xi-was-the-bottom-of-the-divided-jordan-dried-u/#col-440); God as its efficient cause — [Vol I p. 418 (col. 437)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/274-question-x-in-what-manner-did-the-other-part-of-the-wate/#col-437) - **The time of the crossing of the Jordan** [Iordanis transitus tempus] — [Vol I p. 431 (col. 450)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/284-question-v-how-were-those-same-12-stones-set-up-in-the-j/#col-450), [Vol I p. 442 (col. 461)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/293-question-i-what-does-the-crossing-through-the-jordan-sig/#col-461) -

The Jordan's flowing back into its former bed [Iordanis in pristinum alveum refluxus] — [Vol I p. 442 (col. 461)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/293-question-i-what-does-the-crossing-through-the-jordan-sig/#col-461), [Vol I p. 444 (col. 462)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/294-question-ii-what-more-does-the-same-crossing-signify/#col-462) - **The crossing of the Jordan, mystically** [Iordanis transitus mystice] — what it means — [Vol I p. 446 (col. 465 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/295-question-iii-what-other-things-are-to-be-noted-in-the-sa/#col-465); likewise [Vol I p. 467 (col. 487)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The new rendering of Joseph Scaliger reproved** [Iosephi Scaligeri versio nova] — [Vol I p. 95 (col. 87)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/060-question-xxiii-marg-of-those-things-which-moses-did-afte/#col-87) - **Joshua's ancestors and genealogy** [Iosuae maiores & genealogia] — [book 1, ch. 1](/works/serarius-joshua-1/007-caput-i-opening/), and [ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/014-question-vii-whose-sons-properly-were-rapha-reseph-and-t/), [qu. 7](/works/serarius-joshua-1/014-question-vii-whose-sons-properly-were-rapha-reseph-and-t/) — namely [the genealogy] of Christ our Lord - **The genealogy of the true Joshua** [Iosuae veri genealogia] — i.e. of Christ — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/016-question-ix-the-typological-genealogy-of-joshua/)* ([bk 1, ch. 1](/works/serarius-joshua-1/007-caput-i-opening/)), [qu. 9](/works/serarius-joshua-1/016-question-ix-the-typological-genealogy-of-joshua/) - **By whom the name of Joshua was changed** [Iosuae nomen à quibus mutatum] — ch. 2, [qu. 2](/works/serarius-joshua-1/009-question-ii-whether-the-first-nine-named-are-properly-ca/) & 3; when, *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/013-question-vi-how-many-cities-and-how-did-the-same-sara-bu/)* [qu. 6](/works/serarius-joshua-1/013-question-vi-how-many-cities-and-how-did-the-same-sara-bu/) — [Vol I p. 40 (col. 28)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/023-question-vi-when-was-this-change-of-the-name-made/#col-28) - **Joshua called "Auses"** [Iosue Auses dictus] — [Vol I p. 41 (col. 29)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/023-question-vi-when-was-this-change-of-the-name-made/#col-29) - **Whether the Innovators rightly use "Josua" for "Josue"** [Iosua pro Iosue] — in their versions — [Vol I p. 42 (col. 30)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/025-question-viii-whether-iehova-is-the-same-among-the-hebre/#col-30) - **Who deny that "Josue" and "Jesus" are the same** [Iosue & Iesus idem esse qui negent] — [Vol I p. 42 (col. 30)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/025-question-viii-whether-iehova-is-the-same-among-the-hebre/#col-30) - **Joshua appointed by Moses as leader of the war against Amalek** [Iosue dux belli Amalecitici] — [Vol I p. 74 (col. 65)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/041-question-iv-marg-what-was-the-cause-of-that-same-war/#col-65) - **Joshua remained with Moses on Mount Sinai** [Iosue cum Moyse in monte Sinai permansit] — [Vol I p. 126 (col. 121)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/080-question-xiv-marg-how-long-did-joshua-remain-on-mount-si/#col-121); what he did there during the forty days — [Vol I p. 128 (col. 123)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/081-question-xv-marg-was-joshua-together-with-moses-in-the-h/#col-123); whether and what food and drink he had on this mountain — [Vol I p. 129 (col. 124)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/082-question-xvi-marg-in-so-many-days-on-the-mountain-what-d/#col-124) - **That Joshua did not help Moses in delivering the laws of the Decalogue is more likely** [Iosue in ferendis Decalogi legibus] — [Vol I p. 134 (col. 129)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/089-question-iv-marg-to-joshua-saying-those-things-what-repl/#col-129); whether he lied in saying, during the descent of Mount Sinai, that he heard the howl of battle — [Vol I p. 135 (col. 130)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/090-question-v-marg-which-of-the-two-heard-the-shouts-of-the/#col-130) - **Why Joshua is called "chosen" out of many** [Iosue cur electus dicatur] — [Vol I p. 146 (col.

141)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/101-question-iv-marg-for-what-cause-did-joshua-wish-to-forbi/#col-141), [Vol I p. 147 (col. 142)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/102-question-v-marg-was-it-true-that-joshua-showed-emulation/#col-142) - **Joshua in place of Moses** [Iosue pro Moyse] — [Vol I p. 146 (col. 141)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/101-question-iv-marg-for-what-cause-did-joshua-wish-to-forbi/#col-141), [Vol I p. 147 (col. 142)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/102-question-v-marg-was-it-true-that-joshua-showed-emulation/#col-142), [Vol I p. 148 (col. 143)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/103-question-vi-marg-was-joshua-s-emulation-for-moses-a-good/#col-143), [Vol I p. 148 (col. 144)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/103-question-vi-marg-was-joshua-s-emulation-for-moses-a-good/#col-144); he was not among the number of the seventy elders — [Vol I p. 152 (col. 148)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/107-question-x-marg-was-joshua-himself-in-the-number-of-thos/#col-148) - **God named Joshua as Moses' successor** [Iosue Moysi successorem Deus nominavit] — [Vol I p. 190 (col. 190)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/127-question-vii-marg-in-the-designation-of-a-successor-how-/#col-190) - **Why Joshua is called the "minister" of Moses** [Iosue cur minister Moysis dictus] — several reasons — [Vol I p. 110 (col. 103)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/069-question-ii-marg-in-what-did-joshua-minister-to-moses/#col-103), [Vol I p. 111 (col. 104)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/070-question-iii-marg-why-was-this-that-joshua-was-moses-s-m/#col-104) - **Joshua a type of the true Jesus our Lord** [Iosue typus veri Iesu] — [Vol I p. 112 (col. 105)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/070-question-iii-marg-why-was-this-that-joshua-was-moses-s-m/#col-105), [Vol I p. 115 (col. 109)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/071-question-iv-marg-to-what-mountain-did-joshua-go-with-mos/#col-109), [Vol I p. 116 (col. 110)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/072-question-v-marg-why-did-moses-lead-him-joshua-with-him-o/#col-110) - **Joshua bidden to stand before the High Priest and question him** [Iosue coram Pontifice stare iubetur] — [Vol I p. 204 (col. 204)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/142-question-xxii-marg-how-ought-joshua-to-stand-before-the-/#col-204) - **Joshua was present at the dying Moses** [Iosue Moysi morienti adfuit] — [Vol I p. 243 (col. 245)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/168-question-v-marg-whether-joshua-was-present-at-moses-s-de/#col-245); not however at his burial — [Vol I p. 244 (col. 246)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/169-question-vi-marg-whether-joshua-was-present-at-the-buria/#col-246) - **Joshua a type of Christ** [Iosue Christi typus] — [Vol I p. 245 (col. 247)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/170-question-vii-marg-whether-joshua-wrote-the-last-chapter-/#col-247), [Vol I p. 399 (col. 417)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/265-question-i-how-many-and-which-priests-carried-the-ark/#col-417) - **Joshua was a notable type of our Saviour** [Iosue praeclarus typus Salvatoris] — in sparing Rahab [Vol II p. 89 (col. 806)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/052-question-xliv-whether-the-household-goods-of-rahab-herse/#col-806); likewise in stretching forth his hand [Vol II p. 197 (col. 935)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/124-question-vi-what-and-to-what-end-was-joshua-bidden-by-th/#col-935); and in other things [Vol II p. 422 (col. 1205)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/304-question-xiii-what-did-the-leader-joshua-display-in-the-/#col-1205); he lacked a wife [Vol II p. 486 (col. 1284)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/342-question-viii-when-did-joshua-die/#col-1284); the Israelites are not read to have mourned him when dead — [Vol II p. 481 (col. 1277)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/339-question-v-whether-joshua-made-to-the-israelites-a-true-/#col-1277) -

The canonical authority of the book of Joshua [Iosue libri authoritas Canonica] — [Vol I p. 250 (col. 252)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/173-prolegomenon-ii-who-is-the-author-of-the-same-book/#col-252); its usefulness, interpreter, division — [Vol I p. 141 (col. 136)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/095-question-iv-marg-how-and-why-did-joshua-not-depart-from-/#col-136), [Vol I p. 142 (col. 137)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/096-question-v-marg-how-long-did-joshua-keep-this-manner-of-/#col-137) - **An Angel appeared to Joshua** [Iosue Angelus apparuit] — [Vol I p. 623 (col. 640)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Joshua's eagerness and diligence** [Iosue alacritas & industria] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 997)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/178-question-vii-how-did-joshua-raise-the-siege-of-gabaon-an/#col-997); his wonderful obedience [Vol II p. 315 (col. 1071)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/223-question-x-why-did-joshua-do-all-these-things-thus/#col-1071); his other virtues — [Vol II p. 420 (col. 1204)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/302-question-xi-which-inheritance-and-where-did-the-commande/#col-1204) - **What "to jubilate" is, according to St. Augustine** [Iubilare quid sit] — [Vol II p. 39 (col. 746)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/013-question-v-what-is-jobel-the-jubilee/#col-746) - **Jubilee** [Iubilaeus] — see "Jobel" above - **The Jews more fortunate in their priests than the Gentiles** [Iudaei suis in sacerdotibus feliciores] — [Vol I p. 231 (col. 233)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/158-question-xxxviii-marg-what-secondly-is-gathered-from-the/#col-233); but Christians surpass both — [Vol I p. 232 (col. 234)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/159-question-xxxix-marg-what-is-gathered-from-what-has-been-/#col-234) - **How great the religious scruple of an oath ought to be among us** [Iurisjurandi quanta religio] — [Vol II p. 163 (col. 896)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/106-question-xxxvii-for-what-causes-does-the-lord-rightly-pu/#col-896)

L

- **What the abundance of milk and honey in the holy land is** [Lactis & mellis copia] — [Vol II p. 330 (col. 1094)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/240-question-iii-of-what-sort-is-this-land-to-be-divided-so-/#col-1094); the abundance of the same in Lithuania — [Vol II p. 334 (col. 1098)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/241-question-iii-compared-to-other-regions-of-what-sort-is-t/#col-1098) - **The stone set under Moses as he prayed signifies various things** [Lapis Moysi orandi suppositus] — [Vol I p. 86 (col. 78)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/052-question-xv-marg-what-did-aaron-and-hur-signify/#col-78), [Vol I p. 87 (col. 79)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/053-question-xvi-marg-the-stone-placed-under-moses-of-what-t/#col-79) - **A stone signifies Christ** [Lapis significat Christum] — [Vol II p. 479 (col. 1275)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/338-question-iv-whether-the-lord-truly-sent-hornets-before-t/#col-1275) - **How a stone is said to have heard the words of God** [Lapis verba Dei audivisse] — [Vol II p. 479 (col. 1275)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/338-question-iv-whether-the-lord-truly-sent-hornets-before-t/#col-1275) - **The twelve stones taken from the Jordan** [Lapides XII è Iordane sublati] — why they were taken, and where they are today [Vol I p. 436 (col. 455)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/290-question-i-how-was-the-jordan-poured-back-into-its-forme/#col-455), [Vol I p. 436 (col. 456)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/291-question-ii-in-what-year-month-and-day-did-this-marvello/#col-456); where exactly they were set up, *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470)* and [Vol I p. 451 (col. 470)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **It was lawful for Joshua to erect stones** [Lapides erigere Iosuae licuit] — [Vol I p. 473 (col.

492)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 473 (col. 493)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **What the stones erected by Joshua mean mystically** [Lapides à Iosue erecti mystice] — [Vol I p. 473 (col. 493)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **All believers are living stones** [Lapides vivi sunt omnes credentes] — [Vol II p. 212 (col. 953)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/145-question-xxvii-what-is-the-allegory-of-this-ceremony/#col-953); which are the "whole" (unhewn) ones — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/145-question-xxvii-what-is-the-allegory-of-this-ceremony/#col-953)* - **Why God willed an altar to be made for himself of unpolished stones** [Lapidibus ex impolitis] — [Vol II p. 205 (col. 945)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/133-question-xv-on-which-mountain-was-the-altar-and-on-this-/#col-945) - **Whether the reading of Holy Scripture is forbidden by the Council of Trent** [Lectio S. Scripturae num per Tridentinum vetita] — [Vol I p. 283 (col. 291)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/193-question-xii-in-what-manner-does-the-lord-confirm-the-sa/#col-291), [Vol I p. 285 (col. 292)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/193-question-xii-in-what-manner-does-the-lord-confirm-the-sa/#col-291) - **The Levites were taken by God from the Israelites as a kind of tithe** [Levitae quasi decimae] — and what wealth they possessed [Vol II p. 342 (col. 1107 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/243-question-v-into-what-parts-was-the-land-divided/#col-1107); what their condition was [Vol II p. 441 (col. 1229 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/318-caput-xxi-opening/#col-1229) - **On what day the Law was given on Mount Sinai** [Lex in monte Sinai data] — of the third month and of the Egyptian exodus [Vol I p. 119 (col. 114)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/075-question-viii-marg-on-what-day-was-that-command-of-exod-/#col-114), [Vol I p. 120 (col. 115)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/076-question-ix-marg-on-what-day-both-of-the-third-month-and/#col-115); when confirmed — [Vol I p. 120 (col. 115)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/076-question-ix-marg-on-what-day-both-of-the-third-month-and/#col-115) - **The things pertaining to the Law of God** [ad Legem Dei quae spectant] — are held either in writing or communicated orally — [Vol I p. 238 (col. 239)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/165-question-ii-marg-whether-joshua-the-successor-received-t/#col-239) - **How Jesus wrote his new law** [Legem suam novam quomodo scribebat Iesus] — [Vol II p. 212 (col. 954)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/145-question-xxvii-what-is-the-allegory-of-this-ceremony/#col-954); how he bequeaths the same to us [Vol II p. 213 (col. 955)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/145-question-xxvii-what-is-the-allegory-of-this-ceremony/#col-955); and to whom he bequeaths it — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/145-question-xxvii-what-is-the-allegory-of-this-ceremony/#col-955)* - **The compendium of all the Mosaic laws, how many precepts it contains** [Legum omnium Mosaicarum compendium] — [Vol II p. 210 (col. 952)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-952) - **What the "Book of the Just" is** [Liber iustorum] — various opinions — [Vol II p. 365 (col. 1036)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/202-question-xxx-whether-on-account-of-this-miracle-joshua-i/#col-1036), [Vol II p. 365 (col. 1038)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/205-question-xxxiii-whether-the-things-which-our-text-adduce/#col-1038) - **The Rabbis say that some canonical books were burned by Ezra and others** [Libros Canonicos ab Esdra combustos] — [Vol II p. 289 (col. 1039)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/205-question-xxxiii-whether-the-things-which-our-text-adduce/#col-1039) - **The learning of the Gentiles signified by King Dabir** [Litterae gentilium per Regem Dabir] — original

prints col. 1649 (a misprint; the work ends at col. 1298) - **Religion is not bound to such fixed places that we may sin freely** [Locis non ita certis alligata Religio] — [Vol II p. 402 (col. 1181)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/285-question-ix-why-did-the-tabernacle-afterward-emigrate-de/#col-1181) - **Whether "Lucifer" is a name of the devil** [Lucifer an daemonis nomen] — [Vol I p. 659 (col. 670)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The opinions of Luther and others on the sacrilegious** [Lutheri sententiae in sacrilegos] — [Vol II p. 173 (col. 907)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/111-question-xlii-whom-can-achan-s-punishment-terrify/#col-907), [Vol II p. 173 (col. 908)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/111-question-xlii-whom-can-achan-s-punishment-terrify/#col-908)

M

- **Whether it is lawful to use magic arts in war against the enemy** [Magicis artibus in bello uti] — [Vol II p. 190 (col. 928)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-928) - **When the manna ceased** [Manna quando defecerit] — [Vol I p. 608 (col. 627)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); its three causes — [Vol I p. 611 (col. 629)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Manna never fell for the Israelites after their entry into the land of promise** [Manna post ingressum] — [Vol I p. 612 (col. 630)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The laying-on of hands, sixfold** [Manuum impositio sextuplex] — [Vol I p. 193 (col. 193)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/129-question-ix-marg-in-the-divine-naming-of-a-successor-did/#col-193) - **How the laying-on of hands was performed on Joshua** [Manuum impositio in Iosue] — [Vol I p. 194 (col. 194)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/131-question-xi-marg-the-imposition-of-hands-how-manifold-an/#col-194); what its effect was [Vol I p. 195 (col. 195)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/132-question-xii-marg-where-and-how-was-this-imposition-of-h/#col-195); done by Moses as an extraordinary Priest and Pontiff — [Vol I p. 197 (col. 197)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/134-question-xiv-marg-was-joshua-at-once-with-the-imposition/#col-197) - **Why it is called the "Sea of Salt"** [Mare salis cur dicatur] — [Vol I p. 427 (col. 446)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/281-question-ii-how-great-and-of-what-sort-were-those-12-sto/#col-446) - **The Virgin Mary** [Maris Virgo] — why Rahab can in some way be compared to her — [Vol I p. 380 (col. 397)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/252-question-iv-who-were-the-heralds-and-what-about-the-time/#col-397) - **Masius's grave censure concerning the sanctuaries of Christians** [Masii de asylis censura] — [Vol II p. 437 (col. 1223 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/315-question-x-whether-among-the-israelites-and-among-christ/#col-1223) - **The election of St. Matthias made by lot** [S. Matthiae electio sortitione] — [Vol II p. 139 (col. 867)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/089-question-xx-of-lots-which-of-their-own-kind-are-not-vici/#col-867) - **The "midst of heaven" is understood in three ways** [Medium coeli tripliciter] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1011)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/190-question-xviii-whether-joshua-rightly-asked-and-commande/#col-1011) - **The abundance of honey in the holy land** [Mellis copia in terra sancta] — etc.; see "Milk" above - **Whether it is ever lawful to deceive enemies by a lie** [Mendacio hostes circumvenire] — [Vol II p. 220 (col. 963 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-963) - **Some months were called "Kings" by the ancient Jews** [Menses à Iudaeis appellati Reges] — [Vol II p. 232 (col. 977)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-977) -

The term "merit" used by a heretic [Meriti nomen ab haeretico usurpatum] — [Vol II p. 170 (col. 903)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/107-question-xxxviii-whether-human-judges-can-extend-even-th/#col-903) - **Harvest in Scripture is twofold** [Messis in Scriptura duplex] — [Vol I p. 414 (col. 432)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/272-question-viii-from-that-efficient-cause-what-came-to-be-/#col-432) - **The time of the wheat harvest among the Jews, the month of May** [Messis triticeae tempus] — [Vol I p. 414 (col. 432)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/272-question-viii-from-that-efficient-cause-what-came-to-be-/#col-432) - **Why metals alone of all things were preserved in the destruction of Jericho** [Metalla in Hierichuntis excidio servata] — [Vol II p. 82 (col. 797)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/047-question-xxxix-why-was-so-dire-an-anathema-inflicted-upo/#col-797) - **The etymology of the name Michael** [S. Michaelis etymon] — [Vol I p. 633 (col. 650)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Why St. Michael appeared to Joshua armed** [S. Michael cur armatus apparuerit] — [Vol I p. 676 (col. 684)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); his sword is the word of God — [Vol I p. 679 (col. 685)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **An example of soldiers toward their leader, and subjects toward a superior** [Militum erga Ducem exemplum] — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1254)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1254) - **The praise of a good and faithful minister** [Ministri boni & fidelis laus] — [Vol II p. 148 (col. 879)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/096-question-xxvii-of-what-kind-was-achan-s-confession/#col-879) - **Two kinds of marvels** [Mirabilium duo genera] — [Vol I p. 395 (col. 412)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/262-question-xiv-what-again-did-joshua-say-to-the-people/#col-412) - **How some monks, deceived after their profession, perished** [Monachi post professionem decepti] — [Vol II p. 173 (col. 908 & seq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/111-question-xlii-whom-can-achan-s-punishment-terrify/#col-908) - **Moncaeus on the golden calf** [Moncaeus de vitulo aureo] — [Vol II p. 483 (col. 1279)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/341-question-vii-how-did-joshua-strike-make-a-covenant-with-/#col-1279) - **Friendly admonitions are useful** [Monitiones amicae utiles] — [Vol II p. 462 (col. 1255)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/331-question-ii-how-did-they-depart-and-how-as-they-departed/#col-1255); nor to be taken ill — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/331-question-ii-how-did-they-depart-and-how-as-they-departed/#col-1255)* - **What the dying are wont most to impress upon their own** [Morituri quaenam inculcare soleant] — [Vol II p. 464 (col. 1258)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/332-question-iii-did-the-transjordanians-act-rightly-in-erec/#col-1258) - **Preparation for death** [Mortis praeparatio] — [Vol I p. 294 (col. 301)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/198-question-iv-when-was-this-same-preparation-commanded/#col-301), [Vol I p. 294 (col. 302)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/198-question-iv-when-was-this-same-preparation-commanded/#col-301) - **A figure of the death of Christ and of the liberty acquired through it** [Mortis Christi figura] — [Vol II p. 428 (col. 1213)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/310-question-v-why-did-the-death-of-the-high-priest-free-the/#col-1213) - **The excellence of Moses, and a comparison of him with the other Prophets** [Moysis praestantia] — [Vol II p. 365 (col. 1034)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/201-question-xxix-whether-it-is-a-greater-miracle-for-the-su/#col-1034) - **Blessed Mutius the Hermit made the sun stand still** [B. Mutius Eremita] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1026 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/196-question-xxiv-whether-so-long-a-day-had-never-been-befor/#col-1026)

N

- **Nahshon, prince of the tribe of Judah** [Naasson tribus Iudae Princeps] — [Vol II p. 97 (col. 816)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/062-question-liv-are-the-builders-the-masons-and-the-workmen/#col-816) - **When the Nethinim received their name** [Nathinaei quando nomen acceperint] — [Vol II p. 233 (col. 979)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/166-question-xx-whether-the-gabaonites-are-the-nethinim/#col-979) - **A greater affair is to be preferred to a lesser** [Negotium maius minori praeponendum] — [Vol II p. 289 (col. 1045)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/#col-1045) - **Nicholas Crell's confession revealed by the Preachers** [Nicolai Crellii confessio] — [Vol II p. 148 (col. 878)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/096-question-xxvii-of-what-kind-was-achan-s-confession/#col-878); his syllogism — [Vol II p. 330 (col. 1093)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/240-question-iii-of-what-sort-is-this-land-to-be-divided-so-/#col-1093) - **The varied name and meaning of Nun, Joshua's father** [Nomen varium Nun] — [Vol I p. 28 (col. 15)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/014-question-vii-whose-sons-properly-were-rapha-reseph-and-t/#col-15) - **It is permitted to anyone to impose a name at first, but not to anyone to change it** [Nomen imponere fas, mutare non fas] — [Vol I p. 33 (col. 20)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/021-question-iv-what-in-general-is-the-cause-of-changing-nam/#col-20) - **The excellence of a name is taken either from its sound or from its meaning** [Nominis praestantia ex sono vel significatione] — [Vol I p. 47 (col. 35)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/029-question-xii-whether-this-name-jesus-is-the-highest-abov/#col-35) - **What it is "to come in the name of"** [in Nomine venire quid sit] — [Vol II p. 222 (col. 966 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-966) - **Names were formerly given to cities for various reasons** [Nomina urbibus variis de causis indita] — [Vol II p. 216 (col. 960)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/147-question-i-what-city-is-gabaon-and-where/#col-960) - **Why names were formerly given at Circumcision, now at baptism** [Nomina cur olim in Circumcisione, nunc in baptismo] — [Vol I p. 28 (col. 15)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/014-question-vii-whose-sons-properly-were-rapha-reseph-and-t/#col-15) - **Names changed at baptism, Confirmation, entry into religious life, and the reception of Holy Orders** [Nomina mutata in baptismate] — [Vol I p. 34 (col. 21)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/021-question-iv-what-in-general-is-the-cause-of-changing-nam/#col-21), [Vol I p. 34 (col. 22)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/021-question-iv-what-in-general-is-the-cause-of-changing-nam/#col-22) - **Divine names can also be attributed to creatures, but in an inferior manner** [Nomina divina creaturis tribui] — [Vol I p. 93 (col. 85)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/059-question-xxii-marg-what-things-did-moses-do-after-the-vi/#col-85), [Vol I p. 94 (col. 86)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/060-question-xxiii-marg-of-those-things-which-moses-did-afte/#col-86) - **The causes of changing names** [Nominum mutandorum causae] — efficient: God, a good Angel, a bad Angel, men [Vol I p. 33 (col. 20)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/021-question-iv-what-in-general-is-the-cause-of-changing-nam/#col-20); final: impiety, ambition, and fraud — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/021-question-iv-what-in-general-is-the-cause-of-changing-nam/#col-20)* - **Honor is customarily shown to the proper names of great men when they are named** [Nominibus magnorum virorum honos] — [Vol I p. 46 (col. 34)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/028-question-xi-how-out-of-the-hebrew-was-the-name-jesus-mad/#col-34), [Vol I p. 47 (col. 35)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/029-question-xii-whether-this-name-jesus-is-the-highest-abov/#col-35) - **How satisfaction is made to good and great names** [Nominibus bonis magnisque satis fit] — [Vol I p. 66 (col.

56)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/036-question-xix-whether-at-least-anything-can-be-denominate/#col-56), [Vol I p. 67 (col. 57)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/036-question-xix-whether-at-least-anything-can-be-denominate/#col-57) - **The Innovator Beza wrongly charges the Latin interpreter of Sacred Scripture with barbarism** [Novator Beza barbarismi insimulat] — [Vol I p. 382 (col. 398)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/253-question-v-about-the-manner-of-the-advance-do-the-same-h/#col-398)

O

- **The virtue of obedience** [Obedientiae virtus] — [Vol I p. 308 (col. 316)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/205-question-v-why-did-joshua-warn-them-of-such-things/#col-315), [Vol I p. 308 (col. 317)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/206-question-vi-what-can-be-learned-from-the-response-of-the/#col-317) - **The praise of obedience** [Obedientiae laus] — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1254)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1254); how great it was in Moses and Joshua — [Vol II p. 315 (col. 1071)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/223-question-x-why-did-joshua-do-all-these-things-thus/#col-1071) - **What an obedient person ought to be like** [Obediens qualis esse debeat] — [Vol II p. 315 (col. 1071 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/223-question-x-why-did-joshua-do-all-these-things-thus/#col-1071) - **How God is said to obey man** [Obedire quomodo Deus dicatur homini] — [Vol II p. 347 (col. 1113 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/247-question-ix-whether-the-land-ought-to-have-been-divided-/#col-1113) - **There is nothing hidden that will not sometime be revealed** [Occultum nihil est] — [Vol II p. 120 (col. 843)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/077-question-viii-in-what-manner-did-achan-cover-his-thefts/#col-843) - **How many evils the neglected guarding of the eyes has caused** [Oculorum neglecta custodia] — [Vol II p. 115 (col. 838 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/075-question-vi-what-and-how-much-of-gold-did-achan-steal/#col-838); how necessary the diligent guarding of them is — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/075-question-vi-what-and-how-much-of-gold-did-achan-steal/#col-838)* - **The Innovators wrongly despise works of supererogation** [Opera supererogationis] — [Vol I p. 92 (col. 84)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/057-question-xx-marg-what-was-the-second-of-those-things-whi/#col-84) - **How much weight an opinion taught by men can have** [Opinio ab hominibus praecepta] — [Vol II p. 118 (col. 841)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/076-question-vii-in-what-manner-was-achan-led-to-these-theft/#col-841) - **The efficacy of prayer** [Orationis efficacia] — [Vol I p. 82 (col. 73)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/050-question-xiii-marg-how-meanwhile-was-joshua-fighting/#col-73), [Vol I p. 83 (col. 74)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/051-question-xiv-marg-why-when-moses-s-hands-were-lifted-up-/#col-74) - **At the time of prayer, outward reverence too must be shown to God** [Orationis tempore externa reverentia] — [Vol I p. 694 (col. 705)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **By a circular going-around, eternity is signified** [Orbiculari circuitione aeternitas] — [Vol II p. 67 (col. 780)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/#col-780) - **The different orders in God's Church are mutually necessary to one another** [Ordines diversi in Dei Ecclesia] — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 769)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-769)

P

- **By the word "peace" the Hebrews signify all prosperity** [Pacis nomine Hebraei omnem faustitatem] — [Vol II p. 349 (col. 1116)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/248-question-x-who-were-the-dividers-of-the-promised-land/#col-1116) - **The reason for carrying palms on the Sabbath among the Jews** [Palmarum in Sabbato gestatio] — [Vol I p. 523 (col. 546)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **To divide bread, and to eat together, are signs of goodwill** [Panem dividere signa benevolentiae] — [Vol II p. 222 (col. 966)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/151-question-v-whether-the-gabaonites-rightly-employed-the-f/#col-966) - **How often parents' forebodings about their children are vain** [Parentum de filiis auguria] — [Vol II p. 100 (col. 819)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/067-question-lix-did-hiel-do-it-against-the-same-imprecation/#col-819) - **The etymology of "Pascha"** [Paschatis etymon] — [Vol I p. 520 (col. 540)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 520 (col. 541 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **To "make the Pasch" properly is to sacrifice the paschal lamb** [Pascha facere] — [Vol I p. 521 (col. 544)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The primary end of the Pasch** [Paschatis finis primarius] — [Vol I p. 521 (col. 545)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The matter of the Pasch: a lamb and a kid** [Paschatis materia Agnus & Hoedus] — [Vol I p. 523 (col. 547)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Three conditions of the matter of the Pasch** [Paschatis materiae conditiones tres] — that the lamb be without blemish, male, a yearling [Vol I p. 528 (col. 550)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); and the reasons for these conditions — [Vol I p. 529 (col. 551)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 531 (col. 552)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The formal cause of the Pasch: consumption** [Paschatis formalis causa consumptio] — [Vol I p. 531 (col. 553)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Why no uncircumcised person may eat the Pasch** [Paschate vesci incircumcisus] — [Vol I p. 535 (col. 556)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 535 (col. 557)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Who, even among the circumcised, could not eat the Pasch** [Paschate vesci qui non potuerint] — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470)* - **The manner of eating the Pasch is twofold** [Paschatis edendi modus duplex] — [Vol I p. 539 (col. 560)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); each variously explained — [Vol I p. 539 (col. 561 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Why the Lord willed the remainder of the Pasch to be burned with fire** [Paschatis residuum igne comburi] — [Vol I p. 543 (col. 565)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 546 (col. 566)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Those eating the Pasch employed four customs** [Pascha edentes quatuor modos] — [Vol I p. 548 (col. 568)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) -

The three places of the Pasch [Paschatis loca tria] — first Egypt, second the Sinai wilderness, third the land of promise — [Vol I p. 551 (col. 571)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The year of the Pasch's celebration** [Paschatis celebrati annus] — [Vol I p. 555 (col. 575)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 555 (col. 576)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); the month, corresponding to our March and April, *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470)* & seqq.; the day, ordinarily the fourteenth of Nisan [Vol I p. 563 (col. 584 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470); it could extraordinarily be transferred to another day — [Vol I p. 570 (col. 590)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The hour of eating the Pasch** [Paschatis edendi hora] — [Vol I p. 580 (col. 600)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470), [Vol I p. 582 (col. 603)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The Jewish Pasch ceased after the coming of Christ** [Pascha Iudaicum post Christi adventum desiit] — [Vol I p. 589 (col. 608)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The bloody Pasch was a type of our unbloody one** [Pascha cruentum incruenti typus] — [Vol I p. 589 (col. 609)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **What the paschal lamb means mystically** [Paschalis agnus mystice] — [Vol I p. 614 (col. 632)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **A description of the present-day Pasch of the Jews** [Paschatis hodierni Iudaeorum descriptio] — [Vol I p. 618 (col. 636)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Slanderous tongues are to be borne patiently** [Patienter ferendae linguae maledicae] — [Vol II p. 295 (col. 1046)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/#col-1046) - **A few stout-hearted men often rout and lay low many** [Pauci cordati multos fugant] — [Vol II p. 207 (col. 948)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/135-question-xvii-what-sacrifices-were-made-on-ebal/#col-948) - **Peace does not judge of uncertain things, nor confirm things unknown** [Pax de incertis non iudicat] — [Vol II p. 227 (col. 972)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/157-question-xi-whether-the-israelites-were-bound-by-the-oat/#col-972) - **"To sin against God" is understood in two ways** [Peccare Deo dupliciter] — [Vol II p. 105 (col. 826)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/070-question-i-who-was-achan/#col-826) - **The sin of one is often the cause of the punishment of many** [Peccatum unius causa punitionis multorum] — [Vol II p. 159 (col. 892 & seq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/103-question-xxxiv-why-were-stones-cast-upon-the-ashes-or-th/#col-892) - **For an unknown sin, some temporal punishments not rarely remain** [Peccato ignoto temporales poenae] — [Vol II p. 459 (col. 1252)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/329-caput-xxii-opening/#col-1252) - **Sins must be set forth specifically in confession** [Peccata in confessione speciatim exponenda] — [Vol II p. 148 (col. 877 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/096-question-xxvii-of-what-kind-was-achan-s-confession/#col-877) - **Monies are sometimes called by the names of animals** [Pecuniae nominibus animalium] — [Vol II p. 496 (col. 1293)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/350-question-xvi-when-were-joseph-s-bones-buried/#col-1293); and are marked with their figures — [Vol II p. 496 (col. 1294)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/350-question-xvi-when-were-joseph-s-bones-buried/#col-1294) - **The Jewish Pentecost can be considered in two ways** [Pentecoste Iudaica duplex] — [Vol I p. 123 (col. 118)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/078-question-xi-marg-was-the-jewish-pentecost-instituted-for/#col-118);

with each of which ours agrees — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/078-question-xi-marg-was-the-jewish-pentecost-instituted-for/#col-118)* - **The Jewish Pentecost a type of ours** [Pentecoste Iudaica nostrae typus] — [Vol I p. 125 (col. 120)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/079-question-xii-marg-does-our-pentecost-agree-as-to-time-wi/#col-120) - **The Persians put to flight by flies** [Persae à muscis fugati] — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1044)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1044) - **Peter of Blois made a memory lapse** [Petrus Blesensis memoria lapsus] — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1253)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1253) - **Base pictures and statues are not to be tolerated** [Picturae & statuae turpes] — [Vol II p. 205 (col. 946)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/133-question-xv-on-which-mountain-was-the-altar-and-on-this-/#col-946) - **What men the metal lead signifies** [Plumbum quosnam homines significet] — [Vol II p. 84 (col. 800)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/048-question-xl-why-were-the-metals-excepted-from-this-anath/#col-800) - **Against whom the penalty of stoning was formerly established by law** [Poena lapidationis] — [Vol I p. 170 (col. 169)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/116-question-ix-marg-did-the-people-wish-to-stone-joshua-and/#col-169) - **The punishment of the ten murmuring spies** [Poena decem exploratorum] — [Vol I p. 162 (col. 159)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/111-question-iv-marg-ought-joshua-to-have-opposed-the-explor/#col-159), [Vol I p. 162 (col. 160)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/111-question-iv-marg-ought-joshua-to-have-opposed-the-explor/#col-160) - **The example of Achan's penitence is not to be despised** [Poenitentiae Achanis exemplum] — [Vol II p. 170 (col. 903)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/107-question-xxxviii-whether-human-judges-can-extend-even-th/#col-903) - **An example of politicians and courtiers in Hiel** [Politicorum & aulicorum exemplum in Hiel] — [Vol II p. 99 (col. 817)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/066-question-lviii-was-any-of-the-jews-so-bold-that-against-/#col-817) - **In deciding articles of faith and controversies, the Pontiffs must have recourse to God** [Pontifices ad Deum confugere] — [Vol I p. 228 (col. 230)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/156-question-xxxvi-marg-did-joshua-ever-use-urim-and-thummim/#col-230) - **The people neither chose Joshua nor laid hands on him** [Populus Iosue nec elegit] — [Vol I p. 234 (col. 235)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/161-question-xli-marg-what-is-to-be-noted-in-this-election-o/#col-235), [Vol I p. 235 (col. 236)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/162-question-xlii-marg-what-did-eleazar-the-pontiff-do-in-th/#col-236) - **The obedience of the Israelite people toward Joshua** [Populi Israelitici obedientia] — [Vol I p. 43 (col. 31)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/027-question-x-whether-iosue-and-iesus-are-one-and-the-same-/#col-31) - **Moses was unwilling that the people be left without a leader, and for what reasons** [Populum sine Principe relinqui noluit Moyses] — [Vol I p. 188 (col. 188)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/126-question-vi-marg-why-does-moses-shudder-to-leave-the-peo/#col-188), [Vol I p. 189 (col. 189)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/126-question-vi-marg-why-does-moses-shudder-to-leave-the-peo/#col-189) - **An example of superiors' goodwill toward their subjects** [Praepositorum erga subditos benevolentia] — [Vol II p. 460 (col. 1254)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/330-question-i-what-and-how-did-joshua-speak-to-the-transjor/#col-1254) - **What the true praise of a ruler is** [Principis quae vera laus sit] — [Vol II p. 483 (col. 1279)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/341-question-vii-how-did-joshua-strike-make-a-covenant-with-/#col-1279) - **A good ruler is the father of his subjects** [Princeps bonus subditorum pater] — [Vol II p. 143 (col. 872)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/092-question-xxiii-how-with-the-occasion-of-a-night-interven/#col-872) - **Rulers should be devoted to sacred letters** [Principes sacrarum literarum studiosi] — [Vol I p. 279 (col. 287)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/193-question-xii-in-what-manner-does-the-lord-confirm-the-sa/#col-287) -

Who the "princes of the people" were [Princeps populi qui fuerint] — various opinions — [Vol I p. 264 (col. 269)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/188-question-vii-what-are-the-boundaries-of-that-same-land/#col-269) - **The princes of the Jewish people were of two kinds, Political and Ecclesiastical** [Principes populi Iudaici duplices] — and those various — [Vol I p. 154 (col. 151)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/107-question-x-marg-was-joshua-himself-in-the-number-of-thos/#col-149), [Vol I p. 156 (col. 153)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/109-question-i-marg-when-the-explorers-were-sent-was-joshua-/#col-153) - **Religion ought to be of the highest care to Christian rulers** [Principibus Christianis summae curae Religio] — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 770)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-770); and the public good — [Vol II p. 420 (col. 1204)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/302-question-xi-which-inheritance-and-where-did-the-commande/#col-1204) - **The Pool of Bethesda** [Probatica piscina] — [Vol II p. 232 (col. 978)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-978) - **A procession of Christians when Jerusalem was captured** [Processio Christianorum Hierosolymis captis] — [Vol II p. 57 (col. 768)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/031-question-xxiii-how-did-the-israelites-enter-the-city-and/#col-768) - **Examples of sacred processions** [Processionum sacrarum exempla] — [Vol II p. 57 (col. 768)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/031-question-xxiii-how-did-the-israelites-enter-the-city-and/#col-768), [Vol II p. 59 (col. 770)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-770) - **Whether a promise made on the credit of a false assertion binds the parties** [Promissio sub fide falsae assertionis] — [Vol II p. 227 (col. 971)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/157-question-xi-whether-the-israelites-were-bound-by-the-oat/#col-971) - **A condition is wont to be implicit in God's promises** [Promissis Dei inesse conditio] — [Vol II p. 126 (col. 851)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/082-question-xiii-what-was-joshua-s-prayer-to-god/#col-851), [Vol II p. 378 (col. 1152)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/263-question-vii-whether-hebron-was-stormed-by-joshua-or-by-/#col-1152) - **Joshua can be called "servant" (puer) in two ways** [Puer dupliciter dici potest Iosue] — [Vol I p. 125 (col. 120)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/079-question-xii-marg-does-our-pentecost-agree-as-to-time-wi/#col-120) - **How we ought to conduct ourselves, fighting against the kings of hell** [Pugnantes contra inferorum Reges] — [Vol II p. 295 (col. 1046)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/#col-1046) - **A beautiful figure of those fighting against the crimes of the world** [Pugnantium contra mundi flagitia figura] — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 770)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-770) - **Pythagoras placed very great importance in the numerical values of the letters of names** [Pythagoras in nominum Arithmeticis litteris] — [Vol I p. 54 (col. 43)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-43)

Q

- **The oak in the Sanctuary of the Lord** [Quercus in Sanctuario Domini] — [Vol II p. 478 (col. 1274)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/337-question-iii-whether-also-in-joshua-s-own-time-there-wer/#col-1274)

R

- **The name "Rahab," what it means** [Raab nomen quod] — [Vol I p. 328 (col. 344)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/220-question-v-of-what-kind-was-this-same-rahab-a-harlot-whe/#col-344),

[Vol I p. 330 (col. 345)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/220-question-v-of-what-kind-was-this-same-rahab-a-harlot-whe/#col-345) *(original misprints 345 as "245")* - **Rahab was properly a harlot** [Raab proprie meretrix fuit] — [Vol I p. 325 (col. 343 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/219-question-iv-when-the-spies-came-was-rahab-still-exercisi/#col-343); from whose lineage Christ draws his origin (Matt. ch. 1) — [Vol I p. 334 (col. 351)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/225-question-x-where-when-and-how-did-rahab-hide-the-spies/#col-351) - **Rahab was only a harlot, not also an innkeeper** [Raab meretrix tantum, non cauponaria] — [Vol I p. 336 (col. 353)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/226-question-xi-did-rahab-lie/#col-353), [Vol I p. 338 (col. 354)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/227-question-xiii-whether-in-order-that-the-spies-be-preserv/#col-354) - **Rahab hid the spies under flax** [Raab exploratores sub lino abscondit] — [Vol I p. 362 (col. 359)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/231-question-xvii-whether-the-knowledge-which-was-in-rahab-c/#col-358) - **Rahab guilty of a fourfold lie** [Raab quadruplicis mendacii rea] — [Vol I p. 362 (col. 362)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/232-question-xviii-what-was-the-nature-of-the-terror-which-h/#col-362); the gravity of her lie is mitigated — [Vol I p. 362 (col. 363)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/233-question-xix-what-did-rahab-seek-from-the-spies/#col-363) - **Whether Rahab betrayed her country** [Raab num patriam prodiderit] — [Vol I p. 350 (col. 365)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/234-question-xx-whether-the-spies-granted-rahab-s-demands-an/#col-365); whether she would have sinned by killing the spies — [Vol I p. 350 (col. 366)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/234-question-xx-whether-the-spies-granted-rahab-s-demands-an/#col-366) - **The faith with which Rahab received the spies was both supernatural and natural** [Raab fides qua exploratores excepit] — [Vol I p. 351 (col. 370)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/236-question-xxii-how-could-rahab-let-them-down-from-the-cit/#col-370) - **Rahab asked four things of the spies** [Raab quatuor ab exploratoribus petiit] — [Vol I p. 354 (col. 372)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/238-question-xxiv-in-what-order-were-all-these-things-said-a/#col-372); and the spies granted them to her — [Vol I p. 358 (col. 375)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/239-question-xxv-in-what-language-did-rahab-and-the-spies-sp/#col-375) *(original misprints 375 as "275")* - **Rahab let the spies down from the wall** [Raab è muro demisit exploratores] — [Vol I p. 362 (col. 359)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/231-question-xvii-whether-the-knowledge-which-was-in-rahab-c/#col-358), [Vol I p. 373 (col. 390)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/249-question-i-when-did-the-israelites-come-to-the-bank-of-t/#col-390); in what language she spoke with them — [Vol I p. 362 (col. 363)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/233-question-xix-what-did-rahab-seek-from-the-spies/#col-363) - **How much merit Rahab had by her own deed** [Raab quantum meritum habuerit] — [Vol II p. 87 (col. 803)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/051-question-xliii-of-the-anathema-of-persons-who-were-excep/#col-803); the Rabbis trifle that she was taken as a wife — [Vol II p. 89 (col. 806)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/052-question-xliv-whether-the-household-goods-of-rahab-herse/#col-806), [Vol II p. 92 (col. 809)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/055-question-xlvii-what-manner-was-used-in-preserving-rahab-/#col-809) - **The Rabbis' fables about the letter Yod** [Rabbinorum fabulae de littera Iod] — [Vol I p. 39 (col. 27)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/022-question-v-why-specifically-was-the-change-of-joshua-s-n/#col-27) - **The Rabbis' opinion about the falling of the walls of Jericho** [Rabbinorum de murorum Hierichuntis lapsu sententia] — [Vol II p. 50 (col. 759)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/026-question-xviii-concerning-the-anathematizing-of-the-city/#col-759), [Vol II p. 54 (col. 764)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/029-question-xxi-whether-the-same-walls-collapsed-of-their-o/#col-764) - **The errors and fables of the Rabbis** [Rabbinorum errores & fabulae] — [Vol II p. 91 (col.

808)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/054-question-xlvi-for-what-causes-was-rahab-preserved-with-a/#col-808), [Vol II p. 92 (col. 809)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/055-question-xlvii-what-manner-was-used-in-preserving-rahab-/#col-809), [Vol II p. 370 (col. 1141)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/259-question-iii-who-and-of-what-sort-was-the-man-caleb/#col-1141), [Vol II p. 370 (col. 1142)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/259-question-iii-who-and-of-what-sort-was-the-man-caleb/#col-1142), [Vol II p. 408 (col. 1190)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/291-caput-xix-concerning-the-portions-of-the-remaining-six-t/#col-1190), [Vol II p. 411 (col. 1194)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/295-question-iv-whether-by-an-error-of-the-lot-or-in-what-ot/#col-1194), [Vol II p. 485 (col. 1281)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/341-question-vii-how-did-joshua-strike-make-a-covenant-with-/#col-1281)

- **The weakness of human reason** [Rationis humanae imbecilitas] — [Vol II p. 410 (col. 1192)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/293-question-ii-by-what-right-or-manner-was-the-simeonic-por/#col-1192), [Vol II p. 411 (col. 1193)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/295-question-iv-whether-by-an-error-of-the-lot-or-in-what-ot/#col-1193)

- **Why captured kings were trodden under foot** [Reges capti pedibus calcati] — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1041)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/208-question-xxxvi-whither-how-and-when-did-the-victorious-i/#col-1041); what their names signify — [Vol II p. 295 (col. 1049)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/212-question-xl-on-the-allegory-of-this-war/#col-1049)

- **How great kings formerly were** [Reges quanti olim fuerint] — [Vol II p. 324 (col. 1084)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/232-question-i-how-many-and-which-kings-were-subdued-and-des/#col-1084); how inconstant their fortune — [Vol II p. 289 (col. 1045)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/#col-1045)

- **What the golden rule was** [Regula aurea quid fuerit] — [Vol II p. 113 (col. 836 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/074-question-v-what-and-how-much-silver-did-achan-steal/#col-836)

- **The affairs of religion are not to be done slowly and sluggishly** [Religionis negotia non lente agenda] — [Vol II p. 458 (col. 1250)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/328-question-x-whether-in-the-levitic-cities-besides-the-lev/#col-1250)

- **The differing disposition of those who hear and watch divine things** [Res divinas audientium dispar animus] — [Vol II p. 233 (col. 980)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/166-question-xx-whether-the-gabaonites-are-the-nethinim/#col-980)

- **An infant king carried in his cradle to battle** [Rex infantulus in cunis ad praelium gestatus] — [Vol II p. 59 (col. 769)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/032-question-xxiv-for-what-reason-did-the-lord-will-this-war/#col-769)

S

- **What was lawful to do on the Sabbath and on feast days** [Sabbato quid licitum agere] — [Vol II p. 81 (col. 795)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/045-question-xxxvii-were-infants-boys-and-decrepit-old-men-r/#col-795)

- **Whether the Sabbath was abolished by Christ** [Sabbathum an à Christo destructum] — [Vol II p. 69 (col. 781 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/037-question-xxix-of-these-seven-days-which-was-the-first-an/#col-781)

- **The precept of the Sabbath is not eternal, but temporal** [Sabbati praeceptum non aeternum] — [Vol II p. 69 (col. 781)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/037-question-xxix-of-these-seven-days-which-was-the-first-an/#col-781)

- **The dignity of priests** [Sacerdotum dignitas] — [Vol I p. 226 (col. 228)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/154-question-xxxiv-marg-how-ought-joshua-to-go-out-and-to-go/#col-228),

[Vol I p. 227 (col. 229)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/154-question-xxxiv-marg-how-ought-joshua-to-go-out-and-to-go/#col-229) - **The number of priests who carried the ark under Joshua** [Sacerdotum qui arcam portarint numerus] — [Vol I p. 456 (col. 474)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Christian sacred rites** [Sacra Christiana] — [Vol II p. 62 (col. 774)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/034-question-xxvi-why-did-the-lord-judge-that-many-days-trum/#col-774) - **Catholics defend a true unbloody sacrifice in the Church** [Sacrificium verum incruentum defendunt Catholici] — [Vol I p. 614 (col. 633)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **Sacrifice is twofold, bloody and unbloody** [Sacrificium duplex, cruentum & incruentum] — [Vol II p. 205 (col. 946)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/133-question-xv-on-which-mountain-was-the-altar-and-on-this-/#col-946) - **How Joshua and the people are said to have offered sacrifice** [Sacrificium quomodo Iosue obtulisse dicatur] — [Vol II p. 207 (col. 947)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/135-question-xvii-what-sacrifices-were-made-on-ebal/#col-947) - **There are three kinds of sacrilege** [Sacrilegii tres species] — [Vol II p. 154 (col. 886)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/099-question-xxx-what-things-and-what-men-were-burned-and-ov/#col-886) - **He is sacrilegious who leads another away from piety or religion** [Sacrilegus qui alium à pietate abducit] — [Vol II p. 154 (col. 886)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/099-question-xxx-what-things-and-what-men-were-burned-and-ov/#col-886) - **Whether the new Ciceronians rightly shun the name of the Saviour** [Salvatoris nomen novelli Ciceroniani] — [bk 1, ch. 2, qu. 1](/works/serarius-joshua-1/018-question-i-what-is-osee-and-joshua/) - **Whether certain men can rightly be called "saviours"** [Salvatores num recte dici possint] — [Vol I p. 69 (col. 59)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/036-question-xix-whether-at-least-anything-can-be-denominate/#col-59) - **The custom of saluting one's city or homeland** [Salutandi urbem patriamve mos] — [Vol I p. 461 (col. 480)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **The ancient custom of saluting the gods** [Salutandi Deos mos vetus] — [Vol I p. 463 (col. 482)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/296-question-iv-how-is-this-dividing-of-the-jordan-to-be-com/#col-470) - **What it is to be sanctified** [Sanctificari quid sit] — [Vol I p. 395 (col. 412)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/262-question-xiv-what-again-did-joshua-say-to-the-people/#col-412) - **Saraa daughter of Beriah had a name different from Sara the wife of Abraham** [Saraa Beriae filia] — [bk 1, ch. 1, qu. 5](/works/serarius-joshua-1/012-question-v-who-was-sara-and-whether-she-was-properly-the/); she rebuilt cities — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-1/013-question-vi-how-many-cities-and-how-did-the-same-sara-bu/)* [q. 6](/works/serarius-joshua-1/013-question-vi-how-many-cities-and-how-did-the-same-sara-bu/) - **What was the cause of Saul's cruelty against the Gibeonites** [Saulis in Gabaonitas saevitiae causa] — [Vol II p. 233 (col. 980)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/166-question-xx-whether-the-gabaonites-are-the-nethinim/#col-980) - **No little portion of sacred Scripture is useless** [Scripturae sacrae nulla portiuncula inutilis] — [Vol II p. 381 (col. 1156)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/265-caput-xv-the-portion-and-dominion-of-the-tribe-of-juda-i/#col-1156) - **Mount Seir** [Seir mons] — [Vol II p. 313 (col. 1069 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/221-question-viii-in-prosecuting-his-victory-what-cities-and/#col-1069) - **Who are called the "elders of Israel"** [Senes Israel quinam vocentur] — [Vol II p. 124 (col. 850)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/081-question-xii-what-having-learned-of-the-slaughter-and-fl/#col-850) - **Long-lived old men** [Senes longaevi] — [Vol II p. 368 (col. 1140)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/259-question-iii-who-and-of-what-sort-was-the-man-caleb/#col-1140) - **Seven kinds of things, of which this whole universe consists** [Septem rerum genera] — [Vol II p. 66 (col.

777)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/#col-777) - **The number seven is sacred and full of mystery** [Septenarius numerus sacer] — [Vol II p. 66 (col. 777)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/#col-777); often signifies something indefinite, *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/#col-777)* & seqq. - **What the sevenfold of days, circuits, and trumpets signifies** [Septenarius dierum & circuitionum & tubarum] — [Vol II p. 66 (col. 778)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/#col-778), [Vol II p. 67 (col. 779)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/#col-779) - **Masters formerly gave names to their servants** [Servis olim nomina dabant Domini] — [bk 1, ch. 2](/works/serarius-joshua-1/017-caput-ii-opening/) — [Vol I p. 36 (col. 24)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/021-question-iv-what-in-general-is-the-cause-of-changing-nam/#col-24) - **A Sibylline verse about the name of Jesus** [Sibyllinum carmen de nomine Iesu] — [Vol I p. 55 (col. 44)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/031-question-xiv-in-what-way-is-this-same-name-of-jesus-so-e/#col-44) - **The name, figure, antiquity, weight, and value of the Hebrew shekel** [Sicli Hebraici nomen, figura, pondus, valor] — [Vol II p. 108 (col. 830 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/073-question-iv-what-and-of-what-kind-was-the-garment-which-/#col-830) - **Sidon, what it is and whence so called** [Sidon quae & unde dicta] — [Vol II p. 308 (col. 1063 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/217-question-iv-into-what-place-did-these-enemies-assemble/#col-1063) - **The very strict silence of the Israelites** [Silentium Israelitarum arctissimum] — [Vol II p. 62 (col. 774)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/034-question-xxvi-why-did-the-lord-judge-that-many-days-trum/#col-774); what the purposes of it were — [Vol II p. 64 (col. 775)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/035-question-xxvii-why-along-with-the-trumpet-clangor-was-no/#col-775) - **When silence is to be broken** [Silentium quando interrumpendum] — [Vol II p. 64 (col. 775)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/035-question-xxvii-why-along-with-the-trumpet-clangor-was-no/#col-775) - **Mount Sinai is called by three names in Scripture** [Sinai mons tribus nominibus] — [Vol I p. 111 (col. 104)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/070-question-iii-marg-why-was-this-that-joshua-was-moses-s-m/#col-104); whether it is distinct from Horeb — [Vol I p. 112 (col. 105)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/070-question-iii-marg-why-was-this-that-joshua-was-moses-s-m/#col-105) - **Mount Sinai received its name from the brambles frequent upon it** [Sinai mons nomen à rubis] — [Vol I p. 112 (col. 105)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/070-question-iii-marg-why-was-this-that-joshua-was-moses-s-m/#col-105) - **The Society of Jesus is defended** [Societas Iesu defenditur] — [Vol I p. 64 (col. 54)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/035-question-xviii-whether-anyone-can-be-called-jesus-or-jos/#col-54), [Vol I p. 65 (col. 55)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/036-question-xix-whether-at-least-anything-can-be-denominate/#col-55), [Vol I p. 66 (col. 56)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/036-question-xix-whether-at-least-anything-can-be-denominate/#col-56), [Vol I p. 68 (col. 58)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/036-question-xix-whether-at-least-anything-can-be-denominate/#col-58) - **How the Society of Jesus is harassed by slanderous tongues** [Societas Iesu à maledicis linguis] — [Vol II p. 126 (col. 852)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/082-question-xiii-what-was-joshua-s-prayer-to-god/#col-852) - **The punishment of the Sodomites and other wicked men** [Sodomitarum aliorumque impiorum supplicium] — [Vol II p. 155 (col. 887 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/101-question-xxxii-why-were-achan-s-sons-and-daughter-burned/#col-887) - **A "solarium" (sundial) is understood in two ways** [Solarium dupliciter accipitur] — [Vol I p. 362 (col. 360)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/231-question-xvii-whether-the-knowledge-which-was-in-rahab-c/#col-360) -

How many miles the sun runs in the space of one hour [Sol horae unius spatio quot milliaria] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1022)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/194-question-xxii-in-what-month-day-and-hour-did-the-sun-and/#col-1022) - **The sun gets its Hebrew name from "ministering," and why** [Sol à ministrando nomen invenit] — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1044 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1044) - **How the sun teaches us, and how it is to be imitated** [Sol quomodo nos doceat] — [Vol II p. 289 (col. 1045)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/211-question-xxxix-on-certain-moral-lessons/#col-1045) - **A statue of the sun over the tomb of Joshua** [Solis statua super sepulchrum Iosue] — [Vol II p. 483 (col. 1279)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/341-question-vii-how-did-joshua-strike-make-a-covenant-with-/#col-1279) - **Some Rabbis deny that the sun truly stood still** [Solem vere stetisse negant Rabbini] — [Vol II p. 373 (col. 1146)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/261-question-v-what-city-is-hebron-and-what-is-in-it/#col-1146) - **It is the common opinion that the sun stood still for twelve hours** [Solem duodecim horas constitisse] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1023)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/195-question-xxiii-how-long-did-the-sun-and-moon-stand-still/#col-1023) - **One must not indulge in sleep** [Somno indulgendum non est] — [Vol I p. 382 (col. 399)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/254-question-vi-whether-the-appointed-distance-between-the-p/#col-399), [Vol I p. 384 (col. 400)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/255-question-vii-whether-in-the-hebrew-the-reading-is-that-t/#col-400) - **The various kinds of lots** [Sortium genera varia] — [Vol II p. 129 (col. 855 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/083-question-xiv-to-joshua-s-petition-what-was-the-response-/#col-855) - **The use of lots in elections is forbidden** [Sortium usus in electionibus prohibitus] — [Vol II p. 138 (col. 866)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/089-question-xx-of-lots-which-of-their-own-kind-are-not-vici/#col-866) - **The various meanings of "spirit"** [Spiritus variae notiones] — [Vol I p. 177 (col. 177)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/121-caput-ix-opening/#col-177) - **Evil spirits are many, and of various kinds** [Spiritus maligni multi & diversi generis] — [Vol II p. 27 (col. 731)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/007-question-iv-what-do-these-wars-of-the-israelites-against/#col-731) - **St. Stephen** [S. Stephanus] — [Vol II p. 496 (col. 1293)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/350-question-xvi-when-were-joseph-s-bones-buried/#col-1293) - **The best reasons for appointing a successor** [Successorem constituendi optimae rationes] — [Vol I p. 186 (col. 186)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/125-question-v-marg-what-is-the-best-way-of-constituting-a-s/#col-186), [Vol I p. 187 (col. 187)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/125-question-v-marg-what-is-the-best-way-of-constituting-a-s/#col-187), [Vol I p. 189 (col. 189)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/126-question-vi-marg-why-does-moses-shudder-to-leave-the-peo/#col-189)

T

- **The Rabbis posit a twofold Tabernacle** [Tabernaculum duplex constituunt Rabbini] — [Vol II p. 397 (col. 1176)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/278-question-ii-what-assembly-was-held-by-joshua-at-shiloh-a/#col-1176) - **For what use Moses pitched the Tabernacle** [Tabernaculum in quem usum tetenderit Moyses] — [Vol I p. 125 (col. 120)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/079-question-xii-marg-does-our-pentecost-agree-as-to-time-wi/#col-120), [Vol I p. 137 (col. 132)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/093-question-ii-marg-what-kind-was-that-tabernacle-from-whic/#col-132), [Vol I p. 138 (col. 133)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/093-question-ii-marg-what-kind-was-that-tabernacle-from-whic/#col-133) -

Joshua the keeper of the Tabernacle [Tabernaculi custos Iosue] — [Vol I p. 140 (col. 135)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/094-question-iii-marg-what-did-joshua-do-in-that-tabernacle/#col-135); why he was so constant in it [Vol I p. 140 (col. 135)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/094-question-iii-marg-what-did-joshua-do-in-that-tabernacle/#col-135); and how long — [Vol I p. 141 (col. 136)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/095-question-iv-marg-how-and-why-did-joshua-not-depart-from-/#col-136) - **The use of tabernacles and oratories for framing prayers, both among the ancient Hebrews and Christians** [Tabernaculorum & Oratoriorum usus] — [Vol I p. 137 (col. 132)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/093-question-ii-marg-what-kind-was-that-tabernacle-from-whic/#col-132) - **To "be silent" used for "to rest" or "to stand still"** [Tacere pro quiescere, vel stare] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 1003)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/185-question-xiii-whether-in-this-battle-the-sun-and-moon-st/#col-1003) - **Slowness in matters of great importance is ruinous** [Tarditas in rebus magni momenti perniciosa] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 997)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/178-question-vii-how-did-joshua-raise-the-siege-of-gabaon-an/#col-997) - **In what manner the land of Canaan was given to the Israelites** [Terra Chanaan quo pacto data] — [Vol I p. 266 (col. 272)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/188-question-vii-what-are-the-boundaries-of-that-same-land/#col-271) - **The boundaries of the land of Canaan** [Terra Chanaan termini] — [Vol I p. 264 (col. 269)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/188-question-vii-what-are-the-boundaries-of-that-same-land/#col-269) - **An earthquake which the Rabbis assert occurred at Joshua's burial** [Terrae motus in sepultura Iosuae] — [Vol II p. 483 (col. 1279)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/341-question-vii-how-did-joshua-strike-make-a-covenant-with-/#col-1279) - **The Lord was unwilling to give the whole promised land to the Israelites, and why** [Terram promissam totam noluit dare Dominus] — [Vol I p. 270 (col. 276)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/190-question-ix-whether-this-land-was-ever-afterwards-posses/#col-275) - **The Israelites did not perfectly possess this land, by their own fault** [Terram hanc non possederunt sua culpa] — [Vol I p. 268 (col. 275)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/190-question-ix-whether-this-land-was-ever-afterwards-posses/#col-275) - **Terror sent upon the enemy from God** [Terror in hostes divinitus immissus] — [Vol II p. 302 (col. 998)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/178-question-vii-how-did-joshua-raise-the-siege-of-gabaon-an/#col-998) - **What "Thummim" is** [Thummim quid] — see Urim below - **How a title of just possession is acquired by one's descendants** [Titulus iustae possessionis] — [Vol II p. 17 (col. 720)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-720) - **How the Israelite tribes are variously numbered as twelve** [Tribus Israeliticae duodecim] — [Vol II p. 129 (col. 855)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/083-question-xiv-to-joshua-s-petition-what-was-the-response-/#col-855) - **The various kinds of trumpets** [Tubarum diversa genera] — [Vol II p. 34 (col. 739)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/010-question-ii-by-what-plan-was-jericho-to-be-assaulted/#col-739); their various use — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/010-question-ii-by-what-plan-was-jericho-to-be-assaulted/#col-739)* - **The Tubilustrium (feast of trumpet-purification)** [Tubilustrum] — [Vol II p. 34 (col. 740)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/010-question-ii-by-what-plan-was-jericho-to-be-assaulted/#col-740) - **One ought to protect those whom one has taken into guardianship** [Tueri oportet eos quos in tutelam suscepit] — [Vol II p. 288 (col. 1043)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/210-question-xxxviii-for-this-victory-did-joshua-sing-any-so/#col-1043)

V

- **What the Valley of Achor signifies** [Vallis Achor quid significet] — [Vol II p. 184 (col. 919)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/118-caput-viii-the-second-war-of-ai-bellum-ii-haiense-openin/#col-919) - **Whether it is lawful to use poison in war against the enemy** [Veneno in bello uti] — [Vol II p. 188 (col. 926 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/120-question-ii-whether-it-is-lawful-to-use-ambushes-in-war/#col-926) - **Verses and poetic meters in the sacred Scriptures** [Versus & numeri poetici in Scripturis] — [Vol II p. 365 (col. 1037)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/205-question-xxxiii-whether-the-things-which-our-text-adduce/#col-1037), [Vol II p. 365 (col. 1038)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/205-question-xxxiii-whether-the-things-which-our-text-adduce/#col-1038); today they are unknown — *[ibid.](/works/serarius-joshua-2/205-question-xxxiii-whether-the-things-which-our-text-adduce/#col-1038)* - **Hornets sent by God upon the Persian forces** [Vespae Persarum copiis immissae] — [Vol II p. 474 (col. 1270)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/334-caput-xxiv-opening/#col-1270) - **The Jews and other nations were accustomed to rend their garments in the greatest grief** [Vestes scindere in luctu solitae] — [Vol I p. 168 (col. 166)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/113-question-vi-marg-did-joshua-stand-against-these-same-que/#col-166) - **Many things are sometimes forbidden which of their own kind are not evil** [Vetantur multa quae ex genere suo mala non sunt] — [Vol II p. 136 (col. 864)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/088-question-xix-are-lots-evil-by-their-own-nature/#col-864) - **Whether one can justly repel force justly inflicted** [Vim iuste illatam an iuste repellere queat] — [Vol II p. 20 (col. 724)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/005-question-ii-were-these-wars-just-and-first-did-the-israe/#col-724) - **Whether the Israelites had wine in the desert** [Vinum in deserto num habuerint Israelitae] — [Vol I p. 135 (col. 130)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/090-question-v-marg-which-of-the-two-heard-the-shouts-of-the/#col-130) - **How great the number of men in the holy land** [Virorum in terra sancta numerus] — [Vol II p. 332 (col. 1095)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/240-question-iii-of-what-sort-is-this-land-to-be-divided-so-/#col-1095) - **At the last moment of life the good Angels more vehemently urge us to salvation** [Vitae ultimo tempore Angeli boni sollicitant] — [Vol II p. 67 (col. 780)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/036-question-xxviii-why-definitely-were-seven-trumpets-seven/#col-780) - **What those entering a new life ought to do** [Vitam novam ingredientes quid facere oporteat] — [Vol II p. 210 (col. 952)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/141-question-xxiii-in-what-manner-did-the-priests-conduct-th/#col-952) - **The shout of revelers is the shout of affliction** [Vox bacchantium vox afflictionis] — [Vol I p. 135 (col. 130)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/090-question-v-marg-which-of-the-two-heard-the-shouts-of-the/#col-130) - **Cities of refuge** [Urbes refugii] — [Vol II p. 425 (col. 1209 & seqq.)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/307-question-ii-whom-among-the-israelites-did-the-cities-of-/#col-1209) - **What the Urim is** [Urim quid sit] — explained generally [Vol I p. 205 (col. 206)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/143-question-xxiii-marg-what-at-least-universally-and-confus/#col-206), more distinctly [Vol I p. 206 (col. 207)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/144-question-xxiv-marg-how-was-that-ornament-in-which-the-ur/#col-207); the ornament in which the Urim was — called by the Hebrews *Choshen*, by the Seventy λόγιον, by our interpreter *pectorale* (breastplate), by St. Jerome *rationale* — and why — [Vol I p. 205 (col. 206)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/143-question-xxiii-marg-what-at-least-universally-and-confus/#col-206), [Vol I p. 206 (col. 207)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/144-question-xxiv-marg-how-was-that-ornament-in-which-the-ur/#col-207) - **The use of Urim and Thummim** [Urim & Thummim usus] — [Vol I p. 209 (col. 210)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/146-question-xxvi-marg-more-distinctly-what-were-the-urim-an/#col-210),

[Vol I p. 210 (col. 211)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/147-question-xxvii-marg-what-was-the-use-of-the-same-urim-an/#col-211) - **The various modes of inquiring through Urim and Thummim are explained** [per Urim & Thummim interrogandi modi] — [Vol I p. 210 (col. 211)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/147-question-xxvii-marg-what-was-the-use-of-the-same-urim-an/#col-211) - **How Josephus gathers the mode of answering through Urim and Thummim** [per Urim & Thummim respondendi modum] — [Vol I p. 215 (col. 216)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/150-question-xxx-marg-what-is-the-manner-of-responding-throu/#col-216); others give other modes [Vol I p. 221 (col. 222)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/150-question-xxx-marg-what-is-the-manner-of-responding-throu/#col-222); which of all is more probable — [Vol I p. 222 (col. 224)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/151-question-xxxi-marg-what-manners-of-responding-through-th/#col-224) - **To inquire "by the judgment of Urim and Thummim"** [de iudicio Urim & Thummim interrogare] — is to seek from the Priest what God, in the sacred breastplate, indicates is to be done — [Vol I p. 227 (col. 229)](/works/serarius-joshua-1/154-question-xxxiv-marg-how-ought-joshua-to-go-out-and-to-go/#col-229) - **When it was lawful or unlawful for the Jews to marry foreign wives** [Uxores alienigenas Iudaeis ducere] — [Vol II p. 94 (col. 811)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/058-question-l-whether-salmon-rightly-married-this-same-raha/#col-811)

X

- **The festival of Xylophoria (wood-carrying) among the ancient Jews, on 22 August** [Xylophoriae festum] — [Vol II p. 232 (col. 977)](/works/serarius-joshua-2/163-question-xvii-whether-a-wage-was-given-to-the-gabaonites/#col-977)