

Nicolaus Serarius, S.J.

THE THREE SECTS

On the Three Most Famous Sects among the Jews:
the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes

Trihaeresium, seu de celeberrimis tribus apud Iudaeos, Pharisaeorum, Sadducaeorum, et Essenorum sectis — Mainz,
Balthasar Lippius, 1604

English translation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE

DEDICATORY PREFACE

THE CONTENTS OF THE THREE BOOKS

BOOK I — ON THE JEWISH SECTS

- Chapter I. The Occasion, Title, and Division of This Book · 12
- Chapter II. On the Names Heresy and Sect · 12
- Chapter III. Whether There Are Three Sects of the Jews · 13
- Chapter IV. Whether There Were Not More Jewish Sects Than These Three · 14
- Chapter V. How the Established Triad Is Not Overwhelmed by So Great a Number of Jewish Sects · 16
- Chapter VI. Whether These Three Sects Already Existed in the Time of the Maccabees · 19
- Chapter VII. Whether at the Beginning There Were Only Two Sects · 19
- Chapter VIII. Whether Josephus Gorionides Asserts Only Two Jewish Sects · 20
- Chapter IX. Since Josephus Flavius Asserts that There Are Three Jewish Sects, If Gorionides Were to Present Only Two, Which of the Two Should Rather Be Believed? · 23
- Chapter X. Whether Johannes Drusius Correctly Translated the Few Hebrew Words of Gorionides about the Same Number of Jewish Sects · 26

BOOK II — ON THE PHARISEES AND THE SADDUCEES

- Chapter I. The Name of the Pharisees · 29
- Chapter II. From What Tribe, Family, Rank, and Place the Pharisees Came · 30
- Chapter III. What the Doctrines or Institutions of the Pharisees Were · 31
- Chapter IV. Whether All the Doctrines or Institutions of the Pharisees Were Evil · 45
- Chapter V. Were All the Pharisees Evil · 49
- Chapter VI. How Christ the Lord Ordered the Pharisees Sitting upon Moses' Chair to Be Heard, and Yet Warned that Their Leaven or Doctrine Must Be Avoided · 51
- Chapter VII. Whether the Wise, the Lawyers, the Scribes, and the Pharisees Are the Same · 55
- Chapter VIII. Whether, When in Matthew Chapter 5 the Lord So Often Says, "But I Say to You," He Corrects Pharisaic Interpretations of the Old Law, or Rather Adds Something to the Old Law Itself and Perfects It · 57
- Chapter IX. Whether, in the State of the Mosaic Synagogue, the Pharisees Were Truly Heretics · 61
- Chapter X. Whether Catholics Are Signified by the Pharisees, or Rather Lutherans, Calvinists, and Others of Similar Meal · 62
- Chapter XI. When Did the Pharisees Begin · 63
- Chapter XII. Who Was the Author of the Pharisaic Sect · 64
- Chapter XIII. What Authority Did the Pharisees Have · 66
- Chapter XIV. With What Disgraces or Slaughters Were the Pharisees Sometimes Afflicted · 67
- Chapter XV. What Was the Dress of the Pharisees · 68
- Chapter XVI. Whether Pharisees Still Exist Today · 69
- Chapter XVII. Some Maxims or Apophthegms of Certain Ancient Pharisees · 69
- Chapter XVIII. On the Name of the Sadducees · 71
- Chapter XIX. Who Was Sadoc, the Founder and Parent of the Sadducees · 71
- Chapter XX. How the Sect of the Sadducees Arose · 73
- Chapter XXI. What Were the Doctrines and Institutions of the Sadducees · 73
- Chapter XXII. Whether the Sadducees Were Samaritans · 77
- Chapter XXIII. Whether the Sadducees Were Dositheans · 78
- Chapter XXIV. Whether, While the Mosaic Synagogue Stood, the Sadducees Were Truly Heretics · 78
- Chapter XXV. When Did the Sadducees Begin? · 79
- Chapter XXVI. Whether Any Sadducees Have Come Down Even to Our Age · 79
- Chapter XXVII. What Adverse or Prosperous Affairs Befell the Sadducees? · 80

Chapter XXVIII. Whether the High Priests of the Jews Were Ever Sadducees · 82
Chapter XXIX. Are There Any Apophthegms or Maxims of the Sadducees? · 84

On the Essenes

BOOK III — ON THE ESSENES

Chapter I. On the Name of the Essenes · 86
Chapter II. Which of These Conjectures about the Name of the Essenes Is Most Probable? · 89
Chapter III. How the Name of the Essenes Should Be Written · 94
Chapter IV. What Were the Doctrines or Institutions of the Essenes? · 98
Chapter V. Were the Essenes truly heretics under the Mosaic law? · 109
Chapter VI. Were the Essenes Pharisees? · 111
Chapter VII. Hessaeans or Hasidaeans? · 112
Chapter VIII. Were the Essenes Nazaraeans? · 117
Chapter IX. Were the Essenes Rechabites? And when did they begin? · 118
Chapter X. Can the Essenes be reckoned as forerunners and certain models of monks and other Christian religious? · 125
Chapter XI. Do any Essenes still remain now? · 126
Chapter XII. Where does Philo write about the Essenes? · 126
Chapter XIII. Do Philo and the above-cited Flavius Josephus speak about the same Essenes? · 127
Chapter XIV. Philo's words from the *Apology* about the practical or cenobitic Essenes · 129
Chapter XV. Other words of the same Philo about the same practical or cenobitic Essenes, from the book *On the Freedom of the Good Man* · 130
Chapter XVI. On the theoretic Essenes, about whom the same Philo speaks in the book *On the Contemplative Life* · 133
Chapter XVII. Whether the Essenes were Christians · 138
Chapter XVIII. A Resolution of the Arguments by Which the Essenes Seem to Be Driven from the Number of Christians · 142
Chapter XIX. On Certain Other Little Questions Concerning the Essenes · 148
Chapter XX. Whether Johannes Drusius Is a Heretic · 151

THE AUTHOR'S INDEX OF THINGS AND WORDS

THE ERRATA LEAF

TITLE PAGE

The Three Sects

Or,

On the Three Most Famous Sects among the Jews: the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes

For the understanding of various passages of both Testaments and of ancient writers, and as an answer to the recent little book by Johannes Drusius, *On the Hasidaeans*.

Three Books

By Nicolaus Serarius of the Society of Jesus, Doctor of Sacred Theology and Professor in the Academy of Mainz.

With imperial privilege and the permission of superiors.

Mainz, from the printing house of Balthasar Lippius.

In the year 1604.

Emblem Verse

The cross, the pine, the mountains, the wheel, the miter, the crown, and the crozier, O Prince, are emblems owed to your virtue.

If you fasten the miter, the wheels, and the crozier to the cross, then the pine-crown from your native mountain is yours.

DEDICATORY PREFACE

To the most reverend and illustrious Prince and Lord, Lord Johann Schweikhard, elected Archbishop of the holy see of Mainz, Archchancellor throughout Germany of the Holy Roman Empire, Prince-Elector, etc., his most gracious lord.

Those who have departed from the Church of God are accustomed, most reverend and illustrious Prince and Lord, to carp at and tear apart everything in Catholics, even the smallest matters, things plainly grammatical and childish. For they think that, if they can seem more learned in small matters, they will be regarded as more learned in great ones too.

And if Catholics are thought to err in grammar, those same men must also be condemned for error in theology.

Thus a heretical man of letters once reproached the great Doctor of the Church, St. Augustine, because, contrary to the inflections of the Latin language, he said "Donatists" rather than "Donatians"; and because, in a single little word, he used the comparative degree in place of the positive.

Such men are, in truth, very like that pampered youth who, as Cicero writes, found an oarlock while walking on the shore and for that reason wanted to build a ship. For as one oarlock is to the building of a great ship, so is a little expertise in one or another word to the knowledge of the greatest and divine matters.

Again, those who criticize such things in great matters are like, says St. Augustine...

[margin: Augustine, *Contra Cresconium*, bk. 2, ch. 1; bk. 3, ch. 72; bk. 4, ch. 55. Cicero, *De claris oratoribus*. Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, bk. 22, ch. 24.]

...unskilled schoolboys who, when they have learned as some great thing that a singular noun must receive a singular verb, criticize the most learned author of the Latin tongue because he wrote, *Pars in frusta secant*. "He ought," they say, "to have said *secat*." And because they know that one says *religio*, they blame him because he wrote *Relligione patrum*.

Similarly in our own time, how many things have ecclesiastical writers written well, gravely, and learnedly, which certain petty grammarians, imbued with new opinions, mock with great haughtiness and boldness, and with no less rashness and ignorance? I have already noted somewhere those who reject *Iesus Salvator* and want only *Servator*; who sing not *Agnus Dei*, but only *Agne Dei*.

[margin: Aeneid 1. Aeneid 2. Ser., bk. 1, de Ios. [abbrev. uncertain]. De Litaniis, no. 44.]

Recently, moreover, men have come forth from Frisia and Holland who are displeased with those who in the sacred Scriptures are called Asidaeans, and in the ancient Fathers Essenes; and they altogether command and order that, both in speech and in writing, they be called Hasidaeans or Aschidaeans, and Hesseni or Hessaei.

These men, certainly, since in a slight labor the glory of Christ is slight too, might seem fit to be neglected, were it not in their own and others' interest that their arrogance be checked. "Grammarians," says the same St. Augustine quoted before, "must be carefully admonished that, clothed with Christian humility, they learn not to despise those whom they have found to avoid faults of morals more than faults of words."

For nothing is worse, says Quintilian, than those who, having advanced only a little beyond the first letters...

[margin: 1 Macc. 2:42; 7:13; 2 Macc. 14:6. Augustine, *De catechizandis rudibus*, ch. 9. Quintilian, *Institutio*, bk. 1, c. 10.]

...have clothed themselves in a false persuasion of knowledge. For they even disdain to believe those skilled in the matter when they give instruction; and, as if by some right of authority, by which this sort of person generally swells up, they become domineering and, at times raging, teach their own folly thoroughly.

Therefore it matters, as I said, that they be publicly reproved for the sake of others as well: lest, from trifles of that sort, half-lettered men gather among themselves an excessive opinion of superior learning, and be

thought to know some great thing in religion and theology too, and not wrongly or undeservedly to despise and mock the Church and the ancient Fathers.

And for this reason that most serious and most holy Doctor, Blessed Augustine, did not disdain to answer the grammarian Cresconius carefully and learnedly concerning the inflection of the name "Donatists" and concerning the degrees of comparison.

[margin: In the places cited.]

To imitate him in some measure, I have set this dissertation of mine on the Jewish sects against Johannes Drusius, who is treating of the Hasidaeans, especially since weighty matters, not unworthy to be inquired into and known, entered into that dispute, as the attached synopsis of chapters indicates; and since he is already being called by his own people:

*The phoenix and sun of learned men,
who opens hidden things and brings forth what lies concealed,
and sees things seen by no one.
What before had been things seen by no one,
he offers to all to be seen.*

But as for this, whatever little work of mine it is, the reasons that made me dedicate it to Your Highness, most reverend and illustrious Prelate, were partly those very reasons which seven days ago, when on the day after...

[margin: In his own book of Hebrew Questions.]

...on the day after your happy election to that most ample dignity, when I congratulated you in our church, both in my own name and in the name of all my colleagues; and partly also other reasons, among which is that solemn oath which your citizens of Mainz today render to Your Highness as a pledge of their faith and obedience.

For I too was eager to offer to that same Your Highness the duty and due observance of myself and of my companions, and, through these little books as through forerunners, to promise you five others, which I recently gathered on Mainz affairs down to the death of your most reverend and illustrious predecessor, Johann Adam, of pious memory, a truly pious and Christian man.

Finally, I also wished to indicate this: nearly sixty years ago, on the very night that followed the day appointed for Your auspicious election, Luther...

[margin: Year 1546; 18 February.]

...after dining splendidly and eating his fill, was taken from here by a sudden and unforeseen death, by divine agency; so that it may seem an omen that, in the souls of all the sheep entrusted by the supreme Shepherd, Christ Jesus, to Your pastoral care, he will henceforth die out through you.

To this matter I apply what that holy Father and Doctor of mine named above once wrote to the Bishop of Carthage: "So far as we are able, we devote ourselves to prayers, that the Lord may deign to sustain with you the flock entrusted to you, and never abandon you anywhere, but be present as your helper in times of need, showing mercy to his Church through Your priesthood; such mercy as spiritual men beseech him with tears and groans to show."

Mainz, from Your Archiepiscopal College of the Society of Jesus...

[margin: Lib. 2 de Lutheri Magistro, ch. 9. 1 Pet. 5:4. Augustine, Epistle 64.]

...on the day after the Chair of St. Peter at Antioch, in the year of the Lord 1604.

Of Your most reverend and illustrious Highness,

the most unworthy servant,

Nic. Serarius.

THE CONTENTS OF THE THREE BOOKS

Contents of the Books on the Jewish Sects

Book I. Ten Chapters.

- I. The occasion, title, and division of this book. p. 1.
- II. On the names of heresy and sect. p. 2.
- III. Whether there are three sects of the Jews. p. 4.
- IV. Whether there are not more Jewish sects than these three. p. 6.
- V. How the established triad of Jewish sects is not overwhelmed by the number of so many Jewish sects. p. 9.
- VI. Whether these three sects already existed in the time of the Maccabees. p. 17.
- VII. Whether at the beginning there were only two sects. p. 18.
- VIII. Whether Josephus Gorionides asserts only two sects. p. 21.
- IX. Since Josephus Flavius asserts that there are three Jewish sects, if Gorionides were to present only two, which of the two should rather be believed? p. 26.
- X. Whether Johannes Drusius has correctly translated a few Hebrew words of Gorionides concerning the same number of Jewish sects. p. 34.

Book II. Twenty-Nine Chapters.

- I. The name of the Pharisees. p. 39.
- II. From what tribe and family, order, and place the Pharisees came. p. 43.
- III. What were the doctrines or institutions of the Pharisees. p. 45.
- IV. Whether all the doctrines or institutions of the Pharisees were evil. p. 79.
- V. Whether all the Pharisees were evil. p. 89.
- VI. How Christ the Lord commanded that the Pharisees sitting on Moses' seat be heard, and yet warned that one must beware of their leaven, or doctrine. p. 93.
- VII. Whether the Wise Men, Experts in the Law, Scribes, and Pharisees were the same. p. 104.
- VIII. When the Lord so often says in Matthew chapter 5, "But I say to you," whether he corrects Pharisaic interpretations of the old law, or rather adds something to the old law itself and perfects it. p. 108.
- IX. Whether, in the state of the Mosaic synagogue, the Pharisees truly were heretics. p. 117.
- X. Whether by the Pharisees Catholics are signified, or rather Lutherans, Calvinists, Socinians, and others of the same sort. p. 120.
- XI. When the Pharisees began. p. 122.
- XII. Who was the author of the Pharisaic sect. p. 124.
- XIII. What authority the Pharisees had. p. 129.
- XIV. By what disgraces or disasters the Pharisees were sometimes afflicted. p. 130.
- XV. What the clothing of the Pharisees was. p. 134.

- XVI. Whether Pharisees still exist today. p. 135.
- XVII. Sayings or apophthegms of certain ancient Pharisees. p. 135.
- XVIII. On the name of the Sadducees. p. 139.
- XIX. Who Zadok was, the founder and father of the Sadducees. p. 141.
- XX. How the sect of the Sadducees arose. p. 144.
- XXI. What were the doctrines and institutions of the Sadducees. p. 145.
- XXII. Whether the Sadducees were Samaritans. p. 153.
- XXIII. Whether the Sadducees were Dositheans. p. 156.
- XXIV. Whether, while the Mosaic synagogue stood, the Sadducees truly were heretics. p. 156.
- XXV. When the Sadducees began. p. 160.
- XXVI. Whether any Sadducees have survived down to our age. p. 160 [contents misprints 166; corrected from the chapter heading].
- XXVII. What adverse or prosperous fortunes the Sadducees had. p. 162.
- XXVIII. Whether the high priests of the Jews were at any time Sadducees. p. 165.
- XXIX. Whether there are any apophthegms or sayings of the Sadducees. p. 171.

Book III. Twenty Chapters.

- I. On the name of the Essenes. p. 172.
- II. Which of these conjectures concerning the name of the Essenes is most probable. p. 179.
- III. How the name of the Essenes should be written. p. 191.
- IV. What were the doctrines or institutions of the Essenes. p. 199.
- V. Whether, in the Mosaic law, the Essenes truly were heretics. p. 226.
- VI. Whether the Essenes were Pharisees. p. 230.
- VII. Whether the Hesseni were Hasidaeans. p. 232.
- VIII. Whether the Essenes were Nazarenes. p. 244.
- IX. Whether the Essenes were Rechabites, and when those men began. p. 245.
- X. Whether the Essenes can be considered founders and certain models of monks and of other Christian religious. p. 261.
- XI. Whether any Essenes now survive. p. 263.
- XII. Where Philo writes about the Essenes. p. 265.
- XIII. Whether Philo and the above-cited Josephus Flavius speak about the same Essenes. p. 266.
- XIV. Words of Philo, from the *Apology*, concerning the Practici, or cenobitic Essenes. p. 271.
- XV. Other words of the same Philo concerning the same Practici, or cenobitic Essenes, from the book *On the Freedom of the Good Man*. p. 275.
- XVI. Concerning the theoretical Essenes, what the same Philo says in the book *On the Contemplative Life*. p. 281.

XVII. Whether the Essenes were Christians. p. 294.

XVIII. Resolution of the arguments by which the Essenes seem to be excluded from the number of Christians. p. 305.

XIX. On some other small questions concerning the Essenes. p. 318.

XX. Whether Johannes Drusius is a heretic. p. 336.

(printed p. 1)

BOOK I — ON THE JEWISH SECTS

Chapter I. The Occasion, Title, and Division of This Book

(printed p. 1 — Book I)

At the previous autumn fair at Frankfurt, a friend brought me, as though a parting gift from a banquet, a piece of Batavian merchandise. It was Johannes Drusius's little book *On the Hasidaeans*, in which he censured a few out of the many things that I had noted about them four years ago in my Commentary on Maccabees. Since, however, "he who hates correction," or, as our interpreter translates with the Greeks, "he who hates rebukes," is foolish, that censure was certainly not unwelcome to me.

And because the matter was not a large one, but was almost entirely about one little word of Josephus Gorionides and about the spelling of one syllable, it seemed that it might be passed over in silence, and that the critic should not be grudged his small triumph. Yet because the censure is unjust, and because it comes from an adversary of the Catholic faith, it seemed right to defend the truth and not to let even the smallest point pass,

[margin: Occasion. Prov. 12; Greek rendering: "he who hates rebukes is foolish."]

(printed p. 2)

so that the religious innovator could deservedly boast of it.

Yet so that more fruit and usefulness might come to the reader, I resolved on something larger: to discuss, in their whole class, the sects once most famous among the Jews, of which there is very frequent mention either in the sacred pages of the New Testament or in ancient and reputable authors. Since it will be shown later that these are three, I have entitled this little writing *Trihaeresium*, "On the Three Heresies," in the same form and pattern by which Ausonius, no poor master of speech, once said *Trihorium*. I shall treat them first in general, and then each in order, so that there will be three books: the first will contain that general discussion, and the remaining two the particular discussion.

Chapter II. On the Names Heresy and Sect

(printed p. 2 — Book I)

Among the Greeks the word *hairesis* is so called from choosing, because a person chooses for himself a definite manner of thinking or living, where other choices are available. The word is a neutral one, used both in a good sense and in a bad one.

In a good sense Cicero says in the preface to the *Paradoxes*: "Cato, in my judgment a perfect Stoic, belongs to that school which follows no flower of oratory." So too Saint Paul, in Acts 26, says: "According to the most exact sect of our religion I lived as a Pharisee."

[margin: Title. Ausonius, Epistle 4 to Theon. Division. Good heresy.]

(printed p. 3)

In this same way Galen wrote a book on heresies, and Hippobotus another; Diogenes Laertius also has his own preface, in which he counts ten heresies of the philosophers. And in that same author it was once reckoned among distinguished things if someone belonged to a particular heresy, so much so that certain philosophers maintained that the Pyrrhonians did not have a heresy, while the Pyrrhonians themselves insisted, on the contrary, that they did have one.

Among Christians, however, from Saint Paul in Galatians 5:20 and from 2 Peter 2:1, the name is usually taken in a bad sense. It may mean some false and impious doctrine, condemned as such by the Church; or the fault of a person who stubbornly defends and retains that doctrine; or finally the very multitude of people

who stubbornly adhere to such a doctrine. These are called heretics, and sometimes, even in Saint Epiphanius, *haeresiotae* and *haeretistae*, although those same terms are also sometimes taken in a good sense, as is clear from Josephus.

Among the Latins the same principle applies to the word *sect*. There is a good sect, about which our Apostle speaks in the cited passage of Acts 26, and about which Cicero says in the fifth Verrine: "We follow the sect and institution of these men." In *Brutus*, or *On Famous Orators*, he likewise says: "Brutus followed the philosophical sect of the Old Academy." He uses the word often in this way elsewhere too. There is also a bad sect, of which Galatians 5:20 says: "The works of the flesh are manifest: fornication," and, after many other things, "strife, dissensions, sects."

[margin: Evil heresy. Good sect. Evil sect.]

(printed p. 4)

Second Peter 2:1 speaks of "lying teachers who introduce destructive sects." Cicero writes in the third letter to Brutus: "All were judged enemies who followed the sect of Mark Antony."

The usage of the Hebrews' own words *chelakim* and *chelakoth* is not unlike this; these names designate parts, divisions, and sections, as may be understood from Zephaniah 3:9 and from Hebrew writers. Yet the worse kind of heresy is always signified by *minuth*, and the adherents of it by the word *minim*.

When, therefore, I call the work *Trihaeresium*, or when I pursue the number of Jewish sects in general, I include not one meaning or the other, but both. Later, when I come to the individual sects, I shall discuss whether they are bad ones, or whether, in our present manner of speaking, they are truly heresies.

Chapter III. Whether There Are Three Sects of the Jews

(printed p. 4 — Book I)

Flavius Josephus quite often teaches that there are three sects of the Jews: the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes. For in book 2, chapter c. 12, he says: "There are three kinds of men among the Jews who philosophize. The adherents of one kind are Pharisees, those of another are Sadducees. The third, which is thought to practice a more solemn way of life, are called Essenes."

(printed p. 5)

Or, as Rufinus preferred to translate it: "The third, which is also held to be more approved, the Essenes cultivate." At the beginning of his *Life*, the same Josephus says: "There are three sects among us: the first of the Pharisees, the second of the Sadducees, and the third of the Essenes." So also in *Antiquities* 13.9, 15.13, and 18.2.

Hence Saint Jerome himself says in book 2 against Jovinian: "Josephus, in the second book of the history of the Jewish captivity, in the eighteenth book of the *Antiquities*, and in the two books *Against Apion*, describes three doctrines of the Jews: the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes."

The same triad of these sects is handed down by older writers: Theophylact on Acts 22, who says, "Among the Jews there were three sects in general: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes"; Oecumenius on the same place, who says, "There were three sects among the Jews in general, namely Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes"; Photius in the *Bibliotheca*; and, before all these, Saint Chrysostom in homily 44 on the Acts of the Apostles. Among more recent writers, and specifically among Catholics, the same is found in Tostatus Abulensis on Matthew 3, question 63, and on Matthew 23, question 12; in Caelius Rhodiginus, book 5, chapter 9; and in others. Among heretics it is found in Philip Melanchthon, book 2 of the *Chronicle*, and in Illyricus on Acts 4, to omit others for the present.

[margin: Josephus, Jewish War, book 2, ch. 7.]

Chapter IV. Whether There Were Not More Jewish Sects Than These Three

(printed p. 6 — Book I)

The same Josephus relates that, in the time of King Herod - or rather the tyrant - and of his son Archelaus, who succeeded him, a fourth faction arose among the Jews. This faction denied that the Jews ought to have any lords besides the one God, just as those men boasted in Saint John 8:33: "We are Abraham's seed, and we have never served anyone." Consequently, it also denied that any tribute should be paid by the Jewish people to the Romans.

That this sect was different from the three which Josephus himself listed for us in the preceding chapter is indicated not obscurely by the matter itself, and also by Josephus himself, when in the same passage he says that Judas the Galilean was the author of this sect, and adds: "This sophist belonged to a particular sect, resembling none of the others." And he says this both much more clearly and much more fully in *Antiquities* 18.1: "Judas and Saddok introduced among us a fourth philosophy," and in 18.2: "Judas the Galilean became leader of the fourth philosophical school."

Tertullian, in *On Prescription against Heretics*, chapter 45, likewise counts four heretics of Judaism, but different ones: Dositheus the Samaritan, the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Herodians.

[margin: Fourth sect.]

(printed p. 7)

Saint Jerome, in his book against the Luciferians, followed this reckoning of Tertullian and almost his very words. Eusebius, in Greek, in *Ecclesiastical History* 4.22, drawing from Hegesippus, makes the number seven. In Honorius of Autun and in our Rabanus, *On the Institution of Clerics* 2.58, the number of these same sects grows to eight; they are named as follows: Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes or Essenists, Marbonenses or Marbonei, Genists, Merists, Samaritans, and Hemerobaptists.

But Saint Epiphanius, in book 1, counts eleven sects, of which four are Samaritan and seven Jewish. For the Samaritans are divided by him into Essenes, Sebuaeans, Gorthenes, and Dositheans; the Jews into Sadducees, Grammateis or Scribes, Pharisees, Hemerobaptists, Nazareans, Essenes, and Herodians. Saint John Damascene follows Saint Epiphanius in his book *On Heresies*, except that in him they are wrongly written as Jebusaeans. For these, Pamelius, in the cited passage of Tertullian, wrongly substitutes Nebuaeans, since in Epiphanius they are called Sebuaeans.

Philastrius, however, in his own book *On Heresies*, compiled a much longer catalogue. In it, before the coming of Christ the Lord, twenty-eight sects are counted, namely:

1. Ophites, or Serpentarians.
2. Cainites.
3. Sethians.

[margin: Sects: seven; eight; eleven; twenty-eight.]

(printed p. 8)

4. Dositheans.
5. Sadducees.
6. Pharisees.
7. Samaritans.

8. Nazareans.
9. Essenes.
10. Heliognostics, worshippers of the sun.
11. Frog-worshippers.
12. Mouse-worshippers, or Musorites.
13. Fly-worshippers.
14. Troglodytes; see number 22.
15. Worshippers of Fortune.
16. Baalites.
17. Astarites and Remphanites.
18. Molochites.
19. Tophetites.
20. Well-worshippers.
21. Bronze-serpent worshippers.
22. Subterraneans.
23. Thammuzites.
24. Belites.
25. Bahalites or Balaamites.
26. Pythonists.
27. Astarothites.
28. Herodians.

Indeed, still more seem to have to be added. For John Leo, in book 2 of his *Description of Africa*, when speaking of Mount Demensara, says on folio 49: "Innumerable Jews are found here, who serve for pay under some prince and are continually under arms..."

[margin: *More sects.*]

(printed p. 9)

...under arms. These are regarded as heretics by the other African Jews, and in their language they are called *Carraum*, or rather *Caraim*, that is, Readers, Scripturists, or Textualists. For they admit only the text of Scripture, which they judge sacred, rejecting all interpretations of all men, as Elias in the *Tishbi* reports under the word *Tzadok* and under the word *Kara*.

So strongly do the other Jews shrink from them that they do not deign to have with them not only marriages, but even conversations. This may be seen at Pera, or Constantinople, among the several synagogues of the Jews, in one synagogue of those Caraim, which is the only one there.

What of the Rechabites in Jeremiah 35? What of the Nazareans celebrated everywhere? What of the Kenites in Judges 1? What of the Caelicolae, of whom Justinian speaks in book 1 of the Code, title 9, and Maimonides in *The Guide for the Perplexed*, part 3, chapter 30? What of the Hasidaeans, mentioned in 1 Maccabees 2:42, 1 Maccabees 7:13, and 2 Maccabees 14:6? Finally, what of those Tubieni, mentioned in 2 Maccabees 12:17? For Scaliger says in book 6 *On the Correction of Chronology* that these are different from

those others. Behold, then, almost more than thirty-five Jewish sects.

Chapter V. How the Established Triad Is Not Overwhelmed by So Great a Number of Jewish Sects

(printed p. 9 — Book I)

If my purpose were merely to answer Drusius, there would certainly be no reason for me to labor over retaining the triad of Jewish sects which I asserted in chapter 3. For the greater the number of these sects was, the more Drusius would be overwhelmed, since, as I shall say below, he wants only a pair of them.

[margin: Continuation of John Leo on Jews "under arms." Scaliger, fol. 303.]

(printed p. 10)

But because I want even this rather small labor to serve truth and the reader's profit, I shall try to explain briefly how that established triad stands. I shall not do this by playing the boys' game, as the saying goes, that a lesser number is always contained in a greater one. Boys, when asked how many parts of speech there are, if they answer two or three and are taught that there are eight, reply that, if there are eight, there are also two or three.

Observation I

First, it must be held that not every impiety and crime of impious and wicked men is rightly called a heresy. For that reason, of the twenty-eight sects Philastrius was listing, at least eighteen must be excluded from this enumeration. The Heliognostics, and all who follow them in order except only the last, namely the Herodians, were idolaters, not heretics, as is clear from the very things that Philastrius himself handed down concerning them. Likewise the Caelicolae, whether they were Jews or Christians, a question Baronius discusses in volumes 1 and 5, must be removed from here, as must all others of whom the Talmud speaks in *Abodah Zarah*.

Observation II

When the number of Jewish heresies is being considered, only those are in view which existed before Christ the Lord. Therefore the Herodians, and those men who denied tribute and obedience to mortal lords, who were afterwards called Gaulonites, Zealots, or Sicarii, and about whom Josephus says so much in the *Jewish War*, and Saint Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact say something in the cited places, must be entirely set aside.

[margin: Seven observations for reducing the number of sects.]

(printed p. 11)

Perhaps also those first three in Philastrius, the Ophites, Cainites, and Sethians, must be set aside. For Tertullian, in *On Prescription against Heretics* 47, Saint Epiphanius in heresies 37, 38, and 36, Saint Augustine in his book *On Heresies*, heresies 17, 18, and 19, John Damascene, the follower of Epiphanius, and others place them among the heresies that arose after Christ the Lord.

Observation III

The Samaritans also do not properly belong to the Jewish sects. As Saint Epiphanius explains before heresy 9, they were Cuthaeans, Emathaeans, Avvites, and Sepharvaimites from Babylonia, of whom 2 Kings 17:24 and 17:41 speak, although he calls them by Greek forms of those names. Again, there were those who later passed over from the Jews to them in the time of Alexander the Great, so that they no longer sacrificed in the old and universal temple at Jerusalem, but in their own new temple on Garizim, as the same Epiphanius indicates from the opposite side in heresy 14, which is that of the Sadducees.

Although those who deserted from the Jews to them, and yet did not worship idols, were truly heretics for this very reason, that they admitted neither all the divine books nor any interpretations of them,

[margin: Observation II. Observation III.]

(printed p. 12)

nevertheless Josephus does not count them among the Jewish sects, either because they were not Jews by birth, or, if they were, because they had separated themselves from the Jewish temple. Josephus otherwise knew them very well. In book 12, chapter 7, he says that, when Jewish affairs flourished, they used to say they were relatives and brothers of the Jews; but when the Jews were pressed by various calamities, they used to profess themselves their adversaries and enemies. And he treats their Garizim temple in book 13, last chapter.

Thus, then, those who in Epiphanius and Damascene are Samaritans - the Essenes, about another kind of Essenes I shall speak later, the Sebuaeans, the Gorthenes, and the Dositheans - must now be set aside by us.

Observation IV

Those offices or institutions that have been established in some commonwealth or religion and worship of God are not properly to be placed in the number of sects. Therefore the Scribes and Experts in the Law, of whom I shall speak later, must be removed from here, as must those Nazirites who dedicated themselves to God either for a time or forever. The same judgment applies to the Nethinim named in Ezra.

Observation V

Sometimes sects are divided by writers into various smaller parts, and a new sect, as it were, is constructed from some difference in doctrines or institutions of life. On the other hand, other writers pass over certain smaller subdivisions and pursue the larger classes themselves.

[margin: Observation IV. Observation V.]

(printed p. 13)

This can be seen in the sects of our own Germany today. When they are cut up more carefully, are they not thousand-formed? Yet those who touch on their chief heads name only Lutherans, Calvinists, Schwenckfeldians, Anabaptists, and Arians.

Thus Saint Epiphanius counts seven heresies of the Jews, while Josephus counts only three. But these three, as Theophylact and Oecumenius explained in the places already indicated, are general and principal; the others are more particular and, as it were, attached to those general sects. So too the Talmudists, in tractate *Sotah* 3, folio 22, make seven orders or classes of Pharisees, although these are really rather hypocrites: the Pharisee Schichmi, Nikohar, Cizai, Medoukia, Mahchobathi, Veescheneh, Mehaiebah, and Mirah.

To those same Pharisees and Sadducees belong the Nazareans, standing, as it were, midway between the two, or rather sharing in both, except that they would sacrifice nowhere, nor would they eat any flesh of victims, indeed not any living creature at all, as Saint Epiphanius testifies in heresy 18. In the same way the four groups attributed to the Samaritans could be attached to them. And the Caraim themselves, of whom I spoke above, are referred back to the Sadducees by the one who wrote in book 2 *On the Correction of Chronology*: "Those Caraim are from the remnants of the ancient Sadducees."

[margin: Scaliger, fol. 144.]

(printed p. 14)

Before him Elias, in the *Tishbi*, under the word *Tzadok*, said: "*Bilshon romi korin lahem Tzadusee*," that is, "In the Roman language they call them Sadducees," namely those who are Caraim. By the same reasoning, the Hasidaeans were elsewhere referred by me to the Essenes in 1 Maccabees 7, on four arguments; by

Drusius, however, they were referred to the Pharisees on one argument only, and that a very slight one, about which below.

The same can be said about the Tubieni, of whom I spoke in the *Harmony of the Maccabees*, if indeed they constituted any sect. Yet it seems more probable to me that the Tubieni are called Jews who lived in the land of Tob, mentioned in Judges 11:3 and 5, 2 Samuel 10:6 and 10, and 1 Maccabees 5:13. For even if *Tubieni* can be translated "the blessed," in the same way that in the Syriac title of the Acts of the Apostles the apostles are called *Scheliche Toubune*, that is, "blessed apostles," it is nevertheless less suitable for people still living to be called blessed in a strict and simple sense. The saying of Solon is true, which the poet bound in verse:

No one should be called blessed before death and the final rites.

And another says:

Do not think anyone blessed before he is wise and good.

It could nevertheless have happened that this name was first derived either from the goodness of some single person, whether a prince or a famous man, as in Laertius's preface certain philosophers are called blessed by disposition, or from the fertility and happiness of the land itself, just as in Ptolemy's *Geography* 6 Arabia is called Arabia Felix.

(printed p. 15)

Observation VI

Sometimes one and the same sect is marked by several names because of differences of places, times, or other circumstances. Those who today are Calvinists were once called Berengarians and Predestinarians. Those who in Germany are Calvinists are in France Huguenots; those who are Lutherans are Martinists. Among religious orders also, how great is the abundance of such names?

Thus I taught in chapter 1 of Judges that the Kenites, the Rechabites, and the Essenes are in some sense the same; nor have I yet repented of this opinion, about which later.

Observation VII

Sometimes new and different names of certain sects are invented for no weighty reasons, or names once invented are corrupted. Why, for instance, are there Genists in Honorius and Rabanus? Rabanus says: "They are called Genists because they boast that they are of the stock of Abraham. For when the people of God came to Babylon, many abandoned their wives and attached themselves to Babylonian women. Some, content only with Israelite marriages, or born from such marriages, when they returned from Babylon, separated themselves from the whole people and took this name to themselves in boasting."

But what ancient writer ever coined such a name? Who accused them of boasting? Who disapproved the cause of that kind of separation? Certainly not Ezra in book 1, chapters 9 and 10; nor Nehemiah in the second book of Ezra, chapter 13, verse 23 and following.

[margin: Observation VI. Observation VII.]

(printed p. 16)

What are the Esnaei? Are they not, by a foul error, Essaei? What are the Marbonei? Are they not Sebuaeans or Dositheans? For the same Rabanus says: "The Marbonei say that he is Christ who taught them to keep Sabbath in every matter." Some in Origen, homily 28 on Saint Luke, thought that Dositheus was Christ; and he taught that he himself was Christ, as from the same Origen, tractate 2 on Saint Matthew, book 2 against Celsus, and on John 4, it will again have to be noted below.

Finally, what are the Merisei or Meristae? Rabanus says: "They are so called because they separate the Scriptures, not believing all the Prophets, saying that they prophesied by different spirits." For the Greek

word *meros* means "part" in Latin. All the Samaritan heresies fit such people. Indeed, all heretics could be called Merici or Meristae, since, as was said in chapter 3, they divide one body and make parts.

Nor would someone perhaps go very far wrong who thought that those Meristae were invented from the fact that, after the Samaritan heresies in the Greek text of Saint Epiphanius, the phrase follows, "Judaism remains divided." Eusebius, in *Ecclesiastical History* 4.22, says of all heresies that "they divided the unity of the Church." Therefore, from so great a multitude of sects which seem to have existed among the Jews, there remain only those three which were handed down in chapter 3: the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes.

(printed p. 17)

Chapter VI. Whether These Three Sects Already Existed in the Time of the Maccabees

(printed p. 17 — Book I)

John Hyrcanus lived after the Maccabees. He was the son of Simon Maccabaeus, his firstborn, and his successor in the high priesthood and principate, as I showed in the *Harmony of the Maccabees*. In the appendix to his little book *On the Hasidaeans*, chapter 4, Drusius doubts whether the Essenes already existed in his time.

Since, however, at the beginning of this appendix he says, "I shall continue to deserve well of Serarius," I too shall imitate fertile fields, which, as Cicero says, give back much more than they have received. For, to interpret as well and as candidly as possible this excellent service of Drusius toward me, a Catholic and, as he repeatedly says, a Jesuit - a service that others might think irony or abuse - he certainly gave nothing except words. I, however, not like those men who say of themselves, "We are accustomed to give things for things, words for words," shall return words, but I shall give facts, and shall free him from his doubt.

Josephus clearly says in *Antiquities* 18.2: "Among the Jews there were three philosophies from the very ancient beginning of the ancestral institutions." What is "from ancient times"? Is it not "from antiquity," "from old memory," "from the early times of ancestral institutions"? And what is meant by the emphatic adverb joined to it, "from the very ancient"? Is it not "from very great antiquity," "from deeply old memory," "from altogether early times"?

[margin: Drusius, fols. 774-775; pp. 58 and 52. Cicero, *On Duties* 1.]

(printed p. 18)

But I give Drusius an even clearer passage, from book 13, chapter 9: "At that time there were three sects of the Jews." What is "at that time"? Is it not "at this very time," or "about this very time"? And what time was that? Clearly the time when Jonathan Maccabaeus sent ambassadors and letters to Sparta, and received a reply from them. For after narrating the history of this matter, Josephus immediately adds: "At this very time there were three sects of the Jews," and at once names them: Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. Therefore it cannot rightly be doubted that these sects existed in the times of the Maccabees.

Chapter VII. Whether at the Beginning There Were Only Two Sects

(printed p. 18 — Book I)

Drusius says on page 58: "This is clear from history, that at the beginning there were only two sects." If you wish to deserve well of me, and of the reader eager for antiquity and truth, as you claim, my Drusius, then come, name even one historian who affirms this. Produce for us any one Hebrew, Greek, or Latin writer in whom that can be read. Why were you silent? Why, in smaller and less necessary matters, are you so eloquent, but in this one, which could have been for you the great trumpet and support of your opinion, are

you so mute, tongueless, without witness? Plainly no such writer was available to you; no one who asserted this had been read or heard by you. And yet you say, "It is clear."

(printed p. 19)

If this is not plainly selling smoke, painting a gourd, and making sport of the reader, what, I ask, is it? If you had said that the triad of sects could later be reduced to two, that would have been tolerable from the things I discussed above. If you had affirmed from reasoning that there were two, it could in some degree be heard, because when one departs from one, it arrives at a pair before it arrives at a triad or at any other number. If you had wished to say not "at the beginning," but "especially," or "finally," or in some other way that there were or are two, some room for excuse would be open. For perhaps writers could be found who either speak in that way or at least do not greatly shrink from that way of speaking.

For example, Sigonius, in book 5 *On the Hebrew Commonwealth*, chapter 11, speaks thus: "Of all these heresies of the Jews, the Pharisees and Sadducees especially flourished before the coming of Christ." The Drusian Gorionides, of whom I shall speak shortly, could perhaps be drawn into the same opinion. But now you have pronounced something far different: you said that it is clear from history that at the beginning there were only two sects.

Moreover, I wish you had also explained what that beginning was in which there were only two. For Josephus has already explicitly told us that there is a very ancient triad of them, so that Rufinus once translated that phrase "from the very ancient" in this way: "Among the Jews there were three philosophies, already from the beginning after the ancestral institutions had been abandoned: that of the Essenes, that of the Sadducees, and the third, by which those who were called Pharisees philosophized."

(printed p. 20)

And in the Genevan edition, which is more pleasing to men like you, a more recent translator says: "The Jews, devoted to the study of their ancestral wisdom, had already been divided for many centuries back into three sects." But when I speak about the origin of each sect, these matters concerning that beginning will become clearer.

Still, I shall not move on from here without mentioning the mind of Saint Jerome when he writes on Matthew 22: "There were two heresies among the Jews, one of the Pharisees, the other of the Sadducees." For he does not say with Drusius, "There were only two heresies among the Jews." Then let it be so: let us add that word "only" to the words of that holy man. For if Luther added that particle twice to Saint Paul in Romans 3:20 and 3:28, why should Drusius not be able to add it once only to Saint Jerome?

Let Saint Jerome therefore say that there were only two heresies among the Jews; still he will in no way support Drusius. For he is speaking about the time when Christ the Lord disputed with the Pharisees and Sadducees. Yet Drusius himself wants a third sect already to have existed then, on folios 58 and 62. Moreover, Saint Jerome passes over the Essenes because, as must be shown later in another discussion, he more readily refers them to Christian discipline. Indeed, the same holy man wished to exclude the Herodians also, whom Saint Epiphanius, Philastrius, and others place among the sects, and whom Saint Matthew mentions in that very chapter 22, verse 16, because he considered them soldiers of Herod and alien from divine worship. But let us now proceed further.

(printed p. 21)

Chapter VIII. Whether Josephus Gorionides Asserts Only Two Jewish Sects

(printed p. 21 — Book I)

This is the chief controversy about which Johannes Drusius disputes with me. In my *Harmony of the Maccabees*, I had said that three sects are asserted by Josephus Gorionides, and I had cited two Hebrew

editions: the Basel edition, book 4, chapter 6, and the Cracow edition, book 4, chapter 29, page 28.

Drusius, however, says: "The mind of Gorionides escaped you; he commemorates there only two sects, one of the Sadducees, whose side the Samaritans followed, and another of the Hasidaeans, or Pharisees, whom the people followed." To attribute this meaning to the son of Gorion, first he criticizes my Latin rendering of the Hebrew words from that chapter 29, on pages 27, 28, 46, and 63; then he constructs two arguments for himself. One is that the people did not follow the Essenes, but the Pharisees. The other is that the Pharisees were first among the Jews.

I, on the contrary, shall first set the Hebrew words, together with my translation and his, before the reader's eyes; then I shall prove that my view is more consistent both with Gorionides himself and with the truth. The words of Gorionides, then, are: *Vehachesidim lebaddam him haham haholech acherehem lechelek acher*.

[margin: Serarius, *Harmony of the Maccabees*, fols. 706 and 708. Cracow edition, p. 28.]

(printed p. 22)

My translation of these words in the cited passage of the Maccabees, page 708, was this: "And the Hasidaeans, separated from those," that is, from the Pharisees and Sadducees already enumerated, "with the people who followed them, constitute another sect." Drusius's translation, on page 46, is this: "And those pious men, or Hasidaeans, alone with the people who followed them, are the other party."

II. Drusius's Accusation and Serarius's Defense

What, then, does Drusius blame in my translation? This, of course: that I translated *lebaddam* as "separated from those," when it should have been translated "alone." "Serarius," he says on page 7 in his preface, "was misled, as it seems, by the particle *lebaddam*, not rightly understood." But as far as the sense is concerned, surely both amount to the same thing. For those who are alone are separated from others. And in any discourse, if mention has previously been made of several groups, and afterwards some people not previously named are named, and these are said to do something "alone," do they not do that very thing separated from those who were named before?

The kinds of those who philosophize are the Physicists, who examine nature; the Dialecticians, who consider how one thing is rightly or wrongly inferred from another; and the Ethicists alone discuss vices and virtues and shape human morals. What is meant here by "the Ethicists alone"? Surely the Ethicists separated from the others already named? The Ethicists, I say, apart from those same others?

In Hebrew and Greek, Genesis 21:28 speaks of lambs "alone"; our old translator expressed this thus: "Abraham set seven lambs of the flock apart."

[margin: Drusius's accusation. Serarius's defense.]

(printed p. 23)

And in verse 29 Abimelech said: "What do those seven lambs mean, which you have set apart?" In Genesis 43:32: "Set on bread." When it had been set on, Joseph sat apart, and his brothers apart, and the Egyptians also, who ate with him, sat apart before him. And in 2 Samuel 10:8, the army of the Ammonites against David consisted of the Ammonites themselves and of hired Syrians. The former drew up their battle line at the gate of their city; the latter, separated from them, drew up theirs in the field. What the Hebrew and Greek say the Syrians did "alone," our translator renders thus: "The Syrians of Zoba, Rehob, Ishtob, and Maachah were apart in the field."

But since the Innovators often prefer the new wine of new versions to the old wine of the old translator, I cite their most recent translators of these passages, Junius and Tremellius, who render thus: "Abraham had set seven ewe-lambs of the flock apart. Therefore Abimelech said to Abraham, 'What mean these seven ewe-lambs here, which you have set apart?' Set on food; and they set it before him apart, and before them

apart. But before the Egyptians eating with him, apart. The Ammonites went out and drew up their battle line at the entrance of the gate; but the Syrians of Zobah, Rehob, and the men of Tob and Maachah were apart in the field."

If, therefore, I had translated, "And the Hasidaeans apart from those," that is, from the Pharisees and Sadducees already counted, "constitute another sect," would I have erred? But how, I ask, do "the Hasidaeans apart from those" and "the Hasidaeans separated from those" differ?

(printed p. 24)

Therefore those things which Drusius throws at me on pages 27 and 28 - "you did not understand Gorionides's words"; "you translated badly"; "you are pleasantly mistaken about the particle *lebaddam*"; and similar things - can they not more truly be thrown back at him?

Moreover, Gorionides had previously set down two sects clearly, namely those of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and then afterwards he proceeds as follows: "And the Hasidaeans *lebaddam*, with the people who went after them, are another part." Does this not mark a third sect clearly enough? To keep the example already given above: if someone had enumerated those two kinds of philosophers, the Physicists and Dialecticians, and the same person immediately added, "And the Ethicists *lebaddam*, with their hearers, are another kind," would it be obscure to anyone that a third part of those who philosophize is being constituted here?

Nor can we rightly understand by the Hasidaeans, as Drusius invents, the Pharisees in these words of Gorionides, just as in the example above we cannot understand the Physicists by the Ethicists. Gorionides himself supplies a good argument for confirming this very matter, and indeed in this very chapter about which the dispute turns. For when he wanted the Pharisees to be understood by "the wise men of Israel," he carefully gave that notice and explained it once and again. To follow the new division of his chapter made by Drusius, in number 3 he says: "The king sat at table with the wise men. These are the Pharisees." And immediately in number 4: "The king said to the wise men, that is, to the Pharisees." Why, then, in a similar way, did he not say, "And the Hasidaeans, these are the Pharisees," or "the Hasidaeans, that is, the Pharisees"?

(printed p. 25)

For although Drusius uses these two ways of speaking, in the Hebrew there is only one phrase, *hemmah happeruschim*. Why, then, I ask, did Gorionides not use this or any similar explanation? Why not even once, either in this chapter or in any neighboring chapter? Indeed, why not in the whole work, which nevertheless consists of a good five long books in the Basel edition and six in the Cracow edition?

Could anyone have had more doubt about who the wise men of Israel were than about who the Hasidaeans were? Behold, even among us today the former is entirely beyond doubt, while the latter is still in doubt, unless perhaps, as they say, for the sake of a lawsuit Drusius has sown disputes for Serarius about a thing that is thoroughly clear. Yet for the sake of peace and concord I call him not to the tribunal of the praetors, but to the arbitration of those whom he himself chose, and for this one reason also.

Either Gorionides wants there to be only two sects of the Jews, or he does not. If he does, he fights with Josephus Flavius; if he does not, he fights with you. Or, if Drusius prefers this to be explained a little more fully, I say this: either Gorionides asserts three sects of the Jews; or he names only two, but does not deny a third; or he names only two and at the same time denies a third. If the first, Gorionides is on my side. If the second, he is not against me. If the third, he is indeed against me; but on my side against him stands the other Josephus, cited above in chapter 3.

Yet for my part I would not wish such great men to be committed to war with one another, to quarrel, and to fight, nor, if he is wise, should Drusius wish it for his own part.

[margin: Josephus and Gorionides agree with each other.]

(printed p. 26)

Rather, let both of us confess what the matter is: these two Josephuses agree perfectly with one another on this question; each names and counts three sects, and neither contradicts the other. This is more consistent both with the text of Gorionides himself, as I have so far proved, and with the authority of the authors.

Chapter IX. Since Josephus Flavius Asserts that There Are Three Jewish Sects, If Gorionides Were to Present Only Two, Which of the Two Should Rather Be Believed?

(printed p. 26 — Book I)

There is certainly no conflict between these two Josephuses concerning the number of Jewish sects. As was shown in the preceding chapter, each breathes and sounds together in the triad. Yet because Drusius perhaps prefers war between them to changing an opinion once adopted, I shall now show this: if, as they do not, these two Josephuses fought with one another, we should go over to Flavius rather than to Gorionides.

First, the age, name, family, whole manner of life, and deeds at home and abroad of Josephus Flavius himself are very well known to all who have even a modest acquaintance with letters and histories.

(printed p. 27)

For he lived while Jerusalem still stood; he saw it, with its temple, burned by Vespasian and Titus; after that burning, in the times of those same men, he wrote the books on the Jewish captivity; and finally, in the thirteenth year of Domitian, who was the son of the one and the brother of the other, he composed the twenty volumes of the *Jewish Antiquities*. His name is now, and always has been, so illustrious that if someone cites "Josephus," no one understands anyone other than him.

His family and office were priestly. From boyhood he devoted his life to various studies of virtue and letters; for a long time he bore arms for his country; and at last he came into the power of the Romans, as he himself narrates all these things in his own *Life*, in book 20 of the *Antiquities*, the last chapter, and also in book 1 *Against Apion*.

His authority is now so great that his commentaries were approved by the Emperor Titus's own hand, praised by King Agrippa, and entered into the public library at Rome, as may be read in the *Life* itself. There too he was deemed worthy of a statue for the glory of his intellect, as Saint Jerome handed down in the *Catalogue*. Jerome also, in the little book to Eustochium on the keeping of virginity, calls him the Greek Livy.

But what similar thing can be said about Josephus Gorionides? Everything in him and about him is obscure. None of the ancient Latin or Greek writers mentions him.

[margin: Josephus Flavius is better known and more illustrious than Gorionides.]

(printed p. 28)

It is not known when he wrote, where he lived, what he did, or what sort of man he was. In my notes on Saint Kilian, note 5, page 24, I indicated three different opinions of men about him, to which I now add a fourth.

The first opinion is that he is the same as Josephus Flavius himself. Certain rabbis, such as Radak, think this; indeed he is also cited by Pagninus under the word *Meshech*. So do almost all the modern Innovators: Munster in the preface to Gorionides himself, Fagius in his translation of Elias's *Tishbi*, where he treats Jesus, and Lepusculus in the preface to the compendium of the same Josephus.

These two men ascribe to that Josephus, the son of Gorion, the very noble and most illustrious testimony about Jesus Christ our Lord and Savior, which Saint Jerome in the *Catalogue* and Eusebius in *Ecclesiastical*

History 1.22 attribute to Josephus Flavius; which is still read today in his Greek text, book 18, chapter 4; and which was also in the Hebrew translation of the same author, but was erased by impious Jews in some manuscripts, as the most reverend Baronius writes he had discovered at Rome in volume 1 of the *Annals*. But Flavius Josephus was the son of Matthias, as he writes at the beginning of his *Life*, not the son of any Gorion; nor is he read anywhere to have written anything in Hebrew, but everything in Greek.

There was another Josephus in his time, the son of Gorion, also a leader of no common standing in the Jewish factions against the Romans, prefect of the city of Jerusalem together with Ananus, the prince of the priests,

[margin: *On Josephus Gorionides: a fourfold opinion. First opinion.*]

(printed p. 29)

as our Flavius himself narrates about him in book 2, chapter c. 42. Therefore there is a second opinion of men: that this very Josephus, mentioned by Josephus Flavius, is the author of the Hebrew history. Thus those two Josephuses would be contemporaries and men of the same age. This seems to please Genebrard in book 3 of his *Chronology*, and not without cause.

For the Jews set that Gorionides down as very ancient; and he himself says in book 5, chapter 25, that he saw with his own eyes the Jerusalem temple built by King Herod, but that he wrote after the ruin brought upon it by the Romans. For after he had said that there were twelve gates of the temple courts, he proceeds in these words:

In these there was one great gate by which we entered together with our wives, our little ones, and our wood. He is referring to the festival of the wood-offering, of which the other Josephus speaks in book 2, chapter 31. But with holiness and purity we entered that temple, both entering and coming over the pavement which is in the court before the vestibule, which is before the face of the house of the Lord; and we came as far as the vestibule, except only for the women, who did not come to it. And we did not approach the house itself, because it is the place of the priests; and even the priests themselves did not approach the Holy of Holies, but only the high priest once a year. Yet we saw everything that is in the house, while we stood in the vestibule in those days, namely every golden work that was in the house, since that house itself was open

[margin: *Second opinion.*]

(printed p. 30)

toward the court. The vine which is of gold was seen, and every golden work that was in the house, and all the golden ornaments which the king had hung on the wall of the temple, namely the spoils of the nations whom the Lord had given into his hand or power. And we saw these spoils, and we rejoiced.

Does the person who says these things not live while Jerusalem and its temple were still standing? Does he not indicate that he was an eyewitness of all these things? But when, before the words just cited, he was describing the vine just mentioned, he added: "And many Roman writers testified that they saw it at the destruction of the house itself, which even today they call *chourbam habbaiith*." Therefore it appears that he wrote those things after the destruction.

The third opinion, from his own book 4, last chapter, could be that he is Nicolaus Damascenus, that great friend of Herod, from whose name Augustus Caesar, according to the witnesses Pliny, book 13, chapter 4, Athenaeus, book 14, Photius in the *Bibliotheca*, and Illustrius in the *Lives of the Philosophers*, if these three are now read corrected, called a certain kind of dates, or palms, *Nicolaoi*. And so this Gorionides would be not only a most celebrated author, but even older than both Josephuses already mentioned.

Yet this opinion could have arisen from the error of the translator alone. Otherwise Gorionides very clearly distinguishes himself from that Nicolaus in the cited passage, since in Hebrew the words are:

[margin: *Third opinion.*]

(printed p. 31)

Many writers testify, as do I. And so Nicolaus Damascenus. And so said Strabo the Cappadocian.

Not, however, as Munster translates: "Many writers testify to the riches of the temple, namely I, Nicolaus Damascenus; and also Strabo concerning Cappadocia."

The fourth opinion, finally, is that of those who suspect him to be one of the more recent rabbis, and certainly a writer later than the times of Saint Jerome. This is the opinion of many learned men, among whom our Ribera is chief, on Obadiah chapter 1, number 110.

For first, if this writer had existed before Saint Jerome, Jerome would never have passed over an occasion to mention him somewhere. Secondly, this same writer uses certain names of peoples and cities which only a later age employed. For in book 5, chapter 1, he says that Julius Caesar subdued the Franks, the Britons, and the whole West as far as the Ocean. And in chapter 41 in the Hebrew, chapter 42 in the Latin, when he narrates Herod's funeral, he says that his bodyguard soldiers, Germans and Gauls, carried him out; and of these he adds, "*hem Phrankous*," that is, "these were Franks." But in that Herodian age the name of the Franks had not yet been assigned to the Gauls, especially those whom Caesar conquered in Gaul, as is clear from the passages in which I explained the ancient name of the Franks in the cited notes on Saint Kilian.

Again, in book 3, chapter 15, he says that Hannibal reigned in the city

[margin: Fourth opinion.]

(printed p. 32)

of Cartagena. But this name of Carthage is both new and Spanish, whereas in Hebrew, or rather in Syriac, it would be called *Carthachadattha*, or, as in Solinus, *Carthada*; in Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.7 in Greek, and in others, as Saint Jerome testifies in letter 133, *Tharsis*. Thirdly, that the part of Africa in which Carthage lies should be called Barbary is both very recent and barbarous in the Latin language. Yet in that same chapter of Gorionides it is said that "with Hannibal was all the strength of Barbary." Fourthly, in the same place Hannibal is said to have come into Spain and there to have "crushed the pride of the nation of the Goths." But the Goths did not settle in Spain before the age of Saint Jerome.

Fifthly, he always names Spain *Sepharad*. But Josephus Scaliger says in book 7 *On the Correction of Chronology*: "This is the new and recent stupidity of the Jews, interpreting *Tzarphath*, that is, Sarepta of Syria, as France, *Sepharad* as Spain, and *Ashkenaz* as Germany."

It is added that, if he had been equal or nearly equal to Josephus Flavius, each would have remembered the other, either by commending or by reprehending, as we see Flavius did with the historian of his own time from Tiberias, whose name was Justus, about whom he says so many serious things in his own *Life*. And surely the arguments brought forward for this last opinion, and also for the second one, seem so probable that they make even learned and skilled men doubt who, finally, this Josephus Gorionides is. For although

(printed p. 33)

For although something can be said in favor of the reasons on either side, which, in order to be brief, I willingly pass over for now, it nevertheless remains always obscure and ambiguous what family this author came from, where his home was, and in what period he lived. If, therefore, there is disagreement between these two Josephuses, and if a decision cannot be obtained especially from elsewhere, should we not rather trust the earlier one, so well known, so celebrated, and praised by so many?

And although it must not be denied that in this very Josephus there are some blemishes, and that he sometimes departed from that excellent and most certain rule which he announced in his *Life*, namely that truth is necessary for the writer of history - for many have made this clear, and especially the most reverend and illustrious Baronius in volume 1 and in the appendix to volume 10 - nevertheless, when no refutation of him is supplied either from divine Scripture, from writers, or from the weight of other arguments, greater trust should certainly be given to him than to that other author, obscure, unknown, and unpraised, who not

long ago crept out from the shadowy caves of the Jews.

To this latter author, where he does not disagree with better witnesses, I myself grant only as much as I grant to other masters from the workshop of the rabbis: namely, enough to illustrate and confirm some point, unless the sun of truth shines from some other quarter. But Flavius treated the question at issue here so often, as is clear from chapter 3, in so many places, and with such diligence

[margin: Other things being equal, Josephus Flavius should be preferred to Gorionides.]

(printed p. 34)

and fullness; the other, by contrast, touched it only once, and, so to speak, with the very tips of his fingers. Indeed, in the four books which this same Flavius intended to write about God and the Jewish laws, he had resolved to pursue the sects and opinions of the Jews, as appears at the very end of his *Antiquities*. Should not greater trust, then, be given to him than to the other on the number of these sects?

Finally, when Flavius states this threefold number, his words are plain, explicit, and in no way ambiguous. By contrast, the words of Gorionides are of such a kind that I shall show clearly that three sects are present in them, while Drusius sees only two.

Chapter X. Whether Johannes Drusius Correctly Translated the Few Hebrew Words of Gorionides about the Same Number of Jewish Sects

(printed p. 34 — Book I)

As we saw above, Drusius criticizes my translation of Gorionides in a single particle and little word, *lebaddam*, and at the same time boasts of his own translation, adding on page 7: "Since it ought to be translated 'they alone,' as we were the first to translate it." But if a person is ready to speak against another, is it not most fair that he should be free from every fault, or at least from the very fault with which he charges the other? Otherwise the saying of the Savior will be ready at hand: "Why do you see the speck in your brother's eye, and not see the beam in your own eye?"

I have already shown that there was not even a speck in the thing he blamed in my translation, and that, so far as that one little word is concerned, my rendering departs not at all from the opinion which Drusius approves. Now, however, I shall show that in his own translation, which we heard in chapter 8, he labored with fraud and deceit so as to drag and bend Gorionides into his own opinion.

[margin: Matthew 7:3.]

(printed p. 35)

"And those pious men, or Hasidaeans, alone," he says. First, why does he say, "And the pious, or Hasidaeans"? Why is he not content with one of these names? In the Hebrew there is only one word, *Chesidim*. And it matters a great deal whether we translate it generally as "pious men," or take it as the proper name of a certain class of pious men. In the same way, if the words "apostles" or "angels" occur in a Hebrew or Greek text, there is a difference between interpreting them by the general words "envoys" or "messengers" and retaining the proper and customary name of that class, "apostles," I say, and "angels."

But if someone were to express that one word as "messengers, or angels," would he not indicate that there was something obscure in that Hebrew or Greek text, or that one Latin word seemed less suitable than the other? This would be especially so if similar words were added in the same place, capable of being translated in two ways, and yet translated by one word only.

In this passage of Gorionides, however, there are Pharisees, who, by Drusius's own admission - indeed by his own loud assent on page 31 - could be translated in a general way as "distinguished men." Why, then, does he use two interpretations only for *Chesidim*, but for *Peruschim* only one, namely the one proper to the sect?

Why does he not likewise say in number 3 of the same chapter, "These are the distinguished men, or Pharisees"; in number 8, "one of the distinguished men, or Pharisees"; and so likewise in numbers 14, 15, 16, 20, and 22? The same question may be asked about *Tsedukim*, since they can be explained by the more general name "just men" and by the more special name "Sadducees."

[margin: First fault in Drusius's translation of *Gorionides*.]

(printed p. 36)

Why, in number 12, does Drusius not say, "He was one of the just men, or Sadducees"? Why not in number 15, "He was strengthened with the just men, or Sadducees, and was a just man, or Sadducee"? And so on in numbers 21 and 22. What, then, was the reason for using this double translation only with *Chesidim*? Clearly this: Drusius wanted slyly to suggest that *Chesidim* is not taken here as the proper name of a sect, as happens with Pharisees and Sadducees - for then a third sect, which he does not want there, would have immediately shone forth - but as a common epithet by which the Pharisees were called pious.

But in order to persuade the reader of this more strongly, he also inserted the particle "those": "And those pious men, or Hasidaeans." For although in Hebrew there is the letter *he*, which sometimes produces a demonstrative force, it very often does not do so, as is perfectly well known to those who have touched Hebrew, as they say, even with the very edges of their lips.

Indeed, Drusius himself more than once did not want that demonstrative force to be present in this same chapter of *Gorionides*. Otherwise, in verse 20 he would have had to say, "Behold those Pharisees," and in the same place, "by the mouth of those wise men," and in number 21, "those Sadducees," and again "those Cutheans," and in number 22, "with those Pharisees" and "with that king." Why did he omit that Hebrew *he* in all these places, but mark it so deliberately only with *Chesidim*?

[margin: The demonstrative particle in Drusius's rendering.]

(printed p. 37)

Because, of course, he wanted "those pious men" to be understood as the persons previously mentioned, namely the Pharisees. For this reason, in the same words he should also have added, "or those Hasidaeans," but he forgot himself.

Yet let it be granted that the demonstrative had to be expressed here. Why did he prefer to say "those pious men" rather than "these pious men," or at least "these men are pious"? For when *he* performs the office of demonstration, it signifies those two latter phrases rather than the former, or at least not less than the former. But Drusius did this shrewdly. Among Latin speakers, when several groups have previously been mentioned and something is later narrated not about all of them but about some of them, the word "those" is usually applied to the more remote ones, or to those first designated, while "these" or "these here" is applied to the nearer or later ones.

Now *Gorionides* had spoken first about the Pharisees in number 20, then about the Sadducees in verse 21, and in the same verse he adds concerning these Hasidaeans of ours. Therefore, because Drusius wants these men not to be distinct from the Pharisees but the same as they are, if he had translated, "And these pious men," no one would have understood the Pharisees, but rather those who had just been named, the Sadducees. In order to send the reader away from the Sadducees to the Pharisees set farther back, he craftily wrote, "And those pious men." Is this not to force the author whom you are interpreting to say what you wish, rather than to interpret what he himself means?

There is still another roughness in Drusius's translation, when he renders *chelek acher* as "the other part," as though the Hasidaeans were the second part or sect of the Jews, not the third. But in Hebrew it is not "the other part," but "another part."

[margin: Third fault: "another part," not "the other part."]

(printed p. 38)

The difference between these two expressions is sometimes considerable. Whoever is "the other" is also "another"; but not whoever is "another" is "the other." In divine matters, the Son is another and the other from the Father; the Holy Spirit is not the other from the same Father, but another. In human matters, a son is the other and another in relation to his father; in relation to his grandfather, he is not the other, but another. So the fellowship of the Hasidaeans is another fellowship distinct from the other two, not the second of two.

It is therefore clear that these few words of Gorionides were not correctly translated by Drusius, but wrongly and craftily bent and shaped to his own meaning. But we must now approach the other part of this writing, which, after the three sects of the Jews have now been set down, discusses each one separately.

(printed p. 39)

Those things which seemed necessary to say in general about the three sects of the Jews have now been completed. I shall next treat each one specifically. And although bitter hatreds and enmities sometimes flourished between the first two, as will be explained below in its own place, I have nevertheless decided to join them together in this one second book, because there was a great likeness of very bad morals among the followers of those sects, and because, in the most holy Gospels of our Lord Jesus Christ, these same men, joined together, are very frequently and most justly rebuked. But the Pharisees will go first; the Sadducees will follow.

BOOK II — ON THE PHARISEES AND THE SADDUCEES

Chapter I. The Name of the Pharisees

(printed p. 39 — Book II)

Four derivations of this name are handed down. The first is from *parasch*, which means to explain and to spread out, as though the Pharisees were illustrious, exposed to human eyes, and conspicuous, because they broadened their phylacteries, of which more later, as in Matthew 23:5; because they loved greetings in the marketplace, Luke 20:46; and because the trumpet blast that preceded certain almsgivings in Matthew 6:2 might also belong here, if, as some say in Euthymius and Strabus, that had been a custom of the Pharisees. Others, however, do not admit it, because it is not proved.

The second derivation is also from the same verb, but insofar as it has the force of expounding, that is, declaring and interpreting.

(printed p. 40)

This etymology seems to please Gorionides especially, since in the chapter mentioned above - that is, book 4, chapter 6 in the Basel edition, or book 1, chapter 29 in the Cracow edition - they are called "the wise men of Israel" and "explainers of the law," and King Hyrcanus is called their disciple. "The king," he says, "sat at table with the wise men of Israel. These are the Pharisees, who explain the law." By alliteration, this etymology is plainly shown: *Hemmah peruschim hammeporeschim eth thorah*, "These are the Pharisees, the explainers of the law."

The passages read in Scripture can also serve as a support for this matter: Leviticus 24:12, literally, "to declare to them by the mouth of the Lord," or, as our translator expresses the sense, "until they knew what the Lord commanded"; and Nehemiah 8:8, "They read in the book of the law of the Lord explained," as Elias signifies, or rather, as our interpreter has it, "distinctly"; or, as the translator of Elias gives it, "with the discourse explained"; or, as Buxtorf has it, "clearly, fully, and explicitly." There are also the expressions very commonly used among the rabbis, as when some interpretation is called *perousch*, and when they say, *caduecad parasch peloni*, that is, "So and so this man explains," and *caescher pa reschou rabbothenu*, "as our masters explained."

But some object: they ought to be called *Poreschim*, not *Perouschim*. The former is the active participle, *Benoni*; the latter is the passive, *Paul*. First, it may be answered that this pertained to their greater excellence and glory. Since no one can teach unless he has been taught, they are called *perouschim* as men filled and excellently instructed with expositions and interpretations received by tradition both from God and from their ancestors.

[margin: Four etymologies of the Pharisees.]

(printed p. 41)

Secondly, in certain verbs there are sometimes usages outside the ordinary and common rule. So it is also with this verb: in the active conjugation, especially in *Piel*, the rabbis use it absolutely and almost passively, as Elias explains in the *Tishbi*, where he says he marvels at the fact.

And indeed, although Beza, on Matthew chapter 3, praised that objection as if it were excellent and ascribed it with commendation to Johannes Mercerus, nevertheless Junius and Tremellius - either Mercerus's own pupils or his associates in the same sacred work - disregarded it on Mark chapter 7 and said that the Pharisees were named from explaining the law. Melanchthon, in book 2 of his *Chronicles*, approves this more strongly.

Third, according to Saint Jerome in the book *Traditions on Genesis*, the name comes from *parats*, that is, "to divide"; but then in Hebrew they would be called *Perutsim*, and in Greek and Latin more often *Pharitsaei* or

Pharizaei, although, according to the same Saint Jerome in the preface to Amos, also *Pharisei*.

The fourth derivation, then, is more probable and more accepted among the Hebrews themselves: it comes from that same first verb *parasch*, but insofar as it means to divide and separate, as in Ezekiel 34:12, "in the midst of his sheep, scattered and dispersed." Hence among the rabbis, in *Piel*, as I touched on above, it also means "to be separated." Hence too each of the sections which they made in the books of Moses - fifty-three in all - is called a *paraschah*, and every mark by which things are separated from other things,

[margin: Second, third, and fourth derivations.]

(printed p. 42)

which among philosophers is called a difference, is called *peresch*. Hence finally come the Pharisees, as if they were separated and set apart from others.

But from what thing, or for what reason, were they separated? Because, as Baal Aruch says, and Elias in the place already cited, *hem happierouschim middarche haholam*, that is, "because they were separated from the ways of this world," just as the Nazareans were. So too in the *Book of Roots* Radak interprets the Pharisees as *Hannicbadim*, that is, honored, excellent, and eminent. Likewise in the book *Iuchasin*, virgins dedicated to God are called *peruschoth*; and *perischouth* is holiness of life itself. Thus Rabbi Akiba says in chapter 3 of *Pirke Avoth*, *Nedarim seiag liphrischouth*, that is, "Vows are a hedge of holiness of life"; not, as Drusius badly cites it, "Tradition is the hedge of holiness of life," since the preceding expression is *Masoreth seiag lethorah*, that is, "Tradition is the hedge of the law."

As far as the meaning of division is concerned, the Saint Jerome cited above supports this derivation when he says, "The Pharisees, who separated themselves as if they were just, are called divided." And Saint Augustine, sermon 30 *On the Words of the Lord*, says: "The Pharisees were Jews, as it were the eminent Jews. For the nobler and more learned men were then called Pharisees." And more clearly in sermon 15 *On the Words of the Apostle*: "Some were leading men, and, as it were, set apart for Jewish nobility, not mixed with the contemptible common people; these were called Pharisees. For this word is said to be interpreted 'separation,' just as in Latin *egregius* means, as it were, separated from the flock."

(printed p. 43)

Saint Epiphanius, in heresy 16, says in Greek that they were called Pharisees because they separated themselves from others by the excess of religious observance which they thought they possessed; the Hebrew term, he says, is interpreted as "separation."

Chapter II. From What Tribe, Family, Rank, and Place the Pharisees Came

(printed p. 43 — Book II)

They came from every tribe. The Pharisaic institution was not confined to one tribe, as the priesthood and other duties of the temple were bound to the tribe of Levi. Some were from the tribe of Judah; others from Benjamin, as Saint Paul was, Philippians 3:5; others from the tribe of Levi, as Hyrcanus was at the beginning, according to Josephus Flavius, book 13, chapter 18, and according to Gorionides in the place discussed above. Josephus Flavius, at the beginning of his *Life*, indicates that others were from another tribe. Saint Chrysostom, on Matthew 15, says: "The Pharisees were scattered through all the tribes in twelve parts." Euthymius and Leontius say the same.

The same reasoning applies to their family. Whoever wished could follow this or that form of life. Rank, however, may be considered as either plebeian or more noble. Saint Augustine, mentioned above, explains from what source the Jews derived the nobility of which he speaks.

[margin: The Pharisees came from every tribe; family; rank.]

(printed p. 44)

In the same sermon 15 *On the Words of the Apostle*, when he explains why Saint Paul, in Philippians 3, called himself a Pharisee, Augustine has Paul speak in this way: "I was not a sluggish Jew. Whatever seemed opposed to my law, I bore impatiently and pursued sharply." Then Augustine adds: "This was nobility among the Jews."

Josephus shows at the beginning of his *Life* that family, especially priestly family, was considered by them in assessing nobility. He says in Greek, "Among each people there is some different foundation for noble birth; among us, participation in the priesthood is a proof of the splendor of one's family." He indicates almost the same cause at the beginning of book 1 *Against Apion*: just as today in our Germany the nobility of each person is examined when he is admitted to the colleges of the cathedral and metropolitan churches of Mainz, Wurzburg, Speyer, and others, and just as among the Athenians the descent of the archons was investigated, as Sigonius shows in book 3 *On the Athenian Republic*, so too priestly nobility was examined among the Jews.

Now the Pharisees came from both ranks. For Josephus reports in that same book that four men were sent from Jerusalem to drive him out of Galilee, men "different by birth, but alike in education and sect." Two were *demotikoi*, that is, plebeians; likewise in *Antiquities* 13.18 he calls to *demotikon* the people or common crowd, and Gorionides uses the word דלחעם [*dallath ha-am*, the poor of the people] for "the people."

(printed p. 45)

In book 14, chapter 8, Josephus says that the pontificate was made from among the common people. The remaining two were nobles of priestly family: Gozorus, himself from a priestly family and a Pharisee, and Simon, one of the chief priests then at Jerusalem, the youngest in age.

Those who had been sent as delegates to Saint John the Baptist were also priests and Levites, John 1:19, and from the Pharisees in the same passage, verse 24. Nicodemus too is called both a Pharisee and a ruler of the Jews, John 3:1.

Among the Pharisees themselves, however, there was also a certain order. In the same Josephus they are called "the leading men," and a little after the beginning of his *Life*, "the first men of the Pharisees"; in Saint Jerome, writing to Algasia, they are "the very wise men set over the synagogues." Therefore their place was not Jerusalem or Judea alone, but any part whatever of the Israelite land. Luke 5:17 says: "There were Pharisees sitting, and teachers of the law, who had come from every village of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem." Theophylact on Matthew 15 says: "In all places there were scribes and Pharisees."

Chapter III. What the Doctrines or Institutions of the Pharisees Were

(printed p. 45 — Book II)

Among the doctrines of the Pharisees, the first and almost principal one which writers mention is that they assigned all things to fate.

[margin: There was order among the Pharisees.]

(printed p. 46)

But there can be some question about how they understood fate. Saint Epiphanius, in heresy 16, understands this heresy in the way in which it is rejected by Saint Augustine and by the whole Christian Church. For he objects that by this fate they take away the *autexousion* of human beings, that is, free will, and God's just judgment, by which rewards or punishments are ordinarily decreed. For if someone, as the same Saint Epiphanius says, acts "not from himself, not freely, but by the force of fatal necessity," what punishment is there? What reward?

Sixtus Senensis, however, in book 2 of the *Bibliotheca Sancta*, understands fate in the way granted by the Peripatetic philosophers, as may be seen in Alexander of Aphrodisias *On Fate*, Plotinus *On Fate*, Ammonius, Psellus, and Magentinus on Aristotle's *On Interpretation*; Simplicius, Themistius, and Philoponus on book 2 of Aristotle's *Physics*; and also by Christian philosophers, Gregory of Nyssa *On Fate*, Boethius, *Consolation* book 4, prose 6, Julius Sirenus *On Fate*, and Toletus, book 2 of the *Physics*, chapter 6, question 11.

The words of Senensis are these: "By fate, that is, by God's foreknowledge and immutable decree, all things happen, while the free assent of the human will nevertheless remains. For by this tempering God, the best and greatest, governs things in such a way that,

[margin: Fate; Senensis, *Bibliotheca Sancta* 2; Rhodiginus 5.9; Baronius, *Apparatus*.]

(printed p. 47)

although all things depend on his deliberation, in a human being the faculty remains intact for approaching virtue or vice." Rhodiginus too seems to incline in this direction in book 5, chapter 9.

But I rather adhere to the opinion of Saint Epiphanius, not only because his authority is much greater, but also because it agrees more closely with Josephus concerning the Pharisees. In his *Life*, Josephus says that the Pharisaic heresy is near and similar to the Stoic one. It is well known from Cicero, *On the Nature of the Gods* and *On Fate*, from Seneca, *Natural Questions* book 2, chapter 36, from Gellius, book 6, chapter 2, and from others, what necessity of fate the Stoics established.

The same Josephus nevertheless notes two things that somewhat lighten and diminish the vanity of this foolish opinion about fate. One is in book 13, chapter 9: they did not ascribe all things to fate, but only certain things. His Greek means: "The Pharisees say that some things, and not all things, are the work of fate; some things are in our own power, to happen or not to happen." The other is in book 2, chapter 12, where he joins fate with God and leaves something to free will: "They attribute all things to fate and to God; yet to act justly or not, they leave chiefly in the power of human beings."

(printed p. 48)

Second, from this occasion of fate Saint Epiphanius says that these same Pharisees devoted themselves greatly to astronomy, and that from the practice of men deceived by Gentile error they fashioned Hebrew names for the planets and for the twelve signs of the Zodiac. Since these names are in Latin and Greek partly obscure and almost corrupt, I shall here try briefly either to restore or to explain them.

1. The sun: *Emacaeemes*. Two names are involved, *Ema* and *Semes*, that is, the Hebrew names חמה and שמש, corresponding to heat or the sun.

2. The moon: *Iereach* and *Levanah*, likewise two Hebrew words, ירח and לבנה or הלבנה.

3. Mars: *Choreb Ocmol*. Serarius corrects this from the Greek as *Chocheb Omol*: "star" (כוכב) plus a word he explains as mercy or sparing (חמול), because Mars is the star of battles and wars, in which indulgence should have a place, or because pardon should be sought from God on account of it. Or perhaps it comes rather from קמול, a word meaning "to cut down." Today, from the color by which this star is red, or by which blood shed in war is red, it is called by the Hebrews מאדים, *Maadim*.

4. Mercury: *Choreb Ochmod*. Again this should be corrected as above from the Greek as *Chocheb Ochmod*: the star of wisdom (כוכב חכמות) or of desire (חמוד), because Mercury was thought to preside over trade, in which there is continual desire for gain. Today it is called מרקוליס, *Merkolim*.

[margin: Astrology.]

(printed p. 49)

5. Jupiter: according to the earlier correction, this should be read in Latin as *Chocheb Baal*, in Greek as the star of Baal, that is, the principal star or the star of the Lord, כוכב בעל. Today it is called צדק, *Tsedek*.

6. Venus: *Serua* or *Lued*, interpreted as sowing, kindling, or shining; Serarius connects it with the Hebrew words זרוע, sowing, and להט, kindling or shining. Today it is named from splendor, נגה, *Nogah*.

7. Saturn: again, according to the earlier correction, *Cocheb Sabeth*, כוכב שבת, the star of the Sabbath. Today it is simply called שבתאי, *Shabbathai*.

The signs of the Zodiac are these:

1. Aries: *Tele*, טלא, though because of the kinship of the gutturals ה is often placed for א, so that it is also written טלה; it means a lamb or ram.

2. Taurus: *Sor*, שור.

3. Gemini: *Thomim*, תאמים.

4. Cancer: *Sartan*, סרטן, not *fartam* as in the Latin.

5. Leo: *Ariyeh*, אריה, and by syncope *Ari*, ארי, sometimes badly written in Greek.

6. Virgo: *Bethulah*, בתולה.

7. Libra: *Moznayim*, מאזניים, given once in a poorer form and once better.

8. Scorpio: *Akrab*, עקרב, once given corruptly, and earlier correctly.

9. Sagittarius: *Kesheth*, קשת.

10. Capricorn: *Gedi*, גדי.

11. Aquarius: *Deli*, דלי.

12. Pisces: *Dagim*, דגים.

Thus the Gentiles, as Saint Jerome says to Fabiola in letter 128 on the priestly garment, defamed heavenly things and God's ordering by the names of idols.

(printed p. 50)

Some of them, as Pliny in book 1, chapter 3, thought that various forms of animals were truly present in the sky, and that seeds sometimes fell from them upon land and sea. Yet, as Macrobius says in book 1, chapter 19, on the *Dream of Scipio*, all these images and names were made by human choice. Giovanni Pico della Mirandola, in book 8 against astrology, chapter 5, and Theodorus Gramineus, in his work on the sphere, chapter 3, rightly wish that either all of them, or at least a large part of them, be changed by Christians into better and more honorable names. See Saint Gregory on Job, book 4, chapters 6 and 7. But because of Pharisaic astrology, this is enough in this place.

Third, Josephus, book 2, chapter 12, says that they spoke of a migration or transmigration of souls: not of all souls, but of the souls of good men, which remain and enter the bodies of good men. The souls of the wicked, however, they said, were immediately punished with eternal torment. From the first part of this doctrine there arose the many reports of men concerning Christ, and yet by that very fact they testified that he was endowed with goodness and excellence, because they thought the soul of one of those men whom they believed to be very good had entered into his body. Thus in Matthew 16:14 they said, "Some say John the Baptist, others Elijah, and others Jeremiah or one of the prophets."

[margin: Transmigration of souls; eternal punishments and rewards.]

(printed p. 51)

Josephus, cited a little above, says again in book 18, chapter 2, in Greek, as the recent interpreter translates: "They believe souls to be immortal, and that judgments are passed upon them beneath the earth; then rewards come to each according to the merit of virtue or malice; the latter are condemned to everlasting prisons,

while for the former there is an easy return to life."

Fourth, they strongly urged the traditions of the elders, Matthew 15:2 and following, Mark 7:1 and following. Some of the ancient heretics said that these traditions were all the books of the Old Testament, as the Manichees did; others said they were only some of them, as the Ptolemaeans did according to Saint Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 33. Our own Innovators, however, either all of them or almost all of them, both Lutherans and Calvinists, want all the traditions which exist in the Christian Church to be these traditions, if they are not written in the Bible itself.

But first it must be known that the Jewish opinion is that a twofold law was delivered by God to Moses, and by Moses himself to Joshua, and by Joshua then to others. One is the law which was written and is called by them *thorah bichtab*; the other was not written, but handed down by mouth, and is called *thorah schebehalpeh*, just as in Justinian, book 1 of the *Institutes*, laws are written and unwritten.

[margin: Traditions; what the traditions of the Pharisees were.]

(printed p. 52)

Secondly, the same Hebrews think the former law is simple and literal, and they call it *peschat*, as Elias explains in the *Tishbi*; the latter they think mystical and spiritual. Thirdly, from this division of the law the *Masoreth* and *Cabala* also arose. I have said more about these in my work on Joshua, when I asked whether Joshua received the cabala from Moses.

Fourthly, there were at last certain rabbis among the Jews who decreed and prescribed various things, as though necessary or very useful for the worship of God, the observance of the law, and the salvation of the soul. These are called either *gezereth hazekenim*, that is, the decrees or ordinances of the elders, or *misnaioth*, that is, repetitions, as it were secondary laws or laws added in a secondary way to the law of Moses. Rambam says much about these in the preface to his *Iad* or *Hand*, at the beginning of the first volume; so too the author of the book *Arba Turim*, Recanati, and the book of the one hundred blessings. I have discussed the four kinds of traditions celebrated among the Jews in book 1 of the *Maccabees*, chapter 2, page 629, and book 2, chapter 1, page 782.

Hence also comes the Jewish Talmud, whose two parts are the *Mishnah* and the *Gemarah*, although sometimes that common name is given to one of the two parts almost as its own proper name, as Elias shows in the cited book. The *Mishnah* is the "repetition," as it were the text itself; the *Gemarah* is the "completion" or consummation, as it were the gloss and commentary itself. And these latter *gezereth hazekenim* and *misnaioth*

(printed p. 53)

are called by the Lord "the traditions of the elders," or "of men," in Matthew 15 and Mark 7. Saint Epiphanius, in the Ptolemaean heresy, number 33, says: "The traditions of the elders are called by the Jews repetitions." What sort of traditions these were can be understood in two ways: from certain examples, and from the book of *Mishnaioth* itself, which exists in various forms. Here I shall keep to the former method, as I began, by noting those traditions which the holy Gospels supply.

1. They did not in any way take food with common or unwashed hands, Matthew 15:2, Mark 7:3, Luke 11:37.
2. While eating they also washed themselves often, as can be gathered from the water jars set out at the wedding feast of Cana in Galilee, John 2; and what was done there is said to have been according to "the purification of the Jews." Hence Saint Mark says that they wash their hands frequently. Because the Greek has *pygme*, the recent interpreter Beza translates it "to wash with the fist." "The Pharisees," he says, "and all the Jews, unless they wash their hands with the fist, do not eat." Truly an interpretation worthy of being beaten with fists. For by what reasoning are hands washed with a fist?

It is better to say that *pygme* is here an adverb, like *kyklo* and *parresia*, and means frequently, zealously, and diligently, the metaphor being taken from boxers and boxing, which is called *pygme*. In boxing the fists are thrown often, with great effort and diligence.

[margin: Various traditions of the Pharisees: 1 and 2; washing the hands often.]

(printed p. 54)

Thus to do something *pygme* is to do that very thing repeatedly, often, and vigorously. So we see in a certain ancient writer cited by Suidas, though not named - who nevertheless, from the matter itself, seems to be Procopius - that a cognate word takes on adverbial force. From this Casaubon concludes against Beza, though otherwise he praises him, as we shall see below: "Certainly I would no more think that *pygme nipsasthai* in that place should be interpreted 'to wash with the fist' than that, in the earlier passage, *pyx oryxantes* should mean 'digging with the fist.'"

The explanation just given is confirmed from the Syriac text, in which "to wash" is *betilaith*, just as in Luke 1:39 "to go away" is *betilaith*, "with haste." Moreover, Saint Epiphanius, in heresy 15, the heresy of the scribes, twice uses the same adverb in this sense.

So that we may have some image of such frequent and careful washing, hear a few things from the ten requirements which the cited book of the hundred blessings teaches must be done whenever food is taken. "First, one must not eat without the table set. Secondly, the hands must first be washed and dried; otherwise the bread which is eaten is judged unclean. The manner of washing the hands is this: one must stand while washing the hands, and not lean on a wall or on any support. Pure water must be chosen, not salty or corrupt water, which a dog would disdain to drink.

[margin: The Jewish manner of washing hands.]

(printed p. 55)

"Water must be poured over the hands three times. At the first pouring the fingers are to be lifted upward; at the later pourings they are to be lowered. The hands are to be raised together, not one after the other. Thirdly, in the washing of the hands the left hand must serve the right like a servant. Nor will it be enough if, without water, you wipe your hands well with a napkin, or if you come to the table with unwashed hands and, using a spoon, do not touch the food with your bare hand. If someone wishes to come to the table from the privy, he is bound to wash his hands twice." I omit the rest.

3. "From the marketplace," says Saint Mark, chapter 7, verse 4, "unless they are baptized, they do not eat." Because in the marketplace there was a gathering of various people - Jews and Gentiles, and Jews either clean or unclean - they washed themselves as soon as they returned home, lest perhaps they had been polluted by someone's touch. Indeed, as the verb "baptize" seems to suggest, they immersed their whole body in water. So Plutarch says in the book *On Superstition*, "Baptize yourself into the sea." From this came the Hemerobaptists; and from the Pharisees came Banus, that hermit under whose discipline Flavius Josephus placed himself as a youth. Josephus records at the beginning of his *Life* that Banus was accustomed to wash himself often, day and night, in cold water for purity.

[margin: Jewish baptisms.]

(printed p. 56)

4. In the same place Saint Mark says: "There are many other things which have been handed down to them to observe: the washings of cups, pitchers, bronze vessels, and couches." For "pitchers," Beza, wishing to say something new, put "sextarii," although even in the old glossary the word means a little jar; elsewhere it means a measure or small vessel. Others say it is anything that can be scraped out, such as a stone water jar. And in Syriac this Greek word is retained here, as other Greek words are elsewhere.

Why, in the same way, did Beza not put "copper pot," "kettle," or "large vessel" for "bronze vessels"? For the Greek word denotes a kitchen vessel. By "couches" understand the beds on which people reclined when taking food, from which come the dining rooms called triclinia. So too in Matthew 23:28, and where Luke 11:40 speaks of dishes or basins. And today, around the feast of Passover, what washings of their bodies and of almost all their household goods do the Jews not perform? Johannes Pfefferkorn narrates them fully in his little book on their Passover.

5. They did not take food with sinners either, Matthew 9:11. For when the Pharisees saw Christ the Lord reclining with sinners, they said to his disciples, "Why does your master eat with publicans and sinners?"

6. Indeed, they did not even wish to be touched by sinners, Luke 7:39. When the Pharisee saw Mary Magdalene wiping the Lord's feet with the hair of her head

[margin: 4. Other washings; 5. Food with sinners; 6. Contact.]

(printed p. 57)

and kissing them, he said within himself, "If this man were a prophet, he would surely know who and what kind of woman it is who touches him, because she is a sinner." There still remain today certain Jews on an island in the Red Sea who, if they see any foreigner there, immediately cry out, "Do not touch." Mention of them will be made later in due course.

7. Among them there flourished an excessive observance of the Sabbath, to such a degree that they did not want the sick to be healed on it, Luke 6:7 and John 9:16; nor did they want those who had been healed to carry home on their shoulders the bed on which they had lain sick, John 9:10; nor did they want the hungry to pluck ears of grain and rub them for eating, Matthew 12:2.

Moses of Kotzi and Rambam, volume 1, folio 143, report that the general works forbidden to all on the Sabbath were thirty-nine, but that the special works forbidden to certain persons were more numerous, and that among these is counted תלוש, the pulling up of a growing thing. Synesius, writing to Evoptius, reports that there was a Jew on a ship who, when a storm had even arisen, laid down the rudder which he had been holding on the very evening of the Preparation, and through that whole night and the following day remained wonderfully motionless and read a book of the law.

Origen, in book 4 *On First Principles*, reports of the Dositheans that they kept Sabbath rest in such a way that whatever posture, place, or position each of them was found in on that day - whether standing, sitting, inside, or outside - he remained in the same state.

[margin: Sabbath.]

(printed p. 58)

Saint Jerome, imitating that passage of Origen in his letter to Algasia and speaking about the Pharisees, says: "Because it is commanded that on the Sabbath days each person sit in his own house and not go out or walk from the place where he lives, when we begin to press them according to the letter, so that they do not lie down, do not walk, do not stand, but only sit if they wish to keep the commandments, they are accustomed to answer: Rabbi Akiba, Simon, and Hillel, our teachers, handed down to us that we may walk two thousand feet on the Sabbath, and other things of that sort, preferring the doctrines of men to the doctrine of God. We do not say that one must always sit on the Sabbath and not withdraw from the place in which one has been occupied, but that what is impossible in the law, where it is weakened by the flesh, must be fulfilled by spiritual observance."

Origen further adds in the same place: "But what the law says, not to lift a burden on the Sabbath day, seems to me impossible. For from this the teachers of the Jews, as the holy Apostle says, were rolled down into endless fables, saying that it is not considered a burden if someone has shoes without nails, but that it is a burden if someone has boots with nails. And if someone carries something over one shoulder, they judge it to

be a burden; but if over both shoulders, they deny that it is a burden."

8. They fasted frequently, Matthew 9:14 and Luke 5:33. Certainly Banus, the teacher of Josephus Flavius, took in the wilderness only such things as grew of themselves.

[margin: Fasting.]

(printed p. 59)

And that boastful Pharisee in Luke 18 says that he fasted twice in the Sabbath, that is, on two days in each week. Saint Epiphanius, in heresy 16, explains that these were the second and fifth weekdays.

9. Similarly the Pharisees prayed frequently, Luke 5:33; according to Saint Epiphanius, heresy 16, they prayed continually. And Matthew 23:14 and Luke 6:2 show that they made long prayers, as is also apparent in *Cether Malcouth* and in the Jerusalem Talmud, where prayer, or *thePhillah*, is treated. They also prayed in synagogues and on the corners of streets, Matthew 6:5; see Rambam, volume 1, folios 67 and 73.

10. To these fasts and prayers must be referred that extremely austere and extraordinary manner of life which Saint Epiphanius narrates about them in the same heresy 16. First, some of them took upon themselves an exercise of virginity or continence lasting four, eight, or ten years. Josephus, in his *Life*, says that at the age of thirty he kept his wife inviolate.

In this struggle to guard chastity they used such contention and labor that they made continual prayers, lest anything bodily should happen to them, or lest some emission should perhaps befall them secretly and unexpectedly in sleep. Some made for themselves little narrow beds, one span wide, in which they would place themselves in the evening, so that if sleep should perhaps overwhelm them, they would fall to the ground and thus, roused again from sleep, return to prayer and live a sleepless life as far as possible. Others gathered sharp stones and pebbles and put them under themselves, so that, being painfully pricked by them, they would never sink into deep sleep but would force themselves to keep watch. Some even used thorns as a bed. These things are from Saint Epiphanius.

[margin: Prayer; austerity of life.]

(printed p. 60)

11. They gave tithes to God from all their possessions, even the smallest: mint, dill, cumin, rue, and every kind of herb, Matthew 23:23, Luke 11:42, and Luke 18:12. Saint Epiphanius says in the cited place that they tithed, gave firstfruits, offered thirtieth and fiftieth portions, consecrated sacrifices, and paid vows. There were also some to whom tithes were owed and brought as to priests, yet who did not accept them, as Josephus narrates of himself in his *Life*.

12. They also placed very great effort on bringing certain people from Gentilism and idolatry to the Jewish religion. This is what the Lord says in Matthew 23: they went around sea and dry land to make one proselyte. For such a coming over or access by which Gentiles were initiated into the Jewish sacred rites, the Talmudists say that three things were necessary — *מילה וטבילה ודם של קרבן* — circumcision, baptism, and the blood of an offering, that is, a bloody victim.

They add, however: "If it is a woman, only baptism and offering will be necessary." And again, because today the Jews do not have an altar or sacrifices, they add that for men, until the rebuilding of the temple for which they hope, baptism and circumcision are sufficient; for women, only baptism. Rambam explains this more fully in volume 2, folio 137, in *Issure Biah*, chapter 13, where he teaches

[margin: Tithes; proselytes; what was necessary for making a proselyte.]

(printed p. 61)

how in the times of David and Solomon, when many thousands of Gentiles received the worship of God and the Jewish religion, they were not circumcised but were only baptized; and that this same baptism was also to

be given to the Gentiles in the times of the Messiah. We see the same in the Christian Church: it was given formerly, and is now given daily, even in the farthest regions of the rising and setting sun, India, Japan, and Peru - praise and glory to Christ Jesus, the Messiah himself.

13. They broadened their phylacteries and enlarged their fringes, Matthew 23:5, where in Greek the words "of their garments" or "of their cloaks" are added. These phylacteries raise three questions.

First, what were they? Saint Epiphanius, in heresy 15, says: "Those who wish to speak exactly are accustomed to transfer the name phylacteries to purple marks. For this reason the Lord, according to them, called them phylacteries. The following words also indicate the phrase and meaning of the expression, and the fringes of their cloaks: so that he calls the hems and borders fringes, but the signs and marks of the purple itself phylacteries. For he says, 'having broadened your phylacteries and enlarged the fringes of your cloaks.' For each person had certain fringes and borders on the four corners of his cloak, tied from the very thread, at the time when they were living continuously or practicing virginity."

Others, however, hand down that all these were slips of paper, or rather parchments, which they tied to the forehead

[margin: What phylacteries were.]

(printed p. 62)

and with which they crowned the head around both ears, so to speak.

The second question is: what was written on them? Saint Chrysostom and Saint Jerome, on Matthew 23, think that the Decalogue was usually written on them. The Jewish rabbis, however, say that four sections from Scripture were written there. The first is: "Sanctify to me every firstborn that opens the womb," and so forth, Exodus 13:7-11. The second is in the same chapter: "When he has brought you in," from verse 7 to verse 17. The third is: "Hear, Israel: the Lord God of Israel, the Lord is one," Deuteronomy 6. The fourth is: "If therefore," Deuteronomy 11:13-19.

The Jews still keep this custom today. They secretly carry around a little crown for the head, usually made from leather, which they fasten with two knots. In the first knot, which is at the forehead, those written little parchments are enclosed. In the second, nothing is enclosed, but they tell the tale that it was shown to Moses by God.

There are also precepts about the quality of those parchments and the whole manner of writing those sentences. "First, the parchment must be from a clean domestic animal or wild animal; then it must be whole, with no hole in it and no place through which ink might run. The writing must be on that side of the parchment which had touched the flesh of the animal. They must be written with the right hand, even if the writer is otherwise ambidextrous. But if someone can use only the left hand, that will stand in place of the right. If someone cannot write in a straight line unless some line has first been drawn,

(printed p. 63)

he may draw one first. If any one of the letters already written is entirely erased, so that a child who is not foolish cannot read it, it will be unfit; but if the child can still read it, it is fit. In the upper part of the phylacteries themselves, no more empty space is to be left than the letter lamed requires; in the lower part, no more than final caph and nun require. The entire writing of those same phylacteries must be enclosed in four lines. Yet it is not necessary that a line be drawn between the written lines.

"When someone wears them on his head, he must not approach any cemetery within the space of four cubits. If sacred Bibles or those phylacteries are present anywhere, it is not lawful for a husband to know his wife unless either they are carried elsewhere, or are placed inside one vessel, and that vessel again inside a second, and that one inside a third." These and many other things are found in Rabbi Moses of Kotzi, Rabbi Jacob,

the author of *Arba Turim*, and others; Oleaster includes some of them on Exodus 13, question 3.

Why are they called phylacteries? Among the Hebrews they are called טוטפוח, *totaphoth*, and certain Hebrews say that this is an Egyptian word meaning spectacles; Oleaster approves this. But nearly all translate it as frontlets. In the Chaldaic language, however, they are commonly called תפילין, *tephillin* or *tephillah*. Some derive this from תפל, a verb meaning to join, as Baal Aruch wishes, as though they join us to God, just as certain mystical rabbis teach about *theptillah*, that is, prayer; and they join God's law and God himself to us. Or, as Elias in the *Tishbi* prefers, it comes from פלל, the verb for prayer; they also speak of the *tephillah* of the hand and of the head.

Why they are translated in Greek as *phylacteria*, which the Latins retain, is explained in two opinions.

[margin: Whence phylacteries are named.]

(printed p. 64)

Since *phylassein* means "to guard" and *phylassesthai* means "to be guarded," some think they are so called because they were certain remedies and amulets against the destructive terrors, plagues, and snares of demons. Thus Horapollon, book 1 of the *Hieroglyphics*, chapter 24, calls those things phylacteries by which, even without any letters, certain people guard themselves, so that no demonic thing may touch them.

So too Saint Jerome on Matthew 23 says: "They called those little Decalogue slips phylacteries because whoever had them would, as it were, have them for his own guard and defense." Some in Saint Epiphanius, whom he rejects, say the same. From this notion, however, the word is used in a bad sense and condemned by the Trullan Synod: those "phylactery-makers" who, as Balsamon interprets, by the deceit of the demon give to those deceived by it certain bonds woven of silk threads, which are also called *periphta*. Saint Augustine, in sermon 215 *On Time*, calls them diabolical phylacteries.

In a good sense, however, Saint Gregory wrote to Theodelinda, queen of the Lombards, in book 12, letter 7: "We have taken care to send phylacteries to our most excellent son, King Adaloald, that is, a cross with wood of the holy cross of the Lord, and a reading from the holy Gospel enclosed in a Persian case."

Others, however, say they were so named because they guarded the memory of God, of his law, and of his commandments, and were, as it were, a perpetual memorial so that no sin would be committed. And this is more consistent

[margin: Canon 61.]

(printed p. 65)

with the text from which the Jews derived their use and observance of these things, Deuteronomy 6:8 and Exodus 13:16, where in Deuteronomy, in place of *totaphoth*, there is set זכרון, *zecaron*, that is, as the Seventy translated it, a memorial. And so Aben Ezra also explains it.

Two further little questions could be added here. The first is whether all Jews were bound to wear such inscribed plates or little parchments literally. Saint Jerome says that the Pharisees interpreted the matter badly. The second is whether those sacred objects which some wear hanging from the neck - amulets, for example the beginning of Saint John's Gospel, some small cross, and the like - are condemned here. Beza asserts that they are condemned, citing the Synod of Antioch; and Saint Jerome also seems altogether to condemn them in this same place.

To the first question Abulensis, on Matthew 23, questions 40, 41, and 44, replies with Saint Jerome that there was no commandment by which the Jews were bound to these phylacteries. On the second, something has been said elsewhere by the same Abulensis, question 38 on the same chapter of Saint Matthew; by our Gretser in book 2 *On the Cross*, chapter 29, book 4, chapter 47; by our Del Rio in the books of the *Disquisitiones on Magic*; and by me in a certain little discourse about these matters. For now this is enough:

the Pharisees, so that they might display a greater religion toward God, were accustomed to make those parchments broader. This is what it means to broaden the phylacteries.

Saint Jerome says in the cited place: "The Pharisees wrote on parchments the Decalogue of Moses,

[margin: *Del Rio, Disquisitions on Magic, cited.*]

(printed p. 66)

that is, the ten words of the law, folding them and binding them on the forehead, and making, as it were, a crown for the head, so that they might always move before the eyes. The Indians, Persians, and Babylonians still do this today."

There are two Hebrew names for fringes. One occurs in Numbers 15:38-39, צִיצִית, *tsitsith*. The other occurs in Deuteronomy 22:12, גְּדִילִים, *gedilim*. Whatever may be said about those phylacteries, it is certain that these fringes were prescribed, as Abulensis indicates in the questions just cited, so much so that even our Lord and Savior himself wore fringes, Luke 8:44.

They were worn first as a reminder of the divine commandments, as is said in Numbers 15. Secondly, they gave the Jewish people some distinction in dress from other nations, so that, just as circumcision gave a sign of the Jewish people on their bodies, their clothing too would have some difference.

Some nevertheless make a certain distinction between these two names, as though the first signified a cluster of many threads gathered into a little ball and hanging from the edge of the garment, such as we call *zotten* in German, as in curls of hair, in which Cicero said that he saw dripping fringes on Piso; and the second signified the threads themselves, which are called *fransen* in German and *franges* in French. The Seventy, however, simply rendered the former passage as "fringes" and the latter likewise. Still, I do not know how it happened that certain Gentiles almost imitated this kind of garment,

[margin: *Fringes, what they are.*]

(printed p. 67)

as Homer reports of Nestor in book 10 of the *Iliad*.

Therefore, just as the Pharisees made their phylacteries broader, so too they made their fringes larger. For this is what it means to "magnify" them, as is understood from its conjunction with phylacteries, although elsewhere, sometimes in Varro and Pliny, "to magnify" means to boast magnificently and to raise up with praises, and likewise in Euripides' *Bacchae*. In this good sense the Blessed Virgin sang in Luke 1, "My soul magnifies the Lord," as even Henry Stephanus among the Innovators teaches, in his book on the Latinity of Lipsius, that our Interpreter correctly rendered it.

But Saint Jerome adds here something marvelous about our Pharisees. "They made great fringes," he says, "and tied very sharp thorns in them, so that as they walked and sat they would sometimes be pricked, and by this admonition, as it were, be drawn back to the duties of the Lord and the service owed him."

Now since the Hebrew *gedilim* by its own force shows that the fringes ought to be great, the Pharisees nevertheless made them still greater. The Jews still wear these fringes today. For they have a little garment, made square, which covers the back and breast and is open at the sides, as certain small hair-shirts usually are, or as some garments would be if you removed the sleeves. From the four lowest corners of this little garment hang the same number of little cords, and in each of them there are five knots, in memory, as they say, of the five

(printed p. 68)

books of Moses. Sometimes, when they pray among their own people, they put it over their other garments; otherwise they are accustomed to cover it beneath them, attributing to it some force against wicked concupiscence, as Oleaster reports on Numbers 15. Ridiculous, unless they mean that this happens through

the memory of the divine law itself, which restrains that raging desire.

14. On the piety owed by children toward parents, they taught as follows, Matthew 15:5: "Whoever says to father or mother, 'Whatever gift is from me will profit you,' and he does not honor his father or mother." How much difficulty these words contain all the interpreters declare, and most recently Maldonatus, after bringing forward many interpretations, follows one of them, that of Strabus, Hugh, and Lyra, until he finds a better.

Leaving these aside, I think the sense is this, which the transposition of one word, "is," made here by someone or other, has rendered so obscure: "It is a gift, whatever of mine will profit you." That is, you Pharisees teach this doctrine contrary to the divine doctrine: that anyone may say to anyone, but especially a son to a parent in need of help, "It is a gift," or "It is offered to God," or "Let everything by which I can benefit you be vowed and dedicated to God."

For first, this is the force of the Greek words: "A gift, whatever from me you may be helped by." Secondly, this meaning and this order of words are clearly seen in Saint Mark, chapter 7, verse 11:

(printed p. 69)

"Corban, that is, a gift, whatever from me may have profited you." Thirdly, interpreters have commonly rendered *Corban* in Greek as a gift, and our interpreter as a gift or offering, something offered to God, as in Leviticus 1:2 and following, Hebrews 5:1 and 8:3.

Fourthly, in the tractate of the Jewish Talmud on oaths and vows, this formula of vowing is still expressly read: "Let every thing be a gift, or anathema to God, that can be pleasing to you from me," or "that can benefit you from me," as Masius rightly noted on Joshua 6. There is also that excellent passage in Theophrastus, in the book *On Laws*, that the Tyrians forbade anyone to swear foreign oaths, and that among these Josephus, in book 1 *Against Apion*, page 927, records the oath called *Kosban*.

15. On the obligation of oaths themselves the same men taught as follows, Matthew 23:16: "Whoever swears by the temple, it is nothing; but whoever swears by the gold of the temple is bound." And verse 18: "Whoever swears by the altar, or by the altar, it is nothing; but whoever swears by the gift, or by the gift which is upon it, is bound." These were fixed formulas of swearing among the Jews, just as also that formula in Matthew 5:35, "by Jerusalem," and "by one's head," by which Jews still swear according to Rambam, volume 1, folio 23, in *Halecah Thalmud Hatthorah*, chapter 7. The Jerusalem Talmud may also be consulted in *Sanhedrin*, and again Rambam on other sayings, volume 3, folios 374, 375, and 381.

[margin: Oaths.]

(printed p. 70)

16. On their love toward the ancient prophets, Matthew 23:29: they built the tombs of the prophets, adorned the monuments of the just, and said, "If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been their associates in the blood of the prophets." And Luke 11:47-48. But more on this again below.

17. On their disposition toward Saint John the Baptist: some received his baptism, Matthew 3:7; some rejected it, Luke 7:30. Yet they held him in the highest regard, and with great honor they undertook an embassy to him, to learn who he was, whether the Christ, or a prophet, John 1:19 and 24.

18. On the affection of the same men toward Christ the Lord: they themselves acknowledged in general that the Christ was the son of David, Matthew 22:42. But they did not know that our Jesus was that very Christ and the Son of God, Saint Epiphanius says; indeed, they denied it most obstinately and shamelessly, and opposed him by every means they could.

First, they accused him of violating the law because of the Sabbath violated in those ways which were indicated above from Matthew 12:2, Luke 6:7, John 9:15, and elsewhere. Secondly, they blamed him because he transgressed the traditions of the elders: by not washing his hands before food, or at least by not

teaching his disciples that their hands must be washed;

[margin: *The prophets; John the Baptist; Christ.*]

(printed p. 71)

by eating with sinners; and the like, concerning which above from Matthew 9 and 15, Mark 7, Luke 7, and Luke 19:39.

Thirdly, they interpreted Christ the Lord's words and deeds badly, attributing them to vainglory, John 8:13: "You bear witness about yourself"; and even to the devil, Matthew 9:34 and 12:24: "By the prince of demons he casts out demons." Similar things occur in the Jerusalem Talmud, tractate *Avodah Zarah*, and Rambam, volume 1, folio 10.

Fourthly, they objected that he usurped for himself the things that belong to God, such as the forgiveness of sins, Luke 5:21. Fifthly, they very often tempted him and tried to catch him in speech: through disputes, arguments, and contentions, John 8; through cunning questions about dismissing wives, Matthew 19:3; about Caesar's tax, Matthew 22:15-16; about the judgment of the adulteress, John 8:4-5; and through requests for miracles, Matthew 12:38 and 16:1.

Sixthly, they attempted to destroy him, Matthew 21:45 and John 4:1, and more openly John 7:32, when they sent certain officers and soldiers to seize him. Seventhly, they seized him, sending a cohort into the garden where he then was, John 18:3; and they procured his death through false testimonies and through Pilate, as, although it is nowhere said by name, it seems to be gathered from Mark 14:53, 55, and 15:1. After his death they tried to prevent his resurrection and the prediction concerning it, Matthew

(printed p. 72)

27:62. Finally, they gravely and cruelly persecuted his doctrine, disciples, and followers, John 7:47-48, 52; 9:22 and 34; 12:19 and 42. Because of this, Nicodemus was afraid and came to Christ himself by night, John 3.

19. They sat upon Moses' chair, Matthew 23. First, "chair" is taken either properly, for a material seat, whether it is made of wood, gold, or stone, or tropically. Euthymius thought that it is taken here properly, as in 2 Esdras 8:4. Others reject this, because in those ancient times it was not the custom among the Jews that a man who read or interpreted Scripture should go up into a platform or sit on some seat, but rather that he should rise and stand.

This can be confirmed first from that very passage, cited by Euthymius for a material pulpit, 2 Esdras 8, where Esdras read the book of the law standing, with Mattathias, Semeia, and others standing beside him. Secondly, Christ the Lord, Luke 4:16, "entered the synagogue on the Sabbath day according to his custom, and rose to read." Thirdly, Acts 13:16: in the synagogue of Antioch, "Paul rose and, motioning with his hand for silence, said, 'Men of Israel.'" Fourthly, the same custom exists today among the Jews, and formerly also among Christians, 1 Corinthians 14:30. Fifthly, those who heard the word of God stood, Judges 3:20; and among Christians formerly, as Saint Augustine testifies in homily 16. How much more, then, those who proclaimed it?

[margin: *Moses' chair.*]

(printed p. 73)

Still, the custom of sitting was more usual everywhere for teachers when they taught in schools, synagogues, and temples, even among the Jews. First, when Christ the Lord, in Luke 4, had read a place from Scripture and had folded up the book, he sat down, verse 20, and then began to teach, as is explained in the following verses.

Secondly, "when the same Lord saw the crowds, he went up the mountain, and when he had sat down, his disciples came to him; and opening his mouth, he taught them," Matthew 5:1-2. He taught the crowds sitting from a little boat, Luke 5:3. Again, verse 17: "And it happened on one of the days, and he himself was sitting and teaching." Again John 8:1: "Sitting, he taught them."

Thirdly, when he was twelve years old, "he was sitting in the midst of the teachers, listening to them and questioning them," Luke 2:46. If the boy was sitting in the midst of the teachers, then the teachers themselves were sitting too. Indeed, painters depict this boy as being ordered by all who heard him, admiring and astonished, to ascend to a higher chair and to teach from it. Saint Vincent, from the old proverb "Painters and poets," rebukes them; but perhaps with too little reason. For if at times they indulge themselves in some fiction, they should not therefore always be thought to err. And indeed in this matter they have a very ancient writer as supporter, Sedulius, when he says:

*In heart he seemed older, and among the teachers of the law
he sat as an experienced master, a master by right.*

(printed p. 74)

What, then, does the Church say? At the beginning of the Mass on the Sunday when that Gospel is read, does it not recite from Ecclesiasticus 24, "I saw him sitting upon a lofty throne"?

Fourthly, to pass over these things, the metaphorical chairs of which I shall speak later show that true chairs were used in teaching. Fifthly, Saint Augustine teaches, in book 1 *On the Lord's Sermon on the Mount*, chapter 1, that it belongs to the authority of a master that he sit. For this reason the emperor Theodosius did not want Arsenius, the teacher, to stand before his sons, the pupils. Hence the exedrae of the ancients, and the philosophers called "chairmen"; hence among us the thrones and chairs of bishops, about which Saint Chrysostom speaks in homily 3 on Colossians 1, Saint Augustine in book 4 *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 27, and on Psalm 36, exposition 3.

Hence, finally, academies and schools among the Hebrews are called *ieschiboth*, as though "sittings"; and disciples sit before the prophets, 4 Kings 6:2, and likewise in *Pirke Avoth*, chapters 3 and 5. Yet it must not be denied that sometimes and somewhere it happened, either for the sake of reverence or for some other purpose and occasion, that either teachers or learners stood, just as in the Peripatetic school they walked. And when Christ the Lord in Luke 4, Saint Paul in Acts 13, and others in 1 Corinthians 14 are said to have "risen," that sufficiently indicates that they had previously, after the common custom of all the rest, been sitting along with them.

(printed p. 75)

Therefore it seems to me that for another reason "chair" is taken in this place not properly, but tropically. For Moses' chair would either be some one chair in which Moses himself had once properly sat, or one in which Moses was taught, or at least any chair whatever in which and from which Moses was read and taught.

Not the first, because no one tells of any one such chair, preserved from the time of Moses down to Christ the Lord. For even if it had been of stone or gold, age would not yet have destroyed it; yet the storms of so many and such dreadful wars would either have broken it to pieces or carried it elsewhere, and much more would they have burned one made of wood. Nor is it lawful to imagine that it was brought back from Persia or from elsewhere, or guarded somewhere like the sacred ark or the fire.

Not the second, because we do not read of any such single chair. And if there had been one, so many scribes and so many Pharisees could hardly have sat upon it. When time had consumed it, it would no longer have been Moses' chair; or at least the name would have been common to several such chairs.

Not the third, because not only the scribes and Pharisees would have sat upon Moses' chair, but also all fathers and mothers of families, since they were bound privately to teach their children the law and the ceremonies which Moses had prescribed, Exodus 12:26-27; Deuteronomy 4:9-10; 6:20; 11:19. The Sadducees also and the Samaritans would have sat in

(printed p. 76)

Moses' chair, because in their temple on Gerizim they read and taught the law of Moses. Indeed they would claim Moses' chair for themselves all the more, insofar as what they themselves did seemed more Mosaic: to receive Moses alone and to reject all the other writings of the prophets. So today our Lutherans and Calvinists boast that they honor the Scriptures most highly because, they say, they listen to them alone and spurn the rest.

Moreover, whenever the Pharisees sat in some chair of some synagogue, Moses' chair would always be there. For it is clear from Matthew 23:6 and Luke 11:43 that there were several chairs in the synagogues.

But if there is a trope in this chair, what then does it signify? "The doctrine of the law," says Saint Jerome, whom the Venerable Bede follows. But this doctrine is not to be taken in a precise and bare sense. For otherwise, as I said above, Jewish parents too would have held this chair at home, and so would everyone who in some school or synagogue had taught Moses to children or others; and the Sadducees and Samaritans would especially have arrogated it to themselves.

Therefore this chair is indeed the doctrine of the law, but taught and proposed with public and legitimate authority; or it is the public and legitimate authority of teaching and proposing the law. Thus to sit in Moses' chair is nothing other than to have public and legitimate authority and power for teaching and explaining the Mosaic law.

(printed p. 77)

First, this appears from the things already discussed. Then it appears from this: without legitimate power it was lawful for no one to teach in the temple, as the elders and rulers object to Christ the Lord, Matthew 21:23. For when the Lord had come into the temple, the chief priests and elders of the people approached him as he taught, saying, "By what authority do you do this, and who gave you this authority?"

This authority was given first by the high priest, and then by those who had that authority from him, such as the rulers of synagogues, of whom mention is made in Matthew 5, Luke 8, and Luke 13, as Abulensis notes on Matthew 23, question 14.

In this way "seat" and "throne" of the king are also commonly taken for royal power: Genesis 41:40; Deuteronomy 17:18; 3 Kings 1:30, 37 and following; Proverbs 16:12; Jeremiah 17:25 and 22:30; Daniel 5:20; Obadiah 3. So too the seat, throne, and chair of God, Psalm 44:7; Psalm 46:9; Psalm 102:12; Isaiah 6; Ezekiel 28:2; and elsewhere. So too the seat and throne of the one who was once high priest. For in that very chapter of Gorionides, about which there is a dispute between me and Drusius, Eleazar the Pharisee said to Hyrcanus: "Come down from the seat of the priesthood, and let the seat of the kingdom suffice for you," that is, abdicate pontifical power and be content with royal power alone.

So today Saint Peter's chair is pontifical power in the Christian Church. Fourthly, for the same reason it seems to be called the key of knowledge, Luke 11:52. For a key is the symbol of power, Isaiah 22 and Apocalypse 3.

(printed p. 78)

Fifthly, those things which will be noted below from Saint Augustine tend very much in this direction. Lyra also meant this here when he called it authority and judicial power; by this he understood ecclesiastical and spiritual power, not that which is forensic and has a civil tribunal, as Abulensis seems to have taken Lyra's

words in question 11 when he objects against them, although neither there nor in question 14 does he disagree from Lyra's mind.

But let us hear, among the Innovators, Beza alone on Matthew 23: "The Lord signifies," he says, "that this order of interpreting the law, of which mention occurs in Numbers 11:16, was divinely established, and therefore that the truth must be heard even from the mouth of mercenary and hypocritical teachers."

Sixthly, Josephus, book 13, chapter 18, says that certain things were established by them, and that they handed down to the people many ordinances from the succession of the fathers which are not written in the laws of Moses; and for this reason the heresy of the Sadducees rejected them. Seventhly, in the same chapter, Matthew 23:4 and Luke 11:46, it is added that the same Pharisees and lawyers were accustomed to bind heavy burdens, so that Calvin understands by that binding excommunication, which, as in the Christian Church, so also in the old synagogue, was no light penalty, John 9:22; 2 Esdras 13:28.

But Matthew 7:29 says: "Christ was teaching as one having authority, and not as the scribes and Pharisees," as the Syriac text says along with our Latin. Did they therefore have no authority? Some reply that authority here is called that by which someone can make laws by his own decision and authority. Others say it is the power of striking and moving not only the ears outwardly, but also minds inwardly. Others, finally, say it is the power of miracles, by which the Lord confirmed in deed what he taught in word.

(printed p. 79)

If all these are joined together, the exposition will be complete in every respect. Thus Luke 4:32 says: "They were astonished at his teaching, because his speech was with authority."

Chapter IV. Whether All the Doctrines or Institutions of the Pharisees Were Evil

(printed p. 79 — Book II)

This may seem so to someone for the following reasons.

First, they are everywhere blamed so severely by Christ the Lord. For they are called hypocrites, Matthew 15:7, 22:18, and very often in chapter 23; avaricious, Luke 16:14; fools, Matthew 23:17 and 19, Luke 11:40; desirous of empty glory, Matthew 6:2 and 5, Matthew 23:5-7, Luke 11:43; outwardly clean, in the same place and verse 28; whitewashed tombs, Matthew 23:27; monuments that do not appear, Luke 11:44; full of plunder and uncleanness, Matthew 23:25; full of hypocrisy and iniquity, verse 28; blind, Luke 9:40, Matthew 15:7 and 14, 23:16, 17, 19, 24, and 26; an evil and adulterous generation, Matthew 16:4; serpents and broods of vipers, Matthew 3:7 and 23:33; and finally children of Gehenna,

(printed p. 80)

Matthew 23:15.

Secondly, Christ the Lord says very clearly in Matthew 16:11, "Beware the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees." And when he had explained what he meant, "then," verse 12, "they understood that he had not said to beware the leaven of bread, but the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees."

Thirdly, the same Christ the Lord says to the same men, Matthew 15:3: "Why do you transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition?" He then proves this, as also in Mark 7.

Fourthly, Matthew 5:21: "Unless your justice abounds more than that of the scribes and Pharisees, you will not enter the kingdom of heaven." After this he teaches that they either erred or were less exact in the exposition of God's commandments concerning homicide, verse 23; adultery, verse 28; divorce, verse 32; perjury, verse 34; and retaliation, verse 38.

Fifthly, the whole of Saint Matthew's chapter 23 is occupied in censuring them, and likewise a large part of Saint Luke's chapter 11, and this with the terrible "woe" repeated many times.

Sixthly, Saint Jerome, on Matthew 16, says: "The leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees does not signify bodily bread, but perverse traditions and heretical doctrines." And a little after: "This is the leaven of which the Apostle speaks, 'A little leaven corrupts the whole lump.' Marcion, Valentinus, and all heretics had leaven of this sort, which must be avoided in every way." Afterward he compares heretical doctrine with leaven. The same Saint Jerome, on Isaiah

(printed p. 81)

chapter 8, says that by their deuteroses they dissipated and stained the precepts of the law. Again, in the letter to Algasia, he calls those deuteroses "old wives' tales," and says that "many of them are so foul that I blush to speak of them."

Rupert, when in book 1 on Jeremiah, chapter 4, he had said that those things must be destroyed by Jeremiah which had been badly built, added: "Such, most especially, are the assemblies of the scribes and Pharisees, having the root of avarice fixed deep in the earth." Eighthly, Saint Epiphanius and Philastrius call the Pharisees heretics; and Maldonatus, among recent writers on Matthew 3:7, says that heretics are signified through them.

Some distinction must be applied here. For some of the doctrines and institutions of the Pharisees are quite openly evil, as is clear from the things said above: the first, concerning the necessity of fate; the second, concerning the excessive efficacy of the stars; the third, concerning the transmigration of souls; the fourteenth, concerning impiety of children toward parents; the fifteenth, concerning the emptiness of oaths. But the worst and most criminal of all is the eighteenth, concerning their extreme unbelief, wickedness, and savagery toward Jesus Christ.

Some, however, are quite openly good in their own kind: the eighth and ninth, concerning prayer and fasting; the eleventh, concerning the tithing of all possessions; the sixteenth, concerning supreme honor for the ancient prophets; and the nineteenth, concerning the office of teaching and interpreting the divine law.

[margin: Distinction among Pharisaic institutions: some bad; some good.]

(printed p. 82)

For in these matters that saying of Christ the Lord in Matthew 23:23 and Luke 11:42 applies: "These things ought not to be omitted." What else does this word of necessity, "ought," signify except that those institutions of the Pharisees about which the Lord was there speaking were by no means to be neglected, and therefore were also good?

Finally, some are less openly either evil or good, such as the fourth, concerning the traditions of the elders; the seventh, concerning so great an observance of the Sabbath; the tenth, concerning such austerity in food and sleep; and the thirteenth, concerning the broadening of phylacteries and the magnifying of fringes.

Yet all of them, both good and bad, both open and doubtful, are most deservedly blamed in the Pharisees, because even those which were plainly and in themselves good - much more those which were more obscurely good, or could be good - they depraved and corrupted, as almost the first argument shows. For they referred those good things rather to empty glory and ambition. "All their works," says the Lord in Matthew 23:5, "they do in order to be seen by men"; verse 6, "They love the first places at feasts, and the first chairs in the synagogues, and greetings in the marketplace, and to be called Rabbi by men"; Luke 11:43.

Secondly, they employed much hypocrisy and simulated much holiness which they wholly lacked; the place already cited. Thirdly, they sought riches, and for the hunting of them they made prayers and certain other things,

[margin: Both bad and good were badly done by them.]

(printed p. 83)

Matthew 23:14: "You devour the houses of widows, praying long prayers."

Fourthly, they looked around at themselves, displayed themselves, and boasted magnificently, Matthew 6 and Luke 18. Fifthly, they despised others, Luke 7 and 18. Sixthly, they superstitiously observed certain little things and freely violated others much greater. The Lord says in Matthew 23:24: "Straining out a gnat, swallowing a camel." This proverb is taken from hotter regions, such as Judea was, where gnats frequently fly into wine vessels and cups if they stand open even for a little while; so if someone wants to drink that wine very pure, it is necessary to strain it and hold back the gnats in the strainer. In the same way, formerly at Cologne, Mainz, and elsewhere, if anything harmful or unclean happened to fall into chalices, the wine was strained, as I noted in my *Moguntiacis*.

Those, therefore, who feared so greatly to swallow a tiny creature, swallowed, I say, that enormous animal, the camel.

Seventhly, they very zealously pursued certain good things which were voluntarily and freely undertaken and were not necessary; but they set aside the things in the law of the Lord which were necessary and much weightier and greater, for example judgment, mercy, and faith, Matthew 23:23. For these things, which are necessary, weightier, and more useful, ought to be done; those other things, although good, are not necessary,

(printed p. 84)

and lighter, and "ought not to be omitted" if someone has imposed them on himself and has bound himself to them by a vow or by some manner of life. In this way, I take that word "ought" in the latter phrase to be repeated.

Eighthly, they imposed on others certain things which were indeed good, but heavy and burdensome, which they themselves did not touch even with a finger, Matthew 23:4. Ninthly, they did not live in accordance with their good doctrine, Matthew 23:3.

Tenthly, they were a bad example and scandal to many. For this reason, in the same place, verse 13, they shut the kingdom of heaven before men; neither did they enter it themselves, nor did they allow others to enter. Although others take this differently, it seems rightly to be understood with respect to Christ the Lord and his Church, from which the Pharisees called away very many by their example.

Saint Augustine, book 16 *Against Faustus*, chapter 29, refers to the same bad example what is said of the proselytes in Matthew 23:15, that they were made children of Gehenna by the Pharisees. "Not because he is circumcised," he says, "but because he imitates their morals, a proselyte becomes a child of Gehenna." And a little after: "A proselyte became a child of Gehenna not by hearing the words of the law from the Pharisees, but by following their deeds. Therefore what Paul says in Romans 2 could then be said to a circumcised proselyte: 'Circumcision indeed profits, if you keep the law.'"

This exposition, however, explains only how proselytes were rendered liable to Gehenna by the Pharisees, not why they were made twice as much so as they were. Therefore the same Saint Augustine adds:

[margin: How proselytes became children of Gehenna.]

(printed p. 85)

"Because he imitated the Pharisees in not keeping the law, he became a child of Gehenna. For this reason, as far as I think, he was twice as much so as they, because he neglected to fulfill what he had undertaken by his own will: he was not born from the Jews, but had freely become a Jew."

But even if in this way proselytes are conceded to become twice as worthy of punishment, it still does not yet follow that the Pharisees made them so. Eleventhly, then, although others say other things, the Pharisees

seem to have created for their proselytes a double Gehenna because they did not take sufficient care that they cast away their former malice in Gentilism and their depravity of morals, and because they supplied to them the occasion of adding a new malice, and a corrupt example.

Then again, they relaxed the Mosaic law for them and permitted certain things which it prohibited, for example forbidden marriages. This is attested both by what Rambam wrote in volume 2, folio 137, where he treats of *Din thorah lecouthim*, that is, the judgment and manner of the law concerning the Cuthaeans, or Samaritans and Gentiles, and also by the complaint of certain rabbis, when they explain that the harsher things in the law of Moses, and the penalties established for those who sin, ought to be set before all who wish to come to Judaism.

"Certainly," they say, "it would be good for Israel if not so many proselytes were made from the Gentiles, because they are burdensome and harmful to Israel. Since they are not trained in the institutions of the Mosaic law, it happens that the Israelites learn from their deeds. Go and see how much evil was done

(printed p. 86)

in the affair of the calf, and in the graves of craving." For Egyptian proselytes were the authors for the Israelites both of worshiping that calf and of desiring the Egyptian pots.

Twelfthly and finally, the Pharisees, together with certain good works, joined other things which were evil and which were contradicted by those very good works; and so, by actions otherwise good, they pronounced, as it were, a sentence against themselves. This is the case in chapter 23, noted above at number 16, concerning their honor for the ancient prophets and just men in relation to their mausoleums.

For the Lord used against them a most prudent syllogism, as blessed Jerome says, and it can be gathered in this way:

Whoever criticizes evil-doers and yet imitates them does evil and condemns himself. But you Pharisees criticize those who do evil and yet imitate them. Therefore.

The assumption is proved as to the first part. When you build and adorn the monuments of the prophets and saints whom your ancestors killed, you confess, both by deed and by word, that your ancestors acted wickedly. By deed, because you judge worthy of adornment those whom they judged unworthy of life; and those whom they slaughtered with murders, you honor with honors. By word, because you say, "If we had been in the days of our fathers, we would not have been their associates in the blood of the prophets."

Now as to the latter part, the same assumption is proved, because you are of such a mind, such obstinacy and savagery,

[margin: How the Pharisees badly built the tombs of the prophets; on Matthew 23; Jeremiah 2:6, 30, 34.]

(printed p. 87)

that in a similar way you now wish to kill and to afflict with exquisite punishments the prophets, wise men, and scribes who are sent to you by God.

But the Lord expresses this latter part and its proof in various ways, suited to his purpose and to that present time. First, by concession, Matthew 23:32: "And you, fill up the measure of your fathers"; although from certain ancient Greek copies, in which the verb is past, it could be translated: "And you have filled up the measure of your fathers," that is, by the settled purpose of your mind and by your obstinate will of wickedness, you have already equaled the depravity of your ancestors; you are already equal to them in crime and malice.

Secondly, by prediction, verse 34, corresponding to the promise already made: "Therefore behold, I send to you prophets and wise men and scribes; and some of them you will kill and crucify, and some of them you will scourge in your synagogues and persecute from city to city."

Thirdly, by a sharp comparison of both parts in Saint Luke 11:48: "Certainly you testify that you consent to the works of your fathers"; and these works are proved to be impious because "they indeed killed them, but you build their tombs," as though they were most worthy of life and honor. And yet the very things which you condemn in your ancestors, you yourselves do. Therefore, verse 49: "And the wisdom of God said: I will send to them prophets and apostles. And some of them they will kill and persecute."

(printed p. 88)

And thus a passage otherwise difficult is understood without difficulty. These discourses of the holy Fathers also illustrate it.

Saint Augustine, book 2 *Against the Adversary of the Law*, chapter 5, when he explains those words, "You are the sons of those who killed the prophets," says: "The Lord surely called them sons by imitation of crime, not by propagation of race. For the fact that they were born from them according to the flesh could not be charged to them as a crime; rather, it was because they showed themselves like them in unbelieving cruelty. Therefore he turns and says: 'And you, fill up the measure of your fathers.'" And afterward: "It is indeed clear, indeed manifest, that these are sons of evil men by imitation, from whom the holy and just prophets, from Abel himself whom his brother killed, down to Zacharias whom they themselves killed, endured the most impious and criminal persecutions. For how did the blood of those men who lived long before they themselves were born come upon them, unless because there is one kind, one mingling, one mass of the impious, joined together with itself by imitation?"

Saint Chrysostom, homily 75 on Matthew 5, says: "He did not say woe to them because they build, nor because they accuse their fathers, but because in doing and saying these things, they dared to condemn their fathers, while they themselves committed worse things."

Saint Ambrose on Luke 11 says: "By building the tombs of the prophets, they accused of crime those who killed them; and by emulating similar deeds they also declared themselves heirs of paternal iniquity. Therefore it is not the building, but the emulation, that is reckoned as the crime."

(printed p. 89)

As for the things that were objected, the explanation is either already clear from what has been said, or will certainly become clear from what will be said below. For some points require a little question.

Chapter V. Were All the Pharisees Evil

(printed p. 89 — Book II)

Since it has been shown that the doctrines and institutions of the Pharisees were either depraved, or at least depraved by them, and were contaminated with the stains of many quite serious sins, and since the Lord everywhere thunders against them so vehemently, so often, and so seriously, who in such a criminal and condemned people is innocent? Who is not evil? Who is not most damned?

Yet these vices did not belong either to the sect itself as such, nor to all who followed it. The first point can be understood from the Apostle, who in Acts 26:5, before Festus the Roman governor, King Agrippa, and a great gathering of judges and palace officials, says: "According to the strictest sect of our religion, I lived as a Pharisee."

How, I ask, was the Pharisaic sect the strictest of all in Jewish worship and religion, if, by its own institution and first origin, it was fouled by so many crimes, superstitions, falsehoods, and absurdities? In Greek it is called *hairesis akribestate*, that is, the most exact and most accurate sect. And after Saint Paul, Josephus, book 2, chapter 12, calls the Pharisees by almost the same expression,

[margin: *The Pharisaic sect was not evil in itself.*]

(printed p. 90)

those who seemed to explain the legal ordinances with exactness. And in book 7 of the *Antiquities*, chapter 3, he says that they greatly prided themselves on the most exact part of the ancestral law of the Jews.

How could it be the most exact and most accurate sect if, in matters so illustrious and evident, and so relevant to the true worship of God and to the advantage of all, it fell so foully and shamefully by the force of its own axioms? How did the Pharisees understand and explain the ancestral law with the highest exactness, if their discipline necessarily urged the falsehoods, errors, and trifles indicated above?

Moreover, in the same passage of Acts, the same sect is called in Syriac *ioulphana rischaja*, that is, the first doctrine and institution, as Josephus also calls it in book 2, chapter 12, or the chief and principal one. But if the fictions and absurdities thus far reviewed were born by a kind of natural necessity from its own principles, how would it not rather be the very last and most despised of all sects? Or else, indeed, it would have to be said that in the Israelite religion nothing at that time was pure, clear, and sincere. For if what is judged best in some kind is worst, what will the rest be? What will the whole kind be, except vicious, polluted, and detestable?

As for the second point which I advanced, that the vices discussed above did not belong to all the Pharisees, does not the Apostle himself sufficiently indicate it in the same place?

[margin: Matthew 6:23; not all Pharisees were evil.]

(printed p. 91)

"From the beginning," he says, "according to the strictest sect of our religion, I lived as a Pharisee"; and Acts 22:3, "nourished according to the truth," or as above, the exactness, "of the law of the fathers." And in Philippians 3:5: "If anyone else seems to trust in the flesh, I more: circumcised on the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews, according to the law a Pharisee." And afterward, in verse 9, he says that in Christ Jesus he did not wish to have the justice which is from the law, in order that he might have that which is from the faith of Christ.

Therefore he had formerly been just according to that justice which was given not by the Pharisaic hypocrisy and wickedness explained so far, but by the law itself, especially because in the same place he says: "I conducted myself according to the justice which is in the law, without complaint." Thus Saint Jerome plainly declares, in books 1 and 2 on Galatians, on chapter 3, that he was just with Mosaic justice.

What of Gamaliel, the Apostle's own teacher, at whose feet he was instructed according to the truth of the paternal law, Acts 22:3? Was he not a Pharisee? Was he not an upright man, and alien from Pharisaic envy, blindness, and fury? When Saint Peter and the Apostles had been captured by the Jews, rebuked by the chief priest, and surrounded like lambs by savage wolves, by the Sadducees and others sitting in that deadly council, "a certain Pharisee in the council, named Gamaliel, a doctor of the law, honorable to all the people, rose," Saint Luke says in Acts 5:34, "and ordered them to be put outside for a short time." At last he freed them from their jaws,

(printed p. 92)

and finally joined himself to their number, as I explained in my *Paul*, numbers 10 and 11.

Moreover, John 3:1 says: "There was a man of the Pharisees named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews." That he was an upright, simple man and a lover of truth appears from the whole conversation of Christ the Lord with him, and again from his defense of Christ the Lord in the council and from the anger of the other Pharisees against him, John 7:50 and following. Finally, after the Lord had been taken away in death, his hastening to prepare aromatic, lavish, and honorable burial spices, John 19:39, breathes nothing but a good man.

The man who received Christ the Lord, still an infant, into his arms, and sang the swan-song concerning his own dismissal, Luke 2:28 and following, was "a just and devout man, awaiting the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Spirit was in him," verse 25 in the same place. The most exact character of this sect, of which I spoke above, and certain writers suggest that he too was of the Pharisaic institution; although they confuse him with another just Simeon, of whom more below under the founder of the Pharisees.

I pass over others, about whom I spoke in the same *Paul*, number 13, and reason thus: almost the same vices are charged by Christ the Lord against the lawyers, Luke 11, Matthew 23, and elsewhere, as against the Pharisees. Yet it is clear that those vices are not to be transferred either to the very office of knowing and explaining the law, or to all the experts in the law.

(printed p. 93)

Therefore the same, or at least an equal, judgment must be made concerning the Pharisaic sect and its followers: the same if the lawyers and Pharisees were the same people, equal if they were different. But more on this later.

Certainly Acts 15:5 affirms that, besides those whom I have counted, several others came to the faith of Christ the Lord, although some of these later caused disturbances; and likewise some of them came to the baptism of John, Matthew 3. Yet because very many from this order of Pharisees were wicked and criminal, for that reason the eternal wisdom of God warned, rebuked, and censured them in so many ways. It is customary for reprimands and rebukes of this kind to be made as if not even one person were good and free from fault, as in Isaiah 1:6 and Jeremiah 8:6 and 10.

Chapter VI. How Christ the Lord Ordered the Pharisees Sitting upon Moses' Chair to Be Heard, and Yet Warned that Their Leaven or Doctrine Must Be Avoided

(printed p. 93 — Book II)

We heard above the command of our Savior from Matthew 23:2: "The scribes and Pharisees have sat upon Moses' chair. Therefore whatever they tell you, observe and do." This is a great and broadly extending precept. When he says "all things," what has he excepted? When he says "observe," and at the same time adds "and do," does he require only the hearing of bodily ears and the inward keeping of memory?

(printed p. 94)

Does he not also command works and outward actions? But on the contrary, behold the same Lord in Matthew 16:6: "Beware the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees."

But what is this leaven? The Apostles certainly doubted in the same place, and thought that they were being forbidden to accept from the Pharisees, either as a gift or by purchase, the breads which they then lacked and which were necessary for food, verse 7 in the same place. But the same Lord was the interpreter of his own words to them. Therefore, verse 11: "Why do you not understand that I did not speak to you concerning bread, when I said, Beware the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees?" Then, verse 12, "they understood that he had not said that one must beware the leaven of breads, but the doctrine of the Pharisees and Sadducees."

If, then, one must beware the doctrine of the Pharisees, how are the same men to be heard when teaching? How are all the things they say to be observed and done? Some interpreters restrict that word "all," but in various ways.

For some think that only Moses' precepts are included, those which are necessary for salvation and must remain in force at every time as long as human beings exist; but not the Mosaic ceremonies and rites, from

which the Lord wished human minds to be snatched rather than inserted into them. Maldonatus, however, does not assent to these men for this reason: at the very time when Christ the Lord was speaking, indeed while he lived, he himself observed those ceremonies and wished them to be observed by others.

[margin: Various interpretations, 1.]

(printed p. 95)

Others seem to take "all" generally, but either in this way: all things which the law and Moses tell you, while the scribes and Pharisees recite them, observe and do; or in this way: all things which the scribes and Pharisees tell you while reading aloud the books of Moses, observe and do.

But these two interpretations differ little from one another, and they neither escape the difficulty, nor are they sufficiently consistent so as to escape it. For when it is said that all things which the law and Moses tell them, as the scribes and Pharisees recite them, are to be understood, does this mean all things with respect to the bare words of the law and of Moses, or also with respect to the explanation of the scribes and Pharisees? Likewise, when it is said that all things spoken by them while reading aloud the books of Moses are to be understood, does this mean with respect to the bare reading of the words, or with respect to that reading joined with some exposition?

The former interpretation of certain men does not explain itself sufficiently. The latter signifies that a reading with some exposition is to be understood, but one which is consonant with Mosaic doctrine. Yet in either interpretation there always remains the difficulty raised at the beginning: how all the things which Moses commands through the scribes and Pharisees, as readers and expositors, are to be observed and done, while their leavened doctrine must nevertheless be avoided.

And the latter interpretation has this inconvenience also, that it admits an exposition which must nevertheless be consonant with the law itself.

[margin: Interpretations 2 and 3.]

(printed p. 96)

But whose role will it be to judge this? The hearers' own? But how much wisdom and how much judgment would that require? For surely more is required to judge whether the exposition of learned men especially is consonant with the word of God than to read that word itself and to illustrate or enlarge it by some exposition. Thus those who hear would have to be more learned, wiser, and sharper in judging than those who teach; the people more than the scribes and Pharisees; the sheep more than the shepherds. And much more would the people sit upon Moses' chair than the scribes and Pharisees themselves, because the people would pass judgment on the doctrine of these men, although they were most learned and most wise.

But if we understand this passage with a caution and condition - "do all things which the scribes and Pharisees say, provided that they are consonant with the law and with Moses" - there will be no reason why the Lord might not have added, with the same caution, "and do according to all their works." For we would understand "all works" also, if they agree with the divine law and word. In this way the whole force of the Lord's words would be weakened.

Therefore it must be said that all things which the scribes and Pharisees said were to be observed and done not simply and in whatever manner, but those things which they said in the chair upon which they were sitting, and by force of that chair itself; that is, those things which they said by public and legitimate power and authority, and by the impulse, influence, or

[margin: Interpretation 4, the best.]

(printed p. 97)

direction, taught, explained, commanded, and forbade, all these things had to be received by everyone and committed to execution. But what they taught by their own private opinion, or discipline, or by depravity of judgment and morals, even if they taught these things not only at home and within private walls, but also outside, in gatherings of men and in schools, did not necessarily have to be heard. Rather, some of their teaching had to be avoided as a corrupting leaven: namely, those things that were either wicked in themselves, or things that were good, or certainly not evil, but were nevertheless depraved by those Pharisees, and only insofar as they were depraved. These were discussed above.

For these are properly the things which, like leaven, corrupt the whole mass of a good life. This is clear from the fact that the Lord, in the preceding chapter of Matthew 15, was dealing with such impious or futile teachings of the Pharisees; and in Luke 12:1 he calls all these same things by one word, hypocrisy. "Beware," he says, "of the leaven of the Pharisees, which is hypocrisy." It swells and puffs up souls with a vain opinion of virtue, pride, and arrogance; it soaks and irritates minds with a certain rotten bitterness of greed, envy, and cruelty; and finally, whatever good is in the kneading-trough of the breast, whether by nature or by God and discipline, it corrupts the whole as if into one mass and makes it eternally ruinous.

[margin: Chapter 4.]

(printed p. 98)

For what one of the poets said is most true not only before human beings but also before God: pride, when joined to noble character, pollutes it.

In the Syriac text this hypocrisy is called *masab baphe*, that is, acceptance of the face, or a counterfeit pretense made by the face, outward gesture, and habit. And this is the first proof of the explanation just given.

The second proof is taken from the fact that it is clear that the scribes and Pharisees did not impose on everyone the necessity of their one sect, or of their own doctrines and morals. Otherwise, to say nothing of the Sadducees, no Essene could rightly have existed, nor any other Jew outside the three heresies set out above, although there were in fact many who, even if they supported and praised this or that sect, did not for that reason enroll their names in it. For not all Jews were Pharisees, or Essenes, or Sadducees, but only all those who were pleased to philosophize in some particular manner.

The third proof is drawn from the very fine testimonies of Saint Augustine, and these from several books, repeated quite often. Thus in book 4 of *On Christian Doctrine*, chapter 27, he says:

Good faithful people obediently hear not any man, but God himself, when he says, "What they say, do; but what they do, do not do. For they say and do not do." Therefore those who do not act usefully are nevertheless heard usefully. They are eager to seek their own, but they do not dare to teach their own

[margin: Claudian, book 4, *On the Consulship of Honorius*. Augustine on hearing the Pharisees sitting upon Moses' chair.]

(printed p. 99)

from the higher place of the ecclesiastical seat, which sound doctrine has established. For this reason the Lord himself, before saying of such men what I have recalled, prefaced it with, "They have sat upon Moses' chair." Therefore that chair was not theirs; it was Moses' chair that compelled them to say good things, even when they did not do good things. They were doing their own things in their own life; but the chair did not permit them to teach their own things.

In book 16, chapter 29, *Against Faustus*, he says:

The Lord restrains his own from imitating the morals of evil men when he says, "Upon Moses' chair sit the scribes and Pharisees. What they say, do; but what they do, do not do. For they say and do not do." In these words of the Lord you should observe both points: what honor is paid to the doctrine of Moses, in whose chair even bad men sitting there were compelled to teach good things.

In letter 166:

The heavenly master warned that the people should beware, so that even concerning bad prelates they might be secure, lest because of them the chair of saving doctrine should be deserted; in that chair even bad men are compelled to say good things. For what they say is not theirs, but God's, who has placed the doctrine of truth in the chair of unity.

There are similar things in the added letters, letter 7. In the third discourse on Psalm 36, near the end, when he is dealing with good and bad bishops in the Catholic Church and cites the words of Saint Matthew, he says:

You see that in Moses' chair, which the chair of Christ succeeded, even bad men sit; and yet by saying good things they do not harm their hearers. Why, because of bad men, did you abandon the chair itself?

Saint Chrysostom applies similar things in homily 21 on 1 Corinthians, also using the example of Judas the traitor, and in Galatians 1 and homily 3 on Colossians, near the end.

(printed p. 100)

What advantage is it, he says, if you receive us and do not hear the things said by us? What gain comes to you if you honor us and do not attend to what is said to you? This is honor for us; this is admirable worship, which profits you and us, if you hear us. Hear Paul saying, "I did not know, brothers, that he was high priest." Hear Christ saying, "All things which they tell you to observe, observe and do." You do not despise me, but the priesthood. If you see me stripped of it, then despise me; then I am not allowed to command. But as long as we sit in this seat, as long as we have the presidency, we have both authority and power, even if we are unworthy. If Moses' throne was so venerable that men were heard because of it, much more is Christ's throne. We have received that throne. From it we speak; from it Christ has also placed in us the ministry of reconciliation. Ambassadors, whoever they are, receive great honor because of the dignity of the embassy. Look, then: they go alone into the midst of a barbarian region among so many enemies, and because the right of embassy has great force, everyone honors them, everyone looks upon them, everyone sends them back home safely. And so we also undertake the office of embassy, and we come from God. This is the dignity of the episcopate. We come to you carrying out an embassy, asking that you put an end to war, and we say under what conditions: we do not promise that cities will be given to you, nor so many measures of grain,

(printed p. 101)

nor estates, nor gold, but the kingdom of heaven, eternal life, familiar fellowship with Christ, and other good things which cannot be expressed by us in words nor heard by you, as long as we are in this flesh and present life. Therefore we perform an embassy. We wish to enjoy honor, but not for our sake; perish the thought, for we are as vile as can be. We wish it for your sake, so that you may listen carefully to what we say, receive benefit, and not attend with sloth and negligence to what is said. Do you not see how all people gather around ambassadors and observe them? But we carry out the office of God's embassy among human beings. Those who effect these things are not we, but the episcopate itself; not this man or that man, but the bishop. Let no one hear me, but the dignity. Therefore let us do everything so that we may seem to live for God, and so that we may be judged worthy of those good promises by him who loves him, by the grace and kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ.

See also Rupert, book 4 on Exodus, chapter 28, and our Gretser, digression 4.

Perhaps someone will say: if the scribes and Pharisees had to be followed in everything that they taught from Moses' chair with legitimate power and authority, then Christ the Lord should not have been recognized, believed, and worshiped by anyone as Christ and as the Son of God. For those men decreed exactly the opposite, even from Moses' own chair, since both the pontiffs and the whole council condemned him and his disciples, and made those who dared to acknowledge and profess him

[margin: Objection.]

(printed p. 102)

aposynagogoi, that is, after imposing an anathema, they cast them out of the synagogue, or church, of that time.

I reply. Every thing that must perish perishes first when some greater contrary force weakens, breaks, and cuts down its strength and life. Then, before the thing perishes completely and breathes its last breath, so to speak, there come certain preparations, blows, wounds, and illnesses. So too that Mosaic chair and synagogue, and the whole state of the old law, had to be removed and perish. A greater and more powerful opposing force came upon it: Christ the Lord. He wished to remove that chair, synagogue, and state. By the performance of very many, very great, and very certain miracles he proved to the scribes, Pharisees, elders, priests, pontiffs, rulers, and the whole people of Israel that he was truly the Christ sent by God, and the Son of God, and that he used divine power and authority.

At that point, first in this very question, whether Christ had come and was God, and in all matters joined and connected to it, he took away and removed all power and authority from those who sat in that chair. Therefore in this chief question they could now err, fall, deceive, and be deceived, being deprived, namely in respect to that kind of truth, of the Spirit who ruled and governed that chair.

[margin: Response. As Christ's Church gradually rose, Moses' chair gradually fell.]

(printed p. 103)

But in all other matters he still left the authority of that same chair intact, and sanctioned it by his own authority, until he removed that whole state from the foundations: until he cast down the temple, cut off Jerusalem, and overturned the whole polity. Then the synagogue received, as it were, a lethal blow. Then the Mosaic chair, together with all its rites, ceremonies, explanations, and interpretations, was weakened, broken, and exhausted of every vital blood and spirit, and breathed its last breath.

By contrast, the new state of the new law, the new chair of Christ Jesus, of which Saint Augustine spoke above, began first when that strongest foundation had been laid concerning the most blessed coming of Christ the Lord, his divinity, power, divine authority, and similar things. Then it grew up with respect to all other matters which he deigned to sanction and institute by his divine right.

And what philosophers today in the schools call a proportion held in this case: as the old chair, or synagogue, was falling and dying, so the Christian chair, or Church, was rising and acquiring greater strength day by day. Thus, when the old one was extinct, this whole Church now stood, already strong, indeed already alone; it flourished, it was vigorous, it shone, and now stands, is vigorous, and flourishes, and will always stand, be vigorous, and flourish until the final end of this world's time. These things could be proved, but this is enough for the present passage, as it were in passing, since occasion has arisen.

(printed p. 104)

Chapter VII. Whether the Wise, the Lawyers, the Scribes, and the Pharisees Are the Same

(printed p. 104 — Book II)

First, Gorionides teaches in book 4, chapter 29, that the Pharisees are called the wise men of Israel, as we have already seen above. But this must be understood in this sense: they themselves were indeed wise men, and at that time especially prominent among the wise, but they were not the only wise men, nor were there no others who had arisen before them. For who would not count the scribes among the wise? Who would not count the Essenes? Clearly the word "wise" extends more widely than scribe, Pharisee, or Essene, and can include both these and others. Thus all those who excel in doctrine and learning are called wise, just as the Jews often call their rabbis by that name.

Saint Jerome to Algasia: "The teachers of the Jews are called *sophoi*, that is, wise men. And when on fixed days they explain their traditions to their disciples, they are accustomed to say, 'The wise teach the deuteroses,' or rather, 'the traditions.'" Hence sometimes the wise are distinguished from the scribes and

others, as something more general is distinguished from those things that are more special: Matthew 23:34, "Behold, I send to you prophets and wise men and scribes"; Isaiah 33:18 and 1 Corinthians 1:20, "Where is the wise man? Where is

[margin: Who are called wise among the Jews.]

(printed p. 105)

the scribe? Where is the investigator of this world?" Jeremiah 8:8-9.

Elias notes in the *Tishbi* that many later declined the name of wise men and, out of modesty, called themselves *Thalmidim*, as if disciples of wisdom or of the wise, just as Cicero writes of Pythagoras in book 5 of the *Tusculan Disputations*, and Diogenes Laertius in book 1, *On Famous Men*.

Second. Those whom our interpreter calls lawyers and doctors of the law are called in Greek *nomikoi* in Saint Matthew 22:34; Saint Luke 7:30, 10:25, 11:45-46 and 52, and 14:3; and Titus 3:13. Sometimes they are also called *nomodidaskaloi*, Luke 5:17, Acts 5:34, and 1 Timothy 1:7. But that they are not to be distinguished from the scribes can be clear from their office, which I will discuss a little later, and from Matthew 7:29, 17:10; Mark 12:28; Luke 7:30, 11:45; and 1 Corinthians 1:20.

Saint Epiphanius, heresy 16, says that the *grammateis* are interpreted as *nomodidaskaloi*. Immediately he adds that "with them were the same lawyers," that is, the same men were also *nomikoi*, or experts in the law. Cornarius translated this badly, as if the lawyers too kept company with them, as though they were different from them and only had some association with them. They are, however, distinguished from the Pharisees; this is clear from Luke 5:17, 7:30, 11, and often in chapter 14:3. Yet sometimes the same men were Pharisees by sect and doctors of the law by office, as Matthew 22:34 says, "One of them," that is, of the Pharisees, "a lawyer"; and Acts 5:34 says this of Gamaliel, of whom we spoke above.

Among the Hebrews, *moreh*, "teacher," comes from *iarah*, from which also comes *thorah*, law.

[margin: Thalmidim. Lawyers and scribes are the same.]

(printed p. 106)

Third. Scribes are set down in Scripture in two ways: either precisely, or with some addition. Precisely, again, in two ways. For some were occupied with certain civil records, contracts, and instruments, just as notaries are among us today, as can be seen from Jeremiah 32:11 and Psalm 44:2. Others, however, were engaged in sacred books, writing them out, preserving them, and explaining them: 4 Kings 22:8-10; Ezra 1:7 and 10, and chapter 11; Jeremiah 8:8; Matthew 7:29, 17:10, 23:2; and 1 Corinthians 1:20.

These latter men were the same as the *nomikoi*, or lawyers, of whom I spoke a little earlier. They were distinct from the Pharisees, with whom they are often named together: distinct, indeed, but nevertheless sufficiently joined by similarity of life and teaching. See Matthew 5, 12:38, 15:1, 23:2, 13, 14, 23, and 25; Luke 5:21 and 30, 6:7; and John 8:3. And just as the same man can be both a doctor of the law and a Pharisee, so too he can be both a scribe and a Pharisee.

Hence Abulensis, on Matthew 23, question 12, briefly and clearly says:

It must be known that although scribes and Pharisees are placed here as distinct, they are not distinguished from each other as a Pharisee and a Sadducee are, or as opposites are. For no Pharisee is a Sadducee, nor the contrary, because they were separate and, as it were, opposed sects. Rather, they are distinguished as a grammarian and a dialectician are; for being a grammarian is one thing, and being a dialectician another. Yet the same man can be both a grammarian

[margin: Scribes are placed in Scripture in two ways.]

(printed p. 107)

and a dialectician. So too, being a scribe is one thing, and being a Pharisee another: being a scribe is to be wise in the law; being a Pharisee is to have a definite way of life and sect. And yet it happens that the same man is a Pharisee and a scribe, that is, learned in the law.

With an addition, however, they are not called simply scribes, but scribes of the people, Matthew 2:4 and 1 Maccabees 5:42. From this it appears that they had particular authority in relation to some business of the people, or that they especially had to consult the institution and advantage of the people, or that they were assigned to some public council of the people. Something similar seems to appear in those who are called simply elders, Matthew 27:12 and 41; chapter 28:12; and Mark 15:1, or with the addition elders of the people, 1 Maccabees 12:6 and 35; Matthew 27:1; and Luke 22:66.

Since prophecy also signifies the interpretation of divine oracles, as in 1 Corinthians 14, the Chaldean Targum sometimes translates prophets as scribes: 4 Kings 23:2; 2 Paralipomenon 35:8; Jeremiah 26:11 and 29:2.

But to which kind of scribes, precisely taken, do those belong who are sometimes attributed to kings in 2 Kings 8:18 and 20:25; 4 Kings 12:10 and 22:3? This is a question. I interpret them as interpreters of divine matters, just as today at least one notable theologian is always present with kings and princes. But Rabbi Solomon, the Chaldean Targum on Genesis 49, and the Talmudists fabricate the story

[margin: Prophets are sometimes called scribes. What royal scribes were. From what tribe scribes came.]

(printed p. 108)

that scribes came from the poor tribe of Simeon, although from Ezra it is clear that they were either often Levites, or certainly from any tribe whatever. Nor do the Talmudists assert more truly that they were established by Ezra himself, since they already existed before, and he, in his own time, was only the highest and, as it were, the chief of them all.

Chapter VIII. Whether, When in Matthew Chapter 5 the Lord So Often Says, "But I Say to You," He Corrects Pharisaic Interpretations of the Old Law, or Rather Adds Something to the Old Law Itself and Perfects It

(printed p. 108 — Book II)

This question is important and useful for many things. Because our Maldonatus treated it seriously and learnedly, in his own manner, on Matthew chapter 5, number 21, it has seemed most advantageous to bring his words here, lest I thrust my bronze or iron in place of his gold.

"All heretical interpreters," he says, "hold it as settled, for the Holy Spirit has revealed their opinion to them, that Christ corrects not the law, but the traditions and interpretations of the scribes and Pharisees; and on this point they shamelessly criticize the ancient authors because they thought otherwise. The Pelagians, other heretics of old, once taught the same thing, as Jerome writes in the first book against them. Among Catholics,

[margin: Whether the scribes began in Ezra's time. Two opinions; the first.]

(printed p. 109)

I do not know whether anyone taught it besides Strabus, and in our own time certain men who read the commentaries of the heretics with less caution than befits Catholics.

"Nor do I deny that there are some arguments for this opinion which could move a less learned or less steadfast reader. First, they weigh the word repeated in each commandment: 'It was said,' as if he had therefore said 'said' and not 'written' because he was speaking not about the law, but about the tradition and explanation of the Pharisees. Second, because Christ opposes himself to them as a good legislator to perverse interpreters, not in any way to the old legislator, whether that was himself or the Father, who gave the old law through Moses.

"Further, because the things that Christ adds in Matthew 5 were contained in the old law. For not only adultery, but also concupiscence was prohibited: 'You shall not covet your neighbor's wife,' Exodus 20:17. Saint Paul is witness: 'I did not know concupiscence unless the law said, You shall not covet,' Romans 7:7. Therefore Christ added to the Pharisees' interpretation his own interpretation, not something to the law.

"Further, the law did not command hatred of enemies, but rather love. Exodus 23:4: 'If you meet your enemy's ox or ass wandering, bring it back to him. If you see the ass of him who hates you lying under its burden, you shall not pass by, but shall lift it up with him.'

"Further, when Christ is asked by that young man what he must do to possess eternal life,

[margin: Arguments for the first opinion, 1-5.]

(printed p. 110)

he answers nothing other than, 'Keep the commandments,' Luke 18:18. Therefore nothing was lacking in the commandments of the law that Christ could add.

"Finally, there is no greater perfection in the Gospel, nor indeed can one be imagined, than to love God with the whole heart, with the whole mind, with the whole soul, and with all one's strength. Yet the law prescribed this very thing, Deuteronomy 6:5.

"Moreover, Christ says in the same place, verse 20, 'Unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven,' as though indicating that he wished to correct not the law but the Pharisees' interpretation.

"Christ also says that many things were said to the ancients which are not found in the law, such as that phrase in the same place, verse 21, 'He shall be liable to judgment,' and that phrase in verse 33, 'You shall not swear falsely,' and that in verse 43, 'You shall hate your enemy.'

"Let those things be as they are; as I think, the ancient authors saw them. Yet with an incredible unanimity they all taught that Christ corrected the old law itself, by adding those things which were lacking for evangelical perfection. This was not because the law was not perfect in its own kind, but because it was less perfect than the Gospel. For it had been given to the Jews as a pedagogue, as to boys to be instructed rather rudely, until the better master, Christ, proposed more perfect things to minds that were now stronger. And in this way we say that Christ fulfilled the law, because he added what was lacking in it. Thus Irenaeus,

[margin: Arguments for the first opinion, 6-8. The second opinion, twofoldly approved by Maldonatus: first, by the authority of the ancients.]

(printed p. 111)

book 4, chapter 37; Tertullian, in *On Patience*; Clement of Alexandria, book 6 of the *Stromata*; Hilary, canon 4 on Matthew; Epiphanius against the Ptolemaeans, heresy 33; Basil, homily on Psalm 14; Chrysostom, homily 16 on Matthew; the author of the imperfect homily, homily 11; Ambrose, sermon 5 on Psalm 118; Saint Jerome in the letter to Gerontia on monogamy; Chromatius; Theophylact; and Euthymius, in their commentaries on the passage of Saint Matthew.

"I judge this opinion to be most true, not only because I have been compelled by the authority of so many ancient authors, but also by stronger arguments in this direction.

"First, as the heretics weigh that word, 'It was said,' so I, on the contrary, weigh what follows, 'to the ancients,' that is, to those to whom Moses gave the law, as though he were opposing Christians and evangelicals to Mosaic and legal men: 'But I say to you.' For if he were speaking only about the traditions and interpretations of the Pharisees, he would not say, 'You have heard that it was said,' as though they had not heard it from the one who said it, but had received it from others by whom they had heard it. Rather, he would have said simply, 'You have heard, You shall not kill,' or, 'It has been said to you, You shall not kill;

and whoever kills shall be liable to judgment.' Nor, in rebuking them, would he have left the scribes and Pharisees unnamed; rather, he would have said openly, 'You have heard from the scribes and Pharisees.' For we see that Christ always used this freedom. 'Beware,' he says, 'of the leaven, that is, the doctrine, of the Pharisees and Sadducees,' Matthew 16:6

[margin: The same opinion is proved by six arguments, 1.]

(printed p. 112)

and 11-12. Nor can they be called ancient who had existed only a little before; for the Pharisees arose not long before the times of Christ, as is gathered from Josephus.

"Second, because Christ corrects many things in this passage which, it is clear, were introduced not by the Pharisees but were expressed in the law. One example is verse 31: 'Whoever dismisses his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce,' Deuteronomy 24:1. What, I ask, had the Pharisees corrupted here? Yet Christ corrects it: 'But I say to you.' Likewise verse 33, 'You shall not swear falsely,' for the law says this in Leviticus 19:12, and the Pharisees were not corrupting it.

"As for the claim that the Pharisees were accustomed to teach that those who swore by heaven or by earth did not sin, we shall refute it later. But the fact that Christ rebuked the Pharisees in Matthew 23:16 for saying, 'Whoever swears by the temple, it is nothing; but whoever swears by the gold of the temple is bound,' is a different matter. For Christ is not rebuking a false interpretation of the law in them. If he had intended to do that, he certainly would have said it not there, but here in Matthew 5. Nor did the law prohibit swearing by the temple; Christ first prohibited it. Rather, he rebuked their greed, because those who swore by the temple they absolved, while those who swore by the gold they condemned, as if they were more moved by the honor of gold than by the honor of God.

"Further, where did the law say that if anyone struck you on one cheek, you should turn the other to him? Or why should it be the Pharisees' fault that they did not interpret it in this way, since the law had not said it,

[margin: It was said above. Arguments 2-3.]

(printed p. 113)

when even now, with Christ himself teaching, we can scarcely grasp it? Where was it written that we should leave our cloak to the man who takes away our tunic? Therefore Christ does not merely interpret the law; he establishes a new law and brings a new doctrine.

"Further, where does the law say, 'Love your enemies'? For the text brought forward from Exodus 23:4, 'If you meet your enemy's ox,' is nothing. It is speaking of a Jew, with whom a Jew was forbidden to have enmity. And so the man who is there called an enemy is called a brother in Deuteronomy 22:1: 'You shall not see your brother's ox or sheep wandering and pass by; rather, you shall bring them back.' But when the law speaks of true enemies, it commands not only that they be hated but also that they be destroyed: 'You shall blot out his name from under heaven; beware lest you forget,' Deuteronomy 25:19. In the Gospel it is lawful to hate absolutely no one, and to destroy no one by private authority.

"Finally, we see that Christ in this passage amplified the rewards and punishments of the old law. Why, then, unless because he increased the perfection of the law?

"From what we have said, those with some ability will not have much difficulty gathering how the contrary arguments should be answered; still, it will not be tiresome to show less learned readers the manner of replying. What is objected first, that Christ did not say 'it is written' but 'it was said,' is far too slight. For either there is no mystery in that word, since we see the Evangelists using these two words without distinction,

[margin: Arguments 4-6. Solution to the arguments of the first opinion, to argument 1.]

(printed p. 114)

as in 'as was said through the prophets' and 'as it is written'; or, if there is some mystery in that word, it is not what the heretics think, but what Chrysostom and Theophylact noted: that if he had named the Father by whom it had been said, he would have seemed either to oppose himself to him or even to set himself above him; and if he had named himself, since he too had given the old law, he would have stirred up the hatred of the hearers against himself.

Or, as I suspect, he is not tacitly opposing himself to himself or to the Father, but to Moses. For although the old law had been given by God, nevertheless, because the people had received it not from God but from Moses, Moses seemed to be its author. "The law," he says, "was given through Moses," John 1:17. And, "Did not Moses give you the law?" John 7:19. Finally, it is called the law of Moses in Luke 2:22 and 24:44; John 7:23; Acts 13:38, 15:5, and 28:23. And the things that were written and commanded in the law are said to have been written and commanded by Moses, John 8:5 and 1:45. Therefore Christ tacitly opposes himself to Moses when he says, "But I say to you," but he did not wish to name him, in order to avoid envy.

By this reasoning not only the first argument, but also the second is easily solved. The third is answered thus: there is no doubt that concupiscence was prohibited in the old law, but much less expressly and precisely than it is prohibited here by Christ. For the law merely said, "You shall not covet your neighbor's wife"; it did not say that the man who looks upon her with unchaste eyes is guilty of adultery.

[margin: To arguments 2-4.]

(printed p. 115)

"The fourth argument we solved a little earlier, incidentally, while dealing with another point. For we showed that the law commanded certain public enemies not only to be hated, but even to be utterly abolished. Christ alludes to this when he says, 'But I say to you, love your enemies, do good to those who hate you,' Matthew 5:44.

"In the fifth argument it is proved only that not all the things Christ added to the law are precepts. This need not be denied, for many are evangelical counsels. Therefore Christ requires from that young man only that he keep the commandments. Yet if he wishes to follow evangelical perfection, let him sell all that he has, give to the poor, and follow him. This is what Matthew 5 means when it says to let the cloak go also: naked, follow the naked Christ.

"But what greater perfection is there than to love God with the whole heart? I answer: to love him more with the whole heart. For the person who loves in such a way that he places the love of no thing above the love of God loves God with the whole heart. But the person who, for this reason, leaves all that he has and follows Christ, as we read the Apostles did, loves more with the whole heart. I will say it in one word: to love God with the whole heart is to love him in such a way that we do not also love idols or anything else contrary to him. God required this perfection from Abraham when he said, 'Walk before me and be perfect,' Genesis 17:1.

"As for Christ's saying, 'Unless your righteousness exceeds that of the scribes

[margin: To arguments 5-7.]

(printed p. 116)

and Pharisees, you shall not enter the kingdom of heaven,' he does not say this in order to rebuke their doctrine, but their life. For elsewhere he says, 'The scribes and Pharisees have sat upon Moses' chair; therefore whatever they tell you, observe and do. But do not act according to their works, for they say and do not do,' Matthew 23:2. He also says it because the Pharisees professed themselves to be so devoted to the law that, if Christ taught anything better and more perfect, they would reject it outright.

"Nor do I deny that the scribes and Pharisees badly interpreted the law in many matters. For I know, and it was explained above, that elsewhere Christ warned his disciples to beware their leaven, that is, their doctrine, Matthew 16:12. I only say that in this passage Christ is not aiming to rebuke the traditions or interpretations of the Pharisees, but to perfect the law by adding partly precepts and partly evangelical counsels.

"As for what was objected in the last place, that many things are recited by Christ in Matthew 5 as said to the ancients which are not found in the law, I deny this. For the phrase in the same chapter, verse 21, 'He shall be liable to judgment,' has the same meaning as Leviticus 24:21, 'Whoever strikes a man shall die,' and Numbers 35:16, 'If anyone strikes with iron and the one struck dies, the one who struck him shall be guilty of homicide, and he himself shall surely die,' verses 17 and 30. The phrase in verse 33, 'You shall not swear falsely,' is taken, with respect to its meaning,

[margin: To argument 8.]

(printed p. 117)

from Leviticus 19:12, 'You shall not swear falsely in my name,' or, as it is word for word in Hebrew, 'You shall not swear in my name to falsehood,' or to a lie. This is, in Exodus 20:7 and Deuteronomy 5:11, to take the name of the Lord in vain. Finally, the phrase in verse 43, 'You shall hate your enemy,' is taken from Deuteronomy 25:19, as was explained above."

Chapter IX. Whether, in the State of the Mosaic Synagogue, the Pharisees Were Truly Heretics

(printed p. 117 — Book II)

From what has been said, it is clear that, speaking generally, there was a heresy and sect of the Pharisees. But in order that these same men should seem to have been in a wicked and impious heresy even in the state of the Mosaic law itself, some appeal to the things brought above from Saint Epiphanius, Philastrius, Saint Jerome, and also from their own statements about fate, and from many other corruptions of the divine law.

It seems to me that a threefold distinction must be applied: of Pharisaic doctrines, of the Pharisees themselves, and of time. First, their doctrines, as we saw above, were not all wicked in themselves, nor all joined with error. Second, not all Pharisees embraced all wicked doctrines or defended them obstinately. I always except the matters that concern the highest head of our religion, Christ the Lord. Indeed perhaps none, or very few, did so. For I find nowhere that any judgment was brought, either against their doctrines or against them,

[margin: Hunnius is cited in the margin. Response by a threefold distinction: doctrines and Pharisees.]

(printed p. 118)

by the Church of that time, or by the Mosaic chair; nor is there even a suitable cause for suspecting it, since, as we saw above, the chair's right and power had come to them.

Finally, some things were tolerated in that time because of obscurity and a lesser understanding of divine realities. Among Christians they could no longer be tolerated; rather, they have either already been proscribed as errors and heresies, or, if someone were to bring them forward again, they would immediately be proscribed.

Speaking generally, therefore, it seems that one should say that there were indeed certain doctrines of the Pharisees which in themselves, and as the school is accustomed to speak, materially were heretical. Yet the Pharisees were not properly heretics, or certainly not all of them. Only those would be such who are called *fatui*, not in the manner in which Beza preferred to render the *fatui* of Matthew 23 as "fools," but in the way Saint Augustine says in tractate 37 on John: "If your heart were not foolish, you would not believe in fate"; or else those entangled in certain other similar errors, if they obstinately defended them against the judgment of

the Church.

But when Saint Epiphanius calls it a heresy, either he uses the name heresy generally for both the good and the bad side; or he judges them heretics because of doctrines that, as I said, were materially heretical; or he speaks on account of the assertions about fate. In this latter way the Apostolic Constitutions, book 6, chapter 6, seem to speak,

[margin: Distinction of time. Which Pharisees were heretics.]

(printed p. 119)

as do Saint Jerome in the cited passage and Philastrius. Yet in this matter there seems to be room for what Saint Augustine says in his letter to Quodvultdeus: not all people seem to judge the same thing about some doctrine, whether it is a heresy or not.

If the Pharisees had been not only sinners but also heretics, would the Lord have eaten with them so often and so familiarly? Would he, who charged them with hypocrisy and other vices, never have charged them with heresy? Would he have said that they sat upon Moses' chair, and prescribed that they themselves were to be heard in all things? Would Scripture have nowhere struck them with this same accusation, as it struck them with so many other and so serious ones? Would the Apostle have called this sect, that is, the sect of Jewish worship by which God was then truly worshiped, the most certain and the most exact? What similar thing is ever said about the Sadducees? But of these things later.

Certainly among the chief sayings of Rabbi Hillel, which I will cite elsewhere, this is not the least: that he forbids anyone to separate himself from the Church. Indeed he does so in such a way that he uses the very word *parash*, as if he said: "Although by certain institutions you separate yourself from the common way of life of others, beware nevertheless that you do not separate yourself from the Catholic Church."

It is very good, then, that Drusius does not differ at all on this point, since he often calls the Pharisees pious, and indeed in a general way, insofar as that name is opposed to the Sadducees and other impious men, page 5 and 6.16.

[margin: Below, chapter 17.]

(printed p. 120)

Chapter X. Whether Catholics Are Signified by the Pharisees, or Rather Lutherans, Calvinists, and Others of Similar Meal

(printed p. 120 — Book II)

In his commentary on Saint Matthew, chapter 3, verse 7, Maldonatus, after he had explained the origin of the Pharisees and Sadducees, added: "Such today are the ministers of the Supervigilance," or superintendents, "and similar names recently invented by those who, being called by no authority, have usurped the office of teaching and ruling the people."

Genebrard, however, in book 2 of the *Chronology*, often calls the Pharisees Catholics and uses these words:

Certainly, as the Pharisees corresponded to theologians, who search thoroughly into the mysteries of Scripture, so the scribes corresponded to canonists, because they cared for civil and Mosaic laws according to the bark of the law.

Again:

There were also Catholic scribes. Hence in Matthew 23 they are said, together with the Pharisees, to have sat upon Moses' chair, as those who had invaded it when empty, while the priests, abounding in ecclesiastical riches, neglected their office.

Beza, criticizing these words of his on Matthew 2:4, says: "Indeed you say what the matter is. For an egg is not more like an egg than you theologians and canonists are like those old Pharisees, so that with completely equal right they can be called Catholics, whether we look at the dogma of justice from works or at that foul mixture of most superstitious and most impure traditions." So also other heretics not rarely call Catholics, and especially religious

(printed p. 121)

men, scribes and Pharisees as a term of abuse. But because I have set before myself not the sowing or harvesting of insults, but the investigation of pure truth, I think that two things must here be brought into consideration.

One is that one and the same thing, because of its different features, can by some likeness be compared now to good persons or things, now to bad ones. For example, we saw earlier that the name leaven is attributed to wicked doctrine and hypocrisy, as also in 1 Corinthians 5:6. Yet in Matthew 13:33, "The kingdom of heaven is like leaven." Again, Christ the Lord is called a lion in Apocalypse 5:5; but so too the devil, in 1 Peter 5:8, "going about and seeking whom he may devour." Solomon is a symbol of Christ the Lord, who brought true peace to the world; and yet is not every woman-loving man, and everyone who falls away from his office or religion through lust, like him?

The other point is that, speaking generally, there were various things in the Pharisees. First, there was the Jewish religion, or, as the Apostle says in Acts 26:5, the Jewish worship. Second, there was their own sect, with respect to certain particular doctrines and institutions of life, good and bad. Third, there were many and serious vices.

Therefore I now say: with respect to the first, Catholics are not badly compared to the Pharisees, because, as was said above, the Pharisees were not heretics. With respect to the second, the orders of religious men and the families of scholastic disputants can be said to be like them: the Thomist,

[margin: Melancthon, book 2 of the Chronicle and preface to volume 9 of Luther in German, are noted. Two things are to be considered. Threefold answer to the question, points 1-2.]

(printed p. 122)

the Scotist, and the Durandist, if one considers those institutions which are either good or at least not evil in themselves. But with respect to the bad things, all impious sects can be compared with them, whether of Lutherans, Calvinists, or others.

With respect to the third, I say that all are like them who give themselves over to the same vices, of whatever religion or sect they are, of whatever state or order. For if we are hypocrites, superstitious, arrogant, ambitious, despisers of our neighbors, greedy, widening our phylacteries, magnifying our fringes, whitewashed tombs, envious, treacherous, obstinate, and covered with other Pharisaic crimes of this sort, whether Catholics or Lutherans, Calvinists, or heretics of any other stripe, we are Pharisees and, with the Pharisees, which may the most merciful Lord avert, sons of eternal Gehenna. For that word of Saint Jerome on Matthew 23 belongs to all: "Woe to you wretched ones, to whom the vices of the Pharisees have passed over."

In this very respect, however, all bad heretics are more wicked than bad Catholics, because they join perfidy and heresy to these vices; indeed, by its rule, they often plunge themselves into these very things.

Chapter XI. When Did the Pharisees Begin

(printed p. 122 — Book II)

Maldonatus said on Matthew 5, and had already said on chapter 2, that the Pharisees arose not long before the times of Christ the Lord.

Saint Jerome also plainly affirms this in Isaiah chapter 8, but neither defines the exact time. Drusius, folio 32, says: "There are those who have handed down to memory that the wise men, that is, the חכמים, *chacamim*, were so called until Alexander Jannaeus, and that while he reigned they first began to be called Pharisees. I remember reading this in a certain Hebrew book which is commonly called the Compendium of Josephus." Adrichomius, in his *Jerusalem*, traced their beginning from the time of Jason the false high priest.

But because Maldonatus wished to praise both Josephuses as witnesses for his opinion, it will be necessary to understand that opinion from both in such a way that they already existed in the time of the Maccabees, as I showed above; that is, more than 150 years before the birth of Christ the Lord, during the years in which Jonathan, the most brave brother of the most brave Judas Maccabaeus, gained power among the Jews. For it was shown earlier, against John Drusius, from that same passage of Josephus, that in this man's time the three Jewish sects existed, although Drusius piles up other passages which nevertheless do not prove this one point. From book 13, chapter 9, I say, came Genebrard's statement in *Chronology*, book 2: "Under Jonathan, the order of the Pharisees; likewise the sect of the Sadducees."

Yet I would think the rise of the Pharisees, though I shall speak of the others below in their own place, somewhat earlier still. First, Josephus does not say that those heresies were then born, but speaks of them as already existing and flourishing:

[margin: Opinions, 2-5. Above, book 1, chapter 3. The most probable view.]

(printed p. 124)

"Around this time," that is, Jonathan's, "there were three Jewish heresies." Second, that the Pharisees are older than the Sadducees will be clear below from the author of the latter and from their secession from the former. But at that time of Jonathan the Sadducees existed.

Third, from the history it is plain that in the time of John Hyrcanus the number and authority of the Pharisees was already very great; hence that controversy of Drusius, concerning which above and again below. Therefore that sect must already have stood for several more years than those which passed between Jonathan and that Hyrcanus. These years are twenty-four. For in so short a time could so new and so remarkable a sect conveniently have gathered so great a multitude and authority?

Fourth, the times of Jonathan and of the Simon who followed him were almost always very full of tumults and wars. In such conditions it is much if institutions already existing are preserved; new ones are not instituted. Finally, from the very author of the Pharisees, to whom I now hasten, this matter too will receive support.

Chapter XII. Who Was the Author of the Pharisaic Sect

(printed p. 124 — Book II)

Some think that the words of Saint Jerome, which he wrote on Isaiah chapter 8, satisfy this question abundantly. They are these:

The Nazaraeans, who receive Christ in such a way that they do not lose the observances of the old law, interpret the two houses as two families, Sammai and Hillel, from whom arose the scribes and Pharisees, whose school Akibas received, whom they say was the teacher of Aquila the proselyte,

[margin: Saint Jerome's words.]

(printed p. 125)

and after him Meir; Johannan son of Zachai succeeded him, and after him Eliezer, and then in order Delphon, and again Joseph the Galilean, and, as far as the captivity of Jerusalem, Joshua. Sammai, therefore, and Hillel

arose in Judea not long before the Lord was born; the former is interpreted as "destroyer," the latter as "profane," because through their traditions and deuteroses they scattered and stained the commandments of the law.

But in these words two things must be noted. First, Akibas could not have been the teacher of Aquila the proselyte. For that proselyte lived in the time of Hadrian, and translated the Old Testament into the Greek language, as Saint Epiphanius writes in the book *On Weights and Measures*. But Akibas lived before the thrice-saving death of Christ the Lord, as Saint Jerome indicates in that passage, and Saint Epiphanius in heresies 15 and 33; and in heresy 42, that of the Marcionites, he expressly notes that Akibas lived even before the Babylonian captivity. If Jerome had meant Aquila Onkelos, who expounded the Pentateuch in a Chaldean paraphrase, that would be considerably more tolerable.

Second, when Saint Jerome says that the Pharisees and scribes arose from Hillel and Sammai, this must not be taken of their first origin, but of the later origin, which is better known, on account of which

[margin: Two things to note in Jerome's words, 1-2.]

(printed p. 126)

they increased more, and were separated from one another by a great distinction, as will appear a little later. For another, earlier origin will be indicated. And Genebrard, in book 2 of the *Chronology*, when presenting those words of Saint Jerome, adds in parentheses that they rather received increase from Schammai and Hillel.

Therefore the Jews themselves report not one author of the Pharisees but several: all the men of the Great Synagogue, with respect to the first beginning of the sect, and two outstanding rabbis, of whom above and also below, with respect to its greater progress. For they say that Moses on Mount Sinai received not only the written law, but also its understanding, and that which, as I have already said above, is called *behal pi*, that is, what is handed down orally. They say that he handed this to Joshua; that Joshua handed it to the elders who followed him; that these handed it to the prophets; and that the prophets handed it to the men of the Great Synagogue.

These men are said to have founded two distinguished schools or academies of wisdom: one in Babylonia, on the Euphrates, at Nehardea; the other at Jerusalem, through those who returned from the Babylonian captivity. From these workshops of wisdom very many wise men arose.

The men of the Great Synagogue, counted as their chief figures after the return from Babylon, are Zerubbabel son of Shealtiel; Jesus; Nehemiah; Seraiah; Raabiah; Mordecai; Balsan; Maspar; Bagoas; Rahum; Baanas. After these, and from those still remaining from their number, in the time of Alexander

[margin: Answer to the question. Twofold author and origin of the Pharisees. Two Jewish academies.]

(printed p. 127)

the Great, there was Simeon, surnamed Justus, otherwise Jaddus, son of Joshua and grandson of Josedec the high priest. His disciple Antignus, or, as some name him, Antigonus, followed him, a man of Socho. Four disciples of this man are remembered: the two Joses, and Sadoc with his colleague Baietos. But I shall speak later of these latter two under the Sadducees.

Of the two former men, one Jose was the son of a certain Johezer, a man of Tseredah; the other Jose was the son of Johannan and a Jerusalemite. Their disciples were Joshua son of Perachiah and Nithai the Arbelite. Their disciples in turn were Judas son of Tabeai and Simon son of Satachi. Afterward their disciples were Schemaias and Abtalion, most just proselytes. Their disciples were those from whom Saint Jerome above began: Hillel and Schammai. The former of these is interpreted by the same Saint Jerome as "profane," the latter as "destroyer"; but by others the former is interpreted as "praised," and the latter as "heavenly." Hence it also seems to some that the former is called Pollion by Josephus, book 15, chapter 13, and the latter

Sameas.

The Nazaraeans rightly note in the cited passage of Saint Jerome that a certain division was made between these men. For even today among the Jews there are celebrated בית שמאי הלל, the house of Hillel and the house of Schammai. But that this division was good, holy, and made in the name of the Lord is clear from chapter 5 of the tract *Pirke Aboth*, where this saying occurs: "Every dispute that is for the sake of

[margin: The two most learned families of the Jews.]

(printed p. 128)

God will endure to the end; but one that is not for the sake of God will not endure to the end. What is the dispute that is for the sake of God? The dispute of Hillel and Schammai. But the one that was not for the sake of God is the dispute of Korah and his whole company."

Rabbi Abraham Levi says that Hillel was of the stock of David, that he lived 120 years, that at the age of forty he came from Babylon into the Holy Land, and that he taught there for forty years. His disciples are said to have been eighty in number, outstanding in ability and doctrine. The rabbis say that thirty of them were worthy that divinity should descend upon them as upon Moses; that thirty were such that, on their account, the sun would stand immobile, as for Joshua; and that the remaining twenty were of a more ordinary kind. The chief of all was Jonathan son of Uzziel; the least of all was Rabbi Iochan, or John, son of Zaccai, in whose time Rabbi Abraham says Vespasian lived.

Among these was Gamaliel the elder, whose son was Simeon, who was killed in the destruction of the city with Rabbi Ishmael son of Eliseus. The son of this Simeon was Judah Nagid, or Rabbenu Hakkados, or Judah Hannasi, that is, the prince in *Pirke Aboth* chapter 3. His son was Rabbi Gamaliel the second, whose sayings are read in chapter 2 of *Pirke Aboth*. These things are drawn almost entirely from that book, and from Rabbi Moses of Kotzi, in the preface to the book of precepts, and from Rabbi Abraham in the history of the Kabbalah; but I have preferred to follow the order of the first chapter of *Pirke Aboth*, which Rabbi Abraham follows, if at any point they differ,

(printed p. 129)

because that book is more certain and of greater authority. They differ only moderately, just as both also differ from Saint Jerome on Isaiah chapter 8. For Rabbi Akibas is omitted by these writers, although he seems to have been among those eighty disciples of Hillel discussed above. Rabbi Meir is likewise missing, perhaps the Meir of chapter 3 of *Pirke Aboth*; also Rabbi Delphon, about whom I find nothing anywhere; and Rabbi Joshua, although after the destruction Rabbi Tarphon and another Rabbi Akiba are named. If it is useful, see also what Galatinus, book 1, chapter 2; Genebrard, book 2 of the *Chronology*; Capnion, book 1 of the *Kabbalah*; Mercerus, in the book on Hebrew abbreviations; and others have written on these matters.

Chapter XIII. What Authority Did the Pharisees Have

(printed p. 129 — Book II)

It was certainly very great among the whole people. Josephus, book 13, chapter 18, says that they had such influence over the multitude that whatever they said against either king or high priest was immediately believed. He gives this more fully and with stronger testimony in the same book, chapters 23 and 24, where King Alexander, as he is dying, prescribes to his wife Alexandra what she ought to do, and she does what he prescribed. He wishes that, after he is dead, she should go splendidly to Jerusalem and grant some power to the Pharisees. For, he says, if they praised her in return for this honor, they would make the nation well-disposed toward her. He said that these men had great power among the Jews: they could harm those whom they hated and help those toward whom they were friendly; and the multitude especially believed them when, even out of envy, they spoke harshly against someone.

(printed p. 130)

Again, in book 17, chapter 3, Josephus says that there was a group of Jews who prided themselves on the exactness of the ancestral law, to whom the deity was thought to be gracious, and to whom the women's quarters were subject. They are called Pharisees. They were especially able to resist kings: prudent men, but readily moved into conflict and into causing harm.

And in book 18, chapter 2, he reports how almost everything was conducted according to their judgment, so that if the Sadducees wished to take up magistracies and dignities, they had to accommodate themselves to the will of the Pharisees.

But the greatest authority of all belonged to those who lived at Jerusalem, as in the metropolis. For this reason their arrogance, pride, and wickedness were also often greater, as Saint Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Euthymius note on Matthew chapter 15, and as is clear from the things Josephus narrates in the cited book 13, chapter 23.

Chapter XIV. With What Disgraces or Slaughters Were the Pharisees Sometimes Afflicted

(printed p. 130 — Book II)

Especially notable was the disgrace which King and High Priest John Hyrcanus brought upon them. For when he had invited them, as his teachers and friends, to a magnificent banquet, and had been assailed by one of them, Eleazar, who had a more insolent character and tongue,

(printed p. 131)

he became so enraged that, with the king's friend Jonathan, a Sadducee by sect, adding oil especially to the furnace, he annulled all the statutes and decrees of the Pharisees, punished those who observed them, and himself, although up to that point he had been a Pharisee, passed over to the Sadducees. In narrating this history, Josephus says in book 13, chapter 18, that he "departed from the Pharisees." This happened, as Rabbi Abraham says in the historical *Kabbalah* and as the Compendium of Josephus Gorionides says, after Hyrcanus had administered the high priesthood for forty years, although both Flavius Josephus and Gorionides, and the latter's Compendium, attribute to him only thirty-one years of rule in all.

But the son of this Hyrcanus, King Alexander, after he had taken the city Bethome, which we shall soon see is Bethsames, and had led away many captives from it, crucified about eight hundred of them in his own sight while he was feasting with his concubines. Before this, however, he had already inflicted another death upon them, killing their dearest children and wives before their eyes while they were still alive. So Josephus says in book 13, chapter 22.

That these were Pharisees is indeed inferred from chapter 24 of the same book, where the Pharisees demanded punishment for those responsible for the death of those eight hundred, and killed a certain Diogenes and many others among them.

[margin: John Hyrcanus becomes a Sadducee. His son likewise. Eight hundred Pharisees crucified.]

(printed p. 132)

But so that no inference is needed, the epitome of Josephus Gorionides makes the matter plain when it narrates that tragedy in this way:

Once King Alexander had been confirmed and had returned to his kingdom, the fleeing Pharisees came into Bethshemes, fortifying themselves against the king. But the king, gathering his army, set out against them, and after the city had been undermined he seized eight hundred of the leading Pharisees, bound them in iron, and brought them into Jerusalem. Then he made a banquet for all his servants on the roof of his palace in a high place, where they ate and drank and became drunk with him, along with the nobles and the learned men. With a

glad heart he ordered the eight hundred bound men, who were among the greater Pharisees, to be brought out; and all were hanged on gibbets before him. Seeing this, he drank and laughed.

Rabbi Abraham says this about the same Alexander in the historical *Kabbalah*: "He too was infected with hatred for the wise men, and struck them with a great slaughter. He spared only Simeon son of Sata, because he was the brother of his wife. But Joshua son of Peraia, the companion of the preceding Simeon Sata, fled to Alexandria in Egypt until Simeon son of Sata obtained his return from the king by supplication." This is also reported in tractate *Taanith*, chapters 10 and 11, tractate *Sanhedrin*, chapter *Chelek*, and the tractate on betrothals.

At this time, the same Rabbi Abraham narrates, occurred what the impious Talmudists in chapter *Chelek* most falsely fabricate about Jesus the Nazarene:

(printed p. 133)

that he used that Joshua as his teacher, fled with him into Egypt, looked too wantonly on the beauty of a woman, was therefore cast out by his teacher, set up idols, deceived many by magical arts, and at last was fastened to a cross. They most shamelessly transfer the crimes of some other man to Christ the Lord and Savior, or, in the reckoning of times, most wickedly, or at least most ignorantly, confuse more than one hundred and ten years, dull and disgraceful men as they are.

King Herod, when six thousand Pharisees refused to swear loyalty to him, first fined them in money; then, when he learned that the wife of his brother Pheroras had paid that fine, he killed many of them, as is found in Josephus, book 17, chapter 3.

Those whom he mentions in chapter 8 seem to have been from the same order: most learned interpreters of the ancestral laws, and most dear to all because of their constant instruction of the youth, Judas son of Sariphaeus and Matthias son of Margaloth. They were burned alive by him because, at their urging and impulse, the youth, many of whom were also executed, had set out to pull down the golden eagle which Herod had set above the great gate of the temple and to break it apart with axes. They did this because they judged an offering of this kind to be against the law, which forbids setting up images and undertaking the display of certain living creatures before those who live according to it.

[margin: Many Pharisees killed by Herod. Others burned alive by the same man.]

(printed p. 134)

Chapter XV. What Was the Dress of the Pharisees

(printed p. 134 — Book II)

When phylacteries and fringes were discussed, the dress of these men was already indicated in some way. I shall add, however, a little more from Saint Epiphanius, heresy 16, where first he says that they used the costume or habit of the scribes. He had described this in heresy 15 as follows: "Such men wore stoles or cloaks, and dalmatics, or colobia, made with broad marks of purple, so that they were purplish, or bordered with purple."

Second, Cornarius translates another passage in this way: "They proceeded with small cloaks, other ornaments, and women's mantles, in broad sandals and with the straps of shoes." But what if we translate "in the streets," rather than "in broad sandals," since something is then added separately about sandals in this way: "in sandals and with the straps of shoes"? On sandals, see Gellius, book 13, chapter 21.

[margin: Pharisees in cloaks. Purple garments. Sandals.]

(printed p. 135)

Chapter XVI. Whether Pharisees Still Exist Today

(printed p. 135 — Book II)

The Jews who live among us in Germany and the other parts of Europe retain almost the institutions, laws, ceremonies, and certainly the perfidy, obstinacy, greed, and wickedness of the Pharisees. Therefore I have sometimes not unwillingly agreed with some of them when, in their synagogue at Worms, they told me that they were Pharisees.

Benjamin, in his *Itinerary*, also mentions others who, not many years ago, lived in the east, in these words: "The Pharisees mourn Zion and lament Jerusalem, abstaining from meat and wine, always dressed in dark garments, living in caves or huts, fasting every day except the Sabbath, and with constant prayers imploring the mercy of God and the holy name for the deliverance of the captivity of Israel." So he says.

Chapter XVII. Some Maxims or Apophthegms of Certain Ancient Pharisees

(printed p. 135 — Book II)

To conclude that rather gloomy discussion of the Pharisees a little more pleasantly and fruitfully, I shall taste a few of their sayings, as they are recited, always with the names prefixed, in the tractate *Pirke Aboth*, chapters 1 and 2.

[margin: Benjamin, folio 75.]

(printed p. 136)

1. The men of the Great Synagogue stated three sayings: first, be slow in judgment; second, have many disciples; third, make a fence for the law.
2. Simeon the Just, who was among the remnants of the Great Synagogue, used to say: the world stands upon three things: law, religion or the worship of God, and beneficence or gratitude.
3. Antigonus of Socho was accustomed to say: do not be like servants who serve a master on the condition that they receive a reward, and let the fear of God be upon you.
4. Jose the Tseredahite used to say: let your house be a school, or let it be a house into which wise men gather; make yourself dusty in the dust of their feet, and drink their words with thirst.
5. Jose the Jerusalemite used to say: let your house be open toward the street, and let the poor be children of your house.
6. Again he used to say: do not multiply conversation with a woman. Thus, he says, the wise men spoke, and they understood this of one's own wife; how much more of the wife of one's neighbor? From this comes what the same wise men said: during the whole time in which a man multiplies conversation with a woman, first he devours and gnaws evil for himself; then he ceases from the study of the law; finally, third, he descends into Gehenna.
7. Joshua the Perachite used to say: prepare a teacher for yourself; acquire even at a price a companion in study; and judge every person innocently.

(printed p. 137)

8. Nithai the Arbelite said: remove yourself far from a bad neighbor; do not associate yourself with an evil man; and do not despair of vengeance, namely divine vengeance.
9. Judas Tabaeus used to say: do not make yourself like those who arrange lawsuits; and when litigants stand before you, let them both be in your eyes as evil and guilty. But when they have been dismissed from your sight, let them be in your eyes as just and innocent, because they have now accepted judgment upon

themselves.

10. Simon Sarachius said: be abundant in examining witnesses, and be cautious in your words, lest perhaps from them they learn to lie and deceive.

11. Rabbi Schemaias used to say: love work; hate mastery; do not join yourself to dominion, that is, do not become too familiar with great lords.

12. Rabbi Abtalion said: O wise men, use great caution in your words, lest you sin with a fault worthy of deportation or exile, and be transferred to a place of bad waters which the disciples who come after you will drink, and the name of God be found profaned.

13. Rabbi Hillel said: be one of the disciples of Aaron, who loved peace, pursued peace, loved creatures, and applied them to the law. It could also be translated this way: be one of the disciples of Aaron, loving peace, pursuing peace, loving creatures, and using them according to the precept and goal of the law.

(printed p. 138)

14. He said again: whoever makes his name famous loses that very name; and whoever does not increase diminishes.

15. Again: whoever does not learn is worthy of death; and whoever exercises himself in the crown, that is, in the law, for the sake of his own advantage, will perish.

16. He said besides: if I am not for myself, who is for me? And when I am for myself alone, what am I? And if not now, when?

17. The same Hillel said: do not separate yourself from the Church, and do not trust yourself until the day of your death.

18. The same: do not judge your neighbor until you reach his place.

19. The same: do not say anything that cannot be understood on the assumption that, in the end, it can be understood.

20. The same: do not say, "When I have found leisure I shall learn," lest perhaps you never find it.

21. Rabbi Schammai used to say: make your law, that is, the law which you have imposed on yourself or which has been given to you for your benefit, fixed.

22. The same: speak little and do much.

23. The same again: receive every person with a serene face.

24. Rabbi Gamaliel: prepare a teacher for yourself; separate yourself from a doubtful matter; and do not become accustomed to giving tithes often by conjecture.

25. Rabbi Simon Gamaliel says: all the days of my life I was brought up among the wise,

[margin: Pliny, book 2, letter 10. The printed clause in saying 14 appears to read "whoever does not increase, increases"; the standard maxim requires the opposite sense.]

(printed p. 139)

and I found nothing more useful for the body than silence. The foundation of happiness is not speech but work; and everyone who multiplies words brings in sin.

26. The same: the world is founded upon three things: truth, judgment, and peace, according to what is said in Zechariah 8: "Bring truth, judgment, and peace into your gates."

These are those men. From them I pass to the Sadducees.

Chapter XVIII. On the Name of the Sadducees

(printed p. 139 — Book II)

The second part of this second book was assigned at its beginning to the Sadducees. As I did with the Pharisees, I begin from their name, for which a twofold etymology is brought forward not badly.

One etymology comes from the appellative name *Tsedek*, which signifies justice. Saint Epiphanius, heresy 14, says that they call themselves Sadducees, as though by an appellation fitted to justice, for *sedek* is interpreted as justice. Saint Jerome hints at the same thing on Matthew 22; so does Abulensis on the same chapter, question 123; and Melanchthon, a refugee from the Christian faith and justice, says in book 2 of the *Chronicle*: "The Zadducees named themselves from *Zaddic*, which means just, as if they were named the just or justiciaries."

The other etymology comes from *Tsadok*, the first founder of this sect. So Philastrius; Elias in the *Tishbi*; Rabbi Jacob in the preface to the book *En*; the author of *Cozri*; Rabbi Abraham Levi in the historical *Kabbalah*; Rabbi Nathan

[margin: Whence the Sadducees are named. Opinions 1 and 2.]

(printed p. 140)

in his commentary on *Pirke Aboth*; and, among more recent Christians, many Catholics as well as innovators. Who this *Tsadok* was, and how he framed this sect, I shall say not much later. For now I shall make this note concerning the spelling.

The first Hebrew letter is the one which, as I said earlier from Saint Jerome's preface to Amos, is sometimes rightly represented by S. And so our evangelists, Saint Matthew chapters 3, 16, and 22; Saint Mark chapter 12; Saint Luke chapter 20; and Acts chapters 4, 5, and 23, and after them all Greeks and Latins, call and write them Sadducees.

Yet the innovators Junius and Tremellius, so that they might introduce something new wherever there is even the smallest occasion, call them *Zaducaean*s, as Melanchthon had also said a little earlier. For although that letter is rightly expressed also by Z, as in Nazareth and Nazarene, which is done by those same evangelists, why abandon the other form, which is also good and customary? Likewise, to put a single *d* in the middle is certainly allowed by the Hebrew, and it is sometimes read in the Greek Josephus; Drusius holds to it tooth and nail, with no opposition from me. But since those same evangelists and other ancient writers place two *ds*, why should we depart even a fingernail's breadth from them?

Nevertheless those same innovators write *Tsaducaean*s in their note on Mark 7. Therefore another innovator, Hugh Broughton, rightly gives them the rod in his English consensus, together with his Latin interpreter and the minister of the Frankfurt Calvinists,

[margin: How to write "Sadducees."]

(printed p. 141)

Isaac Genius, who says: "I write *Sadduc* in imitation of the seventy interpreters in some passages, and I do this to vindicate the Scripture of the New Testament from the criticism of a certain learned critic," the Calvinist Junius.

Chapter XIX. Who Was Sadoc, the Founder and Parent of the Sadducees

(printed p. 141 — Book II)

Saint Epiphanius notes in the cited passage that there was once a certain priest named Sadoc; and indeed he is very famous in the history of David and afterward, 2 Kings 8, 15, 17, 18, 19, and 20; 3 Kings 1; and elsewhere. But it is clear that he is not the one under discussion here.

This Sadoc was a disciple of that great and ancient Pharisee Antigonus, whom I indicated above as the disciple of Simeon the Just. Sadoc also had, under the same teacher, a fellow disciple named Baithos or Baithus, by some called Baietos, and by Drusius, folio 38, called Boethus. How rightly, I stop asking. Yet I certainly do not assent to Genebrard when he writes in book 2 of the *Chronology*, "I think Dositheus is the Baiethos of the Hebrews." For what likeness is there, either in meaning or in sound, besides a slight one in the last syllable? Besides, all the cited authorities teach that these two were fellow disciples, not that one was the other's teacher.

[margin: Sadoc's teacher was Antigonus, chapter 12. Dositheus was his fellow disciple. Folio 103.]

(printed p. 142)

Therefore it should rather be asked whether some Dositheus was the teacher of these men, and who he was. Philastrius certainly affirms this, and before him Saint Epiphanius in the same heresy 14, when he says that the Sadducees were "a fragment broken off from Dositheus."

As to the name, Dositheus seems to be the same as the man who in chapter 3 of *Pirke Aboth* is called דוסתא, Dosetha. But in reality he seems different from the man now in question, because that Dosetha is the son of Janai, who by another name, according to Fagius's interpretation, is called Meir, and seems to be younger than the other and a Pharisee.

Saint Epiphanius, in heresy 13, paints Dositheus in the colors of foul ambition, hypocrisy, and miserable death in this way:

This Dositheus mingled with the Samaritans, departing from the Jews to their customs. And when he had advanced in the doctrine of the law and had hunted for first place in those deuteroses that exist among them, that is, among the Jews, but had fallen from his hope and attempt and was not considered worthy of any esteem among the Jews, he declined to the Samaritan race and presided over this very heresy, that of the Dositheans. Living in a cave, however, an anchoritic life, because of an excessive pursuit of the wisdom which he had fashioned for himself, continuing in varied and hypocritical fasting, as the report goes, he died in lack of bread and water by his own spontaneous decree or sentence. After some days, they say, certain men came to visit him and found his body exhaling a foul smell,

[margin: Dositheus is also said to have been their teacher.]

(printed p. 143)

with worms bursting from it, and a great cloud of flies standing over it, as if in a swarm.

Tertullian, in *Prescription* 45, says: "Dositheus first dared to repudiate the prophets, as though they had not spoken by the Holy Spirit." Origen, in tractate 27 on Matthew, says: "As the history makes clear to one who reads, there were not many men in the time of the Apostles who said that they were Christs, except perhaps Dositheus the Samaritan, from whom the Dositheans are named, and Simon." And in book 2 *Against Celsus*: "After the times of Jesus, Dositheus the Samaritan tried to persuade his fellow citizens that he was the Christ foretold by Moses, and he seems to have found disciples."

So much concerning Sadoc's teacher Dositheus. Yet it seems that Sadoc is for this reason called by Philastrius a disciple of this man: he went over to him when Dositheus had already separated from the Jews and joined the Samaritans, although up to that point he had been a disciple of Antigonus.

There was also another Samaritan, almost of the same name as Dositheus, Theodosius, who tried to plead the cause of the Samaritans before Ptolemy Philometor, to the great harm of himself and of his associate Sabbaeus. Perhaps from Sabbaeus came the name of the Seboueni Samaritans in Epiphanius, heresy 11, unless their name comes from the seventh month, to which they transferred unleavened bread and Passover, or more generally from their transfer of Sabbaths, as Josephus narrates in book 13, chapter 6.

(printed p. 144)

Chapter XX. How the Sect of the Sadducees Arose

(printed p. 144 — Book II)

Two ways can be considered: one by which the founder of this sect separated himself from the Jews; the other by which he departed from Dositheus, who has already been named. The first way is narrated by Rabbi Abraham in the often cited book as follows:

Alexander came into the land of Israel. When Sanballat the Horonite and the other leaders of the Cuthaeans, or Samaritans, heard of his arrival, they approached him and asked him to allow the priests of their family and their relatives to build another sacred temple on Garizim, and likewise to allow all those who had married foreign wives and did not wish to dismiss them to remain. When the king assented to this petition, they built the temple. Then the people of Israel was split into two parts. One followed Simeon the Just and Antigonus his disciple and his assembly, according to what they had received by tradition from Ezra; the other followed Sanballat and his sons-in-law. And so they offered holocausts and sacrifices outside the temple of the Lord, and established decrees and judgments as their heart dictated. In this shrine Manasses, son of Joshua son of Josedec, performed the priestly office. Sadoc was chief with his colleague Baietos. This was the beginning of the heresy. For Sadoc and Baietos separated themselves from their teacher Antigonus and defected to the shrine of Mount Garizim. There they were chief men.

Rabbi Nathan, in his commentary on the book *Pirke Aboth*, reports the same manner as follows:

[margin: Two ways in which the Sadducean heresy arose; first way.]

(printed p. 145)

Sadoc's teacher Antigonus, named above, was accustomed to use that maxim in frequent conversations and to impress it upon his disciples. It is found in chapter 1 of *Pirke Aboth*, and I reviewed it above in the last chapter on the Pharisees: "Do not be like servants who serve some master on the condition that they receive a reward from him."

For Antigonus meant, and this is otherwise most true, that God is to be loved for his own sake, even if he should give no reward to his worshipers, and that he is to be honored with every worship and obedience. But the wicked disciple corrupted this most beautiful and excellent opinion of his teacher, as if Antigonus had said and taught that no reward would ever be paid by God either for good deeds or for evil deeds. Thus he began to form and construct a new sect; and abandoning the Catholics, he fled to the Samaritans and to Dositheus himself, who was depicted a little earlier.

In what manner he also defected from Dositheus will be understood if I first recall his doctrines.

Chapter XXI. What Were the Doctrines and Institutions of the Sadducees

(printed p. 145 — Book II)

First, they cut down the number of sacred books and admitted only the five books of Moses, rejecting all the rest: historical, prophetic, and hagiographic alike. Rabbi Elias Levi,

[margin: Chapter 17. Second way.]

(printed p. 146)

in the *Tishbi*, under the word *Sadok*, says this; so does Tertullian, *Prescription*, chapter 49, after saying that Dositheus rejected the prophets: "The Sadducees, arising from the root of this error, dared to add other things also to this heresy, concerning which later." Origen, book 1 *Against Celsus* and tractate 21 on Matthew; Saint Jerome on Matthew 22; and the Venerable Bede likewise say this. For that reason they say that Christ the Lord, although several other and clearer Scriptures were available, wished to use against them only that passage from Exodus 3: "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." For, as Saint Jerome says in the cited passage, "the Sadducees received only the five books of Moses, rejecting the oracles

of the prophets. Therefore it was foolish to bring forward testimonies from a source whose authority they did not follow."

Origen, book 3 on the Epistle to the Romans: "The Samaritans make themselves strangers to the letters of God by repudiating the prophets." In this matter of denying certain books of sacred Scripture and expunging them from the sacred canon, today's innovators are so similar to them that Calvin writes on Matthew 22 that the Sadducees rejected the books of the prophets in the same way that he and his party reject Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees.

Saint Epiphanius, before heresy 9 and within it, gives some occasion for why this was done by them. Moreover, the Samaritans, to whom Sadoc fled, mutilated those same five books of Moses by three further letters whenever they occurred ם —, ן, ן [so the errata leaf; the text itself misprints them] —

[margin: From the sacred Bible the Sadducees cast out certain books, just as Lutherans and Calvinists do today.]

(printed p. 147)

the first of these is, as it were, in the middle of Abraham; the second in his son Isaac; the third in his grandson Jacob. Benjamin of Tudela noted this on page 40 of his *Itinerary*, saying that in place of those letters they substitute aleph, that is, the light breathing.

Moreover, they also corrupted the very first verse of Moses. Where it is written, "In the beginning God created heaven and earth," they themselves read, "In the beginning Asima created heaven and earth," because Asima was the idol of the Emathites, as Rabbi Abenezra reported concerning them at the beginning of the book of Esther.

Scaliger, however, in book 7 of *On the Correction of Time*, denies these latter two claims, and says that they are Jewish slander against the Samaritans. First, because Postellus says otherwise. Second, because they would rather have said, "In the beginning Nergel created heaven and earth," since Nergel was the idol of the Cuthaeans, 4 Kings chapter 18, not Asima. But first, it could have happened that in Benjamin's time the Samaritans rejected those three letters, while in our century, in which Postellus lived, they receive them. Second, since the Cuthaeans had several idols, they could have had some reason to put one rather than another.

Second, they admitted no tradition of the elders or interpretation of the written law derived from Moses, the prophets, and other doctors. Elias in the *Tishbi* says: "Antigonus, a man of Socho, had two disciples,

[margin: Samaritans change certain sacred letters. They also corrupt certain words. The Sadducees despised doctors' interpretations in the sacred letters.]

(printed p. 148)

one of whom was named Zadok, and the other Baiethos. Defecting from their teacher, they began among evil men to deny the law handed down orally. Nor did they trust anything except what was written in the law." For this reason, as Elias reports in the same place and later under the word *karah*, they were called *Caraim*.

Hence comes that Jewish distinction: some are *Rabbanim*, that is, Rabbinists or master-followers, who admit the statutes, traditions, and interpretations of the rabbis. These are called in Arabic Damascenes or Syrians, and in Hebrew Israelites and Habaeans. Others are called in Arabic Greeks and in Hebrew Babylonians. Still others are *Caraim*, that is, lectionaries, scripturaries, or textualists, about whom I already spoke above, book 1, chapter 5. Scaliger, in book 2 of *On the Correction of Time*, makes these twofold: some acknowledge only the Pentateuch; others acknowledge other books of the Bible as well, but, as I said, reject every tradition and exposition of the doctors.

Origen, book 3 of the commentary on Romans, after saying the things I cited above about the Samaritans, continues: "But I would not say that the oracles of God have been entrusted to heretics, who speak iniquity on high, who by their impiety divide the unity of the Godhead, and who separate the law from the Gospels,

merely because divine volumes seem to be read among them. Rather, because they understand nothing spiritual in them, nothing worthy of God, I would say that among them there is only the letter which kills."

Saint Hilary, book 2 *On the Trinity*: "Heresy is not from Scripture but from understanding; the sense, not the word, becomes the crime." Saint Augustine,

[margin: The heretics of our own time despise the same things.]

(printed p. 149)

letter 222 to Consentius: "Love understanding greatly; for even the sacred Scriptures themselves, which commend faith in great matters before understanding, cannot be useful to you unless you understand them rightly. For all heretics who receive them as authoritative seem to themselves to follow them, although they rather follow their own errors; and for this reason they are heretics not because they despise the Scriptures, but because they do not understand them."

Third, they believed that after this life there was no reward for good works and no punishment for bad ones. Josephus, book 2 of *The Jewish War*, chapter 12, says that they remove punishments and honors in Hades. The same is also clear from the preceding chapter and from the following items in this chapter. Hence the Apostle said in Acts 23:6, "Concerning hope," that is, the hope by which rewards are expected, "and the resurrection of the dead I am judged."

Fourth, they acknowledged no resurrection of bodies: Matthew 22:23; Mark 12:18; Luke 20:27; Acts 23:8.

Fifth, they said that human souls perish together with their bodies and vanish into nothing. Saint Jerome on Matthew 22; Josephus, book 2 of *The Jewish War*, chapter 12, and book 18 of *Antiquities*, chapter 2. This is also relevant to what I noted in book 2 of Maccabees, chapter 12, against the objection of heretics. For surely against those men, whose mad faction had arisen nearly in those times,

[margin: No reward or punishment after this life. Resurrection denied. The perpetuity of souls also denied.]

(printed p. 150)

the excellent and most wise judgment of Judas Maccabaeus was directed, as the author of that book noted in that passage.

Sixth, they denied angels, Acts 23:8. Calvin says there, and in book 1 of the *Institutes*, chapter 14, section 9, that this heresy is sprouting up again today, just as six hundred others are sprouting up again; and Beza will be cited in the following doctrine.

Seventh, they denied spirit, in the same passage of Acts. Some, in Saint Chrysostom's treatment of that passage, take "spirit" for angel. But in so brief a narration of doctrines, how could angels be signified by two names? And would this be a sufficiently suitable distinction of denials: "the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, nor angel, nor spirit"? Abulensis, on Matthew 22, question 127, understands it as soul, whose immortality the Sadducees denied, as I said above, because this is often called *pneuma* or spirit. But either they would be denying that human beings are furnished with a soul, if they denied soul simply, or it would have to be added and understood: after death, namely that then the human spirit does not survive.

In the cited passage of Abulensis, it is said that perhaps demon can be understood. But this is contained under angel, and there is no reason why it should be called spirit, and indeed without any addition, rather than a good angel. Therefore spirit of God is better understood, as it was understood by Philastrius in the heresy of Dositheus and by Saint Epiphanius when he says, in heresy 14, that "they did not know the Holy Spirit,"

[margin: Angels also denied. How spirit is denied by them: 1, angel; 2, soul; 3, demon; 4, divine Spirit.]

(printed p. 151)

and as is indicated by verse 9 in the same place, when it is said, "What if a spirit has spoken to him, or an angel?"

But some supporter of the first interpretation may say that in that passage only two things seem to be mentioned which those men denied, because it is added as if about two things: "But the Pharisees confess both." I answer that *amphotera*, "both," can be said of several things when those several things can be brought back to two kinds, as Budaeus noted in his commentaries on the Greek language. So too Cicero in the second *Catilinarian* says, "I place both kinds, citizens, in the same class of plunderers and robbers." Therefore, because there is one kind, as it were, of spirits both divine and angelic or human, though the name is extended more broadly than to be included within the logical categories, Saint Luke said *amphotera*. And Saint Chrysostom, in the same passage, notes that the word can be taken of several things; the Arabic and Syriac texts also indicate this, for they translate, "But the Pharisees confess all these things."

Beza notes there that the Libertines are even today in this heresy, so that they deny the subsistence of angels and souls.

Eighth, they said that God neither does evil nor foresees it. The former is most true; the latter most false. Josephus, book 2 of *The Jewish War*, chapter 12.

Ninth, they were also troublesome to Christ the Lord: by asking a sign from him, Matthew 16; Matthew

[margin: Objection and response. The sign-request citation appears to be printed as Matthew 26, but the episode is Matthew 16:1.]

(printed p. 152)

22:23; Mark 12:18; Luke 20:27; by testing him with captious questions, Matthew 22; by being indignant that his disciples were teaching the people and proclaiming in Jesus the resurrection from the dead, Acts 4:1-2; by seizing them and casting them into prison, Acts 5:17-18; and by bringing them to judgment, Acts 23:6.

Tenth, Philastrius says that they proclaimed that one should live according to the flesh, and that the body should be circumcised and baptized.

Eleventh, the same Philastrius says, "They followed Epicurean madness rather than the rights of the divine law." Indeed, from the preceding doctrines, what else could be born except pure Epicureanism? Once the resurrection of bodies is removed, the immortality of souls denied, and the recompense of rewards and punishments mocked, what remains but a beastly life and that old line, "Eat, drink; after death there is no pleasure"? See Chrysostom on Matthew 22, and Abulensis, question 126. Hence in chapter 2 of *Pirke Aboth*, Rabbi Eleazar says: "Apply yourself to learning the law, so that you may have something to answer the Epicurean. And consider before whom you labor, and who is the Lord of your work, who will repay you a reward for your work."

Twelfth, Josephus, book 13, chapter 9, says that the Sadducees remove fate, holding that nothing happens by it, and that human affairs do not receive their completion according to it. Rather, they place all things in ourselves, so that we ourselves become the causes of good things, and receive worse things through our own folly. There are similar things in book 2 of *The Jewish War*, chapter 12.

[margin: Sadducees as Epicureans. Sadducees remove fate.]

(printed p. 153)

Thirteenth, the same Josephus, book 18, chapter 2, says that this doctrine of the Sadducees reaches only a few men, though these are among the first in dignities. They do almost nothing by themselves, so to speak. When they come into offices, unwillingly and by necessity they yield to what the Pharisee says, because otherwise they would not be tolerable to the multitude.

Fourteenth, the same Josephus, book 2 of *The Jewish War*, chapter 12, says that the behavior of the Sadducees toward one another is harsher and that their dealings with those like themselves are savage, as with foreigners. In book 20, and Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 2, chapter 23, say: "The Sadducees are, more than the other Jews, cruel and harsh in punishments."

Chapter XXII. Whether the Sadducees Were Samaritans

(printed p. 153 — Book II)

Samaritans are found in two kinds. Some are alien from the Jewish race and join open idolatry to some worship of the one God, 4 Kings 17:24 and 41. They consisted of about four nations, from which they were named Cuthaeans, Emathites, Avites, and Sepharvaimites; Saint Epiphanius, heresy 8, calls them by similar names. Others arose from these, and among them there were also many from the Jewish race. They had shaken off all open idolatry, yet through ignorance, as Saint Epiphanius says in heresy 9, they still retained something of it, since they turned, whenever they prayed, to

[margin: Sadducees few. High in honors. Intolerable to the people. Harsh and savage. Cruel. Two kinds of Samaritans: earlier and later.]

(printed p. 154)

that mountain in which the idols of those four nations had been buried and hidden, as though it were holy, and called it Garizim. These are the men who held the Garizim temple, obtained from Alexander the Great, as I touched on above from Rabbi Abraham and as Josephus pursues more fully in book 13, last chapter. These are the men who, after the times of this Alexander the Great, are mentioned either in the Gospels or in other sacred and profane writers. Saint Epiphanius describes their doctrines and customs in heresy 9, and what the Arab Geographer narrates about their remnants in the second part of the second climate agrees very closely with these:

After this, he says, comes the island of the Samaritans, which certain Samaritan Jews inhabit. A proof is that each of them says, whenever someone approaches them, "Do not touch." And by this speech it is recognized that they are from those Jews who are surnamed Samaritans, accomplices of the calf in the age of Moses, upon whom be peace.

They are called accomplices of the calf not because they already existed when the calf was worshiped, but because they show themselves imitators of those men, or seem as if descended from those who sinned by worshiping that calf.

Therefore the Sadducees were not Samaritans of the first kind, as is clear. But they attached themselves to the later kind when Sadoc and Baiethos withdrew from their teacher Antigonus, as was said above.

[margin: Chapter 20. Exodus 32.]

(printed p. 155)

Yet, as usually happens in factions of this kind, they were not entirely Samaritans. Rather, they held certain doctrines and institutions of theirs: those concerning acceptance of the Pentateuch alone, and only of what was written there; contempt for all traditions and interpretations; denial of the resurrection of the dead; and similar things. They changed some things and forged others.

For although the Samaritans offered sacrifices only in their Garizim temple, the Sadducees sacrificed in the Jerusalem temple. Saint Epiphanius says in heresy 9: "The Sadducees were not Samaritans, but Jews, for they sacrificed in Jerusalem." The Samaritans had no custom, fellowship, gathering, or conversation with the Jews, John 4:9. But the Sadducees lived in Jerusalem, were familiar with the kings of the Jews, and dealt with the priests and Pharisees, and sat in the same senate, Acts 4, 5, and 23. Hence Saint Epiphanius says in the cited place: "They keep all the same things as the Samaritans, but in all other things they act together with the Jews."

Thus the same Sadducees are sometimes called Samaritans and sometimes distinguished from them, because they were intermediate and, as it were, ambidextrous and *amphidoxoi*, holding two sides. In the dissension which they had with the Pharisees, the Samaritans followed them, as Gorionides says in book 4, chapter 29.

[margin: Sadducees belong to the later Samaritans, with some distinction.]

(printed p. 156)

Chapter XXIII. Whether the Sadducees Were Dositheans

(printed p. 156 — Book II)

I said above that Sadoc withdrew from Dositheus, who had transferred himself to the faction of the Samaritans. Therefore someone might think that the Sadducees were Dositheans, or, as Saint Epiphanius calls them, Dositheî. Yet this must be denied; and one must say that Sadoc dissented from Dositheus and fabricated a new sect from himself. For the Dositheans confessed the resurrection of bodies, as Saint Epiphanius says in heresy 13. But, as we saw above, both the Samaritans and Sadducees were its chief deniers. The same judgment applies to all the other doctrines which are connected and bound up with this one.

Chapter XXIV. Whether, While the Mosaic Synagogue Stood, the Sadducees Were Truly Heretics

(printed p. 156 — Book II)

The Sadducees were truly heretics in the bad sense, even when the state of the old Synagogue still stood. For, as was established earlier, their doctrines were heretical and quite impious; and against them a judgment of condemnation had been issued from Moses' chair. Regarding the number of sacred books, there had already been synodal decrees, partly made in the times of Ezra, partly afterward, as can be seen in *Baba Bathra* and

[margin: Chapter 19. Sadducees were heretics.]

(printed p. 157)

in Rabbi Moses of Kotzi, Elias, the third preface to the Masorah, and Genebrard, book 2 of the *Chronology*. Was not the resurrection of the dead most explicitly established against them in 2 Maccabees 12? Verse 43: "After making a collection, Judas sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem, that sacrifice might be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection; for unless he hoped that those who had fallen would rise again, it would seem superfluous and vain to pray for the dead."

Was not the remuneration of merits in the future age most clearly asserted in the same place, verse 45, against those same men? "He considered," Judas Maccabaeus, "that those who had accepted sleep with piety had an excellent grace laid up for them."

Very often in Hebrew writings they are called *minim*, that is, heretics. Thus in Gorionides it is said that Hyrcanus came to Mount Garizim and captured the fortress of the *hamminim*, that is, of the heretics, and the *haccouthim*, that is, of the Samaritans, and destroyed that Garizim shrine which belonged to the *lamminim*, that is, to the heretics; and that he besieged Samaria, the city that was the mother and city of the *laccouthim lamminim*, the Samaritans and heretics.

Again afterward the same Gorionides says in the Compendium: "One of the king's ministers hated the wise men," that is, the Pharisees, "and there was in them *riach minouth*, that is, an odor of heresy," or, as Latins say, they smelt of heresy. Elias says in the *Tishbi*: "The rabbis call the man in whom there is no knowledge or law *min*."

(printed p. 158)

And Rambam, whose memory is blessed, wrote that this name falls on no one else except a Sadducee and a Baithosian. So he says.

Philastrius calls it not only a heresy, but also a pestiferous heresy. The sixth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, chapter 6, gives the Sadducees first place among the evil heresies. Hence there was rare,

indeed almost no, conversation of Christ the Lord with them, except when they of their own accord harassed him once and again with questions; no gathering or meal with them, although he went to the Pharisees, and with them often ate and reclined at table, Luke 7:36, 11:37, and 14:1.

And today the Jews pursue with great hatred all those who are called *Caraim* for the reason mentioned above, and they do not wish to have any communion with them in prayers, marriages, or trade.

But why, you will ask, did the Sadducees remain in Jerusalem? Why did they deal with the priests and their rulers? Why did they come to councils and synedria? Why did they sacrifice in the temple of God? Because of this question, Abulensis, on Matthew 22, questions 129, 130, and 131, thought that the doctrines of the Sadducees were judged not to be contrary to the articles of faith, and to belong to opinions rather than to fixed dogmas.

But rather it must be said that they were tolerated because the Sadducees were powerful and were supported by the favor of the powerful, as is written by Gorionides, book 4, chapter 29, and by Flavius, book 18, chapter 2. Second,

[margin: Book 1, chapter 5; book 2, chapter 21. Objection. Response 1-2.]

(printed p. 159)

because in royal courts there were hidden heretics from their sect who were devoted to their advantages and interests, as the same Gorionides narrated a little earlier.

Third, their kings themselves also sometimes approved and embraced their teachings, as Hyrcanus did, concerning whom I have spoken above and shall speak again below.

Fourth, the tyrant Herod was, as is plain from his deeds and from Josephus, book 15, chapter 12, a great Machiavellian. For that reason he gladly fostered rival interests and parties as useful to his commonwealth and kingdom. He favored the Sadducees all the more willingly because at times, as we saw above, he was more angry with and hostile toward the Pharisees.

There was also the great tepidity and negligence, because of the many crimes by which they were defiled, of those who were Catholics and who held the chair of Moses, in matters that concerned the repression of heretics; especially since, as was said above, these heretics were very strong in wealth and clientele.

From this it is clear that the Lord did indeed say generally in Matthew 16 that one must beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees, that is, their doctrine. But when that leaven is considered specifically, it must be understood in one way in the Pharisees and in another way in the Sadducees. My Drusius, on folio 16, calls the Sadducees heretics, but not the Pharisees, as was noted where I discussed them.

[margin: References to book 2, chapter 16, sections 27-28; chapter 16.]

(printed p. 160)

Chapter XXV. When Did the Sadducees Begin?

(printed p. 160 — Book II)

The Samaritan heretics had their beginning in the time of Alexander the Great, as I noted above. The heresy of the Sadducees sprang up a little afterward, when Sadoc and Baiethus deserted Antigonus, the disciple of Simon the Just, who had dealt with Alexander the Great, and went over to the Samaritans, as was explained above. Therefore the Sadducees existed even before the time of Jonathan, contrary to what Abulensis, on Matthew 3, question 63, Genebrard, book 2, and Adrichomius in his *Jerusalem* asserted. They began, then, not long after Ezra and Alexander.

Chapter XXVI. Whether Any Sadducees Have Come Down Even to Our Age

We may take Sadducees either properly, as those who have not been initiated into the Christian rites, or figuratively. Concerning Sadducees of the former kind Genebrard, book 2, gives three answers.

First, he says that the heresy of the Sadducees was very numerous down to the destruction of Jerusalem made by Titus and to the Roman captivity of the Jews.

Second, he says that almost seven hundred years later the same heresy was again renewed among the Jewish people, though they were dispersed and afflicted by various exiles,

[margin: Luke 20. Response 1: properly so-called Sadducees.]

(printed p. 161)

by a certain Rabbi Anan and his son Saul. Anan wished, like Dositheus mentioned above, to be Gaon, that is, he desired to be distinguished by the title and dignity of a Talmudic doctorate. For whoever rose to that rank was at that time called Gaon, that is, illustrious and eminent. But when he did not obtain what he desired, he boiled over with anger and revived the old fable of the Sadducees about divine books, their interpretations, and ancestral traditions. He professed that he and his followers accepted only those books which he knew certainly had come from God, and that he adhered to the word of God alone, not to the explanations of any doctors.

Rabbi Abraham, in the cited *Kabbalah*, argues repeatedly against him and against another leading man of the same sect, Carcasnaeus. After Rabbi Abraham had recounted the miracle by which Jaddus, or Simon the Just, mentioned elsewhere, appeased and disarmed Alexander the Great when he was angry and armed, he says: "That remarkable miracle was accomplished through Simon the Just, such as did not happen to Anan or Carcasnaeus, the leaders of the heretical Sereans."

Third, John Leo testifies in his *Description of Africa* that some Sadducees still exist today, but that they are called by the name *Caraïm*. Elias discusses this under the words *Sadok* and *Kara*. I have already previously produced the words of Leo and others concerning them.

As for those who are Sadducees by metaphor, Maldonatus treats them on Matthew chapters 3 and 22.

[margin: Book 2, chapter 19. Maccabean harmony, Josephus, Origen, Jerome on Daniel 9, Nicephorus, and related references. Response 2: metaphorical Sadducees.]

(printed p. 162)

Chapter XXVII. What Adverse or Prosperous Affairs Befell the Sadducees?

(printed p. 162 — Book II)

In the same chapter 18 of the thirteenth book, Josephus Flavius included both the adverse and the prosperous fortunes of the Sadducees when he narrated how John Hyrcanus besieged the city of Samaria for a whole year, and finally captured it through his sons Antigonus and Aristobulus, devastated it, and utterly overturned it.

The epitome of Josephus agrees with him, reporting the matter in this way:

Hyrcanus came to Mount Gerizim and captured the fortress of the heretics and Samaritans, and he destroyed that shrine which the heretics had, which was called by them the house of the sanctuary. It had been built with the permission of Alexander, the first king of the Greeks, and Manasseh the priest, brother of Simon the Just, built it. But Hyrcanus the high priest destroyed it two hundred years after it had been built. Then, going on to the city of Samaria, he besieged it. So the city, which was the mother and city of the Samaritans and heretics, was besieged. They were afflicted by Hyrcanus until they ate the corpses of dogs. When the day of the fast of propitiation came, King Hyrcanus hastened to Jerusalem for the duty of the feast, because he was high priest. He appointed over the army Aristobulus, his elder son, and Antigonus, his second son. Meanwhile the Samaritans

and heretics

[margin: The adverse fortunes of the Sadducees.]

(printed p. 163)

sent a letter to the king of the Greeks, asking him to come to their aid. Therefore the king of the Greeks came to them with a great force and a strong army. The two boys, the king's sons, and the army of Israel went out to meet him, striking him so that almost no remnant was left. They killed twenty-one thousand of the strongest men in the battle; the rest fled. Then the boys returned to besiege Samaria.

When their father, King Hyrcanus, heard that the king of the Greeks had gone out to fight, and that his sons had Greeks on one side and Samaritans and heretics on the other, and did not know what had happened, for that sign happened on the ninth day of Tishri, while the king himself was performing the work of the feast day, his heart was anxious for his sons and for Israel. He therefore entered the house of the Holy of Holies to offer incense and implore mercy for his sons and for the army. He heard a voice speaking to him and saying, "Do not set your heart upon your sons and upon the army of Israel. Yesterday the Lord helped them in his mercies and according to the multitude of his piety, because of your fathers. Therefore let your heart be upright and your hands pure."

So the king came out from the Holy Place and announced this to the people. The next day he sent runners to Samaria. They returned to him and announced that the word had been true. King Hyrcanus was magnified in the eyes of all Israel, for they knew that the blessed Lord had accepted his works, granting him the Holy Spirit and increasing his kingdom and his priesthood.

[margin: The marginal note explains that "Sanctity" here means the Holy of Holies.]

(printed p. 164)

After this the king set out for Samaria. When he had besieged it for a whole year, he captured it and struck it with the edge of the sword. He allowed nothing in which there was breath to live. Then he broke down its wall and palaces and burned the city with fire.

So much for that account.

Yet this was also most fortunate and joyful for the same Sadducees, when the same King Hyrcanus, defecting from the Pharisees, wholly enslaved himself to the Sadducean heresy, on the occasion and in the manner which each Josephus adds. Since I have already touched on this above, and since my Drusius has published the chapter of Gorionides itself in Hebrew and Latin, I shall add only the concluding summary of the whole affair from Flavius:

Jonathan the Sadducee, especially after persuading Hyrcanus, disposed him in such a way that he joined the party of the Sadducees, dissolved the decrees established by the Pharisees among the people, and punished those who observed them.

And the compendium of Gorionides says:

The next day, by the king's command, it was proclaimed through all the cities of his kingdom that they should stand by the ordinance of Sadoc and Bithus. Anyone who rebelled against their decree, or observed the tradition of the wise men, or obeyed their will, would be killed by the sword. Thus did John the high priest, who exercised the high priesthood for forty years and at the end became a Sadducee. Yet the Israelites did not obey the king's command; rather, they secretly obeyed the governance of the wise men. The king, however, with all his servants, followed the tradition of the Sadducees. Therefore the king investigated them, and whoever

[margin: The prosperous fortunes of the Sadducees.]

(printed p. 165)

was revealed to him as agreeing with the ordinance of the wise men, he killed. Thus he drew a great people from Israel into this opinion.

Afterward, under Aristobulus and Alexander, sons of the same Hyrcanus, the fortunes of the Sadducees flourished, because these men were hardly friends of the Pharisees; indeed they were so hostile that

Alexander crucified very many of them, as was narrated earlier. Josephus, book 18, chapter 2, also touches on how those who were foremost in honors were Sadducees.

It would be possible to refer here that calamity of the Samaritans which befell them at Alexandria when Ptolemy Philometor heard the case about the Garizim temple and the Jerusalem temple, because the Sadducees were their disciples and friends, as was indicated in its proper place. Yet because the Sadducees themselves worshiped the Jerusalem temple, I will not make that evil pass over to them.

Chapter XXVIII. Whether the High Priests of the Jews Were Ever Sadducees

(printed p. 165 — Book II)

It has already been said once and again that John Hyrcanus was a Sadducee. His sons Aristobulus and Alexander imitated him. Therefore some of the Jewish high priests were heretics. For these men were at the same time kings and high priests: the first was king in fact only, but the others were kings both

[margin: Chapter 16. Some high priests and kings of the Jews were Sadducees.]

(printed p. 166)

in fact and in title, if we believe Strabo, book 16.

But if he was a Sadducee, and therefore also a heretic, according to what has been established in another chapter, where is that praise of Hyrcanus by which Josephus, book 13, chapter 18, and book 1 of *The Jewish War*, chapter 3, praises him as a prophet? Where is the praise by which Albertus Magnus, in his litany of saints, calls him a saint and invokes him together with his brothers? And what is weightier, where is the constant, firm, and immovable truth, in dogmas of faith and in the general doctrine of morals, of those who sit upon Moses' chair? Where are the pontifical Urim and Thummim of Exodus 28? Where is that word in Deuteronomy 17 about the high priests: "They will show you the truth of judgment"? See, the high priests themselves, before the coming of Christ the Lord, were open heretics and prescribed and inculcated heresy by laws and punishments, as was clearly seen in the preceding chapter.

First, I admit that the example of this fall of Hyrcanus is very sad, and almost like the fall of the wisest Solomon. He was the son of the most holy and most brave man Simon Maccabaeus. He had held power for many years with great glory and happiness. When he was alone in the temple burning incense, he had been taught by a divine voice, at the very moment when it happened, of the splendid victory of his sons over Antiochus Cyzicenus. The sacred deity was with him and had given him foreknowledge and prediction of future things,

[margin: Chapter 24. Objections. Response 1.]

(printed p. 167)

and yet this man, because of the fault of one Pharisee, and that not a grave fault but the fault of a frivolous man warmed by wine; because of one rather imprudent little word spoken at a banquet, among cups, amid the greatest cheer of all, and against everyone else's will; grew hot and violently indignant, and threw himself headlong into the impious heresy of the Sadducees. What a transformation this was! What a deadly second Solomon!

This teaches all, therefore, that whoever thinks he stands should take heed lest he fall; and whoever stands and wishes to stand firm should flee the occasions of falling: banquets, drunkenness, bursts of anger, wrath, hatreds, and the like, through which great and lofty columns have more than once fallen.

Second, he seems not properly to have taught and inculcated the heresy of the Sadducees as something to be fostered by all and necessary for salvation. Rather, he taught only this: that no one should adhere to the peculiar institutions of the Pharisees, and that, conversely, all should conduct themselves according to the

peculiar decrees of the Sadducees. I say "all," not absolutely, but all who were so minded that, beyond the institutions common to all Jews, they wished to follow the peculiar sect of the Pharisees or to live according to their rule. Meanwhile it was permitted to anyone to embrace neither sect, to live content with the common institutions of the Jews alone, or to give himself to the discipline

[margin: 1 Corinthians 10:12. Response 2.]

(printed p. 168)

of the Essenes, whose assemblies were not forbidden by Hyrcanus.

Third, let Hyrcanus have been a heretic, and let him have attempted to teach and force heresy upon others: divine providence was immediately present. The Lord did not allow the Mosaic seat of doctrine, the pontifical breastplate Urim and Thummim, or the authority of pontifical judgment to be fouled and stained by the dissemination of depraved dogmas. For the Lord at once removed this Hyrcanus from the midst. In this way Flavius must be explained by Gorionides, when he seems, after that sedition, to indicate that Hyrcanus lived happily and administered his rule in the best way for thirty-one years. That statement about the years of his rule refers to his whole administration, not to the time after that sedition, which was very short, although Josephus seems to call it happy because it had no wars or other disturbances.

Gorionides says: "This is John the high priest, who ministered in the great priesthood for forty years, and at the end became a Sadducee." This can be gathered both from the sequence of years from the death of Simon Maccabaeus to the most blessed birth of Christ the Lord, and from the fact that, among the deeds of this Hyrcanus, this is the very last history narrated even by Flavius.

Finally, fourth, even if Hyrcanus, as a heretic, had labored for a long time to derange all the Jews with heresy, he nevertheless never sanctioned or taught it as high priest

[margin: Response 3-4. Chapter 27.]

(printed p. 169)

from the chair. Among the other signs by which it is clearly understood that a pontiff, in a matter of faith or of the morals of the whole Church, is doing and deciding something not in the manner of a pontiff, these two are especially manifest.

One is if he suddenly decrees and establishes something at a feast or some game, heated with wine, drunk with anger, or raging with some desire.

The other is if, in the pontificate and the chair given by God, he has held, taught, and fixed some doctrine for many years together with the wisest men, and then afterward suddenly rejects that same doctrine as false and full of errors, unteaches it, and annuls it. Either he himself truly erred before, and then the whole privilege of the pontiff and of his chair concerning its constant truth and divine governance collapses; in that case he can be regarded in the later doctrine no less than in the earlier as suspect, false, deceived, and a deceiver. Or he did not err, and then his privilege indeed remains, but it appears that his later doctrine is false and proceeded from him not rightly and in order, but rashly and thoughtlessly, out of anger or some other disturbance of soul; and therefore no faith or obedience is to be given to it.

These same considerations can be applied to his two sons. Aristobulus reigned for only one year, as Josephus shows in the same book 13, chapter 19.

(printed p. 170)

For that reason Rabbi Abraham passes him over in his *Kabbalah*. Alexander held the scepter for twenty-six years, but it is clear from Josephus in the same book 13, chapter 21, that he raged rather savagely against the whole Israelite people and especially against the Pharisees, partly because he had inherited hostilities against the Pharisees from his father, and partly because of his own hatred. They had stirred up the arms of

neighboring kings against him; and on the very feast day of Tabernacles, while he was sacrificing and standing at the altar, they pelted him with citrons in contempt.

Yet because Josephus never expressly says that this Alexander was a Sadducee, I would think that he was not one, though he burned with hatred of the Pharisees, as I have said. For it can happen that a Catholic, for certain reasons, whether just or not, hates some Catholic order, and yet for that reason does not cast off the Catholic faith. Moreover, as we have seen elsewhere, when this Alexander was dying he strongly commended the Pharisees to his wife Alexandra if she wished her own affairs to be well ordered, in the same book of Josephus, chapter 23.

After Christ the Lord, Ananus the Younger was a Sadducee, as Josephus testifies in book 20 and Eusebius in *Ecclesiastical History* 2, chapter 23. But concerning these later high priests there is no difficulty, since the chair had already been taken away from them, or at least a bridle had been placed upon them by the Pharisees, as Josephus indicates in book 18, chapter 2.

[margin: Chapter 16.]

(printed p. 171)

Chapter XXIX. Are There Any Apophthegms or Maxims of the Sadducees?

(printed p. 171 — Book II)

I do not remember reading any, except this one saying of Sadoc in Eliezer, chapter 4 of *Pirke Avoth*: "Do not make a crown," that is, do not observe the law, "so that by it you may become great; nor use it as an axe, so that by it you may obtain what you eat." Yet this Sadoc does not seem to me to be the one from whom came the cesspool of the Sadducees. For a certain Pharisee named Sadoc is also read in Josephus, book 18, chapter 1.

(printed p. 172)

On the Essenes

This third book will pursue the third sect of the Jews, which I said was that of the Essenes. Since questions are usually raised about them not only on the smaller matters, such as nearly all those which Drusius merely touches upon, but also on great and weighty matters which concern the honor and adornment of the Christian religion, my explanation of them will be in two parts.

First, almost as if Philo, that good and ancient writer, had written either nothing or very little about them, I shall explain their name, discipline, customs, and the things connected with these in the same manner which I have so far followed in the two preceding sects. Then I shall come to the things handed down about them by Philo and discuss whether the Essenes in his account were Christians.

BOOK III — ON THE ESSENES

Chapter I. On the Name of the Essenes

(printed p. 172 — Book III)

Two things must be explained here about the name of the Essenes: first, where it is derived from; second, how it is written. The first point

(printed p. 173)

must itself be explained in two ways: first by listing the opinions, then by making a judgment about some of them.

Several conjectures can therefore be offered about where the Essenes get their name.

First, they may have been named from the city Essa, mentioned by Josephus, book 13, chapter 23, and by Suidas, just as the Emissenes are named from Emissa and the Edessenes from Edessa.

Second, they may have been named from the oracle of the Jewish high priests which used to be before their chest, which our interpreter usually calls the Rational, Exodus 28:4 and following, and which Josephus, in *Antiquities* book 3, chapter 8, calls by a softened form from the Hebrew word *chosen*, since the rougher sound was lightened.

Third, they may be named from the Chaldaic noun *chesin*, if its roughness were removed in the same way. Perhaps it means "acrobuston."

Fourth, they may be named from the Syriac *asan*, that is, to be shod, Mark 5. For their shoes will be discussed below, and even today some names of the Barefoot and the Discalced are taken from shoes. Or they may come from *asana*, that is, a bush, or from *asna*, that is, a palm or date tree. For Pliny says in book 5, chapter 27, that the race of the Essenes is companion to palms.

Fifth, they may be named from the Hebrew verb *asa*, which means to care for, heal, and cure. For Philo and Eusebius usually call them *therapeutae*.

Sixth, they may be named from the Hebrew עשה, *hasah*, which means "I do," as though *haseni*, or, with the aspiration removed, *Eseni*.

Seventh, they may be named from Jesus, Savior and Lord.

Eighth, they may be named from Jesse, the author and father of the Davidic stock from which Jesus our Lord and Savior came. They are called

[margin: On the derivation of the Essene name: conjectures 1-8.]

(printed p. 174)

not only Essenes but also Essaei, as if the name meant Jesseans.

Ninth, one says that the Essaei are, as it were, contemplatives, but he does not indicate from what Hebrew word.

Tenth, they may be named from the Hebrew *shanah*, or more gently *sanah*, which means either to hold the second parts, or to withdraw from others, that is, to retire, as in Luke 5:16 and John 13:1, or finally to study by repeating something again and again, that is, to devote oneself zealously to knowledge and doctrine. Thus in the saying cited above Hillel said: "Do not say, When I have found leisure, I shall learn," or "I shall devote myself to the study of doctrine"; in Hebrew it is *eschneh*, or more gently *esneh*.

The reason for this etymology is not only the easy application of these meanings to the Essenes, but also that Gorionides Josephus, book 5, chapter 23, near the end, in the Basel edition, twice takes the name in this way. Those who are called Essenes by Josephus Flavius, book 15, chapter 13, are there called *haffchonim*, or more gently *haffonim*, as Munster translates there and notes in book 4, chapter 6.

Eleventh, the name may come from the Greek for holy, as if the Essaei were *hagioi*, or rather *hagioi* or *hosioi*.

Twelfth, it may come from the Hebrew *chasid*, from which comes the Syriac ܚܫܝܢ, *chasi*, and *chosio*, that is, holy. Thus, with the hardness of the word softened, it becomes *Aseus* or *Esseus*, especially since Hebrew names ending in yod with chireq are not rarely expressed with the same yod and a preceding patach, as *mitsri* becomes *misrai*, *Yehudi* becomes *Yehudai*, *Perushi* becomes *Perushai*, and *Mini* becomes *Minai*,

[margin: Conjectures 9-12.]

(printed p. 175)

and therefore from *chasi*, *chasai*, or *chesai* there comes, by an easy turn, *Hessaeus*, or more gently *Essaeus*, just as from the other words come *Mitsraeus*, *Judaeus*, *Pharisaeus*, and *Minaeus*.

Of these conjectures, the first and fourth have so far found no supporter whom I have been able to read. The second and third were only hinted at by me in my harmony of the Maccabees, book 1, chapter 7, and book 2, chapter 14. The fifth was advanced by Scaliger in book 6 *On the Emendation of Time*, and by my Drusius in chapter 3 of the appendix to his little book. How Eusebius and Philo call them *therapeutae* I shall say later.

Photius seems to follow the sixth conjecture when, in treating Philo, he calls the theoretic Essenes *therapeutae* and the practical ones simply Essenes. David Chytraeus indicates the same derivation in his theological onomasticon, as though these men had observed the law accurately and had fulfilled it not so much in word as in deed. He says: "The Essenes, or Essei, that is, doers of the law, were a Jewish sect resembling almost the pattern of monastic life." The Syriac text of Romans 2 calls the doers of the law, in a half-Greek form, *hoseie nomuso*. Philip Melancthon, in book 2 of his *Chronicle*, says: "The Essei, that is, workers, from *asa*, appear to have been so called because they showed that they wished to serve God by good works, not by quarrels." Drusius, however, in his preface, while rejecting this etymology, seems to think that it arises from the fact that they used to procure their livelihood for themselves by the work of their hands.

The seventh and eighth conjectures belong to Saint Epiphanius, heresy 29, but in such a way that when he derives the Jesseans from Jesus,

[margin: On the authors of the conjectures. Conjectures 1-8. Folio 502.]

(printed p. 176)

he says this could have happened for two reasons: either because they were his disciples, or because the Hebrew etymology of the name Jesus was considered, from which he is understood to signify a healer, that is, a physician and savior. For *iaschah* and *hoschiah*, from which comes Jesus in Matthew 1:21, means to save or to give salvation. And just as a person can be safe in respect of both body and soul, so too there are both bodily and spiritual *therapeutae*. Jesus, however, was in both ways the most perfect Physician and Savior, but especially a spiritual one, since, as the angel says in Matthew 1, he would save his people from their sins.

In the same spiritual sense they are called *therapeutae* by Eusebius and Philo. Philo derives the name from healing and serving souls, in that they free and cure the souls of those who come to them from the diseases of vicious passions.

As Horace rightly says:

Does your breast burn with avarice and wretched desire? There are words and voices by which you can soothe this pain and put away a great part of the disease.

Likewise, in Diodorus, the library is called a healing-place of the soul, that is, a workshop of medicines for the soul.

And Philo himself, at the beginning of the book which Eusebius had in view, entitled *On the Contemplative Life*, says:

The Essenes profess a medicine more excellent than that common one found throughout all towns. The latter heals only bodies; the former frees souls from grave diseases that are stubborn against remedies,

[margin: Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History 2.16; Philo, On the Contemplative Life; Horace, Epistles 1.1; Diodorus, book 1.]

(printed p. 177)

diseases which pleasures, desires, griefs, fears, avarice, folly, injustice, and the other disturbances, with the countless troop of vices, have caused to invade.

But because *therapeuein* also means to care for divine things, or to undertake that care and solicitude which is applied to divine matters, Philo adds that the Essenes were so called because by nature and by the sacred laws they had been taught "to worship that Being which is better than the good itself, simpler than the one, and older and more primal than unity."

Eusebius completely follows Philo's path. From these two points one may clearly see the notable errors of Joseph Scaliger, book 6 *On the Emendation of Time*.

One error is when he says that Epiphanius says Jesus was named from the Greek verb meaning "to heal," whether in the ordinary or Ionic form, and not from the Hebrew word for saving, as the angel had instructed Mary. Epiphanius nowhere says this; rather, he looks back to the etymology shown by the angel, as I explained above. For that reason he did not call him merely physician, but also added Savior.

The second error is when Scaliger says that Eusebius, without any author, declares that the Essaeans drove out diseases in the name of Christ. Eusebius nowhere wrote this, since, as I have said, he followed Philo, who made no mention of the name of Christ; and when he indicates the driving away of diseases, he uses words

[margin: The margin glosses Philo's "grave and hard-to-heal diseases."]

(printed p. 178)

which chiefly signify diseases not of the body but of the soul, as was clear a little earlier from the words of Philo which he explained here.

The ninth conjecture is not Eusebius's, as Melancthon carelessly wrote in the cited place, but Suidas's. The word from which the Hessaei may be called contemplatives can be either שַׁחַה, *schahah*, to which the German *schawen* is very close, or חָזַח, *chazah*. Each means to look or see, but the latter especially does; from it comes the prophecy *chazon* or *hazon*, Isaiah 1:1, and prophets are called *chozim* or *hozim*, as in 2 Chronicles 9:24, Ezekiel 12:27, 2 Kings 24:13, and chapter 13, verse 16.

The tenth conjecture was proposed by me in the cited passage on the Maccabees. Drusius bites at it, as we shall hear a little later in chapter 2.

The eleventh is often attributed to Philo, in the book *On Every Good Man's Freedom* and in the book *On the Contemplative Life*, and to Eusebius, book 8 of the *Preparation for the Gospel*, chapter 4. But in fact, in the book *On the Contemplative Life*, Philo only says that the Essaeans are called *therapeutae*. He does not state that this is rather the meaning of the Essene name than the name by which those men were then called in Greek in Egypt, without regard to the origin of *Essaeus*. In the other book, *On Freedom*, he indeed says that some Essaeans are named from holiness, but he expressly warns, in words almost omitted by the Latin translators, that this notation is not to be sought from the Greek word. These are his words:

[margin: Conjectures 9-11.]

(printed p. 179)

They are called Essaeans, in my opinion, not according to the exact form of the Greek dialect, but as named from holiness.

Why does Philo warn that he is not looking to this Greek word? Some think the reason is that between *Essaeus* and the Greek word for holiness there seems to be a great dissimilarity of letters and sound. But the reason is rather that among the Greeks, *hosios* was then used especially of the one who worshiped the divinity with as many victims and sacrifices as possible. Hence related words were used for one who sacrificed a victim, as Plutarch testifies in *On the Failure of Oracles* and at the beginning of the *Greek Questions*. The same is clear from the words which Philo immediately adds: they became especially servants of God, not by sacrificing animals, but by judging that they ought to consecrate their own minds in a sacred manner.

Therefore the twelfth derivation is Philo's own, when he derives the Essaeans from holiness, not with respect to the Greek word, as has already been proved, but with respect to another. What could this other word be except the Hebrew *chasid* and the Syriac *chesi* or *hesi*? For this reason, elsewhere he simply asserts, according to his own judgment, that they were named from holiness. In his *Apology for the Jews* he says: "They are called Essaeans, having been judged worthy, it seems to me, of the name because of their surpassing holiness."

Chapter II. Which of These Conjectures about the Name of the Essenes Is Most Probable?

(printed p. 179 — Book III)

Since the first and fourth conjectures still have no patron, they should either be enlarged upon or, rather,

[margin: Plato, *Definitions* and *Euthyphro*; Josephus, *Jewish War* 2; conjecture 12.]

(printed p. 180)

passed over altogether in silence.

The sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth can have some small probability, partly from some affinity of words and partly from the dignity of their authors. The tenth, however, which I judged probable in the place cited, Drusius attempts to weaken. Before I speak, therefore, about the final derivations, I shall defend this one, not as the best and truest, but as not improbable. And I shall do so after quoting Drusius's own words.

He says on page 52: "I shall continue to deserve well of Serrarius, who, just as he has read many things well, for he is certainly a learned man and a man of very wide reading, so also has digested some matters badly."

I have long known, my Drusius, my own bad stomach; and, as I see, this is the point on which you wish to deserve well of me. Seneca says in book 3 *On Benefits*, chapter 9: "Who will estimate the value of having attended a sick man, when his health and safety depended on moments, of having taken hold of the right times for food, and of having refreshed his failing veins with wine?" "Value the physician," says Ben Sira, "before he is necessary to you." How much more, if he is already necessary! If he has run of his own accord, uncalled, to a sick man!

Now you, good physician of stomachs, are such a man for me. You come of your own accord to cure my indigestion. My stomach was weak; it was not digesting the foods it had taken; and behold, when I was not even dreaming of you, you fly in from the farthest borders of the Cauci and Batavi and wish to help my belly. What a service to me this is! Begin, then; show me how badly

[margin: The earlier nine conjectures are rejected. The tenth is not improbable. Seneca, *On Benefits* 3.9.]

I have digested certain things.

Among them is this, that he writes that the Essaeans are also called *Hassonim* in Gorionides, "as if," he says, "they were secondings, that is, those who were second after the Hasidaeans, or those who withdrew from the common life of others and carried themselves off into solitude, or finally Deuterotae."

If the lord doctor had quoted my words, as the change of characters shows, the digestion would not seem so bad. For I had added proofs of each point and had explained some things a little differently, especially the third. Yet since he wished to prepare only some pill from my opinion for himself, I shall swallow this very thing and then consider what purgatives he offers.

First, then, he says: "The Deuterotae were Pharisees, which plainly makes against me." But if he had brought forward my words whole, he could already have omitted this medicine of his. For all Pharisees were indeed Deuterotae, but not all Deuterotae were Pharisees. And therefore I said there that the *deuterosis* or *Mishnah*, from which the Essaeans could be called Deuterotae, was the secondary doctrine of divine things, not written by Moses, but communicated orally and handed down and propagated through the hands of the elders, the prophets, the Great House, and thereafter other wise men.

Otherwise, generally and first, I said that the *Hassonim* were called as it were "students." Then, in order to explain the reason for the name, I showed that doctrine is sometimes called *Mishnah*, which the Greeks call *deuterosis*. Then if

[margin: Drusius's four arguments; response to argument 1.]

he says, "If the *Hassai* were second after the Hasidaeans, then there was a distinction between these names, and the *Hassonim* or Hessaeans were not altogether the same as the Hasidaeans," I answer that I did not write that the Hessaeans were altogether the same as the Hasidaeans, but only the same in a qualified and corrected way.

These are my words: "The Asideans were the same as the Essenes, or certainly the former were some part of the latter, or the latter of the former." By the latter manner of speaking it is indicated either that the Essenes were a sort of whole made up of several parts, one of which was the Asideans, or conversely that the Asideans were a whole of which one part was the Essenes.

Is this not to make some distinction between these names? And even if I had not spoken so cautiously and with such qualification, I nevertheless said later, on folio 714, from Josephus and Philo, what I shall repeat hereafter and what Drusius himself acknowledges in chapter 3 of his appendix: that there are two kinds of Essenes, so that some could be "seconding" or "second" after others.

Third, he says: "The passage which he adduces to prove this point is the only one. It is found in the Venetian codex, folio 78, column 2, but far otherwise than Serrarius cites it. For instead of *Hassonim*, there is in that codex, without any erasure, *Hassarim*, which means princes or chief men." If I allowed my stomach to be accused here either of negligence or of scholarly weakness because it had badly digested that food from Gorionides, I would be worthy indeed for Drusius to conspire against my head with all my other members.

[margin: Response to arguments 2-3.]

For the Basel edition, which I cited, expressly has *Hassonim* for Essenes, and twice in that same chapter which I have already indicated above. What else does a good stomach do but digest the food that is offered to it? The Basel Hebrew text of Gorionides set *Hassonim* before it; it digested these. The Basel Latin text gave Essenes for *Hassonim*; it digested these too.

From Drusius's associates, the innovators of our age, Sebastian Munster wrote most plainly in the notes on that chapter: "*Hassonim*, Essenes, or, as certain Hebrews call them, *chesidim hasidei*, that is, pious." This entire thing the same stomach took in and digested very well. What blame is there in it? What fault?

But the Venetian codex has it far otherwise, namely *Hassarim* instead of *Hassonim*. I believe it; but I have never seen that codex. What depravity of stomach is it if it does not digest hens, pullets, and partridges that are never set before it? It digested the barley or bean bread which the Basel men, perhaps while belching, gave it. It could not exert its digestive power on the Venetian fine loaf and sweet cake, which it lacked. Therefore the digester is not to be accused; rather, one must regret that his hunger was not satisfied with better food, and that he did not have such wealth that he could buy every edition of every book. Drusius would rightly answer me in just this way if I blamed him because

[margin: Hosea 3:2.]

(printed p. 184)

he says on folio 33, "I do not have Munster's *Gorionides*," or because he reads *Hassarim* and not *Hassonim*, when his own Venetian edition gives the former, not the latter, just as, conversely, my Basel edition gives not *Hassarim* but *Hassonim*.

Yet he objects in the preface of his little book, though not in the chapter cited, with what is almost a fourth argument: "The word *Hassonim* is put in a bad sense at Proverbs 24:21. For the *sonim* are certainly men who attempt revolutions."

As though it were not extremely common among the Hebrews for words to be polysemous and neutral. In the same book of Proverbs, chapter 8, verse 14, is not *gaon* taken in a bad sense for arrogance and pride? And yet afterward it became a most honorable title, as Elias, Genebrard, and Scaliger explain; so much so that, as we saw above, the man who went over to the Sadducees did so because he could not become Gaon. We also saw above that *schoneh* is taken in a good sense. And the word *kadosh*, that mark of sanctity which Drusius writes is an epithet of priests, is it not applied in Deuteronomy 23:17 to the foulest prostitutes and catamites?

But since from this point the variation of reading in these books is understood, and each reading can in some way be tolerated, this can now be brought into question: to which reading in this matter should one rather adhere, the Basel or the Venetian? On this point I seem already to have made a certain prejudgment, since I compared the Basel reading with a piece of barley or bean bread, and the Venetian with a fine loaf, sweet cake, partridges, and the like. But

[margin: Folio 33. Book 3, question 1, commentary on section 10. Folio 15. Is the reading of *Gorionides* in the Basel edition more corrupt than the Venetian?]

(printed p. 185)

I did this to show that even if it were granted that the Venetian reading is much better, I am not for that reason near to blame, since I examined and weighed what I was permitted to read.

Now, since I believe Drusius about that Venetian reading, and since I see that the Cracow edition on folio 67 agrees with it, while my own very common edition is the Basel one, let us set aside, I hope, all the dispute about digestion and ask which reading is better in this particular business.

Drusius indeed at once gives first place to his own reading, and quite confidently. "No one even a little humane," he says, "will deny that this reading is genuine. For I think, indeed I do not doubt, that the passage should be translated into Latin in this way: Therefore the king," by which he understands Herod the Great, "did not force them," that is, the Pharisees, "to an oath. Rather, he honored the chiefs of the Hasidaeans and the wise men with great honor, and also the prince Manahem, the colleague of Samai. For Manahem, if anyone else besides, was a just and wise man in those days." The Hebrew words are then given:

לכן לא הביאם המלך בשבועה וגם השרים אשר לחסידים

והחכמים כבד בכבוד גדול וגם השר

מנחם החבר לשמאי כי מנחם אחר זולתו

איש צדיק וחכם היה בימים ההם.

"Serrarius cites these words from book 5, chapter 23, and translates them into Latin in this way: And also the *Hachonim* who belonged to the Hasidaeans (לחסידים) Herod did not force to the oath because of Manahem the *Hachone*, who belonged to the Hasidaeans (לחסידים), since Manahem himself was a just and wise man in those days. Let those who understand these things and

[margin: Drusius's Venetian reading and Serrarius's Basel reading are compared.]

(printed p. 186)

also have judgment now judge."

I most gladly agree to the same judges; and the more numerous they are, the sharper in judgment and the more attentive to the case, the more certain will be the victory for me, or rather for truth.

For it is agreed that Gorionides reports the same narrative which Flavius had reported in book 15, chapter 13: how Herod built and preserved a very beautiful temple to Caesar at the springs of the Jordan and at Paneas, from which it was also named Caesarea Paneas; and how from this arose various remarks and indignations among the Jews, because that tyrant was doing these things against God's law. In order to suppress these, while he did certain other things, he also wished everyone to swear fidelity to him.

When many refused to do this, among them the Pharisees and the Essenes, he inflicted very grave punishments on the others. But he released from this necessity of swearing the Pharisees who were disciples of Pollio and Sameas, mentioned above, and their associates, because of Pollio. At the same time he also released the Essaeans, but for a different reason: because, on account of the proven virtue of Manaemus the Essene and his power of foreknowing and predicting future events, confirmed by experience, Herod thought something greater and more august about them than mortal nature bears.

And so that the judges may more easily compare the two Josephuses with one another here and may more certainly pass judgment about the variant reading of Gorionides, and afterward also about the distinction between the Pharisees and the Essenes,

[margin: Reference back to book 1. Josephus, *Antiquities* 15.13.]

(printed p. 187)

I shall recite the part of Flavius's narrative which concerns the Pharisees and Essenes. In sense it says:

Herod tried to persuade those around Pollio the Pharisee and Sameas, and most of those who spent time with them, to swear. They did not consent, yet they were not punished like those who refused, but were released from this necessity out of respect for Pollio. Those among us called Essenes, who always used a way of life like that shown among the Greeks by Pythagoras, were also released. I shall speak more clearly about them elsewhere. As for the Essenes, from what causes he honored them, thinking something greater about them than is worthy to say of mortal nature, it will not be inappropriate to this history to declare, since it will show what opinion there was about them. One of the Essenes, named Manaemus, was a man otherwise testified to for virtue and nobility of character, and he had from God foreknowledge of things to come.

This is Flavius Josephus. Let the wise and fair judges note only these two things in his words.

First, nowhere in these words is there the term "princes" or "chief men," which in Hebrew is *Hassarim* and which Drusius wants.

Second, on the contrary, the Essenes, whom with other interpreters I called *Hassonim*, are very significantly named several times here. Therefore the Basel Gorionides comes nearer to this Josephus than the Venetian.

Then, the Venetian says that the elders who belonged to the Pharisees of Hillel and Sammei were not compelled to the oath, and in the same phrase it adds that the Essenes, or *Hassonim*, who belonged to the Hasidaeans, were not compelled.

Third, the Basel

[margin: *Josephus quotation on Herod, the Pharisees, and the Essenes.*]

(printed p. 188)

Gorionides first says of the Pharisees: "The king did not bring them to the oath." Then, similarly, concerning the Essenes he plainly and directly adds: "And also the Essenes (*Hassonim*) who belonged to the Hasidaeans, he did not bring to the oath because of Manahem the Essene (*haffeneh*), who belonged to the Hasidaeans, because Manahem was a just and wise man in those days."

But the Venetian, while it first sets down the clause about the Pharisees correctly, in the later words, at least as the Hebrew cited from it by Drusius sounds, confuses matters by saying: "And also the princes who belonged to the Hasidaeans, and the wise men themselves, he honored with great honor, and also Manahem, the companion of Schamai, because Manahem, another besides him, was a just and wise man in those days."

What need was there in the second clause, when he is dealing with the Hasidaeans, to insert the wise men themselves, whom the same Venetian and Drusius with him, on folio 41, had said in book 4, chapter 29, were Pharisees, when these had already been treated in the first clause? Then where does that Manahem, companion of Samai, come from? For Josephus Flavius certainly names only an Essene, and Drusius on folio 18 admits that this is the same man whom that Venetian Gorionides says is another.

Moreover, what connection is there in saying, "He honored the princes and wise men of the Essenes, and Samai's companion Manahem, because there was another Manahem"? Why, because there was another, did he honor that former Manahem? And that companion of Samai was either a Pharisee or an Essene. If a Pharisee, why is he named individually before so many other companions of Hillel and Samai?

(printed p. 189)

If he had to be named individually, why was he not previously listed with Hillel and Samai, but now named out of order? Why also does the same Gorionides assign elders to the Pharisees, not to the Essenes, and princes to the latter, not to the former?

From these points anyone will rightly conclude that this passage seems more correct in the German edition than in the Italian. In addition, our German edition is earlier and older than the Venetian, since the former appeared in 1541 and the latter in 1544, as Drusius himself reports on folio 36.

It also counts in its favor that, among the innovators, not only Munster but also Bonaventure Cornelius Bertram, in chapter 19 of his book *On the Jewish Polity*, approves and explains it. It also counts in its favor that the same Drusius, on the same folio 36, testifies that in one small section of the one chapter which he cited there are two corruptions. It also counts in its favor that the same Drusius, when he had cited the Hebrew words from his Venetian Gorionides, pleasantly, or rather, with his kind permission and for the sake of truth, deceitfully, in order to show that my translation differs from them, adds: "These are the words Serrarius cites and translates into Latin in this way." But how did I cite and translate the words, when I had never read, seen, or possessed the Venetian type of Gorionides? The words I cited and translated came from the Basel codex.

Finally, it also counts in its favor that, in translating the few words under dispute from the Venetian exemplar, the same Drusius committed, I think not from ignorance but by design, a threefold

[margin: *"Drusius twists a few words of the Venetian Gorionides."*]

(printed p. 190)

fraud.

The first is when he translates, "Rather, the chiefs of the Hasidaeans," although the Hebrew in the Venetian has, "And also the chiefs, who belonged to the Hasidaeans." For that phrase "and also" clearly distinguishes the Hasidaeans from the Pharisees, who had been mentioned before, against Drusius himself.

The second is when he translates, "Manahem, if anyone else"; for, as I have already noted above, the Venetian Hebrew says, "because Manahem was another."

The third is when he adds "besides," although the same Hebrew says "besides him."

So now let what Drusius asked for take place: let those who understand these things and also have judgment judge. Yet, so that Drusius may not be saddened by too severe a letter from the judges, I wish to concede certain things to him voluntarily.

First, because of the disagreement of these editions, I am willing to withdraw from this etymology of the Essenes and rather embrace the one which was explained above in the twelfth place.

First, because whichever of the proposed readings is more sincere, the notation seems less certain when its foundation has not been fixed and fastened in a firm, certain, and universally approved reading.

Second, because this is the true and genuine opinion of Philo and Eusebius in the places already indicated, as was concluded above.

Third, because the same notation was also committed to writing by Saint Chrysostom in homily 44 on the Acts of the Apostles, by Theophylact and Oecumenius on chapter 22 of the same Acts, and by others.

Fourth, it seems very likely that the Greek word *hosios* came from the same Syriac source,

[margin: Of the conjectures set out in chapter 1, the twelfth seems most probable. Source page 215 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 191)

as several other words also came from it.

I further concede to Drusius that I have not fully and sufficiently digested some of the things I have read. The first of these is the praise which he assigns to me, both because I know how scanty my equipment is, and because he declares that I have read many things well, yet have badly digested certain others. It does not seem to me that one has read many things well if he digests badly what he has read.

Nor do I digest how the distinction of the Essenes from the Pharisees is not gathered from the cited words of the Josephuses. But more on that later.

Third, I do not digest this: although I had brought forward three causes, and indeed with the disjunctive particle "or," by which the Essenes might seem able to be called *Hassonim*, he rejects them all, and yet he is moved by no argument, not even a slight one of the kind with which he rejects the other two, against the second. But at last let the Essaeans come from the Hebrew *chesid*, from which comes the Syriac *chesi* or *hesi*, that is, holy and pious.

Chapter III. How the Name of the Essenes Should Be Written

(printed p. 191 — Book III)

Just as Saint Jerome does on the first chapter of Saint Matthew, and often elsewhere, when he gives advice about the letters with which certain words should be written, so I am compelled to do in this place by Drusius, who not only himself applies aspiration to both the Essenes and the Hasidaeans, but also wants it necessarily applied by everyone who wishes

[margin: Source page 216 continues the mid-sentence argument from page 215.]

(printed p. 192)

to speak or write correctly.

There are three syllables in *Essenes*. I run through them one by one. The first comes from the first syllable of the Syriac name *chasi*, which can also be written *chesi*, since the Chaldaeans and Syrians not rarely shorten sounds which among the Hebrews are uttered with long points, as when for *cathoub* they have *cethib*, for *karou* they have *keri*, and for *barach* they have *berich*. Conversely, *Academia* came to stand for *Ecademia*.

But should it be said in Latin or Greek with aspiration, *Hessenus* or *Hessenus*? Drusius says in chapter 2 of his appendix: "It is not surprising that the aspiration is commonly neglected, since this happens in very many other words which are now aspirated by all the learned. Thus we write *Hasideus*, although in the books it is *Asidaeus* without aspiration." A little afterward he says: "In the same way a fault was committed in *Esseni*, which ought to be aspirated as *Hesseni*," and similar things on folio 12.

Since, in book 1, question 47 of his questions, he had demanded almost with a grammarian's rod that those whom Greeks and Latins call Asideans should be called *hafidai*, I wrote in my commentary on the Maccabees: "I wonder why he demands the Hebrew aspiration so insistently in this name." I then added several reasons why I wondered. So that the futility of what Drusius argues against them may be clear, I must repeat them here, after first indicating again two notions of my mind about these spellings and pronunciations, since they have also been indicated in the same place elsewhere.

One is this: in the spelling and pronunciation of uncertain words which some learned men write and pronounce in different ways,

[margin: On the first syllable. On what should be done amid variation of spelling and pronunciation.]

(printed p. 193)

one should not labor or contend greatly over which way a person writes and pronounces them.

The other is this: *Asidei* and *Hafidai*, *Essei* and *Hessai*, are indeed written and pronounced correctly, but neither way of writing or pronouncing is necessary. For in that passage I wrote as follows:

I acknowledge various ways of writing and pronouncing, and I freely grant to anyone whichever he prefers in this and in similar cases, as above in Asamonei, Hasamonei, Hasmonii, and Chasamonaei, and in many others, even Latin ones. Indeed I think those men could also be called Asaei or Chasaei, since among the Syrians Asi, Hasi, or Chasi is customary, as is clear in the Syriac Acts of the Apostles, chapter 2, and Romans 3, when the final letter is worn away.

What could be clearer? And yet, so that I might make this judgment of mine even plainer in practice, I wrote there, and intentionally write here again, sometimes *Essenes* and *Asideans*, sometimes *Hessaeans*, *Chasideans*, and *Hasidaeans*. I saw a Pliny printed at Hagenau in 1518 in which book 5, chapter 17 has "the nation of the Hessenenes," as also in the one corrected by Alexander Benedictus.

Do these not sufficiently show that I do not wonder that Drusius writes or prefers *Hasidaeans* or *Hessaeans*, but that he makes this one mode of writing or speaking necessary and condemns the other? I brought forward four reasons for wondering at this. Since I have taken them up a little earlier, I briefly indicate and explain them.

The first was that Greeks and Latins usually omit the Hebrew aspiration both in this name and in very many others.

(printed p. 194)

Indeed, when the Greek Seventy wished to retain a name related and almost native to the one under discussion, in Jeremiah 8:7, they did not say *chasidah* with aspiration, but softly *asida*. What do you answer to this? Not a little word.

Besides these names of ours, which the Greeks softly call *Asidaeans*, take these others: Anna, Alphaeus, Agabus, Aceldama, Bethlehem, Isaac, Ephron, Esebon, and Tharca. Listen also to the father of the Latin language. Cicero says:

I myself, since I knew that the ancestors had spoken in this way and had used aspiration nowhere except before a vowel, spoke in this way, saying pulcros, Cetegos, triumphos, and Kartaginem. Later, and indeed rather late, when truth had been forced from me by the reproach of ears, I yielded the usage of speech to the people, but kept the knowledge for myself.

On that passage of Cicero, Saint Augustine speaks this way in his book *On Grammar*: "Let us observe that we do not subject euphony to rule or reject euphony. For euphony, that is, pleasantness of good sound, has been admitted into Latin speech so that it may temper harshness; and at times one departs from rule and reason where harshness offends hearing. Thus Cicero says: 'It was obtained from reason that one might err for the sake of pleasantness.'"

Catullus too, who mocks excessive aspirators, could be summoned here when he says:

Arrius would say chommoda whenever he wished to say commoda, and hinsidias for insidias.

[margin: Four reasons why *Hafidai* need not necessarily be aspirated: reason 1.]

(printed p. 195)

My second reason was this: Drusius writes *Ebraeus*, although the first Hebrew letter of that word has aspiration. If that aspiration can be omitted by him in *Ebraeus*, why not also in *Asidaeus*? He answers: "The case is different with the name *Hebraeus*, where ayin is at the beginning, which they often expressed by a bare vowel." Who expressed it so? Latins and Greeks, as is clear in *Arabia*, *Elamites*, *Emmanuel*, and similar words. Yet the same people very often did not aspirate names which begin with *heth*, as has now been made plain.

Is it not vanity, and a kind of ostentation, to say *Ebraeus* when all others say *Hebraeus*, but to breathe out *Hafidaeus* for the same man whom others call *Asidaeus*? This seems much more deserving of the rod than Saint Augustine's fault when, as a little boy, he pronounced *ominem* for *hominem* and was beaten, as he says in book 1 of the *Confessions*, chapter 18.

The third reason was this: if aspiration must necessarily be applied in *Hasidaeans*, as Drusius the grammarian insists, should not that aspiration be the one which Saint Jerome, in the Hebrew questions, advises should be expressed by the Greek letter chi? Drusius answers: "The Greek letter chi is not bare aspiration." Why? "Because it includes the letter c besides aspiration, so that grammarians note that chi and ch are equivalent."

But the same reasoning applies to the Hebrew letter. It includes both a sound like c and aspiration. Hence, among the Septuagint and Latins, there are *Chalanne*, *Chalach*, *Chara*, *Chabratha*, and *Cham*. Therefore Saint Jerome says

[margin: Reasons 2-3.]

(printed p. 196)

in his book *On Hebrew Places*: "Up to this point we must read by the letter c, that is, the Greek kappa; from here on it must be written and read by the element chi, which contains aspiration in itself and is not possessed by the Latins."

And in the book *On Hebrew Names* he says: "Up to this point we have read by the simple letter c; from here on it must be read with aspiration added." He repeats this often afterward, even in the Hebrew questions, and so does Drusius himself, book 3, question 83.

But now Drusius makes this exception: "The reason certain names beginning with *heth* are written by chi among the Greeks is that they lack that element." I deny that they lack it; rather, I say that chi, though somewhat more gently, corresponds to the Hebrew. Thus even in a common noun, that is, a portion, the Septuagint say *chelcha* in Joshua 11. The Arabs, moreover, often change the Hebrew *cheth* into *caph*, just as it was said in the discussion of the Sadducees that the Samaritans change other letters.

Yet Drusius concludes: "So we correctly write *Hermon* and *Chermon*, *Hebron* and *Chebron*, because these are found written this way in ancient books." What follows from that "therefore"? By exactly the same reasoning we can rightly write *Asidaeus*, *Hafidaeus*, and *Chasidaeus*, because the first is found in ancient Greek and Latin books, and against Drusius's law quite sufficiently; while the other two have some reasoning behind them.

"But *Chasidaeus* is nowhere extant." I did not say it was extant; I said that, by the analogical reasoning of the other names, which Saint Augustine in the place cited in *On Grammar* testifies is abundant, and which Drusius himself acknowledges in the examples already given, it should be said rather in that way than *Hafidaeus*.

[margin: Response to Drusius on chi, heth, and alternate spellings.]

(printed p. 197)

"If aspiration has rightly been added by learned men in *Havilah*, *Hesebon*, and six hundred other words, why may we not do the same in *Hasidaeus*, especially since it is clear that, by the choice of writers, it has often been omitted?"

What is babbling if this is not? I freely affirmed that *Hasidaeans* can be said without fault. But I said that there is no law, good Drusius, imposing aspiration on them, and that *Asidaeans* is also said correctly. And you, as though you were attacking me, are actually defending my position. This is to beat the air and cast mist before the unskilled.

Yet he adds a new conclusion: "*Asidaeus* is therefore an error of scribes, *Hafidaeus* the truth of Scripture, and *Chasidaeus* Serrarius's fiction."

I beg you, my Drusius, since you are a grammarian, answer grammatically. In writing these names you want either reason or ancient usage to be preserved. If reason, then *Hafidaeans* can indeed be said, but *Chasidaeans* is the truer form, as has been proved. If ancient usage, then *Chasidaeus* will not be said, but neither, as you wish, will *Hafidaeus* or *Habel* be said; rather, one will say *Asidaeus* and *Abel*.

Because you call *Chasideus* a fiction of Serrarius, behold for you from the Calvinian tripod, in which they always express *cheth* by *ch*: Junius, Tremellius, Beza. It would take long to run through all their Bibles. One chapter of Joshua, chapter 11 cited earlier, supplies these four examples: *Chatzor*, *Chittheus*, *Chivvaeus*, *Chermon*. One chapter of Matthew, chapter 27, supplies these four in Beza's notes: *Chebel*, Numbers 27; *chala*, Numbers 34; *Chomets* in the same place; *chaphets*, Numbers 43.

The fourth reason was from Drusius himself against himself, book 3, question 83, where he says:

[margin: Calvinian examples are invoked against Drusius. Reason 4.]

(printed p. 198)

"*Hheth* must always be pronounced with doubled aspiration. But because the Greeks sometimes write kappa for it, we followed that custom in *Malluach*, book 1, question 17."

Here he answers two things. First: "The Hebrew aspiration could not be expressed otherwise in *Malluach*." If that aspiration could not be expressed otherwise there, let us transfer it from the end of that name to the beginning of the *Asideans*, and, despite him, they become *Chafidei*.

Second: "Yet if I had written *Mallue*, I could have defended myself from that name and from similar ones." That is so. But this confirms what I said first: that one can write *Asidaean*s with the Greeks and Latins without aspiration. This is the one thing most strongly argued against those who, as they pursue new things, also pursue new words and new pronunciations and spellings of them, as may be seen in the biblical translations of Lutherans, Calvinists, and others like them.

Let the conclusion therefore stand: *Asidaean*s and *Essean*s are rightly written and pronounced, as are *Chasidean*s, *Hasidaean*s, and *Hessen*es; yet there is a free choice of either mode, both the aspirated and the softer one. The ancients, moreover, more gladly removed harshness from these same words. So much, and rather a lot, against Drusius's rather harsh command concerning the first syllable of the *Essenes*.

[margin: Reason 4 concludes. The first syllable may be written with or without aspiration.]

(printed p. 199)

The remaining two syllables are easier. In the second syllable, one *s* from the Hebrew and Syriac could indeed have been enough; but usage, the master of speech, long ago added the other, as when from *Meschiach* or *Messia* came, among Greeks and Latins, *Messias*, and from *Deborah*, *Debbora*, and in certain books, *Pharisaeus*.

In the third syllable there is a termination nearest to the Syriac, as was said above: *Essaeus*; and in Greek and Latin, *Essenus*, as *Tubiaeus* and *Tubienus*, *Nazaraeus* and *Nazarenus*. Scaliger and Drusius note that Stephanus of Byzantium, under the word *Abarnus*, says that the termination in *enus* is barbarous rather than Greek. Yet he does not say this; rather, from Apollonius he says it is Asiatic rather than European, as in *Medabenus*, *Abilenus*, *Arindelenus*, *Gebalenus*, though he scarcely disentangles himself in *Abydenus* and *Cyzicenus*.

Chapter IV. What Were the Doctrines or Institutions of the Essenes?

(printed p. 199 — Book III)

There are chiefly two authors from whose monuments the ancient doctrines and institutions of the *Essenes* can be learned: Josephus Flavius and Philo. But because many have begun in this age to dispute about Philo, and not lightly or mildly, I shall for now bring forward nothing from him, or certainly very little, since he and the questions about him must be discussed separately later. For the present, then:

[margin: On the second and third syllables.]

(printed p. 200)

First, Josephus Flavius says in book 15, chapter 13, that those among us who are called *Essenes* use a way of life like that shown among the Greeks by Pythagoras. And in book 18, chapter 2, he says that they live not in a wholly different way, but in a way most like those who are spoken of most highly among the *Dacians*.

Because in these words there are almost *Cimmerian* shadows, Rufinus passed over them in silence. A new interpreter, however, part of whose first section one of my friends recently brought me to see and use, explained them as referring to the *Plistae*. But who, pray, are these *Plistae*? What did Josephus mean by them? What is the sense of his words? Surely none at all; none whatsoever.

Therefore some light must be poured upon such darkness from Herodotus, book 4; Strabo, books 7 and 16; Diogenes Laertius, book 8; and Josephus, book 1 *Against Apion*. These authors report the *Getic* or *Dacian* institutions which *Zamolxis*, their god, taught those peoples, and that he was the servant and disciple of the philosopher Pythagoras.

Josephus, from the excellent historian Hermippus, relates how Pythagoras associated with the Jews, learned many noble things from them, and transferred them to his own followers. In sense, Josephus says that

Pythagoras of Samos, an ancient man held to surpass nearly all philosophers in wisdom and piety toward the divine, not only knew the things among us, but was an eager imitator of them. And afterward: "He did and said these things in imitation of the opinions of Jews and Thracians, and transferred them to himself." The same is testified by the Pythagorean Numenius in the book *On the Good*,

[margin: *Essenes resemble Pythagoreans.*]

(printed p. 201)

and from him Origen in book 1 *Against Celsus*.

Thus, when in the earlier words Josephus had said that the race of the Essenes followed nearly the same path and way of life which the Pythagoreans held among the Greeks, in the later words he repeats the same thing and says that the Essenes are like very many of the things which are reported and celebrated among the Dacians or Getae. How true this is will become clear afterward from a comparison of opinions and customs.

This comparison would be still more illuminating if, instead of those *Plistae*, we restored *Ctistae*, concerning whom Strabo writes in book 7 that certain Thracians live apart from women and are called *Ctistae*, consecrated and living without fear because they are honored. The sense of Josephus would then be that the Essenes were like those who among the Dacians are called *Ctistae*, namely celibate and sacred men. Just as Octavius called Masgaba "ktistes" in Suetonius, chapter 98, because he was regarded as the founder of some island or other, so the name *Ctistae* was imposed on these men either because they were regarded as founders and leaders of some sacred sect and way of life, or because they taught the creation of things, "of the great and primal world," as Ovid says in book 14 of the *Metamorphoses*.

Second, Josephus, book 13, chapter 9, says that the sect of the Essenes declares fate to be mistress of all things, and that nothing happens to men except according to its decree. Since this seems difficult, I brought forward two

[margin: *Fate acknowledged by the Essenes.*]

(printed p. 202)

explanations in book 1 of the Maccabees, chapter 9, folio 736. The later one, which I preferred, was that the name "fate" signifies the perpetual and constant law of God which governs all things, but according to the nature and condition which God has placed in each thing, so that no force is imposed on human free choice.

This same explanation can be confirmed, first, from the fact that in book 2 of *The Jewish War*, chapter 12, where Josephus most carefully surveys their whole institution, he makes no mention of fate, as I shall say a little later. Second, because in that same place certain things are called *autexousia*, things left free to them by their ancestors, and much more by God. Third, because in book 18, chapter 2, the same Josephus says that their teaching is to leave all things to God. That Josephus distinguishes between attributing something to fate and attributing it to God can be gathered from book 2 of *The Jewish War*, chapter 12, where he says that the Pharisees ascribe all things to fate and to God. Fourth, because the sixth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, chapter 6, after naming the Sadducees and Masbotheans and assigning fate to the Pharisees, as I also said above, says: "From all these the Essenes separated themselves, who keep the ancestral rites." Fifth and finally, because the Pythagoreans established fate in this way, as can be understood from Laertius in the cited book. In this point some likeness between Essenes and Pythagoreans already shines out, and it will shine out in many others.

Third, because Josephus, when dealing with these three

[margin: *Essenes concede free choice.*]

(printed p. 203)

Jewish sects, often sends the reader to the second book of *The Jewish War*, chapter 12, which in Rufinus's Latin is chapter 7, as in book 13, chapters 9 and 18, and book 18, chapter 2, and yet there he says only a few things about the other two sects but very many about the Essenes, it seems highly fitting and useful that this entire description be summoned here. I shall do it, however, in such a way that, for the sake of clearer light, I moderately interrupt, punctuate, and explain the context.

He speaks generally in this way: the race of the Essenes is considered to practice solemnity and reverence more than the other two kinds, namely the Sadducees and Pharisees. Although Rufinus the interpreter scarcely indicates this whole point, it is gathered from the Greek, where he says "the third kind." Pythagoreans too were once especially credited with *semnobrepeia*, a solemn dignity of manner.

Fourth, they were Jews by race. Why is Josephus so serious about this? Since he is treating Jewish sects, was there danger that anyone would think the third kind was Romans, Greeks, Persians, or some other people? Or did he rather wish, since he was praising their most noble institution and life, to recall that this glory belonged to his own nation? In this Suidas imitates Josephus. By contrast, when Saint Epiphanius reproaches the Nazarenes in heresy 18, he says that they were Jews by race; he similarly says this of the Osseni in heresy 19.

Fifth, the Essenes embraced one another with mutual love and charity

[margin: From Josephus are reported the institutions of the Essenes. The race of the Essenes. Mutual love among the Essenes.]

(printed p. 204)

beyond even the other sects. For although we saw earlier that the Pharisees are also called lovers of one another by the same Josephus, the Essenes are here said to be lovers of one another beyond the rest; this is declared more fully below by their deeds themselves.

Sixth, they especially abhorred pleasure. They turned away from pleasures as vice. This too the Pythagorean discipline professed. Justin says of Pythagoras in book 20:

He daily praised virtue and scorned the vices of luxury; he recounted the collapses of cities destroyed by this plague. He stirred the multitude to such zeal for frugality that it seemed incredible that some of those who had been luxurious were changed into the best fruit.

In Cicero's book *On Old Age*, Cato the Elder praises the very noble speech of the Pythagorean Archytas of Tarentum:

No plague more deadly than bodily pleasure has been given to men by nature; the passions of this pleasure are driven greedily, rashly, and without restraint to possession. From it arise betrayals of fatherland, from it overturnings of commonwealths, from it secret conversations with enemies. In short, there is no crime, no evil deed, to which the lust of pleasure does not impel; rapes, adulteries, and every shameful thing of that kind are aroused by no other enticements than pleasure. Since nature, or some god, has given to man nothing more excellent than mind, nothing is so hostile to this divine gift and endowment as pleasure. When lust rules, temperance has no place; nor can virtue stand at all in the kingdom

[margin: Avoidance of pleasure.]

(printed p. 205)

of pleasure. To make this better understood, he told them to imagine someone excited by as much bodily pleasure as possible. He thought no one would doubt that, so long as he enjoyed such pleasure, he could accomplish nothing with mind, nothing with reason, nothing with thought. Therefore nothing is so detestable and so destructive as pleasure, since, when it is greater and longer lasting, it extinguishes every light of the soul.

Seventh, they are especially devoted to continence and to victory over all disturbances of the passions. They regard self-control and not falling under the passions as virtue. This too is Pythagorean.

Eighth, there was no contracting of marriage among them, but a contempt of marriage. Yet, as Josephus himself will explain a little later, this was not because they despised marriages as evil in themselves, or the procreation and succession that comes from them, but because they preferred to live celibately for two reasons. One was that they thought they must beware of the wantonness and intemperance of women. The other was that they believed no woman kept faith with one husband, according to the common vice of that age, and, as people say, for the most part.

When Ausonius compares the single life with marriage in Pythagorean fashion, he pours out this little verse:

Vain custody is a heavier burden for cautious husbands.

A third reason is added in book 18, chapter 2, that marriage is a cause of dissension. Again, this is to be understood for the most part, and with respect to one

[margin: Continence and struggle against passions. Celibacy.]

(printed p. 206)

particular class of the Essenes themselves, about which Pliny also speaks in book 5, chapter 17: "The race of the Essenes, solitary and wonderful in all the world beyond the rest, without any woman, having renounced all sexual love." Concerning the other class of them, more will be said later.

Josephus, book 18, chapter 2, and Strabo, book 7, note similar things among certain Getae and Thracians who lived without women. Posidonius reports that for this reason Homer praised them and called them the most just of men without life of luxury.

Strabo himself, however, does not enter into Posidonius's opinion, being caught by a very small argument: that Menander says the Thracians are most devoted to women. As though virtue is not more admirable and precious where there is such a mass of vices, like a rose among thorns.

Laertius notes that women also followed the sect of Pythagoras, just as will later be said of the Essenes. Justin, in the cited book, says of Pythagoras:

He taught women chastity and obedience toward their husbands, and young men modesty and the study of letters. Among these things he pressed frugality upon all as the mother of virtues. By the persistence of his disputations he achieved that matrons laid aside golden garments and the other ornaments of their rank as instruments of luxury, brought them all into the temple of Juno, and consecrated them to the goddess, declaring that the true adornments of matrons are chastity, not clothes.

Ninth, but if there were no marriages among the Essenes, then there were no children either,

[margin: Certain women followed the Essene institution.]

(printed p. 207)

since they did not use forbidden intercourse, but virtue and the custody of the divine laws flourished among them. From where, then, was their company and multitude sustained? From where did new supplements come when others died? Pliny wonders at this in the place cited: "For thousands of ages, incredible to say, the race is eternal, though no one is born in it."

But the supplements to them were twofold. One is indicated by Josephus himself. They received the children of other Jews while still tender for instruction, and, as if they were their own blood relatives, trained them in the best disciplines and conformed them to their own customs and institutions. Justin says of Pythagoras in book 20: "He often had separate instruction for matrons apart from men, and for boys apart from parents."

The other supplement was shown by Pliny. Many adults, and older men, gave themselves voluntarily into their fellowship and life. Some were driven by repentance for their former life, others by the varied tossing of fortune. "Day by day," says Pliny, "the race itself is reborn from a crowd of newcomers, as life-weary men, driven by the waves of fortune, throng in great numbers to their customs." And a little later: "So fruitful for

them is others' repentance for life."

Tenth, they are despisers of riches.

[margin: New births among celibates; children were trained to virtue and religion. Adults were received to better fruit. Contempt of wealth.]

(printed p. 208)

Eleventh, among them there is a marvelous community of goods. Not even one person can be found who surpasses the others in wealth. For it is a law that those who wish to enter that sect must give their property to the order itself, so that it may be common to all. Thus among them all there appears neither the humiliation of poverty nor the superiority of wealth; rather, since everyone's goods and possessions are mixed together, there is one substance for all as for brothers. Hence the same Josephus says in book 18, chapter 2: "Money is common to them, and the one who was formerly rich does not enjoy his own things and goods more than the one who formerly possessed nothing." Antiquity especially admired this in the Pythagoreans. Laertius says this once and again, and Justin says:

Three hundred young men, bound by the right of fellowship through a kind of oath, practiced a life separate from the other citizens.

Gellius also says in book 1, chapter 10:

Nor should this be passed over: all who had been received by Pythagoras into that cohort of disciplines gave into the common store whatever each had of household and money. An inseparable society was formed, as if that ancient consortium existed which was called in law, by a Roman word, coenobium.

Twelfth, from this also arises what the same Josephus adds in book 18, chapter 2: they have no possession of slaves, but serve and minister to one another themselves. The reason

[margin: Community of all goods. No slaves.]

(printed p. 209)

is added there, namely that servitude generally brings injustice with it, just as Rabban Gamaliel the Younger says in chapter 2 of *Pirke Avoth*: *Marbeh abadim, marbeh gezel*, that is, multiplying servants multiplies robbery.

Thirteenth, from this too it follows that they appoint treasurers and procurators over common things of this kind which pertain to clothing and food. In book 18, chapter 2, Josephus calls them receivers of revenues and providers of necessities; in book 2, chapter 12, overseers and guardians. In both places he indicates that they presided over all and had authority over all. He says also that they were chosen by vote, men of proved character and priests. More about them below.

Fourteenth, such was their austerity of life that they regarded oil as a stain and disgrace; if someone was anointed even unwillingly, he immediately wiped it off.

Fifteenth, they used white garments. Diogenes says of Pythagoras that his robe was white and clean, and later he commanded the same concerning garments and cleanliness. The reason seems to be added afterward: that white is of a good nature, black of an evil one. See also Strabo in the cited place.

But Josephus adds that the dress of the Essaeans was like that which boys under a pedagogue and in training are accustomed to have: modest and simple. Therefore there is a very obscure corruption in Rufinus; it must be corrected or clarified in this way:

[margin: Stewards of necessary goods. Not anointed with oil. Clothed in white. Their dress was modest and boylike.]

(printed p. 210)

the care of clothing and of the body was such among all as is fitting for boys living under the fear and care of a teacher.

Sixteenth, when they had begun to use clothes or shoes of the sort just described, they neither changed nor laid them aside until they had been thoroughly worn out by use or time.

Seventeenth, they lived not in one city or place only, but in several; indeed the same author says that many lived in every city. Perhaps there was such a great number of them at Jerusalem that one gate was named from them, the Gate of the Essenes, as Josephus narrates in *The Jewish War*, book 5, chapter 13. Pliny says in book 5, chapter 17: "On the western shore of Lake Asphaltites are the Essenes, who flee harmful things everywhere." Josephus reports in book 18, chapter 2, that there were more than four thousand of them in Judea alone, and Philo agrees with him, as will be said below.

Eighteenth, hospitality among them was very great, when men of the same heresy or society came from one place to another. For as soon as strangers arrived at a dwelling, the things necessary for them immediately hastened to them as if they were their own; and they approached men whom they had never seen before as if they were most familiar friends. In every city one distinguished person from the order itself was chosen to have care of travelers and to bring out clothes and all necessities for them.

[margin: No changes of clothes. Where the Essenes lived. Hospitality.]

(printed p. 211)

Nineteenth, this is why they generally made journeys without provisions and carried absolutely nothing with them. They did, however, carry weapons because of robbers, whose great abundance in those regions is clear from the history of Herod and of certain governors.

Twentieth, there was no buying or selling among them. Each person receives without any price the things he needs from another, and they have unrestricted sharing without exchange from whomever they wish.

I shall quote once from Solinus, chapter 36, concerning them:

The Essenes hold the interior parts of Judea; endowed with a memorable discipline, they withdrew from the custom of all nations, appointed, as I think, by the providence of majesty for this way of life. There are no women there. They have utterly renounced sexual love. They do not know money. They live on palms. No one is born there, and yet the multitude of people there does not fail. The place itself has been added to chastity. Although many from every nation hurry there, no one is admitted unless faith in chastity and the merit of innocence accompany him. For anyone guilty of even the lightest fault, even if he wishes with utmost effort to gain entrance, is kept away by divine warning. Thus, over an immense span of ages, incredible to say, the race is eternal though births cease.

Twenty-first, toward the divinity they are religious or pious in a particular way. Since, as I said above, they took their name from piety, Josephus then proceeds

[margin: They travel without provisions. No buying and selling. Religious.]

(printed p. 212)

to explain this more fully, and indeed from their daily studies and works, as follows.

Twenty-second, before the sun rises, they dare to speak nothing profane. Instead, they recite certain ancestral prayers to the sun itself, as if supplicating it to rise.

When I say that these prayers were addressed to the sun, I take this from Josephus's Greek, as I do certain other things from time to time; for when Josephus had meant the divinity, he added not "to it" but "to him," that is, to the sun. But from this a doubt not undeservedly arises: what did these prayers to the sun mean? Was the sun a god for the Essenes? This certainly seems possible either from the opinion of Pythagoras, which Laertius says held that the sun, moon, and other heavenly bodies were gods, or even more clearly from the fact that Josephus afterward narrates that when they wished to relieve the body, they did it so secretly and carefully as not to violate the rays of God himself or treat them with injury. Rufinus translates this less clearly as "so that they might not injure the divine splendor."

If some Gentile writer, not Josephus the Jew, had written this, I would join him with that satirist who wrote falsely and calumniously about the whole Jewish race:

Some, having happened upon a father who feared the Sabbath, worship nothing as deity except clouds and sky.

Now I say rather that these men did not truly and properly pray to the sun, but only to God, the author

[margin: Prayers before dawn.]

(printed p. 213)

and governor of the sun. They uttered certain hymns in which, by personification, they addressed the sun so that it might rise happily and favorably for all, in the way that those most holy youths say in Daniel 3, "Sun and moon, bless the Lord," and David says in Psalm 148, "Praise him, sun and moon." For this reason Josephus did not say "supplicating" but "as if supplicating." Or, to say prayers to the sun is nothing other than to pray toward the east, that is, with the face turned toward the sun, as will be said below from Philo.

When Josephus speaks of the rays of God, he indeed means the rays of the sun, but rays which God gives; or else he calls the sun "God" improperly, just as some sometimes call a very excellent thing both divine and a god. It can also be that, from the material sun, they raised their mind higher to the true and eternal sun, who is God, the best and greatest. In this sense the Church also sings:

Light of light and source of light, day enlightening day, true sun, glide in, flashing with perpetual brightness.

And again:

Shine, you light, upon our senses, and shake sleep from the mind.

Why should I labor over Pythagoras, who mixed many false and evil things with the good and true? Saint Jerome says concerning those whom Ezekiel rebukes in chapter 8: "They adored the rising sun because, having despised the Lord, that is, the Creator, they adored the sun, that is, the Lord's creature."

Twenty-third, after the morning prayers, each man is dismissed by the overseers, or curators, mentioned above, to the crafts

[margin: Morning work nearly until midday.]

(printed p. 214)

which each knows. Since these crafts are not only agriculture, what Josephus also says in book 18, chapter 2, that the whole of their labor is directed to farming, seems to be taken with respect to the greater part of them. Thus divided, they work steadily until the fifth hour of the day, which today is our eleventh hour before noon.

Twenty-fourth, afterward they come together again into one place; girded with linen coverings, they wash their bodies in cold waters, so that there may be a kind of purification and lustration. Pythagoras also spoke of purifications and of washings in certain sprinkled places, and wished everyone to make themselves pure from funeral, bed, and every defilement, as Laertius writes.

Twenty-fifth, after that purification they go together into a particular dwelling, into which almost no one who belongs to another sect is permitted to enter. They themselves, pure and with pure garments, enter the dining room as though entering a certain sacred temple.

Twenty-sixth, in the dining room, once they had silently and quietly sat in order, the baker set loaves before them, and the cook set before each a dish of one kind of food.

[margin: They wash with water. They dine. They eat frugally.]

(printed p. 215)

Twenty-seventh, before the meal the priest poured forth prayers, and it was unlawful to taste the food before the prayer.

Twenty-eighth, after they had dined, the priest prayed again. Thus both beginning and ending the taking of food, they venerate God as the giver of nourishment.

Twenty-ninth, they then lay aside the pure or sacred garments and return again to their work until the evening twilight.

Thirtieth, having returned home from labor, they dine in the same manner as was said of lunch. If any traveling guests had meanwhile arrived, they sit together with them. Philastrius also writes about their frugal food and other matters, but his words will be brought forward together elsewhere. Laertius, Ovid in book 15 of the *Metamorphoses*, and Strabo, book 8, have many things about the temperance of the Pythagoreans, their spare diet, and their drinking of pure water.

Thirty-first, silence was of great concern among them. Noise never disturbs the house, never tumult. Who does not know the five-year silence of the Pythagoreans? So much so that the learned men trained in silence, whose name was *echemythia*, are called by Gellius, book 1, chapter 9, and by Ovid in book 15 of the *Metamorphoses*, a silent company.

Pythagoras said that, as one should not indulge grief, so neither should one indulge laughter; and he himself kept away from laughter,

[margin: They pray before eating and after eating. They return to manual work in the afternoon. They dine. Silence. Pythagoras restrained laughter.]

(printed p. 216)

from every act of pleasing others, from jokes, and from vulgar tales, as Laertius says. Hence in Ausonius's idyll, by daily self-examination, that good and wise Pythagorean man examines:

Was anyone struck by your word, your final phrase, or even by your face?

The Essenes grant conversation to one another in order; and to those who come from elsewhere, the silence within appears like some venerable mystery. The cause of this is perpetual sobriety and the measured taking of food and drink, up to satisfaction.

Thirty-second, there is nothing they do except by command of the overseers or curators. Only these two things among them were free: to bring help to others and to pity them. For it is permitted to aid those who are worthy, when asked, and to offer food to the needy according to one's strength.

Thirty-third, it is not permitted to give anything to relatives without the permission of the curators.

Thirty-fourth, they are just dispensers of anger, restrainers of the soul, guardians of faith, and ministers of peace. Whatever is said by them is stronger than an oath. Swearing is avoided by them, and they think it worse than perjury. For they say that the man who is not believed without God has already been condemned. This too was among the precepts of Pythagoras: not to swear by the gods, but to train oneself to be worthy of trust; and justice is an oath, and for that reason one should speak by justice rather than by an oath.

Thirty-fifth, they are intensely occupied with and study the commentaries of the ancients,

[margin: Obedience. No absolute ownership. Gentle and self-controlled. They do not swear. They read books.]

(printed p. 217)

applying selection to what pertains to the usefulness both of body and of soul. Hence they investigate healthful roots and the properties of stones for the curing of diseases. Concerning those books which benefit the soul, more will be said later.

Thirty-sixth, to those who desire to be joined to their society, who are called *neosystatoi*, as it were novices, access does not immediately lie open. Rather, they have a notable four-year probation.

In the first year they set before the man, while he remains outside, the way of life that has so far been described. They also give him, for the use to be explained later, a small axe, and, for the purifications mentioned earlier, a girdle and a white garment of the sort which they are accustomed to have.

When the one being tested has in this way given a specimen of continence for one year, he comes nearer to the customary way of life and becomes a participant in purer waters for purification. Yet even so he is not yet admitted to the common meal. He tests the institution for two further years, and when he has been found worthy, only then is he enrolled into the community. How, after much examination, men were admitted among the Pythagoreans either to discussion or to seeing Pythagoras can be learned either from what was already said from Gellius or from Laertius.

Thirty-seventh, before the same man touches the common food, he binds himself by terrifying oaths.

[margin: Novices are tested for four years.]

(printed p. 218)

These are as follows. First, he swears that he will worship the divinity piously and religiously.

Second, that he will guard what is just toward human beings and will harm them neither willingly and of his own mind nor by anyone else's command.

Third, that he will always pursue the wicked with hatred and fight for the just.

Fourth, that he will always show what faith requires to all, especially to those who preside and possess authority, for it happens to no one to preside and command except by God.

Fifth, if it should happen that he himself presides and commands, he will never contrive any injustice against magistrates, nor will he display himself above his subjects more splendidly by broader clothing or any ornament.

Sixth, that he will always love truth and try to expose liars.

Seventh, that he will keep his hands pure from theft and his soul from every profane gain.

Eighth, that he will conceal nothing from the companions of the same sect.

Ninth, that he will reveal none of the things which are secret among them to anyone, even if force should be applied to him unto death.

Tenth, they also swear that they will hand down their doctrines to no one in any other way than each received them, lest those doctrines be gradually corrupted and polluted by various later commentaries.

Eleventh, that he will abstain from robbery.

Twelfth, that he will similarly preserve the books of those who belong to their sect, and also the names of the angels.

[margin: The twelve proper oaths of the sect.]

(printed p. 219)

By these oaths, then, they bind those who come to them so that they may be firm. I mentioned above from Justin the Pythagorean oath.

Thirty-eighth, if any men of that society should happen to sin and commit something worthy of a heavier penalty, they expel them from the order itself. The one expelled in this way is usually destroyed by a most wretched death. Bound by the oaths and institutions already mentioned, he cannot take any of the food which

exists among those men; but feeding on herbs and wasting away in his whole body from hunger, he perishes. For this reason they have received many back almost at their last breath, judging that they had paid sufficient penalties for their sins up to death.

The Pythagoreans called those who had departed from the way of their discipline dead, and raised a cenotaph for them even though they were alive and breathing, as Origen teaches in book 2 *Against Celsus*, Clement of Alexandria in book 5 of the *Stromata*, and Theodorus Canterus, from both and from others, in book 1 of *Various Readings*, chapter 12. Thus a deserter of the Pythagorean family, speaking from such a grave, was rightly introduced recently by a certain friend of mine:

Pythagoras buried an immortal soul without mind, a body without breast, and a head enclosed by an empty brain; because I scorned being human, separated from the forces of wisdom, which alone gives mind, breast, and brain.

Thirty-ninth, they are most exact and just in judgments. They do not judge if fewer than one hundred

[margin: Those who offend are punished. Essenes are careful judges.]

(printed p. 220)

judges are present. What is once decided by them remains fixed and immovable.

Fortieth, after God, the name of the lawgiver is in great veneration among them. If anyone says anything insulting against him, he is punished with death.

Forty-first, they regard it as noble to obey elders and many others. Therefore if ten sat together, no one would speak when the other nine were unwilling. Pythagoras says in Laertius that one must honor one's elders.

Forty-second, they avoid spitting among others or to the right side.

Forty-third, they take the greatest pains of all Jews not to do any work on Sabbaths. For they not only prepare foods on the preceding day, whence the day before the Sabbath is called Preparation, but on the Sabbath itself they do not dare even to kindle a fire, or transfer any vessel, or go to the privy.

Forty-fourth, since mention has been made of the privy, on other days they conduct themselves in this matter as follows. With that little axe which I mentioned above among the novices, they dig a hole one foot deep and cover themselves round about with the garment so that they do not injure the rays of God; and thus they sit over the hole. Then they draw the dug-out earth back into the pit. They do this in the most hidden places they can choose.

[margin: They venerate their lawgiver. Their excellent obedience. They love decorum. They observe the Sabbath. They serve bodily necessity with great modesty.]

(printed p. 221)

And although that ejection of bodily filth is natural, afterward they nevertheless wash themselves as though defiled.

They had taken up this modesty, even in natural and shameful necessities, from Deuteronomy 23:12, where the Lord commands:

You shall have a place outside the camp to which you may go out for the necessity of nature, carrying a little spade on your belt. When you sit down, you shall dig around and cover with earth what has been discharged, by which you have been relieved. For the Lord your God walks in the midst of your camp, to rescue you and hand your enemies over to you. Therefore your camp shall be holy, and no foulness shall appear in it, lest he abandon you.

From this it is clear, as I said above, that this reverence was shown to the sun's rays not because they believed that animated sun to be God, but because God, the author and maker of it, pours those most pure and clear rays down to the earth.

And although there is room here for what one of the ancients said, that the sun contracts no uncleanness from latrines, Cicero nevertheless thought that even this matter should be treated among duties. He says:

The things which nature has hidden, all who are of sound mind remove from the eyes, and they labor to obey that necessity as secretly as possible. The parts whose uses are necessary, and their uses themselves, they do not call by their own names.

[margin: Deuteronomy 23:12 is cited to explain their bodily modesty.]

(printed p. 222)

From this the *Moreh Nebuchim* drew a conjecture why the Hebrew language is rightly called holy: because in it there are not found words which express the obscene male and female members, or coitus, urination, and evacuation of the belly, except by circumlocution. What shall I say of the symbol of Pythagoras, "do not wipe the seat with a torch"? Certainly in Horapollo, book 2, chapter 67, after a monkey urinates, it conceals its urine.

Forty-fifth, according to a longer time in the exercise or institution of that life, they are divided into four parts. Those who have come later to it are so much inferior to those before them that, if the earlier are touched by them, the earlier wash themselves as if they had run into someone from outside.

Forty-sixth, they are longer-lived; and, to keep the Greek word, *macrobiotai*, so much so that many extend their life beyond the hundredth year. This, in my judgment, is because of the simplicity of their diet and their good order.

Forty-seventh, they are despisers of things that seem bitter and conquer even pains by their souls.

Forty-eighth, they consider death, if it comes with honor and glory, better than immortality, as experience showed in the Jewish war against the Romans. In that war they were tortured, twisted and bent back like withes, burned, and broken; they went through every instrument of butchery, so that they would not either afflict the name of the lawgiver with any insult or eat foods contrary to their institution. Nor did they refuse to endure anything else;

[margin: Order among themselves. Long-lived. Brave in adversity. They meet death nobly. Source page 247 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 223)

yet they did not wish to flatter even a little, or to weep before, those who were crucifying them. Rather, amid the torments they laughed, mocked those who inflicted the tortures, and cheerfully and gladly gave up their souls, as though they were about to receive them again.

Forty-ninth, for this opinion had been confirmed among them: that bodies are subject to decay, and that matter is not firm and constant, but that souls always remain immortal. When souls come from the most subtle ether, they are entangled in bodies as in certain prisons, drawn there by a wonderful natural love. But after they have been released from the bonds of flesh, as though freed from a long servitude, then they rejoice and are borne aloft.

For good souls, agreeing in this with certain Greeks, they affirm that life is laid up beyond the Ocean, in a place burdened neither by rains, nor snows, nor heats, but refreshed by the perpetual breathing of a gentle west wind. For wicked souls they appoint a dark and stormy cavern, overflowing with punishments that will never cease.

And these are the things the Essenes theologize about the soul, setting before those who have once tasted their wisdom an unavoidable bait. So Josephus, book 18, chapter 2: they affirm the souls to be immortal, judging the gain of justice to be a prize worth contending for. Pythagoras sings in the poet already praised: Souls lack death. And in Laertius:

[margin: They believe souls are immortal.]

(printed p. 224)

purified souls are led to the highest place; the impure neither approach them nor one another, but are bound by the Erinyes with unbreakable bonds. Hence, from the doctrine of Zalmoxis, the Thracians in Herodotus, in the passage already cited, called themselves *athanatizantes*, that is, those who make themselves immortal.

Fiftieth, there are among them men who promise to foreknow future events, since they are constantly occupied with sacred books, various purifications, and the sayings or apophthegms of the prophets. It is rare for any one of them to miss the mark in predictions. Illustrious examples of this are found in the same Josephus: Judas the Essene in book 13, chapter 19, and likewise Menahem the Essene in book 15, chapter 13.

Porphyry also mentions the Essenes who were in Judea. These are the words of Saint Cyril, book 5 against Julian; and Porphyry speaks of them in this way: from that manner of living and from their training in truth and piety, they deservedly, amid those books, various purifications, and the responses of the prophets, rarely erred in predictions.

Fifty-first, there is also another order of Essenes, which agrees with the former in manner of life, morals, and customs, but differs from them in one opinion concerning marriage. They think that celibates, who do not enter marriage, cut off the greatest part of life, namely the succession of children; and much more, that the human race would very quickly fail if everyone followed that opinion of omitting marriage.

[margin: Prophecy. Other Essenes marry.]

(printed p. 225)

Fifty-second, nevertheless these men test their brides for three years. When the women have been purified three times, in order to determine whether they are able to bear children, then they marry them.

Fifty-third, they do not have intercourse with pregnant women, thereby showing that they approach marriage not for pleasure but because children are necessary.

Fifty-fourth, just as it has been said that the men bathe wearing a linen covering, so also the women bathed wrapped in tunics.

Fifty-fifth, Josephus, book 18, chapter 2: They do send offerings into the temple, but they do not perform sacrifices, because of the excellence of the purifications which they have prescribed. For this reason they are kept away from the common temple and perform sacrifices apart, though in other respects they are men of the best morals. Laertius relates that Pythagoras's sacrifices were bloodless, and finally says of him that he forbade the offering of slain victims to the gods and allowed reverence only at an unbloody altar.

Fifty-sixth, Philastrius says: Not expecting Christ the Lord, the Son of God, nor recognizing him as Lord announced in the Law and the Prophets, but expecting him as only some prophet or righteous man, they did not receive him. This, of course, must be understood of those who, after the coming of Christ the Lord, did not receive him, but persisted in their blind Judaism. We shall speak of them later.

[margin: Conjugal continence. Women's modesty. Their relation to the temple. They did not receive Christ the Lord.]

(printed p. 226)

Chapter V. Were the Essenes truly heretics under the Mosaic law?

(printed p. 226 — Book III)

Someone might think that they ought to be shut up in the prisons of the heretics. First, because Saint Epiphanius, in heresy 10, makes the Essenes the first kind of the Samaritans, who were heretics. Second, the same author, in heresy 19, says that the Osseni were Jews and heretics. Third, the Essenes were excluded from the temple, as appears from Josephus, book 18, chapter 2. Fourth, they preferred their own purifications and baths to the sacrifices instituted by God. Fifth, they prayed to the sun as though to God. Sixth, they

attributed all things to fate. Therefore, were they not heretics?

Besides, it was said in the previous chapter that the Pythagoreans were similar to the Essenes. But Origen, book 6 on Romans, calls certain heretics Pythagoreanizers. In Philastrius, Valentinus, from whom came the Valentinian heretics, is more Pythagorean than Christian. Saint Jerome, writing to Ctesiphon against the Pelagians, says: What greater rashness can there be than to claim for oneself, I will not say likeness to God, but equality with him, and in one short sentence to contain the poisons of all the heretics, which flowed from the fountain of the philosophers, and especially from Pythagoras and Zeno, prince of the Stoics? And afterward: Who could explain in fitting speech that rashness, indeed madness, of Rufinus,

[margin: They were not heretics. Objections from Epiphanius, temple practice, the sun, fate, and Pythagorean parallels.]

(printed p. 227)

that he prefaced the book of Xystus the Pythagorean, a man without Christ and a pagan, with a changed name as though it were the book of Sixtus, martyr and bishop of the Roman Church? In that book, according to the doctrine of the Pythagoreans, who make man equal to God and say that he is of God's substance, many things are said about perfection, so that those who do not know the volume of the philosopher may drink, under the name of a martyr, from the golden cup of Babylon.

What, then, shall we think about the Essenes? Certainly, if anyone weighs by a more careful balance all their sayings and decrees which have been reviewed and explained, he will find nothing which, in those times of the Mosaic law, would deservedly be regarded as heresy. Nor, so far as I know, is there any one of the ancients who brands them with the foul mark of heresy. Indeed, many praise them highly, as we have partly seen already, and partly, if the Lord grants my prayers as I hope, we shall see afterward. Nor were they ever rebuked by Christ the Lord, as the Pharisees or Sadducees were, or by the apostles, although they flourished at that time and in that place.

Therefore, to the first objection it must be answered that those whom Epiphanius calls Samaritans were of another kind, although he seems to make two further kinds even of those men. For he reports some who, with the Sebuaeans, celebrated feast days at another time than the Jews, as those do today who prefer the old calendar: Passover and Unleavened Bread in September, or the seventh month, from which perhaps the name of the Sebuaeans comes, since *sebah* in Hebrew means seven;

[margin: Answer to the charge of heresy. Epiphanius's Samaritans are distinguished from these Essenes.]

(printed p. 228)

Tabernacles in March and April, and the rest accordingly. He reports others who, with the Gortheni and Dositheans, differed in nothing from the Jews in the time of the feasts. Of these he says at the beginning of heresy 12, "the Gorthaeans and the other Essenes"; but of the former, at the end of the same heresy 12, he says, "likewise with the Essenes," about whom he had spoken in heresy 10.

To the second objection: those Osseni are different from both kinds of Essenes mentioned by Saint Epiphanius; how much more, then, from these Essenes of ours? And those men existed after Christ the Lord. Moreover, those men took their name from a tree or from wood, which is called *γυ*, *hozs*, in Hebrew, or, as some prefer, from *קש*, a word meaning to be hard. These men, by contrast, took their name from piety, as was argued above.

To the third, I say that, if the statement is true, they were nevertheless not Samaritans on that account, because they did not sacrifice on Gerizim either. They abstained from both temples: from the one so that they would have no communion with heretics, and from the other because of the excellence of their own purifications.

To the fourth, I wonder what those purifications were and of what sort they were. But this was granted to them at that time as a kind of opinion. To the fifth and sixth, an answer was given earlier. To the seventh,

which was woven together from blame of the Pythagoreans, I answer first that among the Pythagoreans, and therefore among nearly all philosophers, there were many things which rightly incurred blame. What they drew from the clear fountains either of nature

[margin: Answers to objections: Osseni are distinct; exclusion from the temple does not make them Samaritans; the Pythagorean objection is limited.]

(printed p. 229)

or of Jewish institutions, they muddied and dirtied with the silt of their own talents and vices. But the heretics who arose among Christians imitated spiders: from those philosophers they not rarely gathered precisely those things which were muddied and dirtied, and which were harmful and poisonous, and they tried to bring them into the honey-bearing hives of the Catholic Church.

The cited Fathers are to be read about these people. Among them, Saint Jerome, in the passage cited against the Pelagians, praises the judgment of Tertullian against Hermogenes, saying: One of our writers finely said that the philosophers, the patriarchs of heretics, stained the purity of the Church with perverse doctrine. And when Tertullian had said many things against the various schools of the philosophers on this very matter, though without naming the Pythagoreans, he concludes: What has Athens to do with Jerusalem? What has the Academy to do with the Church? What have heretics to do with Christians? Our instruction is from the portico of Solomon, who himself had handed down that the Lord is to be sought in simplicity of heart. Let those who have brought forward a Stoic, Platonic, and dialectical Christianity look to it.

But why should the guilt of these men be transferred to the Essenes? For the Essenes did not learn certain things from the philosophers; rather, as was shown above, the philosophers learned certain things from them. Later, the philosophers' error and pride made those things worse, while, professing themselves wise, they became fools. I know that certain superstitious things are attributed to the same Essenes by some authors, but at present I have investigated only heresies.

[margin: Philosophical errors do not make the Essenes heretics. Tertullian and Romans 1:22 are cited.]

(printed p. 230)

Chapter VI. Were the Essenes Pharisees?

(printed p. 230 — Book III)

Drusius, in his little book on the Hasidaeans, affirms that the Essenes were Pharisees, but in such a way that he wishes them first to have been called Hasidaeans, and then Pharisees, who later arose from them, on folios 5, 6, 16, 28, 32, 34, and 58.

But I think I have already sufficiently proved above that they were different from the Pharisees, since I have clearly shown that there were three Jewish sects, and indeed already in that ancient age of the Maccabees. Yet a further heap of reasons could be added against this opinion of Drusius; I include them, however, under these four heads.

First, because Drusius uses no reason for making this assertion, but only that one testimony of Gorionides, which I have already shown above to have been badly translated and explained by him. Second, if the doctrines and institutions of life of the Pharisees and the Essenes are compared with each other, some things will indeed occur that are either the same or similar, as also happens in a comparison of the Pharisees and Sadducees; nevertheless, different and dissimilar things will be found. Third, I shall show later that the Essenes are older than the Pharisees. Fourth, all the writers, Greek and Latin, whom I have so far been able to see, agree that they are different.

[margin: Drusius's opinion. Serarius's opposing view: the Essenes are not Pharisees.]

(printed p. 231)

Indeed, Suidas, who in setting out the decrees of the Essenes compiles the words of Flavius Josephus, writes that the Essenes were Jewish ascetics, differing beyond measure from the discipline of the Pharisees and scribes. Wolphius, one of the Lutherans, translated this as "differing diametrically from the Pharisees and scribes." But it ought rather to have been translated "beyond measure."

As for Drusius's claim that the Essenes later arose from the Pharisees, it could perhaps deserve belief if he supplied any proof. But at present he merely says so. Indeed, on this very matter he is wholly uncertain. In question 47 he says that the wise men of Israel were in ancient times called Hasidaeans, whom a later age named Pharisees. In the preface to his *Hasidaicus*, folio 5, he says that the appellation of Pharisees is more recent, in the times of Alexander the Great, I think. On folio 34 he says: If this name, that of Pharisees, is more recent, namely than the age of the Maccabees, which is under discussion there. On folio 58 he says that he has no certainty whether there were Hessaeans in the time of Hyrcanus. A little later, on folio 59, he says that we ought not doubt that some from the kind of Essenes and solitaries were at Jerusalem before Alexander Jannaeus. If some Essenes were there before Alexander Jannaeus, and indeed at Jerusalem, when Antigonus, as I touched on earlier for another occasion, had reigned only a single year, then they also existed in the time of Hyrcanus. Therefore they existed before that disaster which Hyrcanus inflicted on the Pharisees. Yet on folio 62 Drusius conjectures that after that disaster the Essenes arose from the Pharisees. And on folio 32 he says: Concerning what origin the Hessaeans had,

[margin: The Essenes did not arise from the Pharisees. Drusius's uncertainty is noted.]

(printed p. 232)

it is uncertain. In like manner, then, one may assert that the Pharisees were born from the Essenes; and both the name of division, from which the Pharisees are named, and other matters which will be set out below make this more plausible.

Chapter VII. Hessaeans or Hasidaeans?

(printed p. 232 — Book III)

Three matters must here be weighed in the balance. First, whence the name of the Hasidaeans comes. Second, whether in the times of the Maccabees it was the common name of all the pious. Third, whether the Hessaeans and the Hasidaeans are the same.

As to the first, my commentary on the *Harmony of the Maccabees*, folio 705, taught that the Hasidaeans were called from *chasid*, or from *hasid*. I also showed there, folio 707, and here above against Drusius, that they are rightly called and written Asidaeans. Indeed, it was also shown at length that the final letter is sometimes cut off in *chasid* by the Syrians' usual apocope. Since Junius admits this in chapter 5 on Ephesians, how did he dare in chapter 4 to wish to change *chesioutha* into *chesidutha*, with all the books protesting against him, even those Heidelberg books which he says he followed?

But against a certain great teacher in Israel, who, when I published that commentary, had not yet come before my eyes, Drusius writes thus on folio 12: Someone changes the writing of Hasidaeans and writes Aschidaeans, first against the trustworthiness of all the codices,

[margin: The origin of the name Hasidaeans. Serarius links it to *chasid* or *hasid* and criticizes Junius.]

(printed p. 233)

and then against Hebrew history. For in that history they are called *chesidim*. These are good arguments. But who is that "someone"? Does Drusius spare his name because it does not occur to him? That is indeed what he says about the corrupter of Vatablus on folio 11. But since he copied that man's words, he had the book before his eyes. I am persuaded by Drusius's prudence in the use of time that the man was not of such importance to him that he would memorize him. Or had the name perhaps fallen from his memory after he

had read it long ago? Yet he remembered the name of Lyra, so that he could write on folio 13 that Lyra was plainly being foolish, a name much further removed from daily use. How, then, would forgetfulness have seized him about the name of this man, which was more recent and more familiar?

Let Oedipus play Davus. The man whom Drusius rightly and well rebukes, and whose name he deliberately suppresses, is numbered among the Innovators, a chick of Calvin, a white hen of Holland, Francis Junius, already named above in his notes on 1 Maccabees, chapter 2, number 12. Truth compelled Drusius to pluck him; fellowship persuaded him not to name him.

But what was Junius's reason there for writing Asidaeans so ineptly and corruptly? The etymon which that interpreter assigned to the word had to corrupt the writing, says Drusius, from the Chaldean verb *דשא*, meaning "he poured out." And, as error draws error, Junius says that the name is not that of any people, but properly designates those who, for the sake of religion, were scattered here and there so that they would not be forced by the king's tyranny to some wickedness.

[margin: Junius is identified and criticized for a false etymology and spelling.]

(printed p. 234)

Had Junius really written such things? And are they at all probable? To pass over what Masius says in Joshua, chapter 10, about that verb of pouring out, my Drusius gives this judgment on those things of Junius, and he begins rightly: All these things can be denied as easily as they are said. It is not enough to say something unless you also prove what you say, for etymology is deceptive. Many today admire dreams of this sort, who despise solid learning. Nor is this surprising, since even truth among them has no value.

The received writing and our opinion are supported by the passage which is found in 1 Maccabees 7:16-17: "And he seized from them sixty men and killed them on one day, according to the word that is written: The flesh of your saints and their blood they poured out around Jerusalem, and there was no one to bury them." In these words there seems surely to be an allusion to the name of the Hasidaeans. Indeed, in the Greek text it is "the flesh of your holy ones." And in the Hebrew at David it is *hasidecha*, whose absolute singular is *hasid*. By the ancient explanation, that means "holy."

Nevertheless, not every holy and pious man in whatever manner is called *chasid* by the Hebrews, but one who is outstandingly merciful, holy, and pious, or who strives more intensely after mercy, holiness, and piety. For Drusius goes on to say, from the Hebrew David, what those who misuse Luke 10:36 to deny works of supererogation will hear unwillingly: *Chasid* is distinguished from *tsadik*, or the just man, in such a way that *chasid* is one who does more than he is commanded to do, while *tsadik*

[margin: Drusius rightly rejects Junius. Chasid is distinguished from tsadik.]

(printed p. 235)

is one who carries out God's commands. He writes this from the Midrash on Psalm 103:17. In the Midrash Tehillim on Psalm 16, folio 13, column 4 of the Bomberg edition, Rabbi Alexander says: Everyone who hears an insult or curse directed against him and remains silent is called *chasid*, or pious, as David did in 2 Samuel 16:10-11. Elsewhere it is: And he is silent in judgment. Likewise, the *chasid*, or pious man, is one who enters, hears, and does. He enters the temple, hears the word of God, and does what is taught there; that is, he lives according to its prescription. In chapter 3 of *Pirke Avoth*, a certain rabbi says: *Lo ham baarets chasid*. The common man is not a *chasid*, or pious.

But this in Drusius is ridiculous: if *chasid* means one who does more than he is bound to do by law, then, he says, it is better rendered by the recent interpreters as "kind" than as "pious" or "holy." Why so, I ask? My slight knowledge, says Drusius in this little book, folio 22, is wholly occupied with grammar and history. I leave the doctrines of faith to be handled by others more learned than I. Yet it belongs to the grammarian to explain why *chasid* is better translated "kind" than "pious" or "holy." The Septuagint interpreters do not

believe this, for they translate *chesidim* as holy ones, as you yourself note at length. Are the saints therefore to be called "kind" rather than pious and holy? In Psalm 78 should it be better said, "the flesh of your kind ones," than "the flesh of your saints, and they poured out their blood around Jerusalem"? And in Psalm 148, would it be better to say, "God will exalt the horn of his people; a hymn for all his kind ones"?

[margin: Rabbinic examples of *chasid*. Serarius rejects translating it merely as "kind."]

(printed p. 236)

Among the Hebrews the stork, as this Latin name also preserves in Aben Ezra's Hebrew, is named *chasidah*, or, as it is written by the Septuagint in Jeremiah 8:7, *asida*, because, as Saint Ambrose says in book 5 of the *Hexaemeron*, chapter 16, and book 6, chapter 4, it is called by Roman usage a pious bird. It is of such great piety that Saint Epiphanius, in the *Physiologus*, chapter 24, proposes it for imitation. From it also arose the proverb *antipelargein*, to repay the stork's care.

The memorable Delphic stork in Holland makes this more memorable. Returning from feeding, it saw flames threatening the nest and certain death for its young. It tried in every way to rescue them, already rather grown but still unable to fly, from the flames by its own small means. At last, when all help was despaired of and, as it were, the final word had been spoken, it spread its wings and settled headlong into the nest. Covering the young with its whole body, it seemed to lie over them, all hope of life set aside, ready of its own will to die with its dearest pledges. Cornelius Musso, clear in poetry and piety, handed this down to memory, and from him Hadrianus Junius in his *Batavia*, with these verses:

White stork, hated by the noisy frogs,
had seen her pledges pressed by burning fire.
Should she rescue her own and face open dangers?
Piety urges from one side; love of life forbids from the other.
Generous piety ended this struggle,
and wished one urn and one death-goddess for mother and young.

Therefore, since *chasid* signifies holy and pious, the recent interpreters of the Bible are praised too readily and set above the old interpreter by the Innovators.

[margin: The stork as an emblem of piety; *chasidah*. Cornelius Musso and Hadrianus Junius are cited.]

(printed p. 237)

I, with Pindar, with the Chaldean Targum on Song of Songs 7:9 and 8:2, or rather with those whom Christ the Lord praises in Luke 5:39, shall say: the old wine is better.

Furthermore, this very name *chasid* can be taken in two ways. It can be taken generally for anyone, in whatever nation, order, or discipline, who has devoted himself more zealously to mercy, which, as was said above, was excellent among the Essenes, and to piety and religion. In this way it is often taken in the Scriptures, as we saw a little earlier. Or it can be taken specially for a certain company of some men who, having entered into a society among themselves, pursue religion and piety more diligently by a particular form of life. Drusius acknowledges on folios 16, 58, and 62 that the Hessaeans and Hasidaeans are of this sort.

But from this arises the second of the questions which I proposed: in the books of Maccabees, when *Chesidim* or Hasidaeans occur, is that word to be taken in the broader meaning, or in this narrower one? Drusius affirms the broader meaning on folios 34 and 62. Those whom Josephus calls a nation or people in book 12, chapter 16, he says, in my judgment are not the Hessaeans, but in general signify all the pious whom we have said are called *chesidim* in Hebrew history and Asidaeans in the books of Maccabees; he opposes to them the impious followers of Alcimus. And so that he not seem to put this forward merely as a

probable opinion, he adds: I set this down as certain for myself, while I leave the rest doubtful and ambiguous.

[margin: The old interpretation is preferred. The second question: whether Hasidaeans in Maccabees means all pious people or a particular society.]

(printed p. 238)

And on folio 34 he says: So it seems to me. If it is otherwise, then I am indeed in great error.

But it is otherwise, my Drusius. Therefore you are indeed in great error. I prove my assumption. For in 1 Maccabees 7:13, whether we follow the Latin or the Greek text, it is clearly signified that the Asidaeans are not universally all the pious Israelites who were then at Jerusalem, but only certain men, to whom this name was then proper above others.

The Latin says: "And there came together to Alcimus and Bacchides a congregation of scribes, to seek the things that were just." Behold, this multitude of scribes was, speaking generally, pious, retaining the true worship of God, and not impious and apostate, as not a few of the Jews were, concerning whom the same chapter speaks. And yet, after mention of those pious men, something new is immediately added: "And first the Asidaeans, who were among the sons of Israel, sought peace from them," whether the Asidaeans were also scribes, but different ones, or were not. Either can be said, as I suggested on folio 706 in the *Maccabees*.

The Greek agrees, except that it speaks about the Asidaeans in this way: "The first were the Asidaeans among Israel, and they sought peace from them." Thus, when it had told of the scribes, it adds others, who then were of still greater authority among the Jews, who sought peace from the impious Alcimus and Bacchides; and these are called Asidaeans. For by adding the simple particle "and,"

[margin: Serarius argues from 1 Maccabees 7:13 that Asidaeans were a distinct group, not all pious Israelites. Source page 263 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 239)

Drusius himself translates it on folio 29: "And the first Asidaeans were from the sons of Israel." Similarly, in 2 Maccabees 14:6, when that same wicked apostate Alcimus wishes to stir up King Demetrius against the Jews who retained the law of Moses, the true religion of God, and the priesthood, he does what all the worst men are accustomed to do. He takes care that those who, within the whole kind of pious Israelites, were most zealous for piety, and who took their name from it in a special and particular way, should be as suspect and hateful as possible to the king, and that the king should pour out his anger and rage against them as much as possible.

Speaking to the king, he said: "Those of the Jews who are called Asidaeans, over whom Judas Maccabeus presides, nourish wars and stir up seditions, and do not allow the kingdom to be quiet." In Greek it is clearer: those who are called Asidaeans among the Jews. If in these passages we put and understand pious people in general, will not both the speech and the meaning become cold and fall flat?

Then again, why did the Greeks and Latins here retain the name of Asidaeans? Why did they not, as elsewhere so often, and indeed in that very book 1, chapter 7, verse 17, translate it as saints, pious people, or merciful people? Why would they have retained an unknown and barbarous word, if it had not been a proper and common name in a certain fellowship of the pious, and retained it first of all in these books? Why did all give the word an initial capital letter, and why did Drusius himself do so through almost the whole little book, and especially on the page already cited, 49?

[margin: Asidaeans in 2 Maccabees 14:6. The retained proper name supports a distinct group.]

(printed p. 240)

Add to this that, because the matter is so clear, there is and has so far been complete agreement among all about it. For although not a few dispute about the etymology of the word and about the institution of the

Asidaeans, all confess that there was some certain institution, sect, and family of certain pious men.

But because Drusius says on folio 33, "I do not care for the Catholic Genebrard," although now I shall not praise him, even though he speaks very clearly in book 2 of *Chronicles*, folio 99, nor any other Catholic, I shall cite only some of those Innovators who are more to Drusius's taste. In the first place among them let the Junius already cited hold the place, when he writes Aschidaeans throughout in those books and wishes them to be certain people who had been scattered here and there for the sake of religion. Joseph Scaliger, in book 6 *On the Correction of Times*, folio 503, after he had treated the Essenes, says: "Thus in the books of Maccabees there was a not dissimilar kind of Jews called Asidaeans."

Lake Leman is the fountain of Calvinian wisdom. From it the new translation of the Bible, especially the French one, was thought for some years to flow pure. Yet the lake theologians and ministers themselves corrected it in the year 1588, and in that corrected version they translate "the Asidaeans," so that it is a proper name. Luther, in his German version, uses a word which is otherwise common; but so that he may restrict it to a certain kind of good men, he writes it with a capital letter, saying in 1 Maccabees 2 and 7, "the Pious."

[margin: Serarius cites Protestant witnesses, including Junius, Scaliger, the corrected French Bible, and Luther.]

(printed p. 241)

And with a certain force supplied by the German articles, he says in 2 Maccabees 14, "the Jews who call themselves the Pious." But if *chesidim* or Hasidaeans are taken restrictively in 1 Maccabees 7, as has already been sufficiently established, the same must certainly be held about the *hosioi* in Josephus, book 12, chapter 6, where he narrates the same history. And there he opposes both these *hosioi* in particular and all the holy ones in general to the impious and the exiles. Drusius, however, slyly concealed the words "the holy ones" in Josephus and mentioned only the *hosioi*, so that the impious might seem to be opposed to them in general, and thus all the pious might be understood in general. But now that my assumption has been sufficiently proved, a very true conclusion is drawn from it against Drusius's great error.

The third question now remains: are the Hessaeans Hasidaeans? Drusius teaches three things about the Hasidaeans in his little book, insofar as they pertain here. First, that in the books of Maccabees they are all the pious and holy in general. Second, that these same people, both in those books and in Joseph Gorionides, book 4, chapter 29, are Pharisees. For on folio 5 he says: "The Pharisees were anciently called the wise men of Israel and Hasidaeans." On folio 28: "Gorionides there mentions only two sects, one of the Sadducees, the other of the Hasidaeans, or Pharisees." On folio 34: "In that passage of Gorionides, as also in the books of Maccabees, Pharisees are signified; or, if this name is more recent, the wise men of Israel."

[margin: Whether the Hessaeans are Hasidaeans. Drusius's three claims are introduced.]

(printed p. 242)

And he had written this long ago in that question 47 on account of which this little book of his exists. Third, he now admits what I proved in the *Maccabees*: that the Hasidaeans were Essenes, and a peculiar sect distinct from the Sadducees and Pharisees, but one which first arose after the times of the Maccabees. Thus he says on folio 5: "From the Pharisees arose the Hessaeans, whom the author of the book *Juchasin* calls Nazaraeans, and Gorionides, the compiler of the Hebrew history, also calls Hasidaeans." On folio 31: "If the Pharisees at that time were called Hasidaeans, why later were the Hessaeans called by that name? It is well known that a general name is sometimes restricted to a particular species." On folio 34: "Even if it is true that the Hessaeans are called Hasidaeans, nevertheless in that passage, as also in the books of Maccabees, Pharisees are signified." And on folio 62: "Many from the Pharisees withdrew into solitudes and desert places, and there founded the third sect of the Jews; they were particularly called Hasidaeans."

But of these three claims, the first has just now been shattered. The second was weakened above, in the explanation of that passage of Gorionides which alone caused Drusius to sound the trumpet against the whole fleet of authors. And surely in 1 Maccabees 7 it would be more allowable to include the Pharisees under the

name of scribes than under the name of Asidaeans, as is understood from the things discussed earlier about the scribes. The third is false only insofar as he wishes the Hessaeans, who are also Hasidaeans, to have arisen only after the times of the Maccabees. But this has been refuted from Flavius Josephus already in the first chapters. Therefore

[margin: Serarius rejects Drusius's claims. Source page 267 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 243)

nothing now remains except to set up this conclusion: the Hasidaeans existed when the Maccabees existed. And they were neither pious and holy people in general, nor Pharisees in particular, much less Sadducees. Therefore they were Essenes, since it is also certain from Josephus that the Essenes existed then, and since nothing has been handed down to memory by Josephus or by other writers about any fourth sect of Jews which flourished in the same times.

To make it stand so much more firmly that the Hessaeans and Hasidaeans are the same, I add, although it is not necessary, the very origin and meaning of the names, which, as is clear from the preceding chapters, is wholly the same in both; and likewise the testimony of two Innovators. One of them is Munster on book 4, chapter 6 of Gorionides, already mentioned above in another place. The other is Bonaventure Cornelius Bertram, whom Beza praises as his colleague on Galatians 2, number 7. In his book *On the Jewish Polity*, chapter 19, Bertram says: "Among the heresies or sects of the Jews, the first place is deservedly given to the Essees or Essenes. For I think they are those who in 1 Maccabees 7:13 are called Asidaeans and are called the first and chief of the Jews. That the Essees or Essenes are Asidaeans is argued from the fact that in Joseph son of Gorion, writing in Hebrew, those who are called Essees or Essenes by others, and especially by Josephus when he describes the same histories in Greek, are called *chasidim*, that is, kind or pious."

These are his words. I would move more quickly from him to other matters, unless there were one point by which Drusius wishes to persuade us that the Pharisees were

[margin: The Hasidaeans are identified with the Essenes. Munster and Bertram are cited. Source page 268 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 244)

Hasidaeans, and which I thought it wrong to pass over in silence, since it has not yet been explained elsewhere as the others have. What need is there of many words? he says on folio 34. Hyrcanus himself, in Gorionides, book 4, chapter 29, is called *chasid* by the Pharisees while he was still their disciple, that is, a Hasidaean or pious man.

But he is so called according to the general meaning which belongs to this name, just as in the same place he is also called *tsadik*. Therefore in that passage Drusius badly translates the word as "Hasidaean," and he does not well write "Pious" with a somewhat large capital.

Chapter VIII. Were the Essenes Nazaraeans?

(printed p. 244 — Book III)

One historian of the Hebrews, a book called *Juchasin*, has asserted this. Yet properly, according to the common formula of the Nazaraeans prescribed in Numbers 6:18-21, Deuteronomy 33:16, and Judges 13:5 and 7, they were not Nazaraeans. For many ceremonies were different, and in the books of Maccabees themselves the distinction between them is sufficiently shown, since the proper word of the Nazaraeans is placed in 1 Maccabees 3:49, while another appellation is assigned to the Essenes, namely that of Hasidaeans, as the previous chapter taught.

Yet by a certain likeness they can be called Nazaraeans, and indeed perpetual ones, because they observed certain similar rites and devoted themselves wholly to worship. And with respect even to their outward bodily clothing, that saying of Lamentations 4:7 suitably applies to them:

[margin: Strictly speaking, the Essenes were not Nazaraeans, though they may be called so by likeness. The printed citation appears to read 1 Maccabees 1:4, but the Nazarite passage is 1 Maccabees 3:49.]

(printed p. 245)

"Her Nazaraeans were whiter than snow and brighter than milk."

Chapter IX. Were the Essenes Rechabites? And when did they begin?

(printed p. 245 — Book III)

Not a few deny that the Essenes were Rechabites, but Suidas asserted it when he said: "The Essees were the ancestors, or parents and authors, of Jonadab, son of the righteous Rechab." They were not, as the Lutheran Wolphius translates, his descendants. For in that case they would have been the descendants of the Rechabites, not their ancestors. Yet this assertion, from whatever source Suidas drew it, seems, although not yet demonstrated, nevertheless probable.

For it has been proved above that the Essaeans already existed in the time of John Hyrcanus, and Josephus speaks of them not as though they had then been born, but as older and commonly known. It has also been proved that the Essaeans are the Asidaeans, of whom there is mention in the books of Maccabees. Therefore they either arose in those very times or already existed before. The former seems to be suggested by that opinion which says that because of the savagery and cruelty of Antiochus Epiphanes some Jews were scattered into the solitudes, and that from there they were called Aschidaeans. But although it is true that very many were driven into flight and desert places because of that tyranny, as is found in 1 Maccabees 1 and 2, nevertheless

[margin: Chapter IX begins. Suidas is discussed. The Essenes are connected with the Rechabites, but not as descendants in Wolphius's sense.]

(printed p. 246)

that the name of the Aschidaeans arose from this has been denied above. Rather, therefore, it seems that they already existed before, and that most of those who had already hidden in the solitudes and observed the Sabbath and other ceremonies so carefully were Hessaeans.

As for when they began, or how, nothing more fitting can be said than that from the very time when the Jews entered the promised land from Egypt, they always existed, in a greater or lesser number and with some change or addition of certain institutions. They are the same as those who in Judges, chapter 1, are called Kenites, sprung from Moses's father-in-law Jethro and from his son Hobab, about whom see Numbers 10. One or the other of these, or certainly one from them, was Rechab; I shall speak again about this below. Suidas calls him "the righteous," in Hebrew *chasid*. His son Jonadab added certain things to the old discipline and produced that company or sect which is called the Rechabites in Jeremiah 35.

By family and origin they were indeed Kenites and Hessaeans, but with some change in their institutions and name, so that there were two kinds of Kenites and Essaeans. One was older, with the old institution and name. The other was more recent, namely the Rechabite kind. These things receive probability, first, because it is clear from Judges 1 and 4, but especially

[margin: Serarius proposes an ancient Kenite/Rechabite origin for the Essenes. Source page 271 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 247)

from the last verse of 1 Chronicles 2, that the Kenites, descendants of Jethro, settled with the Israelites in the promised land and cultivated zeal for piety and virtue in an outstanding way. Our text there reads: "The clans also of the scribes dwelling in Jabez, singing and resounding, and remaining in tabernacles. These are the Kenites, who came from the heat of the father of the house of Rechab."

Each point must be weighed. First, they are called scribes. Beza on Matthew 2:4, and Junius and Tremellius on 1 Chronicles 2, say that these men are called scribes because they were writers of private contracts and instruments, and indeed in such a way that Beza asserts that this is clear from the cited passage of Chronicles. Yet nothing is less true. From what particle is that clear? Rather, in Hebrew they are called *sopherim*, in Greek grammateis, and in Latin scribes, because they were skilled in divine matters and were lovers and students of the sacred books and laws, as was said above about the scribes. Genebrard, book 1 on Chronicles, folio 60: "They are called scribes or teachers in 1 Chronicles 2."

Second, the Seventy also call them "dwelling in Jabez," not in a city, but in solitary and wooded places of Jabesh, about which see 1 Samuel 31 and Josephus, book 7, chapter 19. Yet because the phrase in Hebrew can also signify those who sit with Jabez, the author of the Traditions explains this as though they had spent time with a certain man named Jabez, an outstanding teacher. And just as Paul sat at the feet of Gamaliel, so these men sat at his feet for the sake of learning. For in the same book, chapter 4, verses 9 and 10, Jabez is highly commended, because he both made a vow to God

[margin: Four points are noted in 1 Chronicles 2. The first two concern "scribes" and "dwelling in Jabez."]

(printed p. 248)

and was heard by him. The text says: "Jabez was more illustrious than his brothers, and his mother called his name Jabez, saying, Because I bore him in pain. And Jabez called upon the God of Israel, saying: If in blessing you bless me and enlarge my borders, and if your hand is with me and you make me not be oppressed by evil. And God granted what he prayed for." The same man is called by the same author of the Traditions a very pious and illustrious teacher, in Hebrew *chasid*.

Third, they are called "singing and resounding and remaining in tabernacles." The Seventy retain almost the Hebrew names, as though they were Thirhathites, Shimeathites, and Suchathites. But since these are not found as proper names of either people or places, especially the first and second, the meaning carried by the force of the words must be taken. The Thirhathites, therefore, are singers, or those who cry out and rejoice, because they were especially occupied in prayers; they constantly sang praises and hymns to God, and uttered them with conspicuous jubilation and voice.

The Shimeathites are "resounders," because they made others hear what they sang by the projection of the voice. Or else they themselves were "hearers," because they never ceased hearing teachers and interpreters of the divine oracles, and because they obeyed most actively the precepts and institutions of the elders, as appears in Jeremiah 35:10, 14, and 18. The Suchathites are translated "those remaining in tabernacles," because either they lived outside cities and villages in tents fixed somewhere, or

[margin: Jabez is praised. The names Thirhathites, Shimeathites, and Suchathites are interpreted by meaning.]

(printed p. 249)

in cities and villages they lived as though in tents, not in houses, as though in lodgings, not in settled homes; see Jeremiah 35:10-11. But what do these things signify except a holy, pious, and hidden way of life, separate from common custom? The author of the Hebrew Traditions says: "They are written as singing and resounding because they were constantly occupied in the law of God and the prophets."

Fourth, "These are the Kenites, who came from the heat of the father of the house of Rechab"; or, as it is read in the Septuagint from the Hebrew, without the interpretation of the name which the Latin makes not badly: "who come from Chammath, father of the house of Rechab." But who is this Chammath? In Jeremiah 35, the house, or family and company, of the Rechabites is mentioned several times. Its nearer father is Jonadab, about whom see 2 Kings 10:15; its more remote father is Rechab, who is the father of Jonadab. And indeed, because they are not called Jonadabites but Rechabites, Chammath seems to be Rechab himself.

But who is this Rechab? There are several Rechabs in Scripture, as in 2 Samuel 4:2, 6, and 9, and Ezra 2:3, 14. But nothing is said of our Rechab except that he is the father of Jonadab, in 2 Kings 10:15 and 23, and Jeremiah 35:4, 6, 8, 14, 16, and 19. And because that word means horseman or chariot, it is read in the Septuagint for chariot in Judges 1:19, as Saint Augustine, question 4, and Theodoret, question 5, note on that passage. Certainly not a few Hebrews and Latins think that he is Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, or Jethro's son

[margin: The fourth point concerns the Kenites and Rechab. Chammath is identified with Rechab.]

(printed p. 250)

Hobab, who is called the father of Jonadab, not because he was Jonadab's immediate parent, but in the manner of Scripture, because Jonadab was from his stock. Arias Montanus expressly hands this down in Judges 1 in these words: "That Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, had several names, as many others among the ancients also did, we know from frequent testimony. For in this place the name Keni is mentioned; in Jeremiah, however, the same man is called Rechab."

Rabbi Solomon Jarchi, certainly, in Jeremiah 35, affirms that the Rechabites are from the sons of Jethro, who indeed was a man of God. Rabbi David Kimchi in the same place says: "Edom and Hobab are the sons of Rechab." And this is the same opinion of all the sages among the Hebrews. Hence our Lyra, on the same chapter of Jeremiah, says: "The Hebrew and Latin doctors say that those Rechabites descended from Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses." Theodoret, in the question already cited, says: "Divine Scripture everywhere mentions Rechab as a very pious man, *eusebes*, *chasid*, whose religion also flowed down to his descendants."

Therefore from this man's singular piety and religion, which the already cited Suidas and Theodoret mark in their Greek articles, flowed the names of the Chasidaeans, Hessaeans, and Rechabites. This name is used in Jeremiah and the books of Kings; the others are used in Maccabees and then in the histories. Now Pliny, book 5 of the *Natural History*, chapter 17, says: "Through thousands of ages the nation of the Essenes is eternal." Solinus, chapter 36: "Through an immense space of ages, incredible to say, it is an eternal nation,

[margin: Rechab is connected with Jethro and Hobab. Pliny and Solinus are introduced as witnesses to the antiquity of the Essenes.]

(printed p. 251)

though births have ceased." Drusius rejects these witnesses on folio 61, but he merely rejects them and supplies absolutely no reason. Others also reject them, but in such a way that they object to the silence of others, and especially of the Hebrews, about these matters. They excuse Pliny himself, as though, because he knew that the Jewish people was most ancient, he thought the sect of the Essenes to be coeval with them.

But since Pliny, and Solinus who followed him closely, agrees beautifully, in the manner I have explained, with Scripture and with Christian and Jewish doctors, we should rather rejoice in the truth, which has even profane and Gentile writers as witnesses. For from whatever source Pliny received other things about the institutions of the Essenes so truly and so congruently with Josephus, is it not fitting to believe that from the same source he also received information about their antiquity and their institution as distinct from the whole Jewish nation?

Moreover, since we see that the posterity of those men came through a long series of many years down to King Zedekiah, why should we not reckon that the same posterity was afterward still preserved and propagated by God down to the Maccabees, and from them down to Christ the Lord? This is especially so since the Lord himself says in Jeremiah 35:19: "There shall not fail a man from the stock of Jonadab son of Rechab standing in my sight all days," that is, serving and obeying me piously and religiously.

What of the fact that at the death of Saint James the Apostle, who was also called the Just, a priest, his patron, stood near him as a Rechabite, as Eusebius, book 2 of the *History*, chapter 23, reports from Hegesippus, book

[margin: Pliny and Solinus are defended. Jeremiah 35:19 and the death of James are cited.]

(printed p. 252)

This does not mean that he sprang from Rechab by family and blood. For how could someone who was not a Levite and not from the stock of Aaron have been a priest at Jerusalem? Rather, it means that he had joined himself to the discipline and sect of the Rechabites, so that, just as he could be called a Rechabite, he could also be called an Essene.

What of the fact that it also seems likely that Saint James himself, because he excelled in the same discipline before he was an apostle, and much more afterward, was for that reason once called "the Just" by excellence, that is, *chasid*, as Eusebius reports in the same place? For certainly those things which the most weighty writers have handed down about the virginity, abstinence, constancy in prayer, and highest authority among the Jews of this most holy apostle, as I touched on briefly in the little book *On the Apostles*, fit the customs of the Essaeans very well.

But let this be as it pleases each person. To me, certainly, Josephus seems to testify not obscurely to their very ancient origin when he says in book 18, chapter 2: "It is worth admiring above all those who make virtue their concern, because justice, which has never belonged to any Greeks or barbarians, not even for a short time, came to them from of old in this practice and has not been prevented from remaining." Rufinus has so far very absurdly stolen these words from readers who love truth; but a new interpreter has restored them a little, when he translated: "Their justice also is wonderful, by which they far surpass all Greeks and barbarians

[margin: The Rechabite priest at James's death is explained by discipline, not blood. James himself may be understood as linked by discipline to the Essenes.]

(printed p. 253)

by many centuries, having long been worn in its continual pursuits." But Josephus says this almost word for word: "It is indeed worthy to admire them above all who study virtue; for the just, or justice, which never happened to any Greeks or barbarians, not even to the smallest degree, came to them from ancient times, because they were not prevented or hindered from being formed in that way of life."

Again, the same author says that they are very similar to the Dacians in very many of their customs. But it has already been said above that among the Getae, Dacians, and Pythagoreans there flourished very many things which seem to belong to the Essenes, and that these were received by Pythagoras from the Jews. In this way the family of the Essenes is earlier and older than Pythagoras himself. Pythagoras, however, lived at the time of the Jews' return from Babylon and for some time thereafter, and flourished down to the seventieth Olympiad.

But lest this disputation of mine be too tasteless for Drusius, I shall sprinkle in something pleasing to him, some new salt. Peter Martyr, on 2 Kings 10, when he asks why Jonadab gave his sons those commands found in Jeremiah 35 about abstinence from wine, lack of estates, cultivation of solitudes, and other similar matters, himself answers, among other things, this: "That pastoral art belonged to the Rechabites from their fathers, indeed from their grandfathers. For Jethro, Moses's father-in-law, had flocks, and he sent his daughters to feed and guard them. Therefore they did not wish

[margin: Josephus is translated more closely. Peter Martyr is introduced among Protestant witnesses.]

(printed p. 254)

to degenerate from their ancestors." And more fully on Judges 1: "God is shown to have adorned the Kenites in no common way in his commonwealth, and that with three chief gifts. For they excelled in zeal and knowledge of the law. Then they were illustrious by a notable victory. Finally, they lived with praised and

approved morals.

"Concerning their zeal for the law, with which they burned, the first book of Chronicles, chapter 2 near the end, is witness for them. There they are mentioned with the family of Jabez, that is, of Othniel, and are said to have been scribes. From this it appears that the tradition of the Hebrews is not to be despised, namely that in the doctrine of the law they were disciples of Othniel. For they are reckoned in his family, and it is very common for disciples to be treated in the place of sons. Jerome also, in the *Questions on Chronicles*, embraces this opinion, which, as has been said, seems to rest on the Scriptures. Nor do I think that mention of them is made here among the deeds of Othniel for any other reason than that they always lived very closely joined with his family. They are indeed counted with the tribe of Judah, although they were not of Israelite stock. Therefore they too, among the others, bore a type of the calling of the nations.

"The second splendid ornament in their commonwealth was the beautiful victory which is reported in chapter 4 of this book of Judges. For Jael, wife of Heber the Kenite, killed Sisera, commander of Jabin king of Canaan, and by the hand of a woman of this family God willed to grant great salvation to the Israelites. Finally, that they were well-mannered and observant of their fathers' commands is shown by the family of Jonadab

[margin: Peter Martyr on the Kenites: knowledge of the law, victory through Jael, and obedience to ancestral commands. Source page 279 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 255)

of Jonadab son of Rechab declared. They did not drink wine, which was at that time the institution of the Nazaraeans; and, with a remarkable contempt for earthly things, they did not live in houses but dwelt in tents and practiced the shepherd's art, which is very simple. Hence they are very highly praised by Jeremiah the prophet and are adorned before the Jews with a most ample promise, because they showed more observance and obedience to Rechab their parent than was shown by the Hebrews themselves to God, though that people continually boasted of that father and those holy ancestors.

Therefore we acknowledge that what Paul taught to the Romans is most true: those truly have Abraham as father who press on in the footsteps of his faith. These men were not Jews by nature, but by will and faith they became proselytes, and in piety and holiness they surpassed very many who were Jews by nature.

And on Judges 4 he says: It is not surprising that the family of the Kenites lived in tents, since the Rechabites who sprang from them had no fixed dwellings. Fagius, or Munster, on the same chapter of Judges 1, says: From these Kenites the Rechabites at last descended. Pellican, Munster's teacher, on Judges 4, says: The posterity of Jethro was venerated by all, since he was also of special honesty, and from him came the Rechabites.

These are Innovators for Drusius. But for Catholics, besides Suidas, praised at the beginning of the chapter, I also bring forward Saint Nilus as a witness, at the beginning of the *Asceticus*, when he says: The Jews who instituted such a way of living sprang from Jonadab, and all

[margin: Protestant and Catholic witnesses on the Rechabite origin. Saint Nilus is introduced.]

(printed p. 256)

who come to them in order to live in the same manner they lead into the same institutions. They dwell perpetually in tents. They abstain from wine and from all delicate foods. Content with a thin diet, they afflict the body. Therefore they take great care for morals and are constantly occupied in contemplation; from this they are called Hessaeans.

Nothing remains, then, except to strengthen the probability of this opinion also by dissolving the objections raised against it. Six are listed by a very great man of this age for the sake of investigating the truth.

The first objection: If so noble and almost divine a way of life flourished among the Jewish Essenes so many ages ago, what is the reason that no mention of it is found in either the Old or the New Testament?

But it has already been said that mention is made of them, though under other names. This is rather the wonder: since Jonadab existed almost three hundred years before Jeremiah's testimony about the Rechabites, as the chronology shows from Jonadab down to Zedekiah, nevertheless no mention was ever made anywhere of so noble an institution, nor was its origin described. But Jeremiah, as though doing something else, finally opened it up, and briefly.

The second objection: The institution of the Essenes and the Rechabites was different and plainly distinct. For the Rechabites, as is recorded in the sacred letters, were accustomed to seek a livelihood only from what the earth bore of itself, without any cultivation of fields; but, on the contrary,

[margin: First and second objections against identifying Essenes with Rechabites.]

(printed p. 257)

Philo, in the book entitled *That Every Good Man Is Free*, and Josephus testify that all the Essenes were accustomed to cultivate fields and seek their livelihood from them. Moreover, Jerome, writing to Paulinus, testifies that the same Rechabites, in the time of Zedekiah, when the Babylonians were besieging Jerusalem, were compelled to retreat within the city and thus to depart from their institution; and certainly no further mention of them is found in the divine Scriptures.

Those things indicate that there were several forms of Kenites and Essenes. To all of them, indeed, and always, it was common to cultivate zeal for piety and virtue especially. But many things were once free, by which their descendants afterward bound themselves voluntarily, as in the matters just objected; others did not. Thus a very great part of them once married and devoted themselves to children, though some nevertheless, either for their whole lives, as Elijah, Elisha, and Jeremiah did, or for fixed periods which they defined for themselves, as the Hebrews teach about many Levites, guarded continence. Afterward, however, especially after the childbirth of the Blessed Virgin and after Christ Jesus, the Virgin and the greatest teacher of virginity, the larger part rejected all sexual intercourse; the others kept the old custom of marriage. Hence Josephus also indicated to us above that there were two kinds of Essenes.

The third objection: It is a matter plainly worthy of admiration that, although in the Gospel there is mention of all the other sects of the Jews, namely

[margin: Second objection answered by distinguishing several forms of Kenites and Essenes. Third objection begins.]

(printed p. 258)

of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Galileans, and Herodians, yet all memory of the Essenes, whose way of life and institution could seem more worthy of admiration than the others, remains wholly wrapped in silence. Drusius on folio 59, though hesitantly, brings forward one cause: that under Herod, son of the elder Herod, there were no longer any Essenes. "I doubt," he says, "whether there were Essenes even under the second Herod. The reason for doubting is that in the New Testament, where there is frequent mention of the Pharisees and Sadducees, there is deep silence about the Essenes; not even their name appears in those books. What shall we think the cause to be? If there is another cause besides those I have stated, I confess I do not know it. I shall gladly hear the more learned."

But that they did exist even after the second Herod, Josephus is a witness, book 2, *The Jewish War*, chapter 12, to say nothing yet of Philo; and Drusius himself acknowledged this on folio 32. Therefore the cause of this Gospel silence is rather that the Essenes who were at Jerusalem opposed Christ the Lord in no matter, laid no snares for him either by word or deed, and were bound by no more serious vices that could give scandal.

Thus Abulensis on Matthew 3, question 63, says: "Nothing is said in the Gospels about the Essenes and about those who followed the sect of Judas the Galilean, though much is very wisely said about the Pharisees and Sadducees. The reason is that these are introduced insofar as they opposed Christ, and he himself rebuked them for many things, especially the Pharisees. Nothing is said about the sect of the Hessaeanes because they were good men, and perhaps it never happened that they opposed Christ or came together with him for anything."

[margin: Gospel silence about the Essenes is answered; Abulensis is cited.]

(printed p. 259)

The fourth objection: Why did the same Josephus, in those two very explicit books in which he strove with all his powers to attack and refute the slanders gathered by Apion against the Jews, and at the same time very gloriously brings into the open whatever noble or worthy thing he could hunt out about his race from any ancient writers, even from the most hidden places, nevertheless keep silent about the most celebrated institution of the Essenes, when their training-place was so famous and open at Alexandria, where Apion was accustomed to live? Certainly, by that one example of the way of life of the Jewish Essenes, he could sufficiently refute the shameless man's lies gathered against the Jews and beat back his barking insolence.

But I in turn first ask: why is it that the same Josephus in those same books against Apion is utterly silent about the institution of the Rechabites? Second, Saint Jerome, in book 2 *Against Jovinian*, speaks about those books as though explicit mention of the Essenes had at some time been made in them, when he says: "Josephus, in the two volumes against Apion, describes three doctrines of the Jews, the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes." Third, not even now is he wholly silent in those books about the Rechabites and Essenes, since he reports that Pythagoras and his disciple Zalmoxis learned not a few things from them, although he calls them Jews in general, as though the praise which belonged to certain men belonged to all; this was explained earlier.

The fifth objection: If you consult the pagan writers who lived before Christ

[margin: Josephus's silence in Against Apion is discussed. Fifth objection begins.]

(printed p. 260)

and pursued the most praiseworthy customs of various peoples, you will find that they praised the Gymnosophists and Brahmans, and any others who excelled in life and morals in the world, even if they were set in the most remote regions. But concerning the Essenes, who would easily surpass all the aforesaid and were set almost before the eyes of all in the middle of the earth, you will find that they did not say even a word. Let Pompeius Trogus first be an example, and his epitomator Justin, who, when treating the origin and customs of the Jews, does not even mention the Essenes. Further, Strabo, the most distinguished of the cosmographers, who by his profession followed with the greatest exactness the known situation of the world, provinces, cities, and places, and also the customs of peoples, when he treats the Jews and their origin and customs, reports utterly nothing about the Essenes, who by their renown could not have been obscure. Likewise Aristaeas, in the commentary which he wrote about the seventy-two interpreters, when he reviews the institutions of the Jews with the highest praise, made absolutely no mention of the Essenes.

But that very long argument is more easily dispatched, because there is deep silence among those Gentile writers about very many and very great Jewish matters. Which of Trogus, Strabo, or Aristaeas mentioned the Rechabites, the prophets, or so many and such great kings, victories, and miracles? At times one or another tastes a few things; no one pursues all Jewish matters. How great a thing

[margin: Pagan silence about the Essenes is answered by broader pagan silence about Jewish matters.]

(printed p. 261)

was the standing still of the sun in the time of Joshua? How great was its turning back at Hezekiah's prayer? And yet where and by whom among the ancients is anything said about these things?

The sixth objection: There is no memory of the Essenes in Josephus older than the time of Herod the Great.

But this has already been weakened often above. For the prediction of Judas the Essene is reported by Josephus, book 13, chapter 19, in the time of Aristobulus, son of John Hyrcanus. In that place, because the new interpreter omitted "Essene" in his text, unless it is a printer's error, he is hardly excusable. For in Greek it is present. Again in book 1, *The Jewish War*, chapter 3, the same Judas is called an Essene. And it should always be noted that this man is called "the Essene" because others were Essenes only by profession, or choice, and doctrine, not by birth, but by sect, as was said above about the Rechabite priest. And in this sense they too were called sons of Rechab, because in doctrine he was their father.

Chapter X. Can the Essenes be reckoned as forerunners and certain models of monks and other Christian religious?

(printed p. 261 — Book III)

Certainly they can, both generally and particularly. Generally, because they preserved the things that are chief in the religious state:

[margin: Sixth objection answered from Judas the Essene. Chapter X begins.]

(printed p. 262)

excellent religion toward God and, for his sake, chastity of body and soul, flight from pleasures, zeal for poverty, community of all goods, and similar things. Particularly, because they practiced certain things which particular religious later loved above others: hospitality, silence, the education of youth, and other things evident from the preceding discussion.

It is allowed to confirm this from Christian Essenes. But because I have not yet shown that there were any such, I now give only some authors of this opinion. Saint Jerome, to Paulinus, letter 8, when he was discussing the founders and authors of monks, and had already named Pauls, Antonys, Hilarions, and others, goes on: "And to return to the authority of the Scriptures: our prince is Elijah, our Elisha is ours, our leaders are the sons of the prophets, who dwelt in fields and solitudes and made themselves tents near the streams of the Jordan. From these are also those sons of Rechab who drank no wine or strong drink, who lived in tents, who are praised by the voice of God through Jeremiah, and to whom it is promised that there shall not fail from their stock a man standing before the Lord. I think this is also signified by the title of Psalm 70: of the sons of Jonadab, and of those who were first led into captivity. This is Jonadab son of Rechab, who in the book of Kings is written to have climbed into the chariot with Jehu. And his sons are those who, always dwelling in a tent, at last

[margin: Essenes as models of Christian religious life. Jerome to Paulinus is quoted. Source page 287 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 263)

were compelled, because of the irruption of the Chaldean army, to enter Jerusalem, and are said to have endured that first captivity because, after the freedom of the solitude, they were enclosed in the city as in a prison."

Philastrius says: "The Essenes are those who practice the life of monks, not taking delicate foods, not having zeal for clothing, and possessing nothing; but they persist in reading and good works and live also in separated places." Lyra, on Jeremiah 35, says: "From this Jonadab begins the religious manner of living." Abulensis on Matthew 5, chapter 23, question 12, and my Drusius also in the appendix, chapter 3: "The Essenes were cultivators of piety and religion, whom the French call *religieux*, and the Germans *Geistliche*." We heard Chytraeus giving his support earlier. Now it is pleasant also to hear Hugh Broughton in his

Concentus: "The third sect among the Jews was that of the Essenes, who were not unlike monks."

Chapter XI. Do any Essenes still remain now?

(printed p. 263 — Book III)

Since I have taught that the Essenes and Rechabites are the same, Benjamin in his *Itinerary* hands down that the Rechabites still exist, in these words: "The region of Sheba is now called the land of Aliman, bordering the region of Shinar on the north. Its tract contains twenty-one journeys to be made through solitudes; and in that region those Jews dwell who are called sons of Rechab, by another name men of Theima. For Theima

[margin: Jerome's quotation concludes. Philastrius, Lyra, Abulensis, Drusius, Chytraeus, and Broughton are cited. Chapter XI begins.]

(printed p. 264)

is the beginning of their dominion, which Hanan Hanasi now governs. The city Theima itself is great and populous." He adds many other things, by which he sufficiently indicates that they are Rechabites only in name, not in that old probity and justice. Indeed, I almost suspect that they are not called from that ancient Rechab, but from constant riding.

"Their region," he says, "extends among the mountains called northern for a journey of sixteen days, cultivated with great and very fortified cities, subject to the yoke of no foreign people. Coming out from there, the inhabitants plunder all neighboring and even more distant peoples, as many as there are as far as the Arabs, with whom they have a treaty. The Arabs are those who dwell in tents and keep movable dwellings in the solitudes of their region, and invade foreign lands for plunder throughout that whole region of Aliman. And those Jews whom we have just mentioned cultivate fields and pastures and possess herds and flocks, holding a very broad and vast region; from all their produce they give tithes for the use of the disciples of the sages, who are perpetually occupied with doctrine, preaching, and the Pharisees."

But the Jews tell many other fables about other Jews, whom some Sabbatic river, I know not what, and a marvelous vastness of mountains separate from the rest of mortals. For narratives about these men by the Hebrew Eldad the Danite, with some others, are extant in Genebrard. If you say that, nevertheless, by the promise made by the Lord to the Rechabites in Jeremiah 35, some must still exist,

[margin: Benjamin of Tudela is treated cautiously. Serarius doubts that these are ancient Rechabites in the old sense.]

(printed p. 265)

I say that very many exist in spirit, not in the letter. And just as from Saint Paul, Romans 11, some are called children of Israel according to the flesh and others according to the spirit, so also two kinds of Essenes and Rechabites must be established. Good religious among Christians are true Rechabites and Essenes.

Chapter XII. Where does Philo write about the Essenes?

(printed p. 265 — Book III)

Philo was great among the Jews in birth, learning, and authority. Concerning him, as Saint Jerome says, it is commonly said among the Greeks: either Plato follows Philo, or Philo follows Plato, so great is the likeness of their thoughts and eloquence. Saint Augustine, against Faustus the Manichaeon, says: "Philo was a certain man, most liberally learned, one of those whose eloquence the Greeks do not hesitate to equal to Plato's."

He handed down many splendid things about the Essenes to memory. But because, as I noted above, there are some controversies about his opinion, I have decided to trace and explain it step by step. First, I inquire where he treats these men, because I see only two passages of his commonly cited: namely the book whose title is *That Every Good Man Is Free*, and the book *On the Contemplative Life*, or *On Those Who Pray*, or *On Suppliants*. But a third passage must be added from the book which contained an *Apology for the Jews* and

was also

[margin: Chapter XII begins. Philo's works on the Essenes are listed.]

(printed p. 266)

entitled *On the Jews*, as Saint Jerome says in the *Catalogue*, and Eusebius in book 2 of the *History*, chapter 18. For Eusebius, in explaining the Essenes, praises these three books and draws not a few things from them: from the *Apology* and from the book *On the Freedom of the Good Man* in book 8 of the *Preparation for the Gospel*; but from the book *On the Contemplative Life* in book 2 of the *History*, chapter 17, in the Greek.

Chapter XIII. Do Philo and the above-cited Flavius Josephus speak about the same Essenes?

(printed p. 266 — Book III)

In Bellarmine, book 2 *On Monks*, and elsewhere, I read that certain people denied that these two great authors speak about the same Essenes. But whose opinion this is, I do not remember reading, although the most reverend and learned Baronius and others seem to incline toward it in volume 1 of the *Annals*. Bellarmine indicates that they had these two arguments.

The first: Josephus, book 18, chapter 2, asserts that the sect of the Essenes was ancient among the Jews, but Philo indicates that he is speaking of a discipline which arose in his own time.

The second: many things are handed down by Josephus concerning the Essenes which are manifestly erroneous and superstitious, none of which Philo attributes to his Therapeutae. Hence Saint Nilus, at the beginning of his *Asceticus*, asserts that the Essenes, namely those about whom Josephus speaks, had customs similar

[margin: Eusebius's three Philo sources. Chapter XIII begins; two arguments for distinguishing Philo's Essenes from Josephus's are introduced.]

(printed p. 267)

to the customs of monks, but because they lacked faith in Christ, their holy customs profited them nothing.

The most reverend Baronius adds a third argument. Josephus, as we saw above, described a twofold form of Essenes who lived in Judea. For some were milder and occupied themselves with marriages; others were stricter. Yet even these stricter ones were in many matters more relaxed than those who lived in Egypt, whose history Philo wove. For Josephus testifies that his Essenes were accustomed to live in cities; those described by Philo, however, were accustomed to live outside, in gardens and country houses. Furthermore, Josephus writes that the former took lunch and supper every day; Philo, however, hands down that the latter were accustomed to take food only once a day, after sunset, and that some of them continued fasting as far as the third day, while others remained so for six days. Again, among the former a dish was set before each by the cook; for the latter, although they feasted together, salt with bread and hyssop was sufficient as relish. There are also many other differences between them in rites, so that it is plainly clear that even if they agreed in name, they were distinct from each other in very many institutions. Therefore the Alexandrian Essenes were different from those whom Josephus affirms were accustomed to live in Judea.

Others, however, and their number is much greater, judge that Josephus and Philo speak about the same Essenes. Among these Bellarmine counts Matthew Galenus in the book *On the Origin of Monasticism*, which has not yet come before my eyes. Each

[margin: Baronius's third argument distinguishes Judean Essenes from Alexandrian contemplatives. The opposing view is introduced.]

(printed p. 268)

opinion seems probable to the already named Bellarmine, but each seems rather to me something that must be weighed.

For this matter it is not a little useful to have ready to hand that Philo and Josephus indeed lived in the same first century of Christ the Lord, but that Philo was older than Josephus. For when Caius succeeded the emperor Tiberius, Philo was already mature in age, powerful in wisdom and authority. In the very serious business of all the Jews who lived at Alexandria, of whom there were many thousands, an embassy was sent by them to Caius himself in the fourth year of his reign, and Philo was its leader. Both he himself in his book about that embassy and Josephus, book 18, chapter 10, testify to this.

But Josephus was then a little child, indeed an infant of three years, born in the first year of the same Caius, as he himself narrates at the beginning of his *Life*. He completed his books of the Jewish War and the *Antiquities* in the thirteenth year of Domitian, the fifty-sixth of his own age, as he writes at the end of the *Antiquities*. Again, afterward, in the first or second year of Claudius, who was Caius's successor, Philo traveled from Alexandria to Rome. Remaining there for business, he conversed with Saint Peter, who had himself arrived at Rome at about the same time, as Eusebius writes in book 2 of the *History*, chapter 16, and Saint Jerome in the *Catalogue*.

These two writers also have this in common, that both were at Rome, but Josephus spent the greater part of his life in the parts of Judea,

[margin: Philo is older than Josephus; Serarius summarizes chronology and the embassy to Caius.]

(printed p. 269)

the other in Egypt. But whether this one ever saw Judea, or the other Egypt, is not clear. From these things it is further gathered that Philo could not have been an imitator of Josephus, but Josephus rather could have been an imitator of Philo.

Each establishes two kinds of Essenes. Josephus, in book 2, chapter 12, gives one kind as those who marry, and the other as the unmarried. Philo, at the beginning of the book *On the Contemplative Life*, gives one kind as the practical philosophers, who are also called cenobites by him, and another as the theoretic or contemplative philosophers, who are also called solitaries and those who live alone. These latter live separate from others, each leading a solitary life in small dwellings, which they called sacred houses or monasteries, as the same author says in the same book. Therefore I now establish two things.

First: Josephus treats only the practical and cenobitic Essenes, so that his two kinds are two parts of the same cenobites. This is understood, first, from what was said about the greatest community of goods among them, explained above in numbers 11, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, and 20; then from their daily labors and crafts for several hours before and after noon, about which see numbers 23 and 29. Third, because Josephus never mentions contemplation, but only indicates that some of them diligently turned over the ancient physical and divine books, in numbers 38 and 50; and this,

[margin: Philo and Josephus both distinguish two kinds, but not in the same way. Serarius begins his reconciliation.]

(printed p. 270)

in a great multitude, almost never happens without some who do it. And they all did this also for the whole time that could be free from work for them, night and day. Hence, in comparison with the common people, all could be called theoretics, as is signified before Philo's words by Eusebius in book 8 of the *Preparation*.

Fourth, because Josephus asserted that the Essenes who married differed from the unmarried only in that one opinion concerning marriage, number 51. Fifth, because Laertius and Aulus Gellius, book 1, chapter 9, teach that this kind of cenobitic life was Pythagorean, as we saw above. But Josephus has already sung to us that his Essenes were similar to the Pythagoreans.

Second: Philo deals in two places with these same practical Essenes, followers of the common life, and yet only those of them who were celibate: namely in the *Apology* and in the book *On the Freedom of the Good Man*. But with others, who were in a more excellent way theoretics and cultivators of the solitary life, he deals in the book *On the Contemplative Life*. Both parts of this statement are seen clearly at the very threshold of the first part of the last-named book, where he says: "After I have discussed the Essees, who love and practice the active life, excelling in all or, to speak less invidiously, in very many parts, now also, following the order of this treatment, I shall say what is fitting about those who have embraced theory or contemplation." What things are in the *Apology* agree in matter and almost

[margin: Philo's practical/cenobitic Essenes are distinguished from his contemplatives. Source page 295 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 271)

word for word with those things which are handed down in that book *On the Freedom of the Good Man*. This will become clear, both this and each part of the statement I have just established, from Philo's own words, which I now bring here, so that they may be compared with Josephus and with one another as conveniently as possible. Certainly one of the two can be illustrated from the other.

Chapter XIV. Philo's words from the *Apology* about the practical or cenobitic Essenes

(printed p. 271 — Book III)

"Our lawgiver," says Philo, "entrusted innumerable people, who are called Essaeans, to the common life, honored, as it seems to me, with a name from holiness.

First, they inhabit many cities of Judea, and many villages and large, populous gatherings of people.

Second, this institution belongs to them not by birth, for that is not counted among things freely chosen, but from an inflamed love or zeal for virtue and from a desire for humanity.

Third, therefore, no Essaeon is very young, nor is any pubescent or adolescent, because the customs of such people conform to the imperfection of their age and are likewise more childish;

[margin: Chapter XIV begins Philo's *Apology* on practical/cenobitic Essenes: name, places, voluntary discipline, and age.]

(printed p. 272)

but they are mature men, already inclining toward old age, who are neither flooded by the overflow of the body nor driven by disturbances of the mind. They gather a freedom that is not false but truly solid, as though it were fruit. Their very life is witness to that freedom.

Fourth, scarcely any one of them can possess anything at all as his own: neither dwelling, nor slave, nor field, nor flocks, nor any other things that are usually prepared and supplied by wealth. Rather, placing all things in common, they enjoy common use.

Fifth, they dwell together according to certain sacred assemblies, make fellowships and common meals, and diligently work at all things for the common good. The tasks of different men are different, and they eagerly apply themselves to them and contend, making no excuse from frost, heat, or other changes of the air.

Sixth, before the sun rises, they turn to their customary labors, and scarcely return when it sets, exulting with no less joy than those who are approved in gymnastic contests. For they think that the exercises in which they train themselves are more useful for life, more pleasant for soul and body, and much more lasting than those in contests, since they do not wither and perish together with the strength of the body.

[margin: Community of goods, common life, and manual work.]

(printed p. 273)

For some of them are skilled farmers, experts at sowing and cultivating the land; others are shepherds and masters and leaders of every kind of livestock. Some care for beehives; others are craftsmen of other arts, so that nothing should be troublesome, and nothing lacking, among the things compelled by necessary use and belonging to a supply of necessities free from blame.

Seventh, for their diverse works they receive wages and give them to one appointed treasurer. He immediately buys the things that are fitting and supplies abundant foods and other things of which human life has need.

Eighth, these men are daily sharers of the same manner of life and the same table. They gladly use the same things, loving frugality and rejecting abundance as a disease of soul and body.

Ninth, not only their table but also their clothing is common. For in winter there are ready for them thick and rough cloaks, and in summer cheap and thin sleeveless garments, so that each may easily take whichever he wishes, because the things that belong to one belong to all, and the things that belong to all belong in turn to one.

Tenth, if any one of them becomes ill, remedies are supplied to him from the common stock, and he is cared for by the services and solicitude of all.

[margin: Occupations, common treasury, frugality, common clothing, and care of the sick.]

(printed p. 274)

Eleventh, the aged, even if they lack children, are nevertheless accustomed to end life in a most blessed and abundant old age, as though they abounded not only in children but in good children, since they are held worthy of care and honor by so many people, and indeed by those who desire to care for them more by voluntary decree than by necessity of nature.

Twelfth, in addition, because they foresaw most keenly that marriage was the one thing that would dissolve society and the communion of life, they declined marriages and at the same time practiced continence excellently. For no Essaeian takes a wife, since woman is a creature that loves itself, is not a little jealous, and has great power to weaken the morals of a man and subject him to constant enchantments. For when she has devised flattering speeches, and has ensnared the eyes and ears with another cosmetic, as though on a stage, then, once the subjects have been deceived, she deceives the mind itself, which is the ruling part. But if there are children, she is already full of pride and confidence, and what before she insinuated secretly by irony she now demands with a more headstrong boldness; and having advanced to shamelessness, she compels him to do things, any one of which is hostile to the community of life. For whoever is bound either by the charms of a wife or by the care of children, from the very necessity of nature, is no longer the same toward others, but has become another man and, without knowing it, from free has become a slave.

[margin: Care for elders and celibacy. Philo's argument against marriage is translated directly.]

(printed p. 275)

Thirteenth, therefore, this is their life, a life greatly desired by contest, so much so that not only private persons but also great kings, struck with admiration, have been amazed at these men and have venerated the majesty of such a life with approvals and honors." Thus Philo.

Chapter XV. Other words of the same Philo about the same practical or cenobitic Essenes, from the book *On the Freedom of the Good Man*

(printed p. 275 — Book III)

First: "Nor is Syria, which is in Palestine, barren of honesty and virtue, since no small and very numerous part of the Jewish people possesses it. Certain men among them are called by the name Essaeans, more than

four thousand in number. In my judgment, they derive their name not from an exact form of the Greek language but from holiness, because among these men above all there are worshipers of God, not those who sacrifice animals, but those who strive to adorn their own minds with holiness.

Second, they first live by villages and flee cities because of the familiar vices of the citizens there, knowing that danger comes from those who live with us no less than from corrupt and pestilential air, because of the incurable contagion that is cast into souls.

Third, some of them practice agriculture,

[margin: Chapter XV begins Philo's On the Freedom of the Good Man: number, name, village life, and work. Source page 300 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 276)

while others practice those arts which are aids of peace and thus profit themselves and their neighbors. They do not guard silver and gold in treasuries, nor do they possess great divisions of land or estates because of desire for revenues, but they acquire what pertains to necessary uses of life.

Fourth, these alone, from almost all human beings, are without all money and all possession, and by institution rather than by lack of good fortune they are judged most wealthy, since they judge, and rightly, that to be content with few things and to be by no means fastidious in foods is to abound in the greatest riches.

Fifth, among them no one makes missiles, javelins, swords, helmets, breastplates, or shields, just as no one makes other arms, engines, or anything else useful for war. Indeed, you would not even find there those pursuits which are easily abused in peace. They have not seen merchants, shopkeepers, or shipmasters even in a dream, removing the material of greed.

Sixth, there is not even one slave among them, but all free men serve one another in turn. They condemn domination as unjust and impious, opposed to the law of nature, which bore and nourished all equally as a mother, as brothers truly, not only in name. That kinship has been weakened and torn apart by the plots of greed, through whose work alienation of spirit was introduced in place of familiarity,

[margin: Peaceful occupations, voluntary poverty, no weapons or commerce, and no slavery. Source page 301 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 277)

and hatred in place of benevolence.

Seventh, they leave the reasoning part of philosophy to the hunters of words, since they think it unnecessary for acquiring virtue; and the part that investigates nature they leave to the tellers of lofty tales, as being above human comprehension, except insofar as it discusses the existence of God himself and the creation of his universe. They exercise themselves in moral philosophy alone, using the laws of the fathers, which the human mind cannot conceive without the breath of the divine power, as teachers and masters.

Eighth, these ancestral laws are taught to them also at other times, but excellently on the seventh days or Sabbaths. For this seventh day is considered sacred by them.

Ninth, on that day they come to sacred places, which are called synagogues. According to age they sit in certain ranks, the younger below the elders, and with fitting modesty they bear themselves as is appropriate for hearers or disciples.

Tenth, one man takes the books and reads; another from among those most skilled explains and teaches the obscure things. For, out of love and imitation of the ancient custom, they philosophize for the most part through symbols.

Eleventh, they are taught piety, holiness, justice, household order, civic order, and knowledge of the things that are truly good and evil,

[margin: Their philosophy, Sabbath instruction, synagogues, and allegorical interpretation.]

(printed p. 278)

and also of indifferent things, so that they may choose what is fitting and flee the contrary. For this they use three laws and rules: love of God, love of virtue, and love of humanity.

Twelfth, countless signs of the first love, toward God, are supplied throughout their whole life by continuous and never-interrupted chastity, purity, flight from every oath and lie, and by that opinion concerning the divine power: that it is itself the cause of all good things and of no evil.

Thirteenth, the signs of the second love, which was toward virtue, are these: not loving money, glory, or pleasure; continence itself, fortitude, and in addition endurance, simplicity, ease of conduct, humility, constancy, a manner of living in agreement with the law, and things similar to these.

Fourteenth, the signs of the third love, the love of humanity, are benevolence, equality, and a communion or society of common life greater than all speech, about which it will not be untimely to say a few things.

Fifteenth, therefore, no one has anything of his own which does not belong to all; not even a dwelling. For besides the fact that they live together by certain common dwellings, their houses are open even to those who come

[margin: The three rules: love of God, virtue, and humanity. Community of life begins. Source page 303 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 279)

from elsewhere and are of the same institution as themselves.

Sixteenth, the storeroom is one and the same for all, the expenses are the same, the garments are also common, and the foods are common to all who eat together. No one could find the society of the same roof, life, and table more firmly established among others by any work. And rightly so.

Seventeenth, whatever they gain from the wages of their daily labors, each does not keep for himself, but, by placing it in the middle, they make it possible for whoever wishes to enjoy it.

Eighteenth, those who are ill are not therefore neglected because they are now unable to seek their livelihood; from the common goods they have ready at hand remedies and helps for diseases.

Nineteenth, their reverence for the elders and care for the gray head is such as can belong to genuine free children toward their parents. With innumerable hands and services they nourish and sustain them in an abundance of all things in old age.

Twentieth, this philosophy makes such athletes of virtue, exercising them without all the curious and ambitious words of the Greeks, in actions worthy of praise, by which sure and perpetual freedom is established. This was clearly shown in many and various difficulties of the times,

[margin: Community of dwellings, goods, wages, sick care, and elder care.]

(printed p. 280)

under the tyranny of more powerful men endowed with diverse dispositions. Some of these tried to surpass fierce beasts in savagery and omitted no kind of cruelty, driving their subjects in herds and cutting living men into pieces like butchers; nor was there an end before they fell into the same calamities, divine providence taking vengeance. Others, concealing their rage by another kind of malice, gave bitter disasters, disguising hatred with placid speech and secret whispers, like wicked dogs flattering and then fastening incurable bites, so that they might leave to cities monuments of their impiety as a perpetual remembrance of afflictions.

Yet no one from either the cruel or the disguised and deceitful was able to bring the aforesaid assemblies of the Essaeans or holy ones into guilt. Rather, all departed conquered by the virtue of these men, praising them as free and self-governing people, which proceeds from nature, and celebrating their common life and community of goods, which is beyond all speech and is the clearest proof of a perfect and very happy life.

[margin: Philo's praise of the Essenes' virtue under tyrants concludes chapter XV.]

(printed p. 281)

Chapter XVI. On the theoretic Essenes, about whom the same Philo speaks in the book *On the Contemplative Life*

(printed p. 281 — Book III)

After Philo has prefaced with truth the things which he writes about these men, wonderful indeed, he deals with them.

First, concerning their name, as above.

Second, concerning the abandonment of possessions. Those who devote themselves to the institution of this life do so not from custom or because they have been asked, but because they have been seized by love of heavenly things, as though struck by divine frenzy and inspired, until they come to that contemplation which they most desire. Then, especially from desire for immortality and the blessed life, as though already dead to this mortal life, they leave their possessions to children or relatives, voluntarily yielding ownership to them, and also to companions and friends if relatives are lacking.

Third, concerning the abandonment of relatives and native soil. "Leaving behind," he says, "possessions and all enticements, they flee without any backward look: brothers, children, parents, wives; and they abandon numerous kinships, societies, friendships, and finally the very fatherlands in which they were born and raised, since custom has great force for enticing souls."

Fourth, concerning the places in general where they dwell. "They migrate

[margin: Chapter XVI begins Philo on the theoretic or contemplative Essenes: possessions, relatives, and places. Source page 306 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 282)

not into another city, like slaves who obtain sale to other masters, wretches who change servitude, not escape it. For every city, even one adorned with the best laws, is full of great tumult, which no follower of wisdom can endure. But they live outside the walls, in gardens and solitary country houses, loving solitude not from hatred of human beings, but to avoid meetings with the dissimilar, which they know harm good morals."

Fifth, do they live elsewhere outside Egypt? This kind is found in many regions of the world, deservedly, since both Greeks and barbarians have received a share of absolute probity; or, as the Eusebian interpreter renders Philo's words more openly in chapter 17, book 2: "It was fitting that both Greece and the barbarian people should participate in the perfect good."

Sixth, where in Egypt? It is especially frequent in Egypt, through its several districts, and particularly around Alexandria. From all places the best of the Therapeutae, as colonists to the homeland of this kind, are sent to a certain most suitable place, situated by Lake Mareotis, on a gently sloping hill. It is at once secure and praised for the tempering of the air. Neighboring country houses and villages provide security. The air is temperate because of the exhalations of the lake discharging into the sea and because breezes never cease to blow from the deep. The thicker exhalations are borne from the lake,

[margin: Their solitude outside cities; their presence in many regions; the Egyptian community near Lake Mareotis.]

(printed p. 283)

and when these are mixed, the most healthful temperament arises.

Seventh, concerning their dwellings. The dwellings of these immigrants are very frugal, prepared only against heat and cold. They are not contiguous, as in cities, for that does not please lovers of solitude; yet they are not far apart, because they love fellowship and can help one another against chance attacks of robbers.

Eighth, concerning their sacred little buildings. "In each of their dwellings," he says, "there is a sacred building called a *semneion* and a *monasterion*."

Ninth, what do they do in such a monastery? In it, separated and solitary from others, they devote themselves to the holy life. They bring in neither food nor drink, nor anything else for bodily use, but only the Law, the divine oracles of the Prophets, hymns, and certain other things useful for advancing piety and knowledge. Therefore they have continual remembrance of God, so that even in dreams nothing presents itself to them except images of divine beauties; and among them are those who, while dreaming, produce splendid sentences of sacred philosophy.

Tenth, how the daily day is passed. Twice each day they are accustomed to pray, in the morning and toward evening: when the sun rises, asking for a truly happy day and that their minds may be filled with heavenly light; when it sets, asking that the soul, wholly unloaded from the senses and from the weight of sensible things, may trace truth in its domestic council chamber. The middle

[margin: Dwellings, sacred buildings, reading, hymns, dreams, and daily prayer. Source page 308 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 284)

interval between morning and evening is entirely assigned to meditation. For, handling the sacred volumes, they apply themselves to the philosophy handed down from their ancestors, searching its allegories, since they believe that secret natures lie hidden under the open words and must be explained by plausible conjectures. They also have commentaries of the ancients, who, as founders of this sect, left many monuments about allegories of this sort, and they adapt themselves to imitation of these.

Therefore they not only contemplate, but also compose songs and hymns in praise of God, in various kinds of meters and songs, arranged with rhythms into a more august and religious form. For six days each philosophizes separately in those monasteries just described, not going outdoors, indeed not even looking out.

Eleventh, what are they accustomed to do on Sabbaths? On the seventh day they come together into a common assembly and sit according to the order of age in a fitting posture, keeping their hands under the cloak, the right between breast and beard, the left applied to the side. Then the oldest and most skilled in the doctrines of the sect proceeds into the middle and discourses with a face composed to gravity and a moderate voice, not without great prudence, unlike the orators or sophists of our age, displayers of eloquence, for whom refined phrases

[margin: Allegorical study, hymns, solitary six-day discipline, and Sabbath assembly. Source page 309 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 285)

and the diligent and accurate narration of these things are more dear. This narration does not settle only in the tips of the ears, but through hearing penetrates into the soul and adheres firmly there. All the rest listen in deepest silence, nodding only with eyes or head.

Twelfth, what is the form of the common *semneion*, and how are sacred women also present in it? The common *semneion* into which they gather every seventh day is enclosed by a double partition, with the gatherings of men and women separated. For women too listen at the same time, according to custom, provided that they follow the same institution. A middle wall rises from the ground three or four cubits, like a

breastwork, while the upper parts are open up to the roof. From this comes a double advantage: both that provision is made for the modesty of the female sex, and that the words of the teacher are heard easily, without any obstacles intercepting his voice.

Thirteenth, how great is their temperance and the severity of their fasts? After temperance has been laid down in the soul as a foundation, they build the other virtues upon it. No one takes food or drink before sunset, because they judge that the pursuit of wisdom belongs to light, but care for the body to darkness. Therefore they assign whole days to the one, but only a small part of night to the other. Some of them scarcely feel hunger every third day, being more intent on the discipline of knowledge.

[margin: Sabbath instruction, women's separated attendance, temperance, and fasting.]

(printed p. 286)

Nor are there lacking those who, having been richly received at the banquet of wisdom, which abundantly supplies its delights, last twice that time and scarcely taste necessary food on the sixth day, so accustomed by now that, like cicadas, they are said to live on air, as I suppose by songs making hunger light and easy.

Fourteenth, concerning the celebration of Sabbaths. They honor the seventh day as festive and sacred with outstanding reverence; on it, after care of the soul, they also refresh the body, as though relaxing a beast from continual labor.

Fifteenth, concerning the manner of food. In food they use simple bread. Salt takes the place of relish; those who are more delicate add hyssop as seasoning. They draw drink from streams, content to appease hunger and thirst, the mistresses added to mortals by nature, by enjoying things without any enticements, without which it is not possible to live. Therefore they eat so as not to hunger, and drink so as not to thirst, avoiding satiety as hostile alike to soul and body.

Sixteenth, concerning their clothing. Since there are also two kinds of covering, clothing and roof, I have already spoken about their houses: they are rough and temporary, made only for present use. In clothing the same simplicity appears, to ward off heat and cold: instead of skins, a thick tunic in winter, and in summer a sleeveless garment or linen undergarment. For in general

[margin: Fasting, Sabbath celebration, simple food, and clothing. Source page 311 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 287)

they practice moderation as the fountain of truth, just as they judge falsehood to have sprung from pride. From falsehood, indeed, flow the various kinds of evils; from truth, on the contrary, comes an abundance of all human and divine blessings.

Seventeenth, concerning their sacred banquets on certain feast days. Paying special regard to numbers, after seven weeks have passed they renew their assemblies. They honor not only the simple number seven, but also its multiplied power. For they know the week to be chaste and always virgin. That day is the eve of the greatest feast, falling into the most sacred number fifty and most pleasing to nature, since it consists from the power of the right-angled triangle, which is the beginning of the generation of all things.

Eighteenth, when they have assembled, dressed in white and joyful with the greatest gravity, at a signal given by one of the *ephemerutae* - for so they call ministers of this sort - before they recline, they stand decorously in one row, and, lifting hands and eyes to heaven, they pray that the banquet may be pleasing to God. They lift their eyes because they have learned to look upon heavenly things, and their hands because they are uncorrupted by gifts and unlawful gain.

Nineteenth, after the prayers have been completed, the elders recline, and then the others according to each one's dignity. For they do not reckon elders by years, but regard as children even those advanced in age if they have embraced this institution only late. Rather, they give the honor of old age

[margin: Sacred feasts, Pentecost eve, prayers before food, and order of reclining.]

(printed p. 288)

to those who from youth have exercised themselves in this most beautiful and divine part of contemplative philosophy.

Twentieth, women also are admitted to the table, most of them aged, yet virgins. Their chastity is not coerced, as among certain Greek priestesses; rather, they remain continent of their own will, through love of wisdom. In pursuit of that wisdom they have despised bodily pleasures throughout their whole life, desiring divine offspring rather than mortal. Souls dear to God alone give birth to such offspring from themselves, receiving as seed the intelligible rays of the Father, so that by contemplation they may be able to grasp the decrees of wisdom.

Twenty-first, the reclining at table is arranged so that the men hold the right side separately and the women the left separately. If anyone suspects that couches, though not costly, are at least somewhat soft for freeborn people devoted to philosophy, let him know that they are rough mats woven from cheap material, namely from native papyrus, placed slightly above the ground so that their height may support the elbows. For they now relax that Spartan harshness of discipline a little, approving always and everywhere a freeborn frugality and rejecting with all their strength the enticements of pleasure.

Twenty-second, in service they do not use slaves, since they judge slavery to be altogether at odds with nature. For nature made all people free; but greed, that despiser of her laws,

[margin: Women at the meal, seating order, frugal mats, and service without slaves.]

(printed p. 289)

introduced inequality, the fountain of evils, and imposed necessity on the weaker, so that they would do the commands of the more powerful. But at this sacred banquet no slave, as I have said, is present. Freeborn men serve, and they do whatever is needed of their own accord, not waiting for orders, but anticipating them with voluntary eagerness. Nor is that office delegated to just any freeborn people, but a selection is made from all the youth of this fellowship, according as each has displayed some excellent proof of character and virtue. Like true sons, they willingly and eagerly serve fathers and mothers, considering them common parents, and indeed nearer and more closely joined than the parents whom blood and nature have given; for to those who judge rightly nothing is more closely joined than virtue.

Twenty-third, they come forward to serve ungirded and with their tunics let down, so that every appearance of servitude may be absent from this banquet. I know that some will laugh when they hear these things, but only those who themselves do things worthy of lamentation and tears.

Twenty-fourth, wine is not provided on those days, but the clearest water: cold for the rest, but warm for those among the elders who require a softer and more convenient diet. The table is clean from bloody dishes. Bread is set before them as food; salt as relish; and sometimes hyssop is prepared as seasoning for those who are more delicate. For just as right reason prescribes to priests that they sacrifice sober

[margin: Freeborn attendants, serving dress, water instead of wine, and a bloodless table.]

(printed p. 290)

and abstinent, so it prescribes to these men that they live their whole life in the same way. For they regard wine as a poison that brings madness. They say that rich foods stir up desire, a beast that cannot be satisfied. These are the preliminaries of the banquet.

Twenty-fifth, someone may ask: what then happens after the guests have reclined in their proper order and the attendants, duly prepared, have stood ready for service? Does no drinking party follow? On the contrary, there follows a silence greater than before, so that no one is allowed even to mutter to anyone else or to

breathe too loudly. Someone proposes a question from the sacred writings, or else solves one proposed by another, without concern for display in the solution. For he does not hunt for praise of cleverness or eloquence. He aims at this alone: to perceive the matter more carefully, and then, when it has been perceived, not to begrudge it to those who are less perceptive, yet burn with nearly equal desire to learn. And so he dwells upon the teaching, repeatedly pressing and impressing noble judgments upon their minds, using various repetitions. Otherwise, when someone proceeds skillfully and continues many things in one breath, the slower mind of his hearers cannot follow the interpretation; it is left behind and does not sufficiently grasp what it has heard. But all the hearers, intent upon the one speaker and remaining in one and the same posture, listen, and indicate by nod and expression that they understand;

[margin: Spiritual banquet: silence, Scripture questions, teaching, repetition, and attentive listening.]

(printed p. 291)

that they approve, by cheerfulness and expanded brows; and at times that they doubt and hesitate, by gently moving the head and the tip of the right finger. Nor do the younger men who stand by those reclining listen with less attention.

Twenty-sixth, their expositions of the sacred writings consist in allegories. For these men think that the whole law has the likeness of a living creature: the speech itself and the sequence of words correspond to the body, while the more hidden meanings concealed under the veil of words correspond to the soul. In these meanings the rational soul splendidly contemplates the inward things, as though seeing in the mirror of words the wondrous beauty of the thoughts, and unfolds them from the coverings of figures. Thus it brings the deeper understanding into the light for those who, from a slight hint, can gather obscure things from evident ones.

Twenty-seventh, when the president seems, by treating the matter well, to have satisfied the desire of his hearers, applause is openly given by all, since they rejoice together over what had previously been obscure but is now seen to have been explained. Then he rises and is the first to sing a hymn in praise of God, either one newly composed by himself or one taken from some ancient poets. For the poets left them meters and songs of trimeters, processional songs, hymns, paraspondea, parabomia,

[margin: Allegorical interpretation, applause after teaching, and kinds of sacred song.]

(printed p. 292)

stasima, choral songs, strophes, and polystrophes, all carefully perfected. The rest then imitate the president in a fitting order, while all listen intently and quietly except at the end of the hymn and its final clause. Then all together raise their voice, without distinction of sex.

Twenty-eighth, when the hymns of the several persons have been completed, the younger men carry away the table just mentioned, on which that most sacred food, leavened bread with salt and hyssop, is duly placed out of reverence for the sacred table dedicated in the vestibule of the temple. For on that table too loaves with salt are customarily set forth, without any other seasoning; but there the loaves are unleavened, and the salt has no mixture. For it was fitting that the simplest and purest things be assigned to the best part of the holy place as the reward of liturgy or ministry, and that others imitate similar things, yet abstain from those loaves, so that the better persons might have a certain prerogative.

Twenty-ninth, the supper is followed by a sacred all-night vigil with these rites. When all have risen, two choirs are formed in the middle of the dining room, one of men and one of women. For each a leader and director is chosen, the most excellent in honor and skill in singing. Then they sing hymns composed in praise of God, in various kinds of meters and songs, now partly sounding together,

[margin: Final refrains, removal of the table, temple-table symbolism, and the all-night vigil.]

(printed p. 293)

now partly in antiphonal or alternate harmonies, accompanying the song with a fitting movement of the hands, dancing, and being seized by divine inspiration. Then they perform processional songs, stasima, strophes as occasion and use require, and antistrophes. Then, after each choir has separately filled itself with these delights, as though they had drunk unmixed wine of divine love in Bacchic celebrations, they are mingled, and from two choirs one is made. This imitates the ancient institution once held on the shore of the Red Sea because of the wondrous miracles done there. For at God's command the sea brought salvation to some and utter destruction to others.

Thirtieth, after this most honorable festal gathering has been prolonged until morning, they are not weighed down by drunkenness, nor do they nod with sleep; rather, they are more alert than when they came to the banquet. Turning face and whole body toward dawn, as soon as they see the rising sun, they pray for a happy day, truth, and keen vision of the mind for themselves. When the prayers have been completed, each withdraws to his own *semneion* and to the business and cultivation of the customary philosophy.

Thirty-first, finally Philo concludes in this way: thus far concerning the Therapeutae, who have embraced contemplation of nature and live wholly in this and in the soul alone, citizens of heaven and the world, most truly commended to the Father and Creator of things because of their virtue. That virtue has won his friendship for them, the reward most proper to goodness; and when this is set before them, it is better than all prosperity of fortune and reaches to the very summit and highest peak of happiness.

[margin: Antiphonal vigil, Red Sea imitation, morning prayers, and Philo's conclusion on the Therapeutae.]

(printed p. 294)

Chapter XVII. Whether the Essenes were Christians

(printed p. 294 — Book III)

Nearly all the innovators deny that they were Christians, but the chief deniers are the Magdeburg Centuriators, century 1, book 2, chapter 3; Junius against Bellarmine, book 2, *On Monks*, chapter 5; and Joseph Scaliger in the second edition of *On the Correction of Times*, twice, first in the prolegomena and then in book 6. Those, however, who adhere to the judgments of the ancients, as is fairer, more readily say that they were Christians: Matthew Galenus in his book *On the Origin of Monasticism*, Baronius in volume 1, Bellarmine in the cited place, and Gretser in the first and second apologies for the life of our blessed father Ignatius.

In order that the truth of this very obscure question may shine out more clearly and lucidly, the torch of a threefold distinction must be applied. First, the Essenes are either, as has been said thus far, practical or theoretic. Next, they are considered either before the sacred preaching of Christ the Lord and the Apostles or after it. Third and finally, the same Essenes are viewed according to the images set forth earlier either by Philo or by Josephus. I therefore state three conclusions.

First, the practical Essenes, before the preaching of Christ the Lord

[margin: Chapter XVII begins; Serarius lists opponents and supporters, then introduces a threefold distinction.]

(printed p. 295)

and the holy Apostles, were, as was proved above; and yet, both as they are described by Philo and as they are described by Josephus, they were not Christians. The same could also be said of the theoretic Essenes, depicted by Philo alone, if any such had existed then. This is clear from the very force of the words, provided that the name "Christian" is taken in its proper and customary sense, not in that sense in which all who ever had true faith in God are sometimes called Christians, as Eusebius discusses in book 1 of the *History*, chapter 4. For before Christ the Savior and the Apostles announced the sacred Gospel to the peoples, there was neither the discipline nor the name of Christians.

Second, of the practical Essenes, who, as has already been established, are the same in Josephus and Philo, very many after the preaching of Christ the Lord and the Apostles did indeed embrace the saving faith of Christ the Lord, but not all. The first part seems to me most strongly confirmed on the very day of Pentecost in Acts 2. The latter part is proved as follows. First, Philastrius, Nilus, and Suidas, cited above on another occasion, testify to it. Next, Josephus in book 2 of the *Jewish War*, chapter 12, says that in the Jewish war against the Romans many of the Essenes were tortured with the most exquisite punishments, as was cited above in number 48. For in that war, which was the divine penalty for Christ the Lord wickedly slain by the Jews, Christians neither gave any assistance

[margin: Conclusion I completed; conclusion II begins on practical Essenes after Christian preaching.]

(printed p. 296)

nor were they entangled in its calamities and massacres. Saint Epiphanius testifies to this in heresies 29 and 30, and Eusebius in book 3 of the *History*, chapter 5, when he reports that, warned by an oracle of Christ the Lord himself, they migrated from Judea elsewhere, especially to Pella. Yet before that war it is clear from Philo, who lived before it, that the Essenes had been harassed and afflicted by others.

Third, Eusebius himself, from whom almost the beginning of this whole dispute comes, always refers those practical Essenes back to the Jews. In the cited eighth book of the *Evangelical Preparation*, while discussing the excellence and virtue of the Mosaic law and people, he introduces those Essenes as an example and testimony, and clearly divides the whole nation of the Jews into two parts: one that lived according to the common and ordinary meaning received from the laws, and another that pursued the higher philosophy and the contemplation of the things signified in the laws. Of this latter part he adds that it is the race of Jewish philosophers. He also adds that their manner of life was held in the highest admiration by very many outsiders; and that among native Jewish writers, besides others, the two easily foremost of all, Josephus and Philo, rescued the glory of those Essenes from oblivion.

Fourth, when the same Eusebius wishes to bring forth from Philo's *Apology* the passages I have already promised above,

[margin: Christians' flight to Pella; Eusebius treats practical Essenes as Jewish philosophers.]

(printed p. 297)

he himself gives this heading: concerning the life of virtue among the ancient philosophers of the Jews. Here not only the phrase "among the Jews" is to be noted, but also "anciently." When he is about to produce another testimony from the other book, *On the Freedom of the Good Man*, he notes that Philo is still speaking of the same people of whom he had spoken in the previous heading. And in that book Eusebius cites no praise at all of the theoretic Essenes.

Third, the theoretic Essenes seem all to have been Christians. This is asserted, first, by the most ancient and best authors: Eusebius in book 2 of the *History*, chapters 15, 16, and 17, and in the letter to Marinus preserved by Cedrenus; Saint Epiphanius, heresy 29; Saint Jerome in *On Ecclesiastical Writers*, twice, under Saint Mark and under Philo; Cassian, book 2 of the *History*, chapter 5; Sozomen, book 1, chapter 12; the Venerable Bede in the preface to Saint Mark; and Nicephorus, book 2, chapter 15.

Second, that there were any Essenes of this sort before the evangelizing of Christ the Lord is neither testified nor even hinted in any way by Philo or Josephus, although these theoretic Essenes had not a few things in common with the practical Essenes, as is clear from the institutions of both.

Third, when Josephus treats the practical Essenes, he carefully notes in book 2, chapter 12, that they were Jews by race. Was it not enough to have said that there were among the Jews three kinds of philosophers, Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes? Or if that was not enough, why did he not likewise say that the Pharisees and Sadducees were Jews by

[margin: Conclusion III begins: Serarius argues the theoretic Essenes were Christians.]

(printed p. 298)

race? Why did he mark this especially concerning the Essenes, whose description he had begun, unless to distinguish them from the theoretic Essenes, very many of whom were not Jews by race?

Fourth, since this same kind of theoretic Essenes was so excellent, so distinguished, so heavenly and blessed, as we learned from Philo's conclusion set forth above, and since it could have won the highest praise for the Jewish people among all, and since Josephus himself, as we saw above, so often gladly ran into, or rather ran forward to, mention and praise of the Essenes, why did he never say even a word about these people? Why did he not at least touch upon this division of the Essenes, that some were practical and others theoretic? For it is utterly false when Junius writes, in the chapter indicated above, number 29, that Josephus distinguishes those two kinds of Essenes as those who live in community and those who live as solitaries. Josephus nowhere did this. He divides only those whose discipline he explains, and who, as was shown above, were purely communal, into celibates and married men, not into cenobites and solitaries.

Fifth, Philo himself, when in the book *On the Freedom of the Good Man* he said that, just as among the Persians there were Magi and among the Indians Gymnosophists, so among the Jews there were Essenes flourishing with an extraordinary zeal for every virtue, why did he mention only the practical Essenes? Why did he praise only their discipline? Did not the description, or at least the mention, of the theoretic Essenes belong to the comparison with the wise or eminent men of other nations

[margin: Josephus's silence about theoretic Essenes; correction of Junius on Josephus's categories.]

(printed p. 299)

and to the whole argument of that book on the true freedom of the good man? For if someone says that Philo kept silent about them there because he wished to devote another whole book to their praises, that person will seem to say something, but in fact will have said nothing to the point. For when good authors decide to divide two kinds of a single matter, both otherwise belonging to the same subject, and to explain only one in one place and the other in another, they are accustomed to mention this in the earlier place, and either to state or at least to indicate why they wish to separate those kinds. Otherwise that separation would be extremely awkward, and the author who did otherwise would be considered little skilled in order, good writing, and method.

But Philo, whom we know was praised in an ancient encomium as a second Plato because of his learning and eloquence, neither depicts in words nor sketches with even one word in the book *On the Freedom of the Good Man* the theoretic Essenes, who were the freest of all. Nor does he indicate by a single syllable that he has decided to depict or outline them in some other place and book. Instead, he describes only the practical Essenes and is content with the praise of those who lived a social life. This is plainly because, when he wrote that book *On Freedom*, he did not yet know those theoretic and solitary men,

[margin: Serarius argues Philo would have named the theoretic Essenes in *On Freedom* if he had known them.]

(printed p. 300)

much less was he thinking of sounding out their praises on full pipes. But afterward, when he came to know them and admired and loved their virtue, he wished to devote an entire book to them. And because he had already discussed the Essenes in that book *On Freedom*, and now wished to discuss others beyond the opinion he had held in that earlier writing, he did what method advised a prudent and learned man to do: at the beginning of the later book, he now divided the race of the Essaeans into two parts, namely practical and theoretic, and said that he had discussed the former in the book he had written earlier, while in this later book *On the Contemplative Life* he would speak about the latter. Had he not done this, there would have been no connection of this later book with the earlier, nor any excuse for the writer himself as to why, contrary to every principle of method, he had scattered and torn apart parts so closely joined and so suitable to the same

subject, unless he wished to bring forward that other very just excuse which I shall mention below: namely, that he had spoken before about Jews, but now was approaching Christian Essenes previously unknown to him.

Sixth, this too is by no means to be despised: in the book in which the same Philo contained his apology on behalf of the Jews, whether he wrote it before he knew the theoretic Essaeans or afterward - for since that book is not extant, I cannot determine this from elsewhere - he was content with praising only those Essaeans who had devoted themselves more to action than to contemplation,

[margin: Philo's later book implies a new acquaintance with the theoretic Essenes.]

(printed p. 301)

because the theoretic Essenes were no longer Jews by religion, nor, with respect to a great part of them, by race.

Seventh, the practical Essenes are placed by both Josephus and Philo in Syria, Palestine, and Judea, and nowhere else; Pliny and Solinus hold the same view, as all these things have been shown above. Concerning the theoretic Essenes, however, Philo says the opposite: this kind of Essaeans exists in many regions of the world. I mean this kind of theoretic Essaeans, not the other kind, the practical, which was circumscribed by the boundaries of Syria and Judea alone, and diffused itself into other shores in no way at all except perhaps by fame and by some imitation among certain Gentiles, of whom something was said under Zamolxis.

But that kind of theoretic Essenes, when the most sacred and most auspicious Gospel of Christ the Lord began to be spread far and wide, and the sound of the Apostles began to go out into all the earth, at the same time immediately went out spread far and wide. I mean that the Essaeian solitaries and cultivators of contemplation were at once carried and expanded into very many coasts and nations. They existed in Judea, Palestine, and Syria, where the first Christian churches were; in Egypt, and indeed, as Philo says, through all the several parts and districts which, as Strabo explains in book 17, were formerly called *nomoi*;

[margin: Geographic contrast: practical Essenes local, theoretic Essenes widespread with the Gospel.]

(printed p. 302)

they existed also in Greece, and they penetrated even barbarian nations. For Philo adds that it was fitting for the perfect good to be shared both by Greece and by the barbarian region itself. And not only Eusebius but also Saint Jerome noted this argument in his catalogue when he says of Philo: "he records that they existed not only there," that is, in Egypt near Alexandria, "but also in many provinces."

Eighth, the number of practical Essenes is almost fixed by both Philo and Josephus, since it was near four thousand. But no number of the theoretic Essenes is reckoned, nor is a number only a little greater than four thousand implied, since there were so many in all the parts of Egypt, and especially around Alexandria, and likewise in other parts of the world, among Greeks and barbarians, as has just been said.

Ninth, Philo himself indicates that this discipline of those Essaeans arose in his own time, when, according to Eusebius in book 2 of the *History*, chapter 17, he says: "this religion, or this mode of divine worship, began to contemplate with special excellence" that hidden meaning of the divine law. If that sect of those Essaeans had been ancient and already common among the Jews, how would he now say that it "began to contemplate," and not rather "is accustomed to contemplate," or certainly simply "contemplates"?

[margin: Jerome on many provinces; numbers of practical versus theoretic Essenes; Philo's "began" argument.]

(printed p. 303)

But the name by which Philo, in the cited words, calls the sect of those same Essenes must also be observed: namely, "religion." For that name almost signifies, if I may speak so, the highest kinds of worshipping the divine power, not any particular modes and rites within some one kind. For the phrase is used of the Israelite

religion in Acts 26:5, and of the Christian religion; or, as it is called by Eusebius in book 2, chapter 17, the religion according to the Gospel. The three sects of the Jews themselves, though they are called by many names by Josephus and others, are nevertheless never, so far as I can sufficiently remember, called three religions.

From this it is clear how bold Junius is in falsehood. When Bellarmine had said that Philo was speaking of a discipline that had arisen in his own time, Junius says in the place cited, number 31, that this cannot be confirmed from Philo's words by even the smallest point. Is that word "began" a small point, and not rather a lofty and illustrious column? "But," he says, "in the earlier book he expressly affirmed the antiquity of the Essene sect, even by comparison with other philosophers." Junius said this correctly about antiquity against Drusius, who does not want the Jewish Essenes to be ancient; but not against the new light of the Christian Essenes, which in Philo's times began to pour out its first rays in Egypt and other regions of the world. For in Philo's earlier book the discussion concerns practical Essenes, not theoretic Essenes, as has been repeated

[margin: Serarius stresses Philo's word for "religion" and the significance of "began."]

(printed p. 304)

more than once thus far. I should note, however, that at the beginning of this ninth argument I deliberately said that the cited words of Philo are read in Eusebius. For in the Paris Greek copy of Philo they are read almost in the way the interpreter translated above: that in the unseen mind the rational soul began to contemplate its own proper things with special excellence. In those words, indeed, the word "religion" itself is not present; yet that other principal word, "began," remains.

Tenth, the same Philo said earlier that the sacred buildings of the practical Essenes were called synagogues, which are certainly proper to the Jews, as is clear from the Gospels. But to the theoretic Essenes, whom with the ancients I assert to have been Christians, he never attributes synagogues, but only *semnea*, holy places full of piety and gravity, as we saw earlier in its proper place.

Eleventh, the very name of these persons flowed down to later ages from the first beginnings of the Christian Church. Thus in the Areopagite, chapter 6 of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, and in the letter he writes to Gaius the Therapeuta, the old interpreter renders the ascetic life in Trullan Canon 43 as the therapeutic life. So too the name of the solitaries is the name of monks, and monasteries still survive, despite all Lutherans and Calvinists.

Twelfth, their institutions also flowed down to later generations. Witness the renunciation of all property once customary among Christians, the fellowship of common life,

[margin: Synagogues versus semnea; therapeutic and monastic vocabulary; later Christian practices.]

(printed p. 305)

as in Acts 2 and 4, the sacred banquets which were once also called agapae, and vigils not undertaken because of the suddenness of some danger, like those I discussed on Judith 6:6, but fixed and ordinary vigils, of which there remains among us a trace in the eves of certain saints' days, which we call Vigils. What of those fasts in Lent and all the severity before Easter? What of the hymns and their modulation, and what Eusebius, taking it from Philo himself, calls the final refrains? Others add perpetual chastity, the omission of the Jewish temple and of bloody sacrifices, prayers directed toward the east, and other similar things. These I pass over because of other matters still to be discussed, and I turn to those things which either are accustomed to be objected, or can be objected, against that opinion.

Chapter XVIII. A Resolution of the Arguments by Which the Essenes Seem to Be Driven from the Number of Christians

(printed p. 305 — Book III)

Those things by which opponents weaken what has been confirmed above appear weighty. In this question about the Christianity of the Essenes, eight especially important arguments arise which suggest that they were not Christians.

The first is this: in Philo's narration about the theoretic Essenes there is no mention of Christ the Lord and Savior, none of the Gospel,

[margin: Christian continuities claimed; Chapter XVIII begins with eight objections.]

(printed p. 306)

nor of Christian matters of that kind. I answer that Philo, since he was a man and had very much of human weakness, had also been somewhat captivated by the conversations of Saint Peter, into whose presence he came at Rome in the time of Claudius, as Eusebius reports in book 2 of the *History*, chapter 16, and whose friendship, as Saint Jerome says in his catalogue, he had enjoyed. He certainly admired and followed with favorable goodwill the wondrous virtue of those Essenes who were Christians.

Yet, since he was a Jew and had resolved also to die in the Judaism in which he had been born, or at least in that unbelief, because he was a man of such authority among the Jews that he did not wish to withdraw openly, he deliberately wished to wrap Christ the Lord, his Gospel, the sacraments, and similar matters in silence. He therefore wrote in such a way that, since he called them neither Christians nor Jews, because of the similarity of the name and of certain rites, which are treated in the second objection, Jews would think them Jews; because of all the other things, Christians would recognize them as Christians; and because of both, Gentiles would judge them to be either. If they judged them Christians, he wished that granted to truth and to his love for these people. If they judged them Jews, he desired that the opinion of the Gentiles, who often did not distinguish Jews from Christians, should not be diminished, and he greatly desired the whole matter to be conceded to the glory of his own nation. Saint Jerome

[margin: Serarius's answer: Philo admired Christians but concealed explicit Christian language.]

(printed p. 307)

says in *On Ecclesiastical Writers*, under Saint Mark: "Philo, most eloquent among the Jews, seeing at Alexandria the first Church still Judaizing, wrote a book about their way of life as though in praise of his own nation."

If, however, he had named the sacred mysteries of Christ the Lord and of our faith, he would indeed have done what ought to have been done and the duty of a good man; but he would have condemned his own obstinacy in unbelief, and would have placed Christian philosophers before the philosophers of his own people, whom he wished to be considered the best and most excellent of all. Neither pleased him; neither did self-love and the love of empty praise permit.

But he promises truth at the beginning of the book. He does indeed promise it, yet in such a way that he says he will add nothing to the praises of those about whom he writes, not that he will subtract nothing. This subtraction, however, he covers with an honorable excuse: that their virtue was greater than all eloquence. But Eusebius, book 2 of the *History*, chapter 15, says that the whole discipline of those Essaeans was set out. The word "whole" must be taken conveniently as referring to the principal heads of their morals, not to their faith or every single institution.

And since some at times suspect that Philo became a Christian, as they do Seneca, about whom I have spoken elsewhere in my Paul, I shall add from the place where Saint Augustine praised him earlier. Augustine says that Philo "tried to interpret some things, not for understanding Christ, in whom

[margin: Jerome on Philo; Philo's promised truth; Augustine invoked against making Philo Christian.]

(printed p. 308)

he did not believe, but so that from this it might appear all the more how much difference there is between referring all things to Christ, for whose sake they were truly spoken, and pursuing any conjectures whatever with any keenness of mind apart from him." And afterward: "To recall something from the same Philo: when he wished the ark of the flood to be understood as constructed according to the pattern of the human body, he went through all its parts as though member by member. Since he consulted with great subtlety even the rules of numbers, all things fittingly occurred to him which did nothing to hinder the understanding of Christ, because in a human body that Savior of the human race also appeared; yet they did not compel that understanding, because it is a human body and of other human beings too. But when he came to the door which was made in the side of the ark, every conjecture of human ingenuity failed. Yet in order to say something, he dared to believe, to say, and to write that the lower parts of the body, through which urine and dung are discharged, were signified by that door. It is no wonder that, not finding the door, he erred in this way. But if he had passed over to Christ, the veil removed, he would have found the sacraments of the Church flowing from the side of that man; for since it was foretold, 'they shall be two in one flesh,' therefore in the ark certain things are referred to Christ and certain things to the Church, which whole is Christ. So also in the other interpretations of figures, throughout the whole text of divine Scripture one may consider and compare the senses of those who understand Christ there with those of people who try to twist them away from Christ to anything else at all."

[margin: Augustine's comparison of Philo's allegory with Christian interpretation.]

(printed p. 309)

Thus far Saint Augustine.

The second argument: these men observed Jewish ceremonies, namely Sabbaths and Sabbaths of Sabbaths, that is, Pentecosts or fiftieth days. I answer that not a few of the earliest Christians, especially those who came to the faith from the Jews, were accustomed still to retain some Jewish ceremonies. Thus Saint Paul circumcised Timothy in Acts 16:3. He himself took the vow of the Nazaraeans and, on its account, wore his hair uncut, which at the end of that temporary vow he cut in Cenchreae, Acts 18:18. Thus Saint James, prince of the Christian Essaeans, says to Saint Paul himself in Acts 21:20: "You see, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews who have believed, and they are all zealous for the law. Therefore do this which we tell you. We have four men who have a vow upon themselves. Taking these, sanctify yourself with them and spend on them, so that they may shave their heads." And an Apostle obeyed an Apostle. For in verse 26, "Paul, taking the men, on the next day purified with them and entered the temple, announcing the completion of the days of purification until an offering should be made for each one of them."

And Saint Jerome had just said the same, that the Alexandrian Church seen by Philo was Judaizing. Eusebius, in the cited book, chapter 16, says that those Essenes preserved still most of the customs of the ancients in a more Jewish manner. Yet someone might reasonably suspect that Philo, in Jewish language, described Christian

[margin: Second objection: Jewish ceremonies; answer from early Jewish-Christian practice.]

(printed p. 310)

Sabbaths, that is, Lord's days, and the forty-day fast, which many once began from Quinquagesima, and Christian vigils, and sacred Pentecost. Eusebius indicates this in chapter 17, when he refers Philo's fasts and Pentecost to those exercises which, he says, we customarily complete in fastings, all-night vigils, and attentions to divine words on the feast of the Savior's Passion. In this way all of Junius's claims about the superstitions of the Essenes vanish, in the place indicated at number 32, as do Scaliger's claims about Sabbaths in the prolegomena to *On the Correction of Times* and about baptisms in book 6.

There is, however, another answer about these matters. Philo never ascribes daily washing to the theoretic Essenes, much less does Josephus, who, as I said above, treated only the practical Essenes. And indeed if

each of them had attributed it to both, that daily baptism should not therefore be taken in the manner in which it was practiced by those heretics who were called Hemerobaptists from it, as is clear from Saint Epiphanius, book 1, heresy 17, and in the letter to Acacius and Paul, but in the manner in which it was used by the Jews in daily and votive purifications, and by Saint Paul in Acts 21:26.

From this Junius also says ineptly and falsely in number 36 that those contemplative Essenes were inhabitants around Lake Mareotis for this reason, that they might have convenience for their washings, with Philo and Epiphanius as authorities. But neither gives the reason why they lived by that lake; rather, this reason is completely

[margin: Sabbaths as Lord's days; fasts, vigils, Pentecost, and washing/baptism objections.]

(printed p. 311)

omitted. We have heard other reasons from Philo himself earlier, especially since, as I said, he attributes no such washings to them. Scaliger is most inept when he says that, because they were daily bathers, they were the authors of new baptism for the Donatists.

The third argument: Philo himself, at the beginning of the book *On the Contemplative Life*, says that the theoretic Essenes were Jews. Scaliger in the prolegomena and Junius in number 28 indeed assert that he says this. Scaliger says: "That they were not Christians, but merely Essenes, Philo shows at once at the beginning of the book." Junius, however, in order not simply to affirm a falsehood as Scaliger does, argues in this way: Philo had treated Jewish Essenes in the earlier book; therefore the other kind of Essaeans, which Philo says at the beginning of the later book that he is going to set forth, is Jewish. But the consequence is denied, and this whole matter has been explained above.

The fourth argument: there are some things in Philo which present a greater antiquity for those Essaeans than allows their beginning to be derived from Christ the Lord or from the evangelizing of the Apostles. For first, they are said to pursue their ancestral philosophy. What ancestral and inherited philosophy is there except the Jewish? Second, they always have among themselves writings of ancient men, the founders of the sect, who left many monuments of the ideas contained in allegories. Who are those ancients whose commentaries are among them, unless Jews and Essenes of earlier ages? Eusebius, in book 2 of the *History*, chapter 17, thinks they are the Apostles,

[margin: Third and fourth objections: Jewish identity and apparent antiquity.]

(printed p. 312)

Evangelists, and Prophets. For he says that allegorical explanations of this sort were made by them, such as we see published by Saint Paul in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in certain other writings. But two things stand in the way. One is that the Apostles and Evangelists were not ancients in the age of Philo, who spoke with Saint Peter and saw Saint Mark, as was said above. The other is that those who wrote those commentaries are called not only ancients, but also leaders and founders of this sect, and authors of many monuments. Thus, if by "ancients" we wish to understand the Prophets, we must confess that those Essenes existed in the prophetic ages; but if we understand the Apostles and Evangelists, we must maintain that very many works were composed by them through allegories. Where, then, are these works? Who has read, seen, or heard of anything of this kind?

Third, among these Essaeans women of the same sect are said to have been therapeutic women, most of them aged virgins. But how could there have been virgins so old in Philo's time if they had not taken up the purpose of virginity before the saving Passion of Christ the Lord? For from that Passion to the first year of the emperor Claudius there is not even a full decade. Add now as many years as you wish while Philo later wrote that book, and remember that, as I said above and as Baronius says in volume 1, Philo was, if not earlier than the most blessed birth of Christ the Lord, certainly not much

[margin: *Objections from ancient commentaries and aged virgins.*]

(printed p. 313)

later than it. How, then, were those virgins aged? If this institution of virginity began before the Passion of Christ the Lord, then this kind of Essenes already existed before.

I answer the first point: the ancestral philosophy is the Jewish philosophy, namely the one contained in Moses and the Prophets, whose chief head the Lord explained to the disciples on the road to Emmaus in Luke 24. To the second: those ancient commentaries are the writings of ancient Essenes who, although they were practical Essenes, can in some sense be called founders or authors of the theoretic Essenes. For Josephus shows that books of this sort existed also among those practical Essenes. And if Elijah and Elisha are rightly sometimes called founders of our monks, as we recently heard from Saint Jerome, why can the old Essenes not be called leaders of those later ones? Hence Saint Jerome, when describing cenobites to Eustochium, says: "Such persons Philo, imitator of the Platonic style, reports; such persons Josephus, the Greek Livy, reports in the history of the second Jewish captivity." The beginnings of all things are imperfect. Christ the Savior brought perfection, and the holy Apostles expressed it in life and word. Yet by "founders" one could also understand their chief men, presidents, or overseers.

To the third: these aged virgins seem to have belonged to the number of those who, either by the old institution of the practical Essenes or by some other pious, perhaps even civil, plan,

[margin: *Serarius's answer: Jewish Scripture, older practical Essene writings, and delayed marriage.*]

(printed p. 314)

had postponed marriage; afterward, when they heard the commendation of sacred virginity which Christ the Lord chiefly instituted and the Apostles propagated, they resolved to preserve perpetual celibacy.

The fifth argument: Saint Jerome, in the letter to Eustochium, as he was cited a little earlier, does not distinguish the Essenes of Philo from those of Josephus. I answer that he speaks generally. It has already been said above that some Philonian Essenes are the same as the Josephian. Further, Saint Jerome says nothing else than that the Essenes whom each writer expressed in his style are similar to our cenobites, not that they are altogether the same.

The sixth argument: the theoretic Essaeans think that domination is contrary to nature and not to be endured. But this doctrine is false, since all power is from God, Romans 13. I answer that not every domination is repudiated by them, but that old and most bitter domination among the Gentiles, which raged unworthily and, so to speak, altogether tyrannically against the labor and life of slaves. This can be understood from the words cited earlier and from the book *Every Good Man Is Free*, from the book against Flaccus, and from the book *On the Embassy to Gaius*. "He who had rejected all clemency from his soul," he says, "and despised all laws, since he demanded that his own lust be taken as law, was abolishing whatever laws existed anywhere,

[margin: *Fifth and sixth objections: Jerome's wording and domination/slavery.*]

(printed p. 315)

as though they were superfluous. Among our people, however, they were considered not only among slaves but even among the lowest slaves, having obtained the Lord in place of a prince." One who exercises oppressive and bitter domination of this kind is described in 1 Peter 5 as lording it over others, and in Jeremiah 7 and 22 as oppressing them.

The seventh argument: it seems possible to prove that the practical Essenes about whom Josephus speaks and the theoretic Essenes about whom Philo speaks were the same. First, both turn themselves in prayer toward the rising sun. Moreover, both abstained from sacrifices and for that reason were forbidden entrance to the temple. In addition, both cultivated perpetual chastity, with the exception of that one kind of practical Essenes discussed above.

I answer first that it can be granted that these things were common to both. In this way a clear explanation of that prayer toward the sun would be obtained from Philo, since at the beginning he teaches that the sun and other creatures are adored by the impious, not by these holy persons, and again at the end of the book he transmits the manner of their turning themselves toward that star. There would also be, in the practical Essenes, a kind of testimony concerning the carnal sacrifices of the old law: namely, that they were not of such importance that they necessarily had to be undertaken by all, and that spiritual sacrifices were much more excellent than they. This is the point of that question about the greatest of the commandments proposed to Christ the Lord by the Scribes and Pharisees in Matthew 22:36 and Mark 12:28, where Christ himself

[margin: Seventh objection begins: shared eastward prayer, sacrifice, and chastity.]

(printed p. 316)

approves the statement of the scribe who had questioned him, when he says in verse 33 that love of God and neighbor "is greater than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices." Jesus our Lord and Savior strongly approves and praises that approval, for in verse 34, "seeing that he had answered wisely, he said to him: You are not far from the kingdom of God." The same applies to the passage from Hosea 6:6: "I desire mercy and not sacrifice," cited in Matthew 9:13 and 12:7.

Josephus also seems to have touched this same cause when he says that they did not make sacrifices, not because of a variety of purifications but because of the excellence of sanctifications, that is, of spiritual sacrifices. For Josephus likes to express some excellence by words related to this term. Therefore the old interpreter translated this passage of Josephus: "They do not perform sacred rites in the temple because they use holier ceremonies." From this it is likely that the Pythagorean doctrine about gentle and bloodless victims arose, since Josephus earlier showed that the Pythagoreans were similar to the Essenes. Saint Ambrose must also be joined here, in his sixth letter, when he says: "We find a Pythagorean command proclaimed in the writings of some, by which he forbade his disciples to enter the common and customary road with the people. For since he derived his origin from the Jewish people, as most think, he also derived the precepts of his teaching from their discipline;

[margin: Spiritual sacrifices, Josephus on holier ceremonies, and Pythagorean parallels.]

(printed p. 317)

therefore he was deservedly considered great among the philosophers, scarcely finding an equal, as they say." Thus Saint Ambrose, who also adds that Pythagoras read the sacred Scriptures.

But lest the Essenes seem to despise God's temple or other sacrifices, they sent gifts or offerings to the temple itself, as Josephus says. If you ask why, then, they were excluded from the temple, as Josephus also reports there, this is more obscure to me than that I can state the cause with certainty. I suspect, however, that it happened because, although they did not despise it, they nevertheless seemed to despise it. Hence most of the wiser people both offered the customary sacrifices in the temple and did not omit the spiritual ones, as the Blessed Virgin did in Luke 2. From this there would finally be a splendid praise of perpetual chastity among the Israelites from antiquity, which seems also to borrow some proof from the celibacy of the Pythagoreans among the Getae and Dacians, about which there is a discussion in Strabo, book 7.

I answer second: from what has been said, the first and third points seem common to both kinds of Essenes; the second, however, pertains only to those practical Essenes who were in Judea. For Philo has related nothing about these sacrifices and the Jerusalem temple in connection with the theoretic Essenes.

The eighth and last argument is that, in the beginning of Philo's book *On Virtues*, or *On the Embassy to Gaius*, the whole nation of the Jews or Israelites is called the suppliant people.

[margin: Temple offerings, possible exclusion, chastity, and the final objection from Philo's title.]

(printed p. 318)

But the book in which the theoretic Essenes are treated is entitled not only *On the Contemplative Life*, but also *On Suppliants*. I answer first that this author freely ascribes a pious and honorable name to the Jewish nation, which he wanted to be most honored, for the reason indicated in the solution of the first argument. It can also be that in that book he calls the Jews suppliants because they had become suppliants to the emperor Gaius.

Chapter XIX. On Certain Other Little Questions Concerning the Essenes

(printed p. 318 — Book III)

Some further little questions can still be raised about the Christian Essenes.

The first: since the practical Essenes were earlier than the theoretic Essenes, and the latter were Christians while the former were Jews, why was the old name of the Essenes communicated to these latter? I answer: because very many from the practical Essenes became Christians and theoretic Essenes, as Eusebius, book 2 of the *History*, chapter 17, and Baronius, volume 1, say. Further, because the theoretic Essenes retained many things from the discipline of the former and adorned them with greater perfection. Finally, because just as the former could be called Hasidaeans because of sanctity, so the latter could be called this much more; and therefore, because of their reputation for the highest sanctity and their not slight likeness in morals, they were also commonly called Essaeans. Something also helped this matter among the less learned:

[margin: Chapter XVIII ends; Chapter XIX opens with why Christians could inherit the Essene name. Source page 343 ends mid-sentence.]

(printed p. 319)

the likeness of the names Jesse and Jesus, from which the Jesseans arose, as Saint Epiphanius says.

Another question: who is the author of those theoretic Essenes? I would judge their author to be no one other than Christ the Lord and the Holy Spirit. From him this life was instituted at Jerusalem among Christians, Acts 2, 4, and 21. As I touched upon above, Saint James the Apostle held the chief place among them; to him alone, because of his outstanding reputation for sanctity, entrance to the temple was open, as Hegesippus reports in Eusebius, book 2, chapter 23, while to the other Essenes, although they were Jews, every access to it was closed.

A third little question: were the Essenes *coelicolae*? The word *coelicola* has a double meaning. A *coelicola* is called either one who inhabits the heavens, or one who worships, venerates, and adores the heavens. In the former sense the elder Anchises says in the poet:

If the heavenly dwellers had wished me to prolong my life, they would have preserved these seats for me.

And again in the same author:

The Berecyntian mother, rich in offspring of gods, embracing a hundred descendants, all heavenly dwellers, all holding the stars above.

So too Saint Sola, disciple of Saint Boniface, archbishop of Mainz and our martyr, is called by Ermenold the Deacon "most blessed heavenly dweller." In the latter sense, above in book 1,

[margin: Chapter XIX continues: authorship of theoretic Essenes; two senses of *coelicola*.]

(printed p. 320)

I relegated the *coelicolae* to the dregs of idolaters, and rightly so. For we know how often, how vehemently, and how justly those are accused in the divine Scriptures who adored the queen of heaven and the host of heaven, that is, the moon, the sun, and the other stars. Some think that in this way the *coelicolae* should be understood in the Justinian Code, where it is said: "We wish it to be made known to the Jews, the *coelicolae*, their elders, and their patriarchs, that if, after this law, anyone dares to attack with stones or with any other

kind of rage, which we know now happens, someone who has fled their deadly sect and has turned to the worship of God, he is immediately to be given to the flames and burned with all his accomplices."

And again afterward: "The unheard-of name of the *coelicolae* has vindicated, as it were, a new crime of superstition. Unless they turn to the worship of God and Christian veneration, they should know that by these laws they too are bound by which we command heretics to be bound. Their buildings, which have the gatherings of some new doctrine whose nature I do not know, are to be claimed for the churches. For it is certain that whatever differs from the faith of Christians is contrary to Christian law." The same things are read in the Theodosian Code. But the most reverend and most illustrious Baronius judges that they were apostates from the Christians. "Mention of the *coelicolae*," he says, "occurs in Saint Augustine, in the letter to Eleusius and others, where the passage near the end reads: 'For we had already sent to the elder of the *coelicolae*, whom we had heard had been appointed the founder among them of a new baptism,

[margin: Scriptural star worship; Justinian and Theodosian laws on *coelicolae*.]

(printed p. 321)

and had seduced many by that sacrilege, so that we might speak something with him as far as the narrowness of that time permitted.' So Augustine writes there; whether he treats the same *coelicolae* elsewhere, I do not remember. I once thought these people were Gentiles in Africa, so called from the worship of the idol Caelestis set up at Carthage, about which much has been said above. But because, according to Saint Augustine's view, they too were baptized, they seemed to have professed Christianity. And because another sanction of the same emperor wishes them to be compelled to preserve Christianity, this is a plain argument that they were Christians, yet to be counted under the name of apostates rather than heretics. Also, because the *coelicolae* are placed both in the Theodosian and in the Justinian Code not under the title concerning heretics but under the title concerning Jews, it is clear that they were certainly not Christian heretics but apostates. Therefore, as far as may be gathered from the said sanction of Honorius given to Jovinus the praetorian prefect, it appears that those were called *coelicolae* who passed from the Christian faith to Judaism, yet in such a way that, since they knew the Jewish name to be hateful to all, they preferred to be called not Jews but *coelicolae*, and not to live under the patriarchs of the Jews but under other magistrates appointed over themselves, whom they called elders, as appears from Saint Augustine and also from the rescript of Constantine to Evagrius."

Turning, then, to the question: Joseph Scaliger says that some Essenes were communal and others solitary. But the sect of the latter does not seem to have lasted long. Yet synagogues of the communal ones, or of people not unlike them,

[margin: Baronius's explanation of *coelicolae* as Christian apostates to Judaism.]

(printed p. 322)

existed until the times of Justinian. "For there are those who are called *coelicolae*. Even the name indicates it. For *coelicolae* are angels. They wished to be so called because of the holy and heavenly institution of life, as it seemed to them. In a very old Latin-Arabic glossary, *coelicola* is *malach*, that is, angel."

In these words I ask Scaliger himself whether he wishes those *coelicolae* to have been Christians or not. If Christians, he already grants what he always denies elsewhere and in this very place: that the Essenes were Christians. If he does not wish them to be Christians, he has something to answer to Baronius's arguments. For those great emperors plainly distinguish these people from the Jews, and, as if initiated by sacred baptism, wish them to be compelled to the Christian Church; and Saint Augustine speaks of them as if they were Christians. Next, Scaliger proves by no reason at all that the Essenes should be placed among the *coelicolae*. For if he had any argument, it would be this:

All angels are coelicolae.

The Essenes are angels.

Therefore.

Or rather:

Whoever call themselves angels also call themselves coelicolae.

But the Essenes call themselves angels.

Therefore.

Yet in both syllogisms the assumption is denied, and it is not even thinly proved by him. If he said that, because of purity and chastity of life, they were called by some heavenly citizens and inhabitants, I would not deny it, because Philo expressly calls them this.

[margin: Scaliger's attempted link between Essenes and coelicolae is rejected.]

(printed p. 323)

But this is neither faulty nor offensive, since the writer of the *Fasti* sang about astrologers:

Happy the souls whose first care was to know these things and to climb into the high houses of heaven. It is credible that they, with faults and places left behind, lifted their head higher than human things.

Indeed Scaliger placed his own Homer at the front of his own book, to sing about him in heroic verses:

This Scaliger once climbed above the Gentile heavens by a ladder; admitted to the secrets of Jove and to the race of gods, he looked down upon the lights of the great world, the seats above, and kingdoms inaccessible to mortals.

Why, then, could the Essenes not in this way be called *coelicolae*? But they are not *coelicolae* of the latter kind, who either offer divine worship to heaven or have deserted from the holy discipline of Christians; nor do they arrogantly and proudly add themselves to the former kind, which alone Scaliger wants. Now, there were indeed ancient heretics who were called Angels. But when Saint Epiphanius gives three causes for that name, he nevertheless says that none was known to him with certainty, and he testifies that after they arose they immediately disappeared; Saint Augustine followed him. But I see what Scaliger was aiming at. Through the side of the Essenes he wished to attack and wound Christian religious, whom, as was said of the Essenes, he sometimes resents being pronounced by the Fathers companions of the angelic life.

[margin: Celestial language is not itself blameworthy; Serarius accuses Scaliger of targeting Christian religious life.]

(printed p. 324)

For who, says Saint Bernard, would fear to call that celibate life heavenly and angelic? But so that the pride of this man, and of the other innovators as well, their admiration of themselves, and their contempt for the ancients, may appear even in questions which do not strike directly at the throat of faith, I have now decided at last to set out certain Aristarchan judgments of theirs in this investigation of the Essenes.

Therefore Scaliger himself says in the prolegomena to *On the Correction of Times*: "The things narrated by Philo about the Essenes condemn Eusebius and the rest of the ancients, who followed Eusebius and divined the same thing, of sufficient frivolity." In the same place: "Eusebius's statement about the Essenes is a childish delirium." In book 6: "Eusebius divined from Philo that the Essenes were Christians." In the same place: "See what happens when authority precedes truth. For whoever read those things did not doubt they were true, because Eusebius was the author." In the same place: "We answer that those ancient and highest men, when they speak about the beginnings of the Christian, pronounced many things alien from the truth."

Junius in the cited place is still more shameless, number 26: "In this application of the history of the Essenes, as in many other matters, Eusebius was deceived; those who followed him afterward wandered away from historical truth. Learned men long ago not without reason desired more judgment in Eusebius, and they command that judgment be used by anyone reading his writings."

[margin: Serarius quotes Scaliger and Junius attacking Eusebius and the ancients.]

(printed p. 325)

And in number 27: "Indeed Epiphanius, groping in darkness, followed Eusebius as a guide while he wandered away from the thread of truth. And indeed, when I read that passage of Epiphanius, I cannot sufficiently wonder at the man's ignorance, both in interpretation of language and in historical truth. In that single chapter on the Nazaraeans he errs in very many ways against both. He was a man whose piety I love, whose human weakness I bear, whose error, so help me God, I would have passed over, had truth not forced this duty from me." Number 28: "Eusebius had not very much judgment." Number 32: "These good Fathers would easily have noticed this if they had seen fit to consult Philo rather than yield to the authority of Eusebius," as though Saint Jerome, to say nothing of the others, had not consulted Philo. Again, number 36: "Indeed Epiphanius, who knew something of Syriac, indulged conjectures from the affinity of words, and what he conjectured from that, he affirmed rather too freely."

See how much arrogance there is in these innovators, how great their haughtiness and pride. Surely this is how they speak, this is how they condemn the ancients and despise the Fathers, as though they had proved them guilty of error most certainly and most clearly, while the things they themselves bring forward and pronounce were pure Sibylline oracles. What pride! But indeed I have now said what I had to say about the three sects of the Jews. Drusius gave the occasion for writing; love of truth and the usefulness of certain readers gave the cause. The same motives bring it about that if anywhere, as belongs to humanity, I have slipped, or have certainly wavered with a less firm step,

[margin: More citations of Junius; Serarius closes the three-sects discussion.]

(printed p. 326)

I will gladly hear the warnings or rebukes of others, including Drusius himself. One thing remains for me to say about Drusius.

Chapter XX. Whether Johannes Drusius Is a Heretic

(printed p. 326 — Book III)

What I have discussed above generally about the three sects of the Jews - whether, in today's manner of speaking, they should be counted among heretics - must now be considered in the case of Johannes Drusius. For when in my *Maccabees* I praised him because, unlike the custom of other heretics, he abstained somewhat from insults and the bitter gall of a harsh style, I nevertheless confessed sincerely that he was read by me unwillingly, because he was a heretic. This stung him. I do not wonder. Although today it is common, it is nevertheless a great mark, an infamous name, scarcely to be borne by anyone, even by a Hasidaean.

There was once among the holy dwellers in the desert a man of the most tested virtue, Agatho. In order to test his humility and patience, certain people brought various accusations against him: pride, lust, slander, and finally also heresy. To all the others he indeed nodded humbly and patiently, although they were utterly false; but when he heard the name of heresy, he said: "Although I am guilty of many other sins, I am certainly not a heretic. May this be far from my soul." When asked the reason,

[margin: Chapter XX begins; Serarius turns from the Jewish sects to Drusius.]

(printed p. 327)

he answered, among other things, these words: "Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we might follow in his footsteps. Therefore we must bear all adversities with humility. But the speech by which you called me a heretic I could not bear, and I greatly abhorred it, because heresy is separation from God. For a heretic is separated from the living and true God and is joined to the Devil and his angels. Alienated from Christ, he no longer has God to whom he may pray for his sins, because he has perished on every side."

And indeed Saint Gregory teaches that no one should rashly be branded with that name. "There are many of the faithful," he says, "who are inflamed with unskilled zeal, and often, while they pursue certain people as though they were heretics, they make heresies." For not every error, says Saint Augustine, is heresy, although every heresy which is reckoned a fault cannot be heresy without some error. And elsewhere: "A heretic and a person who believes heretics are not one and the same thing. For a heretic, as I think, is one who, for the sake of some temporal advantage, and especially for the sake of glory and his own preeminence, either begets or follows false and new opinions. But one who believes such men is a person deceived by a certain imagination of truth and piety."

You do rightly, then, Drusius, to shudder at the name of heretic. Nor would I be free of fault if, when you were a Catholic, I called you a heretic. Yet it is common that those whom that stain of heresy most disgraces are the very ones who least of all wish to be thought such. "What shall I say," says Saint Jerome, "about heretics, who, although they are outside, nevertheless call themselves Christians?"

[margin: Agatho on the horror of heresy; Gregory and Augustine on using the word "heretic" carefully.]

(printed p. 328)

The grammarian Cresconius, not unlike you, found it very hard to bear being called a heretic by Saint Augustine, as that same holy Father witnesses. And in these very days, while I was occupied with the final part of my refutation of your little book, a certain pious, learned, and friendly man brought me a little book by a Lutheran preacher against me. In it that Lutheran fumes because Luther is called a heretic, and he would like that to be proved. "If you wish," he says, "to call our Luther a heretic, first teach what diseased and corrupt savor each codex of most holy Scripture has," as though the same thing must always be done over again.

The Christian Church has judged, both through her visible head on earth, the Roman Pontiff, and through the ecumenical and general Synod of Trent, that Luther and Calvin are heretics, and likewise that their dogmas are heretical. Therefore, whenever these men or their followers, who are the more learned and the more obstinate, are called heretics, is it always necessary to prove by arguments hunted out anew that they are heretics?

I was reading your little book, Drusius, on the very day of Saint Michael, and there came to mind what Joshua said to Saint Michael himself, about which I have written elsewhere: "Are you one of ours, or one of our adversaries?" Tell me, then, I beg you: are you a Catholic, or not? You know whom I call a Catholic: a man of the ancient faith and of that Roman obedience which, as the Apostle testifies, has been spread abroad and made known through the whole world.

[margin: Cresconius and Luther cited as parallels; appeal to the Roman Pontiff and Council of Trent.]

(printed p. 329)

Say it, then, openly and roundly, without evasion and without stammering: are you ours, or one of our adversaries? If you are ours, I most willingly retract what I wrote. But if you are Lutheran, or rather Calvinian, as I learned long ago and will soon show, why do you judge your name to be slandered? Therefore, to keep the words of Saint Augustine against the grammarian mentioned before: "Why do you not wish to be called a heretic? Why do you grieve more at being called one than at being one?" Why do you not at last correct the bad choice of Calvin as master, and of his dogmas?

But so that I may show that you are what you are called, a heretic, I shall pursue the arguments by which you wish it proved that you are not one. Thus with one and the same hand, as it were, I shall establish my own statement and scatter yours. I find chiefly three such arguments.

The first is this: "For someone to be a heretic two things are required. First, that he err in the foundations of faith; then, that he defend his error with pertinacity. My slender knowledge is wholly occupied with grammar

and history. I leave dogmas of faith to be treated by those more learned than I. In history there is no heresy; much less in grammar."

As for pertinacity, Drusius, I agree with you; you will deal with that again in your third argument. But in error about the foundations of faith you seem to me to be hiding some snake. For what do you call the foundations of faith?

[margin: Drusius's first argument: heresy requires error in foundations of faith and pertinacious defense.]

(printed p. 330)

Do you mean all things about which faith is concerned as its object and matter, or only the chief things among them? If you call them foundations in the former sense, you speak quite obscurely and, as a grammarian, not grammatically enough. For who calls everything of which a building consists by the name of foundations? If all things that fall under faith are foundations of faith, then those parts which belong to the construction of the spiritual building, the walls and even the roofs themselves, will be called foundations.

If you call foundations in the latter sense, then in your judgment one will not be a heretic who errs pertinaciously in some matter belonging to faith, provided it is not among certain great and principal heads. What do you say, Drusius? Even this error of yours, if it has obstinacy joined to it, is heresy. "Whoever offends in one point has become guilty of all." Saint Augustine says: "Those in the Church of Christ who savor anything diseased and corrupt, if, when corrected so that they may savor what is sound and right, they resist stubbornly and refuse to amend their pestilential and deadly dogmas, but persist in defending them, become heretics and, going outside, are counted among enemies who exercise us."

Saint Athanasius in the Creed which is received not only by Catholics but also by Lutherans and Calvinists, as I have proved elsewhere, says: "Whoever wishes to be saved must above all hold the Catholic faith; unless each person preserves it whole and inviolate, he will without doubt perish eternally."

[margin: Serarius rejects limiting heresy only to chief articles of faith; Augustine and the Athanasian Creed cited.]

(printed p. 331)

Indeed, when I consider your skill in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew grammar, I have no doubt that you follow the latter meaning of foundations. For whatever things are principal in any matter are usually called its heads and foundations. Thus the first heads of the Christian faith are customarily called by us articles. So too among the Jews they are called עמודים and עקרין, foundations, as a little book on the foundations of the Jewish faith explains. Indeed the common rabbinic expression uses כלל ועקר, "rule and foundation," for the universal and principal thing, and כל עקר, "every foundation," for every principal matter; wicked men and atheists are likewise called among them כפרין בעקר, deniers of the foundation, as the Chaldaean Targum on Psalm 12 has it, and Elias Levita in his *Tishbi*.

But you say: in history there is no heresy. On the contrary, if someone denied the histories of the patriarchs, Moses, Aaron, Joshua, David, and others; if he denied that Christ Jesus was born in the time of Caesar Augustus, that the census was taken under Quirinius as governor, and that he was crucified when Tiberius was emperor and Pilate procurator of Judea, he would be a heretic. And in other histories, do not Carion, Funccius, and Sleidanus insert many heretical things even in our own age?

Drusius goes on: "Much less is there heresy in grammar." If grammar were content only with the parts of speech, the declensions of nouns and verbs, the rules for speaking and writing correctly, and even the interpretation of poets and orators, it would certainly be immune from heresy.

[margin: Hebrew terms for foundations of faith; Serarius argues that historical denial can be heretical.]

(printed p. 332)

For it does not belong to heresy whether you say or write "Hesseans" or "Hasidaeans," nor whether you think these were also Pharisees. Do not fear, Drusius: no one is a heretic because of those things and things like them. But when grammar rises even to the explanation of the sacred letters, why should it not be able to deprave their sense, introduce foreign opinions, and defend and propagate those opinions once introduced? And who are now leading the household in this kind of work? Are they not the grammarians Melanchthon, Beza, Castellio, and those like them?

The very explanation of words has shown how much darkness it once cast over matters of the greatest weight: in Saint Jerome and Nazianzen, *hypostasis*; in Saint Athanasius and others, *homoousion*; likewise in Saint Basil's book against Eunomius those very small particles, *ex* and *dia*, "in" and "through." What of Catholic transubstantiation, and the Lutheran, or rather, as Beza was pleased to call it, consubstantiation?

"Philosophers," says Saint Augustine, "speak with free words, and in matters very difficult to understand they do not fear offense to religious ears. But for us it is lawful to speak according to a fixed rule." Saint Basil, in Theodoret, says: "Those who have been educated in the sacred letters do not permit even one syllable of the divine dogmas to be betrayed; rather, for their defense, if need be, they willingly embrace every kind of death." Therefore heresy can exist both in the discipline that is guardian of things and in the discipline that is guardian of words.

[margin: Grammar can become heretical when it interprets Scripture; theological terms and Basil cited.]

(printed p. 333)

The second argument is this: "Serarius knows me only from my books. What in them is not orthodox? Or, if there is something, why does Serarius not warn me about it?"

I have certainly at times marked heterodox and wrong things in your books, and from them I easily recognized that you were dwelling in an enemy camp outside the holy Catholic Church. But because I never had all your little books, and because even of those I once had I now have none at hand, I shall not attempt to list those wrong things of yours from memory alone. Rather I shall say that you deceive yourself when you claim that you are known to me only from your books. For I have also spoken with those who know you face to face, and I know you from the books of others too, especially Beza's.

Beza has a notable habit in his annotations on the New Testament: he praises those who share the same errors with him, and he splendidly attacks the rest, whether Catholics or heretics. For, to pass over the Jesuits and other Catholics, he says: "Sebastian Castellio had no learning in these matters and was endowed with no judgment." "That sophist Illyricus of unhappy memory, no less foolishly than shamelessly." And elsewhere: "Illyricus of execrable memory, the pest of the Church."

As for Erasmus, because in religion he seems to have been an amphibious animal, Beza at one time raises him with praises and at another casts him down with attacks. "I am compelled," he says,

[margin: Drusius's second argument: Serarius knows him only from books; Beza's praise and blame used as evidence.]

(printed p. 334)

"as far as the collation of passages itself is concerned, to desire somewhat greater attentiveness in Erasmus. In this matter I have noticed that he sinned more than once in citing both Greek and Latin theologians." And again: "There was no reason why Erasmus, for I shall say what the matter is, should openly resist the truth and obscure to the best of his power this passage, Philippians 2:6, than which hardly any other is more illustrious for refuting all heresies against the person of Christ." Again: "Erasmus's judgment in this argument about the Apocalypse, as in many others, seems to me so variable that one can hardly judge what he decided."

But what does Beza say of the men of his own sect? "Mercerus of pious memory"; "our Tremellius, and that most learned Hebrew, Emmanuel Tremellius, of blessed memory"; "our Franciscus Junius, a most learned

man, of happy memory"; "Vadianus"; "Beroaldus, a man of blessed memory, and in former years my colleague in this Church"; "my colleague Bertramus"; "Casaubon, my colleague in this school at Geneva"; "the faithful servant of Christ and of blessed memory, Ambrose Blaurer"; "that great Joseph Scaliger, my very close friend, a man of recondite learning, and never praised enough either for sharpness of intellect or for tireless diligence."

Now prick up your ears, Drusius. Are you a Catholic? Beza will pierce you with curses. Are you a Lutheran, or of another sect diverging from Calvin? You are not safe from him. But are you a Calvinian? O blessed man! For you have obtained Beza as the herald of your praises. "Johannes Drusius, a man learned in these investigations and very diligent,"

[margin: Beza's judgments of Erasmus and his praises of Reformed scholars; page ends mid-sentence in Beza's praise of Drusius.]

(printed p. 335)

and elsewhere: "Johannes Drusius, often named by me in these books, and deservedly." You see, then, Drusius, how I know you not only from your books. What about the places and schools in which you either learned or taught, and in which you teach up to the present? What about those whom you praise in your writings and to whom you dedicate them? What about that little book of yours on the Hasidaeans? What about the phrases by which you reject the Catholic Genebrard? You name Calvin, Danaeus, and others as very weighty theologians, and you join Bellarmine to them as if a white dove were joined with crows by you. You call the Calvinian preachers, to whom your double preface is addressed, outstanding theologians and faithful servants of Christ. Do not all these things show the Calvinian stench of your breast?

As for what you add, "If there is anything not orthodox, why does Serarius not warn me about it?", the reason is ready at hand. I am not the general admonisher of all. The Church warns you enough. Whoever does not hear her is like a heathen and a publican.

The third argument is this: "Pertinacity makes a heretic, not simple error. For to err is human. I know that nothing human is alien to me. Once warned, I shall not be pertinacious, and I never was. I once professed, and now repeat again, that I subject all my writings to the judgment of the Church."

As to the past, since with the learning you have you could not until now have been ignorant of the Church's voice calling you away from Calvin and all new opinions, I do not see how you can be excused from pertinacity. For when you say that you subject everything to the judgment of the Church,

[margin: Continuation of Beza's praise; Serarius answers Drusius's second and third arguments.]

(printed p. 336)

you seem indeed to speak well and modestly. But since you know that any heretic, Lutheran, Calvinian, Anabaptist, or Schwenckfeldian uses the same words, by that very fact you show yourself not to be Catholic, because you do not clearly and plainly indicate which Church you understand. For although in reality there is only one true Church, and all the rest are not Churches of Christ but synagogues of Satan, nevertheless, because every sect claims that true Church for itself, you ought to have said without any wrappings or evasions of words what I willingly and gladly profess for myself: "I subject all my writings to the judgment of the holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church."

As to the future time, by all means see to it, Drusius, that you perform what you here assert in word: be no longer pertinacious. "Today, if you hear his voice," that is, the voice of God admonishing you through his spouse, "harden not your heart." "A hard heart will fare badly at the end, and he who loves danger will perish in it."

Cassian, when he narrates that Leporius was converted from heresy to the Catholic faith, says: "The first thing is not to incur error; the second is to repudiate it well." And Agatho, praised at the beginning of this

chapter not more in name than in reality, says: "If a heretic is converted to the true and Catholic faith of the holy Church, he is received by our good and pious Savior Jesus Christ, and is joined to the true God, our Creator and Savior Christ."

[margin: Serarius demands explicit submission to the holy Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church.]

(printed p. 337)

That this may happen to you, Johannes Drusius, and to all others wandering from the way of Catholic truth, I pray from my heart.

Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.

End.

At the foot of the source page the index begins with the catchword "Of Things."

[margin: Formal end of the main treatise; the index begins at the foot of this source page.]

THE AUTHOR'S INDEX OF THINGS AND WORDS

(printed p. 338)

Index of Things and Words

Abtalio, 127; two academies of the Jews, 126; Agapae, 305; Agatho, 326, 367; Akiba, 129; Alexander son of Hyrcanus, king and priest, held the scepter for twenty-six years, 170; he crucified eight hundred Pharisees, 131; Alexander the Great granted the Garizim temple to the Samaritans, 144, 154; the region Aliman, 263; Anan renewed the heresy of the Sadducees, 161; Ananus the younger, pontiff and Sadducee, 170; Angelics, 323; Antigonus or Antigonus, disciple of Laddi, 127; Arabs, 264.

Aristobulus son of Hyrcanus, king and priest, a Sadducee, 169; he reigned one year, *ibid.*; Asima, idol of the Cutheans, 147; Aschider, 240, 145; Assidaeans, 9; Astarita, 8; Astarothite, *ibid.*; Audi, 11, 153.

Baalita, 8; Baanas, 126; Bagoas, 126; Bahalita or Baalamita, 8; Baietos, disciple of Antigonus, 127, 141; Balsan, 126; Barbaria, 32; Batracholatra, 8; Belita, 8; Beza is reprov'd, 247; he praises Calvinists and attacks others, 334.

[margin: Index entries A-B begin.]

(printed p. 339)

Coelicolae, 9, 319, 320, 321; Caiani, 7, 11; Carcasnaeus the Sadducee, 161; Caraim, Jews of Scripture, 9, 13, 148, 158; Carthage, 32; the chair of Moses in Matthew 23, what it means, 72, 76; the Pharisees were heard while sitting on it, 96 and following; Chalcophita, 8; Chammath, 249; the authority of Christ the Lord in teaching, Matthew 7, what it means, 78; Philo is silent about him, 307; Christians were freed from the destruction of Jerusalem, 295; they at first observed certain Jewish rites, 309; Ciconia, 236; Cinai, 15, 246; two kinds of Cincor, 246; straining wine, 83; fellowship with wicked men is harmful, 275, 282; Cornarius's error, 105; the Ctistae among the Dacians, celibate and sacred men, 201; Cuthaeans, 11, 153.

Delphen, 129; the pontiff gave the Jews public power of teaching, 77; whether Jewish teachers stood or sat while teaching, 72; Dositheus the Samaritan, 6, 16, 141, 142; Dositheans, 7, 8, 12, 228; they confessed the resurrection of bodies, 156; Drusius, see Johannes Drusius.

As the Church of Christ gradually rose, the chair of Moses gradually fell, 103; Esnaei or Esneista, 7, 15; Essenes, 7, 8, 12, 15, 20; whence they are named, 173 and following, 191, 271, 275; Essenes were Jews by race, 203; most of them celibate, 205, 269.

[margin: Index entries C-D and beginning of E.]

(printed p. 340)

Essenes: contemnors of wealth, 207; without trade, 211, 276; long-lived, 222; strong in adversities, *ibid.*; foreknowers, 224; different from the Pharisees, 230; opposed Christ the Lord in nothing, 258; initiators of Christian religious life, 261; they grant free will, 202; they love one another intensely, 204; they abhor pleasure, 204; continent, 205; they strive to conquer the passions, *ibid.*; they especially care for the sick, 273, and for the aged, 274, 279; they train boys in virtue, 207; they receive adults to better fruit, 207.

Essenes travel without provision, 211; they do not swear, 216; they test novices for four years, 217; they serve bodily need with great modesty, 220; they meet death magnanimously, 222; they believe souls immortal, 223; they neglect logic, 277, and physics, *ibid.*; they learn ethics and theology, 277; they do not sacrifice in the temple at Jerusalem, 229, nor in the Garizim temple, 228; some did not receive Christ the Lord, 225; they are the same as the Assidaeans, 241 and following; they are not properly Nazaraeans, 244; they were Rechabites, 245 and following; they were not heretics, 226; the Essenes were not from the Pharisees, 231, but on the contrary,

[margin: Index entries on the Essenes continue.]

(printed p. 341)

232; the Essenes existed before Pythagoras, 253; some Essenes were such only by sect, 261, 271, and others also by race, 261; some had wives, 224, 269; they test brides for three years, 225; cenobitic Essenes, 269, 272; they inhabit many cities of Judea, 271; they prefer to dwell outside cities, 275; what they do on the Sabbath, 277; among the Essenes there was common ownership of all goods, 208, 272, 279; there was no slave among them, 276, 288; no weapons, 276.

Praise of the Essenes, 2, 75, 279; some Essenes practical, others theoretic, 269; how the name of the Essenes should be written, 191 and following; the sect of the Essenes, 4; their age, 271; austerity of life, 209; clothing, 209, 273, 286; dwelling, 210, 278; hospitality, *ibid.*; religion, 211; prayers, 212, 293; three rules for the way life should be lived, 278; manual labor, 214, 272, 275; washings, *ibid.*; lunch, *ibid.*; supper, 215; frugality, 273, 286; obedience, 216; poverty, *ibid.*, 272; gentleness, *ibid.*; books, 312; reading, 272; oaths proper to the sect, twelve, 218; punishment of offenders, 219; judges, *ibid.*; reverence toward the lawgiver, 220; observance toward elders, *ibid.*, 279; care for decency, *ibid.*; observance of the Sabbath, *ibid.*, 284, 286; order among themselves, 222; silence, 215; conjugal continence, 225; modesty of Essene women, 225; Essene virgins, 285, 288, 292, 313; theoretic Essenes dwell in many regions of the world,

[margin: Index entries on Essene customs and institutions.]

(printed p. 342)

282, 301; the admirable manner of life of the theoretic Essenes, 281 and following; exercises, 283; temperance, 285; vigil, *ibid.*; fasts, *ibid.*; sacred banquets, 287; clothing of those who minister, 289; drinking water, *ibid.*; a table clean from bloody foods, *ibid.*; spiritual feasts at table, 290; various kinds of songs, 291; sacred vigil after the meal, 292; the theoretic Essenes were Christians, 297; some practical Essenes were Christians, 295; Emathai, 11, 153; "to strain out a gnat," whence the proverb came, 83.

The leaven of the Pharisees in Matthew 16, what it means, 86, 94, 97; leaven in a good sense, 121; the fringe of the Jews, 66, and why it was worn, *ibid.*; two Hebrew names for fringe, 66; to magnify fringes, what it means, 67; a woman in love with herself, 274; a certain woman in the Essene institution, 206, 225; Fortunicola, 8; Franciscus Junius is reproved, 233, 298, 303, 310, 311; he contemns the ancients, 324, 325; Franks, 31.

Gamaliel the Pharisee, 91; Gamaliel the elder, 128; Gamaliel the second, *ibid.*; Gaon, a title of dignity, 16, 184; the Garizim temple, 11, 12, 76, 144, 154; Gaulanites, 11; Genista, 7; many maxims of the old Pharisees, 136 and following; Gortheni, 7, 12, 228; Grammateis, or scribes, 7; a grammarian can be a heretic, 331, 332.

[margin: Index entries E-G.]

(printed p. 343)

Heresy, whence named, 2; used in a good and a bad sense, *ibid.*; among Christians almost always used in a bad sense, 3; a grave charge, 326; Meristae were heretics, 16; a heretic differs from one who follows heresy, 327.

Hanan Hannasi, 264; Hasidaeans, 14; whence they are named, 232; they are not Pharisees, 24; the Hasidaeans existed in the times of the Maccabees, 238; how the name of the Hasidaeans should be written, 191 and following; Heliognosti, 8; Hemerobaptists, 7, 310; many Hebrew words are ambiguous and middle terms, 184; Herod killed many Pharisees, 133, and burned some alive, *ibid.*; he was a Machiavellian, 159; he built a temple to Caesar, 186; Herodians, 6, 7, 8, 11, 20.

Hessaei and Hesseni, see Essenes; the Jerusalem academy of the Jews, 126; Hillel, 127, 128; the house of Hillel among the Jews was famous, 127; Spain, 32; Hosians, 141.

Jabes, 247; Saint James the Apostle, the Just, an Essene, 252, 319; Jaddus son of Joshua, son of Josedeck, grandson of the pontiff, 127, 161; Jesus, one of the rulers of the great synagogue, 126; the descendants of Jethro were Rechabites, Hesseans, Hasidaeans, 250; Jesseans, 174, 176, 319; Illyricus depicted by Beza, 334; Iochan, or John son of Zaccai, 128; Johannes Drusius, 17, 19; he is reproved, 235, 242, 303; he unjustly reproves Serarius, 21; praised by Beza, *ibid.*; a Calvinian,

[margin: Index entries H-I begin.]

(printed p. 344)

and a heretic, 326 and following; many errors of Johannes Drusius in translating Gorionides, 35; his threefold deception, 190; John Hyrcanus, from Pharisee to Sadducee, 131; he overturned the city Samaria, 162, 164, 165; he governed for thirty-one years, 168; Jonadab the Rechabite, 246; Jonathan son of Uzziel, 128; two Joses, disciples of Antigonus, 127; the two Josephs, Flavius and Gorionides, 25; their comparison, 26 and following; Flavius is preferred to Gorionides, 33; in Flavius there are some gaps, 33; he is compared with Philo, 268; the errors of Joseph Scaliger, 177, 310, 311, 322, 324; Beza's praise of him, 334; Joshua, disciple of Jose, 127; Jews are almost all Pharisees, 135; Judah Nagid, or Judah Hannasi, 128; Judas the Galilean, 6; Judas son of Tabbai, 127; Junius, see Franciscus.

Lebaddam, a Hebrew word, what it means, 22; the law of the Jews, one written and another unwritten, 51; Christ corrected the old law, 110; experts in the law and doctors of the law are not distinguished from scribes, 105, but are distinguished from Pharisees, *ibid.*, 106; Luther twice added the particle "only" to Saint Paul, 20; he calls the Hasidaeans "the pious," 241.

[margin: Index entries I-L.]

(printed p. 345)

Marbonenses or Marbonians, 7, 16; Mordecai, 126; Marielacus, 310; Maspar, 126; Meir, 129, 142; Meristae, 7, 16; Molochites, 8; monasteries of the Essenes, 269, 283, 304; Munster's error, 31; Myolatra or Musorita, 8; Myiolatra or worshiper of mice, 8.

Nazaraeans, 7, 13; Nathinaeans, 12; Nazaraeans, 8, 9, 12; the Jewish academy of Nehardea, 126; Nehemiah, 126; Nergel, idol of the Cuthaeans, 147; Nicodemus the Pharisee, 92; Nithai, disciple of Jose, 127; Nomi, prefecture, 301.

Ophites, 7, 11; Osseni, 228.

Panias Caesarea, 186; Saint Paul, a Pharisee, 91; he observed certain Jewish rites, 309; Pharisees, 6, 7, 8; whence named, 39 and following; from every tribe and family, 43; from the noble and common orders, 44; not all Pharisees bad, 91, 117; who foolish Pharisees are, 118; cloak-wearing, pretentious, and sandal-wearing Pharisees, 134; Pharisaic astronomers, 48; they taught the transmigration of good souls, 50; they greatly urged the traditions of the elders, 51; they often washed their hands, 53; how, 54; they did not take food with sinners, 56; they did not even wish to be touched by them, *ibid.*; they fasted often, 58; they prayed often, 59; what mind they had toward the prophets and Saint John the Baptist, 70; why and how they were adversaries of Christ the Lord, 70; they are greatly blamed by Christ the Lord, 79; how they badly built the tombs of the prophets,

[margin: Index entries M-P begin.]

(printed p. 346)

86; some Pharisees were by sect and by office doctors of the law, 105; seven orders of the Pharisees, 13; sect of the Pharisees, 4; baptisms, 55 and following; austerity of life, 59; zeal for converting Gentiles, 60; bad institutions of the Pharisees, 81; good ones, *ibid.*; both good and bad things were done badly by them, 82; what the Pharisees taught about the piety of children toward parents, 68; what they taught about the religion of oaths, 69; the sect of the Pharisees is not bad in itself, 89.

Some dogmas of the Pharisees are materially heretical, 118; the origin of the Pharisees and their double founder, 126; the very great authority of the Pharisees among the people, 129; especially of those who lived at Jerusalem, 130; place of the Pharisees in the whole dominion of the Israelites, 45; all who give themselves to Pharisaic vices are like Pharisees, 122; Pharisaic heresy is close to Stoic teaching, 47; Philo similar to Plato, 265; older than Josephus, 268; he conversed with Saint Peter, 306; he remained obstinate in Judaism, 306, 307, 308; why he was silent about the name of Christ and Christians, 306; what phylacteries are, 61; whence named, 63; there is no commandment that the Jews wear phylacteries, 65; the pythoness, 8; the Hebrew names of the planets and the twelve signs of the Zodiac, 48 and following; Puteorita, 8; some pontiffs of the Jews were Sadducees, 165; practical Essenes existed before Christ, 294.

[margin: Index entries on Pharisees, Philo, and related terms.]

(printed p. 347)

Prophets are sometimes called scribes, 107; Egyptian proselytes were authors to the Israelites of adoring the calf, 86; how proselytes were made by the Pharisees twice as much liable to Gehenna as they were, 85; Pythagoras learned not a little from the Jews, 200; when Pythagoras lived, 253; Pythagoreans similar to Essenes, 200 and following.

Rabias, 126; Rabbaniym, 148; Rabbenu Hakkados, 128; Rahum, 126; Rechab, 246; Rechabites, 9, 15, 246; religious among Christians are true Rechabites and Essenes, 265; Remphanita, 8.

Immoderate observance of the Sabbath among the Jews, 17; the Sabbatic river, 264; priestly nobility was especially among the Jews, 44; Sadducees, 6, 7, 8; whence named, 139; why they should be written "Sadducaei" and not otherwise, 140; the Sadducees admit only the books of Moses, 145; they mutilate even those with three letters, 146; they pervert some words of those books, 147; they reject the tradition of the elders and the written interpretation of the law, 147; they deny reward and punishment after this life, the resurrection of bodies, the immortality of souls, angels, and spirit, 149, 150; they say that God neither makes nor foresees evil, 151; they were troublesome to Christ the Lord, 151; they were Epicureans, 152; they were few, without honor in themselves, intolerable to the people, harsh and rustic, cruel,

[margin: Index entries P-S begin.]

(printed p. 348)

153; the Sadducees remove fate, 152; they were truly heretics, 156; they were between Samaritans and Pharisees, 155; why the Sadducees were tolerated at Jerusalem, 158; sect of the Sadducees, 4; how it arose, 144, 160; some Sadducees still exist today, 161; Sadoc, disciple of Antigonus, 127, 141, 144, 145, and afterward of Dositheus, 143; yet he dissented from Dositheus, 156; another Sadoc, a Pharisee, 171; Samaritans, 6, 7, 8, 11; heretics, 153; they erected a temple in the time of Alexander the Great, 144, 160; two kinds of Samaritans, 153.

"Wise man" has wider meaning than either scribe or Pharisee, 104; who the wise men of the Jews were, 104; Scaliger, see Joseph; Schammai, 127; the house of Schammai among the Jews was famous, 127; Schemmaias, 127; Schimhathai, 248; scribes and experts in the law, 12; scribes set down in Scripture in two ways, 106; scribes of the people, 107; scribes of the kings, *ibid.*; scribes were either Levites or certainly from any tribe whatever, 108; Sebuai or Sebueni, 7, 12, 143, 227; a sect may be good or bad, 3; the general and principal sects of the Jews were three, 4, 13, 16; and indeed in the times of the Maccabees, 18, 20, and in Josephus Gorionides, 26; gatherings of the Essenes, 269, 283, 285, 304; Sepharvaimites, 11, 153.

[margin: Index entries S continue.]

(printed p. 349)

Seraiah, 126; Sethiani, 7, 11; Sicarii, 11; Simeon, of whom Luke 2 speaks, seems to have been a Pharisee, 92; Simeon Justus, otherwise Jaddus, 127, 161; Simeon son of Gamaliel the elder, 128; Simon son of Satach,

127; Saint Sola, disciple of Saint Boniface, 319; Solicola, 8; Subterraneans, 8; Suchathai, 248; rulers of the great synagogue, 126; synagogue properly of the Jews, 304.

Tarphon, 129; Therapeutae, 293; Talmidim, 105; the impious lie of the Talmudists about Jesus Christ, 133; Thamuzita, 8; Theodosius the Samaritan, 143; Theima, a city, 264; theoretic Essenes were Christians, 297; Thirhathai, 248; Tophetita, 8; various traditions of the Pharisees, 53 and following; Troglodytes, 8; Tubieni, 9, 14.

Vigils, 305; Essene virgins, 285, 288, 292, 313; companions of the calf, those called Samaritans, and why, 154; Urim and Thummim, 166; Wolphius's error, 245.

Zamolxis, god of the Getae, servant and disciple of Pythagoras, 200; Zealots, 11; Zerubbabel, son of Salathiel, 126.

End of the index.

[margin: Final index entries S-Z.]

THE ERRATA LEAF

(printed p. 350)

Errata: correct the text as follows.

Page 2, line 5; page 10, "however slight"; page 12, "none"; page 13, Mahchobathi Veesheneh; page 15, "about which"; same page, Esnaei; page 16, Attales; page 24, "to the wise, these are"; page 28, Pagninus; same page, "preface"; page 43, "Hebrew"; page 45, "principal"; page 47, "certain" and related words; page 61, "the true God"; page 62, "the Decalogue"; same page, "whole"; page 64, "phylacteries"; page 69, "oaths."

Page 72, "the Jews and formerly"; page 107, in the margin, "Kings"; page 116, "You shall not swear falsely"; page 122, "magnifying"; pages 135 and 171, "apothegms"; page 136, Tseredaeus; page 144, in the margin, "heresy of the Sadducees"; page 146, three Hebrew letters are corrected (to ע, ח, ה); page 177, a Greek particle is corrected; page 179, "holiness"; page 192, "Hessean" should be said; page 193, "and yet"; page 226, "another greater"; page 262, "to Paulinus"; page 276, in the margin, a Greek adjective is corrected; page 285, "is closed"; page 323, "Angelics."

[margin: Errata leaf; original correction terms are translated or transliterated where practical.]