Commentaries and Disputations on Genesis

Benedict Pererius (Benito Pereira), S.J.

Tomus Secundus

English translation — this volume covers PDF pages 8–680
Page markers refer to the original PDF page numbers.

— p. 8 (PDF) · printed p. title page —

Of BENEDICTUS PERERIUS of Valencia, of the Society of Jesus: The SECOND VOLUME of Commentaries and Disputations on Genesis. Containing nine books concerning the History of Moses — on the Flood, the Ark of Noah, the Building of the Tower of Babel, the Confusion of Tongues, and other matters down to the Calling of Abraham: that is, from the fifth chapter to the twelfth. There is also added to this Volume a Book by the same Author On the Blessings of the Twelve Patriarchs. LYON, FROM THE PRESS OF THE GIUNTA. 1593. WITH PRIVILEGE.

Title page (PDF 8). This is the Lyon (Giunta press) 1593 reprint of the work first printed at Rome in 1592 (cf. the colophon at printed p. 577). It announces the volume's nine books (Liber VIII–XVI, Genesis 6–11, 'from chapter 5 to chapter 12') and an APPENDED treatise — the 'Liber de Benedictionibus duodecim Patriarcharum' (On the Blessings of the Twelve Patriarchs) — which would follow the main commentary (likely after the back-matter indexes, PDF 681+). Library stamps on the leaf: Colegio de la Concepción de Alcalá.

— p. 10 (PDF) · printed p. ded. to Albergaria (1) —

To the most illustrious and most learned Lord LUPUS SOAREZ DE ALBERGARIA, Doctor of Sacred Theology, and Inquisitor against heretical depravity and apostasy in Lusitania [Portugal]. JOHN BAPTIST REGNAULD [sends] greeting.

Dedication of the Lyon edition (PDF 10), by the publisher Jean-Baptiste Regnauld, to Lupo Soarez de Albergaria, the Portuguese Inquisitor — a learned bibliophile. (This is distinct from the author's own dedication, which follows on PDF 12.)

Although, most illustrious Albergaria, you might humanely have demanded of us that the second part of the Commentaries on Genesis by Benedict Pererius of the Society of Jesus be published by the press at Lyon — yet it was not as easy for you to command it as for us to dispose our minds to discharge the task. The thing is done; but that it may come to light, it has need of the light of your praise. For it is fitting that from him by

whom this our labor took its auspice, from that same it should claim its patronage. And what shadows of envy or of malevolence will the amplitude and splendor of your name not scatter? This is the first occasion of the dedication that presents itself to my mind. We know how great — set apart though you are by a long tract of lands and ocean — how great is the renown of your lineage, which, drawn from the foremost nobility of Lusitania and the rest of Spain, by the etymology of the Spanish-derived surname ‘Albergaria’ [a lodging, shelter], proclaims you a receptacle and protection of men. Much less can your wisdom, and your singular benevolence toward learned men and toward those zealous for letters even by rude effort, lie hidden. Wherefore we may rightly call you a receptacle not only of men (as your family surname indicates), but most of all of the liberal arts. Why ‘receptacle’? Nay — let envy be far from the praise — a ‘spectacle.’ In you alone, a man of manifold erudition, a most wise cultivator of human and divine letters, you set forth noble arts worthy to be beheld.

§ (Regnauld to Albergaria, part 1). The publisher explains he prints Pererius's second volume at Lyon and dedicates it to Albergaria as its patron; he praises the dedicatee's noble Portuguese-Spanish lineage (punning on ‘Albergaria’ = a shelter/‘receptacle’), his wisdom, and his patronage of letters and the liberal arts.

— p. 11 (PDF) · printed p. ded. to Albergaria (2) —

To you, indeed, the lovers of the good arts look; after the spectacle, they marvel at the theater of your distinguished Library. The most honorable judgments of the most learned men extol you; constant fame everywhere sings of you. To no one, therefore, ought it to seem strange if you take care to bring light to mortals eager to see, and to exhibit spectacles after the ancient example of the Caesars. Go on and prosper in your industry, most illustrious Lupus, to whom Genesis — that is, ‘generation’ — is rightly owed in the open, the covering of obscurity cast off: for you labor that the monuments of literature, buried in darkness, be restored to life by the benefit of Typography. Nay rather, it would escape [reason] by an unfitting

account, that Pererius — from that family which you uniquely love, which has filled the globe with the fame of its name — should flow out, a stream beyond its banks in fullest flood from its channel; and just as the Arar [Saône] receives increase from the Rhône at Lyon, so Pererius, [printed] at Lyon by the Giunta press and, under your auspices, joined to the Rhône or to Gaul, will be beheld with the glory of his erudition growing day by day. But you, most learned Albergaria, neither spurn this pledge of love, nor wish to be disjoined from the Giuntas with an alienated mind. The one of these the author's dignity will obtain; the other we promise ourselves from your humanity. Farewell.

§ (Regnauld to Albergaria, part 2). Continued praise of Albergaria's famous library and patronage; a conceit that publishing Pererius at Lyon (as the Saône joins the Rhône) will increase his fame; and a closing plea that the dedicatee accept this ‘pledge of love’ and keep his goodwill toward the Giunta press. Ends ‘Vale.’

— p. 12 (PDF) · printed p. ded. to Card. Caetani (1) —

To HENRY CAETANI [Enrico Gaetani], Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church and most ample Chamberlain. BENEDICT PERERIUS, of the Society of Jesus, sends greeting.

The author's own dedication (PDF 12), the original Rome 1592 dedication, to Cardinal Enrico Caetani — papal Camerlengo and recently legate to France during the Wars of Religion.

From the time when the first volume of my Commentaries on Genesis, most ample Cardinal, came forth into public, as great an accumulation accrued to the magnitude of your praises, so much faculty also would have accrued to me for treating the Sacred letters according to their dignity: I do not indeed hope that, as that first volume of Commentaries by no means displeased the learned, so this second too should pleasantly please. For at that time was accomplished that memorable legation of yours — which, as it was undertaken most amply, of the gravest labors and dangers and most troublesome cares, so was for you a most fruitful harvest of the highest praise and immortal glory. You indeed poured out in that legation, and

almost overturned, your patrimony; yet so for the public cause of Religion, that you poured it out in defending and protecting a Kingdom once most flourishing [France] — for which it was glorious to pour out even one's very blood and life. But that matter was assuredly greater than could be sufficiently proclaimed in a copious and rounded oration, much less be praised at the present time briefly and in haste according to its merit. It is certainly agreed (it suffices me only to have touched on it at this time) that there was no one at that time in France who was a greater object of hatred and terror to the heretics, or of solace and protection to the Catholics, than you. The heretics, that is, hated and at once feared and dreaded you — for [your] uncovering and unraveling of their hidden designs…

§ (Pererius to Caetani, part 1). Pererius dedicates the second volume to Cardinal Caetani, whose celebrated legation to France (1589–90, during the Wars of Religion) had cost him his patrimony in defense of the Catholic cause; no one in France was more feared by the heretics or a greater protection to Catholics (continues next page).

— p. 13 (PDF) · printed p. ded. to Card. Caetani (2) —

…and your marvelously perspicacious and vigilant prudence in crushing their attempts. And in bravely enduring the evils that could not be avoided, even unwilling they were compelled to admire the unconquered constancy of your mind. But above all it galled them that, by your authority especially, your counsel, and your eloquence, they saw the minds of the Catholics strengthened and sustained, lest they be weakened in such straits. But on the contrary, the lovers and defenders of the Catholic faith and religion fled to you as to a most firm pillar and most safe bulwark of the Gallican Church. And so, as all good men wonderfully revered you when present — for your exceptional gentleness and your greatness both of counsel and of spirit ready for all things — so at your departure and absence you left an incredible longing for you in their minds. Having therefore discharged your office excellently (which in so arduous and perplexed a business was indeed rare), you returned to us with your private fortune much diminished and worn away, yet rich in the consciousness of a

Christian cause prudently, piously, and faithfully conducted, and most wealthy in renown most celebrated among all. Therefore, since — just as Noah by the Ark freed those few men from the destruction of the Flood — so you have saved very many from the deadly inundation of evils threatening from the heretics, we have thought it fitting to offer and dedicate to you those things which we have commented on concerning Noah, the Ark, the Flood, the animals which, received into the Ark, escaped the disaster of the Flood, and other matters pertaining to that History, and have enclosed, committed to type, in this second volume. I do not beg of you that you hold this gift of mine pleasing and accepted: for that humanity toward all, that benignity, and that singular benevolence and grace with which you have deemed me worthy, do not allow me to doubt it. Rather I ask this: that you incline and apply the sons of the most excellent Duke Honoratus your brother — most choice young men, destined for ecclesiastical offices and honors — to these studies of divine letters above all; that you wish them to be kept in these, and to rejoice and delight in these above all. For in these studies the true glories of Christian nobility shine forth; from these the chief ornaments of ecclesiastical dignity are to be sought; these abound in the most honorable delights of the mind and the sweetest pleasures; in these, finally, are contained the treasures not of earthly and quickly-perishing wealth, but of immortal and heavenly riches.

§ (Pererius to Caetani, part 2). The heretics feared Caetani's prudence and constancy; Catholics fled to him as the bulwark of the Gallican Church; he returned from France poorer but glorious. Pererius draws the dedication's conceit: as Noah's Ark saved a few from the Flood, Caetani saved many from the ‘flood’ of heresy — so a volume on Noah, the Ark, and the Flood fittingly belongs to him. He closes by urging Caetani to direct his brother Duke Onorato's sons (bound for the Church) to the study of sacred letters.

— p. 14 (PDF) · printed p. Author to Reader + Approbatio —

THE AUTHOR TO THE READER. I indeed believed, most humane Reader, when I published the first Volume of my Commentaries on Genesis, that what remained of that book could be completed and comprehended in one further volume of Commentaries. But the event

deceived my expectation. For the work so grew — whether on account of the obscurity of many matters, which, being joined together for commentary, more vehemently rouses and sharpens industry, or on account of the abundance and pleasantness of many other matters, which invites to copiousness and at once impels it greatly — that, unless what remained were divided into two volumes, it would seem neither [short] enough nor convenient and pleasant enough for the reader. Now therefore the second volume comes to light, comprising the history of Moses from the fifth chapter to the twelfth in nine books of Commentaries and Disputations. In completing, polishing, filing, and perfecting it, how much of effort, labor, and care had to be undertaken and spent by us, the learned and practiced Reader will easily judge — even while we are silent — from the matters treated in it. Concerning the publication of the third volume I dare promise nothing, on account of the uncertain and deceptive condition of my health and life. Yet this I can truly say: that the greater part of that volume has been worked out and finished by us. Farewell.

'The Author to the Reader' (PDF 14). Pererius explains that the remaining Genesis material grew too large for one volume, so it was split; this second volume covers Gen 5–12 (Noah to the calling of Abraham) in nine books. He will not promise a third volume given his failing health, though most of it is already drafted. (The first volume covered Gen 1–5; a third, on the later chapters, was indeed published later.)

APPROBATION OF THE WORK. I, Brother Joannes Çaragoça [Zaragoza], Master and Associate of the most Reverend Father Brother Bartholomew de Miranda, Master of the Sacred Palace, by commission of his most Reverend Paternity, have seen and read through the second Volume of Commentaries on Genesis comprised in nine books, which the very Reverend Father Benedict Pererius of Valencia, of the Society of Jesus, together with the book On the Blessings of the Twelve Patriarchs, has brought to light, worked out with the greatest diligence. In it I have found nothing dissonant from the Catholic Faith and Christian discipline, nothing adverse to the integrity of morals, nothing that could offend the

minds of Catholic Princes, but much erudition, the varied and manifold doctrine of the holy Fathers, a far from common reading of the Theologians, and a wonderful dexterity in explaining the chapters of Genesis. For which reason I approve it, and judge it worthy to be set forth in print for the common utility and use of all. In faith of which I have signed the present [approbation] with my own hand. The 18th day of April, 1592. Fr. Joannes Çaragoça, Master.

Approbation (PDF 14, foot). The official ecclesiastical license, by Fr. Joannes Çaragoça, associate of the Master of the Sacred Palace (Bartolomé de Miranda), dated 18 April 1592 (Rome) — confirming the work (with the appended treatise on the Twelve Patriarchs' Blessings) contains nothing against faith or morals and is fit to print. A French printing privilege follows on PDF 17.

— p. 15 (PDF) · printed p. ded. to Card. Caetani (2): duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 16 (PDF) · printed p. Author to Reader + Approbatio: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 17 (PDF) · printed p. privileges —

Extract of the privilege of My Lord the Duke of Genevois and of Nemours. By privilege of My Lord the Duke of Genevois and of Nemours, Peer of France, following the power given to him by My Lord the Duke of Mayenne, Lieutenant-General of the Royal Estate and Crown of France: JEAN-BAPTISTE REGNAULD, bookseller-merchant at Lyon, is permitted to have printed the second Tome and volume of the works of the Reverend Father BENEDICTUS PERERIUS, of the Society of Jesus, on Genesis. With prohibition to all other booksellers and printers of this said city of Lyon to print, or have printed, sell, or distribute [it], other than those of the said Regnauld, for the space of ten years, beginning on the day when the said printing shall have been completed, under penalty of confiscation and an arbitrary fine. Which is held as notified to each and all, according to the said [clause] of the said privilege affixed to the said book. Given at Lyon, the last day of March, 1592. Signed, CHARLES DE SAVOIE. And by My Lord, MALEZIEU.

French royal printing privilege (PDF 17, upper). Issued in the name of Charles of Savoy, Duke of Genevois-Nemours — acting under the Duke of Mayenne (the Catholic League's lieutenant-general during the French Wars of Religion) — granting the Lyon bookseller Jean-Baptiste Regnauld a 10-year monopoly on this second volume. Given at Lyon, 31 March 1592. (Text in French, as printed.)

Privilege of the Father Provincial of the Lyon Province of the Society of Jesus, granted to Jean-Baptiste Regnauld. BERNARDINUS CASTORIUS [Bernardino Castori], Provincial of the Colleges of the Society of Jesus in the Province of Lyon, according to the privileges granted to the same Society by the Most Christian King of France on the 10th day of May 1583 (by which all booksellers are forbidden to print books composed by men of the same Society without their permission), do permit Jean-Baptiste Regnauld, bookseller of Lyon, that he may, for the next six years, print and freely sell the work entitled: ‘Of Benedict Pererius of Valencia, Priest of the Society of Jesus and Doctor of Theology, The Second Volume of Commentaries on Genesis’ — to which is adjoined, by the same Author, the ‘Book On the Blessings of the Twelve Patriarchs.’ Given at Lyon, the 6th day of June, 1592. BERNARDINUS CASTORIUS.

Jesuit Provincial's privilege (PDF 17, lower). Bernardino Castori, Provincial of Lyon, grants Regnauld a 6-year license under the Society's royal privilege of 10 May 1583 (which barred printing Jesuit authors' works without permission). Given at Lyon, 6 June 1592. Again names the appended treatise On the Blessings of the Twelve Patriarchs.

— p. 18 (PDF) · printed p. book-synopsis (1) —

WHAT MATTER, MOREOVER, IS CHIEFLY TREATED IN EACH OF THE NINE BOOKS OF THIS VOLUME, the Index which I shall here subjoin will show the Reader clearly and briefly. INDEX OF THE BOOKS OF THE SECOND VOLUME.

Heading of the book-by-book synopsis (PDF 18) — a brief table of contents of the nine books (Liber VIII–XVI).

In the eighth book, which is the first of this volume, is treated the wicked commingling of the sons of God and the daughters of men; the Giants; the general corruption of men, on account of which the Flood was sent by God.

In the ninth book (the second): the praises of Noah and the things that perished in the flood. In the tenth book (the third): the Ark of Noah, both according to history and according to allegory and tropology. In the eleventh book (the fourth): the things that were in the Ark — that is, Men, Animals, and Provisions. In the twelfth book (the fifth): the generation, increase, and state of the Flood. In the thirteenth book (the sixth): the diminution and end of the same flood, and the sacrifice which Noah, as soon as he had left the Ark, offered to God. In the fourteenth book (the seventh): the eating of flesh granted to men after the flood; the forbidden eating of blood; the Rainbow as a sign…

Synopsis of Liber VIII–XIV (1st–7th books of the volume): VIII = sons of God/daughters of men, the Giants, the general corruption that brought the Flood (Gen 6); IX = praises of Noah and what perished; X = the Ark (literal & allegorical); XI = the Ark's contents (men, animals, provisions); XII = the Flood's rise; XIII = its abatement and Noah's sacrifice; XIV begins = post-flood flesh-eating, the blood prohibition, the Rainbow (continues next page).

— p. 19 (PDF) · printed p. book-synopsis (2) —

…of the flood that would never come again; the drunkenness and nakedness of Noah; the partly-curse, partly-blessing of his sons. In the fifteenth book (the eighth): the first multiplication of men from the three sons of Noah after the flood; and likewise the first origin of peoples, nations, and kingdoms. In the sixteenth book (the ninth): the building of the city and tower of Babel; the confusion and division of tongues and the dispersion of men over the whole globe; the progeny of Sem down to Abraham; and the birth, marriage, and migration of Abraham from Chaldea into Mesopotamia.

Synopsis concluded: Liber XIV (rest) = the rainbow covenant, Noah's drunkenness, the curse/blessing of his sons; XV (8th book) = the post-flood multiplication and the first origin of peoples and nations (Gen 10); XVI (9th book) = Babel, the confusion of tongues and dispersion, Sem's line to Abraham, and Abraham's birth/marriage/migration (Gen 11). This matches the full sweep of the translated commentary (printed pp. 1–577).

And to these nine books is subjoined a commentary by the same Author on the Eleven Prophecies of Jacob, or On the Blessings of the Twelve Patriarchs, whose Index — both alphabetical and of passages of sacred Scripture — the reader will find after the end of that Commentary. But the things in each of the nine foregoing books (which are proper to this second volume) that have seemed to us both most beautiful for knowledge and most convenient for the various uses of readers — of these we have here prefixed a most copious Index, and, as it were, a certain Breviary of the whole work.

Structural note (PDF 19): a separate commentary — On the Eleven Prophecies of Jacob / On the Blessings of the Twelve Patriarchs — is appended after the nine books, with its own (alphabetical + Scripture) indexes following IT. And the 'most copious Index' that follows here (PDF 20–67) is the subject index to the nine books, a 'Breviary of the whole work.'

— p. 20 (PDF) · printed p. index (1) — conventions + Bk VIII —

INDEX OF THE DISPUTATIONS AND MEMORABLE THINGS which are treated in the several books of this second Volume of Commentaries on Genesis. The letter that is the mark of the number indicates the section-numbers set in the margin of each book; the following [figure] indicates the page: 'p.' the beginning, 'm.' the middle, 'f.' the end of the page. Those things marked in the margin with this star-sign ✶ contain moral and allegorical doctrine which may be of use to Preachers — so that, for pointing these out to the Reader, there is no need to compose a separate Index of their own.

Header of the analytical index (PDF 20). Explains its citation system: each entry gives the marginal section-number(s) and the page, with p./m./f. = top/middle/foot of the page; a star (✶) flags entries of moral/allegorical interest for preachers. The index is arranged book by book.

IN THE EIGHTH BOOK — that is, the first of this second Volume — which is on the cause for which the flood was sent by God.

Sub-heading: index entries for Liber VIII (the volume's first book; Gen 6, the causes of the Flood).

That the wickedness of those men who lived before the flood was most signal in four respects. §1, p. 69.

Index entry (Bk VIII, §1, p. 2).

The narration of Berosus Annianus concerning the institutions and customs of the men who lived at the time of the flood is examined. §§3 & 4, p. 71.

Index entry (Bk VIII, §§3–4, p. 4).

The multiplication of men, of which Moses speaks at the beginning of the sixth chapter — at what time, after Adam and before the flood, it began. §§6, 7, 8, pp. 72 & 73.

Index entry (Bk VIII, §§6–8, pp. 5–6).

A certain Tradition about the men who lived before the flood, falsely ascribed to Methodius, is refuted. §9, p. 73.

Index entry (Bk VIII, §9, p. 6).

✶ A moral disputation: why, in communities of men, generally at the outset when they are few, virtue and the vigor of discipline flourish more than when they have greatly multiplied. §§11 & 12, p. 74.

Index entry (Bk VIII, §§11–12, p. 7), starred as morally/allegorically useful for preachers.

Intemperance of pleasures makes the procreation of females more numerous than that of males. §13, p. 75.

Index entry (Bk VIII, §13, p. 8).

— p. 21 (PDF) · printed p. index (2) — Bk VIII —

Concerning that [verse], ‘The sons of God seeing the daughters of men,’ etc.: the variant reading of that phrase, ‘sons of God.’ §14, p. 76.

A disputation: what ought to be understood by that phrase, ‘sons of God.’ §15, p. 76.

That Moses did not call them ‘sons of God,’ whether good men or Angels. §§16, 17.

That by that phrase, ‘sons of God,’ four kinds of men can be signified, but chiefly the descendants of Seth. §§20, 21, 22, p. 78.

✶ How harmful and pestilent is fellowship and association with the wicked, and most of all with women: a brief disputation drawn from sacred letters. §25, p. 82.

✶ What the cause is why those who had been the best men, by sinning, often turn into the most wicked. §26, p. 82.

✶ How in various ways the Devil tried to hinder God's plan and purpose of providing man for those heavenly seats from which the evil Angels had been cast down: the excellent opinion of Rupert. §28, p. 83.

On the multitude and weight of authors who thought that the sons of God mingled with women were Angels. §§29–32, pp. 84 & 85.

Why Cyril thinks that opinion greatly pleased many. §33, p. 86.

Cassian's argumentation, by which he refutes the aforesaid opinion, is weighed. §34, p. 86.

That the good Angels did not fall from heaven for the love of women: proved both from sacred scripture and from the clear testimony of Chrysostom. §§36, 37, pp. 87 & 88.

A disputation: whether it was Demons whom Moses said were mingled with women. §38, p. 88.

Strange but false things the Platonists reported about the nature and character of Demons. §§38, 39.

On the various bodies of Demons, and their six kinds according to Psellus. §§42, 43.

The opinion of Franciscus Georgius on the Nature of Demons is false and absurd. §45, p. 91.

It is proved from sacred scripture and from Philosophy that a Demon does not naturally have a body, whether celestial, elemental, or mixed. §46, pp. 91 & 92.

That Demons are not mortal, as Plutarch, Hesiod, and Cardano handed down. §48, p. 92.

If a Demon had an airy body, it would be much inferior to man according to nature. §49, p. 93.

The argument of Cajetan, by which he concludes that Demons naturally have an airy body, is examined. §51, p. 93.

Aristotle thought there is no body having an intellective soul which would not at the same time also have a sensitive soul. §52, p. 94.

— p. 22 (PDF) · printed p. index (3) — Bk VIII —

Even if Demons were naturally corporeal, they could not have the power of generating. §55, pp. 94 & 95.

Even if Demons had the power of generating, they still could not generate anything from women, much less a man. §§57, 58, pp. 95 & 96.

A disputation on Sylvans, Fauns, and Satyrs: whether they existed in nature, and were generated from the intercourse of Demons. §60, p. 97.

A disputation on Demons, Incubi, and Succubi. §61 and following, p. 98.

Whether the Giants were generated by incubus-Demons: a disputation with Paul of Burgos. §66, p. 99 (mid).

A disputation: whether Demons take delight in bodily pleasures. §69, p. 100 (mid).

✶ That the vice of lust is, in four respects, more detestable than the other vices. §71, p. 101 (top).

A disputation: whether a Demon, by means of male seed, can generate a man from a woman. §73 and following, p. 101 (foot).

Whether a Demon can assume a body similar in all respects to a human one. §77.

Whether a body assumed by a Demon can be known by touch not to be a real and truly human body. §79.

Two notable stories from Alexander [of Hales], that bodies assumed by demons are cold to the touch, and cannot render the softness and warmth of human flesh. §§82, 83, p. 105 (top).

A disputation of Cajetan, that the demons themselves confessed that, although they greatly desire it, they cannot make a body similar to a human one as to touch. §84.

✶ Five significations according to which the word ‘spirit’ is used in sacred letters. §85, p. 107 and following.

Whether what Chrysostom advised — that the word ‘flesh’ is always taken in scripture in a bad sense, and said of the carnal man — is proved true. §92, p. 109 (mid).

✶ Whom scripture calls carnal men. §94, p. 110 (foot).

✶ The excellent opinion of Gregory, teaching how man, inasmuch as he is rational, is said to become flesh. §95, p. 110 (mid).

How God, according to Cajetan, judges both the good and the evil in this life spiritually, not corporeally. §98.

A disputation concerning those words, ‘His days shall be a hundred and twenty years’: whether God contracted human life after the flood to only a

hundred and twenty years. §99, p. 112 (foot).

That the period of those hundred and twenty years is the time which God then granted to man for coming to his senses and doing penance; and from when it ought to be reckoned. §102, p. 114 (top).

— p. 23 (PDF) · printed p. index (4) — Bk VIII —

How many years old Noah was when God spoke to him those words which Moses treats at the beginning of the sixth chapter. §103, p. 114 (foot).

A disputation on the Giants: what kind of men ought to be understood as denoted by Moses with the word ‘Giants.’ §111, p. 117 (foot).

What Theodoret, and likewise Berosus Annianus, dispute about the Giants. §113, p. 118.

Various properties are recounted which divine scripture is wont to attribute to those whom it itself calls Giants. §116, p. 120 (top).

A disputation with Paul of Burgos: whether those whom Moses calls Giants were real Demons, counterfeiting human nature with assumed bodies. §117, p. 120 (foot).

On the etymology of the Hebrew word ‘Nephilim,’ which the Latin translator rendered ‘Giants.’ §118, p. 121 (mid).

On the origin of the Hebrew word ‘Raphaim,’ by which word Giants are signified in sacred letters. §120, p. 121 (foot).

The opinion of those who thought the Giants were indeed real men, but yet generated from the mingling of demons and women, is examined. §121.

A disputation against Franciscus Georgius, who denies that the Giants could be generated, like other men, from men alone without the operation of demons. §122 and following, p. 122.

That Giants existed not only before the flood, but also after the flood, and even after the coming of our Saviour. §126 and following, p. 123 (foot) and following.

That the fables of the Poets about Giants perhaps (as it pleases learned men) had their origin from this history of Moses. §129, p. 125.

How certain Poets fabled about the size, strength, shape, dwelling, and battle of the Giants with the Gods. §§129, 130, 131, pp. 125–126.

✶ How that is to be understood which Moses said, that the whole thought of the heart of those men was bent on evil at all times. §137, p. 128 (mid).

A disputation against the heretics of our time, who say that every work and action of any man, even of one justified, is sin. §138, p. 129 (top).

✶ That the heretics are like Sisyphus, laboring in vain to advance their errors. §140, p. 129 (foot).

How that is to be understood which Isaiah said, that all our righteousnesses are as the cloth of a menstruous woman. §142, p. 131 (mid).

Of that saying of David, ‘In your sight no living thing shall be justified,’ four interpretations drawn from the Fathers. §144, p. 131 (foot).

✶ On those words, ‘It repented God that he had made man,’ etc.: a disputation how repentance can truly be said to be in God… [continues on the next page]

— p. 24 (PDF) · printed p. index (5) — Bk VIII end / Bk IX —

…[how repentance and grief are truly said to be in God]: containing the learned testimonies of Justin Martyr, Augustine, Theodoret, Rupert, and others. §151 and following, pp. 133, 134.

✶ A disputation, following Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others: why God willed even the animals, which had committed no sin, to perish in

the flood. §161 and following, pp. 138, 139, 140.

IN THE NINTH BOOK, which is on the praises of Noah and those who perished in the Flood.

Index entries for Liber IX (the volume's second book; the praises of Noah and those who perished in the Flood).

That it is of great praise and virtue to be good among the bad, just as it is of grave fault to be bad among the good: declared by examples and sayings produced from divine scripture. §§1, 2, p. 142.

That at no time was the human race so corrupt that God did not have, even from it, worshippers of his name. §4, ibid.

On the etymology of the name Noah, which means rest or consolation. §5, p. 143.

How Noah consoled the men of his time from their works and labors [Gen 5:29], when in his time the flood came about. §6 and following, pp. 144 (mid)–145 throughout the page.

✶ That Noah, by the mystery of his name, was an illustrious figure of Christ the Lord: the excellent opinion of Rupert. §11, p. 146 (top).

✶ What it is to find grace before God, and how Noah found that grace. §12, pp. 146 (foot) & 147 (top).

That the true nobility of man ought to be estimated not from the renown of parents or predecessors, but from excellence of virtues: an excellent disputation of Ambrose and Chrysostom. §16, p. 148 (mid).

What it is that Noah was just and perfect: the interpretation of Chrysostom and Cajetan. §§18, 19, p. 149 throughout.

What it is that Noah was just in his generation. §21, p. 151 (top).

✶ What it is that is read of some in sacred scripture, ‘to walk with God’ or ‘before God.’ §22, p. 151 (top).

✶ A disputation: whether anyone in this life can truly be called perfect. §23 and following, pp. 151 (foot) & 152 (top).

A disputation of St. Augustine: how scripture calls some immaculate, innocent, and without sin, while elsewhere the same scripture teaches that no one lives without sin. §24, p. 152 (mid).

Who are perfect in this life according to Augustine. §25, p. 152 (foot).

✶ That in five ways some can be called perfect in this life. §26, p. 153 (top).

The praise of Noah according to the prophet Ezekiel. §29, p. 157 (mid).

— p. 25 (PDF) · printed p. index (6) — Bk IX —

The clear panegyric of the same Noah which is in the book of Ecclesiasticus. §30, p. 154 (foot).

The encomium of Noah according to blessed Paul. §31, p. 155 (mid).

How Paul calls Noah the heir of the justice which is through faith. §32, p. 155 (foot) and following.

The saying of blessed Peter is explained, that God did not spare the original world, but kept Noah the eighth, a herald of justice. §33, p. 156 (top).

The testimony of Josephus concerning Noah. §34, p. 156 (mid).

A disputation of Chrysostom on the admirable continence of Noah. §35 and following, p. 156 (foot) and following.

That the opinion is not improbable of those who thought Noah, before begetting Sem, Cham, and Japheth, begot other sons, but that they died before the flood. §38, p. 158 (top).

✶ How it is to be understood that the earth itself is polluted and corrupted on account of the sins of men. §39 and following, p. 158 (mid–foot).

How God is said to see the sins of men. §43, p. 160 (top).

✶ Explanation of that saying, ‘All flesh had corrupted its way,’ and how varied in sacred letters is the meaning of that word ‘way.’ §§44, 45, p. 160 (mid–foot).

Whether at the time of the flood not only men but also animals (as Lyra, following the Hebrews, reported) were mingled against nature with one another. §46, p. 161.

✶ What that is which God said, ‘The end of all flesh has come before me.’ §48, p. 162 (mid).

Prodigies and portents seen in the sky as the persecution of the Lombards threatened. §50.

How it is true, what scripture hands down, that the earth was destroyed and ruined by the flood. §52, p. 163 (foot).

A disputation: whether all who perished in the flood were also condemned to the eternal punishments of hell. §52, p. 164 (mid).

The opinion of blessed Jerome and Rupert is set forth, who seem to have held that not all those who perished in the flood bodily perished also spiritually. §§53, 54, p. 164 (foot).

That Christ after death descended in soul to the lower regions is demonstrated by the testimony of many fathers. §55, p. 165 (mid).

That Christ preached to those who were in hell, and with great fruit for them, is the opinion of many Fathers. §56.

That the preaching of Christ among those below profited those who had perished in Noah's flood: the opinion of Lyra and Cajetan. §58 and

following, p. 166 (foot).

That in three ways it can be conceived that those who perished in Noah's flood did not all perish spiritually, but that none of those ways is pro[bable]… [continues on the next page]

— p. 26 (PDF) · printed p. index (7) — Bk IX end —

…[that none of those ways is] probable. §61, p. 167 (foot).

That besides Noah and those who were saved in the Ark, there were none just at the time of the flood: proved from scripture. §§62, 63 and following, p. 168.

That it is said gratuitously by some, that many of those who perished in the flood, although up to that time they had been wicked, repented at the onset of the flood and did saving penance. §65, p. 169.

That none of those who had been condemned to the punishments of hell was freed thence by Christ's descent to the lower regions: this is Catholic doctrine and opinion, confirmed by many testimonies of the Fathers. §§67, 68 and following, p. 169 (foot) and following.

It is disputed what Christ led out from hell. §71, p. 171 (mid).

A disputation of blessed Augustine: whom, descending into hell, Christ led out thence, loosed from the pains of hell. §72 and following, p. 172 (mid).

A strong argumentation by which it is proved that none of the damned was freed by Christ from the punishments of hell. §76 and following, p. 173 (foot).

Whether, if Christ had freed any men from the pains of hell, it would consequently follow that he had also freed some of the demons. §78, p. 174 (mid).

✶ How that saying of the prophet Nahum is to be understood, ‘God will not take vengeance twice for the same thing.’ §80 and following.

✶ What Peter said in Acts 2, that Christ loosed the pains of hell — and in what ways — is expounded. §84, p. 176 (foot).

Whether it can be gathered from sacred letters that the bosom of Abraham, or the limbo of the holy fathers, was within the earth and a certain part of hell — about which Saint Augustine seems to have doubted. §87 and following, p. 177 (foot) and following.

How it is to be understood, what Peter wrote, that the Gospel of Christ was preached even to the dead. §89 and following, p. 178 (foot) and following.

What it is that Paul in a certain place said, that some are baptized for the dead. §92, p. 179 (foot).

How it is to be understood what Peter said, that Christ preached to the spirits who were in prison, etc. §93 and following, p. 180 (mid).

What the word ‘prison’ signifies in Scripture, besides its common meaning. §94, p. 181 (top).

Just as Scripture names man with the word ‘flesh,’ so also with the word ‘spirit.’ §95, p. 181 (mid).

A remark against Cajetan, who said that those who perished in the flood were indeed unbelievers toward Noah, but not unbelievers toward God. §§99, 100, p. 183 (mid).

— p. 27 (PDF) · printed p. index (8) — Bk X (Ark) —

IN THE TENTH BOOK, which is on the Ark of Noah.

Index entries for Liber X (the third book; the Ark of Noah).

That, among the things mentioned in sacred letters as made by men not only at God's command but also by his designation and prescription — the

Mosaic Tabernacle, Solomon's Temple, and the Ark of Noah — this [the Ark] was more wonderful than the others, for five reasons. §1, p. 185.

A disputation: whether the Ark is rather an ‘ark’ than a ‘ship.’ §§3, 4, pp. 186 (foot)–187 (top).

That the raft on which Deucalion (as the Poets fabled) was saved from the flood was also called by the word ‘Ark’; and that that fable flowed from the History of Moses, with many lies mixed in. §5, p. 187 (foot).

Berosus Annianus is refuted, who says Noah foresaw the coming flood by observation of the stars. §11, p. 187 (mid).

From what kind of wood the Ark of Noah was made. §6 and following, p. 188.

That not the same kind of wood could be suitable for making all the parts of the Ark. §8.

Where the wood could be found that would suffice for constructing an Ark of such magnitude. §9, p. 189 (mid).

The commendation of cedars in sacred letters. §10, pp. 189 (foot)–190 (top).

On the nature and properties of bitumen. §12, p. 190 (mid–foot).

Why God commanded the Ark to be smeared with bitumen inside and out. §13, pp. 190 (foot) & 191 (top).

A disputation on the magnitude and capacity of the Ark. §14, p. 191 (mid).

That the proportion of the Ark's dimensions was such as is the proportion of the human body. §14, p. 191 (foot).

On the various kinds of measures: what is a Pace, an Ell, a Cubit, a foot, a palm, and a finger. §15, p. 192 (top).

That among the Hebrews there were two kinds of cubit: one common, of a foot and a half; the other which they called true and perfect, greater than the common by one palm — the Royal cubit, which Herodotus mentions. §16, p. 192 (mid).

What is that cubit which in Deuteronomy chapter three is called the ‘manly cubit,’ or of a man's hand. §17, p. 192 (foot).

That the capacity of the whole Ark, by geometric reckoning, was 450,000 common solid cubits. §19, p. 193 (mid).

Whether the sacred cubit, by which the magnitude of the Ark and of the Mosaic tabernacle and of Solomon's Temple was defined, was nearly double the common and usual one. §21, p. 194 (top).

A mathematical argument and demonstration by which some have tried to prove that the measure of the sacred cubit was that which is just before describ[ed]… [continues on the next page]

— p. 28 (PDF) · printed p. index (9) — Bk X (Ark) —

…[the measure of the sacred cubit] is defined. §23, pp. 194 (foot) & 195.

Whether the bronze Sea which was in Solomon's temple, and which Scripture says was round, ought to be thought to have been mathematically and perfectly round. §24, p. 196 (mid).

When Scripture says that the length of Solomon's temple was sixty cubits ‘in the first measure,’ what it wished to signify by those words, ‘in the first measure.’ §25, pp. 196 (foot)–197.

The opinion of Origen, thinking that Moses spoke in geometric cubits when he defined the magnitude of the Ark; and that each geometric cubit is defined by Origen as nine feet, and contains six common cubits. §27, p. 198.

The exposition and defense of the aforesaid opinion of Origen, devised by Jean Borrel (Buteo), is examined. §28, p. 199 (foot).

A confutation of Origen's opinion, and a demonstration that Moses, neither in this place nor anywhere else in his books, spoke of geometric cubits. §31.

How enormous and useless the magnitude and capacity of the Ark would have been, if it had consisted of geometric cubits, as Origen thought. §32, p. 201 (foot).

By what men the Ark was built. §33, p. 202 (foot).

Wonders concerning the ship of Hiero, king of Syracuse. §34, p. 203 (foot).

On the Ephesian temple of Diana; and a contradiction removed from what Pliny wrote about it. §35, p. 203 (top).

Berosus Annianus is refuted, in whom it is read that seventy-eight years were consumed in building the Ark. §36, p. 203 (foot).

It is disputed whether the old and common opinion of a hundred years in building the Ark is exact, true, and certain. §37 and following, p. 204 (top).

That five things especially are to be considered in the structure of Noah's Ark: first its stories or floorings (or, as the Latin translator calls them, ‘upper rooms’); then the rooms for the habitation of animals; besides, the door of the Ark; in addition, the window; lastly the top and roof-ridge of the Ark. §39, p. 204 (foot).

A disputation: what were the principal parts of the Ark — parts, I say, of which each contained the whole length and breadth of the Ark, but only some part of the height. §40.

The opinion of Origen, making five parts of the Ark. §41, p. 206 (mid).

Whether the Seventy Translators, saying the Ark was ‘of two chambers and three chambers,’ wished to signify that it had five chambers (as Origen interpreted), or only three (as Augustine expounds). §42, p. 207 (top).

The opinion of Lyra, Tostatus, the Carthusian [Denis], and the Scholastic History, that the Ark was divided into five parts, but yet otherwise than Origen distinguished. §43, p. 207 (foot).

The author's opinion, who — on account of the bottom and the bilge of the Ark — makes three principal parts of it: the bottom, for the habitation of land animals; the middle, for the keeping of provisions; the top, for the habitation of men and birds. §44, p. 207 (foot) and following.

The lowest part of the Ark was eight or nine, or ten, cubits high; but the bottom of the Ark, which they call the bilge, [was] four or five cubits. §44, p. 207 (foot) and following.

What the Latin translator calls in the Ark ‘upper rooms’ (coenacula) and ‘third stories’ (tristega). §45, p. 208 (foot).

When it is said, ‘Below you shall make the upper rooms and third stories,’ what that word ‘below’ signifies, and to what it ought to be referred. §46 and following, p. 209 (mid–foot).

A disputation on the rooms which were in the Ark. §47, p. 210 (mid).

That in that part of the Ark destined for the habitation of animals, 300 rooms could be marked out, sufficient to hold all the animals that were in the Ark; each little room having six cubits of length and as many of breadth, but eight or nine of height. §48.

Description of that part of the Ark in which were the provisions. §49, p. 211 (mid).

How both fodder and drink were dispensed in the Ark to all the animals. §50, ibid.

Description of the topmost part of the Ark, in which were the men, according to Bartholomew. §51, p. 211 (foot).

A disputation with Hugh of St. Victor: whether outside the Ark there were any little rooms affixed externally to the Ark itself, for the use of the animals called amphibians. §52, p. 211 (mid–foot).

That amphibian animals can live long in the waters, and do not entirely need aquatic food. §53, p. 213 (mid).

A disputation on the door of the Ark: on which side of the Ark the door was, and in what part of it — the top, the middle, or the bottom. §54, p. 213 (foot) and following.

How the animals could easily ascend and enter into the Ark. §§57, 58, p. 215 (top–mid).

A disputation on the window of the Ark. §59, p. 215 (mid).

The opinion of the Hebrews, that the Ark had [its light] in a certain very large, most-shining gem. §60, p. 215 (foot).

The opinion of others, that in the top part of the Ark there were several windows round about, of mirror-stone or glass or crystal. §61, p. 215 (foot) and following.

Buteo (Borrel) makes only one window, but a transparent one. §62, p. 216 (top).

— p. 30 (PDF) · printed p. index (11) — Bk X (Ark, allegory) —

How great the size of the window was. §63, p. 216 (top).

A disputation: what was the figure and form of the structure of the Ark; the various opinions of authors are recounted and refuted. §64, p. 216 (foot).

The first opinion, of Origen. §65 and following, p. 217 (foot) and following.

The second opinion, of Hugh [of St. Victor]. §69, p. 219 (foot).

The third opinion, of Cajetan. §72, pp. 220, 221.

The fourth opinion, of Nicholas of Lyra. §73, p. 222 (mid).

The fifth opinion, of Jean Borrel (Buteo). §75, p. 223 (foot).

Whether for that [roof] a single cubit was sufficient for a convenient slope and run-off of the water. §75, p. 224 (top).

✶ *A DISPUTATION on the mystical — that is, the allegorical and tropological — interpretation and understanding of Noah's Ark.*

Sub-heading within Liber X: the mystical (allegorical and tropological) interpretation of the Ark.

That the Ark of Noah, besides the history of the things narrated by Moses, prefigured many mysteries of the Church of Christ — so that no one can doubt or deny these. §77, p. 225 (top).

That a threefold interpretation of the Ark is treated — according to Physiology, Allegory, and Tropology. §78, p. 225 (foot).

A most beautiful disputation of Ambrose, declaring the similarity of the Ark and the human body, as to all the things which Moses hands down about it. §80 and following, p. 226 (foot) and following.

How the Ark of Noah, according to Allegory, is a figure of the Church of Christ. §81 and following, p. 230.

That Noah, both in name and in deeds, was a figure of Christ. §84, ibid.

On the twofold rest which Christ brought to the human race. §85, p. 230 (mid).

How the pastors and Doctors of the Church are like the squared timbers of which the Ark consisted. §87, p. 231 (mid).

How true Christians must be smeared with bitumen inside and out, in the likeness of the Ark. §88, p. 231 (foot).

Just as in the Ark there were many rooms for the diversity of animals and men, so in the house of God there are many mansions for the diversity of merits and rewards. §89, p. 232 (top).

What it allegorically signifies that the Ark was gathered to one cubit at the top, that it had one door on the side, and received light from only one window. §90, p. 232 (foot).

Just as the Ark contained animals of every kind, both clean and unclean, so in the Church there are the perfect and the imperfect, the good and the bad. §91, p. 233 (mid).

— p. 31 (PDF) · printed p. index (12) — Bk X end / Bk XI —

Why the good are signified by the number seven, but the bad by the number two. §91, ibid.

By its length the Ark denoted faith, by its breadth Charity, by its height the loftiness of divine wisdom and of Evangelical perfection. §92, p. 233 (foot).

That the Ark was wide at the bottom but narrow at the top: most beautifully Gregory applies this to the Church. §93.

How the Ark of Noah, according to Tropology, was a figure of the wise and perfect man: the disputation of Origen. §94, p. 234 (foot).

What Moses wrote about the Ark, Hugh of St. Victor excellently applies to the soul of man. §95 and following, p. 235 (mid).

What is the door and the window of the Soul, through which it goes out either to action or to contemplation. §97, p. 236 (foot).

On the four ways by which our mind goes out to action. §98, p. 237 (mid).

On the four ways by which we go out by contemplation; and on the fourfold consideration of creatures. §99, p. 237 (foot).

✶ That every creature speaks to us with these three words: Receive, Render, Flee. Receive the benefit; Render the debt; Flee the punishment. The first word is of a servant, the second of an admonisher, the third of one who threatens. §99, p. 238 (top).

That the three rooms in the Ark signify three kinds of thoughts in the Soul. §100, p. 238 (foot).

IN THE ELEVENTH BOOK, on the things that were in the Ark of Noah: that is, on Men, Animals, and Provisions.

Index entries for Liber XI (the fourth book; what was in the Ark — men, animals, and provisions).

On the name of Noah's wife, and of his sons' wives, according to Berosus Annianus, according to the Gnostics, and according to Epiphanius. §1, p. 241 (mid).

That neither the men nor the animals, while they were in the Ark, were free for generation [i.e. they abstained]. §2, p. 241 (foot).

Where Henoch was at the time of the flood. §3, p. 242 (top).

That Noah alone was worthy to be saved from the destruction of the flood; but the others were saved both for his sake, and that they might be the authors of restoring the human race after the flood. §4, p. 242 (foot).

Why, just as at the beginning of the world God procreated the rest from one man, he did not do likewise also after the flood. §4, ibid.

✶ A disputation on the clean and unclean animals that entered the Ark; and which are called clean, and which unclean, animals. §5, p. 243 (mid).

A disputation: whether before the law of Moses and before the flood there was a distinction of clean and unclean animals… [continues on the next page]

— p. 32 (PDF) · printed p. index (13) — Bk XI (animals) —

…[a distinction of clean and unclean] animals. §6 and following, p. 243 (foot).

That many things sanctioned by the law of Moses were previously in use among upright and pious men. §8, p. 244 (foot).

It is disputed against certain Hebrew Rabbis that many things were lawful before the law of Moses which were afterward forbidden to the Hebrews by that law. §9, p. 245 (mid).

What that phrase ‘by sevens and sevens’ signifies — truly seven animals, or fourteen; and likewise that ‘by twos and twos’ — whether it signifies four or only two. §10 and following, p. 246.

Why God commanded that more of the clean animals be received into the Ark than of the unclean. §11 and following, p. 247.

Why God willed neither more nor fewer than seven of the clean animals to enter the Ark. §14.

What Ambrose hands down on the power of the number seven. §14, ibid.

✶ Whether, as Chrysostom signifies, the mysteries of numbers — which many investigate very curiously and scrupulously — are to be despised. §15 and following, p. 248 (mid–foot) and following.

A quite probable reason why seven of the clean animals entered the Ark. §18, p. 249 (mid–foot).

Four doubts about the animals that entered the Ark are explained. §19, p. 250 (top).

✶ Why, just as in land animals, the distinction of clean and unclean was not likewise placed also in birds. §21, p. 250 (foot) and following.

A disputation: how the animals were brought to the Ark from all the places of the earth. §24, p. 252 (top).

That they were not brought by Noah himself, as Philo signifies. §24, ibid.

That the animals did not come into the Ark of their own accord, to escape the flood already begun, as Hugh seems to indicate. §25, p. 252 (mid–foot).

That the animals were gathered and led to the Ark by the ministry of Angels. §26, p. 252 (foot) and following.

Philo is censured, who sets such a difference between the Ark of Noah and the earthly Paradise: that in the former there were men and [animals] of every kind, but in the latter only men and no animal. §§27, 28, p. 253.

That three kinds of animals did not enter the Ark: one was the aquatic, which the flood could not harm; another, of those that are generated from putrefying matter; the third, of those that are born from a different species of animals. §29, p. 254 (top).

Six species of animals born from rotten matter. §29, p. 254 (foot).

That the aforesaid three kinds of animals were not in the Ark is demonstrated from the narration of Moses, and is proved… [continues on the next page]

— p. 33 (PDF) · printed p. index (14) — Bk XI (animals) —

…[that the three kinds of animals were not in the Ark is confirmed] by the excellent testimony of Augustine. §§30 & 33, p. 254 (foot) and following.

On the animals which were in the Ark.

Sub-heading within Liber XI: the animals that were in the Ark (five kinds).

Five kinds of animals entered the Ark: Birds, Reptiles, carnivorous Quadrupeds, non-carnivorous Quadrupeds of large body, and lastly non-carnivorous Quadrupeds of smaller body. §32, p. 256 (mid).

Three reasons are set out why the Author, in mentioning the animals that entered the Ark, wished to indicate briefly the wonderful natures and powers of some, not known to everyone. §33, p. 256 (foot).

Of the large-bodied animals that entered the Ark, twenty-five species are recounted. §34, p. 257 (top).

✶ Where there are winged serpents which kill by their breath alone, or even by their gaze when one approaches nearer. §34, ibid.

✶ Whether vipers are burst by giving birth and killed by their own young. §§35, 36, p. 257 (mid–foot).

How that is to be understood which is read in Isaiah ch. 14, ‘From the root of the snake shall come forth a basilisk, and its seed shall swallow up the bird.’ §37, p. 258 (top).

On the Basilisk: that one stabled under a certain vault at Rome was, by its breath, very deadly to the Romans. §37, ibid.

✶ Wonders concerning the Tarantulas of Apulia. §39, p. 258 (foot).

That different from this species is the one commonly called at Rome ‘Terrantula.’ Ibid.

Why Aristotle pursued the nature and habits of almost no animal so subtly and copiously as the Chameleon's. §40, p. 258 (foot) and following.

✶ Whether the Chameleon feeds on air alone, and changes into any color. §§41, 42, p. 259 (foot).

✶ The wonderful nature of the Scytale serpent. §43, ibid.

On the various and wonderful kinds of Serpents. §§43, 44, p. 259 (foot) and following.

On the Hydrus and the Hydra. §45, p. 260 (mid).

Thirty-five species of the carnivorous animals that entered the Ark are set out. §46, p. 260 (foot).

✶ On the Dragons of the Atlas mountain, and those by the river Ganges, whose eyes are said to be gems with a precious fiery brilliance; likewise on Dragons generated from an Eagle and a She-wolf. §46, p. 260 (foot).

On the Panther. §47, p. 261 (mid).

On the Tiger. §48, p. 261 (foot).

On the lynx-wolf, which is also called Thos. §49, p. 261 (foot).

That the Lynx is of the wolf-kind; whether it differs from the lynx-wolf; whether its urine hardens into the hardness of a precious stone. §50, p. 262 (mid).

That the Sphinx is numbered among the Apes; and what kind of animal it is, and of what disposition and habits. §51, p. 262 (foot).

— p. 34 (PDF) · printed p. index (15) — Bk XI (animals) —

On the Hyena. §52, p. 263 (foot).

On the Lycaon: what kind of animal it truly is, and what it is fabled to be by the Poets. §53, p. 263 (foot).

✶ Where there are flying cats, yet without wings. §54, p. 263 (foot).

On the Leucrocota. §55, p. 263 (foot).

What kind of animal the Eale is. §56, p. 263 (foot).

On the Boa serpent. §56, ibid.

The wonderful form of the serpents which are in Calicut: for they are four-footed, with a swine-like head and living venom, yet nonetheless killing men with their teeth. §57, p. 264 (top).

On the Bull which has movable horns. §57, p. 264 (top).

On the Chaus and the Cephus. §58, ibid.

The Crocuta, conceived from a dog and a wolf, breaking everything with its teeth and digesting straightway in its belly what it has devoured. §59, ibid.

The wonderful nature of a certain beast, which in Slavonia is called Rossomacha [the wolverine], is described. §60, p. 264 (mid).

A DISPUTATION on the non-carnivorous animals of large body that entered the Ark. Thirty-four species of such animals are recounted. §61, p. 265 (top).

Sub-heading within Liber XI: the large non-carnivorous animals (34 species).

✶ On the Rhinoceros and the Monoceros (Unicorn), wonders are handed down from Pliny, Solinus, and Cardano. §§62, 63, ibid. (top–mid).

On the Bubalus, which in Italy is commonly called Buffalo. §64, p. 265 (foot).

That different from these is the one which Aristotle and sacred scripture name Bubalus. §§64, 65, p. 265 (foot) and following.

Wonders concerning the Wild Asses (Onagers), of which there is frequent mention in the divine letters. §66, p. 266 (mid).

What kind of animal the Urus is: the description of Caesar. §68, p. 267 (top).

On the Bonasus and the Bison. §69, ibid.

On the Tarandus, which takes the color of whatever thing it has approached. §70, ibid.

✶ On the Ostrich (Struthocamelus). §71, p. 267 (foot).

What kind of animal the Tragelaphus (goat-stag) is. §71, p. 268 (top).

The Musmo (mouflon), an animal proper to Sardinia, with deer-like hair, of that size, with ram's horns curved backward. §73, p. 268 (mid).

✶ On the animal commonly called the ‘Great Beast’ (the elk), whose hoof, hung on the neck, is believed to help against the falling sickness: its description from Cardano. §74, p. 268 (mid).

✶ Among quadrupeds, to some no animal has seemed more wonderful than that kind of ox which New Spain bears, called in Spanish ‘Corcobado’ (i.e. humpbacked) [the American bison]: an animal which — it is incredible to say — furnishes so many uses to the natives. §75, p. 268 (foot).

— p. 35 (PDF) · printed p. index (16) — Bk XI (animals, Phoenix, food) —

A DISPUTATION on the non-carnivorous animals of smaller body that entered the Ark, of which thirty-seven species are recounted.

Sub-heading within Liber XI: the small non-carnivorous animals (37 species).

On the Porcupine (Hystrix). §76, p. 269 (mid).

✶ The wonderful cleverness of the Squirrel. §77, p. 269 (foot).

On the Machlis [elk]. §78, p. 270 (top).

✶ The Elk (Alces), what kind of animal it is, Caesar elegantly described. §79, p. 270 (top–mid).

Four kinds of Apes, and wonders concerning the Cercopithecus (long-tailed monkey). §83, p. 271 (top).

The Alopecopithecus, an Ethiopian animal partly like a fox, partly like an ape, having as it were a pouch under its belly in which it carries its young, and does not let them out except while it wishes to suckle them: like it in this is the Chiurca [opossum]. §85, p. 271 (foot) and following.

On the animal which in Brazil is called Tatu [armadillo]. §86, p. 272 (top).

Eight species of Goats. §87, ibid.

Wonderful things are told of the Ibexes. §88, p. 272 (mid).

On a certain animal of wonderful nature but unnamed, from the account of Cardano. §91, p. 273 (foot).

On the Marmot. §92, p. 273 (foot).

✶ On a certain Japanese animal which, although it is a land animal and not unlike a dog in size and shape, at a certain time, frequenting the sea, is gradually and limb by limb changed into a fish. §93, p. 274 (top).

On the Aiotochelus [armadillo]. §94, p. 274 (mid).

Whether in the Ark of Noah there was the bird called the Phoenix. §95, p. 274 (foot).

✶ Whether the things reported about the Phoenix by many are credible, or rather ought to be held as fabulous. §96, p. 275 (top).

Whether it is consonant with philosophical reason that there be, among corruptible things, some species which at no time has more than a single individual. §97, p. 276 (mid).

✶ What the generation of the Phoenix is like. §98, p. 277 (top).

If the Phoenix exists in nature, it is proved that it was in the Ark of Noah. §99, p. 277 (foot).

It is disputed that the Ark was abundantly capacious of all the animals that had to enter it. §100, p. 278 (mid).

✶ Which were once the clean animals is demonstrated from sacred scripture; which animals chew the cud is taught from what Aristotle hands down. §101, p. 278 (foot).

Why to many it seems incredible that that Ark was capacious of all the animals. §102, p. 279 (foot).

On the various kinds of food which were brought into the Ark for the sustenance of animals and men. §102, p. 280 (mid) and following.

Whether the carnivorous animals, while they were in the Ark, fed on flesh. §103, p. 281.

— p. 36 (PDF) · printed p. index (17) — Bk XI end / Bk XII —

The excellent opinion of Augustine, teaching that in four ways the carnivorous animals could be sustained without flesh while they were in the Ark. §103, p. 281 (mid).

Whether whatever is natural to a thing cannot in any way be removed from it. §104, p. 282 (mid).

That something is called ‘natural’ in two ways: either as following the specific nature, or the individual constitution. §105, p. 283 (top).

It is proved in three ways that no animal, while it was in the Ark, used the flesh of animals for food. §106, p. 283 (mid).

A disputation: whether the Ark was capacious of all the food and provisions that would suffice for the animals' sustenance for a year. §107, p. 284 (mid).

Even if the carnivorous animals, while they were in the Ark, were fed on the flesh of other animals, nonetheless the Ark, as it has been laid out by

us, was sufficient for taking in all the animals. §108, p. 285.

IN THE TWELFTH BOOK, on the generation, increase, and state of the Flood.

Index entries for Liber XII (the fifth book; the generation, increase, and state of the Flood).

That the history of the flood was narrated by Moses so diligently that nothing of any moment pertaining to it could be desired even by a curious reader. §1, p. 288 (top).

Why Noah entered the Ark seven days before the beginning of the flood. §2, p. 289 (top).

Whether, as Moses said that the flood began in Noah's 600th year, that 600th year was then only beginning, or already complete. §3, p. 290.

When it is said that the flood happened in the second month, it is disputed of what year that ‘second month’ is said. §4, p. 291 (top).

The opinion of those who think the flood was begun in Autumn. §4, p. 291 (foot).

That most ecclesiastical authors reported the flood began in spring, the season in which the world had been created. §5 and following.

That the month which made the beginning of the flood is called ‘second’ with respect to Noah's lesser year. §8, p. 293 (mid).

On the causes of the flood, which Moses signified he had stated. §9, p. 294 (top).

Philo hands down three causes of the flood. §10, p. 294 (mid).

On the five causes of the flood according to Seneca. §11, p. 294 (foot).

Seneca is censured, who says that a general flood happens by natural necessity, and has happened not only once but often, and ought to happen

often in the future, and that in it all animals and men utterly perish and are naturally regenerated again. §12, p. 296 (mid).

— p. 37 (PDF) · printed p. index (18) — Bk XII (Flood) —

Ovid, describing Deucalion's flood, indicated three causes of it. §13, p. 297.

A disputation concerning those words of Moses, ‘And all the fountains of the great abyss were broken up’: what that great abyss was. §14 and following, p. 298 (top–mid).

Whether that Abyss is what Plato and the ancient Poets called Tartarus, hidden within the earth, which they make the origin and end of all terrestrial waters. §§15, 16, p. 298 (mid–foot) and following.

Whether by the word ‘Abyss’ one ought to understand the Ocean itself, which, flooding most highly and vastly over the earth, caused the flood. §17, p. 299 (mid).

The opinion of Cajetan on the fountains of the abyss and the cataracts of heaven. §19, p. 300 (mid).

The author's opinion, what Moses signified by the word ‘Abyss’ in this place. §20, p. 300 (foot).

A disputation on the cataracts of heaven opened to produce the flood. §21 and following.

On the varied meaning of this word, ‘cataract.’ §21, p. 301 (mid–foot) and following.

It is disputed that the starry heaven was not opened, as in this age Eugubinus [Steuco] and Oleaster thought, and some even before Bede. §23 and following, p. 302 (mid–foot) and following.

The author's interpretation, what it is for the cataracts of heaven, or windows of heaven, to be opened. §26 and following, p. 303 (foot) and following.

That Scripture uses the name ‘cataract’ to signify a vast abundance, whether of goods or of evils. §27, p. 304 (mid).

The tropology of this place, from Ambrose. §29, p. 305 (top).

A disputation on the rain of forty days, from which chiefly the flood was made. §30 and following, p. 306 (top).

Why Scripture sometimes distinctly says something was done in so many days and so many nights. §30, p. 306 (top).

Whence so great and continuous a rain could have been generated. §32, p. 306 (foot).

Which was the more principal cause of the flood, rain-water or terrestrial water. §33, ibid.

A moral lesson of Chrysostom concerning this rain. §34, p. 307 (top).

What that signifies which Moses said, that ‘in the very point of that day’ Noah entered the Ark. §35, p. 308 (top).

On what day Noah entered the Ark. §38, p. 309 (mid).

What that is which Moses said, ‘And the Lord shut him in from outside.’ §39, p. 310 (top).

✶ The excellent disputation of Chrysostom on the evils which Noah suffered shut up within the Ark. §40 and following, p. 311.

A disputation: whether all the mountains of the earth were covered by the waters of the flood. §41, p. 312 (mid).

The opinion of Cajetan is refuted, who says that [the waters] did not reach the peaks of some mountains… [continues on the next page]

— p. 38 (PDF) · printed p. index (19) — Bk XII (Flood) —

…[that the] waters of the flood [did not] reach [the peaks]. §44 and following, p. 313.

What authors have handed down about the height of the mountains Olympus, Athos, and Atlas is examined. §46 and following, p. 314 (mid–foot) and following.

That there is no mountain on earth which rises above the middle region of the air. §48, p. 315 (foot).

✶ An excellent example from Plutarch of [glory] to be despised. §49, p. 316 (top).

A disputation: whether the flood reached up to the middle region of the air. §51, p. 316 (foot) and following.

Who were those ‘heavens’ which Peter signifies perished in the flood. §52, p. 317 (mid).

How long the flood lasted, overwhelming the whole earth. §55, p. 318 (foot).

When Moses says the waters held the earth for a hundred and fifty days, it is disputed from when the time of those days ought to be computed. §55 and following, pp. 318, 319 & 320 (top–mid).

The Stoics, Berosus Annianus, Pierre d'Ailly, and others are refuted, who thought the flood could be produced and foreknown from natural causes. §60 and following, p. 320.

That the flood was made by God's omnipotence is proved from sacred scripture. §§64, 65, pp. 321, 322 (top–mid).

That not even according to Aristotle can a general flood happen. §66, pp. 322 (foot)–323 (top).

In four arguments it is proved that Noah's flood was not made from natural causes alone. §67 and following, pp. 323, 324 (top–foot).

A physical argument: that a general flood cannot be produced by the power and efficiency of the stars, nor by light or motion, nor by any kind of influences. §71 and following, p. 325 (top).

Pagan authors are recounted who made either mention or some signification of Noah's flood. §74 and following, pp. 326 (mid)–327.

How it is to be understood, what Augustine wrote, that Noah's flood was known to no [pagan] historian. §78, p. 327 (foot).

On the flood of Ogyges, which was 1,020 years before the first Olympiad. §79, p. 328 (top).

That the flood of Ogyges was about the time when the patriarch Jacob was in about the 90th year of his age, and nearly 540 years after Noah's flood. §81.

Giovanni Annio (Annius of Viterbo) is rejected, who said the Ogygian flood was the same as Noah's. §82, p. 329 (top).

A remark against Justin, Clement of Alexandria, and Eusebius, who thought the flood of Ogyges happened at the same time when Moses led the Hebrew people out of Egypt. §83, ibid.

— p. 39 (PDF) · printed p. index (20) — Bk XII end / Bk XIII —

It is disputed about Deucalion's flood, and first, under what king of Attica it happened. §83, p. 329 (mid–foot).

On the time when Deucalion's flood occurred, various opinions of authors are recounted. §84, p. 330 (top).

The author, following Eusebius and Orosius, makes Deucalion's flood later than the Ogygian by 230 years, and thinks it fell in the 50th year of Moses's age, and was about 770 years after Noah's flood. §85, p. 330 (mid).

That in the same age happened the ten plagues of Egypt, the flood of Deucalion, and the burning of Phaëthon. §86, p. 330 (foot).

IN THE THIRTEENTH BOOK, which is on the diminution and end of the Flood.

Index entries for Liber XIII (the sixth book; the diminution and end of the Flood, and Noah's sacrifice).

A theological and moral disputation: how God is said to remember and to forget, both the good and the evil. §1 and following, p. 333 (mid–foot) and following.

How it ought to be understood what [Paul] said, that God has no care for oxen. §4, p. 334 (top).

The precepts given through the law of Moses about animals: to what end they were given. §5, p. 335 (mid).

On the two causes for which the diminution of the flood began. §6 and following, pp. 335 (foot)–337 (top).

What that ‘spirit’ was which God sent to dry up the waters of the flood. §11.

Whether that spirit ought to be understood as the Holy Spirit. §12 and following, pp. 338–339 (mid).

Whether that wind drying the waters of the flood was naturally generated. §16, p. 339 (foot).

Whether the power of that wind to dry the waters of the flood was natural. §17, p. 340 (top).

When the closing of the fountains of the abyss happened. §18, pp. 340–341.

In what month and on what day of the month the decrease of the flood began. §21, p. 342.

A remark against Josephus, whose text is shown to be either false or corrupt. §23, p. 343 (top).

✶ A moral lesson: how God mixes the life of his servants with prosperity and adversity in a saving balance, so that they may walk cautious and safe between hope and fear. §24, p. 343 (mid–foot).

✶ That by the destruction of evil men a twofold benefit is provided to the good. §25, p. 344 (top).

On the goodness of God not only toward men but also toward animals. §26, p. 344 (mid).

— p. 40 (PDF) · printed p. index (21) — Bk XIII (abatement) —

✶ That saying of Solomon is explained, ‘The just man knows the souls [cares for the lives] of his beasts.’ §26, ibid.

✶ A story of the singular humaneness of Xenocrates toward animals, similar to that which we read shone forth in St. Francis. §26, p. 344 (foot).

✶ A political lesson: if God, for the things he could do by himself, employs the ministry and work of creatures — the more to demonstrate his goodness and beneficence and to commend and adorn the condition of the things he created — then the more ought Princes to imitate this with their upright, prudent, and faithful ministers. §§28, 29, p. 345 (top).

✶ How every creature most readily serves God, whether for the punishment of the wicked or for the consolation and preservation of the good. §29, p. 345 (mid).

✶ Rupert's allegorical interpretation of this history of Moses, pertaining to Christ. §31, p. 345 (foot) and following.

A disputation on that mountain on which the Ark rested. §32, p. 346.

That the base of the Ark was not narrow like the keel of a ship, but wide and flat. §35, p. 346 (top).

A disputation: how that seventh month is to be computed, in which the Ark is said to have rested. §36, p. 347 (mid).

Cajetan is refuted, who — making such months lunar — yet assigns to each of them only precisely twenty-nine days; and who thinks to say that on the day the flood's waters began to diminish, on that same day the Ark settled on the mountain. §§37, 38, p. 347 (top–mid).

A disputation on the discrepancy of the Latin reading from the Hebrew, concerning the day on which the Ark rested: for according to the Latin it was the 27th day of the seventh month, but according to the Hebrew it was the 17th day. §42 and following, pp. 349 (foot)–351.

That the Latin Vulgate translation, where the text is established as corrected and intact, ought to be of the highest faith and authority. §43, p. 350 (top).

The computation of that seventh month according to the Hebrew reading is explained. §44.

The computation of the same month according to the Greek and Latin reading is set out. §46, p. 351 (foot).

A disputation with Cajetan on that tenth month, on the first day of which the tops of the mountains appeared. §§47, 48, pp. 352 (mid–foot) & 353 (top).

What the year was like among the ancients — Greeks, Romans, Egyptians, even in the time of Moses and Noah — according to Cajetan. §51, p. 354

(top).

The opinion of Cajetan on the length of the year among the ancients is refuted, and it is taught of how many days the year consisted among the Egyptians, Thebans, and Greeks. §52 and following, p. 354 and following.

— p. 41 (PDF) · printed p. index (22) — Bk XIII (raven, dove) —

That Moses, in describing the months and days of the flood, did not name all the months and days of the year in which the flood lasted, but only those on which something signal and memorable happened. §57, p. 355 (foot).

A disputation: how much of the Ark was submerged in the waters, when the waters were at their highest increase. §58, p. 356 (mid).

According to Lyra, the Ark was carried submerged nearly thirteen cubits in the waters. §62, p. 357 (mid).

The opinion of Lyra is refuted, as resting on arguments partly false and partly doubtful. §63, pp. 357 (foot) & 358.

Whence those forty days are to be computed, after which Noah is said to have opened the window of the Ark. §67, p. 359 (top).

It is disputed what that window was like which Noah opened. §§67, 68, p. 359 (top–mid).

Why Noah did not look out with his own eyes through that window to see whether the flood had ceased, but sent out birds to explore. §69, p. 359 (foot).

Why the raven sent out by Noah did not return to the Ark: whether because, having found corpses, it was detained in feeding on them, as the Hebrews think. §§70, 71, p. 360 (mid).

The diversity of the Greek and Latin reading from the Hebrew on the history of the raven is examined: for according to them the raven is said not

to have returned, but according to the Hebrew, to have gone out and returned. §72 and following, p. 360 (mid).

If the raven did not return, why did Noah not judge from it that the flood had now ceased, as he afterward judged from the dove's not returning. §75, p. 360 (foot).

Why Noah, to explore the end of the flood, sent out the raven and the dove rather than other birds. §76, p. 360 (foot).

That Deucalion too, in the flood, sent out a dove, Plutarch narrates: so that it cannot be doubted this was drawn from this history of Moses. §76, ibid.

How the dove found no place where it might rest, when forty days before the tops of the mountains had already appeared, bared of the waters. §77 and following, pp. 362 (foot)–363.

A disputation concerning those words of Moses, ‘Bearing an olive branch with green leaves’: how the olive could, with green foliage, either be preserved while submerged most deeply in the flood for a whole year, or, the flood ceasing and it standing out of the waters, put forth leaves in so short a time. §82 and following, p. 364.

The contradiction which seems to be in Moses's narration is examined: first saying the earth was dried on the first day of the first month, in the 601st year; but then subjoining that the earth was dried up on the 27th day… [continues on the next page]

…[that the earth was dried up on] the twenty-seventh day of the second month of the same year. §86, p. 365 (mid).

Moses, according to Cajetan, computed the time of the flood in three ways: first relative to the beginning of the flood; then relative to Noah's year; finally relative to Noah's current lesser year — in which Cajetan is refuted.

§§86, 87, p. 365 (foot) and following.

A disputation: how long the flood lasted, and Noah remained in the Ark. §88 and following, p. 366 (mid–foot) and following.

Xenophon Annianus is confuted, who reckons [the time] of one flood and defines the times of the several floods. §89, pp. 366 (foot)–367 (top).

Giovanni Annio is disapproved, making Noah's flood last one month. §89, p. 367 (top–mid).

The common opinion of all is refuted, which determines the time of the flood (from its beginning to its end and Noah's exit from the Ark) as ten lunar months and twenty-one days, which are 314 days. §§90, 91, p. 367 (foot) and following.

That the flood lasted one full solar year. §92, p. 368 (mid).

On the exit of Noah and the animals from the Ark: why Noah neither entered nor left the Ark except by God's command. §93, p. 369 (top).

Why God, in commanding the men to enter the Ark, named men and women separately; but in commanding them to go out, named them jointly. §95, p. 369 (foot) and following.

Why a new command of God was needed for Noah to lead the animals out of the Ark: with allegory and history. §§96, 97, pp. 370 (foot) & 371 (top).

On the altar which Noah built, and the sacrifice which he offered to God. §§98, 99.

Why Noah, who had done everything else only by God's command and prescription, in this one thing — not commanded, but of his own accord — made an altar and a sacrifice. §101, p. 372 (mid).

✶ A disputation of Chrysostom: why God willed corporeal sacrifices to be made by those holy Patriarchs. §102 and following, p. 372 (foot) and

following.

✶ That saying is explained, ‘The Lord smelled an odor of sweetness’; and whence those corporeal sacrifices had it that they were acceptable to God. §104 and following, p. 373.

That gifts are valued and commended not so much by their price as by the zeal of the givers, is demonstrated by the example of Artaxerxes, king of the Persians. §108, p. 374 (mid).

✶ The excellent saying of Plato, that God looks not to the excellence of gifts but to the offering, and to the zeal and mind of those who offer. §109, p. 374 (foot).

That the pagans, corrupted of their own accord, twisted the worship and sacrifices of the gods, ‘into an odor of sweetness,’ into the fables which they invented as their own. §110, ibid. and following.

— p. 43 (PDF) · printed p. index (24) — Bk XIII end / Bk XIV —

The manifold calamity and destruction of the earth from the flood. §113, p. 376 (top).

✶ What that reason is why God will no longer curse the earth on account of man, because the sense and thought of the human heart are prone to evil from its youth. §114 and following, pp. 376 (mid–foot)–377 (top).

✶ Why men are carried toward vices straightway from youth. §118 and following, pp. 377–378.

The opinion of Ovid and other poets is censured, who said that the alternation of the four seasons or weathers did not exist in the golden age of Saturn; since it depends, by natural order and necessity, on the immutable law of the motion of the celestial bodies. §129, p. 380 (foot).

IN THE FOURTEENTH BOOK, which is on the eating of flesh granted to men after the Flood, on not eating blood, on the Rainbow,

etc.

Index entries for Liber XIV (the seventh book; post-flood flesh-eating, the blood prohibition, the Rainbow, Noah's drunkenness, the curse and blessing of his sons — Gen 9).

How long Noah lived after Abraham was born. §1, p. 384 (mid).

✶ That God at the beginning of the World gave three goods to man — fecundity of nature, excellence of dominion, abundance of food — and gave the same to him after the flood, but inferior in many respects. §§2, 3, p. 385 (top–mid).

How man is a terror to all the animals. §5, p. 386 (mid).

✶ A very notable opinion of Gregory: that those who are set over others ought by no means to wish to be feared by their subjects. §6, p. 386 (foot).

That the abstinence from eating flesh of those who lived in the primeval age of the world, even the pagans proclaimed. §§7, 8, p. 387 (foot).

Three causes why, after the flood, the eating of flesh was granted to man. §9, p. 388 (top).

From three things arose man's greater need after the flood. §10, p. 388 (mid).

✶ A disputation: whether the eating of flesh was lawful to man before the flood; and first the opinion of Lyra, Tostatus, and the Carthusian is set out, that it was unusual and unlawful. §12 and following, pp. 388 (foot)–390.

The other opinion, that it was usual and lawful: this is attributed to Justin Martyr, but is expressly that of Cajetan, Francisco de Vitoria, and Domingo de Soto. §16 and following, p. 390 (mid) and following.

The third opinion, of Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Thomas, which the Author follows: that the eating of flesh was indeed lawful before the flood, but yet was not in use among upright and pious men. §19 and following,

pp. 392 (mid–foot)–393 (top).

That God did not, after the flood, make the eating of flesh lawful from unlawful, but indicated that the need for it then began, on account of the weakness of human life and health. §21, p. 393 (top).

— p. 44 (PDF) · printed p. index (25) — Bk XIV (flesh, blood) —

The opinion of some is confuted, who say that grains are a better food than the flesh of animals. §§23, 24, p. 393 (mid–foot) and following.

The power of eating flesh was permitted to man by God through indulgence, not imposed by any precept; so that those who, for the sake of virtue, do not wish to use it are worthy of praise. §25, p. 394 (mid).

What were the first precepts of God given to man after the flood. §27, p. 395 (mid).

✶ Four significations of this word, ‘soul’ (anima). §29, p. 396 (top).

✶ How God requires the blood of man from the hand of beasts: the interpretation of Rupert, Cajetan, and others. §31 and following, p. 397 (top).

How it is true, ‘whoever kills a man, he too shall be killed.’ §37, p. 398 (foot).

What it is ‘to shed the blood of man in man,’ as the Hebrew reading has. §38 and following, p. 399.

How strong a reason it ought to be for shunning homicide, that man was made in the image of God. §42, p. 400 (mid).

What it is to eat flesh with blood: the opinion of Eugubinus [Steuco] is refuted. §45 and following, p. 401 (mid).

✶ What that is which Job said, that his companions wished to be filled with his flesh. §47 and following, p. 402 (mid).

Whether to eat flesh with blood is to eat strangled flesh, as Chrysostom interprets. §49, p. 403 (top).

Whether to eat flesh with blood is, as Cajetan expounds, to eat the flesh of a living animal, as the wolf and lion do. §§50, 51, p. 403 (mid).

According to Lyra and Tostatus, the phrase ‘flesh eaten with blood’ can be understood in four ways. §52.

Why God, straightway after the flood, forbade the eating of blood. §53, p. 404 (top).

✶ Five causes why the law of Moses forbade the eating of blood. §55, p. 404 (foot).

✶ Why the life of an animal consists especially in the blood. §58, p. 405 (top).

✶ Why at the beginning of the Church the eating of blood was forbidden by the Apostles. §59, p. 405 (foot).

Why in the Church, for a long time among certain peoples, abstinence from eating blood remained. §63, p. 407 (mid).

What that reason is for which God forbade the blood of an animal to be eaten — namely, that one ought not to shed the blood of man. §64 and following, pp. 407 (foot) & 408, 409.

— p. 45 (PDF) · printed p. index (26) — Bk XIV (Rainbow) —

Why God calls the Rainbow his bow. §71, p. 410 (foot).

✶ On the variety of signs by which God is wont to confirm his promises. §73, p. 411 (mid).

How it is to be understood that God set the Rainbow as a sign that he himself would remember his covenant. §75, p. 413 (top).

That the contemplation of the Rainbow ought to be different among Christians than among the pagans. §77, p. 413 (top).

On the distinction between God's justice and mercy. §77, ibid.

Whether what Scripture here calls the heavenly bow ought to be understood as the Rainbow, or something else, as Ambrose thought. §79 and following, p. 413 (foot) and following.

The opinion of some is refuted, who said that there were neither rains nor did the Rainbow ever appear before the flood. §82 and following, pp. 415 (mid–foot)–416 (top).

Whether the Rainbow can be a natural sign of a flood. §86, p. 416 (mid–foot).

The opinion of Thomas and Cajetan, that the Rainbow is a natural sign that a flood is not going to come, is examined. §87 and following, p. 417.

What this word, ‘generation,’ signifies in Scripture. §91, p. 418 (mid).

Whether the Rainbow is an entirely voluntary sign of a flood not going to come, as it pleases Lyra and Tostatus. §§92, 93, p. 419 (top–mid).

The author's opinion, how the Rainbow is a sign of a flood not going to be. §94, p. 419 (foot).

✶ What natural properties the Rainbow has, on account of which it was very fittingly and aptly applied by God as a sign of a flood not going to come. §96, p. 420 (foot).

✶ Of what natural things the Rainbow is a natural sign, from Seneca, Pliny, and others. §97 and following, p. 421 (top–mid).

✶ Wonderful powers and effects of the Rainbow are indicated. §100, p. 421 (mid–foot).

The opinion of some is refuted, that for forty years before the end of the World the Rainbow will not appear in the heavens. §103, p. 422 (top–mid).

✶ What mysteries the history of Moses about the Rainbow contains. §104, p. 423 (top).

What it is that John in the Apocalypse saw — the throne of God surrounded by a Rainbow. §105, p. 423 (mid).

The threefold color of the Rainbow, of what thing it is a figure. §106, p. 423 (foot).

That the Rainbow never completes a circle: what it mystically signifies. §107, p. 424 (top).

The notable opinion of Rupert, thinking that that history of the Rainbow did not pertain to Noah and his sons, nor to the men of his time, but properly pertains to Christ and to those who believe in him: which opinion, however, is refuted — not as false, but as by no means literal. §108 and following, pp. 424 (mid–foot)–425 (top).

— p. 46 (PDF) · printed p. index (27) — Bk XIV (sons, drunkenness) —

Giovanni Annio and Cajetan are refuted, who again thought that Noah after the flood begot other sons. §112 and following, pp. 426 (mid–foot)–427 (top).

What the cause was why Noah, during the three hundred and fifty years he lived surviving the flood, begot no son. §116, p. 427 (foot).

Whether Chanaan, son of Cham [grandson of Noah], was begotten within the Ark during the flood, as Chrysostom signifies. §117 and following, pp. 427 (foot)–429 (top).

✶ Just as from Noah there was, in so short a time, so great a propagation of the human race from Noah's three sons, so a far greater miracle was that the faith of Christ was propagated through the whole world in the briefest time:

a beautiful disputation of Chrysostom. §121 and following, p. 429 (mid–foot).

Whether Noah was the first of all mortals to till the earth and plant vines, and for what use vines and wine were to man before and after the flood. §123, p. 430 (top).

Whence Noah got the vines which he would plant. §124, p. 430 (mid).

Why Noah after the Flood was so eager to drink wine, when before, for six hundred years, he had lacked wine. §125, p. 430 (foot).

Why Noah did not taste the fruit of the vine before he had pressed the vines. §126, p. 431 (top).

Why Moses narrated the drunkenness of Noah and his shameful nakedness. §128, p. 431 (foot).

✶ Five causes are set out why Noah fell into drunkenness. §129 and following, p. 432 (mid–foot) and following.

That old age, more than any other age of man, is liable to intemperance of wine and the drunken stupor of inebriation. §129, p. 432 (mid).

✶ How the drinking of wine ought to be tempered: interpreting the old precepts about wine. §130, p. 433 (top).

That Noah's drunkenness happened without sin. §132, p. 433 (mid).

That scarcely any wine was in use before the Flood. §133, p. 433 (foot) and following.

On the evil and harm of drunkenness. §133, p. 434.

✶ Blessed Chrysostom called drunkenness a ‘voluntary Demon.’ §134, p. 434 (mid).

The excellent opinion of Pliny on the evil of drunkenness. §135, p. 434 (foot).

The unworthiness of the disgrace of drunkenness is amplified. §136, p. 434 (foot).

✶ How ancient the division of men into good and bad is, and whence it draws its origin. §136, p. 435 (top).

Three causes why Cham is named the father of Chanaan. §138 and following, p. 435 (mid–foot) and following.

Why those parts of the body in which lust is, more than the others, are called ‘pudenda’ (shameful), and whence this shame arose. §140 and following, pp. 436 (mid–foot)–437 (top).

Why we are more ashamed of those parts than of others. §142, p. 437 (top).

— p. 47 (PDF) · printed p. index (28) — Bk XIV (curse, punishment) —

The narration of Noah's drunkenness which is in Berosus Annianus is examined. §144, p. 438 (top).

The opinion of some, that Cham the son of Noah was the very one whom the pagans called Zoroaster, the inventor of the magic arts. §145, p. 438 (mid–foot).

✶ Why the wicked [hate] the good, even those who lie quite hidden: the clear discourse of Basil and Ambrose. §§147, 148, p. 439.

The exceptional reverence and piety of Sem and Japheth toward their father Noah is commended. §§149, 150, p. 440 (top–mid).

✶ The memorable example of Constantine the Great, on honoring the Prelates of the Church and covering their errors, if there be any. §151, p. 440 (foot).

✶ A notable opinion of Gregory, how subjects ought to bear themselves toward the faults of their Prelates. §152, p. 441 (foot).

On the three causes of the name. §153, p. 442 (top).

Whence Noah knew what Cham had done to him. §154, p. 442 (mid).

✶ Why Cham was called by Noah the ‘younger son.’ §155, p. 442 (foot).

✶ How Cham, according to Augustine, was a figure of the heretics; and what benefit accrues to the Catholic Church from heretics. §156, p. 443 (mid).

A description of the impiety and the impious posterity of Cham, according to Berosus Annianus. §157, p. 443 (foot).

A disputation: why [Noah] did not curse Cham who had sinned, but his son Chanaan. §§160, 161, pp. 444 (foot) & 445 (top).

A disputation: how it is not unjust for some to be punished by God for the sins of others. §162 and following, p. 445 (foot).

That the word ‘punishment’ can be taken in three ways. §163, p. 446 (top).

How punishment is very often a medicine. §163, p. 446 (mid).

That no one is punished with a spiritual punishment for another's sin. §165, p. 447 (top).

How some are punished with a corporeal punishment for the sins of others. §166, p. 447 (mid).

That the sin of one can be derived to others in three ways. §167, p. 447 (foot).

A disputation on those words of Exodus ch. 20, by which God is said to visit the sins of the fathers upon the sons unto the third and fourth generation. §170 and following, p. 449.

What it is to avenge sins unto the third and fourth generation. §174, p. 450 (top–mid).

Why, although God punishes some for the sins of others, the same cannot also be done by a Prince or a Judge. §176, p. 451 (top).

✶ A twofold kind of divine vengeance for sins: one in this life, the other after this life. §177, p. 451 (mid).

✶ How, by human judgment, someone can be affected with the punishment of loss for another's sin. §178, p. 451 (foot).

— p. 48 (PDF) · printed p. index (29) — Bk XIV end / Bk XV —

✶ A notable opinion of Gregory on the various ways by which God punishes the sins of men. §180, p. 452 (mid–foot).

That the origin of slavery among men was from sin: the excellent opinion of Chrysostom and Augustine. §182 and following, pp. 453, 454.

Nine goods foretold in sacred letters, promised to sons who are grateful and pious toward their parents. §186 and following, p. 455 (mid–foot).

That what Noah foretold — that Japheth would dwell in the tents of Sem — can be understood in five ways. §190 and following, p. 456 and following.

✶ The tents of Sem, in which Japheth was to dwell, Rupert beautifully interprets as the privileges and prerogatives of the Jews, but most of all the sacred oracles which the descendants of Japheth — that is, the Gentiles converted to Christ — obtained. §193, pp. 457 (foot)–458 (top).

✶ An allegorical interpretation of this history: of the planting of the vine, of the nakedness of Noah, of the blessing and curse of his sons. §194 and following, p. 458 (mid).

✶ How Cham is a figure of the heretics, Sem of good Prelates, Japheth of good subjects. §195 and following, pp. 458 (foot)–459.

The chronology of Noah's whole life is briefly set out. §197 and following, p. 460 (mid–foot).

✶ It is declared how the true faith and the worship of God had their continuance from the beginning of the world. §200, p. 461 (mid).

The opinion of those is refuted who held that there was, [begotten] by Noah after the Flood, a certain man named Ionithus, about whom they relate many things. §201 and following, pp. 461 (foot)–462.

Why Moses wrote so little about Noah, when in the history of Abraham he was so copious. §206, p. 462 (foot).

Where Noah dwelt after the Flood, according to the Hebrews and Berosus Annianus. §206, p. 463 (mid).

Why, after Noah, Sem, and Japheth, and down to Abraham, no man of praised virtue and piety is mentioned by Moses: a disputation of Augustine. §208, p. 464 (top).

✶ The excellent lesson of Augustine, that not all things narrated in the divine books have some hidden mystery, nor are recounted to signify future things. §209, p. 464 (mid).

IN THE FIFTEENTH BOOK, on the multiplication of men after the Flood from the three sons of Noah, and on the first origin of peoples, tongues, and kingdoms.

Index entries for Liber XV (the eighth book; Gen 10, the post-flood multiplication and the first origin of peoples, tongues, and kingdoms — the Table of Nations).

Why Moses wished to recount the nations sprung from the three sons of Noah. §2, p. 467 (mid).

How the first names of the nations were afterward varied, chiefly because of the variety of the Greeks. §3, p. 467 (foot).

How Josephus divides the three parts of the world according to the three sons of Noah. §4, p. 468 (mid).

Epiphanius hands down that Noah, lots having been drawn, assigned to each of his sons a fixed part which had fallen to him by lot. §5, p. 468 (foot).

That Noah after the Flood traversed the world and filled most of its parts with inhabitants: the narration of Berosus Annianus. §6, p. 469 (top).

A brief and clear description of the descendants of Japheth. §7, p. 469 (mid).

How far and wide through the world the posterity of Japheth was spread. §9, p. 470 (top).

Whether Japheth was the same as the one whom the pagans called Iapetus. §10, p. 470 (mid).

The opinion of Josephus, which many have followed, that the Galatians sprang from Gomer the son of Japheth, is examined. §11, p. 470 (foot).

It is declared from a certain place of Ezekiel what nations are those of the Gomerites, and what part of the world they held. §12, p. 471 (top).

What nations sprang from Magog. §13, p. 471 (mid).

On the origin of the Medes. §14, p. 471 (foot).

That the Ionians and Greeks drew their origin from Javan, the fourth son of Japheth. §15, p. 471 (foot).

Whether the Athenians sprang from the Ionians. §15, p. 472 (top).

Of what nations Thubal was the author. §16, p. 472 (mid).

What nations proceeded from Mosoch. §17, p. 472 (mid–foot).

Whence the Thracians drew their origin. §19, p. 473 (top).

Whether the descendants of Ascenez were the Rhegeni, or the Goths, or the Germans. §19, p. 473 (foot).

On the origin of the Paphlagonians. §20, p. 473 (foot).

Whether Thogorma was the parent of the Phrygians, or the Turks, or the Cappadocians, or the Germans. §21, p. 473 (foot).

Whether the descendants of Elisa first inhabited the islands of the Mediterranean sea and Italy itself; and whether, besides, they reached the strait of Gades [Gibraltar], as far as the Fortunate Isles, which were named from them the Elysian Fields. §22, p. 474 (top).

What region Tharsis was, and what is signified by that word in sacred letters. §23, p. 475 (top).

How great once was the power of the Cilicians. §24, p. 475 (foot).

What are called the ‘ships of Tharsis,’ and that by the word Tharsis is sometimes signified the Mediterranean sea and the Indian Ocean. §25, p. 476 (top).

What nation or region is signified in divine Scripture by the word Cethim. §26, p. 476 (mid).

On the origin of the Rhodians. §27, p. 477 (top).

That almost all the islands, and the shores of the whole world, and the lands near the sea, were occupied by Greek settlers. §27, p. 477 (mid).

A description of the thirty-one descendants of Cham whom Moses mentions. §28, p. 478 (top–mid).

A disputation: what region or nation is denoted by the word Chus — whether Ethiopia or Arabia. §29, p. 478 (foot) and following.

Whether Sephora the wife of Moses was an Ethiopian woman. §30, p. 479 (mid).

Zara king of the Chuseans had an army of a million [men], about whom it is asked whether he was a king of the Arabs or of the Ethiopians. §31, p. 479 (mid–foot).

The opinion of those is examined who contend that by the word Chus in Scripture is signified Arabia, not Ethiopia. §32, p. 480 (foot).

That a twofold Ethiopia ought to be established, one Eastern, the other Western. §33, p. 481 (top).

Why Egypt was said by Isaiah to be beyond the rivers of Ethiopia. §34, p. 481 (mid).

At what time Danaus and Aegyptus were brothers, from whom the Nile-land was named Egypt. §35, p. 481 (foot).

A disputation on the antiquity of the Egyptians. §36, p. 482 (foot).

A dispute among various nations over the primacy of antiquity. §37, p. 482 (foot).

By what argument the Phrygians were proved the most ancient of all mortals. §37, p. 483 (top).

The paradox of Gerard Mercator, making the nation of the Egyptians not only older than the flood, but even coeval with the first parents of the human race. §39, p. 483 (mid).

This opinion of Mercator is refuted. §40, p. 484 (top).

The opinion of Giovanni Annio on the first fifteen Dynasties of the Egyptians. §41, p. 484 (foot).

That it is fabulous that before the flood there were many Dynasties of the Egyptians. §42, p. 485 (top).

Why the land of Egypt is sometimes called in sacred letters the land of Cham. §42, p. 485 (mid).

Phut gave colonists to Libya, who were afterward called Libyans. §43, p. 485 (mid).

In what way Saba the son of Chus and the other Saba the son of Regma differ. §46, p. 487 (top).

On the nation of the Sabaeans. §46, p. 487 (mid).

On the happiness [fertility] of the land of the Sabaeans. §47, p. 487.

Who are the Heuilaean peoples. §49, p. 488 (mid).

Who are the Sabatheni and the Astabari. §49, p. 488 (foot).

What nation Regma founded. §49, p. 489 (top).

Who were those Sabaeans who are named in the first chapter of the book of Job. §51, p. 489 (foot).

On the queen of Saba who came to Solomon. §52, p. 490 (top).

— p. 51 (PDF) · printed p. index (32) — Bk XV (Nemrod, Babylon) —

On Dedan, the son of Regma. §§52, 53, p. 490 (mid).

What the nation of the Dedanaeans was — whether in Western Ethiopia, or rather neighboring the Idumeans. §§53, 54, p. 490 (mid–foot).

Why Moses treats of Nemrod separately from the other sons of Chus. §54, p. 490 (foot).

That the first king or tyrant on earth after the Flood was Nemrod. §55, p. 491 (mid).

What Nemrod was like in disposition, character, and deeds, is beautifully described by Josephus and Hugh. §56, p. 491 (foot).

How it is to be understood that Nemrod was a hunter, and on the utility of hunting. §58, p. 492 (mid).

What that signifies, that Nemrod was ‘a hunter before the Lord’: four interpretations. §59 and following, p. 493.

A disputation: who Nemrod was — whether he was the one whom the pagans call Belus, or Ninus, or the son of Ninus, as Eusebius, Jerome, and Augustine think. §61.

The contradiction which seems to be in what Augustine wrote about Nemrod is examined. §61, p. 494 (foot).

A certain fabulous tradition about Nemrod and Ionithus the son of Noah. §62, p. 494 (foot).

According to Berosus Annianus, Nemrod was the first Saturn, and the father of Jupiter Belus, and grandfather of Ninus the king: which opinion Mercator sharply refutes. §§63, 64, p. 495 (top).

Mercator thinks Nemrod was the one whom the pagans call Ninus, and that he was not the son of Chus but a great-grandson: but this opinion is refuted. §§64, 65, pp. 495 (mid–foot) & 496 (top).

The author's opinion, that Nemrod was Belus, the father of Ninus. §§66, 67, p. 496 (mid–foot).

A disputation: whether Nemrod was the first founder and ruler of Babylon, as Jerome, Augustine, and Orosius signified. §68, p. 497 (mid).

Various opinions of authors on the founder of Babylon are reconciled. §73, p. 499 (top).

That the beginning of the Babylonian kingdom fell in the 184th year from the completed flood, but in the 83rd year after the division of tongues. §74, p. 499 (mid).

Various interpretations of those words of Moses, ‘From that land went forth Assur,’ etc. §75, p. 499 (foot).

How great the city of Nineveh was when founded by Ninus. §77, p. 500 (foot).

How great the city of Nineveh was in the time of the prophet Jonah. §78, p. 501 (top–mid).

— p. 52 (PDF) · printed p. index (33) — Bk XV (Assyrian kingdom) —

The slip of Diodorus Siculus, reporting that Nineveh was built upon the Euphrates. §77, p. 501 (top).

A disputation: who Assur the founder of the city of Nineveh was. §79 and following, p. 501 and following.

The opinion of Mercator on Assur is examined. §79, p. 502 (top–mid).

The author's opinion, that king Ninus was not Assur the son of Sem. §80, p. 502 (foot) and following.

Whether Assur the son of Sem was the first builder of Nineveh. §80, p. 503 (foot).

A disputation on the kings of the Assyrians. §82 and following, p. 504 (top).

On the time of Belus, the false opinion of Thales, Theophilus, and Lactantius, who affirm that Belus was older than the Trojan war by 322 years, and was contemporary with the Saturn who was the father of Jupiter.

§§84, 85, p. 504 (mid–foot).

Why Ninus, the first of their kings, obtained writers of his deeds. §86, p. 505 (top).

A remark against Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who thought ill of the magnitude of the Assyrian monarchy. §86, p. 505 (top).

How many kings of the Assyrians there were from Ninus to Sardanapalus: various opinions of authors. §88, p. 505 (foot).

A disputation: how long the monarchy of the Assyrians lasted. §89 and following, p. 506 (top).

A letter of Alexander the Great to his mother Olympias, on the duration of the kingdom of the Assyrians and of other kingdoms — full of lies. §89, ibid.

Josephus wrote variously on the duration of the Assyrian kingdom: in one place signifying that it stood 1,310 years; but elsewhere 1,350 years. §90, p. 506 (mid).

Herodotus assigns to the Assyrian kingdom five hundred years, [during which] they held the empire of Asia. §91, p. 506 (foot).

Diodorus assigns to the Assyrian kingdom 1,360 years; Velleius Paterculus attributes to it 1,070 years; but Justin, 1,300. §91, p. 507 (top).

Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, Cyril, and Isidore defined the duration of the Assyrian empire as 1,240 years. §92, p. 507 (mid).

That Paulus Orosius spoke inconsistently on the duration of the Assyrian kingdom. §92, ibid.

A remark against the opinion of Augustine on the duration of the Assyrian kingdom. §93, p. 507 (mid).

A disputation: how long the city of Nineveh stood. §94 and following, p. 507 (foot) and following.

Whether Nineveh fell while Ozias reigned among the Jews, as Eusebius holds. §95, p. 508 (top).

A remark against the opinion of Jerome, who wrote that Nineveh fell at the time when Astyages reigned among the Medes, and Josiah among the Jews. §96, p. 508 (mid).

Whether, as Bede and the Hebrews hold, Nineveh was overthrown at the beginning of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. §97, p. 508 (foot).

It is disputed against Eusebius, that neither the city of Nineveh nor the Assyrian kingdom utterly collapsed while Ozias reigned. §§98, 99, p. 509 (mid–foot).

On the time of the death of Tobias. §100, p. 509 (foot).

That Babylon, Jerusalem, and Nineveh were often overthrown and again rebuilt. §103, p. 510 (foot).

When the first ruin of the city of Nineveh was. §104, p. 511 (top).

That it is credible enough that the Assyrian kingdom stood about 1,390 years. §105, p. 511 (mid).

What the nation of the Ludaeans [Ludim] was. §107, p. 512 (top).

On the origin and dominion of the Philistines. §108, p. 512 (foot).

Since the Philistines were not of the stock of Chanaan, how their land pertained to the possession of the Hebrews. §109, p. 513 (top).

What the nation of the Caphthorim was. §110, p. 513 (mid).

That the word Cyrene is taken in two ways in scripture. §111, p. 513 (foot).

Many things about the city of Sidon, and why it is surnamed ‘great’ in sacred letters. §§112, 113, p. 514 (foot) and following.

On the Hethaeans: where they dwelt, and what their stature and strength were. §114, p. 515 (mid).

On the Jebusites. §115, p. 515 (foot).

On the magnitude of the nation of the Amorrhaeans, their varied habitation, and the unusual tallness of their body and savagery of their mind. §116, p. 515 (foot) and following.

Where the Hevites (Heuzi) dwelt, and whether they are those whom Scripture calls Rephaim. §§117, 118, p. 516 (mid–foot).

On the Aradians and the island of Aradus. §119, p. 517 (mid).

That the Sinaeans were different from the Cinaeans, and where each dwelt. §120, p. 517 (foot).

A disputation on the city and region of Emath. §121, p. 518 (top).

Whether Emath pertained to the dominion of the Hebrews, and to the lot of the tribe of Nephtali. §§123, 124, pp. 519 (mid–foot)–520 (top).

Why Moses in chapter ten did not mention the Pherezzaeans and Chananaeans among the descendants of Chanaan. §§125, 126, p. 520 (mid–foot).

Of the eleven peoples which Moses in chapter ten recounts as begotten from the stock of Chanaan, which were destroyed by the Hebrews, and to what extent. §127, p. 521 (top).

Why Heber (Ceber) is specially named the son of Sem, since he was his great-grandson: a disputation of Augustine. §131, p. 522 (foot).

A disputation: whether Sem was the eldest-born of the sons of Noah. §132, p. 523 (foot).

— p. 54 (PDF) · printed p. index (35) — Bk XV end / Bk XVI —

If Sem was the first of Noah's sons and born in his 500th year, how he was not [yet] a hundred years old two years after the flood, as scripture narrates: Cajetan's solution of this question is examined. §136 and following, p. 525 (mid–foot).

On the origin of the Elamites and the Persians. §140, p. 527 (top).

Whether the Chaldees sprang from Arphaxad. §141, p. 527 (mid).

On the origin of the Lydians. §142, p. 527 (foot).

What region is named Haran in Scripture, and how variously. §143, p. 528 (top).

On the homeland of Saint Job. §§144, 145, p. 528 (mid–foot).

A disputation: why the name Phaleg was imposed on the son of Heber — because at the time he was born, the division of tongues and the dispersion of men happened. §146 and following, p. 529 (foot) and following.

The course of the wars and victories of king Ninus. §149.

On the river Cophen. §150, p. 531 (foot).

Eustathius cites the fifth book of Aristotle on the deeds of Alexander. §150, p. 532 (foot).

What nation Saba the son of Abraham founded. §151, p. 535 (foot).

On Ophir and Heuila. §152 and following, p. 535 (foot).

Where on earth the Griffins are the guardians and defenders of gold. §154, p. 536 (mid).

Whether Griffins and Pegasi are fabulous animals. §155, p. 536 (foot).

Whether Sem settled in Judaea, and where Jerusalem afterward was. §156, p. 537 (top).

On the discrepancy of the Greek codices from the Latin and Hebrew in the enumeration of the descendants of Sem. §157, p. 538 (mid).

What the division of men was like before the flood. §159, p. 538 (mid).

Since the descendants of the three sons of Noah were far more than those Moses recounts, why he himself passed over the others. §160, p. 540.

IN THE SIXTEENTH BOOK, which is on the building of the tower of Babel, the confusion and division of tongues, and the dispersion of men.

Index entries for Liber XVI (the ninth book; Gen 11 — the tower of Babel, the confusion and division of tongues, the dispersion of men, the line of Sem to Abraham, and Abraham's birth, marriage, and migration). This is the longest book.

The Scholastic History is refuted in two ways: as to what is written in it, that the building of the tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues happened after the death of Noah; and as to its making the progeny of Noah, while he lived, multiplied to no more than 24,000 men. §1, pp. 546 & 547.

— p. 55 (PDF) · printed p. index (36) — Bk XVI (Babel) —

A disputation: whether all the men who were then on earth came together to build the city of Babel. §3, p. 548 (mid–foot) and following.

The opinion of Cajetan, who denies it, is examined. §3 and following, ibid.

What it signifies that Moses says, that the earth was of one lip and of the same words. §§3, 4, ibid.

What the word ‘East’ is to be understood as, when it is said that the sons of Adam, setting out from the East, came into the plains of Sennaar, and why they set out thence. §§6, 7, p. 549 (foot).

✶ A moral disputation of blessed Chrysostom, that men are never content with their present good things. §8, p. 550 (top).

Whether among those who came from the East into the plain of Sennaar were Noah and Abraham. §9 and following, p. 550 (mid).

On the twofold East, an allegorical disputation of Philo. §12, p. 551 (mid).

That pagan authors made mention of the coming of those men into the plain of Sennaar. §13, p. 552 (top).

On the etymology of the name Sennaar. §14, p. 552 (mid).

✶ A beautiful discourse of Philo, that the wicked are themselves the cause of the evils and miseries that befall them; and that the wise treat themselves as sojourners in this world, but the needy as citizens. §16, p. 552 (foot).

Philo makes three kinds of habitation of man after the flood. §17, p. 553 (foot).

On the four causes why the tower of Babel was built of bricks. §18, p. 554 (mid).

How great is the firmness of brick construction. §20, p. 555 (top).

Diodorus of Tarsus is refuted, who says the builders of that tower used lime, not bitumen. §§23, 24, p. 555 (foot) and following.

That Babylonian bitumen was most suitable for buildings. §25, p. 556 (mid).

Whether in the time of Moses the use of bricks was [common] in buildings. §25, p. 556 (foot).

✶ A disputation of Gregory, expounding the aforesaid history morally. §26, p. 557 (top–mid).

That the chief and author of building the tower and city of Babel was Nemrod. §§27, 28, p. 558 (top–mid).

On the threefold use of towers in cities. §29, p. 558 (mid).

The calumny of the pagans against Moses's history of the building of the tower of Babel. §31, p. 559 (top).

Philo wards off that calumny by interpreting Moses's words not historically but allegorically. §33 and following, p. 560 (mid–foot).

The true refutation of that calumny of the pagans. §36, p. 561 (top–mid).

That the poetic fable of the Giants warring with Jupiter and building an ascent to heaven could have had its origin from this history of Moses. §37, p. 561 (mid).

Of how great a height those men made the tower. §39, p. 561 (foot).

Whether that tower was of the height of 4,000 paces, as Jerome reports. §41, p. 562 (mid).

— p. 56 (PDF) · printed p. index (37) — Bk XVI (descent, confusion) —

What things seem to have been reported about that tower by Herodotus and Diodorus. §42, p. 562 (foot).

On the six causes by which those men seem to have been led to build Babel. §44, p. 563 (foot).

That those men did not wish to build the tower out of fear of a flood or a fire. §45 and following, p. 564 (top–mid).

✶ How vehement in man is — but vicious and perverse — the love of praise and fame: an excellent discourse of Chrysostom. §§54, 55, p. 567 (top).

How great is the folly of the wicked, longing to ennoble themselves and become famous by their crimes. §57, p. 568 (top–mid).

A disputation with Tostatus, who denies that those men sinned in building the city and tower. §59 and following, p. 569 (top).

Since God is present to all things, how he is said to have descended to see the city and tower which was being built. §64 and following, p. 571 (top).

✶ Certain moral lessons which may be gathered from this descent of God. §65, p. 571 (mid).

✶ That one must proceed neither rashly nor hastily to condemning and punishing the sins of men: a beautiful discourse of Chrysostom. §68, p. 572 (foot).

✶ The excellent opinion of Philo on the immobility of God, and why words of local motion are attributed to God. §§69, 70, p. 573 (top–mid).

✶ Basil sets a distinction between God's ‘seeing from heaven’ what men do, and God's ‘descending from heaven to see’ what men do; but that distinction is not constant in sacred letters. §§71, 72, p. 573 (mid–foot) and following.

What the descent of God signifies, according to Rabbi Moses the Egyptian [Maimonides]. §73.

Whether the divine persons spoke those words among themselves, ‘Come, let us go down and confound there their tongue,’ as it seemed to some. §74 and following, p. 574 (foot) and following.

That God spoke those words to the Angels. §76, p. 575 (top).

A discourse of Philo, how God has innumerable Angels as ministers of his providence, both in heaven and on earth. §§78, 79, p. 576 (top–mid).

The error of Philo is noted, who thought that those words, ‘Let us make man to our image and likeness,’ God spoke to the Angels. §80, p. 576 (foot).

✶ An admonition to the reader to read the books of Philo cautiously, since in them are mixed many things little consonant with sacred letters. §81, p. 577 (top).

✶ How God speaks to the holy Angels: an excellent disputation of the holy Fathers Augustine and Gregory. §82 and following, p. 577 (mid).

— p. 57 (PDF) · printed p. index (38) — Bk XVI (tongues) —

That God uses the ministry and work of the Angels for an ordered and fitting divine providence, and to commend the dignity of the angelic nature. §87, p. 579 (top).

How the division of tongues was a punishment fitting the impiety and pride of those builders, from Augustine and Cassian. §88, p. 579 (foot).

Just as piety and humility are the cause of unity and union in communities, so pride and impiety are the cause of confusion and dispersion: the opinion of Gregory. §90, p. 580 (mid).

✶ That the concord of the wicked is no less pernicious than the discord of the good is pernicious: a learned disputation of Gregory. §91 and following, p. 581 (foot) and following.

That, on account of the infinite perspicacity of the divine intellect, not only absolutely future things but also conditionally future contingents are certainly known to God. §95, p. 582 (top–mid).

✶ That to the wicked their temporal felicity is most unhappy and most wretched. §97, p. 582 (foot).

✶ The excellent opinion of Philo, that the prosperity of the wicked is rather to be lamented and execrated than to be desired or envied. §98, p. 583

(top–mid).

Whether the confusion of tongues among the builders of the tower of Babel was so great that none of them understood any other of them speaking. §100, p. 583 (foot).

When the division of tongues happened, how great a disturbance of mind and confusion befell those men. §103.

✶ A comparison of what happened at the building of the tower of Babel with what occurred on the day of Pentecost concerning the variety of tongues. §104, p. 584 (foot).

The cause is refuted, which Josephus and Eusebius report from the Sibyl and Abydenus, why the building of the tower was abandoned. §105, p. 585 (mid).

Why that giant Nemrod, who after the division of tongues remained and reigned in that same place, did not carry on the building of the tower, of which he himself had been the author of beginning. §106, p. 585 (foot).

✶ Three causes why it was not only useful but even necessary that men be dispersed over the whole world. §§107, 108, p. 586 (mid–foot).

How it is to be understood, what Moses writes, that the tongue which before had been the one [tongue] of all men was confounded. §110, p. 587 (mid).

By how many things God made the memory of that confusion of tongues and dispersion of men endure for all the time of posterity. §111, p. 587 (foot).

— p. 58 (PDF) · printed p. index (39) — Bk XVI (Hebrew first tongue) —

A disputation: whether the tongue which before the building of the tower of Babel had been common to all men was Hebrew, so that it is the first of all tongues. §112 and following, p. 588 (mid).

The opinion of Theodoret is examined, thinking that the first tongue was Syriac, but that Hebrew was given by God through Moses. §112 and following, ibid. (foot).

Theodoret thinks, but falsely, that the origin of the name ‘Hebrews’ is to be derived not from Heber, but from Abraham himself. §116 and following, p. 589 (foot) and following.

Eupolemus reported that the first inventor of letters was Moses, and that the Phoenicians received letters from the Jews, but the Greeks from the Phoenicians. §117, p. 589 (foot).

Augustine thinks the first of all tongues was Hebrew, so called from Heber, because after the division of tongues it remained in the family of Heber alone. §118, p. 589 (foot).

Because the punishment of the confusion of tongues touched the family of Heber alone, from this Augustine rightly argues that in that family alone the true faith and piety flourished at that time. §119, p. 590 (foot).

That not only the tongue but also the Hebrew letters and characters were in use before Moses. §120, p. 591 (mid).

A disputation: whether Phaleg was the firstborn of Heber. §121, p. 591 (foot).

The opinion of Jerome, affirming that the Hebrew tongue was the mother of all tongues. §122, p. 592 (mid).

A disputation of Tostatus on the primacy of antiquity of the Hebrew tongue. §123, p. 592 (foot).

What the Hebrew tongue was like before the captivity of the Jews, and what it was like after it. §124, p. 593 (mid).

Four arguments by which Oleaster proves that the first of all tongues was Chaldaic, from which Hebrew was not different in the beginning. §126, p.

593 (foot).

The opinion of Genebrardus on the primacy of antiquity of the Hebrew tongue. §127, p. 594 (top).

A disputation: what that confusion of tongues was like. §128, p. 594 (foot).

A philosophical disputation of Philo on mixture, blending, and confusion in natural things. §128, ibid.

Philo thinks that what Moses narrates about the confusion of tongues is to be interpreted not historically but allegorically. §129 and following, p. 595 (mid).

That Moses's account of the confusion of tongues is a true history is proved against Philo. §132 and following, p. 596 (mid).

How that confusion and division and multiplication of tongues was made suddenly. §135, p. 597 (mid).

— p. 59 (PDF) · printed p. index (40) — Bk XVI (72 tongues, Cainan) —

Philastrius, thinking that before the building of the tower of Babel diverse tongues were in use among men, is refuted. §137 and following, p. 597 (foot).

A disputation: whether, the confusion and division of tongues being made, there came to be seventy-two tongues. §139 and following, p. 598 (foot).

What Origen, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine, and Prosper thought on this matter. §140 and following, p. 599 (top).

How Genebrardus explains that from one tongue seventy-two were made. §145, p. 601 (top).

That single tongues did not befall single men, but only single families and nations. §147, p. 601 (foot) and following.

When the tower of Babel was being built, whether there were already seventy-two nations. §148, p. 602 (mid).

Whether those first tongues were like the mothers of all the other tongues, and whether any one of them perished. §§152, 153, p. 603 (foot) and following.

Why the ancient poets called men ‘Meropes,’ that is, of divided or split voice or tongue: a threefold interpretation. §§154, 155, p. 604 (top–mid).

The calumny of the pagans against Moses's history of the confusion of tongues is dissolved. §156, p. 604 (mid).

The ridiculous fable of the pagans about one tongue of all animals. §156, ibid.

The true refutation of the aforesaid calumny of the pagans. §160, p. 606 (mid–foot).

A disputation: whether between Arphaxad and Sale the generation of Cainan ought to be inserted — which the Seventy translators and blessed Luke have, but the Hebrew and Latin codices do not. §163 and following, p. 609 (foot) and following.

The opinion of those is refuted who said the Seventy erred in adding the generation of Cainan, but that Luke followed their error not through ignorance but knowingly and with good counsel. §164 and following, p. 610 and following.

The opinion of Cajetan is disapproved, who says that the Hebrew and Latin books which do not have the generation of Cainan are corrupt and faulty. §167, p. 611 (top).

That Sale and Cainan were not two names of the same person, as it seemed to Ioannes Lucidus and Nauclerus. §169, p. 611 (foot).

Lippomanus and Canus thought the generation of Cainan was genuine, but that it was deliberately passed over by Moses for the sake of some mystery: their opinion is examined. §171, p. 612 (top).

— p. 60 (PDF) · printed p. index (41) — Bk XVI (Cainan, Abraham) —

The opinion of those is examined who think there was no generation of Cainan, nor that it was produced by the Seventy or by Luke, but that through others' ignorance or carelessness it was afterward inserted into their books. §176, p. 613 (foot).

How this question of the generation of Cainan seemed inexplicable to the Venerable Bede. §180, p. 615 (top).

From the flood to the birth of Abraham, according to the Hebrew and Latin codices, 292 years are counted; but according to the Greek, 1,172. §181 and following, p. 615 (foot) and following.

On another twofold discrepancy of the Greek codices from the Hebrew and Latin concerning the generations recounted from the flood to Abraham. §184, p. 617 (top).

A disputation: whether Abraham was born in the seventieth year of his father Thare. §186, p. 619 (top).

The opinion of the Hebrews, Lyra, and Cajetan, that Abraham was born in the 130th year of Thare, but it is refuted. §187 and following, p. 618 (mid).

That the years of Abraham which Moses names are not to be computed from his birth, but from his deliverance from the fire of the Chaldees: the false opinion of the Hebrews. §189, p. 619 (top).

If Abraham was born in the seventieth year of Thare, the time of his birth would be uncertain, and the chronology made doubtful. §193, p. 620 (foot).

If Abraham was born in the seventieth year of Thare, who lived 205 years, how Moses narrates that Abraham — after the death of his father, when he

came from Mesopotamia into the land of Chanaan — was seventy-five years old. §196 and following, p. 621 (foot) and following.

That Abraham set out twice from Mesopotamia into the land of Chanaan: first, while his father was still alive, when he was seventy-five years old; again, sixty years later, his father now dead, when he was in his hundred and thirty-fifth year. §199 and following, p. 623 (top).

A disputation: whether Sara the wife of Abraham was truly his sister, but not uterine, as Clement of Alexandria, Lippomanus, Domingo de Soto, and Cajetan thought. §205 and following, p. 627 and following.

What authors thought that marriage between a brother and a non-uterine sister was lawful in Abraham's time. §212, p. 630 (top).

The author's opinion, that Sara was not the full sister of Abraham, but the daughter of his brother. §214 and following, p. 630 (foot).

That marriage between brothers and sisters was not lawful in Abraham's time. §220 and following, p. 632 (foot).

Among which nations the marriages of brothers and sisters were customary or uncustomary. §225.

It is declared how Abraham said (Genesis 20) that Sara was truly his sister, the daughter of his father but not of his mother. §227, p. 665 (top).

Whether Abraham was the firstborn of Thare is disputed plausibly on both sides. §228 and following.

— p. 61 (PDF) · printed p. index (40) [dup]: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 62 (PDF) · printed p. index (41) [dup]: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 63 (PDF) · printed p. index (42) — Bk XVI end —

That many things are mentioned in sacred letters which of themselves do not touch the history being treated, but [are mentioned] because they have some connection with those things which properly regard the series and order of that history. §231, p. 666 (foot).

Whether Abraham was cast into the fire by the Chaldees, and thence miraculously freed by God, as an old tradition of the Hebrews reports. §231 and following, p. 667 (mid).

That the aforesaid tradition of the Hebrews is improbable. §236, p. 668 (foot).

Whether, when Scripture said that God led Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees, that word ‘Ur’ signifies fire, or rather a proper name of a certain city or region. §237 and following, p. 669 (top).

How it is to be understood, what is written in the second book of Esdras chapter nine, ‘You, Lord, led Abraham out of the fire of the Chaldees’: a twofold interpretation. §240 and following, p. 671 (top).

Whether Thare the father of Abraham was at some time a worshipper of idols. §243 and following, p. 672 (top).

Who is mentioned as the first among mortals — a son — to have died before his father. §244, p. 672 (mid).

According to Epiphanius and Suidas, in the time of Sarug, who was the grandfather of Thare himself, idolatry began; and Thare himself introduced the worship of statues. §244 and following, ibid.

That Thare was not a worshipper of idols in Chaldea: the opinion of Philo and Augustine, which is approved by the author. §247 and following, p. 673 (mid).

✶ A notable opinion of Philo: that the more one knows himself, the more he is a despiser of himself, and the more he advances toward acquiring the

knowledge of God. §252, p. 675 (top).

Because in the book of Joshua it is signified that Thare, while he dwelt beyond the river — that is, in Mesopotamia — was a worshipper of idols: it is made credible that, while he was in Chaldea, he was a worshipper of the true God, but having gone forth into Mesopotamia, he was there corrupted and declined to the worship of idols. §§253, 254, p. 675 (mid–foot) and following.

Whether Abraham was always a worshipper of the true God, or whether he sometimes worshipped idols, as Philo signifies and as it seemed to certain others. §255 and following, p. 676 (foot).

By excellent authorities and arguments it is confirmed that Abraham was always a worshipper of the true God. §260 and following, p. 678 (foot) and following. [End of the Index of Disputations and Memorable Things.]

— p. 64 (PDF) · printed p. Scripture index (1) —

INDEX OF THE PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE WHICH, taken up from other sacred books, are treated with care in this second Volume.

Header of the second front-matter index: a list of passages from sacred books OTHER than Genesis that are discussed in this volume, arranged by biblical book; each gives the book/chapter, the verse, and the commentary location (book, section, page).

Genesis ch. 15: “I am the Lord who led you out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give you this land that you might possess it.” Bk. 16, §§236 & 239, pp. 565 (foot) & 567 (foot).

Genesis 20: “Truly she is my sister, the daughter of my father and not the daughter of my mother, and I took her to wife.” Bk. 16, §227, p. 562 (top).

Genesis 25: “Jecsan also begot Saba and Dadan.” Bk. 15, p. 464 (top).

Exodus 20: “I am the Lord your God, a jealous [God], visiting the iniquity of the Fathers upon the sons, unto the third and fourth generation of those

who hate me." Bk. 14, §170, p. 379 (mid).

Leviticus 17: "Any man who eats blood, I will set my face against his soul, and will destroy it from its people: because the soul of the flesh is in the blood." Bk. 14, §55, p. 335 (foot).

Deuteronomy 2: "The Hevites too, who dwelt in Haserim as far as Gaza, the Cappadocians expelled — who, having gone out of Cappadocia, destroyed those who had dwelt in their stead." Bk. 15, §110, p. 444 (mid).

Deuteronomy 3: "The measure of that iron bed, having nine cubits of length and four of breadth, by the measure of a man's hand-cubit." Bk. 10, §17, p. 123 (mid).

Deuteronomy 14: "Every animal which divides the hoof into two parts and chews the cud, you shall eat." Bk. 11, §101.

Deuteronomy 23: "They hired against you Balaam son of Beor, from Mesopotamia of Syria, to curse you." Bk. 15, §143, p. 459 (top).

Deuteronomy 24: "The fathers shall not be slain for the sons, nor the sons for the fathers, but each shall die for his own sin." Bk. 14, §176, p. 381 (top).

Deuteronomy 31: "Gather to me all the elders and Doctors, and I will speak these words in their hearing, and will call heaven and earth against them." Bk. 16, §120, p. 488 (foot).

Joshua 11: "The Hevite too, who dwelt at the roots of Hermon in the land of Maspha." Bk. 15, §117.

Joshua 19: "As far as Sidon the Great." Bk. 15, §112, p. 402 (mid).

— p. 65 (PDF) · printed p. Scripture index (2) —

Joshua 24: "Thus says the God of Israel: Beyond the river your fathers dwelt from the beginning, Thare the father of Abraham and Nachor, and

they served strange gods." Bk. 16, §§253, 259 & 264, pp. 572, 573 & 577 (top).

Judges 1 & 2: "But the sons of the Cinaean, the kinsman of Moses, went up from the city of palms with the sons of Juda into the desert of his lot, which is to the south of Arad, and dwelt with him." Bk. 15, §110, p. 448 (top).

3 Kings (1 Kings) ch. 4: "The food of Solomon for each day was thirty cors of fine flour, and sixty cors of meal, ten fat oxen and twenty pasture-fed oxen, and a hundred rams, besides the venison of stags, roes, buffaloes, and fatted fowls." Bk. 11, §65, p. 197 (top).

3 Kings 10: "But the Queen of Saba too, having heard the fame of Solomon, came to test him with riddles." Bk. 15, §52, p. 421 (top).

4 Kings (2 Kings) 7: "Behold, the King of Israel has hired against us for pay the Kings of the Hethaeans, and they have come upon us." Bk. 15, §114, p. 446 (mid).

4 Kings 16: "The King of the Assyrians went up to Damascus and laid it waste, and transferred its inhabitants to Cyrene." Bk. 15, §111, p. 445 (top).

1 Paralipomenon (1 Chronicles) 18: "David struck Adarezer king of Soba, of the region of Emath"; and a little below: "David struck the whole army of Adarezer king of Soba." Bk. 13, §13, p. 450 (foot).

2 Paralipomenon (2 Chronicles) 3: "These are the foundations which Solomon laid to build the temple of the Lord: sixty in the first measure of length, twenty cubits in breadth." Bk. 10, §25, p. 128.

2 Paralipomenon 14: "Zara the Ethiopian went out against them with his army of a million." Bk. 15, §31, p. 410 (mid).

Esdras [Nehemiah] 9: "You yourself, Lord God, who chose Abram, and led him out of the fire of the Chaldees, and set his name Abraham." Bk. 16,

§240, p. 568 (top).

Judith ch. 5: “This people is of the progeny of the Chaldees: it first dwelt in Mesopotamia, because they would not follow the gods of their fathers who were in the land of the Chaldees, etc.” Bk. 16, §148, p. 529.

Job 9: [on the homeland of Job]. Bk. 15, §§144 & 145, p. 459 (foot).

Job 1: “The Sabaeans rushed in and carried off everything, and struck the servants with the sword; the Chaldees too made three bands and fell upon the camels.” Bk. 15, §51, p. 420 (foot).

Job 31: “If the men of my tent did not say, who will give of his flesh that we may be filled.” Bk. 14, §47, p. 333 (mid).

Psalm 71: “The Kings of Tharsis and the islands shall offer gifts: the Kings of the Arabs and of Saba shall bring presents.” Bk. 15, §25, p. 418 (mid).

Psalm 119: “Woe is me, that my sojourning is prolonged: I have dwelt with the inhabitants of Cedar, my soul has long been a sojourner.” Bk. 15, §18.

Psalm 142: “Enter not into judgment with your servant, for no living thing shall be justified in your sight.” Bk. 8, §144, p. 62 (mid).

Proverbs 12: “The just man knows the souls of his beasts, but the bowels of the wicked are cruel.” Bk. 13, §26, p. 275 (mid).

— p. 66 (PDF) · printed p. Scripture index (3) —

Ecclesiasticus 3: “He who honors his father shall have joy in his children, and in the day of his prayer he shall be heard.” Bk. 14, §186, p. 386 (mid).

Isaiah 14: “From the root of the snake shall come forth a basilisk, and its seed shall swallow up the bird.” Bk. 11, §37, p. 189 (top).

Isaiah 64: “We are all become as one unclean, and all our righteousnesses as the cloth of a menstruous woman.” Bk. 8, §142, p. 61 (mid).

Isaiah 66: “I will send of those who have been saved to the nations in the sea, into Africa and Lydia [those] holding the arrow, into Italy and Greece.” Bk. 15, §142, p. 458 (foot).

Jeremiah 46: “The mighty of Ethiopia and Libya go forth holding the shield, and the Lydians seizing and shooting the arrow.” Bk. 15, §107, p. 441 (mid).

Jeremiah 49: “Flee and turn your backs, go down into the abyss, inhabitants of Esau: for I have brought the destruction of Esau upon him, the time of his visitation.” Bk. 15, §144, p. 459 (foot).

Jeremiah, Lamentations 4: “The iniquity of the daughter of my people is made greater than the sin of the Sodomites, which was overthrown in a moment.” Bk. 14, §173, p. 380 (foot).

Ezekiel 16: “Your root and your generation is of the land of Chanaan: your father an Amorrhaean, and your mother a Hethaean.” Bk. 15, §116, p. 447 (mid).

Ezekiel 18: “The soul of the father is mine, and the soul of the son is mine: the soul that has sinned, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father.” Bk. 14, §165, p. 378.

Ezekiel 27: “From the house of Thogorma they brought horses and horsemen and mules to your market.” Bk. 15, §21, p. 403 (mid).

Ezekiel 27: “The merchants of Saba and Regma, these were your traders: with all the chief spices and precious stone and gold, which they set forth in your market.” Bk. 15, §46, p. 420 (foot).

Ezekiel 27: “The inhabitants of Sidon and of Aradus were your rowers.” Bk. 15, §119, p. 448 (mid).

Ezekiel 30: “Ethiopia and Libya and the Lydians and all the rest of the multitude, and Chub and the sons of the land of the covenant, fell with

them by the sword." Bk. 15, p. 410.

Ezekiel 43: "And these are the measures of the altar, in the truest cubit, which had a cubit and a palm." Bk. 10, p. 123.

Nahum 1: "A double tribulation shall not rise up"; or, "[God] will not take vengeance twice for the same thing." Bk. 9, §80, p. 196.

Luke 16: "It came to pass that the beggar died, and was carried by the Angels into the bosom of Abraham: a great chaos is fixed between us and you." Bk. 9, §87, p. 108 (foot).

Luke, last chapter [24]: "Handle and see, for a spirit does not have flesh and bones, as you see me to have." Bk. 8, §78.

John 8: "We are not born of fornication: we have one Father, God; and our father is Abraham." Bk. 16, §162, p. 554.

Acts 2: "Whom God raised up, the pains of hell being loosed, inasmuch as it was impossible that he should be held by it." Bk. 9, §84, p. 107 (foot).

Acts 13: "And he gave them seven nations in the land of Chanaan." Bk. 15, §127, p. 452.

— p. 67 (PDF) · printed p. Scripture index (4) — end —

Acts 15: "It has seemed [good] to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no further burden than these necessary things: that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from what is strangled, and from fornication; from which keeping yourselves you will do well." Bk. 14, §59, p. 336 (foot).

1 Corinthians 9: "Is it for oxen that God has care?" Bk. 13, §4, p. 266 (top).

1 Corinthians 15: "Otherwise what shall they do who are baptized for the dead? If the dead rise not at all, why are they baptized for them?" Bk. 9, §92, p. 111 (top).

Hebrews 11: “By faith Noah, having received an answer concerning those things which were not yet seen, fearing, framed the Ark for the saving of his house, through which he condemned the world, and was made heir of the justice which is by faith.” Bk. 9, §31, p. 86 (foot).

1 Peter 3: “In which also, coming, he preached to those spirits who were in prison, who had once been unbelieving, when the patience of God waited in the days of Noah, while the Ark was being built.” Bk. 9, §93, p. 111 (foot).

1 Peter 4: “For this also was the gospel preached to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the Spirit.” Bk. 9, §89, p. 109 (foot).

2 Peter 2: “And he did not spare the original world, but kept Noah the eighth, a herald of justice.” Bk. 9, §§2 & 33, p. 87 (top).

2 Peter 3: “For this they are willingly ignorant of, that the heavens were before, and the earth standing out of water and through water by the word of God: through which the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished.” Bk. 11, §5, & Bk. 9, §52, pp. 248 (mid) & 249 (top).

Apocalypse 4: “And there was a rainbow round about the throne, like in appearance to an emerald.” Bk. 14, §105, p. 354 (mid). [End of the Index of Scripture passages — and of the volume's front matter; the commentary text begins on the next page (printed p. 1).]

— p. 68 (PDF) · printed p. 1 —

THE EIGHTH BOOK OF THE COMMENTARIES ON GENESIS OF BENEDICT PERERIUS, WHICH CONCERNS THE CAUSE FOR WHICH THE FLOOD WAS SENT BY GOD.

THE NARRATIVE OF MOSES. From the sixth chapter of the book of Genesis.

And when men had begun to multiply upon the earth and had brought forth daughters, the sons of God, seeing that the daughters of men were beautiful, took to themselves wives from among all whom they had chosen. And God said: My spirit shall not remain in man forever, because he is flesh; and his days shall be one hundred and twenty years. Now giants were upon the earth in those days. For after the sons of God went in to the daughters of men and they bore children, these are the mighty ones of old, men of renown. But God, seeing that the wickedness of men was great upon the earth, and that every thought of the heart was bent upon evil at all times, repented that he had made man on the earth. And taking precaution for the future, and touched inwardly with sorrow of heart, he said: I will destroy man, whom I have created, from the face of the earth — from man even to the beasts, from the creeping thing even to the birds of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them.

— p. 69 (PDF) · printed p. 2 —

PREFACE.

Two matters are principally treated in the sixth chapter of the book of Genesis. First, Moses sets forth the cause for which God willed to destroy and blot out, by a general flood of the whole world, the entire race of men and of animals (a few excepted). Next, he describes the structure of the Ark built by Noah at God's command, in which Noah himself, with his family and several animals of every kind, escaping the disaster of the Flood, might be preserved as a seedbed, so to speak, of the later restoration and renewal of the world. But we shall devote this eighth book to the first part of this chapter — that is, to explaining the cause of the Flood. Now Moses teaches that the cause of the Flood that was sent was the wickedness (improbitas), depravity, and malice of the men of that time: not wickedness of just any sort, but enormous, monstrous, and intolerable — wickedness which, exceeding all bound and measure, drove God, otherwise most clement and most loving toward the human race, to the destruction of nearly all

mankind.

Now the wickedness of the men of that age was distinguished chiefly by four things. First, it was universal — that is, the wickedness not of a few men but of all, with the sole exception of the eight who were preserved from the destruction of the Flood; and whether all of these were good, or whether the other seven were saved on account of Noah's holiness, is not altogether certain. Nor was that wickedness confined to the posterity of Cain — that is, to impious and criminal men only — but it spread even to those descended from those most holy men, Seth and Enos: so that the very men who, because of their descent from most holy parents, and because they were themselves professors of divine wisdom, piety, justice, and holiness, were called “sons of God,” were infected and corrupted by the same contagion of evil. The malice of men in that time was therefore universal; and Moses, signifying this, says: “All flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth.”

Margin: Qualis fuerit improbitas hominum ante diluvium — “What the wickedness of men before the Flood was like.”

— p. 70 (PDF) · printed p. 3 —

SECONDLY, it was no middling or tolerable wickedness, but supreme depravity carried to the utmost extreme — and, as Scripture is wont to speak, “complete” or “consummated” malice. Moses indicated this when he said that God saw that the wickedness of men was great upon the earth, and that every thought of the heart was bent upon evil at all times. Nor indeed was it a brief wickedness: it lasted a very long time — for nearly seven hundred years — so that one may well marvel at the incomparable patience and longsuffering of God, who for so long endured such perversity of morals and such a cesspool of vices, waiting for those men to come to their senses and repent. But they, “according to their hardness and impenitent heart, were treasuring up to themselves the wrath of God” (Rom. 2). Finally, this declares the magnitude of those men's malice: that

though often warned, terrified by divine threats, and for a hundred years watching the ark being built by Noah — a most certain testimony and proof of the coming flood and of the general destruction of mankind — they nevertheless could in no way be called back from their impiety and depravity. Although Moses does not say this in express words, it may be gathered from the fact that he writes that God granted those men a hundred and twenty years — allotting them, namely, a space for coming to their senses and doing penance.

Margin: Rom. 2.A

Nor does it fail to support this point that St. Peter, in the second chapter of his later Epistle, calls Noah a “herald of justice” (iustitiae praeco) — by which it is signified that he preached to the men of his time the justice of God, that is, that justice which avenges and punishes crimes, and which, unless they departed from their wickedness, would punish them with a most dreadful penalty [reading partly reconstructed]. Or he preached justice by teaching how fair and just it is to worship God rather than the creature, to obey the divine commands, and to desire and pursue heavenly and eternal goods rather than earthly and mortal ones; or he preached that justice which must be kept and exercised toward one's neighbor — namely, by restraining both hand and mind from every evil deed.

Margin: Locus Petri epist. 2. c. 2. Quomodo Noë fuerit praeco iustitiae. — The OCR of this passage is scrambled by interleaved marginalia; the bracketed clause is a reconstruction.

Such, then, and so great was the wickedness of that age, which earned the punishment of the Flood. Nor will that malice be unlike it which shall precede the general conflagration of the world at the consummation of the age — as the Lord indicated not obscurely in Luke 18 and Matthew 24, when he said: “When the Son of man cometh, shall he find, think you, faith on earth?” and “Because iniquity shall abound, the charity of many shall grow cold”; and further on: “For as in the days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage... so also shall the

coming of the Son of man be.”

— p. 71 (PDF) · printed p. 4 —

But Berosus Annianus has recounted, subtly and distinctly, of what sort and how great the wickedness of the men of that time was. I am not unaware that this Berosus is not the true Berosus who is frequently and honorably named by Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome, and other ancient writers — a point we established with clear arguments in the eleventh book of our commentaries on Daniel, in the first question. Nevertheless, it pleases me [?] to record in these commentaries certain things drawn from that book: both because some of them are sufficiently akin to the narrative of Moses and plausible in themselves, and also to gratify certain learned men who, once captivated by devotion to and faith in that Berosus Annianus, can scarcely shake off their love of his book even after being convicted by the weightiest arguments. Thus, then, he relates at the opening of his history, whose origin he traces back to before the Flood:

Margin: Cur Auctor citet Berosum Annianum, quem putat suppositicium [?] — “Why the author cites Berosus Annianus, whom he judges spurious.” (Marginal note partly garbled in OCR.)

“Before the famous calamity of the waters, by which the whole world perished, many ages passed, which were faithfully preserved by our Chaldeans. Now they write that in those times, near Lebanon, there was Enos, a very great city of giants, who lorded it over the whole world. These men, trusting in the vastness and strength of their bodies, invented weapons and oppressed everyone; and being slaves to lust, they invented musical instruments and every kind of pleasure. They ate men, procured abortions and prepared them as food. They lay with their mothers, daughters, and sisters, with males and with beasts; and there was no crime they did not commit — despisers of religion and of the gods. At that time many were preaching and prophesying, and carving upon stones their prophecies concerning the destruction of the world that was to come. But those men, grown accustomed to such things, mocked everything, while the wrath and

vengeance of the heavenly powers pressed hard upon them for their impiety and crimes.” Thus Berosus Annianus.

Margin: Berosus Annianus de causa diluvii — “Berosus Annianus on the cause of the Flood.”

BUT who would believe that Josephus — who diligently and carefully gathered from every quarter all that the pagan writers handed down concerning the Flood and the Ark — would have passed over a testimony about the cause of the Flood so express, so clear, and agreeing so aptly with the narrative of Moses, had it been transmitted by the true Berosus, whom he so often calls upon as a witness of Hebrew affairs? Especially since he did not omit to report a certain brief statement of Berosus about the Flood and Noah's Ark in the first book of his Antiquities, in these words: “Berosus the Chaldean, speaking of this flood, writes of Noah roughly as follows: It is said that a part of this vessel still survives in Armenia, at the mountain of the Gordyaeans, and that some scrape off the bitumen from it and carry it away with them, which the people of that place are accustomed to use as an amulet.”

Margin: Iosephus Iudaeus.

— p. 72 (PDF) · printed p. 5 —

CHAPTER SIX. Verse 1. “And when men had begun to multiply upon the earth, and had brought forth daughters.”

With these words Moses marked the time at which the intolerable malice of men, which earned the vengeance of the Flood, began to flourish upon the earth. At the time, he says, when the human race began to multiply — at that very time the enormous depravity of men began to flourish on earth. The human race began to multiply while Adam was still living; indeed, it is credible that within two or three hundred years from the beginning of the world it had multiplied enormously, since it is established from the sacred writings that the posterity of Jacob, in not more than three hundred years, multiplied to such an extent that at the departure of the Hebrews from

Egypt six hundred thousand fighting men were counted, not including the women, the little ones, and the old (Exod. 12). Ninus, king of the Assyrians, came to his throne about two hundred and fifty years after the Flood; and in so short a span of time the human race had so propagated itself that in Ninus' army alone there were one million seven hundred thousand foot soldiers, two hundred thousand horsemen, and a little fewer than ten thousand six hundred scythed chariots, as Diodorus Siculus (book 3, chapter 2) reports from the writer Ctesias. Since, therefore, it must be believed that the fecundity of human nature was greatest at the beginning of the world, it is not to be doubted that a great multiplication of mankind likewise took place in a short time in that age.

Margins: Exod. 12.F; Magnitudo exercitus regis Nini — "The size of King Ninus' army"; Diodorus Siculus.

FOR THIS REASON Cajetan thinks that this multiplication of men, of which Moses here speaks, took place from the time when Cain killed Abel — that is, about the one hundred and thirtieth year from the founding of the world; for it was then that Cain said, "Everyone who finds me will kill me." But it is more probable that Moses was speaking not of just any multiplication of men, but of one exceedingly numerous and spread far and wide.

Margin: Quando coepit secundum Caietanum multiplicatio et malitia hominum ante diluvium — "When, according to Cajetan, the multiplication and the malice of men before the Flood began."

— p. 73 (PDF) · printed p. 6 —

It is therefore truer to say what Josephus relates in the first book of his Antiquities: that the notable propagation of those men before the Flood, and their decline into evil, occurred in the seventh generation after Adam. For writing of the honorable pursuits and outstanding virtues of the descendants of Seth, he added: "In this manner," he says, "for seven generations they persevered in worshipping the one God, the Lord of all things, always keeping virtue in view. But as time went on they

degenerated from their ancestral institutions, neither keeping human laws nor rendering to God his accustomed honors; and those who before had vied with one another in the exercise of virtue afterward pursued malice with twice the zeal, and so made God hostile to themselves." Thus Josephus. Akin to this is what Theodoret relates in his 47th question on Genesis: "The descendants of Seth" (says Theodoret), "as pious and good men, were surnamed sons of God; for the race of Seth was kept separate and did not mingle with the kindred of Cain, on account of the curse laid upon him by God. But long afterward (for God brought on the Flood after more than a thousand years), seeing that the daughters of Cain's kindred were beautiful, and enticed (as is likely) by the musical instruments devised by them — for Thubal, flourishing among them, had invented the psaltery and the cithara — they mingled with them and defiled their own nobility." Thus Theodoret. To their opinion I gladly assent.

Margins: Iosephus; Theodoretus.

For it is quite probable that it was in that time of the seventh generation from Adam that this notable depravation of the human race began. For it is conjectured, from the example of Lamech, that polygamy then began to be practiced; then Henoch, who was the seventh from Adam, was translated — namely, "lest malice," which had begun to flourish, "should change his heart, and lest deceit should beguile his soul," as is written in the fourth chapter of the book of Wisdom. Then, through the sons of Lamech, were invented musical instruments — incitements to wantonness and luxury — and weapons — instruments for waging war and practicing cruelty.

Nor do I permit myself to pass over even those opinions which I judge false and absurd, if they have been put forward by great men or attributed to great men; for it is better that the reader be given the full store of all that is memorable, and that what we disapprove be condemned rather than passed over. The Master of the Scholastic History, in his History of the book of Genesis, chapter 31, records some opinion of Methodius which pertains to

this passage of Moses. For he relates that Methodius arranged the time from the beginning of the world up to the Flood into roughly three chiliads (thousands) of years; and that in the five hundredth year of the first chiliad after the founding of the world, the sons of Cain abused the wives of their brothers in excessive fornications; that in the six hundredth year the women, turned to madness, mounted the men and thus began to abuse them; that on Adam's death Seth separated his kindred from the kindred of Cain — for Adam, while living, had forbidden their intermingling — and that Seth dwelt on Cordan, a certain mountain near Paradise, but Cain in the field where he had slain Abel (Gen. 4); that in the five hundredth year of the second chiliad men burned with lust for one another; and that in the seven hundredth year of the same chiliad the sons of Seth conceived desire [for the daughters of Cain — sentence continues on the next page].

Margin: Memorabilis historia, sed falso adscripta Methodio, ex Magistro Historiae Scholasticae — "A memorable account, but falsely ascribed to Methodius, from the Master of the Scholastic History" (i.e., Peter Comestor). Also: Gen. 4.

— p. 74 (PDF) · printed p. 7 —

…[the sons of Seth] lusted after the daughters of Cain; and that from them the giants arose; and finally that the Flood came when the third millennium had already begun. These things the Master of the Scholastic History reports from Methodius. But these are false, and falsely fathered upon Methodius. For they rest on a manifest error of chronology, since they reckon more than two thousand years from the beginning of the world to the Flood, whereas it is established and certain that that interval was only one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years. On this matter we have argued carefully in the seventh book of the first volume of our Commentaries on Genesis, in the Disputation on the chronology of that period, through its three questions.

§10 (continued from p. 73): conclusion of the refutation of the account falsely ascribed to Methodius.

Moreover, this is no new thing, nor to be considered here only in passing: that when men began to multiply, then they began to become worse; so that what is said in Isaiah, chapter 9, may truly be applied here: “Thou hast multiplied the nation, but hast not increased the joy.” And the multiplication of men was indeed an immense benefit of divine kindness, and a great good for human nature, such that it ought rather to have availed toward increasing piety and religion toward God than toward contempt of God, the corruption of oneself, and the violent oppression of others. Yet it was not therefore fitting that God should be more sparing in doing good, merely because men would abuse his benefits to his contempt and to their own ruin. Ambrose expressed this in few but elegant words in the book he wrote On Noah and the Ark, ch. 3. But let me finish what I began to say a little above: that in the very multiplication of men it is not virtue that is multiplied, but wickedness (flagitia). For so it indeed comes to pass that industry and frugality are generally the companions of fewness of men and of poverty, but sloth and depravity the companions of multitude and wealth. One may observe this in many cities, commonwealths, and empires once most flourishing, and indeed even in congregations of pious men prudently ordered and long renowned for the praise of holiness. For when men were few, and not equipped with great supports and ornaments of nature and fortune, it is recorded that many of them were outstanding men, both in their private pursuits and morals and in the handling of public offices and the conduct of affairs at home and in war; but, on the contrary, when men had multiplied, dominion was extended, and wealth increased both privately and publicly, then, with discipline gradually slipping, most degenerated and became daily worse, until such a pitch of wickedness was reached that the very things which had formerly been among them incitements to virtue and rewards of glorious deeds afterwards became provocations to vice and the wages of crimes. Greek and Roman history is filled with examples, but Christian history above all.

§11. Margin: Moralis observatio — that virtue flourishes more among a few men than in a multitude. Cites Isaiah 9 and Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 3.

But what should we suppose to be the cause of this? Is it that in human affairs too, as in natural things, virtue united is stronger than virtue divided? Now in a small number of men virtue is more united, and can be kept inviolate and free from every contagion of evil more readily than in a multitude. Or is a multitude more exposed to the contagion of external vices and evils? Or rather…

§12 (continues on p. 75): inquiry into the cause — whether virtue is stronger united than divided.

— p. 75 (PDF) · printed p. 8 —

Or rather because a multitude is more subject to internal dissensions and discords? For “by concord small things grow, by discord the greatest fall to ruin.” Or is it that the very fewness of men, the weakness of their resources, the slenderness of their wealth, rivalry with their betters, and fear of the more powerful restrain men from sliding into vices? Or, finally, does a burning desire to win for oneself and one’s country liberty, the greatness of dominion, and the glory of a name through good arts either extinguish or suppress all desires for baser things — not only for vices — and make men industrious, patient of toils, bold in facing dangers, and prompt and eager in undertaking and accomplishing great things? It is in this way that the blessed Augustine argues the Roman empire was enlarged, in The City of God, bk. 5, ch. 12 and following.

§12 (continued from p. 74). Cites Augustine, City of God, bk. 5, ch. 12 and following.

But what does Moses mean here when he says: “When men had multiplied upon the earth, and had begotten daughters”? What does that phrase signify, “and had begotten daughters”? Were females not begotten before? Whence then did they take wives, or whence did they beget sons? For my part I think these words signify that, in that great multiplication of men, females in particular were multiplied, so that far more were then born than before. If this be referred to natural philosophy (physiologia), it is probable that it came about thus: that because of those men’s intemperance in sex and in food and drink, and because of luxury and other vices of body and

mind, the generative faculty in the man being severely weakened and the vigor of the male seed impaired, a more frequent and more numerous generation of females resulted. For this reason the men of that age, enticed at once by the number and the beauty of the women, took many wives, and, having repudiated their former wives, took others and yet others according to their lust — a thing which for a long time had been unusual among the descendants of Seth. I have a twofold argument for this. For Moses above, in chapter four, writing of Lamech alone that he had two wives, indicated not obscurely that polygamy then first began. Next, we read that Noah entered the Ark with only one wife, and each of his sons with a single wife.

§13. Margin: Gen. 7 (Noah entering the Ark with a single wife).

Verse 2. The sons of God, seeing the daughters of men that they were fair, took to themselves wives of all whom they had chosen.

Genesis 6:2 (Vulgate lemma).

By these words Moses seems to have wished to magnify the wickedness of the men of that time, signifying that it was so great that not only did the wicked offspring of Cain — drawing impiety as if hereditary from their forefather — wallow in the deepest mire of crimes, but even the descendants of Seth, renowned for the nobility of their holy forefathers, illustrious for their zeal for divine wisdom, and venerable for their profession of piety and religion toward God, [entering into] the fellowship with Cain’s line which had been forbidden them and accursed by their ancestors…

Comment on v. 2 (continues on p. 76).

— p. 76 (PDF) · printed p. 9 —

…joining themselves with the descendants of Cain, sinned more grievously than they, plunged into the depths of all crimes.

Comment on v. 2 (continued from p. 75).

For that word “of God,” when it is said “sons of God,” in Hebrew it is Elohim, a word which in Scripture is taken both in the singular for the one true God and in the plural for “gods” — that is, either for the angels of God, or for holy men, or for those who are judges, governors, and rulers of peoples. Aquila renders it here “sons of gods,” signifying either angels or saints; Symmachus, “sons of the mighty.” The Chaldee Paraphrase has “sons of nobles”; Pagninus rendered “sons of princes”; Jerome [and] Oleaster think that men surpassing the rest in extraordinary height and strength of body are signified — namely those from whom the giants were begotten, as Moses relates a little later. For in the same manner Scripture is wont to call “mountains of God” and “cedars of God,” to signify the loftiness and height of their greatness (Ps. 35; Ps. 79). The codices of the Septuagint translators here had a variant reading, as may be understood from the commentaries of the ancients on this passage, both Greek and Latin: for some codices had “angels,” but others “sons of God.” “Some codices,” says Augustine (Questions on Genesis, q. 3), “both Latin and Greek, have not ‘angels of God’ but ‘sons of God,’ whom certain men believed to have been just men, who could also be called by the name of angels.” For of the man John it is written: “Behold, I send my angel before thy face, who shall prepare thy way” (Mark 1). The same Augustine, in The City of God, bk. 15, ch. 23, says thus: “The Seventy Translators called these both angels of God and sons of God — which indeed not all codices have, for some have nothing but ‘sons of God.’” But Cyril, in the ninth book against Julian, judges the reading which has “sons of God” more correct than that which has “angels of God.” From these things it is plain that this reading of ours is the truer and is plainly to be retained.

§14. On the Hebrew Elohim and the variant readings ‘angels of God’ / ‘sons of God.’ Margins: Oleaster; Jerome; Ps. 35; Ps. 79; Augustine, Questions on Genesis q. 3; Mark 1; Cyril of Alexandria.

Moreover, what is signified by “sons of God” is a most perplexing question. There are two principal interpretations of these words; but each is again multiplied into three or four parts, like the two branches of a single

tree spread out into many boughs. The first interpretation is that by “sons of God” Moses signified angels; but this is divided three ways. Some interpret them as good angels, who, enticed by the beauty of the women, degenerated by mingling with them. Others think they were demons who coupled with the women in their own proper bodies — for they supposed (which was the opinion of very many) that the demons are truly and naturally embodied. Many, finally, judged that they were indeed demons, but not in their own bodies (since in the opinion of these men they are incorporeal), but mingled with the women through bodies assumed by them, and begot sons through seed not their own and natural, but taken from a man and infused into a woman’s womb; and demons of this kind these men call “succubi” and “incubi.”

§15. Margin: ‘What is signified by sons of God — various interpretations.’ Sets out the two principal readings (angels vs. men), each subdivided.

This threefold interpretation can be refuted in two ways: either by demonstrating that what is handed down by them concerning the good angels and concerning the demons…

§16 (continues on p. 77): the threefold ‘angels’ reading can be refuted two ways.

— p. 77 (PDF) · printed p. 10 —

…is false, indeed absurd and impossible. But on this matter we shall speak a little later, in those questions which are to be treated after the explanation of this passage. Or it can be refuted by showing that three interpretations of this kind in no way agree with the sense of Moses’ words, but are discrepant from and plainly contrary to his narrative. Chrysostom thinks that interpretation is pierced through by this most powerful weapon: “Never,” he says, “in Scripture are angels called sons of God,” though that appellation is not rarely attributed to men. Indeed Paul, to the Hebrews 1: “To which of the angels,” he says, “did He ever say, Thou art my Son?” But of them it was said: “Who maketh his angels spirits, and his ministers a flame of fire” (Ps. 103). Yet Divine Scripture seems to Chrysostom to

contradict this in the first and thirty-eighth chapters of the book of Job, where it names angels “sons of God.” But in both places the translation of the Septuagint, which Chrysostom followed, does not have “sons of God” but “angels.” That argument drawn from Paul, however, is not firm; for Paul does not deny to the angels every sonship of God, but only the natural and substantial sonship, such as is Christ’s; for as to adoptive sonship, which comes about through participation in grace, there is no reason why it cannot be attributed to angels as well as to men.

§16 (continued from p. 76). Margin: Chrysostom, Homily 21 on Genesis; Ps. 103. Heb. 1 also cited.

But in fact, that Moses’ words cannot even by violence be wrested, much less aptly and fittingly applied, to angels, whether good or evil, may be concluded from this single argument. Moses relates that God willed to destroy the whole human race by a universal flood, a few excepted, on account of their intolerable crimes — but especially on account of the sins of those who, though they were called “sons of God,” were nevertheless degenerate from their forefathers, forgetful of their profession, and finally contemners of both human and divine law, and were coupled in most ardent lust with impious and impure women. Whence a flood of many and great crimes and evils overflowed. Therefore it was to punish the sins of these men that God brought on the Flood. The Flood, then, was sent not on account of angels and their sins, but on account of men alone and their crimes. For it was not demons who perished in the Flood, but men; nor were the sins of demons, but of men, avenged by the Flood.

§17. Margin: ‘The argument by which Moses shows that those he named sons of God were not angels, whether good or evil.’

Hence it follows that those whom Moses called “sons of God” can in no way be understood to be either good or evil angels. For God spoke of men alone when he said: “My spirit shall not remain in man for ever, because he is flesh; and his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.” And again: “God, seeing that the wickedness of men was great on the earth, and that all

the thought of their heart was bent upon evil at all times, it repented him that he had made man on the earth." And forewarning, etc.: "I will destroy," he says, "man whom I have created." And again: "When God had seen that the earth was corrupted (for all flesh had corrupted its way), he said to Noah: The end of all flesh is come before me; the earth is filled with iniquity from before their face, and I will destroy them with the earth."

§18. The Flood texts speak only of men: Gen. 6:3, 6:5–7, 6:11–13 quoted.

Do you see that God always spoke of men, but of angels or demons…

§19 (continues on p. 78).

— p. 78 (PDF) · printed p. 11 —

…uttered no word? This argument Theodoret too saw before us, and used it against the same interpretation which we are now refuting, in the forty-seventh question on Genesis. For when he had posed this question — "Whom did Moses call sons of God?" — answering it, he says thus: "Certain men, too stupid and dull, supposed them to have been angels, thinking perhaps that they would find a defense for their own intemperance if they could hold angels guilty of the same crime. But they ought to have heard God speaking thus: My Spirit shall not remain in men for ever, because they are flesh; but their days shall be a hundred and twenty years; and thence to consider that an incorporeal nature has no flesh, and that angels do not have a life limited in time, for they are immortal." Then, when Theodoret had recalled the other words of the Lord which we set forth a little before, he adds: "All these things surely indicate that those who embraced an iniquitous life were men. For if angels had been mingled with the daughters of men, men would have been wronged by the angels, inasmuch as they would have corrupted their daughters by force; they would also have suffered injury from God the creator, in that he did not punish the angels who served him. But not even the father of lying would dare to say these things. For in many words sacred Scripture has taught both that men sinned and that the divine sentence was pronounced against

them.” Thus far Theodoret.

§19 (continued from p. 77). Margin: Theodoret, Questions on Genesis, q. 47, quoted at length.

There is, to be sure, also a second principal interpretation of this passage: that by “sons of God” are signified not angels, but men only. This, however, is divided into four parts. Some think that by “sons of God” should be understood men far more distinguished than the rest in height and strength of body, as Oleaster held; others, powerful men, such as the judges, governors, and rulers of peoples, as the Hebrews prefer; some suppose that they were called “sons of God” as it were in opposition and contrast to the “sons of men.”

§20. Margin: ‘The second interpretation, divided four ways: who the sons of God were.’ Oleaster cited.

Now Scripture is wont to call “men,” or “sons of men,” those who are wise according to the flesh, whom Paul names “natural men” (animales): “The natural man,” he says, “perceiveth not the things that are of the Spirit of God.” And what manner of men these are, David finely depicted in the fourth Psalm when he said: “Ye sons of men, how long will ye be dull of heart? Why do ye love vanity and seek after lying?” Paul likewise: “Whereas there is among you envying and contention, are ye not carnal, and walk according to man?” But “sons of God” are named those whose pursuit and purpose are plainly the contrary, whose mind and disposition, manner of life, morals, and deeds are contrary — who, as contemners of earthly and human things, desire and pursue heavenly and divine goods, and are professors and practitioners of piety toward God, of justice toward their neighbor, and of mortification toward themselves. Such, then, had these men long been whom Moses calls “sons of God,” or at least their forefathers had been, on whose account they themselves, though much degenerate in pursuits and morals, nevertheless retained the same appellation. This interpretation displeased neither Augustine, in The City of God, bk. 15, ch. 23, nor Ambrose, in the book On Noah and the Ark, ch.

4.

§21. Margin: 1 Cor. 2 (‘the natural man’); Ps. 4; 1 Cor. 3; this reading approved by Augustine (City of God 15.23) and Ambrose (On Noah and the Ark, ch. 4).

But that interpretation is exceedingly celebrated and greatly ennobled by the authority of great writers: that those whom Moses calls “sons of God” were…

§22 (continues on p. 81; note that PDF pages 79–80 are duplicate scans of pages 77–78). Introduces the favored reading: sons of God = posterity of Seth.

— p. 79 (PDF) · printed p. 10: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 80 (PDF) · printed p. 11: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 81 (PDF) · printed p. 12 —

…the descendants of Seth; but the “daughters,” or “sons of men,” those who had been begotten of the stock of Cain. Now why the descendants of Seth should be called “sons of God,” a twofold reason is given, each probable. For either they were so called because the things which the aforesaid threefold interpretation hands down fitted them well — namely, the descendants of Seth were, all or most of them, of tall, robust, and handsome body, and were themselves powerful men, magnates, and rulers, and, on account of their profession and practice of justice, religion, and holiness, were highly honored and venerable. Or they were named “sons of God” because they were the sons of Seth and Enos, each of whom we have received to have been most outstanding in piety and sanctity, and to have been called by the men of their time by the appellation of “God” (i.e., the divine).

§22 (continued from p. 78). Margin: ‘Why the descendants of Seth are called sons of God.’ Two reasons given.

Suidas indeed, under the word SETH, confirms that he was called “a god,” both on account of his excellent justice, piety, and holiness, and on account

of his invention of letters and of the knowledge of heavenly things. And Enos was the first of mortals who, in a certain singular manner, began to call upon the name of God, as Moses said in the closing words of chapter four. And for Enos's being adorned with this surname of "God," I have as my authority Cyril of Alexandria, in the ninth book against Julian. Since, therefore, the descendants of Seth held and proclaimed these two men as the founders of their line, for that reason they were called "sons of God." And these, indeed, for a very long time, as had been enjoined upon them by their forefathers, vehemently shunned fellowship, and also marriage and dealings, with the descendants of Cain. But afterwards, when zeal for religion and the cultivation of the virtues had grown cold, enticed by the beauty of the women of Cain's stock and inflamed with love, they took them as wives; and, polluted and corrupted by their shameful intercourse, they cast themselves headlong into all crimes, and turned out even more wicked than the descendants of Cain themselves. It is indeed astonishing that, out of so holy and numerous a posterity of Seth, only one was found — Noah — who was just, innocent, dear to God, and worthy that God should preserve him by so great a miracle from the destruction of the Flood. Of this last interpretation the authors are very many: Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis; Augustine, The City of God, bk. 15, ch. 23; Theodoret, question 47 on Genesis; Cassian, Conference 8, ch. 21; Cyril, bk. 9 against Julian; Rupert, bk. 4 on Genesis, ch. 12; the blessed Thomas, in the First Part, question 1 [?], last article.

§23. Margins: 'Seth called a god by Suidas, and why'; Cyril; and the roster of authorities for the Sethite reading: Chrysostom, Augustine, Theodoret, Cassian, Cyril, Rupert, St. Thomas. The St. Thomas reference ('Prima Pars, q. 1 [?], last article') is garbled in the original.

As for the phrase "that they were fair," another reading has "that they were good." But the sense is the same; for, as Augustine says in the place I mentioned a little before, according to the usage of Scripture the word "good" (Bonum) often signifies the same as "comely and beautiful in body." Although the Hebrew word here, tob, signifies not only "good" and

“beautiful” but also “great” and “tall,” as Oleaster confirms by the testimony of Scripture, and he thinks that this signification fits this passage well, so that the sense here is: that the “sons of God” — that is, men exceedingly strong and tall of stature — chose for themselves as wives women very tall, so that from them he might beget robust and tall sons, and in this way, prevailing over other men, might subjugate them under his own dominion.

§24. Margin: Oleaster on Genesis. On the variant ‘that they were good’ and the senses of the Hebrew tob.

— p. 82 (PDF) · printed p. 13 —

This passage of Moses affords us a certain salutary lesson. For from it we learn how harmful and pestilent is association and intimacy with the impious, but most of all through carnal pleasures with women. For this reason God, in the gravest words, forbade the Jews marriages with foreigners, as may be seen in Exodus 34 and Deuteronomy 7: “Thou shalt not,” he says, “enter into marriages with them: thou shalt not give thy daughter to his son, nor take his daughter for thy son; for she will seduce thy son not to follow me, and to serve other gods the more; and the fury of the Lord will be kindled, and will speedily destroy thee.” What great calamity and slaughter did the mingling of the Hebrews with the Midianite women produce? “They were mingled,” says David (Ps. 105), “among the nations, and learned their works.” For this cause the holy patriarchs, such as Abraham and Isaac, were unwilling to give their sons wives from among the Canaanites, lest they should slip into idolatry. Because Solomon clung with most ardent love to foreign women, although he was already old and endowed with such great wisdom, he was nevertheless seduced by them to such a degree that he publicly worshiped their gods. When Esdras heard that the Jews, lately returned from the Babylonian captivity, had mingled by intermarriage with foreigners, he took it so grievously that, from the greatness of his grief, he is said to have rent his cloak and tunic and torn out the hair of his head and beard, grieving that the holy seed had been

mingled with the peoples of the land. Moved by his admonition and rebuke, most of the leaders of the Jews put away all those wives, as is recorded in chapters 9 and 10 of the book of Esdras.

§25. Margin: ‘A moral observation’ on the danger of fellowship with the impious. Citations: Exod. 34; Deut. 7; Num. 25; Gen. 24; 3 Kings (1 Kings) 11; Ps. 105; Esdras 9–10.

This too may here be observed: that those who have long been very good and religious, afterwards degenerating and corrupted by the habits of the wicked, not rarely turn out more conspicuous than the rest in the foulness of their vices and the magnitude of their crimes. The cause of this one may perhaps conjecture to be the following. Every change (as philosophy teaches, and experience, the parent of philosophy itself, confirms) takes place from one contrary into the other; therefore those who are best, gradually degenerating and slipping into vices, are changed into the worst. Or else, on account of their ingratitude in not acknowledging, as they ought, God’s benefits bestowed on them beyond others, and sometimes even abusing them to the injury of God and the ruin of themselves and others, it is just that these men, cast far away from the face of God and despised more than the rest of mortals, should be stripped of the aids of divine care and protection; and, deprived of these, as if the reins were removed, they are borne headlong to crimes and are irrecoverable for virtue. Finally, great talents and lofty spirits do not tolerate mediocrity: on either side they are conspicuous, whether for vices or for virtues.

§26. Margin: ‘That often the best men turn out the most wicked in sin.’

Those words of Moses are not to be passed over in silence: “The sons of God,” he says, “seeing the daughters of men that they were fair, took to themselves wives of all whom they had chosen.” For Chrysostom, weighing these words in homily 22 on Genesis, most truly noted that by them Moses wished to indicate the very great intemperance of those men. As if he were to say that the men — not from a desire to bear offspring and to multiply the human race, which is the laudable end of matrimony,

thereby honoring and commending carnal union, but to fill and glut their…

§27. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis. (Continues on p. 83.) The original page bears an unrelated bleed-through library stamp ('UNIVERSIDAD…') in the OCR, which has been ignored.

— p. 83 (PDF) · printed p. 14 —

…lust, took not one wife but many — and these not by the counsel of their parents, nor at the persuasion of reason and the guidance of uncorrupted judgment, but, captivated by beauty (which is the enticement of baseness) and by a mad love of obtaining pleasure (which is the bait of all evils), they married them.

§27 (continued from p. 82).

Nor should we be silent about what Rupert, in book 2 On the Victory of the Word of God, ch. 23, wished us to note on this passage: that the devil incited the men of that time to such unbridled lust in order, by that means, to hinder the counsel and purpose of God concerning the raising of man into the place of the angels. Already once and again he had attempted to hinder this purpose of God: first, when he drove Adam to sin, on account of which Adam was cast down from the most happy state of innocence in which he had been placed by God; then, when he incited Cain to the murder of his just brother Abel. Now, however, when he saw the seed of the just multiplying greatly, he attempted to make men hateful and odious to God; and in this he certainly prevailed, by driving even the "sons of God" to the gravest crimes. Indeed he seemed to have thrown God's plan into confusion, since God said: "It repenteth me that I have made man." But God's grace and truth were stronger, and God's purpose stood unchangeable; for, though he destroyed the impious by the Flood, he yet preserved a few just — namely, the future seedbed of his elect — by a tremendous miracle.

§28. Margin: Rupert, On the Victory of the Word of God, bk. 2, ch. 23 — the devil incited this lust to thwart God's plan of raising man into the place of the angels.

Let the reader, therefore, weigh here how great an evil, how hateful to God, and how worthy of punishment is the intemperance of unrestrained lust, seeing that for the punishing of it the whole world perished in the Flood. And although this vice is to be censured in all men and is displeasing to God, yet in the “sons of God” it is most especially to be condemned and execrated, and most especially provokes the divine indignation and vengeance. “Know ye not,” says Paul to the Corinthians, “that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? But if any man violate the temple of God, him shall God destroy.” Therefore men of the Church and religious ought to flee from the obscene pleasures of the flesh more than from poison and pestilence and death itself. But now that the explanation of this passage is completed — so that what we said above, when we argued that the “sons of God” (whom Moses relates to have mingled with the daughters of men) were neither good angels nor demons, may be plainer and more certain to the reader — three disputations on this matter are now to be treated in this place. The first disputation: whether it is credible that good angels were polluted by carnal love of and intercourse with women. The second disputation: whether demons are of such a nature that they can of themselves mingle with women and beget sons from them. The third disputation: concerning incubus and succubus demons, whether a demon — not indeed of itself, but in an assumed body fashioned into the appearance of a man — can have intercourse with women and make them pregnant with a human offspring.

Concluding exhortation and transition. Margin: 1 Cor. 3. Announces the three disputations to follow on Gen. 6:2 (good angels; demons generating; incubi and succubi).

— p. 84 (PDF) · printed p. 15 —

FIRST DISPUTATION. Whether it is credible that the good angels were mingled with women.

Heading of the First Disputation on Genesis 6:2.

It is shameful to say it: the things which I am about to relate here concerning the best writers are not only false, but shameful and absurd, and unworthy both of the reputation for genius and learning of such great men and of the excellence of the purity and holiness of the blessed angels; yet truth compels me to say them, lest perhaps, on account of the authority of those men, something should seem probable to anyone which ought in no way to be approved. At the same time it will become plain to the reader from this disputation how great advances the Church of Christ has made, from that time to this day, in the science of sacred letters and the knowledge of divine things. For many things once obscure and doubtful, or even unknown, to the most learned men are now perceived clearly, indubitably, and with certainty even by the moderately educated.

§29 (opening of the disputation).

It was, then, the opinion of many men distinguished for the praise of antiquity, learning, and sanctity, that the “sons of God,” whom Moses relates to have mingled with the daughters of men, were good angels, who, captivated by the beauty of the women, sank into an obscene love and intercourse with them; and that this was their first sin, by which they lost the heavenly dignity of the angelic state and the glory of their purity and innocence. It will be agreeable, I think, to the reader if we set forth this so remarkable paradox — or rather “prava-dox” (perverse opinion) — of great teachers, in some of their own words here transcribed. Philo, in the book On the Giants, writes that those whom Moses here named “angels” are called by the philosophers “genii,” which are aerial living beings. Josephus too, in the first book of the Antiquities, hands down that these were angels. Justin Martyr, in the former Apology for the Christians, says: “God committed the care of the things that are under heaven to angels appointed to this office; and these, departing from their duty and overcome by love of women, took from them an offspring which the common people call ‘genii’; and, advancing to greater boldness, they subjected the human race to themselves — partly by magical writings, partly by the inculcated fear of

punishments, partly by the rites they revealed, which consist of victims, incense, and libations, for which they were held by desire; and, men's minds being bound fast through these passions, they everywhere filled all things with sorceries. For which reason the poets and tellers of tales, not knowing that it was the angels and the genii born of them who had had to do with males and females, attributed the cities and nations recorded by them to Jupiter himself, and to the sons of him and of his brothers Neptune and Pluto, and to their offspring." Thus Justin.

Catalogue of authorities (still §29). Margin: 'Authors who thought the sons of God were mingled with the daughters of men'; Philo; Josephus; Justin Martyr.

Clement of Alexandria, in the third book of the Stromata, has it thus: "Now the angels too, having been incontinent, overcome by desire, came down from heaven." Tertullian says this more openly in the book On the Apparel…

§30 (continues on p. 85). Clement of Alexandria; Tertullian. Margin: Clement of Alexandria; Tertullian.

— p. 85 (PDF) · printed p. 16 —

…on Women's Apparel, and On the Veiling of Virgins, where he refers to angels of this kind that saying of Paul: that "a woman ought to be veiled in the church on account of the angels of God" — that is, lest their beauty be an enticement to the angels to lust after them; and he thinks that this saying of Paul too belongs to the same matter: "Know ye not that we shall judge angels?" "Therefore," says Tertullian, "a face so dangerous, which has hurled scandals as far as heaven, ought to be veiled." And Tertullian supposes that the daughters of men with whom the angels coupled were virgins. Eusebius, in book 5 of the Preparation for the Gospel, ch. 4, suspects that it was from this passage of Moses, ill understood, that the poets took what they invented about the marriages of gods and women, and about the Giants who waged wars against the gods. Indeed Julian the Apostate, as Cyril reports of him at the beginning of the ninth book against

him, affirmed that those whom Moses here named “angels,” and said to have mingled with women, are the very same who are called “gods” by the poets, and whose unions with women are sung. Lactantius, in book 2 of the Divine Institutes, ch. 15, judges that the “sons of God” mingled with the daughters of men were angels to whom God had enjoined the office of ruling and guarding the human race.

§30 (continued from p. 84). Margins: 1 Cor. 11; 1 Cor. 6; Eusebius, Preparation for the Gospel 5.4; Cyril of Alexandria; Julian the Apostate; Lactantius, Divine Institutes 2.15.

Of the same opinion Ambrose seems to have been, in the first book On Virgins, writing in this manner: “Chastity made the angels. He who has preserved it is an angel; he who has lost it, a devil.” And a little below: “How splendid it is,” he says, “that angels through their intemperance fell from heaven into the world, while virgins through their chastity passed from the world into heaven?” But that this opinion was by no means pleasing to Ambrose, he himself does not conceal in the book he composed On Noah. For in the fourth chapter of that book, explaining this passage of Moses — “The angels of God, seeing the daughters of men” (for so Ambrose reads, following the reading that in his time was in many codices of the Septuagint translators) — he interprets the “angels of God” not as celestial substances, but as holy men, whom divine Scripture is also wont to call “sons of God.” Ambrose’s words in that place run thus: “Scripture frequently calls angels ‘sons of God,’ because souls are generated from no man. And so God has not disdained that faithful men be called his sons. As, therefore, men of upright life are called ‘sons of God,’ so those whose works are carnal we call, on the authority of the Scriptures, ‘sons of the flesh.’ For John the Evangelist says: As many as received the Lord Jesus, to them he gave power to become the sons of God, to those who believe in his name, who were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.” So Ambrose there. And he, on Psalm 118, in the seventh Sermon, and in Epistle 84 To Demetrias, says clearly and affirmatively that the first sin of the devil, before the fall of man, was

Pride. It appears, therefore, that Ambrose, in the book On Virgins, touched on that opinion about the fall of the angels through the intemperance of lust not because he himself held it, but in order the more magnificently to extol the glory of chastity.

§31. Ambrose (apparently of this opinion in On Virgins, but in fact holding the Sethite reading in On Noah). Margins: Ambrose; John 1; Ambrose on Ps. 118, Sermon 7; Epistle 84 To Demetrias.

This is remarkable, that that opinion so pleased Severus Sulpicius that he set it forth not only in open and explicit words, but even with great asseveration, writing thus, not far from the beginning of the first book of his Sacred History: “At which…

§32 (continues on p. 86). Margin: Severus Sulpicius (Sulpicius Severus), Sacred History, bk. 1.

— p. 86 (PDF) · printed p. 17 —

“…At which time, when the human race was already abounding, the angels, whose dwelling was heaven, captivated by the beauty of comely maidens, sought after illicit desires, and, degenerate from their own nature and origin, abandoning the higher regions of which they were inhabitants, mingled themselves in marriages with mortals.” So he.

§32 (continued from p. 85): the quotation from Sulpicius Severus.

And these are the things which by those writers were both believed and set forth in writing concerning the intemperance of the angels — an opinion which we cannot doubt pleased many, both because the authority of such great men made it probable, and because men seeking some patronage for their own lusts and pleasures desired that it be held for true, so that, namely, their own intemperance might seem more excusable by the example of the angels. “It is likely,” says Cyril, in the ninth book against Julian, “that many are disturbed by that opinion, and, despising better things, choose the love of pleasures, while they consider how difficult and arduous it is for them to resist carnal pleasures altogether, and believe that even the holy angels themselves pursued obscene affections. For it is

exceedingly harmful to hear and to believe that the holy angels themselves are affected by the comeliness of bodies and take delight in pleasures so profane and absurd.” Thus Cyril. St. Augustine, in chapter 23 of book 15 of The City of God, does indeed reject that opinion, but so modestly that he seems, out of reverence for so many and so great teachers who had followed it, to have remitted the severity of the censure which that opinion deserved. “I could in no way believe,” says Augustine, “that the holy angels of God could at that time have so fallen, nor that the Apostle Peter said of these: For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but, thrusting them down into the prisons of the darkness of hell, delivered them to be reserved for punishment unto judgment; but rather of those who, first apostatizing from God, fell with the devil their prince — who first deceived man through envy by the serpent’s guile.”

§33: why the opinion pleased many. Margins: Cyril (against Julian, bk. 9); Augustine, City of God 15.23; 1 Pet. 2.

Cassian, in the eighth Conference, chapter 21, thought that opinion was strongly refuted even by this single argument. “In no way,” he says, “is it to be believed that spiritual natures can be carnally mingled with women. For if at some time this could have been done literally, how is it that now too the same thing would happen, even not rarely, so that we should see some born of women in like manner without seed or the intercourse of a man, by the conception of demons? — especially since it is established that they take great delight in the filth of lusts, which without doubt they would prefer to practice through themselves rather than through men, if that could in any way have been accomplished.” Thus Cassian. But this argumentation of Cassian is feeble. For the approvers and defenders of that opinion could meet his reasoning in two ways. They would say, first, that the angels have the power of entering women, but that they used that power only once, by God’s permission, and thereafter were forbidden by God to use it — just as the demon has the power of harming men as he harmed Job, yet God does not allow him to exercise that power against other men;

for the demon can do many things which he would do frequently and willingly, but, God forbidding, he does them either rarely, or only once, or even never at all. They would say, furthermore: that since good angels or demons enter women only under the appearance and figure of a man, therefore…

§34 (continues on p. 87). Margin: the argument of Cassian (Conference 8, ch. 21) is weighed, and shown to be feeble.

— p. 87 (PDF) · printed p. 18 —

…it cannot be discerned whether they are men or spirits fallen from heaven [?]. So that it is not incredible, they will say, that many who are reckoned sons of men were begotten by the seed of demons.

§34 (continued from p. 86). The opening clause is badly garbled in the OCR; the reconstruction is conjectural [?]. Margin: 'It is shown that the good angels did not fall from heaven on account of love of women.'

By these two arguments, then, that opinion is to be overthrown. It is beyond controversy that angels are either incorporeal, or, if they are corporeal, have a body different from the human — aerial, namely, or fiery, or invisible to human eyes. For the figure of a human body, by which they have declared their presence to certain persons, they assume for a time, either from without, or by conforming their own body — since it is most subtle and capable of being shaped in every way — to that appearance. Hence, then, it is concluded that angels can in no way be affected by the delights and pleasures of our flesh and take delight in them of themselves, nor be bodily mingled with women, nor beget sons from them. But because this reasoning applies commonly and equally to good angels and to evil demons, let it for the present be omitted, to be treated more fully and conveniently a little below, when we deal with the demons. There is, then, a second most powerful argument against that opinion: if the holy angels fell from heaven through the intemperance of lust, then the first sin of the angels was the sin of lust; but that the angels had other, prior sins

is proved by manifest testimonies of Scripture. For the sin of lust, if it was committed by the angels, was certainly not committed before a thousand years had passed since the founding of the world; for about that much time elapsed from the beginning of the world up to the time at which Moses relates that the sons of God mingled with the daughters of men. But that there were other, far more ancient sins of the angels — namely, committed by them at the very beginning of the world — is plain from the words of our Lord which are in John, chapter eight, where he said that the devil was "from the beginning of the world a liar and a murderer." In the book of Wisdom too it is written that "by the envy of the devil death entered into the world"; but death entered as soon as Adam sinned, as Paul testifies to the Romans in chapter five, when he says: "By one man sin entered into this world, and by sin death." Long before that sin of lust, therefore, we find in the sacred writings that there were three other sins of the angels: of Envy, of Lying, and of Murder.

§35: the two decisive arguments stated; the second developed — the angels' first sin was not lust.
Margins: John 8; Wisdom 2; Rom. 5; 'the first sin was not lust.'

Indeed it is acknowledged among almost all the Fathers and Theologians that the first sin of the angel was pride; so that for that reason it is recorded in the book of Ecclesiasticus, chapter ten, that "the beginning of all sin is pride." For the first of all sins was the sin of Lucifer; and this was pride, as the Doctors are wont to argue from those words of Isaiah which are in chapter 14: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, who didst rise in the morning?" etc. — where, under the figure of the king of Babylon, is described Lucifer's fall from heaven to hell on account of pride. It appears, therefore, that the first sin of the angels was not the sin of carnal lust. I said "carnal lust," on account of the opinion of Scotus, who judged that the first sin of the angel was a certain spiritual lust. But if the first sin of the angels was not carnal lust, then the good angels were not, on account of the foul lust which…

§36 (continues on p. 88): the first sin of the angels was pride. Margins: Ecclus. 10; Isa. 14; Scotus, Sentences bk. 2, dist. 4 (who held it a spiritual lust).

— p. 88 (PDF) · printed p. 19 —

…they practiced with women, cast down from heaven, nor did they lose the dignity of their state.

§36 (continued from p. 87).

This argument the blessed Chrysostom — reckoning it a most powerful weapon for destroying that opinion — treated in these words, in homily 22 on Genesis: “But what do these men say? Surely they say that they were indeed angels, but that, because they descended to this iniquitous deed, they fell from their dignity. Behold again another, more fabulous tale! What then? Did the angels fall, and was this the cause of their ruin? But Scripture teaches us otherwise: that before Adam was formed, the devil fell from his dignity. For a certain wise man says: ‘By the envy of the devil death entered into the world.’ For if he did not fall before man was made, when, remaining in such great dignity, did he envy man? For it is not reasonable that an incorporeal angel, established in such dignity, envied man bearing a body; rather he envied because he had been cast down from supernal glory into the utmost ignominy. Therefore, although he was incorporeal, yet, seeing man endowed in the body with such great honor by the goodwill of the Creator, he blazed with envy, and by the deception in which he used the serpent’s aid, he made man liable to the punishment of death. For such malice cannot but bear grievously the happiness of others. For of what great madness would it be to say that the angels were cast down in order to have to do with women, and that an incorporeal nature was joined to bodies? Do you not hear the Lord saying of the substance of the angels: ‘In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God’? For it is not possible that an incorporeal nature should at any time have such concupiscence.” Thus far Chrysostom. But enough has been said for vindicating the good angels

from the intemperance of lust and from the obscenities of women's loves. Next let us dispute, treating a similar question, concerning the evil angels, who are commonly called demons or cacodemons.

§37: the long confirming quotation from Chrysostom. Margins: Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis; Wisdom 2; Mark 12.

SECOND DISPUTATION. Whether it is probable that demons, in their own bodies, were mingled with women, and from them begot sons.

Heading of the Second Disputation.

If it had been openly and confessedly held among all philosophers and theologians that demons (as they truly are) are incorporeal, plainly no room would have been left for the discussion of this question. For an incorporeal nature cannot be affected by bodily pleasures, nor through bodily intercourse with women generate a bodily offspring. But because very many and most noble of the philosophers and ecclesiastical writers judged them to be corporeal, it did not seem to some impossible or incredible that they could have been lovers and corrupters of women and begetters of children.

Opening of the Second Disputation.

— p. 89 (PDF) · printed p. 20 —

It was certainly a most celebrated doctrine of the Platonists that demons are naturally endowed with an aerial body, and that some of these are persuaders and authors of the most obscene crimes and sorceries, and are moved by bodily affections in like manner as men. And, not to be long in setting forth at great length the opinion on this matter of the Platonists — Iamblichus, Plotinus, Porphyry, Maximus of Tyre, and others — I shall here append a brief passage of the Platonist Apuleius from his book On the Daemon of Socrates, as Augustine reports it in book 8 of The City of God, ch. 17. "When the same man," says Augustine — he means the Platonist

Apuleius, whom he had named a little before — “spoke of the character of the demons, he said that they are agitated by the same disturbances of mind as men, provoked by injuries, appeased by compliances and gifts; that they rejoice in honors, take delight in the various rites of sacrifices, and are disturbed if anything in them is neglected. Among other things he says that to them belong the divinations of augurs, soothsayers, seers, and dreams; and that from them also are the miracles of the magicians. And, defining them briefly, he says: Demons are, in genus, living beings; in soul, subject to passion; in mind, rational; in body, aerial; in time, eternal. And of these five attributes, the first three they have in common with us, the fourth is proper to themselves, the fifth they have in common with the gods.” Thus Augustine, from Apuleius.

§38: the Platonist doctrine of demonic corporeality; Apuleius. Margins: ‘The teaching of the Platonists on the nature of demons’; Apuleius (in Augustine, City of God 8.17).

Maximus of Tyre, the Platonist philosopher, in Oration 26, not only makes demons corporeal, but says also that some of them profess medicine, others give counsel in doubtful matters, some declare hidden things, many devote labor with men to the practice of the arts, some are companions on a journey, some urban, others rustic, these maritime, those of the land. Plutarch, in the book entitled That the Oracles Have Ceased, says: “There is, as in men a diversity of the virtuous and the appetitive and irrational part, so also in the demons themselves. But in some this irrational part is weak and feeble, in others vehement and impetuous, contriving immense calamities and ruin for men, privately and publicly.” The same Plutarch, in the book he wrote On Isis: “Plato,” he says, “Pythagoras, Xenocrates, and Chrysippus, following the ancient theologians, affirm that the demons are more excellent than men; but they said that their nature is conjoined of soul and body, wherefore they too are affected by pleasure and pain, some more, some less; for, as among men, so also among demons a diversity of virtue and vice is found.” And Empedocles affirms that the demons even pay penalties for their sins: for the ether and the sea expel them, the earth in

no way receives them; thus, driven from one element to another, they are horribly tormented, until, purged, they return to their first place. But if the demons, according to these Platonists, were agitated and vexed by the same disturbances as men, it would not be a vain conjecture that they are compacted of earthly bodies and dying members; for that such disturbances befall souls from the association and contagion of mortal and earthly bodies, the Poet sings in those most elegant verses…

§39 (continues on p. 90): Maximus of Tyre, Plutarch (twice), Empedocles, leading to Virgil. Margins: Maximus of Tyre, Oration 26; Plutarch, On the Cessation of Oracles; Plutarch, On Isis; Empedocles; Virgil, Aeneid 6.

— p. 90 (PDF) · printed p. 21 —

“Fiery is the vigor of those seeds, and heavenly their origin, / so far as harmful bodies do not clog them, / and earthly limbs and dying members do not dull them. / Hence they fear and desire, grieve and rejoice; nor, / shut in darkness and a blind prison, do they look up to the open air.” (Virgil, Aeneid 6)

§39 (continued from p. 89): the verses of Virgil. (The original’s marginal numbering appears to skip from §39 to §41 here.) Margin: Virgil, Aeneid 6.730–734.

But as for the things which have so far been said from the Platonists about the demons, let the reader account them but sport and a joke — even as are the things I shall now subjoin. A certain Psellus, both a philosopher and a Christian, but (so far as may be judged from his writings) unschooled in Christian doctrine, wrote a book On Demons, having been taught most of these matters by a certain Marcus, who, on account of his long familiarity with and devotion to demons, was reckoned the most expert of all men of his time in demonic matters. But if the things he handed down were as true, or at least as probable, as they are novel and marvelous, and did not altogether disagree with the tenets of the theologians, this Psellus would surely have disclosed to us many things about the varied nature of the demons, and likewise about their various pursuits, habits, and powers —

things which are most abstruse and can neither be investigated by human reason, much less comprehended. Now the things set forth by him about the demons (so far as pertains to our present concern) can be reduced to four heads. First, he says that the body of good angels and that of demons is not the same. For he hands down that the angelic body sends forth rays and cannot be endured by human eyes, penetrates and passes through all things, and is even less subject to passions than a ray of the sun; whereas the bodies of demons, though invisible because of their subtlety, are nevertheless in a manner material and subject to passion — so much so that some of them are subject to touch, and when struck feel pain, and when they approach fire are burned, and some of them even leave behind ashes.

§41: Michael Psellus On Demons (learned from one Marcus); the first of his four ‘heads.’ Margins: ‘What Psellus hands down about demons’; ‘the four heads of Psellus.’

Next Psellus hands down, on the authority of that Marcus, that some of the demons emit seed, from which certain tiny living things arise; and that they are also nourished — some, indeed, by inhalation, as the spirit thrives in the arteries and nerves; others by moisture, yet not drawing it in by the mouth as we do, but like sponges and oysters, sucking up the moisture lying adjacent on the outside, while excreting whatever is thicker and more solid in the moisture. But not all demons undergo this, only that kind of demon which is nearest to matter, and which hates the light and is aquatic and subterranean.

§42: Psellus’s second head — that some demons emit seed and are nourished.

Besides this, he enumerates six kinds of demons, distinguished according to the variety of places in which they mostly dwell. One is called fiery, which roams about the higher air; for every kind of demon has been banished from the celestial region as some profane thing from a temple. A second kind of demon is named aerial, wandering in this air near us. The third is called earthly, because it dwells mostly about the earth and opposes man by earthly things and devices. The fourth is called aquatic and marine,

which plunges into the waters, gladly dwelling about lakes and rivers, stirring up waves and storms in the sea, and to men's ships…

§43 (continues on p. 91): Psellus's third head — the six kinds of demons. Margin: 'Six kinds of demons.'

— p. 91 (PDF) · printed p. 22 —

…sinking the ships laden by men. The fifth is subterranean, dwelling beneath the earth and infesting the diggers of wells and mines, causing chasms in the earth, shaking foundations, and stirring up fire-belching winds. The sixth and last kind of demon is light-shunning and inscrutable and utterly dark, violently destroying many things by its cold passions. And these six kinds of demons are so disposed that they both hate God and are hostile to men, but one worse than another; for the subterranean, the aquatic, and the light-shunning are exceedingly malevolent and pernicious.

§43 (continued from p. 90): the fifth and sixth kinds.

Lastly, he hands down this too: that no demon is by its own nature either male or female, but, as it pleases, takes on for a time the figure of either sex; for the bodies of demons are simple, easily led and bent, and naturally apt for every configuration. And these are the things which Psellus set forth about the demons, drawn partly from his own judgment, partly from the teaching of that Marcus.

§44: Psellus's fourth head — demons are by nature of neither sex.

Nor have there been lacking in this our age men who have published abroad, in books put before the public, things no less novel and marvelous about the demons. Francesco Giorgio, a philosopher and theologian, but (as appears from his writings) more zealous for any opinions whatever that had novelty and made for marvel than skilled in true philosophy and theology and divine Scripture, published six volumes of "Problems" pertaining for the most part to sacred Scripture. From problems 54, 74, and 75 of the first volume, and from problems 330 and 331 of the sixth volume, it is plain that

he held not only that demons are corporeal, but that they also have the power of generating and emit seed; and that, approaching women, they condense their bodies and fittingly shape them to what they wish to do; and that their own offspring are giants. And so these demons, he holds, are those “sons of God” from whose intercourse and mingling with the daughters of men the giants were begotten, as Moses relates in this sixth chapter. And the “seed of the serpent,” which the Lord foretold would always be hostile to the seed of the woman, he judges to be this offspring of demons — that is, the giants, fiercely hostile to men. But indeed, the things we have briefly recounted about the demons from the opinion of the Platonists, of Psellus, and of Giorgio, the reader may, as much as he pleases, laugh at and despise as mere trifles — trifles, I say, more futile than the trifles of the most trifling poets.

§45: Francesco Giorgio (Zorzi) and his ‘Problems’; Pererius dismisses all this as nonsense. Margins: Franciscus Georgius; Gen. 3 (the seed of the serpent).

Come now: that the reader may more clearly recognize how far removed from the truth it is that demons, in their own proper bodies, lustfully mingled with women and begot sons, let us demonstrate by four reasons that this is false. First Reason. Demons are incorporeal; therefore, according to their nature, they could neither mingle in bodily intercourse with women nor beget sons from them. That demons are incorporeal is sufficiently shown by a great indication and argument: namely, what we read in Luke, chapter eight — that within one man, whom Christ the Lord freed from demons, there was a “legion” of demons, that is, six thousand demons. But it is utterly incredible, if the demons…

§46 (continues on p. 92): the first of four refutations begins — demons are incorporeal. Margins: ‘It is proved by four reasons that demons were not lustfully mingled with women in their own bodies. First reason: demons are incorporeal’; Luke 8 (the ‘Legion’).

— p. 92 (PDF) · printed p. 23 —

…were corporeal, that so great a number of demons could be compressed and contained within the narrow space of a single small human body. But if demons have a body, of what sort will such a body be — whether of celestial substance, or rather of elemental and sublunary matter? Yet since demons move in every direction — up, down, to the right, to the left, forward, backward, and in a circle (for when Satan was asked by God whence he came, he answered: “I have gone round about the earth and walked through it”) — and since demons have a body which they can most easily extend to any magnitude or contract to smallness, and constantly vary in their body all the appearances of colors and figures; and finally, since demons, as these men say, are tormented in their bodies by fire and racked with the most bitter sensations of pain — for these things a celestial body is by no means suited, but rather utterly unfit. For it is capable only of circular motion, and, since it is most solid, “like bronze,” as Job says, it can be varied neither in quantity nor in figure; and finally, since it is incorruptible, it is subject to no corruptive alteration, and therefore cannot be the seat of the sensation of pain.

§46 (continued from p. 91): the demon’s body cannot be of celestial substance. Margins: ‘The body of a demon is not of celestial substance’; Job 1–2; Job 37.

But if they make the body of demons elemental — as indeed they do — that is, aerial, it must be dissoluble, and the demons must be mortal. For what the blessed Augustine wrote in book 3 of On Genesis according to the Letter, ch. 10 — that the aerial body of a demon is not corruptible, because in air and fire there is the power of acting, as in earth and water the power of being acted upon, and therefore the demon’s body is more active than passive — this, I say, agrees neither with true philosophy nor with experience. For air is more passive than active, since its proper quality is moisture, by which, namely, it is marked and distinguished from the other elements. And Aristotle, in book 2 of On Generation, text 8, and at the beginning of book 4 of the Meteorology, makes heat and cold active qualities, but moisture and dryness passive. Moreover, it has been

ascertained by manifest and daily experiments that air is not only passible and corruptible, but is also most easily changed and corrupted; for its change into either fire or water is most ready and most swift.

§47: nor can the demon's body be aerial (against Augustine, On Genesis according to the Letter 3.10). Margins: 'The body of demons is not aerial'; Augustine; Aristotle (On Generation 2; Meteorology 4).

But if they make the demons corruptible, they must necessarily make them generable as well — unless they are willing that the number of demons should be diminished more and more day by day, and that from the time they were created up to this present day they should have been reduced to the very fewest. But if demons are generated, what, I ask, will be the mode of their generation? For not even by feigning can it be determined what the generation of demons is. I am not unaware that it was written by Plutarch, in his book On the Failure of Oracles, that demons are mortal and die after very long spaces of time; and he confirms the same — that under the reign of Tiberius Caesar the most famous of the demons, who was called by the heathen "Great Pan," had died — on the testimony of most weighty men. Likewise, according to the opinion of Hesiod…

§48 (continues on p. 93): if corruptible, then generable — but no mode of demonic generation can be conceived. Margins: Plutarch, On the Cessation of Oracles; 'the demon Pan is dead'; Hesiod.

— p. 93 (PDF) · printed p. 24 —

…he fixes the life of the demons, whom the heathen named "genii," at nine thousand seven hundred and twenty years.

§48 (continued from p. 92): Hesiod's reckoning of demonic lifespan.

Cardano, however, in book 16 of On the Variety of Things, ch. 92, affirms that his father — who for more than thirty years had been most familiar with demons — was wont to tell him that he had learned from the demons themselves that they come into being and perish; and that, so far as he himself could conjecture from the face and age of the demon who

conversed with him, it seemed to him that their life is prolonged to two hundred or even three hundred years. But these and other like fabrications of men I, for my part, count of no value, and I gladly follow that most prudent counsel of Aristotle: that it is foolish to attend to whatever anyone says, especially if he says things contrary to opinions long and greatly approved. For many (as the same writer says), looking to few things, easily and rashly pronounce on anything.

§49: Cardano's report dismissed; Pererius invokes Aristotle. Margins: Cardano (On the Variety of Things, bk. 16, ch. 92); Aristotle, Topics 1; On Generation and Corruption 1.

To these I add: if the body of a demon were aerial, or of any other sublunary matter, it would follow that the demon, according to its nature, is more imperfect and less noble than man — which, however, the defenders of that opinion utterly deny. For they hold that demons are midway between the celestial gods and men, inferior indeed to the former but superior to the latter, and that they serve the former with their ministries and functions, but preside over the latter. But that, according to these men, man would be more excellent than the demon, is plain from this: that among the bodies which are below the moon, the more composite and multiform any body is, the nobler and more perfect it is agreed to be. For metals are more perfect than the elements, plants than metals, animals than plants, and of all the most excellent is man, whose body — designed by the wisest reason and elaborated and perfected with admirable artifice — who does not see to be far nobler than a simple aerial body? But indeed, between form and matter there is by nature such a proportion that nature has always provided and assigned a nobler matter to a nobler form; therefore, if the body of man is by nature nobler than the aerial body of the demon, the soul of man too must necessarily be nobler and more excellent than the soul and mind of the demon. But let us conclude this first reason: that demons and all angels are incorporeal is an opinion long since received in the Church of God, and confirmed both by the consensus of all theologians and by the authority of the Great Lateran Council under

Innocent III.

§50: a demon with an aerial body would be less noble than man — which the defenders themselves deny; conclusion of the first reason, citing the Fourth Lateran Council. Margins: 'If a demon had naturally an aerial body, it would by nature be more imperfect than man'; Council of the Great Lateran under Innocent III.

Wherefore I cannot but greatly wonder at Cajetan, who, in his Commentaries on chapter 2 of the Epistle to the Ephesians, explaining those words of Paul, "according to the prince of the power of this air, the spirit," etc., was not afraid to say that it seems most consonant with the reasoning of true philosophy that demons are spirits naturally constituted with an aerial body. "For," he says, "just as the vegetative is found without the sensitive, and the sensitive without the locomotive, and the intellective without the sensitive and locomotive as to place, so it is credible that the intellective is found without the sensitive, with only locomotion as to place; and such are the demons." So he argues. But a fine [opinion indeed]…

§51 (continues on p. 94): the criticism of Cajetan begins (sentence breaks off at 'Egregiam vero…'). Margin: 'A criticism of Cajetan, who asserts that demons have naturally an aerial body'; Eph. 2:2.

— p. 94 (PDF) · printed p. 25 —

…a true reason why a doctrine so greatly praised and approved for so many ages now among all theologians and the best philosophers should have to be abandoned. For indeed this kind of argumentation has little force for proving; it bears only a certain shadow of probability, and in the schools such reasonings are usually called "convenances" or "congruences." For if Cajetan's reasoning were admitted, it could likewise be concluded that the sensitive is found without the vegetative, and the intellective with the sensitive but without locomotion as to place — namely, so that no combination of this kind should be lacking to the totality and perfection of things.

§51 (continued from p. 93): conclusion of the critique of Cajetan — his reasoning is merely a ‘congruence,’ not a proof.

Aristotle, in book 2 of On the Soul, says that these four grades of living things — the vegetative, the sensitive, the locomotive (as to place), and the intellective — are so naturally disposed and ordered among themselves that the prior is contained potentially in the posterior: so that, although the prior can indeed exist without the posterior, the posterior cannot exist without the prior. And we discern something similar to this in the species of numbers and of rectilinear figures. Therefore the locomotive (as to place) cannot exist without the sensitive; so that Cajetan, who holds that demons are capable of motion as to place, just as animals are, must grant that they too are sensitive.

§52: Aristotle, On the Soul 2, on the ordered grades of living things. Margin: Aristotle.

Aristotle, moreover, in the third book of On the Soul, denies that there can be any body (whether it be generable or ungenerable) which has an intellective soul and yet lacks sense — and wisely so. For of what use is a body to the intellect without sense? And for what end or use would nature have assigned a body to a demon? For matter is for the sake of form, and the body for the sake of the soul. That is, matter is necessary to a material form for its existence, operation, and perfection; for such a form can neither exist, nor operate, nor attain its perfection without the aid of matter.

§53: Aristotle, On the Soul 3 — no body has an intellective soul without a sensitive one. Margin: ‘For Aristotle there is no body having an intellective soul which does not have a sensitive one.’

But the mind of the demon, since by nature it is more excellent than the human mind, exists by its own power as intelligent and immortal, and needs no body in order to exist. Likewise the demon’s proper action, in which its natural perfection consists, is intellection, for the perfecting of which a body is not necessary to the demon; for it does not, like the human mind, seek and acquire the matter of its understanding through bodily senses. Nor does it need a body to effect local motion: for the demon can

by its own power transfer itself from any place to any other place; and, in bodies assumed for a time, it can represent any motions of animals — walking, running, leaping, crawling, turning about, flight, and the like. But let us pass on to the second reason.

§54: but the demon's mind needs no body to exist or to act. Margin: Second reason (heading of the next argument).

Second Reason. Even if demons were corporeal, they would not for that reason have the power of generating, nor would they have prolific seed. For generative seed is the residue of the last nourishment, useful for generation. Indeed the faculty of generating and of producing seed pertains to the vegetative soul, whose proper works are to generate and to use nourishment, as Aristotle teaches in book 2 of On the Soul, text 34. For in whatever…

§55 (continues on p. 95). Second Reason: even if demons were corporeal, they would have no generative power or prolific seed. Margins: 'Second reason: even if demons were corporeal, they could not have the power of generating or seed'; Aristotle, On the Soul 2.

— p. 95 (PDF) · printed p. 26 —

…bodies the vegetative soul is present, those bodies must necessarily have been at some time generated, and must at some time perish. Nor would there be in the demons only a vegetative soul, if the faculty of generating were in them, but there would also be a sensitive soul. For it is natural in perfect living beings to take pleasure from the very act of generation — a pleasure which indeed the followers of this opinion do not deny to the demons, but rather assert that they seek out those pleasures and rejoice and delight in lustful and obscene couplings. But the sensation of such delight pertains to the sense of touch, which arises from the tempering of the primary qualities, and has its seat not in a simple body, but in one mixed and tempered from the elements.

§55 (continued from p. 94): a generative faculty would entail a sensitive soul and the sense of touch.

From these things, then, it would be concluded that the body of a demon is not simple, but mixed from all the elements; nor uniform (what is in Greek called homogeneous), but having multiform parts — namely, organs destined and adapted for performing the various actions of the soul. Wherefore the body of a demon would be solid and gross, visible and conspicuous to all. Add to this that the faculty of generating carries with it the distinction of sex into male and female; for perfect generation requires that both sexes come together, since in the one is the active power of generation, and in the other the passive, nor can generation be effected without the concurrence of both. There would therefore be among demons some males and some females, and there would be among them a coupling for the sake of generating. The lies of the poets, then, would not be lies, nor would Hesiod’s Theogony be fabulous, but true; and the things the heathen fabled about gods and goddesses, and about their marriages, adulteries, and incests among themselves, would have to be believed as true. Finally, since the demons have already passed so many thousands of years from the time they were created, if they had the power of generating, the progeny of demons would plainly be innumerable and intolerable. If these things are false, absurd, impossible, and incredible, then it must likewise be false, impossible, and absurd that a demon has the power of generating.

§56: hence the demon’s body would have to be composite, sexed, and the pagan theogonies would be true — all absurd.

Third Reason. Although demons were corporeal and had the power of generating, they could not for that reason generate anything from women. For two principles must necessarily come together to perfect generation: the one is the active principle of generation, which is in the male; the other is the passive principle, which is in the female. Wherefore, if a demon were to generate from a woman, the active power of generation would be in the demon, but the passive power in the woman. But this cannot happen. For between the active and passive power of generation there must be a natural agreement and kinship, such that both are in things of the same species —

as in man and woman, horse and mare, lion and lioness — or at least of the same nearest genus, as in a horse and a she-ass, whence a mule is begotten. For not any animal whatever can be generated from any animal whatever, much less an animal from a non-animal, since these differ in genus. But a demon and a woman differ not only in species, but also in genus, both as to soul or mind and as to body;…

§57 (continues on p. 96). Third Reason: even granting a generative power, demons could not generate from women. Margins: ‘Third reason: demons cannot generate anything from women’; ‘two principles necessary for perfecting generation.’

— p. 96 (PDF) · printed p. 27 —

…there would therefore be no agreement between the generative power of the demon and that of the woman, and consequently no generation would arise from them. This is confirmed by the authority of Aristotle, who, in book 10 of the Metaphysics, text 25, writes thus: “Male and female are indeed proper affections of the animal, but not according to substance — rather in the matter and the body. Hence the same seed, having undergone some affection, becomes either female or male.” And in the following text, toward the end of that book, he affirms that the corruptible and the incorruptible differ in genus. But a demon is by nature incorruptible, whereas a woman is corruptible; therefore they are diverse in genus from each other. The demon, then, cannot have the active power of generation with respect to a woman, nor the woman the passive power with respect to the demon.

§57 (continued from p. 95): confirmed by Aristotle, Metaphysics 10. Margin: Aristotle.

Fourth Reason. But let us grant that demons are corporeal and have the power of generating, indeed that they can generate something from a woman: even so, with these things posited and conceded, it could not be concluded that a demon can generate a man from a woman, but rather, on the contrary, that the offspring from the woman, if the demon should produce it, would not be human. For when two things of diverse species

come together for generation, what is generated from the mingling of the two is diverse in species from both. For from a horse and a she-ass a mule is generated, and the same is seen in other things that are so generated. For things generated from parents (so to speak) of diverse species would either be of the same species as both parents — which cannot happen, since they differ in species — or would be of the same species as one parent; but why with the one rather than the other? Philosophical reasoning therefore compels us to hold that the offspring must be diverse from both, yet in such a way that it also has some agreement with both, as is manifest in the mule. But since the demon is diverse in genus from the woman, how can that which is generated from the union of a demon and a woman be a man — that is, wholly like the woman, but wholly diverse from the demon? — when the contrary ought rather to happen, that it should be more like the demon in substance than the woman, seeing that the demon would have the active power of generation, the woman the passive; and, as the matter of the offspring is from the female, so its form is taken chiefly from the active principle.

§58: Fourth Reason — even granting generation from a woman, the offspring would not be human. Margin: 'Fourth reason: even if a demon generated something from a woman, it would still not generate a man.'

There makes for the confirmation of this our opinion what Pliny writes in book 6, ch. 2, citing as his authority Duris, by whom it was recorded that certain of the Indians couple with wild beasts, and that the offspring are mixed and half-beast; for which reason, perhaps, the poets of the Gentiles called those begotten of parents one of whom was a god, the other a man — such as Hercules, Dionysus, Aesculapius, Aeneas, Romulus — not gods simply, nor men, but demigods and half-men. Although these were in truth men, for their whole substance was that of a man; but as regards the fabulous origin of their generation and the feigned condition of their parents, they were called demigods.

§59: a confirmation from Pliny (Duris) and the pagan 'demigods.' Margin: Pliny.

But I fear lest there steal into the mind of some of those reading these things a suspi-…

§60 (continues on p. 97).

— p. 97 (PDF) · printed p. 28 —

…cion, lest perhaps from the intercourse of a demon with a woman were generated those monsters which foolish paganism named and worshiped as Silvani, Fauns, and Satyrs, in which something bestial and something human, and even something divine, was said to be. “There are,” says Pliny in book 7, ch. 2, “in the eastern mountains of the Indians (the region is called Cartulodorus) Satyrs, a most swift animal, running now on four feet, now upright, with a human likeness; on account of their speed they are not caught except when old or sick.”

§60 (continued from p. 96): the Silvani, Fauns, and Satyrs. Margins: ‘On the Silvani, Fauns, and Satyrs’; Pliny (Natural History 7.2).

Someone might perhaps suppose those monsters to have been of this kind which St. Jerome relates, in the Life of Paul the Hermit, to have appeared to the blessed Antony in the wilderness, in roughly this manner: “Antony espies a man mixed with a horse, to which the poets’ fancy gave the name Hippocentaur. At the sight, he arms his forehead with the impression of the saving sign, and says: ‘Ho there! In what part does a servant of God dwell here?’ But that creature, gnashing out some barbarous thing, and breaking his words rather than speaking them, sought through his bristling jaws a friendly address to the old man, and, with the outstretched extension of his right hand, points out the desired way; and so, traversing the open fields in winged flight, he vanished from the eyes of the astonished man. But whether the devil feigned this to terrify him, or whether the desert, fertile as it is in monstrous animals, also begets this beast, we hold uncertain. And so Antony, amazed and turning over within himself what he had seen, goes farther on. Without delay, in a rocky valley he sees a not-large little man, with hooked nostrils, his forehead roughened with horns, the lower part of

whose body ended in goat's feet, who offered him the fruits of palms as provision for the journey, as if pledges of peace. At this, Antony checked his step, and, asking who he was, received this answer from him: 'I am a mortal, and one of the inhabitants of the desert, whom paganism, deluded by various error, worships under the names of Fauns, Satyrs, and Incubi. I perform an embassy on behalf of my flock: we beg you to entreat for us the common God, whom we have learned came for the salvation of the world, and whose sound has gone out into all the earth.' He had not yet finished his words when, as if on feathered flight, the frisking animal fled away. Lest this move a scruple in anyone through incredulity, it is vouched for, under King Constantine, with the whole world as witness. For afterward the lifeless carcass, lest it be dissipated by the heat of summer, was, with salt poured in, brought to Antioch, that it might be seen by the Emperor." Thus far the blessed Jerome.

§61: the centaur and satyr seen by St. Antony, from Jerome's Life of Paul the Hermit. Margin: Jerome.

But for my part I believe that these things, and certain others like them, were the fabrications and mockeries of demons: for either they were merely the bare simulacra of the things that were seen and empty specters, or they were monstrous animals, strange to behold, through which the demon counterfeited human speech and sense, and made a show of human, or even more-than-human, power and wisdom. But let this be the end of the second question. For I think it has been sufficiently proved by these four reasons that a demon, mingled in its own body with a woman, cannot procreate a human offspring; from which it also appears that the "sons of God," whom Moses here relates to have mingled with the daughters of men and begotten the giants, were not demons.

§62: Pererius's own judgment — these were demonic illusions or strange beasts — and the conclusion of the Second Disputation.

— p. 98 (PDF) · printed p. 29 —

THIRD DISPUTATION. Whether a demon, having coupled with a woman in a body assumed externally and for a time, can generate a man by seed not its own but male seed infused into the woman.

Heading of the Third Disputation.

That demons are neither corporeal nor have a natural power of begetting human offspring has long since been established by the wise and believed by almost all. But that demons not only can, but also not rarely are wont, in a body assumed externally and shaped into the likeness of a man, to enter into intercourse with women and procreate children, is frequently bandied about in talk, as though it were proved by the testimony of most weighty men and ascertained by many and manifest experiences and examples. St. Augustine, in book 15 of The City of God, chapter 23, although he suspends his judgment and sentence on this matter, nevertheless says things which make it quite likely and probable. For he writes thus: “It is a most frequent report, and many assert that they have experienced, or have heard from those who experienced it (of whose trustworthiness there is no room to doubt), that Silvani and Fauns, whom the common people call ‘incubi,’ have often been wicked toward women, and have desired and accomplished intercourse with them; and that certain demons, whom the Gauls call ‘Dusii,’ assiduously attempt and accomplish this uncleanness — so many and such persons affirm it, that to deny it would seem effrontery. For my part I do not dare to determine anything rashly: whether certain spirits, embodied in the aerial element (for this element, even when it is stirred by a fan, is perceived by the body’s sense of touch), can also suffer this lust, so as to mingle, in whatever way they can, with women who feel it.” Thus Augustine.

§63: the question stated; Augustine’s much-cited testimony. Margin: Augustine (City of God 15.23).

A demon is called an “incubus” who, coming on under a male appearance, lies upon a woman; but a “succubus” he is called who, under a female

figure lying beneath a man, undergoes the woman's part. There exists a decretal letter of Pope Innocent VIII, of that name, against malefic women who hold intercourse, shamefully and impiously, with incubus demons, in which, among other things, are these words: "Not without great distress has it come to our hearing that very many persons of both sexes, forgetful of their own salvation and deviating from the Catholic faith, abuse themselves with incubus and succubus demons. Wherefore, lest the stain of this heretical depravity should diffuse its poisons to the ruin of souls, desiring to provide fitting remedies as our office requires, we have decreed that the Inquisitors deputed by us carry out the due office of inquisition in such matters." So Innocent. A twofold example — one of an incubus demon, the other of a succubus, both foul and at the same time horrible to hear — Cardano relates in book 16 of On the Variety of Things, ch. 93, and Philostratus in the Life of Apollonius, bk. 4, ch. 8; from recounting which examples here, serving partly brevity and partly modesty, I abstain.

§64: definitions of incubus and succubus; the decretal of Innocent VIII; further examples (passed over for modesty). Margins: Innocent VIII; Cardano (bk. 16, ch. 93); Philostratus, Life of Apollonius, bk. 4, ch. 8.

— p. 99 (PDF) · printed p. 30 —

Tostatus, however, on the sixth chapter of the book of Genesis, in the sixth question, writes about incubus and succubus demons of this kind in roughly this manner: "These demons cannot pour forth seed, since they are not corporeal, nor have they whence seed might fall; but, taking it from men, they themselves infuse it into women. And there are two kinds of them. For sometimes the demon is a succubus, sometimes an incubus; yet it is a succubus before it is an incubus. For when men are polluted by nocturnal seed, there the succubus demon, with a body shaped from air into a female appearance, receives the seed and preserves it lest its spirit exhale, whereby it becomes apt for generation; then, with the sex transformed, putting on the appearance of a man, it inserts the male seed which it had received into a woman's womb. And in this way some say that Merlin, the

seer famous in England, was begotten — the seed of a certain man having been received by a succubus demon and afterward infused into the mother's belly by the same demon as an incubus. Now incubus demons of this kind appear while women are awake, wickedly troubling them; but succubus demons rarely appear to men except in dreams. And from such conceptions most robust and most tall men can be born, because demons know the powers of seeds, what is suited to each; they know also the opportune times at which seeds ought to be infused into the woman, whereby marvelous generations come about; and finally they know, and can apply, those things by which, once applied, nature produces wondrous and unusual effects." Thus far Tostatus.

§65: Tostatus on incubi/succubi and the begetting of Merlin. (In the original the long quotation is scrambled across the column/margin layout; restored here to reading order.) Margins: Tostatus (on Genesis 6, q. 6); 'The begetting of Merlin, the English seer, by an incubus demon.'

Moreover, the opinion of those who interpret the "sons of God" mingled with the daughters of men, as is said in this passage, to be evil angels or incubus demons, Hugh of St. Victor mentions in his Annotations on Genesis, and the Master of the Scholastic History in his History of the book of Genesis, ch. 31 — yet they do not disapprove it. This opinion, most rightly refuted by Lyra, Paul of Burgos, defending it most pugnaciously in his first Addition to Lyra's Postill on this sixth chapter of Genesis, contends to be most true, as being both most congruent with Moses' narrative and approved by the blessed Augustine. For those whom the Latin translation here names "giants," Moses called by the Hebrew word Nephilim, which in Latin means "the falling ones," undoubtedly denoting by that word the demons fallen from heaven on account of sin — of whose prince Lucifer Isaiah said in chapter 14: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer?" and the Lord in Luke, chapter 10: "I saw," he says, "Satan falling like lightning from heaven." Moses, therefore, signified not obscurely that incubus demons, mingled with women, begot that offspring of giants. Furthermore, the blessed Augustine, in the 22nd chapter of book

15 of The City of God (a passage we cited a little above), says that the opinion about incubus demons is so famous, and so proved by experiences and examples, that to refuse it credence would seem the mark of a man too incredulous or even shameless; and Augustine says this while treating this passage of Moses about the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men. So Burgos.

§66: the demon-incubi reading (Hugh of St. Victor, the Master of the Scholastic History), refuted by Lyra but defended by Paul of Burgos via the etymology of 'Nephilim.' Margins: Hugh of St. Victor; Master of the Scholastic History; Nicholas of Lyra; Paul of Burgos.

Nevertheless, unless I am much mistaken, Burgos is mistaken and has erred in three ways. First, the etymology of that word Nephilim he too little…

§67 (continues on p. 100): Pererius answers — Burgos errs in three ways; first, on the etymology of 'Nephilim.'

— p. 100 (PDF) · printed p. 31 —

…unskillfully refers to demons only, whereas the most learned of the Hebrews interpret the meaning of that word far otherwise. For they say that this name is most aptly applied to the giants, and that they were therefore called "the falling ones," because, by the vastness of their bodies and the strength of their powers violently rushing upon other men, they made them fall down before them and subjected them to their power; or because others, seeing their tallness of body and ferocity of spirit, oppressed and dismayed by fear, fell to the ground. Next, Burgos does not notice that the "sons of God" who mingled with the daughters of men (whom he himself supposes to have been incubus demons) are not called by Moses Nephilim, but Benelohim, that is, sons of God or of gods; and that those are named by Moses Nephilim who had been generated from the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men.

§67 (continued from p. 99): the Hebrews refer 'Nephilim' to the giants, not to demons; and the 'sons of God' are called Benelohim, not Nephilim.

Burgos's argument against Lyra, then, drawn from the etymology of the word Nephilim, is plainly null. Nor does the authority of the blessed Augustine support his opinion, but rather destroys it. For Augustine dares neither to deny nor to affirm that there are incubus demons who mingle basely with women; but that by the "sons of God" who mingled with the daughters of men one ought to understand incubus demons, as Burgos would have it, Augustine said neither in that place nor anywhere else. Indeed, the opinion of those who interpreted the "sons of God" as the descendants of Seth, Augustine followed in that place as by far the most probable.

§68: Burgos's argument from the etymology collapses, and Augustine's authority destroys rather than supports his view. Margins: 'Augustine did not understand incubus demons by the sons of God, as Burgos foisted on him'; Augustine, City of God 15.23.

Moreover, three doubts are here to be resolved. The first doubt is Augustine's, who, in the place we just mentioned, left it in doubt whether demons (whom he supposes embodied in the aerial element) can suffer the lust of carnal pleasure and be affected and delighted by lustful intercourse with women. But one ought to answer without any doubt that demons are not of themselves susceptible to pleasures of this kind: for they are incorporeal, as we showed above in treating the second question. And even if they were corporeal, nevertheless, because they have no natural power of generating, nor the sense of touch (to which venereal delights pertain), they could not be titillated and stirred by the sensation of such pleasures. Finally, even if these were present in the demons, yet, since they have a nature diverse from man not only in species but also in genus, they would neither seek out nor perceive those pleasures from a human being; for we observe that both man and animals pursue such delights only in those that agree with them in species or in the nearest genus.

§69: the three sub-doubts announced; the first (Augustine's) — can demons feel carnal pleasure? Answer: no. Margins: 'Demons by their own nature are not affected by venereal pleasure.'

Why, then, someone will say, are demons thought to rejoice and delight so greatly in the pleasures of the body? They do indeed rejoice greatly, but not on account of their own delight, but on account of man's ruin, in which they vehemently rejoice. For they know that man's nature is most prone to pleasure, and that this is the enticement of every baseness and wickedness, and the bait of all evils. They have, moreover, found by experience that men endowed with however great prudence, probity, and gravity, when soothed by the allurements of pleasures, have very often been corrupted and dragged into great crimes.

§70 (continues on p. 101): why, then, are demons thought to delight in bodily pleasures? Because they rejoice in man's ruin. Margin: 'Why demons rejoice in venereal pleasures.'

— p. 101 (PDF) · printed p. 32 —

They remember, too, that Samson, the strongest of all mortals, and Solomon, the wisest, and even David, the most holy, having been lured by the sweetness of pleasure, were defiled and worn down by the most impure crimes and the gravest calamities.

§70 (continued from p. 100): Samson, Solomon, and David as warnings. Margins: Judg. 14; 3 Kings (1 Kings) 11; 2 Kings (2 Samuel) 11.

Nor are they ignorant that the vice of lust surpasses the other vices in four respects: in extent, in duration, in fruitfulness, and in difficulty of cure. For this taint of pleasure is most widely diffused and has embraced almost every kind of men. And whomever it once seizes, it clings to him so tenaciously that he can scarcely ever be torn away. You may see many grow old and die in the pleasures they have pursued from boyhood; and although the capacity for obtaining pleasure often fails them, yet their burning desire, mad even to the point of frenzy, never fails. Finally, this vice, ingrained and grown inveterate in the minds of men, is most difficult to cure: besides man's natural proclivity, it is also strengthened by long habit. What more? Bodily pleasure is the seedbed of innumerable evils, both private and public: on its account have befallen the disasters and ruin

not of one or a few men only, but of families, cities, nations, empires, and finally of the whole world.

§71: lust surpasses other vices in four respects. Margin: 'The vice of lust is more detestable than other vices in four respects.'

Demons, therefore, willingly — not for their own sake — seek out and pursue women's pleasures, but in order the more vehemently to harm man, whom through those pleasures they defile, afflict, and destroy with many and great crimes and calamities. And bodily intercourse with women under a male appearance, or with men under a female one, demons eagerly seek out and perform for this reason: that by this means, with novel and exquisite allurements and enticements, they incredibly inflame men to lust, and, having blinded them with pleasures, drag them to whatever crimes they wish. The second doubt is: whether a demon, by the seed which, acting as a succubus, it received from a man and afterward, as an incubus, infused into a woman's womb, can generate a man?

§72: demons therefore seek these unions to harm man, not for their own pleasure; and the second sub-doubt is stated. Margins: 'Why demons willingly act as incubi and succubi'; 'Whether a demon can generate a man by male seed.'

That a demon can do this, and sometimes even does it, is bandied about in the talk of many and recorded in writings. For if it is not doubted that a demon, by aptly and opportunely applying the seminal causes of natural effects, can produce those effects — and it is believed that through the magicians of Pharaoh he made serpents, blood, and frogs — why should he not likewise be able to generate a man by human seed? Nor indeed ought he who is generated from the demon's intercourse to be held or named the son of the demon, but rather of that man whose seed it was through which he was generated. Just as farmers, druggists, and alchemists, if we speak physically and properly, are not the makers and authors of the wondrous effects which, by their skill, art, and industry, are as it were forged out of the most hidden power of nature. On this matter Augustine disputes acutely and learnedly in many places in the books On the Trinity and On Genesis

according to the Letter.

§73: the affirmative is widely reported (the demon applies natural seminal causes, as the magicians of Pharaoh did). Margins: Exod. 7; Exod. 8; Augustine (On the Trinity; On Genesis according to the Letter).

It is not my intention at present to attack this opinion, so widespread and approved. Yet I frankly confess that I once doubted much about this same matter,…

§74 (continues on p. 102): Pererius declines to attack this common opinion outright, but confesses his own long-standing doubt.

— p. 102 (PDF) · printed p. 33 —

…and that now I greatly waver. The cause of my wavering has been, I think, neither useless nor empty. That part of the male seed which contains that generative and prolific power is plainly, as it were, aerial — that is, most thin, most subtle, foamy, and thriving with a most subtle heat unlike the heat of fire, and akin and cognate to the heat of the stars; wherefore that part is most easily dissipated and exhaled. I doubt, therefore, whether the male seed, outside the genital vessels — either of the man where it is generated, or of the woman where, once received, it works generation — could, remaining for any while, preserve that prolific power and not at once exhale and lose it. For one may think and judge the same about the male seed as about the natural, vital, and animal spirits, which outside the human body can neither be generated by a demon nor preserved whole and inviolate, such that, poured back into the human body, they would be effective in their natural functions. Let the reader hear what Aristotle writes in the second book of On the Generation of Animals, chapter three, for these things make for the proof of this opinion: “There is present in the seed of all things,” he says, “that which makes seeds fertile, namely what is called heat. And this is not fire, nor any such faculty, but the spirit (pneuma) which is contained in the seed and in the foamy body, and the nature which is in that spirit, corresponding by proportion to the element of

the stars. But the body of the genitive matter, in which the seed of the animal principle is contained, comes forth together with it, partly separable from the body (in which is comprehended the divine part, such as is that which is called mind), partly inseparable; this seed of the genitive matter, I say, is dissolved and, turned into spirit, vanishes, since it has a moist and watery nature." Thus Aristotle. I could bring forward other things for the confirmation of this opinion — or, to speak more truly, of this doubt; but because chaste ears and minds reject a longer treatment of a shameful matter, yielding to my own and the reader's modesty, I forbear to discourse further.

§74 (continued from p. 101): the ground of his doubt — male seed loses its prolific power outside the body; with the Aristotle passage. Margins: 'A doubt whether a man can be generated from the intercourse of a demon with a woman'; 'A notable opinion of Aristotle.'

The third doubt. Since the body which the demon either has or assumes is fashioned of air, or of some other thin matter not unlike air — which, namely, can, when there is need, be immediately formed, and, when the need has ceased, suddenly dissolved — since, I say, the body assumed by the demon is such, how can it come about that it is made not only visible to the eyes, but also, by touch, handleable and palpable with the hands after the manner of a human body? The blessed Augustine, in the Enchiridion to Laurentius, ch. 59, thinking it difficult to explain how the angels (and the same must be said of demons), although they consist of an aerial body, sometimes so manifest themselves to men that they are not only seen with the eyes but also handled with the hands; and again how, if they are corporeal, they can speak and operate within the soul of man — this difficulty, which he had proposed to himself, Augustine left in the middle in that place, nor anywhere else (so far as I recall) did he discuss it. Augustine writes thus in that place: "Who can explain with what sort of bodies the angels appeared to men, so as not only to be seen but even to be touched? And again, how, not by solid corpulence but by spiritual power, they present certain visions, not to the bodily eyes but to the spiritual eyes

or to the minds, or…

§75 (continues on p. 103): the third sub-doubt — how an assumed aerial body can be made tangible like a human one; Augustine's acknowledged difficulty. Margins: 'How a demon can assume a body not only visible but tangible like a human body'; Augustine (Enchiridion, ch. 59).

— p. 103 (PDF) · printed p. 34 —

…[present] something not from without but within the soul of man, themselves also established there — as it is written in the book of the Prophets: 'And the Angel that spoke in me said to me' (for he does not say, 'that spoke to me,' but 'in me'); or how they appear in dreams and converse after the manner of dreams. For we have in the Gospel: 'Behold, the Angel of the Lord appeared to him in his sleep, saying.' For by these ways the angels in a manner indicate that they do not have palpable bodies, and they raise a most difficult question: how the patriarchs washed their feet, how Jacob wrestled with the Angel in so solid a grappling. When these things are inquired into, and each conjectures them as best he can, men's wits are not unprofitably exercised, if a moderate debate be employed and there be absent the error of those who think they know what they do not know. For what need is there that these things and the like be affirmed or denied or defined at one's peril, when without peril they are unknown?" Thus Augustine.

§75 (continued from p. 102): the rest of Augustine's quotation. Margins: Zach. 1; Mal. (Malachi); Gen. 32.

This doubt befell him because he believed that angels and demons are embodied from the element of air; from which it was difficult to understand how an aerial body could present to one touching it the solidity and hardness of a human body. And this was harder still to understand: if the angels were corporeal, by what means they could remain and operate within a man, either in his mind or in his imagination. But this difficulty does not press us at all: for we make angels and demons incorporeal by their own nature, and we judge that they can assume a body either of aerial

matter or of gross and solid matter, according as they wish either to be merely seen by men or even to be touched.

§76: Augustine's difficulty arose from his belief that angels and demons are aerially embodied; Pererius, holding them incorporeal, is not troubled by it.

But come, let us in a few words resolve the doubt proposed above. A demon can, from air or other similar condensed matter, feign a body most like a human one as to bulk, figure, color, motion, and voice; and this indeed is not difficult to understand and readily wins belief and assent. But from air, or from other thin matter resembling air, a demon cannot form a body that reproduces the solidity and the other tangible qualities of a human body. For how can an aerial body present, to one touching it, the solidity of a human body, representing to the sense of touch the softness of human flesh, the hardness of bone, the rigidity of sinew, and the roughness of an artery? It will therefore be necessary that the body which represents these things be fashioned from grosser and more solid matter, which, tempered in different ways according to its different parts, is felt in one part of itself soft, in another hard, in others rough and rigid.

§77: Pererius's own resolution — a demon can feign a body like a human one in size, figure, color, motion, and voice, but cannot from air represent true solidity and tangible qualities. Margins: 'The author's opinion'; 'A demon cannot form an aerial body like a human one to the touch.'

This, moreover, I shall not fear to say without hesitation: that no demon can form a body so like a human one that, if someone were to touch it with care and attention of mind, he would not easily discern that it is not a human body. And so a demon can deceive the eyes by the likeness of a body, but cannot wholly deceive the sense of touch [?]. This, that I may make it plainer and more certain to the reader, I shall confirm by four arguments. And the first of these can be proved by the same argument by which the Lord Jesus wished to persuade his disciples of the truth of his body after the resurrection. For when he had suddenly stood in the midst of them, while they were terrified and [did not know] who he was…

§78 (continues on p. 104): no demon can form a body so like a human one as to deceive careful touch; the first proof (from Christ's risen body, Luke 24) begins and breaks off. Margins: 'A demon cannot form a body that cannot be detected by the sense of touch to be a human body'; 'The passage of Luke, last chapter.'

— p. 104 (PDF) · printed p. 35 —

…[supposing him] to be a spirit with a phantom body — to repel that opinion the Lord said: "Handle and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have." By these words he clearly shows that they could, through the sense of touch, explore without error and ascertain with certainty that his body was not feigned, but a true human body. And in that phrase "Handle and see," the word "see" does not signify knowledge by the eyes, but simply the evidence and certainty of knowledge, according to the usage of divine Scripture, in which the verb "to see" is frequently used to signify the sure and undoubted knowledge of any sense, and even of the intellect itself. Hence that saying in the thirty-third psalm, "Taste and see that the Lord is sweet," it is fitting to interpret and understand thus: By nothing will you know the sweetness of God more evidently and certainly than by tasting it, that is, by experiencing it.

§78 (continued from p. 103): the first proof completed — Christ's 'Handle and see' (Luke 24). Margin: Ps. 33.

From these things it appears that a demon cannot feign a body so like a human body that it could not be distinguished, through the sense of touch, from a true human body; otherwise those words of the Lord, "Handle and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones," would not be a true and certain statement. Next, the softness of human flesh, the hardness of bone, and other tangible qualities of this kind; and besides, that warmth and the vital and pleasant heat which is felt by touch in living flesh; and finally the very tempering of the body and of its several parts — these, I say, are proper to a living man, and can proceed from no other principle than either the generative faculty, which from the beginning fashioned and tempered the human body, or the soul itself, which preserves these and, if at any time

they slip and fail, can repair and restore them. Whence one may understand that outside the human body — that is, apart from the formative faculty of the human body, or apart from the soul itself — no other natural cause whatever can produce such things as are felt to be in the body of a living man; therefore the demon, in an assumed body, will not be able to present them to the sense of touch.

§79: the living body's tangible qualities come only from the formative faculty or the soul, which a demon lacks.

Besides, if someone were to touch attentively and carefully the corpse of a recently dead man, even while still warm, he would nevertheless at once recognize from the touch that that body is not a living man's; for he would not feel that softness of flesh, that sweet and vital warmth, and the other things felt in a living body — even though that dead body were, in substance, the same as it had been when alive, and all its members, as to bulk, figure, number, substance, and many qualities, were exactly the same as they had been in the living body. How much more easily and certainly, then, can a body assumed by a demon be detected — if someone touch it with attention and care — not to be a true body of a living man, since it has a substance diverse from this, and qualities likewise diverse from those that are proper to a living body?

§80: even a fresh corpse is detectable by touch as not living — so much more an assumed body.

You will say: How, then, did Abraham, in washing the feet of the angels, not recognize that the body he was touching was not human? Doubtless because, his mind being already preoccupied with the persuasion that those whom he had seen were men, he did not…

§81 (continues on p. 105): the objection from Abraham washing the angels' feet (Gen. 18). Margins: 'An objection'; Gen. 18.

— p. 105 (PDF) · printed p. 36 —

…direct his mind to investigating it; and because, in washing, he felt a certain softness and hardness such as is wont to be felt in human feet, he remained in his former opinion.

§81 (continued from p. 104): the answer to the Abraham objection.

Lastly, by the experiences of many who have seen and handled demons in human bodies, it has been ascertained that the bodies in which demons appear are cold and rough to the touch, and affect the sense of touch in a manner far different from a true body of a living man. Alexander ab Alexandro relates, in book 2 of the Genial Days, ch. 9, that to a certain man resting at an inn — yet awake — there suddenly appeared the specter (as he thought) of a certain friend of his lately deceased, of the utmost pallor and leanness, and with nearly the same cast of countenance as when he had left him sick. He, though terrified with fear, nevertheless asked who he was. But the specter, answering nothing, having (as it seemed) taken off its clothes, lay down on the same bed and drew near as if to embrace him. He, however, now nearly lifeless with fear, withdrawing to the edge of the bed, drove off the one approaching him. The specter, when it saw itself being expelled, is said to have looked at him with a grim countenance, and, having put its clothes back on, to have risen from the bed and, girded and shod, departed. But that man was seized by a sudden onset of disease and oppressed almost to death by a most grievous sickness. He used to report that, while he wrestled in the bed with that specter, he had handled its bare foot so icy and stiff that no ice could be compared to the cold of that foot.

§82: the bodies in which demons appear are felt as cold and rough — the anecdote of Alexander ab Alexandro. Margins: ‘The bodies of demons are felt by one touching them as cold’; Alexander ab Alexandro (Genial Days, bk. 2, ch. 9).

Cardano, in book 16 of On the Variety of Things, toward the end of chapter ninety-three, recounts what happened to himself: that as he lay in bed (there was, moreover, in the same chamber a certain young man, his friend), a demon stood by him on the first night and struck the wall with

frequent blows. When he wondered what it was, the young man answered that he should not be afraid, for it was a familiar demon, of the number of those whom the common people call “Folletti.” When it had fallen silent for the space of half an hour, he felt a thumb laid on the crown of his head by it — and that from the cold, for it did not press the hand; then it laid on the index finger, then the middle, then the rest, so that the little finger reached all the way to his forehead. And its hand was so cold that it caused him no small discomfort. Meanwhile Cardano rejoiced at the occasion offered him of learning a thing so marvelous. Gradually that hand glides onto his face, and, descending over the nose (it was the left hand, as he could conjecture from its position), at last enters the mouth, the tips of two fingers being thrust in. But he, suspecting lest perhaps it wished to enter his body, drove it off with his right hand. It fell silent for half an hour; again it was present, but did everything more lightly than before — yet not so gently as to keep from disclosing its immense cold. This, moreover, was remarkable: that although the face and teeth felt the coldness of the fingers, the lips, exquisitely pressed, nevertheless closed [against them]; so that from this it might be understood that that body was aerial. Thus far I have reported from Cardano what pertained to the present matter.

§83: Cardano’s own experience with a ‘Folletto.’ Margin: Cardano (bk. 16, end of ch. 93).

But to confirm that which I have here undertaken to teach — that it is not…

§84 (continues on p. 106): the corroboration from Cajetan begins.

— p. 106 (PDF) · printed p. 37 —

…difficult to discern through the sense of touch the difference between a body assumed by a demon and a true human body, there contributes greatly what was set forth by Cajetan in his Commentaries on the Second Part of the Second Part of the blessed Thomas, question 95, article three. This indeed seemed to me worthy neither to be passed over by me in silence, nor to be read drowsily by the reader, but with care and attention. Disputing about the apparitions of demons in assumed bodies, formed to the likeness

of the human body, he writes roughly thus: “It frequently happens that demons appear in assumed human bodies to those who are awake, conversing with them familiarly — not indeed having true flesh nor true bones, but only the likeness of them, not only visible but also palpable and solid, as I have heard from many trustworthy persons relating it from their own experience. In two things, however, I have learned that they fall short of human bodies: first, in the tempering of the flesh; for the father of lies himself confessed, when his flesh, being as it were icy, was troublesome to the touch of human flesh, that he could not do better. For he cannot so mix natural things, without a true generation of a man, as to produce human flesh; and for a like reason he cannot produce human seed, because of the perfection which these and similar effects require — namely, proper, perfect natural active [powers]. And from this it is plain that most true is what Christ said to his disciples after the resurrection: ‘Handle and see, for a spirit (or demon) hath not flesh and bones.’ Secondly, the body of a demon falls short of a human body in the delight of touch and intercourse; for the natural union of human persons is more delightful than that of a demon in an assumed body by as much as the true exceeds the merely lifelike.” Thus Cajetan. But here this threefold disputation about angels and demons must be ended — treated by us a little more subtly and at length for this cause: that the truth of that most noble statement of Moses concerning the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men might be clearly discerned, once all the fog of false and foul opinions, which the ignorance of many had spread over it, was dispelled.

§84 (continued from p. 105): Cajetan’s testimony (on ST 2-2, q. 95, a. 3) and the close of the three disputations. Margins: Luke 24; Cajetan.

Verse 3. And God said: My spirit shall not remain in man for ever, because he is flesh.

Genesis 6:3a (Vulgate lemma).

These words contain a grave threat of God against the crimes of the men of that time. Now God is wont to announce punishments before he inflicts them — a thing which is a sign of great clemency. For he threatens for this reason: to deter from sins, lest he be compelled to punish. “Such is our Lord,” says Chrysostom: “he often threatens, not in order to carry out his threats in deed, but in order, once we are corrected, by no means to bring the threats to the deed. Otherwise, if he wished to punish, why would he foretell it? But because he does not wish it, he always holds back, and contrives delays, and defers, and foretells, giving the guilty an occasion that, by fleeing wickedness and laying hold of virtue, they may not experience punishment.” And so, after he had threatened that he would deliver them to a general destruction (for this is what is meant by “My spirit shall not remain in those men”…

Commentary on v. 3 (continues on p. 107): God threatens before he punishes — Chrysostom. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis.

— p. 107 (PDF) · printed p. 38 —

…that is, ‘I will not allow them to live henceforth’) — deferring his indignation, he mercifully grants a span of a hundred and twenty years for doing penance. So Chrysostom. Now God punished the whole human race for its sins with the penalty of death in two ways. First, on account of the sin of Adam, of which all his descendants, as sharers in the guilt, so also became liable to death. For the words, “In whatever day thou shalt eat, thou shalt die the death,” and the words, “Dust thou art, and into dust thou shalt return,” pertain not to Adam alone, but also to all his descendants. Secondly, on account of the abominable crimes of men, he reduced almost all men to destruction by the punishment of the Flood. But why did God appoint the penalty of death, as the gravest of all, against sinners? Doubtless because nothing can be more terrible to man, fixed upon the comforts and goods of this life, than death; and death, as it brings an end of living, so also of living badly and of harming others. But let us weigh the words of Moses.

Commentary on v. 3 (continued from p. 106): the 120 years as a clemency, and the two ways God punished mankind with death. Margins: Gen. 2; Gen. 3.

The sense which our Latin translation has, the Greek reading plainly renders the same; nor does the Chaldee disagree, rendered into Latin word for word, sounding thus: “Then the Lord said, This evil generation shall not endure before me for ever, because they are flesh, and their works are evil.” But because the word “Spirit” is taken in various ways in the sacred writings, this passage therefore has various interpretations. First, that phrase “my spirit” can signify the Spirit of God himself, that is, God himself who is Spirit, so that the sense is this: “I will be no longer with those men”; or, “I will no more set my heart toward them, nor, as I have done hitherto, will I henceforth continue to wish them well by preserving them on the earth; I will depart from them, I will turn my face away from them, that, forsaken by me, they may perish” — as David said: “When thou turnest away thy face, they shall be troubled”; and, declaring what that future trouble would be, he adds: “Thou shalt take away their spirit, and they shall fail, and shall return to their dust.”

§85: the Greek and Chaldee agree with the Latin; the fivefold meaning of ‘spiritus,’ and the first sense (God himself). Margins: ‘A fivefold meaning of Spirit; this passage has five expositions’; Ps. 103.

The word “spirit” is also taken for anger and indignation, as in Isaiah, chapter 2: “Cease ye,” he says, “from the man whose spirit is in his nostrils, for he is reputed high.” What is that, “whose spirit is in his nostrils”? That is, whose anger is ready and vehement. According to this signification the sense will be: “My indignation against those men shall not remain, or not endure, for ever”; as if he were to say, “I will punish them in this world with a temporal punishment, lest after this life they be punished with eternal pains.” Or: “I will not defer to exercise my indignation against them for ever, or for a very long time; for unless within a hundred and twenty years they do worthy penance, I will pour out upon them the spirit of my indignation.”

§86: the second sense — ‘spirit’ as wrath/indignation. Isaiah 2.

The Spirit of God is also taken for the care and providence which God exercises over men, by guarding their life and by opportunely and bountifully bestowing the things which are necessary, or even useful and pleasant, for living it conveniently. So the name “Spirit” seems to be taken in Psalm 103, in those words: “Thou shalt send forth thy spirit, and they shall be created, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.” And so Chrysostom interprets this passage. And the sense is: “I will no longer continue to have care and providence over those men…”

§87 (continues on p. 108): the third sense — ‘spirit’ as God’s care and providence. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis; Ps. 103.

— p. 108 (PDF) · printed p. 39 —

…by sustaining and prolonging their life; I will take from them this spirit of my care and providence, and when it is withdrawn they will fall utterly to ruin.

§87 (continued from p. 107).

Furthermore, in the sacred writings the word “Spirit” is frequently used for the rational soul, on which this name has been bestowed for this reason: that Moses, expounding the creation of the soul, says that God “breathed into the face of man the breath of life.” And as the presence of the soul is the cause of life, so its departure from the body is the cause of death. Moreover, the rational soul is called “the spirit of God,” because it is created by God alone and infused into the body and there preserved, and thence, when it pleases God, called away; as it is written in Ecclesiastes, chapter 12: “Until the dust return into its earth whence it was, and the spirit return to God who gave it.” Therefore that phrase, “My spirit shall not remain in man for ever,” signifies nothing else than that the human race will not live perpetually on the earth. For the remaining of the spirit of God — that is, of the soul — in the body is the cause of men’s life; but the removal of the soul from the body is the cause of death. “Thou shalt take away,” says David in Psalm 103, “their spirit, and they shall fail, and return

to their dust."

§88: the fourth sense — 'spirit' as the rational soul. Margins: 'Spirit in Scripture for the rational soul'; Gen. 2; (Eccles. 12).

Kindred to this signification of "spirit" is the signification of the same word when it is put for life, since this is preserved by breathing and breath. So Job uses the word, chapter 27: "As long as breath remains in me, and the spirit of God in my nostrils, my words shall not speak iniquity, nor shall my tongue meditate a lie." And Daniel (as is written in his book, ch. 5) said to King Belshazzar: "God, who holds thy breath in his hand and all thy ways, thou hast not glorified"; that is, in whose hand and power is thy life. For "in him," as Paul said, "we live and move and are." Lastly, the phrase "the Spirit of God" is often put in Scripture to signify the Holy Spirit, in which sense Ambrose interpreted this passage, in the book On Noah and the Ark, ch. 3 — accommodating, namely, these words of Moses from their proper sense to the mystery and to Christ, in whom the Holy Spirit is recorded in the sacred writings to have remained. "The Holy Spirit," says Ambrose, "is given to men, but does not remain in them, because they are flesh. For the nature of the flesh is repugnant to discipline, because it obeys pleasure. Finally, of the Lord Jesus alone it is written: 'He upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending from heaven and remaining upon him, he it is who baptizes in the Holy Spirit.' It remained in him whom no carnal corruption recalled by its impediments from keeping, uncorrupted and unmixed, the order of discipline — he whose flesh saw no corruption." So Ambrose.

§89: a fifth, kindred sense — 'spirit' as life (preserved by breath); and a sixth use, for the Holy Spirit (Ambrose). Margins: Acts 17; Ambrose (On Noah and the Ark, ch. 3).

But although the Holy Spirit remained in a certain extraordinary and singular manner in Christ alone, yet we read in the sacred writings that the Holy Spirit remained also in others. For our Savior said to his Apostles: "I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may

remain with you for ever.” Nor can it be doubted that the Holy Spirit remained in John the Baptist, since he was filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother’s womb — to say nothing here of the most blessed Virgin. Of these five significa-…

§90 (continues on p. 109): yet the Holy Spirit did remain in others too. Margins: John 14; Luke 1.

— p. 109 (PDF) · printed p. 40 —

…tions and interpretations of the word “Spirit,” we most approve that by which either the soul or life is signified, as most aptly fitting this passage.

§90 (continued from p. 108): the preferred sense — soul or life.

The phrase “for ever” (in aeternum) is, moreover, expounded in two ways: either so that the word “for ever” does not properly signify eternity, but some very long time whose fixed end is not expressed — in which signification that word is found not rarely in the divine books; and thus the sense will be: “Hitherto I have given man a very long life, so that some have extended their life nearly to the thousandth year; but henceforth I will cut short this length, and contract it to a hundred and twenty years.” Or the word signifies eternity properly, so that the sense is: “I will not suffer the human race to be henceforth everlasting, that is, to live perpetually on the earth; for I will destroy it by the Flood and blot it out from the earth.” And this signification and interpretation is the more convenient, and adheres more aptly to what follows.

§91: ‘for ever’ (in aeternum) expounded two ways.

For that phrase “because he is flesh,” the Greek reading has, in the plural, “because they are flesh,” just as it also has, in the plural, “My spirit shall not remain in those men.” What “because he is flesh,” or “because they are flesh,” means, Chrysostom interprets in homily 22 on Genesis in this manner: “Because,” he says, “they give themselves wholly to carnal works, and abuse the substance of the soul, and, as though, surrounded by flesh alone, they lacked a soul, so they consume their life. For it is Scripture’s

constant custom to call carnal men ‘flesh,’ just as it names those outstanding in virtue ‘free of flesh.’ So Paul speaks: ‘But you are not in the flesh’ — not that they were not surrounded by flesh, but because, though bearing flesh, they were superior to carnal affections and senses. And as Paul said of these, ‘You are not in the flesh,’ because they despised carnal things, so it is said of those men, ‘because they are flesh’; for although they had the rational soul as their better part, yet they lived just as if they consisted of flesh alone, without reason.” Thus Chrysostom.

§92: ‘because he is flesh’ — the Greek plural, expounded by Chrysostom. Margins: Chrysostom; Rom. 8 (‘ye are not in the flesh’).

But in fact, that this observation of Chrysostom is not always true, the blessed Gregory shows by manifest testimonies of divine Scripture, in book 14 of the Morals, ch. 29, treating those words of Job: “And again I shall be encompassed with my skin.” For when he had first recalled the disputation which he himself held at Constantinople with Eutychius, bishop of that city — who denied that man would rise again in the true substance of flesh, on the ground that Paul seemed to confirm this in those words which are in chapter 15 of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, “Flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God” — Gregory, replying to this objection, says: “In sacred discourse, ‘flesh’ is said in one way according to nature, and in another according to fault or corruption. For ‘flesh’ is said according to nature where it is written: ‘This now is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh’; and, ‘The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us.’ But ‘flesh’ is said according to fault where it is written: ‘My spirit shall not remain in those men, because they are flesh’; and David says: ‘He remembered that they are flesh, a spirit that goes and returns not.’ Whence Paul said to his disciples: ‘You are not in the flesh, but in the spirit.’ For it was not that those to whom he sent his epistles were not in the flesh, but because the passions of carnal desires had been over-…”

§93 (continues on p. 110): Gregory shows Chrysostom’s observation is not always true — ‘flesh’ by nature vs. by fault. Margins: ‘A remark against Chrysostom on the use of the word “flesh” in

Scripture'; Gregory, Morals, bk. 14, ch. 29; Job 19; Gen. 2; John 1; Ps. 77; Rom. 8.

— p. 110 (PDF) · printed p. 41 —

…come, [and] being now free through the virtue of the spirit, they were not in the flesh. When, therefore, the Apostle says, 'Flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God,' he wishes 'flesh' to be understood according to fault, not according to nature. Whence, because he was speaking of flesh according to fault, he immediately shows this, adding: 'Neither shall corruption possess incorruption.' In that glory of the heavenly kingdom, therefore, there will be flesh according to nature, but according to the passion of desire it will not be; because, the sting of death being overcome, it will reign in eternal incorruption." Thus Gregory.

§93 (continued from p. 109): the conclusion of Gregory's quotation.

But, lest the reader be ignorant of this, he must be warned that in the sacred writings 'carnal men' are usually called not only those who pursue the obscene pleasures of the flesh, but also those infected with other vices — even those which seem to proceed rather from the soul and mind than from the flesh. For Paul calls the Corinthians, among whom there were rivalries, dissensions, and schisms, 'carnal': "For whereas," he says, "there is among you envying and contention, are you not carnal, and walk according to man?" And likewise in the fifth chapter of the epistle he wrote to the Galatians, enumerating the works of the flesh, he reckons the service of idols, sorceries, enmities, contentions, rivalries, angers, quarrels, dissensions, sects, and envyings. Yet it must not be denied that, when the sins of the flesh or of carnal men are named, what is chiefly and most signified are the sins which are concerned with sordid lusts and pleasures of the flesh. Whence, although in this passage the word 'flesh' can be extended to all the works of the flesh which Paul, as we said above, recounts, yet it pertains chiefly to the vices of carnal pleasures.

§94: 'carnal men' in Scripture means not only the lustful, but those infected with other vices too. Margins: 'Whom Scripture calls carnal men'; 1 Cor. 3; (Gal. 5).

I will not fail to relate a certain splendid saying of the blessed Gregory, not only not foreign to this passage of Gregory, but very prettily congruent with it. The blessed Gregory, treating, in book 6 of the Exposition on the First Book of Kings, those words which are in chapter 15 of that book, “Saul and the people spared king Agag and the best of the flocks,” etc., writes thus: “Who is Agag, king of Amalek, but carnal sense? For since from the soul we have rationality and sensuality, rationality is ascribed to the mind, sensuality to the flesh; and by the one we have fellowship with the angels, by the other with the brute animals. In the former, the higher we are exalted, the nearer we approach to the citizens above; but by the latter, when we slip down to the allurements of the flesh, we are found, so to speak, more carnal. Whence also, when the daughters of men had now been seen and desired, and pleasures in lust now fulfilled, the Lord in Genesis threatens those who by merit of purity were called sons of God, saying: ‘My spirit shall not remain in man for ever, because he is flesh.’ For a man becomes flesh when reason is subjugated to the sense of the flesh. King Amalek, then, is the vigor of carnal sense, which commands by base motions, so that it may drag captive reason to the enticements of obscenity. And the name Agag fits carnal sense well, for Agag is interpreted ‘meditating’ or ‘speaking.’ For to meditate, for it, is to gather lascivious phantasms by inward meditation; and to speak, for it, is to rouse the flesh by base motions to lust. For he who, by striking the flesh, more ardently stirs it, has, as it were, a great clamor of speech. For by meditating it gathers what by speaking it sets forth; because everyone subject to carnal sense, the more freely he beholds lascivious images within, the stronger motions of baseness…”

§95 (continues on p. 111): a fine passage of Gregory on how a rational man is said in Scripture to ‘become flesh’ (on Agag, 1 Kings 15). Margin: ‘A notable saying of the blessed Gregory.’

— p. 111 (PDF) · printed p. 42 —

…of baseness he feels outwardly. He meditates, therefore, through the inward vision of baseness, but speaks through the outward motion of

delight.” Thus Gregory.

§95 (continued from p. 110): the close of Gregory’s passage.

Thus far we have explained the sense of the words of Moses according to the Latin translation, from which neither the Greek reading nor the Chaldee disagrees. But next we must weigh the Hebrew reading, which seems far different; and this very reading, those who most faithfully strove to interpret the sacred books from the Hebrew have rendered in quite various ways. For that which we read, “My spirit shall not remain in man” — for that word “remain,” I say — in Hebrew it is iadon, a word which can be derived from neden, which means “a sheath.” Whence Pagninus renders thus: “My spirit shall not be as in a sheath in man for an age”; that is, the soul shall not be enclosed in the body perpetually, as a sword is sheathed in a scabbard. For the body seems to be, as it were, the sheath of the soul. Cajetan, however, interprets this reading thus: “My spirit shall not be sheathed,” etc. “This is said,” he says, “after the likeness of a sword hidden in a sheath, which, as long as it is in the sheath, one does not use for cutting or striking.” And the sense is: “My justice shall not be, for punishing man, like a sword in the sheath, for ever; but I will unsheathe it after a hundred and twenty years, and punish men.” Others think the root of that word is dun, which is to contend, dispute, judge, litigate. Rabbi Solomon expounds thus: “My spirit shall not dispute with man,” or “for man”; as if to say, “I will not long dispute what I am to do with man — whether I ought to punish him or not; at length I will decide what I am to do. For because he is wholly given over to pleasures, I will now at once punish him, nor will I give him a longer time for repenting than a hundred and twenty years.” Oleaster, taking the Hebrew word for “to litigate,” expounds thus: “I will not litigate with man”; that is, “I will no longer contend with man by admonishing and reproving him not to follow his concupiscences; for since he is wholly carnal, no admonition or reproof moves him; there is need, therefore, of the extreme remedy, that is, of the ultimate punishment.” The word iadon can also be derived from nadah, which is “to prolong”; and if it

were from this root (for nun is often put for he), there would be no difficulty in this passage, for the sense would be: “My spirit shall not prolong the span of living in man, but his days shall be a hundred and twenty years”; as if to say, “I will not prolong for man the span of living beyond a hundred and twenty years; beyond which span, unless he do penance, I will destroy him.” And this reading and interpretation agrees with our Latin reading, which has, “My spirit shall not remain in man for ever.”

§96: the Hebrew reading, variously rendered (iadon from neden ‘sheath,’ or from dun ‘to contend/judge,’ or from nadah ‘to prolong’). Margins: ‘A variant reading and exposition of this passage according to the Hebrew’; Jerome; Cajetan on Genesis; Rabbi Solomon; Oleaster.

The blessed Jerome, in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis: “In the Hebrew,” he says, “it is written, ‘My spirit shall not judge those men for ever, because they are flesh.’ That is: Because the condition of man is frail, I will not keep them for eternal torments, but will here render to them what they deserve. Therefore it sounds not of severity, as it is read in our codices, but of the clemency of God, while the sinner is here visited for his crime. Whence also the angry God speaks to cer-…”

§97 (continues on p. 112): Jerome’s Hebrew Traditions — the verse sounds of God’s clemency, not severity. Margin: Jerome.

— p. 112 (PDF) · printed p. 43 —

…tain men: ‘I will not visit your daughters when they shall have committed fornication, nor your spouses when they shall have committed adultery.’ And in another place: ‘I will visit their iniquities with a rod, and their sins with stripes; nevertheless my mercy I will not take away from him.’” Thus Jerome.

§97 (continued from p. 111): the rest of Jerome’s citation. Margins: Hosea 2; Ps. 88.

I know not what came into Rupert’s mind, to set forth in writing that formerly in the Hebrew this reading existed, “My spirit shall not judge in

man," but that now, according to the Hebrew truth, this is the reading, "My spirit shall not remain in man" — as though the Hebrew Scripture had been altered, and had been otherwise of old in the time of the blessed Jerome than it now is; whereas both then and now the Hebrew reading of this passage was the same, and the same Hebrew word, which, according as its various derivation is found, was likewise rendered variously into Latin by the interpreters, as we showed above.

§(against Rupert): Rupert wrongly supposed the Hebrew text had changed since Jerome's day. Margins: Rupert; Cajetan.

Cajetan, moreover, interprets that Hebrew reading, "My spirit shall not judge those men," much otherwise than the blessed Jerome. For he thinks that God signified by these words that before that time he had judged men spiritually; for such a judgment was both becoming to God, who is Spirit, and congruous to man, whose nobler part is also spirit. For the ordinary judgment of God, both toward the good and toward the wicked — helping the former, abandoning and punishing the latter — is in this life internal, spiritual, hidden, so much so that many deny it to God, saying: "He walks about the poles of heaven, and does not consider our affairs." For the spiritual judgment by which God judges the wicked in this world is to deprive them of his grace, and of certain singular benefits and aids by which he helps and protects just men dear to him. But rarely does God in this world afflict wicked men even with bodily punishments, in such a way that it is plain to all that they have been so punished for their crimes. But because the men of that time, against whom this sentence of God was pronounced, had become so carnal that they seemed to have nothing spiritual or rational, therefore God said: "I will no longer continue to judge and punish those men only spiritually, but, since they have become wholly carnal, I will punish them (unless within a hundred and twenty years they repent) with carnal penalties and the bodily destruction of the Flood."

§98: Cajetan reads the Hebrew differently from Jerome — God had judged men 'spiritually' before, but now will punish them with bodily death. Margins: Cajetan; Job 22.

And his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.

Genesis 6:3b (the original prints this as ‘Vers. 4’).

The question here is, to what this span of a hundred and twenty years ought to be referred: whether to the future life of men hereafter, as though it would not pass beyond a hundred and twenty years; or rather to the span of time granted to men before the Flood — namely, for doing penance and averting the vengeance of God hanging over the whole human race. Philo, in the book On the Giants; Josephus, in the first book of the Antiquities; Lactantius, in the second book, chapter fifteen; Rupert, in book 4 of the Commentaries on Genesis; and Tostatus, on this sixth chapter of Genesis, question 11, refer this to the future life of men hereafter, so that it…

§99 (continues on p. 113): does the ‘120 years’ refer to the future span of human life, or to the time granted for repentance before the Flood? The proponents of the first view. Margins: Philo; Josephus; Lactantius; Rupert; Tostatus.

— p. 113 (PDF) · printed p. 44 —

…has been circumscribed by God to only a hundred and twenty years; so that the sense is: “Hitherto man’s life extended beyond the nine-hundredth year; but because man abused so great a length of life to perpetrate graver and more numerous crimes daily, it will not be so hereafter, but, a very notable diminution being made, the life of man will be contracted to a hundred and twenty years.” Hear Rupert thus expounding these words in the aforesaid place: “‘And his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.’ Some, indeed, lived a little more, some a little fewer years after the Flood — as Jacob, who lived a hundred and forty-seven, as Joseph, who lived a hundred and ten years; but the days of him who wrote these things, namely Moses, were a hundred and twenty years. For so it is written of him: ‘Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died.’ And in a wonderful way, the man most meek above all who dwelt on the earth thrusts himself, in season and out of season, into that throng of the dying and of those living a shorter time on account of the corruption of their life;

in a manner bewailing that there, according to the foreknowledge of God, he himself was struck, and that, being about to die, he could not even fulfill the times of Methuselah, so as to enter the land of promise, but that his days were few — that is, a hundred and twenty years." Thus Rupert.

§99 (continued from p. 112): the 'shortened lifespan' view, expounded by Rupert. Margins: Gen. (last ch.); Deut. 34; Num. 12.

Tostatus, however, judges that it was fitting that God should announce to men the measure of their future life. For since he was about to bring on the Flood, from this it necessarily followed that human life would be diminished; for the surface of the earth, in which there was great power of germinating the best plants, was uncovered and scoured away by the waters of the Flood, while the lower part of the earth, which was not equally effective for germinating, was uncovered and exposed to the labor and cultivation of men. And — what was of greater moment — the salt waters of the Ocean, permeating through the whole earth, corrupted its power; for salt makes the earth sterile, wherefore it was once the custom to sprinkle with salt lands that were cursed to be sterile, as is plain from the tenth chapter of the book of Judges; and in Psalm 106 it is written: "He turned a fruitful land into barrenness, for the wickedness of them that dwell therein." The earth, therefore, covered and overwhelmed by salt waters, lost in great part that excellent power of germinating, whereby it came about that the fruits of the earth were fewer and less wholesome. And since we live on the nourishments born of the earth, when these are corrupted, human life too must necessarily be diminished and weakened. Since, therefore, God, by bringing on the Flood, wished to diminish the life of men, so that the brevity of life might lessen the license and lust of sinning — lest those who were to be after the Flood, seeing that man's life had been made shorter than it had been before, should think this had happened by chance and only from natural causes, rather than recognize that it had been done by God's counsel, will, and command — it was fitting that the future brevity of human life be announced and foretold by God long before,

and its span determined by him. So, then, do these men expound this passage.

§100: Tostatus — it was fitting that God foretell the measure of future life, since the Flood would shorten it (salinated, scoured soil yielding poorer food). Margins: Judg. 10; Ps. 106; Tostatus.

But in very truth this opinion and interpretation of God's words is manifestly refuted by the examples of very many who, for many ages after the Flood, far exceeded the foretold limit of years of human life. For Shem lived after the Flood five hun-…

§101 (continues on p. 114): Pererius objects — the long lifespans of the post-Flood patriarchs refute this. Cut off mid-sentence (Shem).

— p. 114 (PDF) · printed p. 45 —

…five hundred years; Arphaxad, Sale, and Heber, more than four hundred; the rest, down to Abraham, more than two hundred; and thereafter the Patriarchs down to Moses, for about eight hundred years after the Flood, lived more than a hundred and thirty years — except Joseph alone, who prolonged his life no further than a hundred and ten years. What more? Jehoiada the priest, born nearly one thousand five hundred years after the Flood, lived to his hundred and thirtieth year, as is recorded in the second book of Paralipomenon (Chronicles), ch. 24.

§101 (continued from p. 113): the long post-Flood lifespans refute the 'shortened-lifespan' reading. Margins: Gen. 50 (Joseph); 2 Paralipomenon (Chronicles) 24 (Jehoiada).

There is, then, a second interpretation and opinion of those words, nearer to the truth and more probable: that that span of a hundred and twenty years ought to be referred not to the future age of men, but to the time granted to men before the Flood for coming to their senses and doing penance. And the blessed Jerome confirms this very thing in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis: "Moreover," he says, "lest he should seem cruel in this, that he had given the sinners no place for penance, he added that phrase, 'But their days shall be a hundred and twenty years'; that is, they shall have a

hundred and twenty years for doing penance. Human life, therefore, was not — as many err — contracted to a hundred and twenty years, but to that generation a hundred and twenty years were given for penance. For we find that after the Flood Abraham lived a hundred and seventy-five years, and the rest more than two and three hundred years." Thus Jerome. Chrysostom's commentary on this passage also has plainly the same opinion. "Not content," says Chrysostom, "with the long-suffering of five hundred years, which throughout the whole life of Noah was taught by the hearing of his name, now again, prolonging and deferring his indignation, he prescribes for them another time, and says: 'I have threatened and made manifest my indignation, which it is just to bring upon you for the multitude of the sins you have committed; but because I wish even those who have sinned incurably to be saved, and none to perish, I therefore grant you a hundred and twenty years, that if you will, and will wash away your sins, and by coming to your senses and turning to better things will give yourselves to virtue, you may escape both the punishments and the dangers.'" To the opinion of these men Augustine also subscribed, in chapter 24 of book 15 of The City of God, whose words must be recalled more opportunely a little below. I here pass over very many of the more recent writers to whom the same opinion is approved. But I doubt whether Rupert rightly, in the aforesaid place, called this latter opinion older than the one I expounded a little above, since we named above as its authors Philo and Josephus, the most ancient of all writers.

§102: the better reading — the 120 years are the time granted for repentance before the Flood (Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustine). Margins: Jerome; Gen. 25; Chrysostom (homily 22 on Genesis); Augustine (City of God 15.24).

But this brings a difficulty: that from the time when God spoke these words up to the Flood, only a hundred years are found. For God spoke these words when Noah, being five hundred years old, had already begotten three sons, as is plain from the closing words of the fifth chapter; but the Flood came in the six-hundredth year of Noah, as is written in the seventh chapter

of this book. Where, then, are the other twenty years? Jerome thinks that, because those men were unwilling to do pen-…

§103 (continues on p. 115): the grave difficulty — only 100 years lie between God's words and the Flood; Jerome's solution (20 years cut off). Margins: 'A grave and hard doubt'; Jerome.

— p. 115 (PDF) · printed p. 46 —

…ance, God shortened the appointed time by cutting off twenty years, and hastened the Flood. "Because," says Jerome, "they scorned to do penance, God was unwilling to wait for the time he had decreed, but, twenty years' space being cut off, brought on the Flood in the hundredth year appointed for doing penance." Things like Jerome's, Chrysostom said in homily 25 on Genesis. Following Jerome, Hugh: "As," he says, "God threatened Hezekiah with imminent death, but, because he repented, deferred the imminent death for fifteen years; so, conversely, he had granted to those men a space of a hundred and twenty years for repenting, but because they became worse through God's patience, the space granted was shortened. Nor in any of these things was God's counsel changed, but only his sentence."

§103 (continued from p. 114): Jerome's and Chrysostom's/Hugh's solution (God's sentence, not his counsel, changed). Margins: Jerome, Hebrew Traditions; Chrysostom, homily 25 on Genesis; Hugh, Annotations; Isa. 38 (Hezekiah); Augustine.

But this interpretation is somewhat harsh. Wherefore, when Augustine had read it, being by no means content with it, he sought another more convenient. Augustine answers, then, in the place cited just before, that when God spoke these words Noah was in fact not five hundred years old, but only four hundred and eighty; which time, however, Scripture calls "five hundred years," since it is wont, by the name of any whole sum of years, to denote the greatest part of it. Since, therefore, Noah had completed the greatest part of his five-hundredth year — namely, four of its parts being finished, if that hundred be divided into five parts — for that reason he is said to have been of five hundred years. But it is better to hear

Augustine himself narrating these things in his own words: “When God said, ‘Their days shall be a hundred and twenty years,’ it is not to be taken as though it were foretold that henceforth men would not exceed a hundred and twenty years, since we find that even after the Flood some exceeded even five hundred years; but it is to be understood that God said this when Noah was about the end of his five hundredth year — that is, was living the four-hundred-and-eightieth year of his life, which Scripture in its custom calls ‘five hundred,’ generally signifying by the name of the whole the greatest part (for in the six-hundredth year of Noah’s life, in the second month, the Flood took place). And thus the foretold hundred and twenty years were the future [span] of the life of the men who were to perish, when these had passed, he would be destroyed by the Flood. Nor is it idly believed that the Flood was so made, when there were no longer found on earth any who were not worthy to be carried off by such a death as was inflicted on the impious; for none of those whom holy Scripture records as propagated from the seed of Seth died in the Flood.” Thus far Augustine.

§104: Augustine’s preferred solution — Noah was really 480, which Scripture rounds to ‘500.’ Margin: Augustine.

But although Augustine met this objection rightly, he does not seem to have closed up another crack that lies open to cavil. For God spoke these words when Noah had already begotten Shem, Ham, and Japheth — for Moses had told their generation beforehand in the closing words of the fifth chapter. If, therefore, God spoke those words when Noah was living his four-hundred-and-eightieth year (and then Shem was already born), then when the Flood came Shem would have been at least a hundred and twenty years old; but it is read in the eleventh chapter of the book of Genesis that he was, when the Flood was over, a hundred years old. But it must be supposed that God spoke these words about the hundred and twenty years of man’s life twenty years before…

§105 (continues on p. 116): another crack remains — Shem’s age implies the words were spoken 20 years before Shem’s birth. Margin: Gen. 11.

— p. 116 (PDF) · printed p. 47 —

…before Noah begot Shem. Why, then, you will ask, did Moses narrate the generation of Shem before the recording of these words of God? Moses did this by an anticipation frequent in the sacred writings; for he wished to describe all the generations from Adam down to the Flood, woven together in a continuous series. And as, in each of the prior nine generations, he had said in what year of his life the father had begotten his son, so in the tenth, which was Noah, Moses had to say in what year of his life Noah had begotten his sons — although, in order of time, other things were prior and ought to have been told before the generation of Noah's sons.

§105 (continued from p. 115): Moses narrated Shem's generation by anticipation (a frequent scriptural device).

It is not necessary, therefore, for us to say with the blessed Augustine that, when Noah is said to be of five hundred years, this is to be understood not of the five-hundredth year completed, but of the five-hundredth running — namely, with eighty years of that five-hundredth year elapsed; for it can be understood more plainly and easily of the five-hundredth year itself, either precisely completed, or a little less or more than completed. This I say on account of Shem, whom Noah seems to have begotten when he was five hundred and two years old, since Shem is said to have been a hundred years old two years after the Flood.

§106: so we need not, with Augustine, take '500' as the 500th year running. Margin: Gen. 11.

But Augustine's saying that none of the descendants of Seth perished in the Flood must be understood of the upright and pious men among Seth's descendants, or those whom Scripture records by name. For Methuselah, the grandfather of Noah, departed in the very year of the Flood, and a few years before, his father Lamech. But that very many of the descendants of Seth — whom Moses called "sons of God" — perished in the Flood, because, degenerating from their fathers' probity and piety, they had been plunged into the gravest crimes, one may recognize from this very

narrative of Moses.

§107: Augustine's 'no descendant of Seth perished in the Flood' must be understood of the pious ones. Margin: Gen. 5.

Verse 4. Now giants were upon the earth in those days. For after the sons of God went in to the daughters of men, and they brought forth [children], these are the mighty men of old, men of renown.

Genesis 6:4 (Vulgate lemma).

In Hebrew it is, word for word, thus: "Giants were in the land in those same days; and also after the sons of the princes went in to the daughters of men, they bore to them; these are the mighty who were of old, men of name." In Chaldee it is thus: "Giants were in the land in those days. For after the sons of the nobles went in to the daughters of men, and took children from them, they too turned out robust — those famous men who were renowned of old." And the reading of the Seventy Translators (as Augustine cites it in chapter 23 of book 15 of The City of God) ran here thus: "Now there were giants upon the earth in those days. And after that, when the sons of God went in to the daughters of men and begot for themselves, those were the giants, men of old, men of name."

The literal Hebrew, Chaldee, and Septuagint readings. Margin: Augustine (City of God 15.23).

Moses signifies by these words what kind of offspring and progeny was produced from that wicked mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men…

§108 (continues on p. 117): what Moses signifies — the monstrous offspring of that union. Margin: 'What kind of offspring [came] from the sons of God.'

— p. 117 (PDF) · printed p. 48 —

…namely [an offspring] most notorious for impiety, cruelty, obscenity, and savagery of manners, and which, presiding by its gigantic height and strength of body, was most proud, most ferocious, violent, sparing none,

oppressing all, and reckoning whatever pleased it to be also lawful. And at the same time Moses indicates this: that it was chiefly on account of this kind of men that the Flood came, so that their enormous and intolerable pride, impiety, and cruelty might be punished with a signal and, for all ages, memorable punishment.

§108 (continued from p. 116): the giants' infamous pride and cruelty, and the Flood sent chiefly because of them.

Now the Latin reading signifies that the origin of those giants was from the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men, as though before that there had been no such monsters of the human race, or, if there had been, certainly not so frequent and so huge; for this is indicated by the phrase, "For after the sons of God went in to the daughters of men." But according to the Hebrew reading and that of the Septuagint, which we set down a little above, it is signified that there were giants both before and after the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men. And Augustine contends that this is plainly indicated by the words of divine Scripture, when it is said: "Giants were upon the earth in those days, and after that, when the sons of God went in to the daughters of men and begot for themselves, those were the giants and men of name." "Therefore," says Augustine, "there is no doubt that there were many giants before the Flood, and that these were citizens of the earth-born society of men; but that the sons of God, who according to the flesh were propagated from Seth, declined, justice being forsaken, into this society. Nor is it to be wondered at that giants could be born even of these; for not all were giants, but there were certainly more then than after the Flood. And it pleased the Creator to create them, that even hence it might be shown that not only the beauties, but also the magnitudes and strengths of bodies, are not to be greatly esteemed by the wise man, who is beatified by spiritual and immortal goods, the proper goods of the good, and not by those common to good and bad. Recalling which matter, another Prophet says: 'There were the giants, those renowned men who were of old, of great stature, expert in war. The

Lord did not choose them, nor did he give them the way of knowledge, but they perished; and because they had not wisdom, they perished through their folly.’” Thus Augustine.

§109: were there giants before the Flood too? Augustine, on the Hebrew/LXX, says yes. Margins: ‘Whether there were giants before the Flood’; Baruch 3.

Now these giants are said to have been “of old,” or “from the beginning,” mighty and famous; whereby it is signified that they flourished chiefly about the first age of the world — that is, from the beginning of the world up to the Flood; for this time is called “from the beginning,” or “of old.” For in place of that word “of old” the Hebrew is holam, which signifies a hidden and concealed time, that is, one whose beginnings, because of their antiquity, lie hidden from mortals. And that phrase “men of name,” as it is in Hebrew — that is, “men of renown,” namely celebrated and famous — denotes that the vastness and strength of body of those giants, the ferocity of their spirit, the savagery of their manners, and their warlike deeds, were bandied about in men’s frequent talk not only in their own times but also in the succeeding ages down to the age of Moses, and were of celebrated fame among all.

§110: the giants are called ‘of old, mighty and famous’ — flourishing from the world’s beginning to the Flood (Hebrew holam; ‘men of name’).

But it must be carefully explained what Moses wished to signify by the word “giants” in this place. For it pleases many that by the word “giants” are signified not those who are commonly called giants, men…

§111 (continues on p. 118): what does ‘giants’ mean here? — the view that it means proud, savage men. Margin: ‘Whom Moses here calls giants.’

— p. 118 (PDF) · printed p. 49 —

…I mean of unusual bulk and height of body, but proud, impious, cruel men, in fine like, in the savagery of their manners, to those giants whom the poets fabled to have dared even to make war against the gods. In this

opinion Philo seems to have been, in the book On the Giants; for, treating these very words of Moses, “Now there were giants in the land in those days,” he says: “Someone might perhaps think that the lawgiver here hints at what the poets fable about giants, since these things, though immensely swollen with fables, cling to the very traces of truth. For this reason Moses cast out of his commonwealth the praised and elegant arts of painting and statuary, because they corrupt truth with falsehoods, deceiving credulous minds through the eyes. Moses, then, brings forward no fable about giants, but wishes to teach you this: that some men are of the earth, some of heaven, some of God. Of the earth, those who hunt the pleasures of the body, seeking from everywhere the matter of each (and giants, as the name indicates, are so called as it were g■geneis, that is, earth-born). And men of heaven are called those who pursue the arts and sciences, which are the glory and ornament of our mind, given from heaven. For what in us is heavenly is the mind, by which one both contemplates the motions of heaven and, exercising itself in the rest of the arts, acquires for itself acuteness for understanding such things. And men of God are rightly named the Priests and Prophets, whose dignity is too great for them to mix themselves with the human commonwealth and become citizens of the world, but who, more sublime than all sensible things, have migrated into the intelligible world, having obtained there a dwelling, enrolled in the commonwealth of ideas and incorruptible things.” Thus Philo.

§111 (continued from p. 117): Philo’s allegory — men of earth, of heaven, of God. Margin: Philo (On the Giants).

Josephus too seemed to refer the word “giants” not to bulk of body, but to wickedness of manners, writing thus in the first book of the Antiquities: “Many angels of God, coupling with women, procreated an insolent offspring, contemning all law and right through confidence in their strength, whose deeds, not unlike those which the Greeks relate about giants, have been handed down to posterity.” To the same opinion the words of Chrysostom and of the Damascene too are cited in the Catena.

Those of Chrysostom are these: “I think that by ‘giants’ Scripture here means not an unusual kind of men or an unwonted form, but heroes and strong, warlike men.” And those of the Damascene: “I judge that those are here called giants who were of most robust body; whence the saying, ‘A giant shall not be saved by the greatness of his strength.’” To the opinion of these Cyril must be joined, who, at the beginning of the ninth book against Julian, disputing about this very passage of Moses, writes thus: “It is the custom of divine Scripture to call the wild and fierce and robust ‘giants.’ For of the Persians and Medes who were to devastate Judaea, God said through Isaiah: ‘Giants shall come to fulfill my fury,’ etc. For we do not say that the giants were, as the Greek poets have it, of such lofty bodies that they could snatch islands from the midst of the sea and hurl them into heaven, but foul of aspect and monstrous and reckless; nor yet, however, so far transcending the measure of humanity as it seemed good to the Greek sages, who were lying, to say.” Thus Cyril.

§112: Josephus, Chrysostom, Damascene, and Cyril likewise refer ‘giants’ to wicked, warlike, robust men. Margins: Josephus; Chrysostom; Damascene; Ps. 32; Cyril; Isa. 13.

But, on the contrary, others (whose opinion is the truer) judge that by Moses are called “giants” men of remarkable height and vastness of body, with which, however, there was at the same time joined an incredible savagery…

§113 (continues on p. 119): the truer view — ‘giants’ = men of huge stature joined with savagery and impiety.

— p. 119 (PDF) · printed p. 50 —

…and cruelty, and likewise pride and impiety; such, indeed, as the Interlinear Gloss describes them here — namely huge of body, proud of spirit, exceedingly strong, and disorderly in manners; whence they are called “giants,” that is, “sons of the earth.” But Cassian, in Conference 8, ch. 21, says that they were most robust hunters, most violent and most truculent men, who were called “giants” because of the enormity of their

bodies, or of their cruelty and malice. “For these were the first among men to begin to ravage their neighbors and practice plunder, content rather to pass their life by booty than by the sweat and labor of their own work; and whose crimes had so grown up that the world could not be expiated except by the inundation of the Flood.” Thus Cassian.

§113 (continued from p. 118): the Interlinear Gloss and Cassian. Margin: Cassian (Conference 8, ch. 21).

Ambrose too, in On Noah and the Ark, ch. 4, follows the same interpretation. “The author of divine Scripture,” he says, “does not wish the giants to be seen, after the manner of the poets, as sons of the earth, but asserts that those whom he calls by this name were generated from angels and women, wishing to express the greatness of their body.” Although in the same place, carrying over what is here written about the giants to a mystical understanding, Ambrose says that those are like the giants who pursue only the things of the flesh, but have no care for the soul — whence they can be named “sons of the earth”; and because they oppose the divine will and precepts, they seem, after the manner of the giants, to make war with the powers above. The blessed Augustine too, in the book of Questions on Genesis, q. 3, and in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 23, interprets what Moses here writes about the Giants of true and commonly so-called giants.

§114: Ambrose and Augustine — Ambrose (literal: angels’ offspring; mystical: the carnal); Augustine takes them as real giants. Margins: Ambrose; Augustine.

Theodoret, moreover, illustrates and at the same time confirms this interpretation with brilliant testimonies of divine Scripture. For he says thus in the 48th question on Genesis: “Some say that those whom divine Scripture calls ‘giants’ are those who lived many years; but some say they are men, haters and adversaries of God. Those who think thus do not suppose that they had bodies larger than other men. But I, when I hear Scripture saying that Enac was sprung from the giants, and that the iron

bedstead of King Og was nine cubits in length and four in breadth; and likewise when I hear the spies of Joshua relating that the Hebrews, in comparison with the giants who were in the land of Hebron, were as locusts; and God saying, ‘I delivered up the Amorite, whose height was like the cedars and his strength like the oaks’ — I judge that there were certain exceedingly large men, God wisely dispensing this, that men might know that God, as the omnipotent Creator, distributed to men so great a measure. For it was very easy for God to create men larger than they are; but, in order to cut down pride and restrain arrogance, he did not give men the largest bodies. For if, endowed with small bodies, man exalts himself not only against his fellows but even against God the Creator of all, what would they not have committed had they obtained the largest bodies?” So Theodoret. And, if it please, let it be permitted to add to these what Berosus Annianus set forth about giants of this kind at the beginning of his History: “They write,” he says, “that in those first times, before the general inundation of the lands, there was around Lebanon Henos, a very great city of Giants, who lorded it over the whole world from the setting of the sun to its rising; these, trusting in the vastness and strength of their body, and with the weapons they had invented…”

§115 (continues on p. 120): Theodoret confirms real giants from Scripture; and Berosus on the giant-city of Henos. Margins: Deut. 2; Num. 13; Amos 2; Berosus Annianus.

— p. 120 (PDF) · printed p. 51 —

“…and with the weapons they had invented, oppressed all; they ate men, procured abortions and prepared them for food; they had intercourse with mothers, daughters, sisters, with males and with beasts; and there was no crime they did not commit, all reverence for religion and the gods being despised.” So he.

§115 (continued from p. 119): the close of the Berosus passage (its lurid catalogue of crimes).

I have found, in the sacred writings, that by the word “Giants” are called men eminent above all in five respects: that is, in vastness of body, in

strength, in knowledge and power in war, in pride beyond the human measure, and finally [men] who, on account of their inhumanity and cruelty, were most formidable and terrible, and on whose account chiefly the Flood was sent. And, to omit the scriptural passages cited by Theodoret, what I have said can be plainly recognized from certain other passages of Scripture. David, Psalm 18: “He rejoiced,” he says, “as a giant to run his course” — there you have giant-like agility and swiftness; and Psalm 32: “A giant shall not be saved by the greatness of his strength” — there you have strength and might. Solomon, Proverbs 9: “And he knew not that there are giants there, and that her guests are in the depths of hell.” Isaiah, ch. 14, speaking of the king of Babylon: “Hell beneath was troubled to meet thee at thy coming, it stirred up the giants for thee” — hence it appears that the Giants were a kind of men terrifying and most to be feared. Baruch 3: “There were those renowned giants who were from the beginning, of great stature, expert in war” — from this it is clear that the Giants excelled in height of body and knowledge of the art of war. Isaiah, ch. 26: “Let not the giants rise again; therefore hast thou visited and crushed them, and destroyed all their memory.” Job, ch. 16: “He hath rushed upon me like a giant.” Wisdom 14: “When in the beginning the proud giants were perishing, the hope of the world, fleeing to the boat, sent back to the age the seed of birth, which was steered by thy hand.” Ecclesiasticus 16: “The ancient giants did not obtain pardon for their sins, who were destroyed trusting to their own strength.” From these last two scriptural passages it is plain that the Flood was sent chiefly for the sake of destroying the Giants. It appears, therefore, what force and notion underlies the word “Giants” in the sacred writings: for that word signifies the tallest of all mortals, the most robust, the most warlike, and, on account of their savagery, the most horrible.

§116: Pererius’s own scriptural definition — ‘giants’ = men eminent in five respects, for whom chiefly the Flood was sent. Margins: ‘Of what kind were those whom divine Scripture calls Giants; the author’s opinion’; Ps. 18; Ps. 32; Prov. 9; Isa. 14; Isa. 26; Job 16; Wisdom 14; Ecclus. 16.

FOURTH DISPUTATION. Whether the Giants of whom Moses speaks were demons under a human appearance, or rather the sons of demons — that is, procreated from the intercourse of demons with women.

Heading of the Fourth Disputation.

Paul of Burgos, in his first Addition to Lyra's Postill on this sixth chapter of the book of Genesis, argues, from the etymology of the Hebrew word Nephilim, which Moses uses here (and which our translator renders into Latin as "Giants"), that they were demons under a human appearance; since Nephilim…

Opening (continues on p. 121): Paul of Burgos's argument from the etymology of Nephilim. Margin: Paul of Burgos.

— p. 121 (PDF) · printed p. 52 —

…means "the falling ones," from the verb naphal, which means "to fall," by which are denoted the demons who fell from heaven, as our Lord said: "I saw Satan falling like lightning from heaven"; and Isaiah: "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer?" But that the opinion of Burgos is false is conclusively proved by manifest arguments. For from Moses' narrative one may understand that those whom he here names Nephilim were generated from the mingling of the sons of God with the daughters of men, and that the Flood was sent chiefly on their account — namely, that their sins might be punished, they themselves being destroyed in the Flood; but demons were neither generated from men nor perished in the Flood. Nor does the etymology of the word Nephilim help Burgos. For the most learned of the Hebrews, Rabbi Abraham and Aben-Ezra, interpret the giants to have been called Nephilim, that is, "the falling ones," because other men, seeing the unusual vastness of their bodies, oppressed at once by amazement and fear, fell down before them; or because they violently rushed upon men and laid them flat on the ground (to which Job seems to have alluded in those words: "He rushed upon me like a giant"); or because those giants fell in

the Flood, to which perhaps could be referred that passage of Job, ch. 26: “Behold, the giants groan under the waters.” Jerome indeed, in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis, says that for “the falling ones,” or “Giants,” Symmachus rendered “the violent”; and that the name “Falling ones,” which in Hebrew is Nephilim, fits both angels and the children of the holy — as though the descendants of Seth, degenerating from the holiness and piety of their forefathers, were called “the falling ones,” because they did not stand in the way of their forefathers, but slipped down to the pursuits, institutions, manners, and crimes of the descendants of Cain.

§(against Burgos, continued from p. 120): the argument refuted — the Nephilim were begotten of the union and perished in the Flood; the Hebrew etymology (Rabbi Abraham, Aben-Ezra, Jerome/Symmachus). Margins: Isa. 14; Luke 10; Rabbi Abraham; Aben-Ezra; Job 16; Jerome.

But that by the word Nephilim demons are not here signified is strongly argued by this: that in the book of Numbers the giants who were of the stock of Enac are called by the same word. For in place of what we read in the closing words of chapter 13, “There we saw certain monsters of the sons of Enac, of the giant race,” the Hebrew words, if rendered into Latin word for word, sound thus: “We saw there also the Nephilim, the sons of Hanach, of the Nephilim.” More often, however, in the sacred books giants are called Rephaim; for in many passages of Scripture in which we read the word “Giant,” the Hebrew is the word Rephaim — as in Proverbs 9 and 21, Isaiah 14 and 26, and Deuteronomy 2, where we read: “It was reputed a land of giants; giants dwelt in it of old,” etc.; for that “giants,” the Hebrew is Rephaim.

§119: that Nephilim does not mean demons — it names the giants of Enac’s stock (Numbers 13); and giants are more often called Rephaim. Margins: Nephilim; Rephaim.

But the origin of this word is variously handed down. For Rapha, from which comes Rephaim, means “to heal,” with aleph at the end; and giants are called Rephaim because they are robust and strong, like healthy men. Whence the Targum interprets Rephaim as “the strong.” But if Rephaim (Giants) be derived from raphah, which means “slack” and “weak,” we

shall interpret the Giants to have been named Rephaim because other men, when they saw them, were weakened by fear and bereft of their strength. Or perhaps they were called Rephaim from a certain giant so named, Rapha, whose descendants too, being giants, were called Rephaim; and afterward that name was applied to denote any gi-…

§120 (continues on p. 122): the origin of the word Rephaim variously given. Margin: 'On the origin of the word Rephaim, by which giants are signified in the sacred writings.'

— p. 122 (PDF) · printed p. 53 —

…ants. For in the first book of Paralipomenon (Chronicles), ch. 21, certain giants of the stock of Rapha are named; just as also the Enacim, giants who dwelt in the land of Hebron, were named from their forefather Enac. The Nephilim, then — that is, the giants — whom Moses here named, were not demons.

§120 (continued from p. 121): Rapha and Enac as eponyms (1 Paralipomenon 20); the Nephilim were not demons.

There was, moreover, the opinion of some that the giants here named by Moses were indeed true men, but begotten from the intercourse of demons with women. Josephus, certainly, in the first book of the Antiquities, and Ambrose in the book On Noah and the Ark, ch. 4, signify that those giants were the sons of angels and women; to which opinion the Master of the Scholastic History too, in the History of the book of Genesis, ch. 31, seems more inclined; and the same is professed in open words, at the beginning of his Sacred History, by Sulpicius Severus. For when he had said that the angels, captivated by the beauty of comely maidens, sought illicit desires, and, degenerate from their dignity and origin, abandoning their heavenly dwellings, mingled themselves in marriages with mortals, he adds that from their intercourse giants were brought forth, since the mixing of natures diverse from one another begot monsters.

§121: the view that the giants were true men, but begotten of demons' intercourse (Josephus, Ambrose, the Master of the Scholastic History, Sulpicius Severus). Margins: 'The opinion that the

giants were sons of demons is refuted'; Josephus; Ambrose; Master of the Scholastic History; Sulpicius Severus.

But the over-bold genius of Francesco Giorgio, headlong toward the byways and precipices of opinions, went much further. For he, in the first volume of his Problems, problems 54, 74, and 75, and in the sixth volume, problems 330 and 331, hands down these four things, worthy indeed of great censure. The first is that demons are corporeal and, by condensing their bodies, can mingle with women. The second is that they have their own seed and beget sons from the women they enter. The third is that the proper offspring of demons are giants — for such monsters cannot be begotten from men alone, or by the customary mode and order of human generation — and that such were the giants here recorded by Moses, namely born from the mingling of the sons of God, that is demons, with the daughters of men; and that this is that "seed of the serpent," that is, of the Devil, between which and the "seed of the woman," that is, the rest of men, God placed enmities. The fourth is that, after the coming of Christ (who overthrew the dominion which the Devil had long held in the world, as he himself said of him: "The prince of this world shall be cast out"), our Lord forbids [the Devil] to use the power of coupling with women and begetting giants which the demon once exercised; and that for this reason there were no giants in Christ's time, because Christ broke the power of the demons. But this opinion of that author contains most grave and most foul offenses and outrages against Philosophy and Theology. And that demons are not corporeal, and cannot beget from women sons who are true men, we showed above by many arguments in the second and third Disputation of those three Disputations which we treated upon those words, "The sons of God seeing the daughters of men," etc. Now we must examine two other sayings of that author: one is that giants cannot be generated otherwise than from the intercourse of demons with women; the other is that, after the com-…

§122 (continues on p. 123): the four bold claims of Francesco Giorgio, judged worthy of severe censure. Margins: 'A remark against Francesco Giorgio'; Gen. 3; John 12.

— p. 123 (PDF) · printed p. 54 —

…ing of Christ neither can demons couple with women, nor have there been any giants.

§122 (continued from p. 122): the second of Giorgio's claims stated in full.

That giants cannot be generated from men alone, but that their generation is effected by a demon, is neither true nor probable. For giants, since they are true men, are of the same substance as the rest of men; for the difference according to the largeness and smallness of the human body is accidental, and does not vary the species. And of things that are of the same species, just as the matter and the form are the same according to species, so also the efficient and generating cause is the same, and the same the mode of generation; wherefore giants, like the rest of men, can be begotten from men alone, without the demon's agency. Next, the mingling of things that are of diverse species from one another, if it generates anything, [produces something] diverse in species from both whence it is generated — as may be seen in the mule, which is begotten from a horse and a she-ass, and in other like cases. Since, therefore, between a demon and a man there is a difference not only specific but more than generic, if anything were begotten from the mingling of a demon with a woman, it would assuredly be diverse from both — that is, it would be neither a demon nor a man; but giants are true men, therefore they are not generated from the intercourse of demons with women.

§124: giants are true men, of the same substance as the rest, generated from men alone — size is an accidental difference. Margin: 'Giants are generated, like other men, from men alone, without the demon's agency.'

Besides, the extension of the human body according to largeness and smallness comes from the matter — namely, from the abundance or scarcity of matter; but, according to Aristotle (which is the more correct opinion), the whole matter of the human body is furnished by the female; wherefore the extension of the human body into the greater, or its

contraction into the smaller, ought to be assigned not to the generator but to the woman. Since, therefore, the demon, if it concurs in generation, plays the part of the generator, the giant-like height of body ought to be referred not to it but to the woman. Add that, if the measure of the human body can naturally be twice or even thrice smaller than the just and usual greatness of the human body (which is manifest from the example of pygmies and dwarfs), why could not the stature of a man also naturally be twice or thrice greater than it is generally wont to be? And if pygmies and dwarfs are naturally generated from men alone without the concurrence of demons, why may we not think and say the same about the generation of giants? Indeed, since the just stature of a man is six feet, in the principate of Augustus a certain man named Conopas, kept as a favorite of Julia, the granddaughter of Augustus, was only two feet and a palm tall, as Pliny relates in book 7, ch. 15; and in chapter 2 of the same book he writes marvels about the remarkable smallness of body of the pygmies.

§125: bodily size comes from the matter (the female's, per Aristotle), not the generator; the pygmy/dwarf analogy. Margins: Aristotle; Pliny (Nat. Hist. 7.15–16, the dwarf Conopas).

Finally, not only before the Flood were there those giants whom Moses here records, and whom that author supposes to have been the sons of demons, but after the Flood too there were giants, who are called in the sacred writings Enacim and Rephaim, sprung from Repha and Enac. Nor were there lacking, in other ages, giants whose parents were known. As, therefore, giants of this kind were born from men alone, so too those who lived before the Flood could be born. I shall conclude this disputation with a most beautiful…

§126 (continues on p. 124): there were giants after the Flood too (Enacim, Rephaim), of known parents; sentence breaks off ('I shall conclude this disputation with a most beautiful…').

— p. 124 (PDF) · printed p. 55 —

…most beautiful, and most powerful for the confirmation of our opinion, judgment of the blessed Augustine. Refuting the opinion of those who

thought that the ‘sons of God’ who mingled with the daughters of men ought to be understood as angels — on the ground that from them are said to have been born the giants, who seem unable to be generated from men alone because of their unwonted bulk of body — Augustine writes thus: “But this troubles some, that we read that from those who were called ‘angels of God’ and from the women whom they loved, there were born not, as it were, men of our race, but giants — as though, indeed, bodies of men far exceeding our measure had not been born in our own times also. Was there not, a few years ago, when the destruction of the city of Rome (which was done by the Goths) was drawing near, a woman at Rome, with her father and her mother, who by her gigantic body far surpassed the rest? To see her a marvelous concourse came from every quarter; and this was the great wonder, that her parents were not even as tall as the tallest men we are accustomed to see.” And the same Augustine, toward the end of the same chapter, calls the opinion of those who said that the giants had no human fathers but were born of demons a fable, drawn from a certain apocryphal book stuffed with fables, which was once circulated under the name of Enoch.

§126 (continued from p. 123): the close of the Fourth Disputation — Augustine’s witness (the giant woman seen at Rome before the Gothic sack); and his calling ‘giants had no human fathers’ a fable from the apocryphal book of Enoch. Margin: Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, ch. 23.

But that which was set forth by that same author — that after the coming of Christ our Lord the power of coupling with women was taken from the demons, and that for this reason there were no giants on earth after that time — rests on a false reasoning, and contains a no less false opinion. For the foundation and prop of his opinion is that giants can be begotten only by demons, which was shown a little above to be far from the truth. The opinion too is false, that demons after the coming of our Savior are forbidden intercourse with women. For the blessed Augustine, in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 23, confirms on the authority of weighty men (whom it would be the part of an impudent person not to believe) that even

in his own time demons were often wicked toward women and desired and accomplished intercourse with them. Widespread, too, and proved by many experiences, is the doctrine of the theologians concerning succubus and incubus demons. Let the reader recall to memory what we disputed on this same matter above, when we explained the third disputation upon those words, “The sons of God seeing the daughters of men,” etc.

§127: refutation of Giorgio’s claim that, after Christ’s coming, demons were barred from coupling with women and so no giants remained. Margins: ‘That there were no giants after Christ’s coming, refuted as false’; Augustine.

Moreover, that there were no giants after the coming of our Lord, Augustine refutes by manifest examples of his own and his own time — whose example of a certain gigantic woman, recorded in the aforesaid place, it is needless to repeat. Pliny, concerning a certain giant seen at Rome under the emperor Claudius, writes in book 7, ch. 16, in this manner: “The tallest man our age has seen was one named Gabbara, brought from Arabia under the emperor Claudius, nine feet and as many inches tall. Under Augustus there were two, half a foot taller, whose bodies, for the sake of that marvel, were preserved in the tomb of the Sallustian gardens; their names were Pusio and Secundilla.” Thus Pliny. Julius Scaliger, in the work he wrote against Cardano, in exercise 263, affirms that he himself saw at Milan, in the public hospital…

§128 (continues on p. 125): Augustine refutes from his own day the claim that no giants existed after Christ; Pliny on the giant Gabbara, and Pusio and Secundilla. Margins: Pliny; Julius Scaliger.

— p. 125 (PDF) · printed p. 56 —

…a certain young man of such height that he could not stand; for nature had not been able to supply nourishment enough for the thickness and proportion of his strength, and so he lay down, and filled two beds joined together lengthwise. He adds, moreover, this, worthy of careful observation: that the Samogitian peoples, who are between Prussia and Livonia, although for the most part of tall stature, nevertheless beget, as it

were by turns, now the tall, now the almost dwarfish — not unlike the disposition of certain trees that bear fruit every third year, as if, the matter being once exhausted, nature lays up the residue as a reserve, paying back in more remarkable size what it had withheld in the dwarf. So Scaliger.

§128 (continued from p. 124): Scaliger's giant youth, and his note on the Samogitians who alternately bear tall and dwarfish offspring.

It is not beyond belief, the conjecture of some who think that from this account of Moses about the Giants the ancient poets took occasion to fable about Giants those things which have been set forth by them in their writings — namely, corrupting and defiling the truth of the sacred history by an admixture of fables and falsehoods. The poets feigned that the giants were born from the Earth and the blood of Heaven, at the time when Saturn cut off his father's privy parts, as Hesiod sings in the Theogony. Although Apollodorus, in the first book, makes the Giants sons of Earth alone, and these brought forth by an angry Ops (Earth) to avenge the gods, by whom the Titans had been slain. Homer, however, in the Odyssey, hands down that the Giants were sons of Neptune and Iphimedeia, who tried to set Ossa on Pelion and Olympus [on Ossa], to climb up into heaven to storm Jupiter. These, the poets say, not only excelled in greatness of body and were unconquered in strength, but were also of plainly terrible aspect, with hair flowing from the head, a long beard, and serpent feet, as Ovid writes in the fifth book of the Fasti in those verses: "The Earth brought forth fierce births, huge monsters, the giants, / who would dare to go against the house of Jove. / She gave them a thousand hands, and serpents for hair, / and said: Move your arms against the great gods. / These prepared to pile mountains up to the highest stars, / and to assail great Jove with war. / Jupiter, hurling thunderbolts from heaven's citadel, / turned the vast weights back upon their authors."

§129 (continues on p. 126): the poets took occasion from this passage to fable about giants (Hesiod, Apollodorus, Homer, Ovid's Fasti). Margins: Josephus, Antiquities; Eusebius, Preparation for the Gospel, bk. ?, ch. 4; Hesiod; Apollodorus; Homer, Odyssey bk. 11; Ovid.

— p. 126 (PDF) · printed p. 57 —

They relate that the giants dwelt in the Phlegraean fields, and there waged war with the gods — although Pausanias, in the Arcadica, affirms that the Vale of Bathos was the site of that battle. And when they had climbed up the highest mountains, they are said to have hurled huge rocks at the gods, of which those that fell into the sea became islands, but those that fell on land, mountains. They relate, moreover, that the giants by their rashness and audacity struck such fear into the gods at first sight that, as soon as Typhoeus appeared to them, all fled into Egypt, where, wearied by the long journey and bereft of hope of flight, they hid themselves transformed into various shapes of animals, as Ovid sings in book 5 of the Metamorphoses; and that for this reason the Egyptians worshiped as gods those very animals into whose form the gods had put themselves. And they report Typhoeus to have been of such bodily size that all Sicily is laid upon his body: over his right hand the promontory Pelorus, looking toward Italy; over his left, Pachynus; over his legs, Lilybaeus; and his head is weighed down by Aetna. The Giants were slain, some by some gods, others by others, chiefly by the counsel of Pallas and the might of Hercules, and were thrust down to the underworld.

§130: the giants in the Phlegraean fields; the hurled rocks; Typhoeus and the gods' flight to Egypt; Typhoeus pinned under Sicily. Margins: Pausanias; Ovid (Metamorphoses 5).

These fabulous inventions of the poets about the Giants, Macrobius, in book 1 of the Saturnalia, ch. 20, interprets according to mythology thus: "But what else are we to believe the Giants to have been than a certain impious race of men denying the gods, and therefore reputed to have wished to drive the gods from heaven? Their feet ended in serpent-coils, which signifies that they thought nothing upright, nothing of the things above, the whole course and progress of their life tending toward the things below." Thus Macrobius.

§131: Macrobius's mythological reading of the giants — an impious, God-denying race. Margin: Macrobius (Saturnalia, bk. 1, ch. 20).

Verse 5. And God seeing that the wickedness of men was great on the earth.

Genesis 6:5a (Vulgate lemma).

Moses wishes to declare the greatness of the iniquity and wickedness of the men of that time, so that from this it may appear how just was the punishment of the Flood, by which God punished such great crimes of men. Above, Moses said that the sons of God had mingled with the daughters of men, indicating the unbridled lust of the men of that age — not only of the impious (such as the descendants of Cain were), but also of the descendants of Seth, who professed the pursuit and practice of piety, justice, and holiness. Then Moses said that there were giants in that time, undoubtedly wishing to signify the gigantic pride, impiety, violence, and cruelty of those men. Now Moses, magnifying still more the wickedness of those men, calls it generally "wickedness," and indeed "great"; and he adds that all the thought of the heart of those men was bent upon evil at all times. Whereby it is signified that those men were vitiated and corrupted both inwardly and outwardly — in heart, in mouth, and in deed — and on every side. Moses subjoins, moreover, that God was so moved and offended by the crimes of those men that he was touched with sorrow of heart within, and it repented him that he had made man. Nor was that wickedness of a few, or only in certain places, but "all flesh had corrupted its way," and all the earth was corrupt before God and filled with iniquity. Finally, the greatness of the punishment by which God destroyed all the earth, and the whole race (a few excepted) of men and animals, plainly declares the greatness of the divine indignation and offense; and the greatness of God's indignation and offense proves the unspeakable enormity of the crimes with which all the earth was then filled. But the words of Moses must be weighed one by one.

§132: Moses magnifies the wickedness to show how just the Flood was.

“And God seeing that the wickedness of men was great on the earth.” The blessed Cyprian…

§133 (continues on p. 127): Cyprian’s citation of the verse. Margin: Cyprian.

— p. 127 (PDF) · printed p. 58 —

…writing to Novatian, cites this passage thus: “And the Lord God saw the wickednesses of men overflowing upon the earth, and that all were minded toward evil from the beginning of their days.” Moses signifies by these words that those men sinned not from ignorance, nor from any disturbance or weakness of mind, but from malice — that is, from a depraved habit and custom — and that, knowingly and willingly, without any shame or fear, and with no regard for God or men, they rushed into every kind of crime with joy and pleasure. Weighing this rightly, Ambrose, in the book On the Ark and Noah, ch. 4: “God knew,” he says, “that man, placed in the region of earth and bearing flesh, could not be without sin. For the earth is, as it were, a certain place of temptations, and the flesh an enticement of corruption. Yet they were for this reason worthy of no pardon: that, although they had a mind capable of reason and a power of soul infused into the body, they rushed into the fall without any consideration, from which they would not call themselves back.”

§133 (continued from p. 126): Cyprian’s reading; men sinned from settled malice, not ignorance — Ambrose. Margin: Ambrose.

For that word “wickedness,” the Hebrew is rahah, signifying both the evil of guilt (as in Jeremiah 4: “Wash thy heart from wickedness”) and the evil of punishment (as in Jeremiah 1: “From the north shall all evil be opened”; and that saying of the Lord: “Sufficient for the day is its own evil”). Here it can signify either — that is, either the iniquity and wickedness of those men, or their violence and harassment, by which they afflicted, harassed, and oppressed others. And it is said to have been “great wickedness”: either because it was not of a few, but of many men; or because it was not enclosed within one or another region, but extended far and wide; or

because it was not simple and of one kind, but various and manifold, embracing every kind of crime; or, finally, because it was not moderate or tolerable, but extreme and carried to the utmost and intolerable — or, as Scripture is wont to speak, it was a wickedness complete and consummate.

§134: the Hebrew rahah (both ‘evil of guilt’ and ‘evil of punishment’); why the wickedness is called ‘great.’ Margins: Jer. 4; Jer. 1; Matt. 6 (‘sufficient for the day is its evil’).

And all the thought of the heart was bent upon evil at all times.

Genesis 6:5b (the original prints this as ‘Vers. 6’; it is the second half of Vulgate 6:5).

In Greek, if rendered into Latin word for word, it is thus: “And each one thinks in his heart diligently upon evil things all his days.” But the Hebrew reading yields this sense: “And every fashioning (or, as Pagninus renders, imagination) of the thoughts of their heart was only evil.” But of these three readings the sense is the same. In Hebrew the word is Ieser, signifying “a fashioning,” from the verb Iasar, which is “to fashion.” Now Ieser signifies that which is fashioned, whether inwardly in mind and thought, or outwardly in work, as a potter fashions vessels. Whence man himself is called a “fashioning,” because he was fashioned and formed by God: both as to the body, formed from dust (as David said in Psalm 102: “For he knew our frame; he remembered that we are dust”), and as to the rational soul, created from nothing by God, as it is in the same…

§135 (continues on p. 128): the Greek and Hebrew renderings; the Hebrew Ieser (figmentum), and why man himself is called a ‘fashioning.’ Margin: Gen. 2.

— p. 128 (PDF) · printed p. 59 —

…David, Psalm 32: “Who fashioned the hearts of them one by one”; and in Zachariah, ch. 12: “The Lord stretching forth the heaven and founding the earth, and fashioning the spirit of man within him.” And this word “fashioning” fits well the vanity of the human mind, which fashions very many things idly and most vainly, according to that saying of David: “The Lord knows the thoughts of men, that they are vain.”

§135 (continued from p. 127): further scriptural uses of ‘fashioning,’ aptly applied to the vanity of the human mind. Margin: Ps. 93.

Moreover, by these words of Moses is signified the greatest depravation and corruption of the human soul, not only as to the sentient soul, but also as to the rational; for this is signified by the word “heart,” that is, both the intellect and the will — namely, where, as in a workshop, every good or evil of man is first fashioned; for upon the heart chiefly depends the goodness and the depravity of human actions. And as the Lord said: “From the heart come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts”; and finally, “what comes out of the heart defiles a man.” Therefore those men were led to evil not from without only — that is, by some occasion, or by the persuasion and impulse of others — but from within, by their own counsel, choice, and malice. The words of Moses have great emphasis: not “some” thoughts, he says, but “all” thought; nor does he say it was “prone” to evil, but “bent,” that is, applied with all its force, leaning and fixed upon evil — which signifies a vehement effort and drive toward evil; nor was this for some fixed time, but “at all times.”

§136: ‘heart’ signifies both intellect and will, the workshop of good and evil; the emphasis of Moses’ words (‘all,’ ‘bent,’ ‘at all times’). Margin: Matt. 15.

Someone will say that it seems incredible that those men never conceived any good thought, did no good moral work. Those who hold that not even a morally good work can be done by man by the powers of nature alone and the faculty of free will, but that for the doing of any moral good there is need of God’s special aid, would readily meet the doubt by saying that those men, on account of the gravest crimes committed by them, were unworthy to be helped by God’s special aids; and, lacking these, it is no wonder if they did nothing good. But this seems the easier and more probable answer: that this saying of Moses is hyperbolic, such as is frequent in divine Scripture; from which saying one ought not to understand what the words sound simply and precisely, but something at the maximum. For Moses wishes to signify that those men, for the most

part and in the greatest part, thought and did the things that are evil and wicked — so much so that, if they did any good, it was very slight, scanty, and rare, and to be reckoned as nothing. So too, a little below, Moses uses a hyperbolic expression when he says that all flesh — that is, man — had corrupted its way upon the earth, and that the end of all flesh had come before God. For from these general statements one must without doubt except Noah, who in this very passage is called just and perfect and gracious before God. And things like these which Moses writes of the men of that time, David sang in Psalm 13 of impious men, or of all men lacking the grace of God, in which sense it seems to be cited by Paul to the Romans 3: “The fool said in his heart, There is no God; they are corrupt and have become abominable in their pursuits; there is none that does good, no, not one…”

§137 (continues on p. 129): a doubt — could those men have done no good at all? Answered as hyperbole; Noah excepted. Margins: ‘A doubt, whether all the thought and work of those men was simply evil’; Rom. 3 / Ps. 13.

— p. 129 (PDF) · printed p. 60 —

…The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that understood or sought after God. All have gone astray, they have become together unprofitable; there is none that does good, no, not one.”

§137 (continued from p. 128): the rest of the Psalm 13 / Romans 3 citation.

FIFTH DISPUTATION. Against the heretics of our time, who argue from this passage of Moses that every work and every action of any man whatever — even of the justified and the holy — is sin.

Heading of the Fifth Disputation.

The heretics are wont readily to wring by force out of the sacred writings, from wherever they can, arguments by which to build credit for their tenets

and to put forward some appearance of truth and piety for their errors. And so from this passage too, where Moses says that all the thought of the human heart is bent upon evil at all times, they argue that all things whatsoever that men do — even the justified and the holy — are evil and sins, although these are not imputed, to those who believe in Christ, unto damnation and eternal punishment. This indeed their leader Luther handed down in his articles condemned by Leo X, article 31. “For if,” they say, “every human heart is bent at all times upon evil, and from the heart proceed all the actions of man, then it is surely necessary that, the heart being corrupted as a fountain, all the actions, like streamlets flowing from it, be corrupted and vitiated. For a bad tree cannot bring forth good fruit.”

§138: the heretics’ argument from Gen 6:5 (Luther, condemned article 31). Margin: Matt. 7.

This same thing they confirm by other sentences of divine Scripture, but chiefly by two. For they bring forward those words of Isaiah from chapter 64, by which Isaiah most openly confesses that all the actions of men, even those that seem just, are unclean: “We are all become,” he says, “as one unclean, and all our justices as the rag of a menstruous woman.” And they add that saying of David from Psalm 142: “Enter not into judgment with thy servant, for in thy sight no living thing shall be justified.” “If no mortal,” they say, “can be justified before God, then the works of no mortal can be just; for if they were just, man would be justified from them and on account of them — for ‘the doers of the law,’ says Paul, ‘shall be justified before God.’” Thus they.

§139: their two further proof-texts — Isaiah 64 and Psalm 142. Margin: Rom. 2.

But someone aptly said that the heretics are like that Sisyphus whom the poets fable to be punished in the underworld with that kind of penalty: that he is compelled to roll a huge stone up to the summit of a mountain, which, when he has nearly raised it to the top, suddenly slips back down. Whence that line in Cicero: “…the stone that Sisyphus keeps turning, / sweating, by straining, and gains not a whit.”

§140 (continues on p. 130): the heretics are like Sisyphus. Margin: Cicero, Tusculans, bk. 1.

— p. 130 (PDF) · printed p. 61 —

In like manner the heretics strive earnestly to obscure and pervert the true and sacred doctrine of the Catholic Church — but in vain, namely with a vain effort, a fruitless endeavor, and no effect. For just as from the sacred writings badly understood and explained the darkness of heresies arises, so, on the contrary, by the right and genuine interpretation and understanding of those same sacred writings, as by the splendor of the sun, all the fog of heresies is dispelled. Let us therefore show that the three aforesaid sentences of Scripture in no way support and favor the opinion of the heretics.

§140 (continued from p. 129): the heretics labor in vain; let us show the three texts do not favor them.

And first, to that sentence of Moses one may reply in three ways. For Moses there uses a hyperbolic manner of speech, which is to be interpreted and understood not altogether universally, but for the most part and in the greatest part, as we said a little above. For because almost all of that age were most wicked, and most of their works were most criminal, so that there was scarcely one or another good man, a true and pious worshiper of God, therefore Moses said that all the thought of the human heart was bent upon evil at all times. Next, Moses said this not of all men of all ages, but only of the men of that time which preceded the Flood; and not even of all of those, for soon Moses himself excepted Noah, calling him just, perfect, and pleasing to God. Add to this that this saying of Moses is to be taken of impious men, living according to the flesh and lacking the Spirit and grace of God. Wherefore the heretics act ignorantly — not to say impudently — who wrest that sentence of Moses to the whole race of men, even to the just and holy.

§141: the threefold reply to the Moses text — hyperbole; only the pre-Flood men; only the impious. Noah excepted.

Nor is it laborious to interpret that other sentence, drawn from chapter 64 of Isaiah, in such a way that it is plain it lends no credit at all to this opinion of the heretics. Isaiah in that place speaks of the wicked and impious Jews, of whom there was at that time so great a multitude that, in comparison with them, the good and pious men, because they were very few, were reckoned as nothing. And he calls “justices” their legal observances and other works, just in the appearance and estimation of men; but because they were void of the grace of the Holy Spirit, and done with a depraved mind and intention, and mixed and contaminated with innumerable crimes, those “justices” are deservedly called “the rag of a menstruous woman.”

§142: the reply to Isaiah 64 — of the wicked Jews; their ‘justices’ are legal observances void of grace. Margin: ‘The passage of Isaiah, ch. 64.’

Nor is it fitting that anyone be drawn away from this interpretation because Isaiah numbers himself among those men. For it is the custom of the Prophets — as also of our preachers — when they deplore or rebuke the sins of men, or implore the divine clemency on their behalf, to associate and number themselves with the sinners, although they themselves are just and not partakers of such crimes. They did this, doubtless, either for the sake of humility, or that they might thus the more bend God’s mercy, or from the affection of charity, which makes all things common, even sins — not indeed to consent to them, but to mourn them as if they were their own, or to pray and make satisfaction for them. Jeremiah, indeed, was not only holy, but even in his mother’s womb was sanc-…

§143 (continues on p. 131): that Isaiah numbers himself among the sinners is a prophetic custom of humility/charity, not an admission. Margin: Jeremiah.

— p. 131 (PDF) · printed p. 62 —

…tified, so that he is believed to have committed no mortal sin in his whole life; yet he, in the third chapter, speaks thus: “We shall sleep in our confusion, and our shame shall cover us, because we have sinned against the Lord our God, we and our fathers, from our youth even to this day, and

have not heard the voice of the Lord our God." In the same way Isaiah, in the aforesaid place, enumerates the gravest sins as common to himself with the rest of the Jews — which, however, it is certain were most remote from him: "There is none," he says, "that calls upon thy name, that rises up and lays hold of thee" — who does not see that this in no way fits Isaiah? Therefore, in the sermons of the Prophets in which the people are reproved, general statements are sometimes not to be interpreted universally, but to be taken for the most part and in the greatest part; such as that of Micah, chapter 7: "The holy man has perished from the earth, and there is none upright among men"; and that of Jeremiah, chapter 8: "From the least even to the greatest, all follow after avarice."

§143 (continued from p. 130): Jeremiah and other prophets number themselves with sinners; such general statements are not to be taken universally. Margins: Micah 7; Jeremiah 8.

There remains to be explained that third sentence: "In thy sight no living thing shall be justified"; which assuredly helps the cause of the heretics no more than the foregoing sentences. And this, most correctly, Augustine interpreted — in the exposition of that Psalm, and in the book On the Perfection of Justice, and in sermon 49 On the Season — and Jerome, in the Epistle to Ctesiphon and in the first book against the Pelagians; Gregory likewise, and Theodoret and Arnobius, in the exposition of that Psalm 142. From the commentaries of these fathers we shall here set down, most briefly, a fourfold explanation of those words of David, collected together. First interpretation: No one can be justified before God as before men, with whom by our own powers and works we can so merit some reward that we can demand it by our own right and from the rigor of justice, because from things that are ours and not owed to them we can render them homage, service, or any other duty. It is not so with God. For no one has first given to him, that it should be repaid to him; for to each mortal is said that of Paul: "What hast thou that thou hast not received?" For the good merits of men are of no value before God, except in so far as they proceed from grace and the Holy Spirit dwelling in us; and grace is

given to us not on account of our works, but freely — otherwise it would not be grace, as Paul argues to the Romans 11.

§144: the reply to Psalm 142 — patristic sources, and the first of four interpretations (no merit before God is owed of strict right). Margins: Augustine; Jerome; Gregory; Theodoret; Arnobius; Isa. 40; Rom. 11; 1 Cor. 4.

Second interpretation. That no man is justified in God's sight signifies nothing else than that no one is reckoned just in comparison with God; so that "in the sight of God" is the same as "in comparison with God." For just as no one is called good, wise, immortal, and clean except God alone, so also just; for however great the justice of men, if compared with the justice of God, it is plainly nothing. "Judge me not," says Augustine, "according to thyself, who art without sin, because 'in thy sight no living thing shall be justified.' Enter not into judgment with me; for however upright I may seem to myself, thou yet bringest forth from thy treasury the rule of justice, fittest me to it, and I am found crooked." This interpretation is greatly illustrated by two sentences of Job: one is in the fourth chapter, "Shall man," he says, "be justified in comparison with God, or shall a man be purer than his maker? Behold, they that serve him are not steadfast, and in his angels he found depravity; how much more shall they that dwell in houses of clay, who have an earthly foundation, be consumed as it were by the moth?" Most like this is that other sentence in chapter 25: "Can man be justified compared with God, or appear clean, born of a woman? Behold, even the moon does not shine, and the stars are not clean in his sight; how much more man, rottenness, and the son of man, a worm?"

§145: the second interpretation — none is reckoned just compared with God (with the two Job texts). Margins: Augustine; Job (4 and 25).

— p. 132 (PDF) · printed p. 63 —

Third interpretation. David did not say that no work of man is just before God, but said that no man is justified in the sight of God — that is, that no one is utterly and altogether just. For those who are named, and truly are,

just, although they do many good works, nevertheless both formerly committed many sins, and even while they are just frequently slip into lighter faults. For “there is not a just man on earth who does good and does not sin,” as is written in Ecclesiastes 7 and 3 Kings (1 Kings) 8. And that prayer of the just is no less true than humble, which the Apostles also used: “Forgive us our debts.” On account of this admixture, then, of good works with evil, David and every just man dreads the judgment of God, and no one is pronounced perfectly just before God.

§146: the third interpretation — none is wholly and altogether just (even the just sin in lighter matters). Margins: Matt. 6; Eccles. 7; 3 Kings (1 Kings) 8.

To this interpretation pertains what the blessed Gregory writes in the exposition of the seventh penitential Psalm, expounding these words of David, “In thy sight no living thing shall be justified”: “I know,” he says, “that many seem just in the sight of men, and, raised to the hope of the heavenly promises, live innocently in the world, who, even if they do not offend in deed, nevertheless sometimes slip in a vain or perverse thought. For whose mind do vain thoughts not tear? Whose heart do temptations not vex? Whose soul do the desires of the flesh not trouble? Therefore he is not justified in the sight of God who offends in the heart, which God beholds.”

§147: a passage of Gregory supporting this — even the innocent slip in vain or perverse thought. Margin: Gregory.

Fourth interpretation. That phrase, “no one is justified in the sight of God,” ought to be understood not simply, but with that adjunct which David had just placed before, saying: “Enter not into judgment with thy servant.” A man can, then, be justified before God, if God deal mercifully with him and not contend with him by the utmost right and rigor of justice. For just as David said that no one is justified before God, so Paul said, in Romans 2, that the doers of the law are justified before God; and of Zachariah and Elizabeth, Luke wrote that they were just before God. Therefore, if God should call a man into judgment and conduct an inquiry into his life and

morals, with no mercy mitigating the severity of the judgment, undoubtedly anyone whatever would be found unjust and guilty. For who lives so piously and holily on earth that, ordered to render an account at the tribunal of God, he could defend his cause, if God should wish to exact all that is owed to him by the most just and best right? “If thou shalt mark iniquities, Lord, Lord, who shall stand it?” For just as one is said not to be justified in judgment before someone by whom he can justly be accused of many things, and convicted by true charges laid against him which cannot be denied, so too, when God expostulates with us, or with ourselves as judges, we shall be convicted as unjust.

§148 (continues on p. 133): the fourth interpretation — taken with ‘enter not into judgment’; under strict justice all are found guilty. Margins: Luke 1; Ps. 129.

— p. 133 (PDF) · printed p. 64 —

For besides the debts of gratitude, which no one can sufficiently discharge to God, those debts too which by divine precept we are bound to pay, no one perfectly pays. What of the fact that all are found to have done many things which ought not to have been done, and, on the contrary, not to have done many things which ought to have been done? Hear the blessed Augustine in Sermon 49 On the Season: “What is, ‘Enter not into judgment with thy servant’? Stand not with me in judgment, exacting from me all that thou hast commanded; for thou wilt find me guilty if I enter into judgment with thee. There is need, therefore, of thy mercy rather than of thy most pure judgment.” To this interpretation makes what Job said in chapter nine: “If a man should wish to contend with God, he could not answer him one for a thousand. What am I, that I should answer him and speak my words with him? Even if I have anything just, I will not answer, but will entreat my judge. If I wish to justify myself, my own mouth will condemn me; if I show myself innocent, he will prove me wicked. I feared all my works, knowing that thou wouldst not spare the offender. If I be washed as it were with snow waters, and my hands shine as most clean, yet thou wilt dip me in filth, and my own garments will abhor me. For I shall

not answer a man who is like myself, nor one who could be heard with me in judgment on equal terms.” Thus there.

§149: no one perfectly pays the debts owed to God — Augustine (Sermon 49) and Job 9. Margins: Augustine; Job 9.

But on dissolving the objections of the heretics, let what has been said thus far suffice. For to argue that the works of just men are many and good is neither the place here, and, because it is evident in the sacred writings, seems superfluous. Certainly the heretics who deny this do great injury to the grace of Christ, as though it were not effective for cleansing man from sins and doing good works — whereas Paul says to Titus 2 that Christ gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity and cleanse to himself an acceptable people, a follower of good works; and in six hundred places Scripture cries out that God will render to each according to his works. “For they shall come forth,” says the Lord in John, “who have done good, unto the resurrection of life; but they who have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment.” Wherefore this error of the heretics was deservedly condemned in the Council of Trent, in Session 6, which is on Justification, ch. 11, in these words: “It is established that they contradict the orthodox doctrine who say that the just man, in every good work, sins at least venially, or — what is more intolerable — even merits eternal punishments.”

§150: conclusion against the heretics — that the just do many good works is evident; the error condemned at Trent (Session 6, On Justification, ch. 11). Margins: John 5; Council of Trent.

Verse 6. It repented him that he had made man on the earth. And being touched inwardly with sorrow of heart, and forewarning for the future, etc.

Genesis 6:6–7a (Vulgate lemma; the original labels it ‘Vers. 6’).

These words declare the unspeakable love and tenderness of God toward man, and at the same time his anger and indignation against his crimes. For

so great was the enormity of the crimes of the human race in that time that, to express it, Moses said that it repented God that…

§151 (continues on p. 134): these words declare God’s love for man and his wrath against sin; cut off mid-sentence.

— p. 134 (PDF) · printed p. 65 —

…that he had made man, and that it impelled him, stirred by sadness, sorrow, and as it were fury, to destroy man. “God does not think as men do,” says Ambrose, “so that some new resolve should come upon him, nor is he angry as one mutable; but these things are written in order to express the bitterness of our sins, which has deserved the divine offense — as though guilt had grown to such a point that even God, who by nature is moved by no anger, hatred, or passion, should seem provoked to wrath.” Chrysostom too, weighing that word “it repented,” or (as he reads) “he reconsidered” or “turned over in his mind”: “See,” he says, “a gross word, accommodated to our littleness. ‘It repented God.’ Not that repentance falls upon God — far from it — but God speaks to us after the human manner; for the enormous sins of those men made the merciful God indignant. As if he were to say: I had not produced man for this, that, fallen by so great a ruin, he should become to himself the author of perdition; but I marked him with so great honor, and declared that I had so great care of him, that, being free for virtue, he might be a stranger to perdition. But since he has abused my mercy, it will henceforth be better to hinder his evil endeavors.”

§151 (continued from p. 133): God does not ‘repent’ as men do — Ambrose and Chrysostom on the human idiom. Margins: Ambrose, On the Ark and Noah, ch. 4; Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis.

But someone will say: Repentance is repugnant to the foreknowledge of all future things which is in God; and sadness, sorrow, and anger are contrary to the infinite simplicity and immutability of the divine nature. Whence we truly read in First Kings 15: “The Triumpher in Israel will not spare, and will not be bent by repentance, for he is not a man, that he should do penance”; and Numbers 23: “God is not as a man, that he should lie, nor as

the son of man, that he should be changed.” For with God, as James said, “there is no change, nor shadow of alteration.” But this is easily resolved. For repentance, sorrow, anger, fury, sadness, and other such things are said of God not according to propriety, but according to likeness; nor according to the affection of the mind, but the effect of the work, because God does such things as men are wont to do when seized by repentance or anger or fury. “The repentance of God,” says Eucherius (borrowing it from Augustine, bk. 15 of The City of God, ch. 25), “is the immutable plan for changing things.” And the Interlinear Gloss: “God seems to repent while he changes his work, yet his will and disposition remaining immovable.” And Rupert: “Such a saying about the repentance of God indicates not a mutability of the impassible God, but his fixed sentence, for the destruction of the former deed, or its very necessary improvement.” And Hugh: “‘It repented him’ — namely, by changing what he seemed to have begun in Paradise, where he had said to men: Increase and multiply, and fill the earth.”

§152 (continues on p. 135): how repentance is attributed to God, who is immutable and foreknows all. Margins: ‘How repentance is attributed to God’; ‘the solution’; Eucherius (from Augustine, City of God 15.25); the Interlinear Gloss; Rupert (on Genesis, bk. 4, ch. 14); Hugh of St. Victor; 1 Kings 15; Num. 23; James 1.

Nor unlike these are the things which, to this same effect, Justin Martyr admirably wrote, answering the thirty-sixth question of the Orthodox, which was about the repentance of God over the anointing of Saul as king and over the overthrow of the city of Nineveh: “God,” he says, “because he is always the same, and because he always does what befits him, is altogether immutable. But when those whom he cares for are changed, he himself changes things as is expedient for those he cares for; and therefore both in pardoning and in not pardoning he is immutable. For he pardons immutably those who correct their faults; but those who from evil cannot be…”

§153 (continues on p. 135): Justin Martyr to the same effect (on the repentance over Saul and over Nineveh). Margin: Justin Martyr.

— p. 135 (PDF) · printed p. 66 —

"…revoked, he immutably does not pardon. What, then, he said of the anointing of Saul, 'It repenteth me,' shows his immutability in not pardoning; but that it repented him of the destruction of Nineveh shows his immutability in pardoning. For God is immutable, and always perseveres in those things which it befits him to do, nor ever admits a change toward doing those things which would misbecome him." Thus Justin.

§153 (continued from p. 134): the close of Justin's answer. Margins: 1 Kings 13; Jonah 3.

But this sentence of Moses must be weighed in detail. "It repented." In Hebrew the word is nacham, properly signifying "to console"; but consequently it also signifies "to repent," whether of guilt or of punishment, because the one repenting seems consoled over the evil deed. The Septuagint rendered enethym■th■, that is, "he thought" or "reconsidered," as Augustine reads in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 24. Aquila, however, expressed the force of the Hebrew word, translating metemel■th■, that is, "he repented"; which word, in this place, Procopius of Gaza holds to mean the same as pareklyth■, that is, "he called himself back."

On the word 'paenituit' — the Hebrew nacham, the Septuagint, Aquila, Procopius. Margins: the translation of the Seventy; Procopius of Gaza; Augustine.

For my part, I wonder why the Septuagint rendered this place so unlike the Hebrew reading, as "He thought"; nor do I wonder less why St. Jerome did not note so divergent a Septuagint version from the Hebrew in his Hebrew Traditions on Genesis, where he is wont to pursue the diversity of the Hebrew reading and of the translation of the Seventy in this book of Genesis subtly, carefully, and diligently.

§154: Pererius's puzzlement that the Septuagint rendered 'he thought,' and that Jerome did not note the divergence.

That phrase "forewarning for the future" is in none of the originals — neither in the Hebrew, nor the Chaldee, nor the Greek; why the Latin translator wished to add it, I do not know. Yet it has a right and convenient sense: "forewarning for the future" — namely, lest those evils, the lust of men going unpunished, should become more numerous day by day and graver; God wishing to hinder the evils from multiplying, wishing also to set a barrier against men's wickedness, and finally wishing, when men's crimes could be healed by no other remedy, to end them by the punishment of death. And God is said to have forewarned for the future (as Hugh interprets) not as though through imprudence he had only now come to that which he had not thought before — he from whom nothing is hidden — but because he both forewarns who forbids a thing to be done and he against whom it is forbidden, and carefully avoids it. Or that "forewarning for the future" signifies that God wished this punishment of the Flood — by which almost the whole race of men and animals was destroyed — to be a lesson to posterity, that from it they might learn how greatly sin displeases God. Or because God had undertaken to educate the whole world as one man; and man, while he is a boy, must be restrained from evil by fear of punishment and kept in the good, lest, left to himself, he rush headlong and unbridled into crimes. "Strike thy son with the rod," says Solomon, "and thou wilt deliver his soul." Therefore God, providently and usefully, seized the young world — wantonly insolent and frolicsome — as a foolish little boy, striking it with such a blow that it could not forget it throughout its whole age.

§155: 'forewarning for the future' is in none of the originals — yet its sense is sound (God as the chastiser of the world-as-child). Margins: Hugh, Annotations on Genesis; Prov. 23.

But as for what follows, "And being touched inwardly with sorrow of heart," in Greek it is dieno■th■, which means "he reconsidered" rather than "he repented"; and that it is so read in some Latin codices, Augustine

testifies in the Questions on Genesis…

§156 (continues on p. 136): ‘touched inwardly with sorrow of heart’ — the Greek and the Hebrew hatsab. Margin: Augustine.

— p. 136 (PDF) · printed p. 67 —

…q. 5, and so he himself cites this passage in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 24. In Hebrew it is thus: “God grieved unto his heart,” or “in his heart,” or “God saddened himself,” or “he was affected with anguish unto his heart.” For the Hebrew word hatsab means “to compress, to be straitened or distressed,” and hence also “to grieve or be saddened.” And this is said of God not properly, but after the likeness of a man who, offended by a most grievous injury from those whom he most loved and on whom he had bestowed the greatest benefits, is greatly saddened and grieves that he must punish them with deserved penalties. “There is no grief,” says Hugh, “except over the loss of what is loved. Whence, when we lose a thing we do not care about, we are wont to say: This does not touch our heart. The deeper, therefore, the love, the higher did the grief touch.” But here it is a matter of the destruction of a beloved thing, and therefore the grief is rightly said to be great. By this manner of speaking, then, Moses intimated that the multitude and the magnitude of the crimes of the men of that time could not be sufficiently expressed in words. He wished it also to be plain from this that God punishes, as it were, unwillingly, since it is rather of his will to do good; wherefore he is said to have come to punish man “touched with sorrow of heart within.” The whole of this passage of Moses the Chaldee paraphrase, rendered into Latin word for word, expressed thus: “And it repented the Lord, in his word, that he had made man on the earth; and he said, by his word, that he would break their strength according to his will.”

§156 (continued from p. 135): the Hebrew sense ‘he grieved in his heart’; God punishes as if unwilling; the Chaldee paraphrase. Margins: Hugh, Annotations on Genesis; the Chaldee paraphrase.

I cannot command myself, in this place, to leave behind three sayings of noble writers upon these words: one of the blessed Augustine, a second of Theodoret, a third of Rupert; for they are so suited to explaining and illustrating what was said by Moses about the repentance and sorrow of God that it would be wrong to suppress them in silence. The holy Augustine, then, in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 25, treating this passage of Moses, writes thus: “The anger of God is not a disturbance of his mind, but the judgment by which punishment is inflicted on sin; and his thought and reconsideration (so Augustine calls it, following the Seventy Translators, what the Latin translator renders ‘the repenting of God’) is the immutable plan for changing things. For God does not, like a man, repent of any deed of his, whose sentence about all things is as fixed as his foreknowledge is certain. But if Scripture did not use such words, it would not, in a manner, more familiarly insinuate itself into every kind of men, for whom it wishes to provide — so as both to terrify the proud, and rouse the negligent, and exercise the seekers, and nourish the understanding; which it would not do unless it first stooped, and in a manner descended, to those lying low.” Thus Augustine.

§157: three notable patristic sayings — Augustine first. Margin: ‘Three excellent sayings of Augustine, Theodoret, and Rupert.’

Theodoret, in the Questions on Genesis, poses this question (it is the fiftieth): Why did God destroy the multitude of men by the Flood? To which he answers in these words: “God willed to destroy the offspring of Cain, and because the tribe of the pious was mingled with it, on that account it shared the punishment. But God did not (as some say) do this led by anger and repentance; for such passions are human, from which the divine nature is wholly free — especially since repentance befits those who, after a danger has happened, have learned a course previously to be considered: for, ignorant of what is to come, and then, after the danger has happened, learning that they did not deliberate rightly, they are led to repentance. But God sees the things that are to be many ages hence just as

if they had already happened; hence it comes that, as one foreseeing and foreknowing, he dispenses all things. How, then, will repentance fall upon him who by his foreknowledge governs all things? Wherefore the repentance of God is nothing else than a change of his disposition. ‘It repenteth me,’ he says, ‘that I made Saul king’ — which is as much as to say, ‘I have resolved to depose him and create another king.’ So too in this place: ‘It repenteth me that I made man’ — that is, ‘I have decreed to destroy the human race.’” Thus Theodoret.

§158: Theodoret’s 50th question — God acted not from passion but from foreknowledge. Margin: 1 Kings 15.

— p. 137 (PDF) · printed p. 68 —

No less devout, weighty, and learned, pertaining to the same matter, is Rupert’s discourse in the fourth book of the Commentaries on Genesis, ch. 15, which runs thus: “Here the divine word labors, and is, as it were, nearly broken in turning over a mass of excessive greatness, while it strives to make plain to our understanding what no man suffices to explain sufficiently: namely, how God heals without movement, slays without cruelty; how, with his tenderness unharmed, he takes vengeance, and with tranquillity holds fury. ‘It repented him,’ he says, ‘that he had made man on the earth, and forewarning for the future, and touched inwardly with sorrow of heart’: ‘I will destroy,’ he says, ‘man, for it repenteth me that I have made man.’ He who was to say through his prophet, ‘I will speak like a woman in labor,’ has indeed already spoken as one in labor. For just as a woman in labor brings forth what she has conceived not without the sensation of pain, and yet prefers to grieve than not to bring forth what she has conceived, so God brings forth the sentence of judgment not without a sense of tenderness, and yet, his tenderness overcome, prefers to see the miseries of the wicked than not to bring forth what, justice dictating, he has conceived. Why? Namely, because it is more useful to press the surgeon’s iron deeper into the disease than to foster the rottenness by stroking it. And so, that he is said to have repented and to have been touched inwardly with

sorrow of heart, is of tenderness; but that, not overcome by that sorrow, he said, ‘I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the earth,’ this decree is of severe judgment, or of judicial severity. Something like this he says elsewhere too: ‘It repenteth me that I made Saul king over Israel.’ Indeed, such a saying indicates not the mutability of the impassible God, but his fixed sentence, for the destruction of the former deed or the necessary improvement of that same deed.”

§159: Rupert — how God can punish ‘without disturbance,’ like a woman in labor. Margins: Rupert; Isa. 42.

“I will destroy,” he says, “man whom I have created, from the face of the earth, from man even to beasts, from the creeping thing even to the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them.”

Genesis 6:7 (Vulgate lemma).

In describing by these words the gravity of the punishment by which God punished the sins of men, Moses at the same time indicated the greatness of God’s offense and indignation, and likewise showed the bitterness and savagery of the crimes which drove God to so great an atrocity of punishment. This passage, the Hebrew reading expressed into Latin word for word, has thus: “And the Lord said, I will blot out the men whom I have created from the surface of the earth, from man…”

§160 (continues on p. 138): the gravity of the punishment; the Hebrew of the verse; ‘I will blot out’ (machah).

— p. 138 (PDF) · printed p. 69 —

“…even to the beast, even to the creeping thing, and even to the fowl of the air, because it repenteth me that I have made them.” That phrase “God said” signifies that God spoke these words either to the angels or to Noah himself — unless perhaps “he said,” by a Hebrew idiom, means the same as “he thought, deliberated, decreed within himself,” so that the effective will of God, his immutable counsel and purpose of destroying men, may be

signified. “I will blot out”: the Hebrew word machah properly means “to scrape out and wipe away,” so that in the thing wiped away no trace remains. God decreed, then, so to wash the surface of the earth with the Flood that no trace of men or animals should remain on it. That phrase “whom I have created” has great emphasis, as Chrysostom rightly weighed, as if God were to say: “What belonged to my office, I have all displayed. I produced man from nothing, that he might be; I implanted in his nature the knowledge of the things to be done or not done; I gave free will; I used unspeakable long-suffering; and after that long time, and after the indignation and the threats which I uttered, I yet appointed beforehand a span of a hundred and twenty years, wishing that, man perceiving his sins, my indignation might be called back. But because I gain nothing and make no progress, necessity compels me to fulfill my threats in deed, and to blot out man in every way — like some evil leaven, to abolish the whole human race, lest in later ages they become authors and teachers of sinning.” Thus Chrysostom.

§160 (continued from p. 137): ‘whom I have created’ — Chrysostom’s paraphrase of God’s long-suffering. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis.

That phrase, “from man even to beasts, from the creeping thing even to the fowls of the air,” the Latin translator said following the Septuagint (for in Hebrew it is thus: “even to the creeping thing, and even to the fowl of the air”). And that it announces also the destruction of all animals — Augustine says, in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 25 — declares the greatness of the coming calamity; it does not threaten destruction to the animals devoid of reason as though they too had sinned. The Lord here speaks (says Cajetan) after the likeness of an angry man, who is wont to threaten vengeance not only against the man by whom he was injured, but against all who dwell with him too. Whence David, vehemently angered at Nabal, threatened that he would slay even him that pisseth against the wall. In such a manner, indeed, God threatens that he will destroy man together with all the animals dwelling with man. And for this reason no mention is

made of fish, because they do not share in dwelling with man; for fish dwell beneath the waters, but man and the rest of the animals dwell upon the earth in the air.

§161: ‘from man even to the fowls’ — the magnitude of the calamity (Augustine); God speaks like an angry man (Cajetan; David against Nabal); why fish are not mentioned. Margins: Augustine; Cajetan on Genesis; 1 Kings 25.

There follows: “For it repenteth me that I made them.” He did not say “that I made these things [the animals],” because the cause of God’s repentance was sins, which were none in the animals; but on account of the sins of men, the animals too were destroyed together with men. For that “it repenteth me,” the Septuagint has “because I thought”; for in Greek it is enethym■th■, which Theodoret interprets, “I have resolved to destroy the race of men”; but in some Greek codices it is metemel■th■. The blessed Augustine, however, in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 24, has for this “because I am angry with them,” and Ambrose seems to have followed the same reading in the book On Noah and the Ark, ch. 4. Chrysostom, weighing these words of the Lord: “And in my mind,” he says, “I have reconsidered that I made th-…”

§162 (continues on p. 139): ‘it repenteth me that I made them’ — the variant readings; Chrysostom begins. Margins: Theodoret, q. 50 on Genesis; Augustine; Ambrose; Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis.

— p. 139 (PDF) · printed p. 70 —

“…them,” he speaks thus: “By this word, how greatly does he accommodate himself to our lowliness! Did I wish,” he says, “to punish them with so great a penalty? They themselves, by the savagery of their sins, drove me into so great an indignation.”

§162 (continued from p. 138): the close of Chrysostom’s paraphrase.

But a doubt arises: since man alone had sinned, and there had been no crime of the animals, why are the animals destroyed together with man,

which, as they had not sinned, so had deserved no punishment? Four causes of this may be adduced. First, God had made the animals for the service and use of men; man being removed, then, their preservation seemed superfluous. Next, for the punishment and affliction of man, in whose power and possession the animals were — just as good sons too are slain on account of sinful fathers, that by the death of the sons the fathers may be racked with a more bitter grief. Besides, for the detestation of man's impiety and malice; wherefore God had ordered the beast with which someone had coupled to be killed, for the detestation of that crime, as is plain in Leviticus 20. So too the Jews, about to fight against the Canaanite king Arad, and against the city of Jericho, and against the king of Amalek, and finally against the Gibeonites, were ordered to destroy and blot out all that was theirs — not only the men, but even the cities and all their beasts — as is plain in Numbers 21, Joshua 6, 1 Kings 15, Judges 20. Finally, this was done (as some have set forth) because the men of that time were wont to abuse even the animals lustfully, or wickedly for the perpetrating of other crimes; indeed, they had even trained animals of different species to couple with one another contrary to nature.

§163: why the innocent animals were destroyed too — four causes. Margins: 'Why the animals, which had not sinned, were destroyed in the Flood — four causes'; Lev. 20; Num. 21; Joshua 6; 1 Kings 15; Judg. 20.

But these things must be seasoned and adorned with the most brilliant words and sentences of Chrysostom and Ambrose. And Chrysostom, explaining those aforesaid words of Moses, "I will blot out man whom I have created from the face of the earth, from man even to beasts," writes in this manner: "Someone will perhaps say: Why, when man declined to evil, do the brutes too undergo the same punishment? Were the brutes produced for their own use? They were made for man's sake; when, then, he is taken from the midst, what use would there be of them? Therefore they bear this punishment in common, that from this too you may learn the gravity of the punishment. And just as in the beginning, when Adam had sinned, the earth

received a curse, so now too, when man was to be abolished, the brutes also share. As, when man is pleasing to God, the creature too is a partaker of human felicity (as Paul says: ‘And this creature shall be delivered from the servitude of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God’), similarly now, when man is to be punished for the multitude of his sins, the creature too is delivered together to a universal destruction. And as in a household, when he who presides falls into the indignation of the master, it is likely that his fellow workers grieve with him, so here too, the men perishing as it were in a household, all that is in the household and under their dominion must necessarily incur the same punishment.” Thus Chrysostom.

§164 (continues on p. 140): Chrysostom on why the brutes share the punishment. Margins: Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis; Gen. 3; Rom. 8.

— p. 140 (PDF) · printed p. 71 —

Ambrose, in the book On the Ark and Noah, ch. 10, explaining this same passage of Moses more fully both in words and sentences: “What,” he says, “had the dumb animals done amiss? For what cause are those subjected to punishment who have no sense of sinning? But just as in war, when the general is slain by the enemy, his army dies with him and all military strength is broken, so it seemed not to differ from justice that, when man perished — to whom the Lord God gave a certain royal power over every kind of animal, that he might preside with imperial authority over all the fowls, wild beasts, and beasts — the cattle too and whatever animals were irrational should die with him. Finally, whenever there is a pestilence, the region of the sky being corrupted, the dire plague first contaminates the irrational creatures, and chiefly dogs, horses, oxen, and infects those which are seen to consort with men, [and] so the force of the disease involves the human race. This, then, is the first cause, as I think, of the just assertion. The second is this: that no one accuses nature because the rest of the members of our body die when the head alone is removed, although we see many survive with hands and feet cut off. But the rest of the members do

not have the same prerogative as the head; and therefore, when that is cut off from which our senses go forth into the rest of the body, all the members also die; nor in this is the Maker's providence deserted, nor the human substance refuted. So, similarly, let no one now object that, because man is the head and a certain principal part of the rest of the animals, when he dies it ought not to seem strange if the rest of the animals die. The third is this: that the irrational creatures were generated not for their own sake but for man's; for they were ordained for man's sake, that by their subjection the human condition might be furnished. Finally, the Prophet attributes them to man's favor, saying: 'Thou hast subjected all things under his feet, all sheep and oxen, moreover the beasts of the field, the birds of the air and the fishes of the sea'; because for his sake are all those things — some for use, some for the sake of delight, some of pleasure. It was consequent, then, that, when man was blotted out from the face of the earth, for whose sake they were made, they too should be blotted out by a like fall." Thus Ambrose.

§165 (end of Liber VIII): Ambrose on why the animals perished with man — three reasons. Margins: Ambrose, On the Ark and Noah, ch. 10; Ps. 8.

— p. 141 (PDF) · printed p. 72 —

THE NINTH BOOK OF THE COMMENTARIES OF BENEDICT PERERIUS ON GENESIS, WHICH IS ON THE PRAISES OF NOAH AND ON THE GENERAL DESTRUCTION OF THE WORLD.

Title page of Book IX (Liber Nonus).

THE NARRATIVE OF MOSES, from the sixth chapter of the book of Genesis. But Noah found grace before the Lord. These are the generations of Noah: Noah was a just and perfect man in his generations; he walked with God. And he begot three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. And the earth was corrupted before God, and filled with iniquity. And when God had seen that the earth was corrupted

(for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth), he said to Noah: The end of all flesh is come before me; the earth is filled with iniquity from before their face, and I will destroy them with the earth.

The Scripture passage prefixed to Book IX: Genesis 6:8–13 (Vulgate). Verse numbers are marked in the margin of the original.

— p. 142 (PDF) · printed p. 73 —

PREFACE.

Preface to Book IX.

True is that saying of Aristotle, worn by the almost daily talk of all: “Opposites placed beside each other shine forth the more.” For, when there had first been described by Moses the incredible wickedness and malice of those men who lived before the Flood, and then set forth the singular and extraordinary probity and holiness of Noah, it came about that, by the comparison, each was rendered the more notable and the more illustrious. Indeed it was a most brilliant proof of Noah’s excellent justice and innocence that, amid so great a corruption of the souls of the men of his time, and so great a perversity of pursuits and morals, and so great a confluence and savagery of all crimes, he was of all crime most pure, most holy, and most dear to God. Most aptly to the praise of Noah fits what the blessed Gregory wrote of Job at the beginning of his Morals: “Let it be told,” he says, “where Job dwelt, that this may profit his praises — that he was good among the wicked. For it is not greatly praiseworthy to be good among the good, but to be good among the wicked. For as it is a graver fault not to be good among the good, so it is of immense renown to have been good even among the wicked. Hence it is that blessed Job bears witness to himself, saying: ‘I was the brother of dragons, and the companion of ostriches.’ Hence Peter extolled Lot with great praises, because he found him good among the reprobate. Hence Paul said to his disciples: ‘In the midst of a depraved and perverse nation, among whom you shine as lights in the world.’ Hence it is said to the Church of

Pergamum: ‘I know where thou dwellest, where the seat of Satan is, and thou holdest my name there, and hast not denied my faith.’ Hence the holy Church is praised by the voice of the Bridegroom, when it is said to her in the Canticle of love: ‘As the lily among thorns, so is my beloved among the daughters.’” Thus Gregory. Rightly, then, did Moses set forth the virtue of Noah, having first recalled the malice of the men of that time, in order to show that he lived good among the wicked, and that, according to the Bridegroom’s commendation, he might be displayed as a lily grown among thorns.

The Preface: by contrast with the pre-Flood wickedness, Noah’s sanctity shines the brighter — Gregory on Job, ‘good among the wicked.’ Margins: Gregory; Job 30; 2 Pet. 2; Eph. 2; Apoc. 2; Cant. 2.

— p. 143 (PDF) · printed p. 74 —

Noah found grace before the Lord.

Genesis 6:8 (Vulgate lemma).

Moses said this (lest anyone should think, as Chrysostom notes, on account of what had been said just before about the destruction of the whole earth and of all the animals and men, that there would be an utter abolition of the human race, and that our nature was to be eradicated root and branch) — but rather that it might be understood how great an evil sin is, and how great a good virtue is, and that one man doing the will of the Lord is better than ten thousand transgressors. Whence Moses subjoins: “But Noah found grace before God.” As if to say: Although the whole multitude had cast itself into so great a malice, this just man nevertheless preserved a spark of virtue; and just as those, by their evil works, provoked the merciful God to indignation, so this man, strong in virtue, found grace before the Lord God. God is no respecter of persons; but if in so great a multitude he find a man doing the things that are pleasing to him, he does not despise him, but deems him worthy of his care, and has the more regard for him by as much as, when there are so many who try to drag him to evil, he himself the more

steadfastly resists and pursues the way of virtue. Hence, then, it appears how great force and efficacy excellent virtue and piety have with God; for by this one Noah so pleased God that he merited not only an escape from the Flood for himself and his family, but also that, with himself as its author, there should be a repair and renewal of the world.

§3: why Moses adds this — Chrysostom: lest one think the whole race was to be abolished; one man doing God's will outweighs ten thousand transgressors. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 22 on Genesis.

This too must be observed: that God has his own servants and worshipers of his name even in the midst of the impious, and that the wicked do not so far prevail in multitude or power that there are not among them some good men whom God knows, protects, and, lest they perish with the wicked, marvelously preserves. An example of this stands in Elijah, who, complaining before God that he alone was left as a worshiper of God among the people of Israel, was answered by God that he had reserved and preserved to himself, among the people of Israel, seven thousand men who had not bowed their knees before Baal. But let us examine the words of this sentence of Moses, and first let us open up the meaning of this word 'Noah.'

§4: God has his own even amid the impious (Elijah and the seven thousand). Margins: 3 Kings (1 Kings) 19; Rom. 11.

FIRST DISPUTATION. On the interpretation of the name Noah.

Heading of the First Disputation of Book IX.

His father Lamech both imposed and explained the name of Noah, as Moses narrated above toward the end of the fifth chapter, writing thus: "And Lamech lived a hundred and eighty-two years, and begot a son; and he called his name Noah, saying: This one shall comfort us from the works and labors of our hands…"

§5 (continues on p. 144): Lamech named and explained 'Noah' (Gen. 5); the lemma breaks off.

— p. 144 (PDF) · printed p. 75 —

…on the earth which the Lord had cursed. Now the name Noë, or Noach (for so it ought to be said according to the form of Hebrew writing and pronunciation), means ‘rest,’ from the verb Noach, which is ‘to rest’; whence what follows, “He shall comfort us,” etc., the Septuagint translators rendered more in accordance with the etymology of the name Noah, saying, “He shall make us to rest,” etc. Eugubinus, in his annotations on the Pentateuch on this passage, hands down that there are two very similar Hebrew words: one (nacha) signifying to soothe, mitigate, and make to rest; the other (nacham), with mem, signifying to console — and that this latter is now in the Hebrew codices; but that the Septuagint translators, led by the similarity of the words, took one for the other, or read it in the former way. It could moreover be said that the final m is not of the essence of the verb, but is added in the pronoun ‘us,’ a thing which often happens among the Hebrews. Jerome seems to have read it similarly, since in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis he derives the etymology of the name Noah from that which is ‘to make to rest’; and almost all the Fathers followed the reading of the Septuagint, not only the Greeks but many of the Latins too. Although “he shall comfort us from our labors” and “he shall make us to rest” seem to have the same sense; for it is a great consolation to the laboring to rest from their labors.

§5 (continued from p. 143): the name Noah (Noach) means ‘rest’; the Septuagint, Eugubinus, and Jerome on its derivation. Margins: Augustine; Eugubinus; Jerome.

Chrysostom indeed, explaining the aforesaid words of Lamech: “Among us,” he says, “the name Noah, if one interpret it, means ‘rest’; and he calls ‘rest’ that general destruction which was to come after many years, just as Job too said, ‘Death is rest for a man’; for wickedness is a very great labor, and so its coming abolition through the Flood he called ‘rest.’ Whence he subjoined: ‘This one shall give us rest from our works,’ that is, ‘He shall make us cease from wickedness,’ and ‘from the works of our hands,’ that is, from our evil works — not that the hands did evil, but because through

their works and evil actions trouble and sadness were increased. And ‘from the earth,’ he says, ‘which the Lord God cursed’: he calls the earth cursed, which is worked and tilled with labor, on account of Adam’s transgression. Hence observe, beloved, how that little boy, gradually growing, was to all who saw him an occasion of learning; for as soon as anyone asked the boy’s name, from the interpretation of the word he learned that a general destruction would come. If someone, breathed upon by the divine Spirit, had simply said this would come to pass, it would at once have been given over to oblivion, and the gravity of the punishment would not have been fully known; but because that boy was before the eyes of all, in season and out of season he represented the divine indignation.” Thus Chrysostom, having carefully interpreted those words of Lamech according to the translation of the Septuagint.

§6: Chrysostom’s reading of Lamech’s words — the ‘rest’ is the Flood’s abolition of wickedness. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 21 on Genesis.

That phrase ‘from the works,’ Chrysostom and Hugh interpreted (with Jerome also assenting) of evil works and of sins. But more fitting is the interpretation which refers it to the laborious and troublesome works of men in tilling the earth. For, as if explaining what those works were, he added, ‘from the labors of our hands in the earth’; for which the Septuagint rendered ‘from the sorrows of our hands,’ others ‘from the troubles,’ others ‘from the pains,’ the Latin translator ‘from the labors.’ In Hebrew Hitsebon, having its origin from the verb Hatsab, properly means to press, compress, to be straitened; whence an idol is called…

§7 (continues on p. 145): ‘from the works’ — better referred to laborious toil in tilling the earth; the Hebrew Hitsebon. Margins: Hugh of St. Victor, Annotations on Genesis; Jerome, Hebrew Traditions; Hugh.

— p. 145 (PDF) · printed p. 76 —

…hetseb, because the material from which an idol is fashioned by the craftsman is pressed with the hands. Here, then, it signifies the labor,

distress, and oppression with which men before the age of Noah were afflicted in the cultivation of the earth. And that phrase, ‘In the earth which the Lord cursed,’ looks to what Moses had narrated in the third chapter that God said to Adam: ‘Cursed is the earth in thy work; in labors shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; in the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat thy bread.’ The earth, then, is called cursed because, though tilled by man with much and constant labor, it rendered him fruit neither abundant, nor perpetual, nor of the best.

§7 (continued from p. 144): the Hebrew hetseb (idol), and ‘the earth which the Lord cursed’ (Gen. 3).

But someone may ask how, or by what means, Noah consoled men, or made them to rest, as his father Lamech had foretold by a prophetic inspiration. Saint Jerome: “Because,” he says, “under Noah all the works before him rested through the Flood, for this reason he was called Noah, that is, Rest.” I do not know of what works done before him Jerome speaks, unless perhaps of the evil works and sins of men, according to the interpretation of Chrysostom and Hugh set down above. Hugh says that Noah consoled men in this, that through him and by him the seedbed of the human race and of the animals was preserved in the ark, lest all things should wholly perish in the Flood.

§8: how Noah brought ‘rest’ to men — Jerome and Hugh. Margins: ‘How Noah brought rest and consolation to men’; Jerome, Hebrew Traditions; Hugh.

Quite probable is that interpretation of Rabbi Solomon and the Hebrews: that Noah was called the author of men’s rest and consolation because he first invented the principal rustic implements for carrying on and practicing agriculture; whence below, in the ninth chapter, Noah is called a husbandman. And in particular he is said to have devised the ploughshare and the plough, and that oxen, yoked beneath and dragging the plough, should cut the earth, whereas before men did this with their own hands. Great, then, was the consolation and rest of men, the labors of agriculture being for the most part transferred from men to the beasts. To others it is

most pleasing that Noah consoled the men of his time chiefly in this, that he discovered the use of wine; for wine gladdens the heart of men and mitigates the harshness of labors, by restoring and strengthening the powers and cheering the spirit.

§9: the Hebrews' reading — Noah as inventor of farming implements (and of wine). Margin: the interpretation of Rabbi Solomon and the Hebrews.

Nor are there lacking those who believe that Lamech, by a prophetic spirit, foresaw that God, on account of Noah's extraordinary piety and justice, would bless the earth — that is, that it would come to pass that the earth would henceforth be tilled by man with less labor and a more joyful yield. I will not be silent that there have been some who supposed that Lamech foresaw that to his son Noah, after the Flood, the use of flesh-food would be granted by God, to be a great aid and solace to mortals for the firmness of health and strength and for the preservation and propagation of human life. Therefore Noah, when he was newly born and could not yet, by reason of his tender age, give any hope of his singular character, was called by his parent by that most august name Noach, that is, 'Rest' or 'Consolation'; which name promised a new and more joyful face of the world, the malignity of the earth being somewhat mitigated — that earth which, afflicted by the divine curse, had to a great degree frustrated the labors of mortals. And indeed the augury the outcome beautifully con-…

§10 (continues on p. 146): Lamech may have foreseen God's blessing of the earth, or the post-Flood grant of flesh-food; the augury of the joyful name.

— p. 146 (PDF) · printed p. 77 —

…firmed it, when after the Flood God, restoring the world, promised that he would no more curse the earth for man's sake, but that there would be henceforth preserved a perpetual and inviolate alternation and order of the four seasons of the year. Indeed, blessing Noah himself and his sons, he bade them increase by begetting offspring, and again imposed a new bridle of his word upon the wildness of the animals. Finally, after the sin of

Adam, by a new covenant, as one now more appeased, he first bound himself to the human race.

§10 (continued from p. 145): the outcome confirmed it — God's post-Flood covenant and blessing. Margin: Gen. 9.

Although I, for my part, think that this so joyful name of Noah looked even further, and that it set before the minds of the pious even then the hope chiefly of that consolation or rest by which it would come to pass that, in Christ — who was to reconcile the human race to the angry Father — man would at length plainly find rest, and not faint in despair of the felicity lost in Paradise. In express words Rupert explained this very thing in the fourth book of the Commentaries on Genesis, ch. 16 and 17, writing in this manner: "Noah signified the Mediator of God and men both by his name and by his deed. By his name, namely, because the name itself, which is Noah, is interpreted 'rest'; and our rest is truly he who says, 'Take my yoke upon you, learn of me, for I am meek and humble of heart, and you shall find rest for your souls.' But how he signified Christ by his deed must be more fully told hereafter. Therefore not without a divine presage did his father call him Noah, saying: 'This one shall comfort us,' or 'shall make us to rest, from our works in the earth which the Lord cursed.' And what is the rest or consolation with which this true Noah, namely the Son of God, consoles us, but the remission of sins which he bestows on us in his baptism, after the likeness of him who by his faith preserved with him in that Flood a few souls? For that the Flood was a figure of baptism, the Apostle Peter too testifies, when he says: 'Who had once been incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noah, when the ark was being built, in which a few, that is eight souls, were saved by water; whereunto baptism, being of the like form, now also saves us,' and the rest. And so, the Flood, baptism; those who perished in the Flood prefigured our sins, which are blotted out in Baptism. And in this way the prophecy is mystically fulfilled, of him who says: 'This one shall comfort us,' or 'shall make us to rest from our works.' There was one Noah, and in that one was

the seed saved for the recovery of the world; because, namely, there is one Christ, in whom is our salvation, and ‘There is salvation in no other, for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved.’” One may also read what Ambrose wrote about the mystical interpretation of the same name in the book On the Ark and Noah. These things, then, about the word Noah, I have indicated could be said here briefly and not unaptly, thinking they would not be unpleasant to the reader.

§11: the name pointed further — to the rest found in Christ; Rupert’s mystical reading (the Flood as a figure of baptism). Margins: 1 Pet. 3; Acts 4; Ambrose.

There follows: “He found grace before the Lord.” For the condemnation of the rest (Ambrose says) and for the expression of the divine tenderness, Noah is said to have found grace with God. At the same time it is shown that the offense of others does not overshadow a just man, when he himself is reserved as the seedbed of the whole race…

§12 (continues on p. 147): ‘he found grace before the Lord’ — Ambrose: said for the condemnation of the rest and the expression of God’s tenderness.

— p. 147 (PDF) · printed p. 78 —

…‘To find grace before God,’ or ‘with God,’ or ‘in the eyes,’ or ‘in the sight of God,’ is a Hebraism signifying to please and be acceptable to God. For the word ‘grace,’ in Hebrew is the word Chen, signifying not only grace but also mercy, just as the verb Chanan means ‘to have mercy.’ And thus the sense will be: that, while all the others were perishing in the Flood, Noah alone found mercy with God, that he might escape the destruction of the Flood, and be the preserver not only of his own life and safety, but of the whole race of men and animals.

§12 (continued from p. 146): the Hebrew Chen (grace/mercy); Noah alone found mercy to escape the Flood.

And rightly it is said (as Cajetan noted) that Noah found grace with God, but not justice; nor in the eyes of Elohim, that is, of God the judge, but in the eyes of Jehovah, that is, of God the fount of being: for it was of grace that the being of man and of the rest of the animals should be saved through Noah. Weigh the progress of the divine kindness: at the first turn he gave a space for repenting; but at the second turn he took Noah into his grace, that in him the human race might be saved. And by saying ‘he found,’ the zeal of Noah in seeking the divine grace is commended. But for what did Noah find the grace of God? For the escape from the Flood, for the preservation of the race of men and animals, and that he might present a signal and illustrious image of Christ and the Church.

§13: Cajetan — Noah found grace, not justice; in the eyes of Jehovah (the fount of being), not Elohim (the judge); the progress of God’s kindness. Margin: Cajetan on Genesis.

But by what things did he find grace with God? Moses indicated it, subjoining that Noah was just and perfect in his generations and walked with God. And he is pointedly said to have found grace before God, and not before men (as Chrysostom well weighed this): namely, that toward that one eye of God, which never sleeps, which sees all things, to have pleased which is the highest grace and felicity, Noah always directed himself and all his affairs to be regarded; but men’s favor or contempt or hatred or goodwill he valued at little. For it is likely that, since he alone, against the custom of all, cultivated virtue, and indeed reproved their crimes with great freedom and constancy, he was jeered at by them, mocked, and incurred their offense, hatred, and indignation. The sense, therefore, is: although Noah was disagreeable, burdensome, and odious to the men of his time, because he would not enter upon that way on which they were set, yet to God, who searches hearts, he was most pleasing and most dear. And what harm could the alienation of men from him do him, when he himself was in the grace of God, and had God not only propitious to him, but even a friend and intimate?

§14: by what Noah found grace — before God, not before men (Chrysostom); the world mocked the lone righteous man. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 23 on Genesis.

Verses 9 & 10. These are the generations of Noah. Noah was a just and perfect man in his generations; he walked with God.

Genesis 6:9–10 (Vulgate lemma).

The word ‘generations’ seems here to signify the genealogy of Noah — not passively, that is, in respect of the forefathers from whom Noah drew his lineage, but actively, that is, in respect of his descend-…

§15 (continues on p. 148): ‘generations’ here means Noah’s genealogy taken actively (his descendants).

— p. 148 (PDF) · printed p. 79 —

…ants and the sons of Noah; for there follows: ‘And he begot three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.’ The sense, then, is: This is the progeny and offspring of Noah, which was preserved together with him from the destruction of the Flood. The generations of Noah are mentioned by Moses three times: first, in the closing words of the fifth chapter, because in them the progress of the first age of the world was bounded and ended (for beyond the generation of Noah’s sons there was no other generation in the direct line until after the Flood); in the second place, the generations of Noah are named here, to signify which men were to be preserved from the Flood; in the third place, they are named after the Flood, inasmuch as they were to be spread out and multiplied into every race of men, and for this reason they are named below, in ch. 9 and 10. There are some who interpret that phrase, ‘These are the generations of Noah,’ thus: ‘These are the things that happened in the times of Noah,’ or, ‘this is the history of the things that befell Noah.’

§15 (continued from p. 147): Noah’s ‘generations’ named three times in Scripture; alternative reading (‘the history of what befell Noah’). Margin: ‘The generations of Noah are narrated three times.’

But because Moses, after he had said ‘These are the generations of Noah,’ did not next append his carnal progeny, but his virtues, saying that he was just and perfect and walked with God, Chrysostom therefore hands down that a man’s chief nobility and the splendor of his genealogy ought to be regarded and esteemed not from the glory of his forefathers or descendants, but from the excellence of his virtues. Hear Chrysostom: “This is a rare and unusual manner of genealogy; for, as Scripture said, ‘These are the generations of Noah,’ and filled our ears with a certain expectation, as though about to narrate his genealogy — and who his father was, and whence he drew his lineage, and how he was brought into this life, and the other things which it is the custom for those narrating genealogies to recount — yet, leaving all those things aside, even the former custom, it says, ‘Noah, a just and perfect man in his generation, pleased God.’ Have you seen an admirable genealogy? Let us too, then, follow the rules of divine Scripture, and of those whose genealogy we relate let us not bring forward into the midst the fathers and grandfathers and great-grandfathers, but set forth their virtues and good deeds. This is the best manner of genealogy. For what profit is it to draw one’s origin from illustrious and upright parents, if you are devoid of a good life and of virtues? Or what harm would it be if your parents and forefathers were ignoble and obscure, but you yourself flourish in virtues? For such was Noah; for Scripture does not record his parents as noble in virtue. Yet he won for himself the grace of God, and although he had many obstacles and impediments to doing well, he nevertheless reached the highest summit of virtue and perfection.” Thus Chrysostom.

§16 (continues on p. 149): why Moses follows ‘generations’ with virtues, not lineage — Chrysostom on true nobility. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 23 on Genesis.

Ambrose chimes in with things like Chrysostom’s. Noah (he says) is praised not by the nobility of his lineage, but by the merit of his justice and perfection. For the lineage of an approved man is the offspring of virtue; because, as the race of men are men, so the race of souls are virtues. For

families of men are ennobled by the splendor of their lineage; but of souls, the grace is made illustrious by the splendor of virtues. Thus Ambrose. Yet it must not be denied that, when Moses said ‘These are the generations of Noah,’ he did not mean to designate Noah’s carnal progeny; for a little below he subjoined the generation of his three sons. But that he interposed the virtues of Noah came about so that he might indicate of what sort and how great a man he was describing the generation: namely, by whose merit not only he himself, but his whole progeny — that is, the seedbed of the human race —…

§17 (continues on p. 149): Ambrose to the same effect — Noah praised by his justice, not his lineage. Margin: Ambrose, On the Ark of Noah, ch. 4.

— p. 149 (PDF) · printed p. 80 —

…escaped the calamity of the Flood.

§17 (continued from p. 148): the close of the sentence.

But let us see of what sort this encomium of Noah is, by which Moses proclaimed him as a man just and perfect and walking with God. Certainly to none of the earlier patriarchs — not to Seth, not to Enos, not even to Henoch himself — was so extraordinary and illustrious a commendation given by Moses. Chrysostom, treating this encomium of Noah with a brilliant interpretation: “Behold,” he says, “another very great kind of commendation: Noah is called ‘just,’ which appellation embraces every virtue; for this name ‘just’ we are wont to apply to those who exercise virtue of every kind. Then, that you may learn how he reached the highest summit — that which was then required of our nature — he says, ‘Just, being perfect in his generation.’ He fulfilled, he says, all the things which it befits him to do who embraces virtue. For this is the perfect man; for he omitted nothing, he halted in nothing; he did not do well in this and sin in that, but was perfect in every virtue in which it befitted him then to be strong. Moreover, that he might also from the time and from the comparison with others present the just man to us more illustriously, he

says, ‘Perfect in his generation’ — in that time, in that perverse generation which so declined into evil that it would not bear even a trace of virtue. In that generation, then, in those times, that just man not only displayed virtue, but reached so high a peak of virtue that he was perfect and complete in all things. And what I said before, that to do well among the enemies of virtue and among those who hinder virtue always bears witness to a greater weight of virtue — whence by this reasoning that just man gained greater praises. Nor here does divine Scripture make an end of praising him, but still demonstrates the excellence of his virtue, and that he was approved by the divine reckoning; for after it said ‘Perfect in his generation,’ it adds that Noah pleased God. So great was the glory of his virtue that he deserved to be praised even by God. For ‘Noah pleased God,’ it says, that you may know that he was approved by God; he pleased that eye which cannot be deceived, and won for himself so great a favor of his by the good works of his life that He not only freed him from the indignation to be poured out on all, but also made him to preside over others.” Thus Chrysostom.

§18: the praise of Noah examined — Chrysostom on ‘just,’ ‘perfect in his generation,’ and ‘pleased God.’ Margin: Chrysostom, homily 23 on Genesis.

It is the same, then, according to Chrysostom, to be named ‘just’ and to be called furnished and adorned with all the virtues. And he is ‘perfect’ who fulfills all the offices of the virtues abundantly, and fails in nothing at any time. And ‘to walk with God,’ or ‘before God,’ is to please God and to be approved and praised by his testimony. Cajetan says that Noah is here described as endowed with two general virtues: one relative to the good, when he is called ‘just’; the other relative to the evil, when he is called ‘perfect.’ For justice renders to each his own; but perfection signifies that nothing of the things required is lacking, and excludes every defect. Tostatus, however, thinks that Noah was called ‘just’ because he did not depart from the precepts of the natural law and from the holy institutions of the ancient Patriarchs, who had instituted certain rites and ceremonies

pertaining to the external worship of God. We say briefly that justice is the virtue which renders to each his own. The just man, therefore,…

§19 (continues on p. 150): what it is for Noah to be ‘just’ — Cajetan and Tostatus; justice renders to each his own. Margins: Cajetan on Genesis; Tostatus, q. 14 on Genesis 6.

— p. 150 (PDF) · printed p. 81 —

…is he who renders what he owes, and as he owes, and when he owes, to God, to his neighbor, and to himself: to God, faith, hope, charity, obedience, and worship and reverence both inward and outward; to himself, continence and the subjection of his passions under the judgment and command of reason; to his neighbor, love, equity, mercy. Since, therefore, Noah excelled in this threefold kind of duties in his time, he is rightly named ‘just.’

§19 (continued from p. 149): the just man renders to God, neighbor, and self what is due.

For the word ‘perfect,’ in Hebrew is the term tamim, which means ‘whole and perfect,’ from the verb tamam, which means to perfect, complete, and finish. And he is called a ‘perfect man’ who is commonly called a ‘complete man’ (huomo compito) — in whom, namely, you could desire nothing that pertains to the offices of the virtues; who not only fulfills the things that are due, but also pursues the things that are of supererogation, and who follows and cultivates the virtues not in a common or moderate manner, but according to the highest degree and, as it is said, the heroic.

§20: the Hebrew tamim (‘perfect, whole’); the ‘complete man’ who follows virtue heroically.

And that phrase ‘In his generations’ is variously expounded. First, it is said thus according to Jerome, that it may be shown that Noah is called ‘just’ not according to consummate justice (which is simply called justice), but according to the justice of his generation — that of which, namely, the condition of human nature is capable, or which was required of the men of that time. Augustine, in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 26, refers that phrase ‘In his generation’ to the present life: “Noah,” he says, “is called

just in his generation — not, indeed, as the citizens of the city of God are to be perfected in that immortality in which they will be made equal to the angels of God, but as they can be perfect in this pilgrimage." Chrysostom interprets 'In his generation' as 'Among the men of his own age,' so that this may profit much for the praise of Noah, that, although he lived among impious and wicked men, he himself was nevertheless most religious and lived blamelessly. Cajetan, by 'In his generation,' understands and expounds the progeny and sons of Noah, so that it may be signified that not only was Noah good and just, but that his whole family and progeny were so uprightly instructed by him that it too pursued piety and justice — although after the Flood one of his sons, Ham, was insolent toward his father and worthless and reprobate. Lyra and Tostatus say that 'In his generation' can be taken two ways: in one way, so that it makes for a certain diminution of Noah's praise, so that the sense is, 'Although Noah was just and perfect in comparison with the men of his own age, yet in comparison with the later patriarchs, such as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had he lived in those times, the fame of his justice and sanctity would have been dimmer and less'; in the other way, it can be expounded so that it pertains to the amplification of Noah's praise, so that it is signified that Noah, in his generation — that is, in comparison with all his forefathers who had been from Seth down to himself — was in justice and perfection of virtue the most excellent of all, so that he surpassed in the summit of virtues not only Seth and Enos, but even Henoch himself.

§21: 'in his generations' expounded four ways — Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Cajetan, and Lyra/Tostatus. Margins: Jerome, Hebrew Traditions; Augustine (City of God 15.26); Chrysostom, homily 23 on Genesis; Cajetan; Lyra; Tostatus.

— p. 151 (PDF) · printed p. 82 —

There follows: 'He walked with God.' The same Moses said above, in the fifth chapter, of Henoch, writing that he walked with God. The same too is written below, in chapter 17, of Abraham, to whom the Lord said, 'Walk before me and be perfect.' Now 'to walk with God' and 'before God' is a

Hebraism, which the Doctors interpret variously, but to nearly the same sense. The Septuagint translators, both here and in the fifth chapter, rendered ‘He pleased God’; which Chrysostom expounds: to be commended by the divine reckoning, suffrage, and testimony, and to please the divine eye which sees all things and cannot be deceived, and so to have won for himself the favor of God that he not only freed himself from the indignation to be poured out on all, but also preserved with himself the seed of the human race. The Chaldee paraphrase expressed this Hebraism thus: ‘In the fear of the Lord Noah walked.’ Jerome expounds: ‘He followed the footsteps of God.’ Cajetan: ‘He walked — that is, advanced — according to the form of divine justice and divine law,’ so that hence it might be manifest of what sort the justice and perfection of Noah was, namely according to the divine law. Others thus: ‘He led a divine life, feared God, and never failed him’; or, ‘in all things he considered what God willed or what he required of him, and conformed himself plainly to every will of God’; or, ‘he always beheld God as it were present to himself, wherefore he always went about most cautious, most modest, and most devout’; or, ‘he was always ready, prompt, and intent on carrying out all God’s commands and biddings promptly and eagerly, as ministers and servants are wont to be in the sight of their masters.’

§22: ‘he walked with God’ — the same said of Henoch and Abraham; the various expositions. Margins: ‘What it is to walk with God and before God’; Chrysostom, homily 23 on Genesis; the Chaldee paraphrase; Jerome, Hebrew Traditions.

SECOND DISPUTATION. Whether Noah, or any other mortal living on earth, could truly be called perfect.

Heading of the Second Disputation of Book IX.

But this is not without difficulty: how Noah was truly called perfect, since that word seems unable to fit any mortal while he lives on earth. For the perfect is that to which nothing is lacking of the things that pertain to its integrity and completion; but the grace and virtue of any man in this life is

always imperfect, increasing and advancing day by day, and not receiving its final complement and perfection until after death in heaven — for there alone is grace consummate, to which no addition can be made. And what of the fact that the final perfection cannot occur except by those who have attained their ultimate end? But the end of man is beatitude; as, therefore, no one is blessed on earth, so neither is anyone perfect. Indeed, this too increases the difficulty: that not only are some called perfect in the sacred writings, but God even bids man to be perfect; for he said to Abraham, ‘Walk before me and be perfect.’

§23 (continues on p. 152): the difficulty — ‘perfect’ seems to fit no mortal; God yet commands perfection. Margins: ‘How Noah was truly called perfect, since the perfect is defined as that to which nothing is lacking’; Gen. 17.

— p. 152 (PDF) · printed p. 83 —

…and our Lord, ‘Be ye perfect, as also your heavenly Father is perfect.’ But since God commands man nothing impossible, and to be perfect is impossible in this life, it may seem strange how God commands this to man. Add that the blessed Paul — inferior to Noah neither in the grace of God nor in the excellence of any virtue — denied that he himself was perfect, writing thus to the Philippians in the third chapter: “Not,” he says, “as though I had already attained, or were already perfect; but I follow after, if I may by any means lay hold, wherein I am also laid hold of by Christ Jesus. Brethren, I count not myself to have laid hold. But one thing — forgetting the things that are behind, and stretching forth myself to those that are before — I press toward the mark, to the prize of the supernal vocation of God in Christ Jesus.”

§23 (continued from p. 151): Christ too commands perfection; yet Paul denied he was perfect. Margin: Matt. 5.

The blessed Augustine, in the book On the Perfection of Justice against Caelestius, resolves this difficulty — and not only this, but that other too: how some are called in the sacred writings immaculate, innocent,

irreproachable, and without sin, when elsewhere Scripture teaches that no one lives without sin; for it is written in the book of Ecclesiastes, ch. 7, ‘There is not a just man on earth who does good and does not sin’; and John said, ‘If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us’; and the Lord taught his Apostles to pray, saying, ‘Forgive us our sins.’ Teaching, then, how these are to be understood, Augustine writes thus: “Of these testimonies of Scripture, some exhort those running to run perfectly; some recall the very goal to which one tends by running. And not absurdly is he too said to walk without spot — not he who is already perfect, but he who runs irreproachably toward perfection itself, lacking damnable crimes and not neglecting to cleanse even venial sins by almsgiving. For this our journey, by which we tend toward perfection, a clean prayer cleanses; and that is a clean prayer in which it is truly said, ‘Forgive us our debts’ — so that, while what is not imputed is reproved, our course toward perfection may be held without reproach, that is, without spot; in which perfection, when we have reached it, there may be nothing at all that needs to be cleansed by pardon.” Thus the blessed Augustine.

§24: Augustine resolves the difficulty — to walk ‘without spot’ is not yet to be perfect, but to run blamelessly toward perfection. Margins: Augustine; Eccles. 7; 1 John 1; Luke 11; Matt. 6.

Therefore the ‘perfect,’ on Augustine’s authority, are called not those who already have perfection, but those who run perfectly toward attaining it. And perfection is commanded to man, not because he can have it in this life, but that, by looking to it and desiring it, he may run perfectly toward its attainment. For Augustine himself, a little before the words I have set down, says thus: “Why should not perfection be commanded to man, although in this life no one has it? For one does not run rightly if it is not known whither one must run; and how would it be known if it were shown by no precepts? So, then, let us run that we may lay hold. For all who run perfectly lay hold — not as in a theatrical contest, where all indeed run but one receives the palm. Let us run by believing, hoping, desiring; let us run

by chastising the body, and by doing alms in giving goods and in pardoning evils cheerfully from the heart, and by praying that the strength of those who run may be aided; and so let us hear the precepts of perfection that we neglect not to run to the fullness of charity.” Thus far Augustine.

§25: hence the ‘perfect’ are those who run perfectly toward perfection; why God commands what none can fully have here. Margins: Augustine.

— p. 153 (PDF) · printed p. 84 —

But let us, briefly and distinctly (namely, in the scholastic manner), untangle the proposed question. In five ways some can be called ‘perfect,’ even in this life, although they are not in every way and altogether perfect. In the first way, some are called perfect by comparison with others who are imperfect: for in the warfare of Christ some are, as it were, recruits and novice soldiers, but others are like veterans; the former are named imperfect in the way of the Lord, the latter perfect. Whence three grades of the followers of Christian discipline are distinguished: one of Beginners, another of Proficients, the third of the Perfect. Indeed the blessed Paul recognized among the followers of Christ some as perfect, but others as imperfect, and that these latter needed milk like infants, but the former are nourished with solid food, as those who have their senses exercised for the discernment of good and evil; and among these Paul spoke wisdom. “Whereas you ought to be masters for the time,” says Paul, writing to the Hebrews in the fifth chapter, “you have again need to be taught what are the elements of the beginning of the words of God; and you are become such as have need of milk, not of solid food. For everyone who is a partaker of milk is unskilled in the word of justice, for he is a little child; but solid food is for the perfect, for those who by custom have their senses exercised for the discernment of good and evil.”

§26: a scholastic resolution — five ways one may be called ‘perfect’ in this life. The first: by comparison with the imperfect (beginners, proficients, the perfect). Margins: ‘Five ways some are called perfect even in this life’; ‘The three grades of the followers of Christian discipline’; 1 Cor. 2.

In the second way, some are called perfect, not absolutely, but only with that perfection which is required in this life and of which this life is capable — not that which after this life will be in heaven, complete in every respect. And the perfection of this life consists chiefly in this: that one run perfectly toward attaining that heavenly perfection. And to run perfectly in the way of the Lord is not only not to go backward or to stand still, but not even to advance slowly and slackly, but to hasten thither with the greatest possible exertion. Wherefore Paul, writing to the Philippians in the third chapter, after he had said that he was not perfect, subjoins: ‘As many of us, therefore, as are perfect, let us be thus minded.’ He had first said that he was not perfect, and soon named not only himself but others too ‘perfect.’ But that phrase ‘As many of us as are perfect’ means the same (as the blessed Augustine, in the book On the Perfection of Justice against Caelestius, interprets) as ‘As many as run perfectly, let us be thus minded’ — namely, that we are not yet perfect, that we may there be perfected whither we are still running perfectly. The perfection of this life, then, consists in this: that we ever more and more advance in the pursuit of the virtues, and that ‘He who is just, let him be justified still’; for, as it is written in Proverbs 4, ‘The path of the just, like a shining light, goes forward and grows even to the perfect day.’

§27: the second way — perfect not absolutely, but with the perfection this life admits (running perfectly toward heavenly perfection). Margins: Augustine; Apoc. (last ch.).

In the third way, some are called perfect not so much in themselves as by reason of the state in which they are — just as Christians are called perfect in comparison with the Jews, because the state of Christianity is perfect, but that of Judaism was imperfect; and in this way too the Religious are named perfect in comparison with seculars. In the fourth way, some are called perfect because they pursue virtue not in any manner whatever, but perfectly — not moderately and commonly, but eminently, with a singular…

§28 (continues on p. 154): the third and fourth ways — perfect by the state one is in (Christians vs. Jews; religious vs. seculars), and by pursuing virtue eminently; sentence breaks off.

— p. 154 (PDF) · printed p. 85 —

…with a singular [zeal], with all earnestness, and with the greatest possible care and diligence, desire and pursue the highest degree of virtue, and embrace a certain heroic excellence of each virtue. In the fifth way, those are called perfect for whom it is not enough to keep the precepts of God, but who besides cultivate the evangelical counsels of Christ. These are they who have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven; who sold all that they had and gave to the poor, that they might follow Christ more unencumbered and more eagerly; who handed over and dedicated themselves wholly, for Christ's sake, to the will and judgment of other men, that those might order, rule, and govern all the affairs of their life; and, finally, who denied themselves and, taking up their cross, followed Christ. But having briefly disputed these things about the perfection of man in this life, let us return to Noah.

§28 (continued from p. 153): the fourth way (pursuing virtue eminently) and the fifth (the perfect who keep the evangelical counsels). Margins: Matt. 19; Matt. 16.

Besides this encomium of Noah, here comprised by Moses in a few words, there exist in other places of the sacred writings most copious testimonies and commendations of that man's excellence. In Ezekiel, chapter 14, the Lord said this: 'If these three men be in the midst of this people, Noah, Daniel, and Job, they shall deliver their own souls by their justice; but their sons and daughters they shall not deliver, but the land shall be made desolate.' By these words God at once magnifies the inexpiable impiety of the Jews and the singular sanctity and grace by which Noah had great power with God. For this is the sense of those words: 'So great is the gravity and bitterness of the impiety and crimes of the Jews, and I am so hostile and angry with them, that if Noah — otherwise a man most gracious in my sight — had a son among this people, and besought me on his behalf, I would nevertheless not hear him.' And why those three men in particular

are named, Jerome declares on that passage of Ezekiel, and Augustine on Psalm 132 and in book 2 of the Questions on the Gospels, q. 44.

§29: other scriptural praises of Noah — Ezekiel 14 (Noah, Daniel, Job). Margins: 'The praises of Noah from other places of Scripture'; Ezekiel 14; Jerome; Augustine.

To the same Noah this encomium is given in the book of Ecclesiasticus, chapter 44: 'Noah was found perfect, just, and in the time of wrath he was made a reconciliation; therefore was a remnant left to the earth when the Flood came; the covenants of the age were placed with him, that all flesh might not be destroyed by the Flood.' These words must be expounded in passing. When it is said 'Noah, perfect, just,' allusion is made to what Moses wrote of him in Genesis 6, 'Noah found grace before the Lord, and was just and perfect in his generations, he walked with God.' Nor is that phrase 'was found perfect' without emphasis; for it signifies that he alone, and he only, among all the men of his time was just — as if God, seeking in that whole race of men someone who was just, found no other but the one Noah, as he himself said to him: 'Thee I have seen just before me in this generation.' And what follows, 'In the time of wrath (or, as it is in Greek, org■s) he was made a reconciliation,' signifies this: that, when God was so angry with the men of that time that he wished to destroy the whole race of men, Noah, by his justice and innocence, obtained from God that he himself, with a few, escaping the calamity of the Flood…

§30 (continues on p. 155): the praise in Ecclesiasticus 44 ('Noah was found perfect, just; in the time of wrath he was made a reconciliation'). Margins: Ecclesiasticus 44; Gen. 7 ('Thee I have seen just').

— p. 155 (PDF) · printed p. 86 —

…might preserve the seedbed of the human race. For that word 'reconciliation,' in Greek it is allagma, signifying the price by which something is bought or redeemed, so that Noah, by his sanctity and innocence, as it were by a certain price, redeemed the race of men from destruction before God. Whence it is subjoined, 'Therefore was a remnant left to the earth,' that is: on account of Noah, who found grace with God,

there were left in the world some remnants of the human race, through whom the race of men might again, after the Flood, be repaired. For that ‘remnant’ is put substantively for ‘a remainder,’ and that ‘to the earth’ is in the dative case, so that the sense is: ‘Therefore’ — that is, on account of Noah, who was made a reconciliation — ‘a remnant was left to the earth,’ that is, ‘Some remnants of men were left on the earth.’ And in the words that follow, ‘The covenants of the age were placed with him,’ the word ‘covenants’ signifies a treaty and pact, and is put in the plural for the singular; and that ‘of the age’ is put for the adjective ‘age-long,’ that is, eternal and to endure for every age. And by these words allusion is made to what is narrated in the eighth chapter of Genesis: that Noah, the Flood being over, having gone out of the ark, built an altar to the Lord and offered upon it holocausts, which God is said to have smelled in an odor of sweetness — that is, they were so acceptable to him that he promised he would never more curse the earth for man’s sake. And he confirmed that promise by a pact, adding the sign of that pact — namely, the heavenly bow, which, appearing in the clouds (whence the danger of a flood might seem to threaten), would make men more certain of the divine promise and covenant.

§30 (continued from p. 154): ‘reconciliation’ (Greek allagma, a ransom-price); the ‘covenants of the age’ = God’s post-Flood pact (the rainbow). Margin: Gen. 9.

There is a magnificent praise too of Noah which the blessed Paul attributes to him in chapter 11 of the Epistle to the Hebrews, writing of him thus: ‘By faith Noah, having received an answer concerning those things which as yet were not seen, fearing, framed the ark for the saving of his house, by which he condemned the world, and was instituted heir of the justice which is by faith.’ The interpretation of these words must be touched on, as it were, in passing. Noah, then, says Paul — when there was no sign of the coming Flood, nor could it be foreboded by any conjecture or suspicion that it would come, and when all the men of his time indulged in pleasures and delights — believed, without any doubt, God announcing that the

Flood would come, and built the ark at God's command, by which he saved himself and his family from that destruction of the Flood. 'By which,' says Paul, 'he condemned the world.' And indeed that 'by which,' if it be referred to the faith of Noah, signifies that the unbelief of those men was condemned by comparison with the faith of Noah, since, while the rest remained unbelieving and perishing, he alone believed and escaped. But if that 'by which' be referred to the ark, this will be the sense of those words: by the ark built by himself Noah condemned the world, because they, seeing an upright man and worshiper of God building an ark against the imminent Flood, did not even so believe, and were therefore condemned by the ark; for unless Noah had built the ark, they would not have been guilty of the Flood heard of and not believed.

§31: the praise of Noah in Hebrews 11 — 'by faith… he condemned the world.' Margin: Paul, Hebrews 11.

But what is subjoined, 'And was instituted heir of the justice which is by faith,' Theophylact expounds thus…

§32 (continues on p. 156): 'heir of the justice which is by faith' — Theophylact's reading. Margin: Theophylact on Hebrews 11.

— p. 156 (PDF) · printed p. 87 —

…Noah gained, or obtained, that he should seem just before God, because faith bestowed on him the name and praise of justice; as if to say, Noah, by believing God's oracle, gained this, that by God's testimony he was called just. But to me a more fitting explanation of those words seems to be that which is in Cajetan's commentary on that passage. For because, while all the rest were perishing in the Flood, Noah alone, because he was just, was saved with his own, he is aptly said by Paul to have been heir of justice — namely, of his forefathers and of the ancient fathers, whose justice, as if hereditary, came down to the one Noah and was preserved with him.

§32 (continued from p. 155): Cajetan's preferred reading — Noah heir of his forefathers' justice. Margin: Cajetan on Paul.

Not to be passed over is the commendation of the same Noah handed down by the blessed Peter in the second chapter of his latter Epistle — small indeed in words, but in sense most ample. For he says thus: ‘And the original world he spared not, but preserved Noah the eighth, a herald of justice, bringing in the Flood upon the world of the impious.’ Peter calls ‘the original world’ the men who lived before the Flood, because that was, as it were, the first age and childhood of the world, near to the origin and the beginnings of the world. And Noah is called ‘the eighth,’ not from Adam (for from him he was the tenth), but among those who were saved from the Flood by the ark; for the others were seven, and he himself the eighth. And why Peter named Noah ‘a herald of justice,’ we expounded above in the Preface of this book.

§33: the praise in 2 Peter 2 (Noah the ‘eighth, a herald of justice’); ‘the original world.’ Margins: 2 Peter 2; ‘the original world.’

But let us conclude the praise of Noah by adding what Josephus sets forth about him in the first book of the Antiquities; for, when he had recalled the wickedness of the men of that time, he subjoined this about Noah: ‘But Noah, bearing their deeds with grief and indignation, urged them to change their wills and works for the better. But when he saw that they did not obey him and were wholly succumbing to the sweetness of vices, fearing lest they should kill him and his family, withdrawing with his own he migrated into another region. Then God, delighted with the man’s justice, did not condemn the men of his age alone for their extreme malice, but, having decreed to extinguish the whole human race and to establish another new one and pure from vices, abolished by the Flood that whole [race] of men; but Noah alone was saved, taught by a divine oracle the way and the manner of escaping.’

§34: Josephus’s account — Noah, unable to reform his contemporaries, withdrew; God saved him alone. Margin: Josephus.

Verse 10. And he begot three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth.

Genesis 6:10 (Vulgate lemma).

Concerning these words this alone seems here to be noted: because Moses said above, in the last words of the fifth chapter, that Noah was five hundred years old when he begot these three sons, and because after their generation Noah is not read to have begotten any other son in the remaining hundred years up to the Flood, from this the blessed Chrysostom gathers that Noah abstained from marriage until the five-hundredth year of his age and led a celibate life. For if he had married before, he would also before have be-…

§35 (continues on p. 157): Chrysostom infers Noah's celibacy until his 500th year. Margins: 'The admirable continence of Noah'; Chrysostom, homily 24 on Genesis.

— p. 157 (PDF) · printed p. 88 —

…gotten sons. But as he began late to give himself to the begetting of sons, so, as soon as he had begotten them, he left off bestowing care on children for those hundred years that remained up to the Flood. Wherefore Chrysostom greatly marvels and extols with the highest praises so great a continence of that man — especially in that first age of the world, in which age to use marriage and to serve the begetting of sons was reckoned not only honorable and praiseworthy, but nearly necessary; and he could even be incited to it by the example of those who among his forefathers had been most holy and most dear to God, Seth, I mean, and Henoch, since they had wives and begot sons before their hundredth year, or a little more. The continence of Noah is shown to be still more admirable by comparison with the rest of the men of that age, who, the reins of their desires loosed, rushed headlong to every kind of lust and obscenity.

§35 (continued from p. 156): the more admirable for the age in which marriage was thought nearly necessary, and amid universal license.

But let the reader hear Chrysostom; for he, explaining the aforesaid words, 'Noah begot three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth': 'Not without cause,' he says, 'did divine Scripture designate to us both the time and the number of

the sons of this just man; namely, it wished latently to intimate his excellent and manifold virtue. For above, saying that Noah was five hundred years old when he begot these three sons, it taught us sufficiently that the highest magnitude of his continence existed then, when all the men of his time were given to such great intemperance, and all ages rushed to evil with such great wantonness. For you have heard Scripture saying: When the Lord saw that the wickednesses upon the earth were full, and that there was none who did not diligently devise evil in his heart from his youth — where it plainly declares that the young outdid the elder in years, and that the old raged no less than the young, and that even the age inexperienced in evils was inclined to evil with great proneness. That we may therefore learn how, while all the rest displayed so great a madness and frenzy of lust, that just man alone remained, strenuously keeping the virtue of continence until he reached the five-hundredth year, Scripture therefore said that Noah, when he was five hundred years old, begot three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Consider how great a thing of virtue it was, for so great a length of time, to bridle the frenzy of concupiscence and to enter on a way far different from others, and not only to restrain himself from unlawful intercourse, but even from the lawful and blameless.' Thus Chrysostom.

§36: Chrysostom on why Scripture noted Noah's age and the number of his sons.

It was, then, a signal example of the chastity of Noah (on account of which, perhaps, he so greatly pleased God): first, that he began so late to beget, namely when he was five hundred years old; then, that so quickly he left off the use of marriage and the begetting of sons, for he is not read to have begotten more than these three sons. Let the heretic now go and shamelessly cry out that it is impossible for a man to lead a celibate life — as though we had few examples of such continence, not only in the time of the evangelical law, but even in the time of the Mosaic law, indeed even before the law of Moses. Certainly this one example of Noah ought to be enough to convict the shamelessness of those men. For if Noah could live

chastely for five hundred years, why now too, for a hundred years (how great…

§37 (continues on p. 158): the example of Noah's chastity refutes the 'heretic' who calls celibacy impossible. Margin: 'That it is not impossible for a man to lead a celibate life.'

— p. 158 (PDF) · printed p. 89 —

…at most, is the life of man) can someone not live chastely?

§37 (continued from p. 157): the close of the argument.

Although this too could here be said with sufficient probability: that Noah, before the five-hundredth year of his life, both had a wife and begot sons, but that they are nevertheless passed over in silence in the sacred writings because they were all carried off before the Flood by either a natural or a violent death, and that these three alone survived the Flood, and through them the whole race of men was propagated and multiplied. But why, someone will say, is neither Noah himself nor any of his sons recorded to have begotten any son in those hundred years that remained after the generation of those three sons up to the Flood? For my part I think the cause of this is undiscovered by mortals — unless perhaps, as if by divining, it helps to say that it was done by divine counsel, because God knew that, if Noah had begotten more sons, they would, by the example of the rest of men, have been impious and wicked, and on that account would have perished in the Flood, which would surely have been a cause of the greatest grief and sorrow to Noah; or because, with Noah's progeny increasing and multiplying immensely, the throng of men who were to be saved from the Flood by the ark would have been greater than was fitting. But concerning the order of time in which these three sons of Noah were begotten — that is, which was born first, which second or last — it will be disputed in another place.

§38: an alternative — Noah may have had earlier children who perished in the Flood; and why no children were born in the final hundred years.

Verse 11. And the earth was corrupted before God, and filled with iniquity.

Genesis 6:11 (Vulgate lemma).

Explaining these words, Hugh writes in this manner: ‘All this about the corruption of the men of that time Moses repeats and inculcates rather often, to show the increase of the crime and the just anger of the avenger. That he says “before the Lord” marks the person of the judge — namely, that God knows as a judge, who is said “not to know” a matter except when it has been proved before him; for although in himself he knows, yet he does not know it for vengeance. But this deed was so manifest that it needed no proof. Or “before the Lord,” who attended to their sin; for they sinned so carelessly that they did not even reckon it to be sin.’ Thus Hugh.

§39: Hugh on the repetition (to magnify the crime); ‘before the Lord’ marks the judge. Margin: Hugh, Annotations on Genesis.

Cajetan, treating the same words: ‘Weigh,’ he says, ‘the progress of sin. For first there was both the declining and the depravation of the sons of God from concupiscence; then the great malice of man; and at last the earth was corrupted. The malice of men is described as having advanced even to the corruption of souls, so that the evil morals of those men may be understood to have been wholly irreparable — and this before the supreme Judge, who is the witness of the inmost truth. And the greatest corruption of souls is intimated by the corruption of the earth; for it is signified that the corruption of souls was so great that it was poured out even onto the earth, as though men were corrupted not only inwardly, according to their senses and affections, but outwardly too, according to their external actions and works, which were so vicious and corrupt that they even infected, polluted, and corrupted the earth — that is, the places in which these things were done.’

Cajetan on the progress of sin — down to the corruption of souls, irreparable, even poured out onto the land. Margin: Cajetan on Genesis.

— p. 159 (PDF) · printed p. 90 —

That phrase, then, ‘The earth was corrupted,’ can be understood of the earth itself, which men, by living corruptly, also corrupted. For just as, on account of the sanctity of the men dwelling in them, or of the things there transacted, certain places themselves are named and held holy, so, on the contrary, on account of men’s crimes, their places are reckoned polluted and accursed. Credit is given to this by what is written in Leviticus, chapter 18: ‘With a male,’ says the Lord, ‘thou shalt not mingle with feminine intercourse, for it is an abomination. With no beast shalt thou couple, nor be defiled with it. A woman shall not lie under a beast, nor mingle with it, for it is a crime. Defile not yourselves in all these things, with which all the nations are contaminated which I will cast out before your sight, and with which the land is polluted, whose crimes I will visit, that it may vomit out its inhabitants. For all these execrable things the inhabitants of the land who were before you committed, and polluted it.’ Or the word ‘earth’ can here be understood and taken for man, either by a synecdoche, as the container being put for the contained — that is, ‘earth’ for the men inhabiting the earth — or so that man himself is called ‘earth’; for as a little above man was called ‘flesh,’ because he had become wholly carnal, so now (as Chrysostom interprets) he is called ‘earth,’ because he was wholly earthly — that is, fixed upon the desires of earthly goods and pleasures.

§40: ‘the earth was corrupted’ may be taken of the land itself, polluted by men’s crimes (Lev. 18), or of man (synecdoche/‘earthly man,’ Chrysostom). Margins: Lev. 18; Chrysostom, homily 24 on Genesis.

For that ‘corrupted,’ the Hebrew is the verb Sachath, signifying to dissolve, destroy, corrupt. And Lyra indeed, and Tostatus, interpret this kind of corruption of the earth to have been on account of carnal vices of every kind, even those that are nameless and against nature, which at that time reigned most widely and most strongly. And the corruption of the soul is most discerned in the nameless vice, in which is most corrupted the order and institution of nature, which refers intercourse to the begetting of

offspring; which order he wholly perverts and corrupts who uses that kind of intercourse which cannot be referred to the begetting of offspring, but is undertaken for the sake only of pleasure, and that indeed a most impure and most vicious pleasure to be enjoyed.

§41: the Hebrew Sachath (to dissolve/destroy); Lyra and Tostatus refer the corruption to carnal vices, especially the 'nameless' sin against nature. Margins: Lyra and Tostatus on Genesis 6.

In what is subjoined, 'And filled with iniquity,' for the word 'iniquity' the Hebrew is Chamas, which word signifies fraud, rapine, violence, subversion, and oppression. And that 'before the Lord' Tostatus interprets as 'publicly,' as it were in the sight of God and of heaven and earth; for they sinned publicly, without any shame. Which God reproached to the Jews through Isaiah, chapter three: 'They have proclaimed their sin like Sodom, and have not hidden it.' So in the second book of Kings, chapter 12, God threatened David through Nathan: 'I will take,' he says, 'thy wives before thy eyes, and give them to thy neighbor, and he shall lie with them in the sight of this sun,' that is, openly and in the sight of all Israel. Or that 'before the Lord' signifies the utmost irreverence and ingratitude of those men toward God, who, although they believed God to be present to them and to discern not only their deeds but even the hidden thoughts of the mind and its inmost recesses, nevertheless sinned shamelessly and irreverently. For to sin, or be corrupted, 'in the eyes of God' seems to sig-…

§42 (continues on p. 160): 'filled with iniquity' (Hebrew Chamas); 'before the Lord' = openly (Tostatus), or with utter irreverence. Margins: Tostatus; Isa. 3; 2 Kings (2 Samuel) 12.

— p. 160 (PDF) · printed p. 91 —

…nify him who is mindful of God, and who thinks him present to himself, yet offends him. For there are others who sin wholly forgetful of God, and who, as David says, 'have not set God before their sight.'

§42 (continued from p. 159): the difference between sinning before a remembered God and sinning forgetful of God. Margin: Ps. 53.

Verse 12. And when God had seen that the earth was corrupted (for all flesh had corrupted its way), etc.

Genesis 6:12 (Vulgate lemma).

Although God sees all things even before they happen, yet in the sacred writings God is said to ‘see’ the sins of men when he wills and resolves to punish them. For then sins are said to come before the eyes and into the sight and into the memory of God, when God determines to avenge them with deserved and due punishments. For before God punishes, he seems like one asleep or ignorant; whence he is said ‘to be roused,’ ‘to rise up,’ and ‘to take notice,’ because, when he punishes what he did not punish before, he seems like one awaking and noticing. As below, in chapter 18, God said: ‘The cry of the Sodomites and Gomorrhaeans is multiplied, and their sin is exceedingly grievous; I will go down and see whether they have accomplished in deed the cry that has come to me, or whether it be not so, that I may know.’ Wherefore, when we wish something to be punished by God, in daily and common speech we are wont to say: ‘Let God see and judge’ — not that we are ignorant that it is seen by God, but that we desire it to be seen by God for punishment. So, then, in this place God is said to have seen that all the earth was corrupted and that all flesh had corrupted its way, because he had decreed to defer the vengeance of such great crimes no longer, but to punish them as soon as possible with the punishment of the Flood.

§43: God ‘sees’ sins when he resolves to punish them. Margin: ‘When God is said to see the sins of men.’

What follows, ‘All flesh had corrupted its way,’ Ambrose, explaining, writes thus: ‘Here Moses put “flesh” for earthly man, in whom the enticement of the flesh had corrupted his way. Who, if he had understood what gift he had received from God, would by no means have suffered the flesh to stand in the way of the soul’s virtues. And so the flesh was the cause of the soul’s being corrupted too — the flesh, which is as it were the

origin and a certain seat of pleasure, from which, as from a fountain, burst forth the rivers of concupiscences and evil passions and overflow far and wide, by which the soul is sunk like an oarage with the steersman cast out, when the mind itself, overcome as by certain storms and tempests, yields its place. And he says beautifully, “Because man by his own nature corrupts his way.” For his way was in Paradise, in that path of blessings, in that flower of virtues, in that incorruptible grace — which way he defiled with earthly footsteps. Others have “His way,” that is, God’s way; this is usually declared by the word of the Lord.’ Thus Ambrose.

§44: ‘all flesh had corrupted its way’ — Ambrose: ‘flesh’ for earthly man, the flesh the source of corruption. Margin: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 5.

But the use of that word ‘way’ in the sacred writings, as it is most frequent, so it is most ample and exceedingly varied. For it signifies a man’s life, pursuits, morals, institutions, works, customs; but very often that word is used for the law of God, in which way some think it is taken here…

§45 (continues on p. 161): the manifold scriptural senses of ‘way’ (life, morals, the law of God). Margin: ‘What the word “way” signifies.’

— p. 161 (PDF) · printed p. 92 —

…so that the sense is: all flesh — that is, every man — had corrupted its way, that is, had violated the law given to it by God; not indeed the law of Moses or any other positive law (for there was none at that time), but the natural law, and especially as to the concupiscence of the flesh and the harassment and oppression of the neighbor. Others interpret that they corrupted their way as to the natural manner of intercourse — namely, with women for the sake of begetting offspring. For they abused intercourse against nature, doing that which Paul writes in Romans 1: ‘Their women changed the natural use into that use which is against nature; and in like manner the males also, leaving the natural use of the female, burned in their desires one toward another, males with males working that which is filthy.’ Indeed, some think that the baseness of lust and the corruption of

souls was so great that males mingled not only with males, but even with beasts.

§45 (continued from p. 160): ‘all flesh corrupted its way’ = violated the natural law, especially in lust and against nature (Rom. 1). Margin: Rom. 1.

Lyra adds, moreover (this being borrowed from the Hebrews), that the animals too corrupted their way, since animals of one species mingled with animals of diverse species; which, however, does not seem probable to me. For animals have a natural propensity toward one single thing predetermined and fixed for them by nature, whereby it comes about that, unless instigated or trained by man, they do not seek the coupling of those that are of a diverse species. But man, who is endowed with intellect and will — which are universal and indeterminate principles of acting — can vary his natural propensity and act according as it seems good and pleasing to him.

§46: Lyra adds (from the Hebrews) that the animals too corrupted their way — which Pererius doubts, since beasts follow a fixed natural instinct. Margin: Lyra.

Verse 13. The Lord said to Noah: The end of all flesh is come before me; the earth is filled with iniquity from before their face, and I will destroy them with the earth.

Genesis 6:13 (Vulgate lemma).

This is God’s final threat, much graver and more vehement than the earlier ones. For first he had said, ‘My spirit shall not remain in man for ever,’ explaining nothing of the penalty with which he wished to strike man. Then he indicated the penalty, adding, ‘I will destroy man,’ but did not express how and when this would come to pass. But here he opens both: the time, saying, ‘The end of all flesh is come before me’; and the manner, adding, ‘I will destroy them with the earth’ — namely, by an almost immense flood of waters overwhelming the whole earth to the greatest depth and destroying all things that were in it. For a little below, saying this same

thing more distinctly: ‘Behold,’ he says, ‘I will bring the waters of a flood upon the earth, to destroy all flesh wherein is the breath of life under heaven, and all things that are in the earth shall be consumed.’

Commentary on v. 13: this is God’s final and gravest threat — the earlier threats compared.

It is indeed a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God, and, by the persistence and bitterness of one’s crimes, to compel, as it were, God — who long, most mercifully, deferred the punishment — at last to the supreme vengeance…

§47 (continues on p. 162): how dreadful to fall into God’s hands when his patience is at last exhausted. Margins: Gen. 15; Ezek. 7; Jer. 7; below ch. 15.

— p. 162 (PDF) · printed p. 93 —

Truly horrible is such a threat of God, deliberately and emphatically declaring that he will spare no longer, but will punish crimes with due penalties; for then there is no place for entreaty, no place for pity. For when sinners have filled up a certain measure, so that their iniquities are complete, as the Lord said of the Amorites, then there is no escape from the divine chastisement, nor does anything remain but condemnation. Whence to the Jews too, through Ezekiel, God said, ‘The end is come,’ etc., and adds, ‘I will not spare, nor have mercy’; and to Jeremiah he said, ‘Do not thou pray for this people, for I will not hear thee’; and again, ‘If Moses and Samuel stood before me, my soul is not toward this people.’ That ‘God said to Noah’ plainly signifies that God spoke with Noah; but by what kind of locution he used, is obscure and uncertain. For it may have been that God spoke these things by an interior and spiritual locution — that is, by an intellectual revelation, as he usually spoke with the Prophets — or by an apparition in sleep, or by some Angel speaking under the visible form of a human body.

§47 (continued from p. 161): when the measure of iniquity is full, no place is left for entreaty; the manner of God’s speech to Noah. Margins: Gen. 15; Ezek. 7; Jer. 7; below ch. 15.

That ‘The end of all flesh is come before me’ is a Hebraism signifying this: ‘It is determined with me to destroy all flesh,’ or ‘to impose an end on the malice of men by destroying them with all that they possess and that is upon the earth.’ For what the Latin translator has as ‘end,’ the Septuagint translators rendered ‘time’; but Aquila and Symmachus translated similarly to our translator, the one telos, that is ‘end,’ the other peras, that is ‘term.’ But of all these translations the sense is the same. For that ‘The time of all flesh is come’ sounds thus: ‘The supreme time of punishing men’s crimes has arrived, and their vengeance will be deferred no further.’

§48: ‘The end of all flesh is come before me’ — a Hebraism; the renderings (finis / tempus / telos / peras).

That phrase, then, ‘The end of all flesh is come before me,’ signifies either a general calamity of all men and the destruction of the whole earth, as in this place, or the greatest destruction of men and of the greatest part of the earth. For that the blessed martyr Euthicius used this same saying of the Lord, foretelling the immense calamity and innumerable disasters then threatening because of the coming and the savagery of the Lombards, the blessed Gregory narrates in the last chapter of the third book of the Dialogues. And it has seemed good to transcribe his words here. For when he had recalled a certain vision of Redemptus, bishop of the city of Ferentinum and most intimate with him, and had asked him to explain that vision more openly to him, he subjoins this: ‘He said that one day, while he was making his rounds of his parishes as usual, he came to the church of the blessed martyr Euthicius. And as the day was drawing toward evening, he wished a bed to be made for him beside the tomb of the martyr, and there, after his labor, he rested. When, at midnight, as he asserted, he could neither perfectly keep awake nor sleep, but, weighed down (as is usual) by sleep, his waking mind was also burdened with heaviness, the blessed martyr Euthicius stood before him, saying: “Redemptus, art thou awake?” He answered, “I am awake.” And he said: “The end of all flesh is come; the end of all flesh is come; the end of all flesh is come.” After which

threefold…

§49 (continues on p. 163): the phrase signifies a general or great destruction — Gregory's Dialogues on the martyr Euthicius foretelling the Lombard calamity. Margins: St. Gregory; the martyr Euthicius.

— p. 163 (PDF) · printed p. 94 —

…utterance the vision of the martyr, which appeared to the eyes of his mind, vanished. Then the man of God arose and gave himself to the lament of prayer.

§49 (continued from p. 162): the vision vanished.

And presently those terrible signs in the sky followed, so that spears and fiery battle-lines were seen from the region of the North. Presently the savage race of the Lombards, drawn from the sheath of their dwelling, raged against our neck, and the human race which on this land had sprung up, by reason of its excessive multitude, after the manner of a thick crop, was cut down and withered. For cities were depopulated, camps overthrown, churches burned, monasteries of men and of women destroyed; estates, desolate of men and bereft of every cultivator, the land lies in solitude; no owner inhabits it; beasts have occupied the places which before a multitude of men held. And what is being done in other parts of the world, I know not. For in this land in which we live, the world no longer announces its end, but shows it. So much the more urgently must we seek eternal things, by as much as we know that temporal things have fled from us. This world ought to have been despised by us even if it flattered, if it soothed the mind with prosperous things; but after it is pressed by so many scourges, wearied by so great adversity, and redoubles for us so many griefs daily, what else does it cry to us but that it not be loved? Thus Gregory.

§50: the close of Gregory — the fiery portents and the Lombard devastation; 'the world no longer announces its end, but shows it.' Margin: 'Prodigies and portents at the onset of the Lombard persecution.'

There follows: ‘The earth is filled with iniquity from before their face.’ This, about the extreme wickedness and malice of the men of that time, is here rather often repeated and inculcated, that the savagery of the crimes and the justice of the divine vengeance — punishing those crimes with so great a penalty — might be the more vehemently magnified. That ‘The earth is filled’ has emphasis — that is, the measure of sins has been carried to the utmost and filled up — so that the sense is, as it were, this: ‘Since these men set before themselves nothing but crimes, I too have set before myself nothing but their calamity, devastation, destruction.’ That ‘from before their face’ is a Hebraism and signifies the same as ‘by them,’ as the Septuagint translators rendered it; or, as the Chaldee paraphrase expressed it, ‘because of their evil works.’ Ambrose reads, ‘The earth is filled with their iniquities.’

§51: ‘the earth is filled with iniquity from before their face’ — the repetition magnifies the crime; the Hebraisms.

But concerning those words, ‘I will destroy them with the earth’ (or, as the Septuagint have it, ‘I will destroy them and the earth,’ or, as others render, ‘I will destroy them from the earth’), it is asked: how did God destroy the earth by the Flood? But it is easily answered that the earth was not destroyed as to its substance, but as to the adornment which is on its surface, arising from the beauty of plants and from the comeliness of buildings; or as to the diminution of its fertility — for, long drenched and overwhelmed by the salt waters of the Ocean, it was thereafter more barren, that is, bringing forth fruits neither so abundant nor so wholesome; or because (as the Hebrews hand down) the surface of the earth, to a depth of three palms, was wasted by the Flood, consumed, and turned into water — and in that outer part of the earth the germinating power and faculty of the earth especially thrived. But why did this punishment of God pertain only to the earth and not touch the water? Was it because the earth alone, up to that time, had been infected and contaminated by men’s crimes? For men had not yet entered the sea, the art of navigation had not yet been

invented — from which, as many goods have arisen, so on account of men…

§52 (continues on p. 164): how God ‘destroyed the earth’ by the Flood — not in substance, but in adornment and fertility; why the sea was spared. Margin: ‘How God destroyed the earth by the Flood.’

— p. 164 (PDF) · printed p. 95 —

…[from navigation], either insatiable avarice, or an insane lust of dominating, or beastly cruelty, innumerable evils overflowed. But in the other, general judgment and destruction of the world to come at the consummation of the age — which will be made not by water, as this one, but by fire — not only the earth but the water too will be purified, on account of the innumerable crimes of men perpetrated upon the waters up to that day.

§52 (continued from p. 163): conclusion — the final fiery judgment will purify water too.

THIRD DISPUTATION. Whether all who perished in the Flood were also damned to the eternal punishments of hell.

Heading of the Third Disputation of Book IX.

But there remains, in the last place (to close this book), that grave question — not unpleasant to learn, and certainly most pertinent to this passage — to be treated: Whether all those who, drowned by the waters of the Flood, lost their bodily life, also lost their spiritual and eternal life. For that some of those who perished in the Flood escaped the damnation of hell, a weighty author signifies — Jerome, in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis, treating those words of the Lord which are in Moses, the sixth chapter of Genesis, according to the Hebrew reading: ‘In the Hebrew,’ he says, ‘it is written, My Spirit shall not judge these men for ever, because they are flesh. That is: Because the condition of man is frail, I will not keep them for eternal torments, but here will render to them what they deserve. Therefore it sounds not of severity, as it is read in our codices, but of God’s

clemency, while the sinner is here visited for his crime.' Thus Jerome. But the same writer confirms this same thing, in more and plainer words, on the first chapter of the prophet Nahum, on those words 'What do you devise against the Lord?', writing thus: 'If he seems to you cruel, rigid, and bloody, because in the Flood he destroyed the human race, rained fire and brimstone on Sodom and Gomorrah, drowned the Egyptians in the waves, laid low the corpses of the Israelites in the desert — know that he therefore rendered punishments for the present, that he might not punish for ever. Surely, what the prophets say is either true or false: if the things they seem to say about his severity are true, they themselves said, The Lord will not judge twice for the same thing in tribulation; but if they are false, and this is false which is said, A double tribulation shall not arise, then false too is the cruelty which is described in the law. But if it is true — as they will not be able to deny, the Prophet saying, The Lord will not judge etc. — then those who have been punished will not afterward be punished; but if they will afterward be punished, Scripture lies, which it is impious to say. They received, therefore — both those who perished in the Flood, and the Sodomites, and the Egyptians, and the Israelites in the wilderness — their evils in their [own] life.' Thus from the blessed Jerome. If, therefore, God for this reason willed to punish those men with the temporal punishment of the Flood, that he might not punish them with everlasting punishments after this life, hence it becomes credible that many of those men escaped the eternal punishments.

§53: the question; Jerome (Hebrew Traditions; on Nahum 1) suggests some who perished escaped eternal punishment — God punished them temporally so as not to punish them for ever. Margins: Jerome; Gen. 19; Exod. 14; Num. 26.

— p. 165 (PDF) · printed p. 96 —

But Rupert holds and teaches this very thing most openly, in the fourth book of the Commentaries on Genesis, ch. 16, writing in these words: 'It must be known that the judgment of the one Trinity is threefold: the first, namely, by which the devil was cast down from heaven; and the last, by

which the same devil, with his angels and with evil men, is to be sent into the eternal fire; and besides, this middle one, by which the Flood is brought upon the world — and this is middle in quality as well as in time or order. For in the first and last judgment the reprobate alone are struck and the elect alone saved; but in this middle one neither are the elect alone preserved, nor the reprobate alone drowned. For it is to be believed that some perished in this Flood whose sin, by that same peril of death, was blotted out, according to what is written, God will not avenge twice for the same thing; yet that most of them, as impious, passed from that temporal flood of waters to the eternal burning, according to what is written, A fire is kindled in my fury, and shall burn even to the lowest hell. And of those who survived, reserved by so great a grace of God — although there were only three sons of Noah — one turned out reprobate; and from all those three a vast forest of the reprobate grew up.' Thus Rupert.

§54: Rupert says the same — the Flood is the 'middle' judgment, in which neither only the elect are saved nor only the reprobate drowned. Margins: Rupert; Deut. 32.

This may also be argued from three propositions, which once proved, what those men intend seems to be concluded. First Proposition: Christ, after his death, descending to hell according to his soul, preached the Gospel to those who were there. This proposition does not seem to need much proof, since St. Peter sets it forth plainly in the third chapter of his first Epistle, in those words: 'In which also coming he preached to those spirits that were in prison, who had once been incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noah, when the ark was being built.' And in the fourth chapter of the same Epistle: 'For this cause,' he says, 'was the Gospel preached also to the dead.' And those words of Peter very many and most weighty Fathers interpreted of a true descent of Christ's soul to hell and his preaching there: as Athanasius in the book On the Incarnation of the Word, and in the Tract against Apollinaris, and in the Sermon against all heresies, and in the Epistle to Epictetus (from which Epistle Epiphanius records his words in Heresy 77); the same was the opinion of

Hilary on Ps. 118, on those words, ‘When wilt thou comfort me?’, and on Ps. 141, in the commentary on that passage, ‘Bring my soul out of prison’; and of Nazianzen in the Oration on Easter; of Epiphanius in Heresy 45; of Jerome on those words of Zachariah, ch. 9, ‘Thou also, by the blood of thy testament,’ etc., and on that of Hosea, ch. 13, ‘O hell, I will be thy bite’; of Cyril in the book On the Right Faith to Theodosius, and in book 12 on John, ch. 36; of the Damascene in the third book On the Orthodox Faith, ch. 29, and in the Sermon ‘That the dead are aided both by sacred works and by the benefits of the living’ — to omit for the present very many others more recent than these.

§55: the case may be argued from three propositions. First: after his death Christ’s soul descended to hell and preached the Gospel to those there (1 Pet. 3 & 4) — confirmed by a long roster of Fathers. Margins: Athanasius; Epiphanius; Hilary; Gregory Nazianzen; Jerome; Cyril; Damascene.

Second Proposition: Christ’s preaching in hell was fruitful, and profited those who heard it — if not all, yet many; profited, I say, unto their liberation from hell. The opinion of this proposition Bede, in his commentary on that passage of Peter, attributes to Hilary; for although he is silent as to his name, yet the words which he there re-…

§56 (continues on p. 166): Second proposition — Christ’s preaching to hell profited those who heard it, at least many, unto their liberation; Bede ascribes this view to Hilary. Margins: ‘Christ’s preaching to hell was useful’; Bede, from Hilary, Epiphanius.

— p. 166 (PDF) · printed p. 97 —

…records there are Hilary’s, on Psalm 118. Epiphanius certainly does not seem to deny it, in Heresy 46, writing thus: ‘Christ came into the world and descended into hell, that to those who had once known him and had not erred from his Deity, but were detained in hell on account of errors, he might bestow pardon — to those, indeed, who are in the world, through penance; but to those who are in hell, through mercy.’ Nor does the author of the Commentaries on Paul’s Epistles, who is commonly named and thought to be Ambrose, seem to shrink from that opinion. For on the tenth

chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, on those words ‘Who shall descend into the abyss?’: ‘Everyone,’ he says, ‘whosoever, having seen the Savior in hell, hoped for salvation from him, was freed — Peter testifying this when he said, For this cause was the Gospel preached also to the dead.’ Similar things the same author writes, explaining those words of Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians, chapter four, ‘But that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended?’ etc.: ‘The devil being triumphed over,’ he says, ‘Christ descended into the heart of the earth, that his showing-forth might be a preaching to the dead, and that as many as desired him might be freed.’

§56 (continued from p. 165): the witness of Epiphanius (Heresy 46) and pseudo-Ambrose (on Rom. 10 and Eph. 4). Margins: Ambrose; 1 Pet. 4.

The blessed Augustine, from the fact that Peter said in Acts 2 that Christ was raised up by God ‘the sorrows of hell being loosed,’ argues that Christ, when his soul descended to hell, freed some of those who were tormented by the torments of hell. Augustine’s words, in book 12 of On Genesis according to the Letter, ch. 33, are these: ‘That Christ’s soul came as far as those places in which sinners are tormented, to loose from torments those whom by his hidden justice he judged were to be loosed, is believed not without reason. For how otherwise is to be taken what was said, “Whom God raised up from the dead, the sorrows of hell being loosed,” I do not see, unless we take it that he loosed the sorrows of certain ones in hell, by that power by which he is Lord and to whom every knee bows, of things heavenly, earthly, and infernal — by which power he could not even be held by those sorrows which he loosed.’ Thus Augustine. And the ‘sinners who are tormented in hell’ one may understand to be none other than those damned to the punishments of hell; and yet some of these Augustine thinks were freed by Christ.

§57: Augustine (On Genesis literally 12.33) argues from Acts 2 that Christ freed some who were tormented in hell. Margins: Augustine; Phil. 2.

Third Proposition: Christ's preaching in hell profited others, but especially many of those who perished in Noah's Flood. This proposition gains credit from the confirmation of the foregoing. For if Christ's preaching in hell profited those who heard it, and that preaching was made especially to those who perished in the Flood (since Peter names by name only these, to whom Christ preached in hell), hence it follows that Christ's preaching profited many of those who were drowned by the waters of the Flood. To Lyra, certainly, it seems quite probable that some of those men, who at first did not believe Noah foretelling that the Flood would come, afterward, when the Flood was rushing on and beginning, believed and did penance, and so were worthy that, when Christ descended to hell, they should be freed from there — not indeed from the hell of the damned (since they had done penance at the approach of death), but from the limbo of the fathers. If someone object…

§58 (continues on p. 167): Third proposition — Christ's preaching profited especially many who perished in the Flood (whom Peter names); Lyra's view of last-minute converts. Margins: 'Christ's preaching to hell profited especially those who perished in Noah's Flood'; Lyra.

— p. 167 (PDF) · printed p. 98 —

…that the Flood came suddenly and unexpectedly — for, as the Lord said in Luke 17, 'While they were eating and drinking, the Flood came and destroyed them all' — Lyra answers to this that the beginning of the Flood was sudden and unexpected, and suddenly occupied the valleys and the plains of the earth, but not the mountains; wherefore those who dwelt in high places the Flood did not at once overwhelm, since its rising, as Scripture relates, lasted forty days and forty nights.

§58 (continued from p. 166): Lyra's reply to the objection that the Flood came suddenly (Luke 17). Margins: Luke 17; Gen. 7.

Cajetan, finally, set forth the same with great asseveration, expounding those words of Peter in his Commentaries: 'From the fact,' says Cajetan, 'that Peter mentions only those who were unbelieving in the time of Noah,

it is signified that he was not speaking of that preaching of Christ by which he manifested in hell that he himself was the Messiah and convicted both demons and unbelieving men (for such a preaching was common to all in hell); but this one, of which Peter speaks, is described as peculiar to those who lived in Noah's time, whence it is intimated that this preaching was fruitful. And to this make those words, "When the long-suffering of God was awaited," that we may hence understand that they were not unbelievers simply — that is, without true faith in God — but were unbelievers toward Noah saying that the Flood was imminent; and that, with this unbelief, they awaited the long-suffering of God — that is, trusting in God's long-suffering, they thought the universal Flood would not come.' Thus Cajetan. And these are about the things by which credit can be built up for the opinion of those who hold that not all who perished in the Flood were damned to the punishments of hell, but that some of them, when the Flood was beginning, were converted to God and, repenting of their crimes, expiated them by that punishment of the Flood patiently undergone by them; or that, if they all died impenitent, yet afterward, believing in Christ descending to hell and preaching, they were freed thence by the infinite power and mercy of Christ.

§60: Cajetan — Peter's naming only those of Noah's time signals a special, fruitful preaching; they were not unbelievers 'simply,' but disbelieved Noah's warning. Margins: Cajetan; 1 Pet. 3.

But in truth this opinion, in my judgment, has very little probability. For in three ways it can be feigned that many of those who perished in the Flood were not damned to the punishments of hell: either because, though most of them and nearly all were wicked, yet some men were upright and just — but, because these were very few and the throng of wicked men was innumerable, divine Scripture spoke after its manner generally, saying that all the men of that time were most worthless and most wicked; or it could be said that, though at first all were wicked, yet at the end, when the Flood was rushing on, they were moved by its horrible aspect to penance, and, both on account of the penance duly done by them and on account of the

patience with which they undertook and bore that calamity as deserved and due to their crimes, escaped the damnation of eternal death; or, finally, this too may be feigned: that, although all those died infected with sins and liable to eternal damnation, yet afterward, when Christ descended to hell and preached, embracing his preaching and faith, they became partakers of eternal salvation. In these three ways, then, it can be feigned that some of those who perished in the Flood were, as to the soul, saved…

§61 (continues on p. 168): Pererius rejects the view — three ways it might be feigned that many who perished were not damned; the first (a few were just). Margin: 'That all who perished in the Flood are to be reckoned guilty of eternal damnation.'

— p. 168 (PDF) · printed p. 99 —

…saved. But none of these three is either true or even probable; therefore that opinion, as plainly improbable, is to be cast away. And first, that when the Flood came there were on earth no other just men except Noah and his family, is confirmed in three ways. But the reader must be forewarned that infants are removed from this disputation, and that for the present we dispute only of adults who already exercised reason and free will. For if there was even before the Flood something in a manner like Christian baptism or Jewish circumcision, by whose application to infants (or by the faith adumbrated and attested by that thing) infants were cleansed from original sin (which I see has long since been received and approved in the schools of the theologians), then it is most likely that many of the infants who perished in the Flood (as having been freed from original sin) were saved. For very many were the sons of the descendants of Seth, who, although they had much degenerated from the probity and piety of their forefathers, and were therefore caught in that destruction of the Flood, nevertheless — the ancient method and rite of purging infants from original sin, religiously kept by their forefathers — it is by no means to be doubted that they used in purifying their own infants. Of adults alone, therefore, has this disputation been undertaken.

§62: none of the three is true or probable; infants set aside (likely many were saved, freed from original sin by a rite); only adults discussed.

And that besides Noah and the others who were saved in the Ark there were at that time no innocent and just men, Scripture shows plainly enough in the sixth chapter of Genesis, relating that the malice of all the men of that age was common, and that Noah alone was found just; for it says generally that then all the thought of the human heart was bent upon evil at all times, and that all flesh had corrupted its way, and gives this one cause why God willed to destroy the whole race of men by the Flood — namely, that all were most worthless and most wicked. But such general statements of Scripture it is not lawful to restrict and narrow by introducing exceptions, unless such exceptions can be drawn from other passages of Scripture, or unless reason teaches that such exceptions are needed — namely, when, without them, the general statements of Scripture, if taken altogether generally, would entail something manifestly false or absurd.

§63: Scripture plainly shows no just adults remained but Noah and his family — and general scriptural statements are not to be narrowed by exceptions without warrant. Margin: 'That at the time of the Flood there were no just men except those saved in the Ark.'

Next, if there had been other just men, they too would similarly, like Noah, have been saved from the Flood; for Scripture gives this as the cause why God destroyed all other men but saved Noah — that they were wicked, but he just. And indeed it is consonant with reason, what Abraham said to God: 'This is not thy way, O Lord, who judgest all the earth, to slay the just with the wicked, and that the just should be as the wicked.' Finally, this too is confirmed by the authority of the blessed Augustine, who in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 24, writes that it was brought about by the singular counsel and providence of God that, at the time the Flood came, there should remain none save Noah, a just man, and none who was not worthy to be punished by the punishment of the Flood. 'Nor is it idly,' says Augustine, 'believed that the Flood was so made, there being now found on earth none who were not worthy to be carried off by such a death as was

inflicted on the impious.’

§64: if others had been just, they too would have been saved; Abraham’s plea (Gen. 18) and Augustine (City of God 15.24). Margins: Gen. 18; Augustine.

— p. 169 (PDF) · printed p. 100 —

But the second way of defending the aforesaid opinion seems to me certainly very weak. These men say that all the men of that age were at first wicked, but at the end (namely, when the Flood was already beginning) turned to God and did penance, and so were saved. But if they proved this by some testimony of Scripture, or by the authority of noble Doctors, or by firm reasons or conjectures, they would surely deserve belief, nor would we contradict them; but since they bring forward none of these to prove it, who does not see that it is said by them gratuitously and rashly, and is plainly a fiction? In general, when a question arises (as they say) ‘of fact’ — that is, when it is asked whether something was done or not — it is not enough to demonstrate that it could have been done; for many things can be done that never were done, and many things were done at a certain time and place and by certain persons which cannot be shown to have been done at any other time and place, nor by any other persons. It is necessary, therefore, that what is said to have been done at some time or place be confirmed, as having been done at that time and place, by weighty testimonies or probable arguments. For if one is allowed to feign in that way, by a like reasoning it will be allowed to feign that many of the Sodomites consumed by the heavenly fire were saved, because they, while they saw fire raining down and were themselves being seized by the conflagration, came to their senses and did penance. The same too someone will feign about the Egyptians drowned in the Red Sea, and about those whom the gaping earth swallowed alive together with Dathan and Abiron. Aristotle aptly said that it is unseemly for a philosopher to opine anything in philosophy without reason, much less to affirm it. And I would say it unworthy of a theologian and a weighty handler of the sacred letters to dote on opinions which have in themselves no probability, and to undertake to

defend them by his patronage. Although I by no means condemn the pious sentiment of those who think that some of those who perished in the Flood were saved; but what is more consonant with reason and the doctrine of the sacred letters, that I now inquire into and weigh.

§65: the second way (last-minute conversion) is groundless — mere assertion; one might as well claim Sodomites or Egyptians repented; Aristotle on not opining without reason. Margins: 'Without cause are many said to have been converted to God at the very end of life'; Exod. 14; Num. 16; Aristotle, Physics bk. 8.

There remains the third way of expounding and defending the same opinion, which, since it is more involved than the foregoing, requires a longer discourse in treating and refuting it. Some, then, say that all who perished in the Flood were wicked and persisted in their crimes to their last breath, and were therefore consigned to the punishments of hell, but that afterward they believed Christ preaching in hell, and through his mercy and indulgence were made partakers of eternal salvation. This opinion, that I may the more strongly assail and demolish it and convince it of being plainly false, I have judged it necessary to teach in general, and to prove by the weightiest testimonies and valid reasons, that through Christ's descent to hell none of those who had been damned to the punishments of Tartarus was freed.

§66: the third way (liberation by Christ's descent) is more involved; Pererius will prove from Fathers and reasons that no one damned to hell's punishments was freed by the descent.

This indeed the blessed Gregory and the Venerable Bede handed down as a certain dogma of the Church and of Catholic discipline. For writing…

§67 (continues on p. 170): Gregory and Bede taught this as certain Catholic doctrine; Gregory's letter begins. Margin: 'That none of those damned to the punishment of hell was freed by Christ's descent to hell.'

— p. 170 (PDF) · printed p. 101 —

…the blessed Gregory, to George the priest and Theodore the deacon of the Church of Constantinople (this letter of Gregory is in the sixth book of the

Epistles, no. 179), says thus: ‘After your departure, my most beloved sons the deacons relating it, I learned that your charity had said that our almighty Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, descending to hell, loosed all who there confessed him to be God and freed them from their due punishments. About which matter I wish your fraternity to think far otherwise. For descending to hell, he freed by his grace only those who had both believed him to be coming and had kept his precepts by living [them]. For it is plain that, after the incarnation of the Lord, none even of those can be saved who hold his faith and have not the life of faith; because it is written, “They confess that they know God, but in their deeds deny him”; and John says, “He who says that he knows him, and keeps not his commandments, is a liar”; James too, the brother of the Lord, writes, saying, “Faith without works is dead.” If, therefore, the faithful are now not saved without good works, and the unfaithful and reprobate without good action were saved when the Lord descended to hell, then better was the lot of those who did not see the incarnation of the Lord than of those who were born after the mystery of his incarnation. And of how great folly it is to say this, the Lord himself testifies to his disciples, saying, “Many kings and Prophets desired to see the things that you see, and saw them not.” But, not to detain your charity in my disputation, let it learn what Philaster, in the book he wrote On Heresies, said about this heresy. His words are these: “There are heretics who say that the Lord descended into hell and announced to all, even there after death, that those confessing might be saved there — whereas this is contrary to the prophet David, who says, ‘But in hell who shall confess to thee?’, and to the Apostle, ‘As many as have sinned without the law shall perish without the law.’” With whose words the blessed Augustine too agrees, in the book he wrote On Heresies. Treating all these things, therefore, hold nothing else but what the true faith teaches through the Catholic Church: that the Lord, descending to hell, rescued from the bars of hell only those whom, living in the flesh, he preserved by his grace in faith and good operation. For what he says through the Gospel, “When I shall be lifted up from the earth, I will draw all things to myself”

— “all,” namely, the elect; for he could not be drawn to God after death who separated himself from God by living evilly.’ Thus Gregory.

§67 (continued from p. 169): Gregory’s letter (Epistles bk. 6, no. 179) — Christ freed only those who had believed and kept his precepts; Philaster and Augustine on the heresy. Margins: Tit. 2; 1 John 2; James 2; Matt. 13; Philaster; Ps. 6; Rom. 2; Augustine, On Heresies, no. 79; John 12.

Bede, however, in his Commentaries on that passage of Peter, when he had recalled the opinion of a certain author (he means Hilary, as we said above) who said that Christ in hell preached exhortation and consolation even to the unbelieving, subjoins this (and let him have said these things): ‘But the Catholic faith holds that the Lord, descending to hell, led out not the unbelieving thence, but only his own faithful, and brought them with himself to the heavenly kingdoms; and that he shows the way of life daily, not to souls stripped of the body and shut in the prison of hell, but in this life — either through himself, or through the examples or words of his faithful.’ Thus Bede.

§68: Bede — the Catholic faith holds that Christ led out from hell only his faithful, not the unbelieving. Margin: Bede.

The Damascene, in the third book On the Orthodox Faith, ch. 29: ‘The deified soul of Christ,’ he says, ‘descended into hell, that, as to those who were on earth the sun of justice arose, so also to those who beneath the earth in darkness and in the shadow of death…

§69 (continues on p. 171): the Damascene — Christ’s soul descended that, as a sun of justice to those on earth, so light might shine on those below. Margin: Damascene.

— p. 171 (PDF) · printed p. 102 —

…were sitting, light might shine; and that, as on earth he had evangelized peace, to captives remission, to the blind sight, and to those who believed was made the cause of eternal salvation, but to the unbelieving a reproach and refutation of their unfaith, so also to those who were in hell — that to him every knee might bow, of things heavenly, earthly, and infernal.’ By

these words the Damascene signifies that Christ's preaching profited not all who were in hell, but the faithful only; and to the unbelieving was rather a reproach and confusion.

§69 (continued from p. 170): the Damascene — the preaching profited only the faithful, but was reproach to the unbelieving. Margins: Heb. 5; Phil. 2.

Oecumenius, however, in his Commentaries, explaining that passage of Peter (from which passage both the occasion of treating this disputation was taken, and the great part of the difficulty of explaining it arises), says that Christ preached in hell, but led out thence only those who, before his coming, had lived so justly and piously that they would without doubt have believed Christ, had Christ come to them in their time. And it is by no means to be thought that Oecumenius speaks of these as the Lord speaks of the impious Tyrians and Sodomites in Matthew 11, saying that they, if they had seen such miracles as the Jews had seen, would have believed and done penance; for these had not so prepared themselves, by faith in Christ's future incarnation and by good morals, as to be fit and worthy to receive the coming Christ — but [he speaks] of those who believed Christ would come and had so lived that, if Christ had come in their time, they would have believed him to be the Messiah.

§70: Oecumenius — Christ led out only those who had lived so justly that they would surely have believed had he come in their day.

And to this opinion Oecumenius enlists Gregory Nazianzen too, whose words in the second Oration on the holy Pasch, according to Billius's translation, run thus: 'If Christ descend into hell, descend with him; learn also those mysteries which Christ there designed: what was the counsel of his twofold descent, what the reason — whether by his coming he saved all without any exception, or there too only those who believed?' Thus Nazianzen; whose last phrase ('who believed') Oecumenius took for that which is ('who would have believed'), that is, who had so lived on earth that, if Christ had come in their time and preached to them, they would

without doubt have believed. But Nicetas, in his scholion on those words of Nazianzen, deflects Nazianzen's words rather to the contrary opinion, writing thus: 'Chrysostom himself affirms that no one in hell received salvation from Christ except one who was worthy of salvation when he departed from this life. But perhaps,' he says, 'those who then believed in hell were deemed worthy of salvation. Something of this kind is told in the histories of the Fathers about the heathen Plato — that he, of the unbelievers, was the very first of all to believe Christ preaching in hell; but whether this be true or not is to be left to the reader's judgment.' Thus Nicetas. Billius too, inclined to this opinion, bends Nazianzen the same way. For in a certain note which he subjoins after Nicetas's aforesaid scholion: 'Nazianzen,' he says, 'seems by those words to allude to what Peter says in the third chapter of his first Epistle, that Christ preached to those who were in prison. From which passage Nazianzen suspects that Christ so dealt with them that those who at his coming embraced his faith he led to heaven, but those who would not have faith in him he left in their punishments.' Thus Billius.

§71: Oecumenius enlists Nazianzen too; Nicetas's scholion (Chrysostom: none in hell received salvation but the worthy; the legend of Plato); Billius's note. Margins: Chrysostom; Nicetas; Billius the translator of Nazianzen.

— p. 172 (PDF) · printed p. 103 —

But, lest the reader be ignorant of this, he must be warned that, in the aforesaid words of Nazianzen, for what Billius rendered 'who (believed),' in the Greek of Nazianzen it is not pisteusantas, which sounds 'who believed,' but is a present participle, pisteuontas, signifying 'believing,' or (because it sometimes has the force of the past imperfect) 'those who were believing' — unless perhaps that 'believing' stands in place of a noun, meaning the same as 'the faithful,' or those imbued with and endowed with faith; and according to this interpretation the sense of Nazianzen's words would be plain. For since there were in hell two kinds of men — one of the faithful, who had departed this life with right and living faith; the other of

the unfaithful — Christ, descending into hell, freed the faithful thence, but left the unfaithful there.

Pererius's philological note: Nazianzen's Greek has the present participle 'believing' (= the faithful), not 'who believed'; on this reading his sense is plain — Christ freed the faithful, left the unfaithful.

The blessed Augustine, moreover, in Epistle 99, which he wrote to Evodius, turning over this very question, disputes very variously; and although he leaves much in doubt, yet he seems at last to affirm without hesitation that Christ descended to hell and freed thence some loosed from the sorrows of hell — and that these were not those most holy Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, David (for the mind refuses to believe that these were in the sorrows of hell). For if that poor Lazarus was, after death, led by the angels into Abraham's bosom — that is, into a place of rest and most full delight — and received, how much more truly is it to be believed that those most excellent Patriarchs were free of all pain and established in the highest peace and tranquillity? I shall transcribe here the words of Augustine: 'But because evident testimonies of Scripture record that Christ descended to hell and loosed the sorrows of hell, no cause occurs why the Savior should be believed to have come there except to make some safe from its sorrows; but whether all whom he found in them, or certain ones whom he judged worthy of that benefit, I still inquire. Yet that he was in hell, and bestowed this benefit on those established in its sorrows, I do not doubt. Whence, what he conferred, when he descended into hell, on those just men who were in Abraham's bosom, I have not yet found — from whom, as to the beatifying presence of his divinity, I never see him to have withdrawn. For in Paradise and in Abraham's bosom there was, even before, the beatifying wisdom, and in hell the judging power; for where is the divinity not, since it is besieged by no place?' Thus Augustine.

§72: Augustine (Epistle 99 to Evodius) — though leaving much in doubt, affirms Christ freed some loosed from hell's sorrows, but not the patriarchs in Abraham's bosom (who were free of all pain). Margins: Augustine; Luke 16.

In these words of Augustine two things indeed seem worthy of note. The first is that Augustine dares not determine who those were who were loosed by Christ from the sorrows of hell: he denies that they were those who were in Abraham's bosom (since those were free from all pain and torment); but that those who were tormented with the Tartarean torments together with the devil were loosed by Christ, Augustine dares not say. But there were others, as it were interposed and intermediate between these, whom we can assert to have been loosed by Christ from the sorrows of hell — those, I mean, who were for a time tormented by the purgatorial fire, that, thoroughly expiated and purified from every stain of sin, they might pass thence to the quiet seats of the saints, or Abraham's bosom. But the second thing in the words of Augustine…

§73 (continues on p. 173): two things to note — Augustine dares not say who were loosed; Pererius suggests the souls in purgatory; and the second point.

— p. 173 (PDF) · printed p. 104 —

…worthy of note is that the just who were in Abraham's bosom were, before Christ's coming, beatified through the presence of his divinity; which I, for my part, interpret not of the full and perfect beatitude which consists in the clear vision of God (for this is rightly believed to have befallen no mortal before Christ's coming), but of a certain most quiet and most joyful life and beatitude — namely, as great as is permitted to be granted to a man set in that state, short of that heavenly and divine beatitude.

§74: the just in Abraham's bosom were beatified before Christ's coming — not the full beatitude of the vision of God, but a most quiet and joyful state.

But indeed, Augustine, not fully acquiescing in what he had said, at last in disputing falls to thinking that that passage of Peter is to be interpreted not of a preaching of Christ made in hell, but of that which he himself either through himself (when he was seen as a man on earth and conversed with men), or before his coming to earth, even before the Flood, through his

Prophets and the heralds of his word (who were lacking in no age of the world to none), caused to be done or commanded. And Augustine judged this interpretation the more probable for this reason: that according to it he would not be compelled to confess that through Christ's descent to hell some were absolved from the infernal punishments, which he could hardly bring his mind to believe. And Augustine writes thus: 'Consider whether perhaps all that which Peter says about the spirits shut in prison who in the days of Noah had not believed pertains not to hell at all, but rather to those times whose figure he transferred to these times. For that deed had been a figure of things to come, so that those who now do not believe the Gospel, while the Church is being built among all nations, may be understood to be like those who then did not believe when the ark was being built; but those who believed and are saved by baptism may be compared to those who then were saved in that same ark by water. Whence he says, "So baptism, being of the like form, now also saves you." To this likeness of figure, then, let us fit the rest about the unbelievers too, and let us not suspect that in hell, for making the faithful and freeing them, the Gospel was preached, or is even still preached, as though there too the Church were established.' Thus Augustine. But of the testimonies of the Fathers, by which we undertook to prove that none of those who had been damned to the punishments of hell was freed thence by Christ's descent to hell, what we have so far recalled may suffice for the reader.

§75: Augustine, not fully satisfied, ends by reading the Petrine passage not of a preaching in hell, but of Christ's working through Noah and the prophets — the Flood as a figure of baptism. Margin: Baruch 3.

It follows that we confirm the same (as was set down above in the second place) by some reasons — although to argue what is of itself sufficiently plain and evident might perhaps seem to someone superfluous. It greatly undermines the opinion of those who think otherwise that they are forced to say either that Christ in hell preached only to those who had been unbelieving in Noah's time, or that he preached to all who were being

punished with the punishments of hell. But no probable reason can be given why Christ should have willed to preach the Gospel and impart salvation only to those who lived in Noah's time, leaving aside innumerable others who surpassed them neither in impiety nor in wickedness. But if Christ the Lord preached…

§76 (continues on p. 174): now to confirm the same by reasons; the opposing view forces an arbitrary singling-out of Noah's contemporaries. Margin: 'It is proved by reasons that none of those damned to hell's punishments was freed by Christ when he descended to hell.'

— p. 174 (PDF) · printed p. 105 —

…to all who were shut up and damned in the prison of hell, either he gave them sufficient aid by which they could be converted to God, or he did not. If he did not, he preached to them in vain and with no effect at all; for without God's aid not only those who were hardened in evil, but not even those who in this life are flexible toward good and evil, can in any way be brought to penance and salvation. But if he say that sufficient aid for conversion was given by Christ to all of them, how were not all of them converted to God? Wherefore these men will slide, even unwilling, into the heresy which Philaster and the blessed Augustine relate and condemn (in the book On Heresies, number 79) — of those who, magnifying Christ's indulgence, said that by his descent to hell all who were there were led out and freed.

§76 (continued from p. 173): the dilemma — either Christ gave the damned sufficient grace (then why were not all converted?), or he did not (then he preached in vain); the view collapses into the condemned heresy (Philaster; Augustine, On Heresies 79).

And that, if sufficient aid had been given to all who were in hell, all would have believed, seems to be gathered from this: for two things concurred which would altogether have moved and drawn them to conversion. The one, that all would most eagerly have seized and embraced so desirable and so unhoped-for an occasion of emerging from those punishments, offered to them, and the faculty given by Christ. The other, that — to make them

thoroughly believe Christ's words and promises to be true and certain — there worked and plainly persuaded the unwonted and wonderful descent of Christ into those places, and his incomparable majesty shining in those Tartarean shadows above the splendor of the sun, and, finally, the power and dominion which Christ showed himself to have over all the demons.

§77: indeed, if all in hell had been given sufficient aid, all would have believed — two causes would have moved them: the longed-for chance of escape, and Christ's overwhelming majesty in the darkness.

Next, if he freed some men from hell, why not some demons too? for the condition and case of both is equal, since both are alike hardened in malice and hatred of God, both damned and consigned to the eternal punishments of hell. Indeed, this would the more have declared the power of Christ and the efficacy of his passion, if he had been the redeemer of demons too, and not only of men; and in this way it would have been manifest that the grace of Christ was wider and more abundant and more efficacious than the sin of Adam — for this destroyed only men, but that would have saved and freed both men and angels who were lost. But if these things seem, as they are, plainly incredible and absurd, then that too must be judged absurd which is the head and fount of this absurdity: that through Christ's descent to hell some of the reprobate were absolved from the punishments of hell. Nor does it fail to make for the confirmation of this matter, that in the book of Ecclesiasticus, chapter 24, it was foretold of the divine Wisdom — that is, of Christ who would descend to hell, and would enlighten only those who there hoped in him: 'I will penetrate all the lower parts of the earth, and will behold all that sleep, and will enlighten all that hope in the Lord.'

§78: if he freed some men, why not some demons? The view makes Christ the redeemer of demons too — plainly absurd; Ecclus 24 ('I will enlighten all that hope in the Lord'). Margins: Rom. 5; Ecclus. 24.

But four sentences of the sacred writings seem to contradict this our opinion; wherefore it must be brought about, by their right interpretation, that they in no way seem to oppose us. The first sentence is in the Prophet

Nahum, chapter one, which according to the trans-…

§79 (continues on p. 175): four scriptural objections; the first, Nahum 1 (‘he will not judge twice’).

— p. 175 (PDF) · printed p. 106 —

…lation of the Septuagint translators it has thus: ‘He will not avenge twice for the same thing in tribulation’; for which Symmachus rendered, ‘They shall not bear the onset of a second distress’; Theodotion has as our version, ‘A double tribulation shall not arise’; Pagninus rendered, ‘Distress shall not arise twice.’ ‘If God,’ they say, ‘does not punish the same sin twice, then a sinner punished for his sin in this life God will not punish again after death; wherefore those whose sins God avenged by the destruction of the Flood, those sins he by no means punished after death with the eternal pains of hell.’

§79 (continued from p. 174): the various renderings of Nahum 1; the objectors’ inference (God does not punish the same sin twice). Margin: Nahum, ch. 1.

But that this testimony in no way harms our opinion we shall show by a twofold reply. And first, indeed, we answer that the meaning of that sentence of Nahum is far different from what these men would have it: the Prophet there speaks to the Ninivites, against whom he chiefly uttered that prophecy, and threatens them with the utmost punishment, saying that God will punish them with one and final punishment, so that there will be no need of another punishment to punish them, because, once punished, they will be utterly destroyed, consumed, and blotted out. For their vengeance will be such that another is not needed. This understanding both the words themselves render most clearly, and the very context of the preceding and following words confirms it.

§80: first reply — the Nahum text means God will so utterly destroy the Ninivites at one stroke that no second punishment will be needed. Margin: ‘The passage of Nahum explained.’

There is added the authority of Theodoret and Theophylact, who explain those words in the same manner. Theodoret, indeed, in his Commentaries

on that Prophet, on those very words: ‘So bitter and heaped-up a punishment,’ he says, ‘will God take of you, that there will be no need to inflict a second blow upon you.’ And Theophylact, on the same passage, writes thus: ‘Such is the power of God that, if he will punish someone according to his deserts, he accomplishes this very thing fully at one blow, and needs no second vengeance, finishing and consuming him entirely at once.’ You see, reader, that that sentence of Nahum, if it be understood as it ought — that is, as it has been expounded by us — makes nothing against us?

§81: Theodoret and Theophylact read it the same way. Margins: Theodoret; Theophylact.

But grant that those words of the Prophet have the sense these men would have: assuredly that will oppose us no more. Be it so — that by those words it is signified that a sinner is not punished twice by God for the same sin, that is, both in this life and after death. But let us ask of these men whether they would have this understood of a sinner truly repentant of his sins, or of one who departs this life wholly impenitent. If they say it is to be understood of a repentant sinner, I for my part agree with them: for to a sinner duly repentant of his crimes, the eternal punishments deserved and due for his sins are remitted, and commuted into temporal punishments, to be paid either in this life or after death. But this in no way helps the cause of those who perished in the Flood, for that they died impenitent we showed above as the more likely. But if these men contend that the Prophet’s saying can be understood even of an impenitent sinner, not only do I not agree with them, but I vehemently resist. For since mortal sin, of itself and according to the law of divine justice, merits eternal punishment, how will it — if it be punished with a temporal punishment only — be (as it ought,…

§82 (continues on p. 176): second reply — even granting the objectors’ sense, it applies only to the repentant sinner; for the impenitent, mortal sin still merits eternal punishment.

— p. 176 (PDF) · printed p. 107 —

…and as the justice of God requires) punished? Wherefore it is necessary to confess that, besides the temporal punishment of the impenitent sinner, there remains for him the eternal punishment corresponding of itself and due to the desert of his sins. For if mortal sin were punished, as it ought, by a temporal punishment alone, then surely to no mortal sin would eternal punishment be due; wherefore we should slide into the absurd opinion of Origen — long since exploded and condemned by the Catholic Church — who thought that all the reprobate who are tormented with the Tartarean punishments, even the Devil himself, would at some time at last be absolved and freed; whom, however, divine Scripture most openly contradicts, crying that the fire of hell and its burning are inextinguishable and eternal, and that, as the rewards of the good, so the punishments of the reprobate will be everlasting.

§82 (continued from p. 175): otherwise one falls into Origen's condemned error that even the devil will at last be freed. Margins: 'The error of Origen'; Matt. 25.

I am pleased to confirm this our interpretation of that sentence of Nahum by the authority of Rupert, who expounds that sentence in the same manner in the third book of the Commentaries on Genesis, ch. 7, writing thus: 'Some would have it that the sin of Cain was blotted out by the death of the body, on the ground of what is written, God will not avenge twice for the same thing; but how weak this reasoning is, both Faith itself knows, and the more careful opinion of the Fathers evidently establishes. For this saying is fittingly taken of those whose confession God accepts either before the punishment or in the very punishment, and therefore afterward, the temporal punishment being taken away, does not add for them the eternal — as, for example, to the thief who confessed on the cross the Lord not unjustly opened Paradise, because God will not avenge twice for the same thing. For the other thief was carried over from a temporal to an eternal punishment; of whom too you may rightly say that not even in him will God avenge twice for the same thing, for that is well called one vengeance which, begun here, is completed unto everlasting.' Thus Rupert.

§83: Rupert reads Nahum the same way (the good and bad thief). Margins: Rupert; Luke 23.

The second sentence is that of the blessed Peter, which Luke reports in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 2. Peter said that Christ was raised from the dead, ‘the sorrows of hell being loosed’; by which words it is signified that those who were held by the sorrows of hell were by Christ absolved from them and freed. And these the blessed Augustine, in book 12 of On Genesis according to the Letter, ch. 33, says were sinners who were tormented by the torments of hell. But that sentence of Peter may most conveniently be explained in four ways, so that it seems neither to profit these men nor to harm us. And first, indeed, that saying of Peter can be referred to Christ the Lord, who is said to have loosed the sorrows of hell because, descending thither, he could not, like the rest, be touched — much less held — by those sorrows, since he was ‘free among the dead’; and with this understanding wonderfully agrees what Peter next subjoins, ‘inasmuch as it was impossible that he should be held by it.’ And this interpretation Augustine commends in Epistle 99. Christ, then, loosed the sorrows of hell, not because he was at any time caught and bound by them, but because by his power he brought it about that he could in no way be held and caught by them. Next, that sentence of Peter can most aptly be accommodated to those who were in the purgatorial fire; for that place too is a part of hell…

§84 (continues on p. 177): second objection — Peter (Acts 2): Christ raised ‘the sorrows of hell being loosed’ (Augustine reads them as the tormented). Four replies; the first (Christ himself could not be held); then purgatory. Margins: Acts 2; Augustine; Ps. 87.

— p. 177 (PDF) · printed p. 108 —

…and those who are in it are tormented for a time, and Christ, when he descended to hell, is believed to have freed them — all or most — from those sorrows.

§84 (continued from p. 176): Christ is believed to have freed those in purgatory from their sorrows.

In a third way: because, for that word ‘of hell’ which the Latin translator has in that place (for he seems to have read in Greek hadou, which word

means ‘hell’; but the Greek codices have thanatou, that is ‘of death’), it will be easy to understand how Christ, descending to hell, loosed the ‘sorrows of death’ — that is, those with which the soul of man is affected after death. And these sorrows, even in just and holy men, are at the least two: the one, that the soul remains separated and sundered from the body, which is against the natural appetite of the soul; the other, that before Christ’s coming entrance into heaven lay open to none, but all were detained in hell. These sorrows Christ loosed, both going out free from hell and ascending to the heavens, and — three days after he had died, the soul again joined to the body — returning to immortal life.

§85: third reply — the Greek reads ‘sorrows of death,’ not ‘of hell’; the two pains of the just souls after death, which Christ loosed. Margin: ‘Two pains of the just souls after death, which Christ loosed by his descent to hell.’

In a fourth way, that saying can be nicely accommodated also to the holy fathers who were in limbo, or in Abraham’s bosom. For although they were afflicted in that place by no torments of sorrow on account of their sins, yet they could not be without all sorrow of mind, on account of the most ardent desire with which they burned for the coming of the Messiah and for seeing the face of God; and so long a deferral of that desire and hope could not be without some affliction of mind. For true is that saying of Solomon, ‘Hope that is deferred afflicts the soul.’ And this explanation of those words of Peter the blessed Thomas approves and follows, in the Third Part, q. 52, a. 2, in the Reply to the second objection, expounding those words of Peter: ‘To the second,’ he says, ‘it must be said that sorrow is twofold: one from the suffering of the punishment which men endure for actual sin, according to that of the Psalm, “The sorrows of hell surrounded me”; the other sorrow is from the deferral of the hoped-for glory, according to that of Proverbs 7, “Hope that is deferred afflicts the soul” — which sorrow indeed the holy fathers suffered in hell (to signify which, Augustine in the sermon On the Passion says that with tearful entreaty they prayed to Christ). And both sorrows Christ loosed by descending to hell, yet in one way and another:

for the sorrows of the punishments he loosed by preserving from them, as a physician is said to loose a disease from which he preserves by medicine; but the sorrows caused by the deferral of glory he loosed actually, by bestowing glory on them.' Thus St. Thomas.

§86: fourth reply — accommodated to the holy fathers in limbo, who suffered the pain of deferred hope (Aquinas, ST III, q. 52, a. 2). Margins: Prov. 7; St. Thomas; Ps. 114.

But what St. Augustine objects to this interpretation (in Epistle 99 and in book 12 of On Genesis according to the Letter, ch. 33) — that nowhere in sacred Scripture is the word 'hell' (Infernum or Inferi) placed in a good sense, but is always taken in a bad sense, and that therefore Abraham's bosom and the place in which the holy Fathers were (highly commended in the sacred writings as most full of rest and delight) was not any part of hell, especially since in that Gospel parable of Lazarus and the rich man, Abraham is introduced saying to the rich man, 'A great chasm is fixed between us and you' — this objection of Augustine, I say, seems to have no great force. For although divine Scripture does not openly and expressly hand down that the Limbo of the Fathers was within the earth, yet this is drawn out from the things that are handed down in it…

§87 (continues on p. 178): Augustine's objection (the word 'hell' is never used in a good sense; Lazarus and the 'great chasm') carries little force. Margins: 'Whether it can be gathered from Scripture that Abraham's bosom / the limbo of the holy fathers was some part of hell'; Luke 16.

— p. 178 (PDF) · printed p. 109 —

…For in the book of Genesis, chapter 37, Jacob says: 'Mourning, I will go down to hell to my son Joseph'; but Jacob did not think that his son Joseph — that most holy and most innocent boy — was in the hell of the damned, nor did he think that he himself would go to that place. Nor indeed can it be supposed that there the word 'hell' is put for 'the grave': for Jacob, believing his sons who told him that Joseph had been devoured by beasts, did not think that he, or his body, had been laid in a grave. To this also looks what we recalled above from chapter 24 of the book of

Ecclesiasticus, about the divine Wisdom — that is, about Christ who would descend to hell: ‘I will penetrate the lower parts of the earth, and behold all that sleep, and enlighten all that hope in the Lord.’ Therefore within the lower parts of the earth were detained ‘those who hope in the Lord’ — that is, the holy fathers, awaiting their liberation from hell through Christ’s descent into those places. The blessed Jerome, on those words of Hosea, chapter 13, ‘O death, I will be thy death; O hell, I will be thy bite’: ‘Hell,’ he says, ‘is a place in which souls are shut up, either in refreshment or in punishments, namely according to the quality of their merits.’

§87 (continued from p. 177): Jacob ‘I will go down to hell to my son Joseph’ (Gen. 37); Ecclus 24; Jerome on Hosea 13. Margin: Jerome.

What more? Not even Augustine himself ought to have shrunk from this opinion: for he, in Epistle 99, affirms without hesitation that among the others whom Christ, descending to hell and loosing the sorrows of hell, led out from those places, was Adam, the parent of the human race. But from where, I ask — or out of what hell — did Christ lead Adam? not, surely, from the place of the reprobate and damned (as is plain), nor from the purgatorial fire, by whose temporary torment the just are purified; for it is incredible that, from the time when Adam had died until the time when Christ after death descended into hell — that is, more than three thousand years — Adam was in purgatorial torments. Adam, then, was led out from the limbo of the Fathers. Wherefore that place too was a part of hell, and to the Fathers who were there is rightly applied — even according to Augustine — that sentence of Peter about the sorrows of hell loosed by Christ.

§88: indeed Augustine himself says Christ led Adam out of hell — and Adam can only have been in the limbo of the fathers. Margins: Augustine; ‘Christ led Adam out of the Limbo of the Fathers.’

The third is that sentence of Peter in the fourth chapter of his first Epistle: ‘For this cause the Gospel was preached also to the dead, that they might be judged indeed according to men in the flesh, but live according to God

in the spirit.' For if Christ preached the Gospel to the dead — that is, to those whose souls were held in hell — and it is not credible that he preached there in vain and with no effect and fruit, then it must be believed that through Christ's preaching some were converted to God and freed from the punishments of hell. But those words of St. Peter have various interpretations, which I shall briefly set forth, that it may be plain that the cause of those whose opinion we assail is in no way helped by those words. The first interpretation is that of Oecumenius, who interprets that Christ, when he descended to hell, preached the Gospel to all who dwelt there: so that those who in this world had lived carnal-…

§89 (continues on p. 179): third objection — 1 Peter 4 ('the Gospel preached to the dead'); the readings; Oecumenius. Margins: 1 Pet. 4; Oecumenius.

— p. 179 (PDF) · printed p. 110 —

…ly were judged by Christ, that is condemned; and at the same time were vivified by him — that is, endowed with eternal salvation and with a deathless and blessed life — those who according to God had lived spiritually. For Oecumenius supplies, in those two places, 'according to men in the flesh' and 'according to God in the spirit,' the whole phrase, 'who lived,' or 'who had lived in this world'; and likewise he says that those words 'that they may be judged' and 'may live,' which are of the future tense, are put for verbs of the past tense, 'were judged or condemned, and lived.'

§89 (continued from p. 178): Oecumenius supplies the ellipses and reads the future verbs as past.

Not unlike is the interpretation of the same words of Peter in Cajetan, in the Commentary on that Epistle: 'The sense is,' he says, 'that they may be judged indeed by reason of the flesh in which they lived according to men, that is according to human concupiscences; but may live by reason of the spirit which they had according to God, that is conformable to the divine will. To this end, then, Christ evangelized — manifesting himself in hell to be the judge of all — that the impious might recognize that they were to be

judged or condemned by him, because they led a human and carnal life; and at the same time the just might recognize that they would receive eternal life, because they lived according to the spirit and God. And so Peter revealed to us the cause why Christ willed to evangelize in hell: namely, that such an evangelization might prepare for Christ the judgment of the dead. For the judgment of the living, after his first coming, the evangelization which is made in the world through the Apostles and their successors prepares for him, that all may have knowledge whence they are to be judged.' Thus Cajetan.

§90: Cajetan's similar reading — the Gospel preached in hell prepared Christ's judgment of the dead. Margin: Cajetan.

The second interpretation is in Augustine, in Epistle 99, who by 'the dead' understands those dead in sins as to the soul, or the unfaithful — just as the Lord said to a certain man, 'Let the dead bury their dead'; and Paul, writing to Timothy, 'A widow living in pleasures is dead.' The sense, then, of those words of Peter according to Augustine is this: that the Gospel was preached to impious sinners, that, when they have believed, they may be 'judged indeed according to men in the flesh' — that is, vexed by various tribulations according to the flesh, and condemned by men who hate and persecute their conversion and faith — 'but live according to God in the spirit,' because through such tribulations they attain the life and glory of the spirit. The third interpretation runs thus: We know that Christ will be the judge of the dead, because the Gospel is preached even to those who are already dead before Christ's judgment, so that, although by human opinion they are condemned by the death of the flesh before the Lord comes, yet by the power of the Gospel which in this life they received through faith they may live in the spirit with God, about to take up their flesh again when Christ comes to judge. So Paul, in 1 Corinthians 15, proves the resurrection of the dead: 'If the dead,' he says, 'rise not again, then they who have slept in Christ have perished.'

§91: Augustine's reading (Epist. 99) — 'the dead' = those dead in sin (the unbelieving); and a third reading (the Gospel preached to those soon to die). Margins: Matt. 8; 1 Tim. 5.

A fourth interpretation I judge by no means to be set below the three above. That word 'dead' sometimes in the sacred writings signifies one who is near to death, or, by disease or some other chance, adjudged to death by the laws. So in Matthew, chapter nine…

§92 (continues on p. 180): a fourth reading — 'the dead' = those near death; Pererius judges it not inferior. Margin: Matthew 9.

— p. 180 (PDF) · printed p. 111 —

…Jairus said that his daughter was deceased, whom Mark in chapter five relates to have been at the point of death, and Luke writes that she was already dying. Paul too, in 2 Corinthians 11, says that he was 'often in deaths,' and in 1 Corinthians 15, 'Daily,' he says, 'I die' (which he soon explains), 'We are in peril,' he says, 'every hour.' Peter, then, proves that Christ will judge the dead by this argument: that the Gospel is daily preached even to those who by human judgment are condemned to death; with this purpose, namely, that, although they die according to the flesh, they may yet live with God in the soul, on account of the faith and conversion to Christ which they had at the last; for unless Christ had care of souls, the Gospel would by no means be preached to men just about to die. Similarly Paul, in 1 Corinthians 15, argues from the baptism of the dying to the future resurrection of the dead: 'Otherwise,' he says, 'what shall they do who are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not again? Why then are they baptized for them?' Treating which passage, Epiphanius in Heresy 28: 'Rightly,' he says, 'those interpreting this saying of Paul say that those near death, if they have been instructed in the doctrine of piety, are for this hope made worthy of the sacred laver before their decease — showing that he who is dead will one day rise again, and therefore in the present life needs the remission of sins.' Thus Epiphanius.

§92 (continued from p. 179): examples (Jairus's daughter; Paul 'I die daily'); the Gospel preached to the dying proves Christ's care of souls; 1 Cor. 15 on baptism for the dead (Epiphanius). Margins: Luke 8; 1 Cor. 15; Epiphanius.

The fourth, finally, is that sentence of the same Peter in the third chapter of his first Epistle, in which indeed almost the whole weight of this disputation consists: 'in which also coming he preached to those spirits that were in prison, who had once been incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God in the days of Noah.' Peter indicates by these words that Christ preached in hell to those who in Noah's time had been incredulous and had perished in the Flood; and to think — much less to believe — that this preaching of Christ was either undertaken by him rashly or done altogether uselessly, is not lawful. I do not deny that this passage of Peter is most obscure — indeed, that by its very obscurity it has at all times been especially ennobled and celebrated among the Fathers; but that the passage neither opposes us nor aids those who think against us will be manifest from the twofold interpretation of it which I shall here subjoin. The first interpretation is that of St. Augustine, which he treats at length in Epistle 99. Augustine thinks that Peter does not speak of Christ's descent to hell, nor of a preaching made by him in hell, but, using figurative speech, teaches that that time of Noah, in which the Flood was made, bore an illustrious likeness and image of the time of Christ's coming and of the preaching of the Gospel law. For at that time Christ came 'in spirit,' preaching to those men — that is, coming by spiritual inspirations and revelations into the mind of his servants, such as Noah and others, through them he preached to the men of that time; but in this time Christ himself, seen on earth and conversing with men, preached to the world both through himself and through his disciples. Then it was preached that the Flood would come to destroy all men; after-…

§93 (continues on p. 181): the fourth and chief objection — 1 Pet. 3:19 ('the spirits in prison'); Augustine's figural reading (the Flood era as an image of the time of the Gospel). Margins: 'The passage of 1 Peter 3 treated at length'; Augustine; Baruch 3.

— p. 181 (PDF) · printed p. 112 —

…after Christ's coming, there began to be preached the final conflagration of the world and the last judgment, in which all the reprobate are to be consigned to everlasting punishments. Then very many were incredulous, and so were drowned and overwhelmed and perished in the Flood, but a few were saved through the ark; but after Christ's coming the lesser part of men believe the Gospel, and are saved through baptism and faith. Lastly, at that time penance was preached to men while the ark was being built, up to the coming of the Flood; but at this time the Gospel is preached to all, by which Christ's Church is built up among all nations up to the consummation of the age.

§93 (continued from p. 180): the figural parallel completed (the few saved in the ark / the few saved by baptism).

Nor ought the word 'prison,' here put by Peter, to seem unusual — taken either for the body, in which the soul is held as if shut in a prison, according to that of Psalm 141, 'Bring my soul out of prison' (indeed Bede reads, for 'prison,' 'flesh,' although he mentions our reading too); or for the misery of errors and vices by which the unbelieving were held bound and as it were captive. For Isaiah, in chapters 42 and 49, narrating the calling of the Gentiles and describing the state in which the Gentiles were before receiving the faith, depicts the unbelieving as bound with chains, darkened, shut in with iron bars and gates of bronze, and confined in a most foul prison: 'I gave thee,' he says, ch. 42, 'for a covenant of the people and for a light of the Gentiles, that thou mightest open the eyes of the blind and bring forth the prisoner from confinement and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house.' The same in chapter 49: 'I gave thee for a covenant of the people, that thou mightest raise up the earth and possess the inheritances that were destroyed, that thou mightest say to them that are bound, Come forth, and to them that are in darkness, Show yourselves.'

§94: 'prison' may mean the body, or the misery of error in which the unbelieving were held captive (Isa. 42, 49). Margins: Bede; Isa. 42, 49.

Nor is it so harsh and unusual in the sacred writings (as Catharinus thought) for a man to be called ‘spirit,’ since sometimes divine Scripture uses, by synecdoche — as the name ‘flesh’ and ‘soul,’ so the name ‘spirit’ — for the whole man, as in Psalm 77, ‘He remembered that they are flesh, a spirit that goeth and returneth not.’ By which manner of speech the common people too use it, calling men worn out with leanness ‘spirits’; and of a man of elegant talent it is wont to be said in common speech, ‘he is a gentle spirit’ (è un gentil spirito). Thus far, roughly, from Augustine. Whose interpretation does not seem very probable: both because it is figurative and mystical rather than inhering in the sense of Peter’s words and (as they call it) literal, and because it excludes Christ’s descent to hell — whose doctrine and belief most of the Fathers are wont to gather and prove especially from this passage of Peter.

§95: nor is it strange that a man be called ‘spirit’ (synecdoche); Augustine’s whole reading is rejected as figurative, not literal, and as excluding the descent. Margins: Catharinus; Ps. 77.

The other interpretation, because it fits better the sense of the blessed Peter’s words and at the same time embraces the doctrine of the Fathers who from this passage confirmed Christ’s descent into hell, I judge preferable to the rest and more probable. According to this interpretation, then, we shall explain that sentence of St. Peter distinctly, part by part. ‘In which’: Cyril, in the book On the Right Faith to Theodosius, expounds thus: ‘Using his divine virtue and power, he appeared also to the spirits that were in hell’; for he refers this ‘in which’ to that a little above, ‘But being vivified in the spirit,’ that is, by the power of the divinity. But Oecumenius [takes] that…

§96 (continues on p. 182): the second, preferred (literal) interpretation; parsing ‘in which’ (Cyril; Oecumenius). Margins: Cyril; Oecumenius.

— p. 182 (PDF) · printed p. 113 —

…‘in which’ to mean the same as ‘for which,’ and to be causal, so that this clause is connected with the preceding in this manner: Because Christ died

for the unjust — not only for those who lived after his coming, but for these too who preceded his coming — therefore he descended into hell, etc. That ‘in which’ could also be referred to the spirit, or rational soul, of Christ, according to which he descended into hell, his body being meanwhile laid in the tomb; in which signification that which had preceded, ‘being vivified in the spirit,’ can also be taken, so that the sense is: Christ in his passion died according to the flesh, but according to the spirit — that is, the soul — remained living and immortal. For in the sacred writings ‘to vivify’ does not always mean to make a living thing out of a dead one, but sometimes means the same as to preserve in life or to keep from death, as in 1 Kings 27 it is written of David: ‘He saved alive neither man nor woman,’ that is, he left none alive. And in this signification it is very often used in the Psalms.

§96 (continued from p. 181): Oecumenius reads ‘in which’ as causal; ‘in which’ may also refer to Christ’s soul; on ‘vivified.’ Margin: (1 Kings 27).

‘And to those who were in prison’: by the word ‘prison’ the place of hell is most aptly described; and more than once in the Gospel parables the place of hell is designated by the likeness and word of ‘prison.’ ‘The Spirit, coming, preached’: by ‘spirits’ he calls the souls which were detained in hell, whether of the good or of the evil. Others read ‘coming in spirit,’ that is, descending into hell according to the soul only. Although Augustine, in Epistle 99, interprets this ‘coming in spirit’ as ‘coming by spiritual revelations and inspirations into the minds of his servants, who before his coming in the flesh were, in every age, the heralds of his word and the interpreters of his will.’ For Augustine interpreted these words of Peter not of Christ’s descent to hell, but in the manner I expounded a little above.

Parsing the rest: ‘to the spirits in prison’ (= hell), ‘coming he preached’; the variant ‘coming in spirit’; Augustine’s figurative reading noted again. Margin: Augustine.

That word ‘preached’ does not signify a preaching of the Gospel made by Christ for the conversion of those who were in hell, but a manifestation of

himself in hell — that he was that awaited Messiah and Savior of the world, and the future judge of all, who would render to each according to his deserts either eternal rewards or punishments; whence to the faithful and holy came an incredible consolation and joy, but to the unfaithful and wicked grief and confusion. ‘Who had once been incredulous’: some refer this to the just whom Christ led out of hell, and say that they are called ‘incredulous’ because they had once been incredulous and disobedient to God, or because all, at least in Adam, had been incredulous and sinners. Which Athanasius hints in the book On the Incarnation of the Word; and Jerome, on those words of Zachariah, chapter nine, ‘Thou also, by the blood of thy testament,’ etc., says that Christ led out of hell those who were held by the sins of Adam and by the chains of ingrained error.

§97: ‘preached’ = his self-manifestation as Messiah and judge (joy to the faithful, dismay to the rest); ‘who had once been incredulous.’ Margins: Athanasius; Jerome.

But Oecumenius interprets thus: that Christ preached to all the spirits who were in hell, the very many who had once been incredulous being left in damnation, but a few [being brought] to the salvation of the soul — namely, those who in this life had believed and lived well —…

§(Oecumenius, continues on p. 183): Christ preached to all the spirits, leaving the many unbelievers in damnation, freeing the few faithful — as in Noah’s day. Margin: Oecumenius.

— p. 183 (PDF) · printed p. 114 —

…just as, for example, it happened in the days of Noah, at which time, innumerable men perishing in the Flood because they had been incredulous, a few believers were saved from the Flood through the ark. And so that [saying] about the incredulous in the days of Noah was uttered by the blessed Peter as it were by way of example; for although the same could have been said of very many others, Peter mentions these especially, because they were well-nigh innumerable and were at the very origin of the world, and because both their destruction, which befell them by the Flood, and the preservation of those few men through the ark, was a thing most

memorable and admirable, and a certain illustrious image of the things that came to pass after Christ's coming. It is plain, therefore, that that [saying] about the incredulous in Noah's time was neither idly spoken by Peter, nor yet favors the opinion of those who thought that they were freed from the punishments of hell by Christ's descent to hell.

§(Oecumenius, continued from p. 182): the Noah example given by Peter as an instance — memorable and an image of what followed Christ's coming. Margin: Bede.

'When they waited for the patience of God.' So it now stands in the Latin books. But Bede in this place, and Jerome and Augustine in the passages set forth above, read in this manner, 'When the patience of God waited [for] those sinners unto penance, through a hundred years while the ark was being built.' The Greek verb apexedecheto admits both readings, because it is common (deponent in form) and can be read both passively and actively — that is, 'was waiting' and 'was being waited for'; and this latter falls back into our reading, according to which these words are referred to the incredulous who lived in Noah's time, who therefore did not believe him announcing that the Flood would come, because they 'waited for the patience of God' — that is, trusting in God's clemency and kindness, they thought God would deal patiently and clemently with sinners, and would never suffer the whole race of men to perish by the Flood. Behold, then, the true and genuine interpretation of that sentence of the blessed Peter, from which, however, it is clearly seen that this passage of Peter in no way supports those whose opinion we have assailed in this disputation.

§98: 'when they waited for the patience of God' — the active vs. passive reading of the Greek; the true sense. Margins: Jerome; Augustine; Bede.

But I cannot pass over in silence what Cajetan, explaining these words of Peter, left written. For he says (which we recalled above too, at the beginning of this disputation) that those who perished in the Flood were not unbelievers simply, but were unbelievers only toward Noah, not toward God; since, while they waited for [God's] patience, believing that God in

his infinite clemency would never destroy the whole race of men, he therefore thinks that, by the merit of this trust, they pleased God and were judged fit to be brought, through Christ's presence and preaching, to eternal salvation.

§99: a remark against Cajetan — that those who perished were unbelievers toward Noah but not toward God, and so found favor. Margin: 'A remark against Cajetan.'

But who would not marvel that so great a genius as Cajetan did not see how absurd this was? For since Noah was a prophet of God, and in God's name announced his will and commands to the men of his time, how were they not unbelievers toward God, if they did not believe Noah, the prophet of God, expounding his commands? For what the Lord said to his disciples, 'He who hears you hears me, and he who despises you despises me,' also…

§100 (continues on p. 184): Pererius marvels at Cajetan — to disbelieve Noah, God's prophet, was to disbelieve God; cut off (Luke 10, 'he who hears you hears me'). Margin: Luke 10.

— p. 184 (PDF) · printed p. 115 —

…[that saying] may most truly be applied to the Prophets too, and to all who spoke in God's name. And that is true which King Jehoshaphat said to the Jews: 'Believe in the Lord your God, and you shall be secure; believe his prophets, and all things shall turn out prosperously.' And in the book of Exodus it is written that the Jews, having seen so many and so great miracles done by God in Egypt through Moses, believed God and Moses his servant. And trust in the divine long-suffering, if it does not — recalling a man from his sins — lead him to do penance, is vain, and displeasing to God, and avails nothing for the pardon or excuse of sin, but rather makes for the man's condemnation. But let us here end the course of this disputation, as now brought to its goal.

§100 (continued from p. 183): to disbelieve the prophets is to disbelieve God; trust in God's long-suffering that does not lead to repentance is vain — the close of the Third Disputation and of Book IX. Margins: 2 Paralipomenon (Chronicles) 20 [Jehoshaphat]; Exod. 14.

THE TENTH BOOK OF THE COMMENTARIES OF BENEDICT PERERIUS ON GENESIS, WHICH IS ON THE ARK OF NOAH.

Title page of Book X (Liber Decimus).

THE NARRATIVE OF MOSES, on the Ark of Noah; from the sixth chapter of the book of Genesis. Make thee an ark of planed timber; thou shalt make little rooms in the ark, and thou shalt pitch it within and without with bitumen. And thus shalt thou make it: The length of the ark shall be three hundred cubits, the breadth of it fifty cubits, and the height of it thirty cubits. Thou shalt make a window in the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish the top of it; and the door of the ark thou shalt set in the side; with lower, middle, and third stories shalt thou make it.

The Scripture passage prefixed to Book X: Genesis 6:14–16 (Vulgate).

— p. 185 (PDF) · printed p. 116 —

PREFACE.

Preface to Book X.

There are three things in the sacred writings exceedingly memorable and celebrated, made by men not only at God’s command but even by his prescription and design: the Mosaic Tabernacle, the Temple of Solomon, and the Ark of Noah. But this last may, for many causes, seem more wonderful and more worthy of telling than those: first, by the length of time in which it was made, for it is believed that a hundred years were spent in building it; then, by its magnitude and capacity, the like of which has hitherto, since the founding of the world, been seen on the waters; next, by its use and end, which was the escape from the universal Flood of the world, and the preservation of the whole race both of men and of animals, and the repairing of the ruined world, and as it were a certain new origin of a world reborn; and besides, by the manifold marvelousness of the things

by which that ark was magnified and ennobled beyond what can be estimated — such as, for example, the coming of animals of every kind to the Ark from all the shores of the earth, the holy Angels gathering them and leading them to Noah; and the so easy and peaceful introduction by Noah into the ark of so many fierce and savage and cruel animals, and their most quiet sojourn there for one year; and likewise the divine steering of that Ark, for it was moved and governed through the waters not by human force and art, but by the power of God and the ministry of the Angels; and finally, by the richness and sublimity of its mysteries — concerning which mysteries great and marvelous things handed down to memory by the Fathers we shall explain in their place. To explain, then, the history of this Ark briefly described by Moses, we have devoted this whole tenth book; and, that the things we have undertaken to teach might be set forth more lucidly and distinctly, we have arranged it in two parts. For first is delivered the historical and (as they call it) literal explanation of what Moses wrote about the Ark; and afterward is added the Mystical — that is, Allegorical and Tropological — interpretation of the same things. And the disputation itself which is about the Ark we have made threefold: for in the first place there is disputed the material of the Ark; in the second, its magnitude and capacity; lastly, its figure and the distinction and disposition of its parts.

The Preface: three works most celebrated in Scripture were made by men at God's express direction — the Tabernacle, the Temple, and Noah's Ark; why the Ark is the most wonderful; and the plan of this book (a literal then a mystical part; a threefold disputation on the Ark's material, size, and form). Margin: 'In five [three] respects the Ark of Noah seems more wonderful than the Tabernacle of Moses and the Temple of Solomon.'

— p. 186 (PDF) · printed p. 117 —

Verse 14. Make thee an ark of planed timber; thou shalt make little rooms in the Ark, and thou shalt pitch it within and without with bitumen.

Genesis 6:14 (Vulgate lemma).

Consider, says Chrysostom, the condescension of God and the ineffable mercy which transcends all reckoning, and at the same time his admirable providence toward Noah, commanding Noah to make himself an ark and ordaining the manner in which it was to be built, and by that very thing bringing him the greatest consolation, while by the building of the ark he shows the hope of salvation. God also wished that those who had most grievously sinned should, by the building of the ark, be admonished of their crimes, so that, by coming to their senses, they might by no means experience the impending indignation and vengeance; for no small time was again granted them for doing penance — namely, while the ark was being completed — in which they could have corrected their life, had they not been so ungrateful and stupid toward the amendment of their crimes. For it is likely that whoever saw Noah insisting so on the building of so great an ark, having inquired from him the cause of the construction, came to know the divine indignation; wherefore, had they wished, they could easily have come to the recognition of their sins. But these things brought them no profit — not because they could not come to their senses, but because they would not. Thus Chrysostom.

§1: Chrysostom on God's condescension — commanding the ark gave Noah consolation and the sinners a further warning to repent. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 24 on Genesis.

'Make thee an ark.' By God's warning and teaching, Noah understood that the Flood would come, and how he might avoid that calamity. As for what Berosus Annius said — that Noah, a man most learned in astrology, foresaw the coming Flood from the inspection and observation of the stars — these are Berosian trifles, or rather an Annian fabrication. For we shall show in the twelfth book, by manifest reasons, that the Noachic Flood neither proceeded from natural causes, nor could have been foreseen by the science of star-divination. Moses indicates by the aforesaid words the material of which God wished the ark to be made. That 'make' does not signify that it was commanded of Noah by God that he himself alone, or with his own hands, should make the ark, but that he, with others — as

many as were necessary for the work — should make it, or should see to its being made by other craftsmen skilled in doing that work, hired by him for wages. That ‘for thee’ denotes the use of the ark, as if to say: for the preservation of thyself and thy family, that thou mayst escape, safe and unharmed, the Flood by which the rest of mortals are to be destroyed.

§2: ‘Make thee an ark’ — Noah learned of the Flood from God, not (against Berosus Annius) from astrology; ‘make’ = by himself or by hired craftsmen; ‘for thee’ = for his own preservation. Margin: ‘Against Berosus Annius.’

FIRST DISPUTATION. Why it was called an ark, and not a ship.

Heading of the First Disputation of Book X.

That word ‘ark’ shows the form of the work. But why was it called an ‘ark’ (in Hebrew Tebah), and not rather a ‘ship’? Doubtless it was more like an ark than a ship, both in shape and in use: for a ship is narrowed at the lower part…

§3 (continues on p. 187): why ‘ark’ (Hebrew Tebah), not ‘ship’ — it was more like an ark in shape and use.

— p. 187 (PDF) · printed p. 118 —

…and contracted, but at its upper part is open and ample; whereas the ark of Noah was, on both sides — both above and below — closed and broad. For because it had to keep off not only the lower waters on which it floated, but also the upper ones poured down from heaven for forty continuous days with incredible abundance and force, it was therefore necessary that it be on every side closed and well fortified. And that it might be capacious enough for the many and great animals which had to dwell in it for one year, it was therefore needful that it be broad throughout. Moreover, a ship has a figure handy and fit for the use for which it is made — namely, that it be moved and steered through the waters by oars and winds and human art; but that ark of Noah was driven not by the moving and steering of men, but

of God. Hear Chrysostom: ‘Was it not by supernal grace that the ark was moved this way and that, and not sunk by so great a force of waters, when there was no steersman? For you cannot say that it was after the manner of a ship, so that its course could be directed by some art of his. The ark was on every side closed and fortified, and, by the precept of the Creator, not only could the force of the waters not harm it, but, made higher than they, it rendered its inhabitants quite secure. For when God works anything, do not by human reason seek out the things that are done; for they transcend our mind, and human thought cannot attain and comprehend the reason of the things founded by God. Therefore it is fitting that we, hearing what God commanded, obey and believe the things said by him; for, since he is the founder of nature, he composes and transforms all things as seems good to him.’ Thus Chrysostom. And Augustine, in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 27, says that the ark of Noah was built not with curved but with straight lines, stretched out far and wide, which no effort of men would launch into the sea, but the wave would lift when it came, by the natural order of weights, and which the divine providence rather than human prudence would steer as it floated, lest it anywhere suffer shipwreck. Thus far from Augustine. It had, likewise, the use of an ‘ark,’ which serves for the hiding and keeping of things; whence Varro said that an ark (arca) is so called in Latin because it ‘keeps off’ (arceat) thieves from the things it holds stored and shut up within it. Similarly the ark of Noah kept off the waters of the Flood from the men and animals which it held and covered within itself.

§3 (continued from p. 186): the ark closed top and bottom (to keep out the waters above and below), and broad (for the animals); unlike a ship, it was steered by God, not by human art. Margins: Augustine (City of God 15.27); Varro.

The raft, too, on which Deucalion with his wife Pyrrha is said to have escaped the flood (a thing feigned and set forth by the Poets), I find was called by the heathen an ‘Ark’; doubtless, as many other things of that Flood, so this about the Ark too, the Poets borrowed from the history of Moses. Lucian, in the Timon or Misanthrope, writing of the flood of

Deucalion, calls the vessel by which he escaped a ‘little ark,’ in Greek kib■tion: ‘So suddenly,’ he says, ‘did the shipwreck happen under Deucalion that, all being sunk in the deep, scarcely a single little ark survived and was driven ashore at Lycorea.’ Adron of Teos calls the same a larnax, that is, an ark. And because it was driven ashore at Mount Parnassus, for that cause (on the authority of Stephanus) that mountain was anciently called Larnassus, but afterward, the first letter being changed, was named Parnassus. By a similar word the Scholiast of Homer na-…

§5 (continues on p. 188): the raft on which Deucalion escaped the flood is called an ‘ark’ by the heathen (the poets borrowing from Moses); Lucian, Adron of Teos, Stephanus on Parnassus. Margins: ‘The raft on which Deucalion is said to have escaped the flood was called by the heathen an Ark’; Lucian; Adron of Teos; Stephanus, On Cities; Iliad 1.

— p. 188 (PDF) · printed p. 119 —

…names the raft of Deucalion, writing in this manner: ‘Jupiter, pouring much rain from heaven, so flooded many parts of Greece that many men perished, a few excepted who fled to the nearest mountains. But Deucalion, sailing through the sea in an Ark (en t■ larnaki), in nine days and as many nights came to land at Parnassus, and there, the rains ceasing, having gone out of the ark, sacrificed to Jupiter Phyxius (the Protector of fugitives).’

§5 (continued from p. 187): the Homeric Scholiast on Deucalion’s ‘ark’ (larnax) and the nine-days’ voyage to Parnassus.

SECOND DISPUTATION. Of what kind of wood the Ark was built.

Heading of the Second Disputation of Book X.

Moses says the Ark was made ‘of planed timber.’ The Septuagint translators have ‘of squared timber’; for planed and squared timbers are better fitted and joined together. But to be ‘planed’ and ‘squared’ does not denote any particular kind of wood; for it belongs to any kind of wood that it can be planed and squared. St. Jerome says that in the Hebrew it reads ‘of

pitched timber.' But in Hebrew 'bitumen' is Copher; in this place, however, it is Gopher — a word, namely, different and of a different signification. St. Augustine, in the sixth Tract on John, hands down that it is found in sacred Scripture that the ark of Noah was built of imperishable timber. But what is written of the Ark of Moses in Exodus, Augustine accommodated to this ark of Noah. Indeed Ambrose warns that here 'timber' is put simply, but in Exodus 'imperishable.' Some interpret 'of boards of boxwood.' But Pliny, in book 16, ch. 40, writes that boxwood is a most dense and therefore most heavy material, and so does not float on the waters. Oleaster, although he says that the word Gopher is of a signification unknown to the Hebrews, yet makes the conjecture himself that by that word is signified pitch, or the pine which bears pitch. For below, in chapter 19, the name gophrith is put, which is of the same root, for pitch or brimstone, when it is said that the Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah pitch and brimstone and fire; and it is found in the same signification in Ezekiel, ch. 39, and in Isaiah, ch. 38. And although pine timbers, because they are easily corrupted by water, may therefore seem least fit for building that ark, nevertheless the inner parts of the pine are most firm and unconquered by waters. Thus Oleaster.

§6: the readings — 'planed/squared timber,' 'pitched' (Jerome); the Hebrew Gopher (a word of uncertain sense); Augustine, Ambrose, Oleaster (pitch-pine?). Margins: Jerome, Hebrew Traditions; Augustine; Exod. 25; Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 7; Pliny; Oleaster on Genesis.

But let us return to the word Gopher. That it is of a quite obscure and uncertain signification, and is nowhere else placed in Scripture, the Hebrews confess. Aben-Ezra (who deserves to be reckoned of the first class of Hebrew interpreters) says that he thinks by that word is signified a certain kind of wood, light and floating on the waters, yet impenetrable and incorruptible by them — though it is not clear to him of what species it is. Wherefore some thought it was fir or larch, which trees Pliny writes are of all the tallest and straightest, and, for sustain-…

§7 (continues on p. 189): the Hebrews own that Gopher is obscure; Aben-Ezra (a light, floating, incorruptible wood); some say fir or larch (Pliny). Margins: Aben-Ezra; Pliny, bk. 16.

— p. 189 (PDF) · printed p. 120 —

…ing weight in water, the strongest of all: for they resist, and are not easily broken, and fail by rot sooner than by their strength. Others believe it was the cypress, surpassing in durability, which Pliny so beautifully described: ‘For it is peevish, useless in fruit, grim with berries, bitter of leaf, violent of odor, of porous timber, of little grateful shade, sacred to Dis (Pluto), and therefore placed at houses as a funeral sign.’ Many think it was cedar; for the Chaldee paraphrast too renders in this place, ‘of cedar timber.’ Certainly Pliny relates that in Egypt and Syria the kings, for lack of fir, use cedar for their fleets. And cedar feels neither rot nor age, nor of itself takes crack or fissure. At Utica, in the temple of Apollo, beams of Numidian cedars endured in Pliny’s time just as they had been placed at the first founding of that city — that is, for one thousand one hundred and eighty-eight years.

§7 (continued from p. 188): fir/larch resist weight in water; others say cypress (Pliny’s description); many say cedar (the Chaldee ‘of cedar’; cedar’s incorruptibility). Margins: Pliny, bk. 16, ch. 40; ‘Description of the cypress.’

I judge that no one particular kind of wood was fit for building the whole ark, but that some woods were more suitable for building some parts of the Ark. And among the trees themselves there is a great difference of tallness, thickness, strength, lightness, and durability. And so the longer and more rigid suited chiefly the base; those of a lighter temper served excellently for the roofs; others nicely served for the joistings and planking of the stories; some, of tractable material, were especially adapted to interior work and small cuttings. Therefore, either Moses by that word Gopher did not wish to signify any one particular species of wood; or, if he did, it pertained not to the use of the whole construction of the ark, but only to its larger, firmer, and principal parts.

§8: Pererius's own view — not one wood but several, each fit for different parts of the Ark.

But the reader will perhaps wonder how beams of such magnitude as would suffice for building so great a mass of ark could be found and procured. But he will easily lay aside his wonder if he considers that the base and the sides along the length of the Ark were not made of single beams extended lengthwise, which would equal and fill the whole length of the Ark, but of many beams joined together lengthwise, which were propped by other beams set crosswise according to the breadth of the Ark. This too will take away the wonder, which is handed down to memory by approved authors about the length of certain trees. Pliny affirms that in the principate of Tiberius there was seen at Rome a beam of larch a hundred and twenty feet long, two feet thick, uniform throughout — by which the rest of its height, scarcely credible, was understood by those estimating the taper to the top. In Cyprus a cedar was cut down for the eleven-banked galley of Demetrius, a hundred and thirty feet in length, and in thickness to the span of three men. That the robbers of Germany were wont to sail in single hollowed trees, so that some of them carried even thirty men, Pliny is the author in the same place. And the same writer, in book 7, ch. 2, writes marvels about the tallness of the Indian trees, saying that they cannot be overshot by arrows.

§9: how trees great enough were found — the base and sides were not single beams but many joined; the wonders of tree-size in Pliny. Margins: 'On the magnitude of the trees from which the Ark was built'; Pliny, bk. 16 (and 7).

Most praised in the sacred writings is the height of cedars; and so when…

§10 (continues on p. 190): the cedar's height most praised in Scripture.

— p. 190 (PDF) · printed p. 121 —

…divine Scripture wishes to magnify the tallness of anything, it compares it to the height of cedars, as may be seen in Ezekiel, ch. 31, and Amos, ch. 2, and David in Psalm 91, [who] compares the increases of the virtues and glory of just men with the growth and increase of cedars: 'The just man,'

he says, ‘shall flourish like the palm; he shall be multiplied like the cedar of Lebanon.’ For this cause too the same Scripture calls them ‘cedars of God,’ namely on account of their excellent tallness; although, besides their height, the cedar’s scent and shade, and the firmness and durability of its material, are also eminently commended.

§10 (continued from p. 189): Scripture compares lofty things to cedars (Ezek. 31; Amos 2; Ps. 91, ‘the just shall flourish like a cedar’); ‘cedars of God.’

But what follows, ‘Thou shalt make little rooms in the Ark,’ in Hebrew and Greek reads thus, ‘Thou shalt make the ark [into] nests,’ as though the whole ark were to be, as it were, a nest — that is, filled with many nests. And after the likeness of birds’ nests, the places destined for the habitation of the animals are called ‘nests.’ For the multitude and variety of the animals, places had to be built separately for their abode, diverse both in figure and in capacity; and besides these, cells too had to be constructed, where the foodstuffs that would suffice for one year, both for the animals and for the men, could be stored and preserved. And he called them ‘little rooms’ because the places were to be narrow — namely, such as would be enough for the animals to stay in, but not to range about or run to and fro at large.

§11: ‘little rooms’ — Hebrew and Greek read ‘nests’; the ark full of ‘nests’ for the animals and cells for the year’s provisions; why ‘little’ (narrow, just for staying).

And thou shalt pitch it within and without with bitumen.

Genesis 6:14b (the continuation of the lemma).

Bitumen, says Rabanus, is a most fervent and most powerful glue, whose virtue is such that timbers smeared with it can be eaten neither by worms, nor dissolved by the sun’s heat, nor by the blasts of the winds, nor by the violence of the waters. But about bitumen Pliny disputes more fully and brilliantly in book 35, ch. 15, setting forth its nature, powers, and various uses, and even its manifold native soil. The force of bitumen is indeed

incorruptible and stubborn against waters, and so it preserves timbers from drinking in noxious moisture, nor does it allow air to penetrate, and it keeps off moths, ship-worms, and other faults from timbers — on account of which it especially affords durability to works; but there is in it also a chief virtue of joining, not only timbers but even bodies, for it binds up wounds and glues together sinews. It also provided the use of lime to Queen Semiramis, the Babylonian walls being thus soldered with brick of baked clay. The bitumen which was in the Lake Asphaltites of Judaea — also named in the sacred writings the Dead Sea — was held in singular admiration; for it is said to have been of such tenacity that whatever things were smeared with it could be dissolved by nothing else than menstrual blood of a woman poured over them.

§12: bitumen — a most powerful glue (Rabanus); its nature, virtues, and uses (Pliny); the Dead Sea bitumen. Margins: Rabanus; ‘The virtue of bitumen’; Pliny.

On account, therefore, of these virtues of bitumen, so opportune for the structure of the Ark, besides the faces of the timbers within and without, all the sides of the joints too, where they met one another, and finally the whole interior work, must be believed to have been smeared with bitumen; which not on-…

§13 (continues on p. 191): why the whole work was pitched — for joining and for hundred-year durability.

— p. 191 (PDF) · printed p. 122 —

…only availed for the cementing, but also for the hundred years’ durability before the Flood, which time is believed to have been spent in building the ark; after which time, even down to the times of Josephus, certain remnants of that Ark endured for more than two thousand years. The ark, moreover, is commanded to be smeared with bitumen both without and within: without, indeed, that the joints of the boards might be well closed against the waters, both those surrounding and those poured over the ark; but within, lest the violent force of the water — whether falling from above, or

vehemently dashed against the very sides of the ark — should, if they scraped away the outer coating, be able (the inner coating resisting) to penetrate inward to the ark; or lest the great moisture on the outer part should make the inner part of the ark slimy.

§13 (continued from p. 190): the pitching served both for joining and for durability (remnants survived to Josephus's day); why pitched inside and out. Margin: Josephus, Antiquities, bk. 1.

THIRD DISPUTATION. On the magnitude and capacity of the Ark.

Heading of the Third Disputation of Book X.

Verse 15. The length of the Ark shall be three hundred cubits, the breadth of it fifty cubits, and the height of it thirty cubits.

Genesis 6:15 (Vulgate lemma).

By these words is declared the magnitude of the Ark according to all its dimensions — of length, breadth, and height; whence one may understand how great was the capacity of that Ark. The length of the Ark, then, was sextuple to the breadth, as 300 to 50, but decuple to the height, as 300 to 30 — which is, namely, the proportion among the dimensions of the human body. For the length of the body, from the crown to the soles of the feet, is six times as great as the breadth, which is from the right side to the left through the middle of the chest, and ten times as great as its height, which is the straight line measuring the depth of the chest of a man lying prone or supine. And lest these be thought drawn from my own opinion, I have followed the blessed Augustine as the author and leader of this view, writing thus in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 26: 'The very measure of the length, breadth, and height of the Ark signifies the human body. For the length of the human body, from the crown to the footprints, has six times as much as the breadth, which is from one side to the other side, and ten times as much as the height, the measure of which height is from the back to the belly: as, if you measure a man lying supine or prone, he is six times as

long from head to feet as he is broad from right to left, and ten times as long as he is high from the ground.' Thus Augustine; who says the same in book 12 against Faustus, ch. 14. But because Moses defined the dimensions of the Ark in cubits, that the magnitude of the Ark may be understood, something must be said about the measure of the cubit.

§14: the Ark's three dimensions in the proportions of the human body (6:1 length-to-breadth, 10:1 length-to-height) — Augustine (City of God 15.26). Margin: Augustine.

Many measures are in use drawn from the human body, such as are…

§15 (continues on p. 192): measures drawn from the human body. Margin: 'On the measure and capacity of the cubit.'

— p. 192 (PDF) · printed p. 123 —

…the finger, the palm, the foot, the cubit (cubitus or cubitum), the ell (ulna), the pace. Now the Pace is the space to which both hands are stretched, between the longest fingers of either hand; and this is the measure of the human body, equal to that which is from the crown to the soles of the feet. And the Pace consists of four cubits. The cubit, moreover, is the interval from the middle joint of the arm, or its bend, to the very tip of the middle finger — a foot and a half, that is, consisting of one foot and a half. The ell, on the authority of Pollux and Hesychius, is the same as the cubit — although Servius, on those words of Virgil, 'Tell in what lands (and thou shalt be to me great Apollo) the space of the sky lies open no more than three ells,' makes the ell equal to the pace. In Ovid, however, in the seventh book of the Metamorphoses, and in Pliny, book 16, ch. 40, the ell is put for the whole limb comprising the arm, the forearm, and the hand; but (as we said above) the common sense and use of men [makes it equal to the cubit]. The foot consists of four palms; the palm, of four transverse fingers. Therefore the cubit, in common use, is a foot and a half, and consists of six palms. About these measures Vitruvius and others [have written], but of all men most subtly and most diligently has Agricola discoursed.

§15 (continued from p. 191): the finger, palm, foot, cubit, ell, pace; the pace = 4 cubits; the cubit = a foot and a half (6 palms). Margins: Julius Pollux; Hesychius; Servius on Eclogue 3; Ovid; Pliny; Vitruvius; Agricola.

I would not, for my part, deny that these measures were anciently larger than they now are, as the human body itself too was; but to what extent they have decreased is uncertain. Among the Hebrews there is said to have been a twofold kind of cubit: the one common and ordinary, of a foot and a half, as has been defined; the other, which in Ezekiel, ch. 43, is called the ‘truest and perfect’ cubit, greater than the common by one palm, and therefore named by some the ‘palm-cubit’; from which cubit the Royal cubit was but little distant, greater than the common and ordinary by three fingers, which Herodotus mentions in his first book.

§16: anciently the measures (and bodies) were larger; among the Hebrews two cubits — the common (1½ ft) and the ‘true and perfect’ (Ezek. 43), greater by a palm; the royal cubit (Herodotus). Margin: Herodotus.

There is named, moreover, in the sacred writings, the ‘manly cubit,’ or the ‘cubit of a man’s hand.’ For in the third chapter of Deuteronomy, about Og the giant, king of Bashan, it is written thus: ‘Og alone, king of Bashan, remained of the stock of the giants. His iron bed is shown, which is in Rabbath of the children of Ammon, having nine cubits in length and four in breadth, according to the measure of the cubit of a man’s hand’ (or, as the Septuagint translators have it, word for word from the Hebrew, ‘in the cubit of a man’). And it is called the ‘manly cubit’ which is of a just and perfect measure; for such is the cubit of a man — that is, of a man perfect alike in age and in stature — for the cubit of a boy or of some little fellow is far less. And although the measure of the cubit was drawn from the arm of a man (from whose bend to the very tip of the middle finger, when it is extended, it is called a ‘cubit’), nevertheless, because, with the variety of men’s stature, the magnitude of the human cubit also varies, while a measure which is applied for measuring things must necessarily be fixed and uniform, it therefore came about that the measure of a cubit, made of

wood, metal, or other material and adapted to the magnitude of the manly cubit (that is…

§17 (continues on p. 193): the ‘cubit of a man’s hand’ — Og’s iron bed (Deut. 3); why a standard cubit was kept publicly. Margins: ‘The passage of Deuteronomy, ch. 3; what the cubit of a man is according to Scripture.’

— p. 193 (PDF) · printed p. 124 —

…the perfect [cubit]), should be kept publicly and applied for measuring things, that no fraud might lie hidden beneath.

§17 (continued from p. 192): the standard cubit kept publicly, to forestall fraud.

But it is fitting to know that in that passage of Deuteronomy, for what we have, ‘according to the measure of the cubit of a man’s hand,’ the Chaldee paraphrast rendered thus, ‘according to the king’s cubit’; which some think is to be referred to King Og himself, so that it is signified that his bed had not the length and breadth of a common cubit, but according to the measure of the cubit of that same king, who, as in the rest of his body, so also in his cubit, exceeded other men. And this the author of the Complutensian edition followed; for he has, ‘in the cubit of the same king.’ Although there are some who think that the ‘royal cubit’ is so called for that which is ‘public’ — just as a road is called ‘royal,’ that is, public — so that Moses meant to signify the public cubit, which, by the decree of the King or Magistrate, has the perfect and invariable measure of a cubit.

§18: the Deuteronomy passage — the Chaldee ‘the king’s cubit’ (= Og’s own, or = the public/standard cubit).

The capacity, then, of the whole Ark, which within those three dimensions contained the whole empty space of the Ark — all the obstructions of the columns being subtracted, and the thickness too of the stories and the planking distinguishing the nests and storerooms — is by geometrical reckoning concluded to have been four hundred and fifty thousand cubits; which magnitude amply sufficed for taking in and containing all those

things which Moses relates were within the ark. For if you multiply, by geometrical reckoning, the length of three hundred cubits into the fifty cubits of breadth, there result fifteen thousand square cubits; multiplying this sum again into the thirty cubits of height, there result four hundred and fifty thousand solid cubits; and this is the interior empty space of the ark and its capacity. But if Moses spoke of cubits not common but perfect and truest, as he called them in Ezekiel ch. 43 (which are greater by a palm than the common and ordinary cubits), the magnitude of the Ark must necessarily have been far greater. For, the reckoning being made, by adding to each of the common cubits one palm, we shall find that the length of the Ark was three hundred and fifty cubits, the breadth fifty-eight cubits and two palms, and the height thirty-five cubits.

§19: the Ark's capacity computed — 450,000 (solid) cubic cubits; or larger if Ezekiel's 'perfect' cubits. Margin: 'How great was the capacity of the Ark.'

This too must be observed, which the blessed Augustine mentions in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 27: that the length and breadth of the Ark are multiplied as many times as the floors or stories were multiplied which were made for the different habitations in the Ark; and because these, according to Augustine, were trebled, he therefore said that, as regards habitation, the Ark was of nine hundred cubits in length, a hundred and fifty in breadth, ninety in height. But with the height it is otherwise than with the length and breadth; for the height, because of the multiplication of the storeys, is not multiplied, but rather, on the contrary, diminished and used up.

§20: Augustine — the length and breadth are multiplied by the number of stories (he gives three), so as to 'dwelling' the Ark was 900 × 150 × 90; but height behaves differently. Margin: Augustine (City of God 15.27).

— p. 194 (PDF) · printed p. 125 —

FOURTH DISPUTATION. In which a certain new opinion about the measure of the sacred cubit is examined.

Heading of the Fourth Disputation of Book X.

As I was about to commit this book to the press, I learned that a certain man of acute genius, well learned in the sacred letters, had found out that there were of old two kinds of cubit in use among the Hebrews, and that they are not obscurely signified in sacred Scripture: the one common, of which we discoursed a little above; the other, which he calls ‘sacred,’ much greater than the common cubit. For the common cubit contains twenty-four fingers, this sacred one forty-two; that, six palms, this ten palms and a half-palm; that, a foot and a half, this two feet and a half and besides an eighth part of a foot; that, finally, two Roman palms, this three Roman palms and over half a palm besides. The sacred cubit, then, contained the common one, and besides the half of it and the half of the half. And the author of this opinion judges that divine Scripture used a sacred cubit of this kind in describing the construction of the Ark of Noah, the Tabernacle of Moses, and the Temple of Solomon.

§21: as the book went to press, Pererius learned of a scholar’s claim that there was a ‘sacred cubit’ (42 fingers / 10½ palms) much larger than the common one (24 fingers / 6 palms), used in Scripture for the Ark, Tabernacle, and Temple.

And that the sacred cubit consisted of the measure we have stated, he proves from what is written about the Bronze Sea which was in the Temple of Solomon. For it is recorded, in the second book of Paralipomenon (Chronicles), ch. 4, that Solomon made a bronze sea of ten cubits from brim to brim, round in compass, five cubits in height, whose circumference was thirty cubits; and it held three thousand baths, or metretes. From this passage he argues, by a mathematical reasoning, that the cubits of the circumference of that bronze sea were not common but sacred — namely, of that measure which we set forth a little before. I have here subjoined the whole argumentation of that man, comprised in the greatest possible brevity.

§22: he proves the sacred cubit from the Bronze Sea in Solomon’s Temple (2 Chron. 4): 10 cubits across, 5 high, 30 in circumference, holding 3,000 baths/metretes — arguing mathematically that

those cubits must be ‘sacred.’

The Roman amphora, or Quadrantal, is a cubic vessel whose length, breadth, and height is a Roman foot; and the Roman foot is a measure containing four palms, or sixteen fingers, or twelve inches — or (what is the same) a Roman palm and a third part of it besides, so that the proportion of the foot to the palm is one-and-a-third (sesquitertia, 4:3). Now this amphora holds two urns, or three modii, or 48 sextarii. The metretes (also called the Attic amphora) contains one amphora and a half, that is three urns or 72 sextarii; wherefore the proportion of the metretes to the Roman amphora is one-and-a-half (sesquialtera, 3:2). But if a third measure be set up containing one and a half metretes, this will have to the metretes the proportion one-and-a-half, but to the amphora the proportion two-and-a-quarter (dupla sesquiquarta), namely 9 to 4, as appears in these three terms 9, 6, 4…

§23 (continues on p. 195): the units defined — the Roman amphora (cubic foot), the metretes (= 1½ amphorae), and a measure of 1½ metretes (proportion 9:4 to the amphora).

— p. 195 (PDF) · printed p. 126 —

…in which are continued two proportions of one-and-a-half: the one, of that third measure containing a metretes and a half, which is 9 to 6; the other, of the metretes to the amphora, namely 6 to 4. These being laid down, since the Bronze Sea, round in compass and having the form of a hemisphere, had a diameter of 10 cubits, a height of 5 cubits, and finally a circuit of 30 cubits, hence it comes that, if we multiply the half-circumference, 15 cubits, by the half-diameter, 5 cubits, we make the area of the greatest circle (that is, the mouth of the sea) 75 square cubits; and again, if we multiply this greatest circle of 75 square cubits by a third part of the diameter — that is, by 3■ cubits — we shall find that the solidity of the hemisphere contains 250 cubic, or solid, cubits; which 250 solid cubits are equal to 4,500 amphorae, or 3,000 metretes (for so much did the Bronze Sea hold), or 2,000 measures, each of which we said

contains a metretes and a half. Wherefore, if 2,000 such measures (which are equal to 3,000 metretes) be divided by 250 solid cubits, we shall find that one solid cubit contains 8 such cubic measures, which are equal to 12 metretes. Wherefore, if each of the sides of the solid cubit be cut in two, and through the opposite sections planes be drawn, the solid cube will be cut into eight equal cubes, each of which will be equal to the cubic measure that holds a metretes and a half. And thus we have, if this measure containing one and a half metretes be cubed, that the side of this cube is half of the cubit mentioned in the description of the Bronze Sea. If, then, we shall know the magnitude of the side of this cube (which is the eighth part of the solid cubit) with respect to the Roman foot known to us, and that magnitude be doubled, the sacred cubit will become known with respect to the same Roman foot. And this must be investigated in this manner. It was said above that the cubic measure which contains a metretes and a half (and is the eighth part of the solid cubit) has to the Quadrantal, or to the Amphora, the same proportion as 9 to 4; and consequently the amphora has to such a cube the proportion of 4 to 9. Therefore, if between the Roman foot and a straight line which has to the Roman foot the proportion of 9 to 4 (such as is that which contains the foot twice and a fourth part of it besides), two mean proportionals be found, the line found which is nearest to the Roman foot will be the side of the cube which is the eighth part of the solid cubit. And since (as was said above) the side of such a cube is half of the sacred cubit, it is plain that, if that side be doubled, the whole length of the cubit comes forth, which will contain two feet and ten seventeenths — that is, three Roman palms and a half, a little less. It is established, therefore, that if a cubic vessel be set up containing two amphorae and a fourth part of an amphora besides (or a metretes and a half), its side doubled is equal to the sacred cubit which we were seek-…

§23 (continued from p. 194): the geometric derivation — the Sea's hemispherical volume = 250 cubic cubits = 3,000 metretes; so one solid cubit = 12 metretes; the side of the ■-cubit cube = half a (sacred) cubit; the two mean proportionals give the sacred cubit as ~2 10/17 Roman feet.

— p. 196 (PDF) · printed p. 127 —

…ing. And since the length of the Ark was 300 cubits, the breadth 50, the height 30, if by geometrical reckoning you multiply the 300 cubits of length into the 50 of breadth, there will result fifteen thousand square cubits; multiplying these again into the 30 cubits of height, there will result four hundred and fifty thousand solid cubits, and this was the capacity of the Ark. But if the sacred cubit was greater than the common one by one Roman palm and nearly a half, and the dimensions of the Ark consisted of such cubits, its length of 300 such cubits would contain 525 common cubits; the breadth of 50 cubits would have, of common ones, 87½; and finally the height of 30 cubits would be of common cubits 52½. And if the 525 cubits of length be multiplied by the 87½ of breadth, there will result 45,937½ square common cubits; which if you again multiply by the 52½ of height, you will have, of solid common cubits in all, 2,411,718¾ — that is, two million, four hundred and eleven thousand, seven hundred and eighteen, and three quarters. And this was the capacity of the Ark according to the vulgar and common cubits.

§23 (continued from p. 195): with the ordinary cubit the Ark's capacity is 450,000 solid cubits; with the (larger) sacred cubit, ≈ 2,411,718¾ ordinary solid cubits.

But why both the novelty and the trustworthiness of this opinion seem suspect to me, I will say as briefly as I can. Altogether, the foundation on which this view chiefly rests seems quite weak and fragile. For it lays down as most certain that that Bronze Sea — which sacred Scripture calls 'round' and Josephus names 'hemispherical' — was most perfectly round, that is, according to the exact reckoning of mathematical roundness; which, however, is neither proved by these men, nor (as I think) can be easily proved. Nay, rather, it is more credible that divine Scripture — both elsewhere, when it speaks of the figures of things, and in that very place where it treats of the roundness of that Sea — speaks of such things not according to that most refined and most absolute reckoning of mathematical subtlety, but according to the common use and sense and the

common custom of men in speaking. For what approaches a round figure more nearly than any other, and falls little short of roundness — and such a falling-short is not easily detected by the judgment of the senses — that, in popular estimation, is reckoned and called ‘round.’ It is uncertain, therefore, whether that Sea was called round mathematically, or rather popularly; and if it was not mathematically round, since it is not clear how much it fell short of mathematical roundness, the reasoning which is built by these men upon its mathematical and perfect roundness can neither have firm force nor make sure conviction.

§24: Pererius doubts this view — its foundation is weak, since it assumes the Bronze Sea was perfectly round in the strict mathematical sense, whereas Scripture speaks ‘popularly.’ Margin: ‘The author’s [view].’

Next, the approvers of this opinion say (for now, as I hear, it has begun to have followers) that this kind of sacred cubit is signified in the sacred books neither once nor obscure-…

§25 (continues on p. 197): they say this sacred cubit is signified in Scripture (2 Chron. 3, ‘in the first measure’). Margin: ‘The passage of 2 Paralipomenon, ch. 3.’

— p. 197 (PDF) · printed p. 128 —

…ly. But I, to confess frankly (if it be so, my ignorance), have been able as yet to see no traces in the divine letters by which such a cubit could be tracked out, much less found. These men adduce something or other from the second book of Paralipomenon, ch. 3, where it is written that the length of the temple was sixty cubits ‘in the first measure.’ They think that by those words ‘in the first measure’ this sacred cubit of theirs is signified. But this is refuted in two ways. For that ‘in the first measure’ is not referred to the cubit, but signifies that, in the first laying-out and description of the foundations of the temple, the oracle or sanctuary was not separately designated, and the temple itself apart, but that the foundations of both were measured undivided, of a length of sixty cubits; and afterward, separately and properly, out of those sixty cubits twenty were destined and

assigned to the sanctuary, but forty to that which is called the temple. And this interpretation, which — since it inheres in the sense of the words — is quite probable, plainly does not at all help the opinion of these men. But be it so: let the sacred cubit be signified by those words ‘in the first measure.’ Yet whence do these men prove that the cubit of ‘the first measure’ was as great as they make it? Nay, rather, ‘the cubit of the first measure’ signifies nothing else than a cubit of a just, exact, and unvarying measure — such as were the measures and weights of the sanctuary, by whose standard the common measures were tested and examined, so that, if any fraud lay beneath them, it could be detected by comparison with these. And of these measures and weights of the sanctuary frequent mention is made in the Mosaic books, as in Exodus 30 and 38, Leviticus (last chapter), and Numbers 18.

§25 (continued from p. 196): Pererius can find no such cubit in Scripture; their proof-text (2 Chron. 3, ‘in the first measure’) refuted twice over — ‘first measure’ means the undivided foundation, or a standard fixed measure (the sanctuary weights/measures). Margins: Exod. 30, 38; Lev. (last ch.); Num. 18.

But this, in my judgment, seems to convince that that opinion is false: that Ezekiel, in chapter 43, defining the measure of the sacred cubit (whose use, namely, was in the temple, and which there the blessed Jerome named the ‘truest cubit,’ and the Septuagint translators the ‘perfect cubit’), makes it greater than the common and vulgar by one palm only, that is, four fingers; for he speaks of the lesser, or mathematical, palm, not of the greater, or (as they call it) Roman, which is four times greater. Wherefore in that place it is called by the Septuagint translators palaist■, by which name the lesser palm is signified; and Jerome, in the commentary on that passage, interpreting the name ‘palm,’ says it is the sixth part of a cubit. Therefore, according to Ezekiel, the sacred cubit was greater than the common by one palm only, or four fingers; but according to these men it was greater by four palms and a half, or eighteen fingers: their opinion, therefore, does not agree with the doctrine of Ezekiel. These things I wished for the present to dispute briefly concerning the aforesaid opinion; which if, nevertheless, it

shall seem to anyone firm and probable enough, and our refutation of it ineffectual, he may follow it, with no resistance from me. I have judged it the part of my office not to pass over in silence, nor without some examination, a new opinion, contrary or at least diverse from the view received by all up to this day, and (as it seems to me) by no means agreeing with the doctrine of the sacred letters…

§26 (continues on p. 198): the decisive refutation — Ezekiel 43 defines the sacred cubit as greater than the common by only one palm (4 fingers), not by 4½ palms; so this view disagrees with Ezekiel. Margin: 'The passage of Ezekiel, ch. 43.'

— p. 198 (PDF) · printed p. 129 —

…[an opinion] by no means agreeing [with Scripture]. For the rest, I leave the decision and judgment of this whole dispute to the learned reader.

§26 (continued from p. 197): Pererius leaves the whole dispute to the learned reader's judgment.

FIFTH DISPUTATION. Whether Moses spoke of geometric cubits, as Origen held, each of which contains the measure of six common cubits.

Heading of the Fifth Disputation of Book X.

Because the magnitude of the Ark which Moses described seemed to many too small and narrow for taking in and preserving so many and so great kinds of animals, and besides their foods, some therefore devised a certain kind of 'geometric cubits,' far greater than the vulgar and usual cubits, so that the magnitude of the ark, consisting of this kind of cubits, might without doubt seem most ample and most capacious of all the things that were in it. Origen, then, from the tradition of the ancients, affirms that Moses here, in describing the magnitude of the ark, used geometric cubits — inasmuch as the blessed Stephen testified that he was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians (among whom Geometry was held in the highest esteem and honor). And one geometric cubit Origen reckons to contain six usual cubits, and to be defined by nine feet. The opinion of Origen

Augustine reports in this manner, in book 15 of The City of God, the last chapter: ‘But if we consider,’ he says, ‘what Origen not inelegantly maintained — namely, that Moses, a man learned, as it is written, in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, who loved Geometry, could have signified geometric cubits, where they assert one is worth as much as six of ours — who would not see how much of things that magnitude could have held?’ Thus Augustine. Whence one may understand that in Hugh of St. Victor, in his Annotations on Genesis, it is read faultily in this place that the geometric cubit consists of nine cubits, whereas according to Origen it contained only six cubits. Either, then, for ‘nine’ should be put ‘six,’ or for ‘cubits’ should be read ‘feet’; for in truth the geometric cubit, if it contained six vulgar cubits, must consequently have contained nine feet, since the vulgar cubit is a foot and a half. But it will perhaps be pleasing to the reader to read Origen’s own words in this place. In the second homily on the sixth chapter of Genesis, Origen writes to this effect: ‘Apelles,’ he says, ‘a disciple of Marcion but the inventor of another heresy, disputes against the structure of the ark, wishing to prove that the writings of Moses have nothing of divine wisdom, nor proceeded from the Holy Spirit. He argues that it could in no way have come about that so small a space of the ark could take in so many ani-…’

§27 (continues on p. 199): because the Ark seemed too small, some invented ‘geometric cubits’; Origen held Moses used these (1 geometric = 6 common = 9 feet); Augustine (City of God 15.27) reports it; a note correcting Hugh’s text. Margins: Origen; Acts 7; Augustine; Hugh of St. Victor.

— p. 199 (PDF) · printed p. 130 —

…mals, and their foods that would suffice for a whole year. For since two and two of the unclean animals (that is, two males and two females), but seven and seven of the clean, are said to have been let into the ark, how could it have come about that the space of the ark described by Moses could have held even four elephants only? And after he thus objects through the several species, he concludes in these words: ‘It is established, then, that the tale is fictitious; and if it is so, it is established that this

Scripture is not from God.' Thus Apelles. 'But to these things,' says Origen, 'we will bring to the notice of our hearers what we have learned from prudent men, and those skilled in the Hebrew traditions, and ancient masters. The ancients, then, used to say that Moses, who (as Scripture testifies) had been learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, according to the geometric art in which the Egyptians are especially skilled, set down here the number of cubits. For among the Geometers, according to that reckoning which among them is called "power" (virtus), from the solid and the square, either one is reckoned for six cubits if [taken] generally, or for three hundred if [taken] in detail; and if this reckoning be observed in the measure of this Ark, there will be found such spaces both of length and of breadth as could truly have held the seeds of a whole world to be repaired, and the reviving seedbeds of all the animals.' Thus Origen in that place. The same, in the fourth book against Celsus, argues that that ark of Noah was most ample and like to a great city, since its base was ninety thousand cubits in length and twenty-five thousand in breadth. And so far from Origen. But I, I frankly confess, do not grasp the meaning either of these last words or of those earlier ones about the multiplication of the cubit either into six or into three hundred according to the geometric 'power'; and when I had consulted the most expert and most learned men of Geometry about this same matter, they — having long and much considered the aforesaid words of Origen — at last answered that they by no means understood what Origen could have understood and meant to signify by those words; so that I am the less ashamed to confess that I do not know what I do not know.

§27 (continued from p. 198): Apelles's objection (the ark couldn't hold four elephants) and Origen's reply (Moses, learned in Egyptian geometry, used a numbering 'from the solid and square'). Margins: Gen. 7; Acts 7; Origen.

It does not escape me what John Buteo thought about this opinion of Origen and left in writing; for he so interprets Origen's words that, recalling and accommodating them to geometric cubature, he contends that

Origen’s opinion is correct and most agreeable to geometric reasonings and tenets; and it has seemed good here to set before the reader, to be learned and considered, that man’s brief disputation on the matter. Thus, then, he says in the little book he published on the Ark of Noah: ‘It must be seen by what distinction of sense Origen’s saying can stand. Already in the preceding I showed that the solid of the ark contains four hundred and fifty thousand cubical cubits. It is plain, besides, that the length of the ark was sextuple of its breadth. The base of the ark, then, can be divided into six equal squares, whose common side is fifty cubits; which, multiplying into itself, you will make two thousand five hundred square cubits. This will be the area (Embadon) of one of the six squares in the base. Again, multiplying the two thousand five hundred square cubits into the thirty cubits of the height of the ark, there will be made seventy-five thousand cubi-…’

§28 (continues on p. 200): Buteo’s interpretation defending Origen — the Ark’s 450,000 cubic cubits; its base divisible into six 50×50 squares. Margins: John Buteo; ‘Buteo’s interpretation of Origen’s saying on geometric cubits set out and examined.’

— p. 200 (PDF) · printed p. 131 —

…cal cubits, which is the sixth part of the body of the ark. Therefore, as Origen says, ‘each of such cubits is reckoned for six,’ since six times seventy-five thousand cubical cubits constitute the sum of four hundred and fifty thousand, which is the capacity of the ark — the same that I found before by my calculation.

§28 (continued from p. 199): Buteo — six × 75,000 = 450,000 (the ‘one reckoned for six’).

The other part too of Origen’s saying — namely, that ‘one cubit is reckoned for three hundred’ — I show thus. Take either of the smaller planes of the ark, of which one side is thirty cubits, the other fifty; these two sides multiplied together produce one thousand five hundred square cubits; multiplying which number again into the third dimension of the ark, of three hundred cubits, you will make, out of each square cubit in detail,

three hundred solids, and in the sum four hundred and fifty thousand. And this is the solid of the ark, as before, which was to be demonstrated. And thus, according to geometric reasoning, from the solid and the square, Origen's saying holds true in both ways. Not, however, that a geometric cubit is worth as much as six of our cubits, as Augustine asserts; nor by a geometric cubit, but by a geometric cubature, does Origen solve the question, since a Geometer has not 'cubits' but 'cubature' apart from common use. This, however, must be noted: that it is most faulty that a thing in itself difficult is, moreover, so obscured by Origen with an affected riddling of words that one must rather divine than interpret. For it would have been plain if he had said that the numbers of the cubes set down in the description of the Ark are found, by geometric reasonings, to make in the body a capacity of the ark of four hundred and fifty thousand cubits. Thus far were the words of Buteo.

§29: Buteo on the 'one reckoned for three hundred'; he insists Origen meant not a geometric cubit but a geometric cubature, and that Origen needlessly obscured it.

But grant that it is as Buteo will have it: yet by such geometric cubits the ark turns out no greater and no more capacious than if its magnitude be defined by vulgar cubits — and this Buteo himself confesses. But Origen, against those who carped at the smallness of that ark, wished to demonstrate and prove that, because Moses in describing the magnitude of the ark used not vulgar but geometric cubits, it came about that the ark was far greater than it would seem to have been to those measuring its magnitude by vulgar and usual cubits. And all the ecclesiastical writers who followed Origen both held themselves, and confirmed in their writings that Origen held, that the ark turns out much more ample if its magnitude be estimated by geometric cubits. And indeed, if the ark were of equal magnitude and capacity whether we define its dimensions by geometric or by vulgar cubits, to what end, I ask, would Origen have transferred the question of the ark's magnitude from common cubits (of which there is among all a manifest knowledge and frequent use) to geometric cubits,

even to a geometric cubature (as Buteo thinks) — a thing, namely, very abstruse and obscure and known to very few?

§30: but even on Buteo's reading the Ark is no larger than by common cubits (he admits it) — yet Origen meant it to be far larger; why else divert the question from common cubits to a recondite geometric cubature?

I wonder, moreover, why Buteo did not likewise undertake to interpret that other saying of Origen, which is in the fourth book against Celsus (set down by us a little above), affirming that the base of the ark was ninety thousand cubits long and twenty-five thousand broad — why, I say, Buteo did not likewise under-…

§31 (continues on p. 201): Pererius wonders why Buteo did not also interpret Origen's other saying (against Celsus, base 90,000 × 25,000 cubits).

— p. 201 (PDF) · printed p. 132 —

…take to interpret it, since it is either false, or, if true, has a most obscure sense and a most difficult explanation. Had Buteo perhaps not read that passage of Origen? Or had he indeed read it, but, because he found no sufficiently apt interpretation of those words, prudently preferred to pass it by untouched and unmentioned rather than touch on what he could not expound? In Hugh, in the first of those four books which he wrote On the Mystical Sense of the Ark of Noah, in the third chapter, I remember reading something or other pertaining to the understanding of this saying and opinion of Origen.

§31 (continued from p. 200): perhaps Buteo had not read that passage, or found no fit interpretation and prudently passed it by; Hugh's On the Mystical Sense of the Ark touches on it.

But however the matter stands, that opinion certainly — approved by so many — that Moses, in describing the magnitude of the Ark, spoke of geometric cubits (each of which is worth as much as six of the vulgar cubits), may be refuted by these arguments, as agreeing neither with reason nor with divine Scripture, but plainly improbable. First, that measure of the

geometric cubit which Origen describes is in use, and ever was, neither among the Geometers themselves, nor in any discipline, nor among any craftsmen, nor, finally, among any nations; it is therefore not to be believed that Moses spoke of such a cubit. Next, Moses spoke, in describing the magnitude of the ark, of those cubits of which he speaks in his other books, and of which frequent mention is made in the rest of the monuments of the divine letters; for if in this place he had spoken of other cubits, Moses would without doubt, to cut off the occasion of ambiguity and obscurity, have indicated the different signification of ‘cubit’ which he was here using; but in all other places of his writings Moses speaks of the common and usual cubit, and of that geometric cubit there is nowhere a single letter in him; therefore it is far from reason and from truth to suppose that Moses here spoke of a geometric cubit.

§(refutation): in any case, the geometric-cubit view is refutable — such a cubit was never in use anywhere; and Moses everywhere else uses the common cubit, with no hint of a different one here. Margin: ‘Refutation of Origen’s opinion on the geometric cubits, by which he thinks Moses spoke here.’

And the minor premise of this our argument (I mean, that in other places Moses never fails to speak of the vulgar cubit) can be confirmed by many examples. In Exodus, ch. 27, God orders an altar to be made five cubits long, as many broad, and three cubits high; which height, by the reckoning of Origen’s geometric cubit, would contain eighteen vulgar cubits, that is twenty-seven feet; and the length and breadth of that altar would have been of thirty vulgar cubits, that is forty-five feet. But so great a vastness of that altar could be of no use for making sacrifices, and, because of its height, one could not have ascended to its hearth except by ladders set against it; and this was utterly abhorrent to the rite of the sacrifices — indeed it had been forbidden by God, as is recorded in the twentieth chapter of Exodus: ‘Thou shalt not go up,’ says God, ‘by steps to my altar.’ Besides, in the third chapter of Deuteronomy, from the size of the bed of Og, king of Bashan (which was nine cubits in length), is signified the gigantic tallness of that king, as though it was nearly even nine cubits; but nine cubits,

according to Origen’s geometric reckoning, contain of vul-…

§(examples, continues on p. 202): Moses always uses the common cubit — the altar (Exod. 27; cf. Exod. 20); Og’s bed (Deut. 3). Margins: Exod. 27; Exod. 20; Deut. 3.

— p. 202 (PDF) · printed p. 133 —

…gar cubits fifty-four, that is nearly eighty feet; but it is incredible that that king, or even any mortal, was ever of such tallness. There is added to these: in the first book of Kings, ch. 17, the height of the giant Goliath is described as six cubits and a palm; which measure, according to Origen’s opinion of geometric cubits, has thirty-six usual cubits, that is fifty-four feet; wherefore the head of that giant, according to the proportion which the human head has to the rest of the body, would have been nearly nine feet. How, then, could David (as is written in that place) have lifted with his hands the head of Goliath cut off by him — bigger, namely, by at least three feet than his whole self — and carried it to Jerusalem?

§(examples, continued from p. 201): Og would be ~80 ft tall, Goliath’s head ~9 ft (David could not have carried it) — absurd. Margin: 1 Kings 17.

Finally, according to that measure of geometric cubits, the magnitude of the Ark would have been enormous and incredible; for its length would have been one thousand eight hundred cubits, that is two thousand seven hundred feet; the breadth three hundred cubits, that is four hundred and fifty feet; the height one hundred and eighty cubits, that is two hundred and seventy feet. And finally the capacity of the Ark would have contained ninety-seven million two hundred thousand cubits, and would have been greater and more capacious than the Ark as it is defined by us according to the vulgar cubits, two hundred and sixteen times over; which so monstrous a mass of an Ark would have been of no use (for whatever is contained in it could be taken in and held in the smallest part of it), nor does it seem to have been able to be built or handled by any means and labor of men. Let us therefore hold the former description of the Ark’s magnitude according to the usual cubits; for such a dimension and capacity of the Ark amply

sufficed for taking in all that is said to have been brought into it, as will be plainly demonstrated a little below.

§32: with the geometric cubit the Ark's size would be monstrous (1,800 × 300 × 180 cubits; capacity 97,200,000 cubits, 216× the ordinary), useless and unbuildable; so keep the ordinary cubit. Margin: 'How great the Ark's size would have been by Origen's geometric cubits.'

SIXTH DISPUTATION. By whom and in how long a time the Ark was built.

Heading of the Sixth Disputation of Book X.

Some wonder how a work of so great a mass could be finished by four men only — Noah, I mean, and his three sons. But to this the answer is easy; for although those four were the chief craftsmen of the work, yet it must be believed that many other workmen, hired for wages, were employed; for although those did not believe Noah foretelling that the Flood would come, yet for the sake of gain they willingly hired out their labor for the completing of that work. It must likewise be weighed that a hundred years' time was spent in building the ark; for the length of the building offsets the fewness of the builders; for it is the same thing for a few men in a hundred years…

§33 (continues on p. 203): could four men build it? — hired workmen helped; and a hundred years' span offsets the fewness of the builders.

— p. 203 (PDF) · printed p. 134 —

…to have finished that work, as if more men had completed it in one year.

§33 (continued from p. 202): the close of the comparison.

It is certain, on the authority of Athenaeus, that Hiero, king of Sicily, completed that ship of incredible magnitude — in which there was a triple decking, and the apparatus of material of sixty triremes, or twenty banks of rowing — within one year, when the material had already been brought from Mount Aetna, three hundred workmen being employed in making the

work (besides the assistants serving the building), the architect of the work being Archias of Corinth.

§34: Hiero of Syracuse's vast ship (triple-decked, made in one year by 300 craftsmen) — Athenaeus. Margins: Athenaeus, bk. 5; 'Hiero's ship, a thing to wonder at.'

Indeed it seems very great and memorable, what is recorded by Pliny in book 16, ch. 40, about the temple of Diana at Ephesus: that it was completed in four hundred years, all Asia building it; although the same Pliny, in book 36, ch. 14, makes the building of that temple half as long, writing that it was built in two hundred years by all Asia — so that one or the other passage must necessarily be faulty, either by Pliny's lapse of memory, or by the fault of the copyists' negligence or ignorance. In the same manner the blessed Augustine explains the aforesaid question, in book 15 of The City of God, the last chapter. 'For,' he says, 'what some argue — that an ark of so great a magnitude could not be put together — they most absurdly cavil, since they know that immense cities have been built, and do not attend to the hundred years in which that ark was built. Unless, perhaps, stone can cling to stone, joined by lime alone, so that a wall runs around for so many miles, and wood cannot cling to wood by dovetails, nails, and the glue of bitumen, so that an ark be built — stretched out far and wide not with curved but with straight lines, which no effort of men would launch into the sea, but the wave would lift when it came, by the natural order of weights, and which divine providence rather than human prudence would steer as it floated, lest it anywhere suffer shipwreck.' Thus Augustine.

§35: the temple of Diana at Ephesus took 400 (or 200) years (Pliny — a discrepancy in his own books); Augustine answers the objection (City of God 15.27). Margins: Pliny; Augustine.

Nor is that question here to be wrapped in silence: in how long a time was the ark of Noah built. Berosus Annianus says that in the seventy-eighth year from the beginning of the ship which was covered after the manner of an ark, the Flood happened unexpectedly; whereby it is signified that

seventy-eight years were spent in building the ark. Expounding this opinion of Berosus in his Commentaries, John Annius: ‘It was doubted,’ he says, ‘about what Berosus said — that the ark began to be built in the seventy-eighth year before the Flood — since Moses reckons a hundred and twenty years in the sixth chapter of Genesis. But to this it must be answered that Noah received the command to build the ark a hundred and twenty years before the Flood, as Moses signifies; but for forty-two years Noah prepared the timber, on account of the immensity of the work to be done; whence in the following year, which was the seventy-eighth before the Flood, the building of the ark was begun, as Berosus reckons.’ Thus he. But these — whether the fabulous traditions of Berosus, or (what is truer) the fictitious comments and interpretations of Annius — I judge are to be counted as nothing. For whence, I ask, did it become known to Berosus or Annius that forty-two years passed while the material for building the ark was being procured? Since, then, they said this without weighty authority, without probable reason, without any likely conjecture, with the same ease with which it was said, it is fair that it be despised.

§36 (continues on p. 204): how long the Ark was building — Berosus/Annius (78 years) rejected as a baseless fabrication. Margins: ‘In how long a time the Ark was built’; Berosus Annianus.

— p. 204 (PDF) · printed p. 135 —

There is another, very old and very widespread opinion of the Doctors: that the ark of Noah was built in a hundred years. This Origen hands down in the fourth book against Celsus; Augustine in book 15 of The City of God, the last chapter, and in book 12 Against Faustus, ch. 18, and in the book of Questions on Genesis, q. 5; Gregory, moreover, in homily 15 on Ezekiel; and Rupert in book 4 of the Commentaries on Genesis, ch. 20; and finally, of the later doctors the opinion is nearly the same. But whence do these men gather this? Namely, from this: that Moses, when at the end of the fifth chapter he had said that Noah was five hundred years old, next subjoins both other words of God spoken to Noah, and especially the command of God given to him about building the ark; Noah, therefore, was

five hundred years old when he was ordered by God to build the ark. Nor is it credible that Noah put off carrying out God's command about the construction of the ark for a long time, but rather that he set about the work as soon as possible and applied himself with all zeal and effort to its execution and completion. And the Flood came in the six-hundredth year of Noah's life — namely, as soon as the building of the ark was finished. Therefore the making of the ark lasted from the five-hundredth year of Noah up to his six-hundredth, that is, for a hundred years. So these men reason.

§37: the old common view — the Ark was 100 years in building (Origen, Augustine, Gregory, Rupert), inferred from Noah being 500 at the command and 600 at the Flood. Margins: 'Whether the Ark was built in a hundred years'; Origen; Augustine; Gregory; Rupert.

But that these conjectures, by which the opinion of these men is propped and supported, are not very firm, the reader will easily perceive of himself, even without my pointing it out. For it is not certain how long after the five-hundredth year of Noah the command about building the ark was given him, nor is it clear at what time its building was finished. For it does not follow, because Moses, having mentioned the five-hundredth year of Noah, appended God's command about the construction of the ark, that the command was therefore given in that very five-hundredth year; since frequently both Moses and other sacred writers join in their narrative many things that were separated from each other by long intervals of time. Indeed, the blessed Augustine, who in book 15 of The City of God, ch. 24, said that the words of God which Moses in the sixth chapter relates to have been spoken to Noah were spoken to him when he was four hundred and eighty years old — that is, a hundred and twenty years before the Flood — it would seem to follow that he should say the ark was built over a hundred and twenty years.

§38: but these conjectures are weak — the time of the command and of the finishing are both uncertain; Scripture often joins things far apart in time (Augustine put the command 120 years before the Flood). Margin: Augustine.

But someone might perhaps argue that the ark was built in far less than a hundred years, from those words which Moses in the sixth chapter relates that God spoke to Noah: ‘I will set my covenant with thee, and thou shalt enter the ark, thou and thy sons and the wives of thy sons’; for by these words it is signified that, at the time God commanded Noah about building the ark, Noah’s sons already had wives. From which it would follow that, if the ark began to be built a hundred years before the Flood, Noah’s sons too had wives a hundred years before the Flood — which is plainly false and contrary to divine Scripture, which in chapter 11 of Genesis relates that Shem, Noah’s son, was, when the Flood was over, a hundred years old; therefore Shem was born a hundred years before the Flood; how, then, at that ti-…

§39 (continues on p. 205): one might argue for far less than 100 years from Gen 6:18 (the sons already had wives), since Shem was only 100 two years after the Flood.

— p. 205 (PDF) · printed p. 136 —

…me could he have had a wife? But to this the followers and defenders of the common opinion could answer that not all that Moses relates in this chapter that God spoke to Noah was spoken at one and the same time, but some things earlier, some later, although Moses joins them all in a continuous series and context of narrative; and so that the command to build the ark was given him a hundred years before the Flood, but that about the entry of Noah’s sons and their wives into the ark was commanded when the building of the ark was already plainly finished, or nearly completed. Unless perhaps this pleases more: that God spoke all these things at the same time, but said that about Noah’s sons and their wives entering the ark not as a present thing, but announced it long beforehand as future — so that we may think that God said and signified this to Noah: ‘Make thee an ark, that thou mayest escape the calamity of the coming Flood; and thou shalt enter the ark, thou and thy wife and thy sons who have lately been born to thee, or (if they were not yet born) who shall be born to thee, and besides the wives of thy sons, whom they will

marry in their time’ — so that by these words God meant to signify whom, and how many men, he had determined to save from the destruction of the Flood. Although, therefore, the common opinion about the hundred years of the Ark’s building is not supported by very firm reasons, yet, because it is very ancient and of many and weighty authors, and since it cannot be demonstrated how much more or less than a hundred years the ark was built, that opinion seems deservedly to be preferred to the rest.

§39 (continued from p. 204): the answer — not all God said was spoken at once; the command came 100 years before, the entry-clause later (or as a foretelling). The 100-year view, though weakly grounded, is preferred as ancient and well-attested.

ON THE FIGURE OF THE ARK, AND THE DISPOSITION AND DISTINCTION OF ITS PARTS.

Heading of the third major section of the Ark treatise.

Verse 16. Thou shalt make a window in the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish the top of it; and the door of the ark thou shalt set in the side; with lower, middle, and third stories shalt thou make it.

Genesis 6:16 (Vulgate lemma).

Here we must dispute about the plan of the structure, and the figure and disposition of the Ark itself. And to the explanation of the aforesaid words of Moses it pertains that we explain, concerning five matters, certain things that have obscurity and difficulty: first, about the intervals or interstices which were within the ark — that is, about the stories and floorings of the ark; then about the little rooms designed and prepared for the habitation of the animals and the preservation of the food; next about the door of the ark; besides, about the window of the ark; lastly, about the peak and ridge of the ark. As to the first, one must know that the ark was…

Introduction (continues on p. 206): five obscure points to be explained — the stories, the rooms, the door, the window, and the roof.

— p. 206 (PDF) · printed p. 137 —

…divided into several interstices or intervals, distinguished from one another by different decks, which were equal among themselves according to the length and breadth of the Ark, but differed according to the height of the ark. These some call ‘stories,’ or ‘floorings,’ or ‘chambers,’ or finally ‘upper-rooms’ (cenacula); we, for the sake of clarity, will name them the ‘principal parts’ of the Ark.

Introduction (continued from p. 205): the Ark divided into several stories, equal in length and breadth but differing in height; called stories, floorings, chambers, or upper-rooms (Pererius: ‘principal parts’).

SEVENTH DISPUTATION. How many stories or floorings there were in the Ark.

Heading of the Seventh Disputation of Book X.

About the number of the parts of the Ark — namely, how many there were in it — there arises the first question to be treated by us. Philo, toward the end of the second book On the Life of Moses, seems to have made four such parts of the Ark, which he names ‘floorings.’ For he writes thus: ‘Noah built a very great work of timber, three hundred cubits in length, fifty in breadth, thirty in height, distinguished by continuous cells, some lowest, others arranged in the second and in the third and fourth flooring.’ The same Josephus signifies, in the first book of the Antiquities: ‘Noah,’ he says, ‘built an ark of four floorings; and the ark was firm, both in roof and in sides, against all the force of storms and the assault of the waves.’ But to the use of what things each of those floorings was destined, neither Philo nor Josephus indicated.

§40: Philo and Josephus seem to make four stories. Margins: Philo; Josephus.

Origen makes those parts of the Ark five, distinguishing them thus and designating them for various uses: one he makes the lowest, near the base of the Ark, into which place were thrown the excrement and filth of the whole Ark; in the second, which was above this, were stored the fodder and

food of all the animals; in the third dwelt the beasts that were wild and untamed; in the fourth, the gentler animals, both quadrupeds and creeping things and birds; in the fifth and highest, men and birds. Origen's words, in the second homily on this sixth chapter of Genesis, are these: 'Now within, the parts called the lower parts of the ark are placed "two-chambered," that is, containing a double habitation; but the upper, "three-chambered," as if we should say distinguished by triple upper-rooms. And these distinctions of habitations are said to have been made for this: that the different animals or kinds of beasts might more easily be separated in their several lodgings, and the tame and harmless be set apart from the wild beasts. It has been handed down to us, and not without probability, that the lower parts, which we called two-chambered, were double in this manner. For because the animals were a whole year in the ark, it was necessary to provide them food for the whole year; and not food only, but also to assign places for their droppings, that neither the animals themselves nor the men might at the same time be troubled by the stench. They relate, then, that the lowest part of the ark, which was in the bottom, was destined for receiving such filth and excrement; but that which was above this pertained to the keeping of fodder. For it seemed necessa-…'

§41 (continues on p. 207): Origen makes five parts (bilge, food-store, wild beasts, tame beasts, men & birds), drawn from the LXX 'lower with two chambers, and three chambers shalt thou make it.' Margin: Origen.

— p. 207 (PDF) · printed p. 138 —

…ry that, for the beasts carnivorous by their nature, animals should be separately introduced into the ark and assigned for their food and the preserving of their life, for the sake of repairing posterity; but for the other, non-carnivorous animals, other foods should be kept, according as the natural need of each demanded. To these uses, then, the two lower parts of the ark, which are called two-chambered, pertained. And the three upper parts of the ark were thus distinguished: in the third, the wild and untamed animals had their dwelling; in the fourth, the gentler animals lodged; in the

fifth and highest, men, whom, as God made them superior to all animals in reason and wisdom, so it was fitting that they should be higher in dwelling and habitation in the ark. So Origen; who seems to have been led to this five-part division of the Ark from the translation of the Septuagint translators. For it has thus: ‘Lower parts two-chambered and three-chambered shalt thou make it,’ as if to say that the inner capacity of the ark was to be divided into five chambers.

§41 (continued from p. 206): Origen on the carnivores’ provisions; the three upper parts (wild beasts; tame; men highest), drawn from the LXX five-chamber reading.

But St. Augustine, understanding and explaining these words of the Septuagint translators much otherwise, seems to make only three principal parts of the ark. For in the book of Questions on Genesis, q. 6, he writes thus: ‘As to what he says, when he speaks of the building of the ark, “Two-chambered and three-chambered shalt thou make it,” it is usually asked whether the lower parts were to be two-chambered and three-chambered. But in this distinction he wished the whole structure of his ark to be understood — that it should have lower parts, have middle and upper parts, which are called three-chambered. For in the first habitation, that is in the lower parts, the ark was once-chambered; in the second habitation above the lower it was now two-chambered; and by this, in the third above the second, it was three-chambered.’ So there Augustine. Similar is what the same writes in book 15 of The City of God, the last chapter, distinguishing the ark into three parts, each of which would be three hundred cubits long and fifty broad.

§42: Augustine reads the LXX much otherwise — only three principal parts (lower, middle, upper). Margin: Augustine.

The Scholastic History, Lyra, Tostatus, Denis the Carthusian, and not a few others of the more recent writers, besides Origen’s five-part division of the Ark, hand down another, also five-part, but distinguished by a different reckoning. For first they make three principal parts of the ark — the lowest,

the middle, and the highest; and the lowest they call the ‘dung-part’ and like the bilge of a ship; the middle they assign to the keeping of food, and make it two-chambered, that is, distinguished into two spaces according to the length of the ark, in the one storing herbs and greens, in the other fruits and more solid foods; the highest part of the ark they destine to the habitation of animals and men, making it tripartite, so that in its two outer parts (according to length) the animals dwelt — in the one the wild, in the other the tame — while the middle part contained the habitation of the men. And these things have been handed down by others about the disposition of the Ark and the distinction of its parts.

§43: the Scholastic History, Lyra, Tostatus, Denis the Carthusian, and others — another five-part division (bilge; food-store, two-chambered; the top tripartite: wild / men / tame). Margins: Scholastic History; Lyra; Tostatus; Denis the Carthusian.

I think I shall act more in keeping with the narrative of Moses if I make three principal parts of his ark — three, I mean, which pertained to the habitation of animals and men and the preservation of food, the bottom of the ark being passed over; for if one wishes to take account of this too in the division of the ark, the ark will have to be divided into four parts. And the first (beginning from the lowest) contained the base and bottom of the ark according to its whole length and breadth, but had four or five cubits of the ark’s height; this was the receptacle of all the filth of the ark, flowing down thither from every quarter through channels prepared for it, and was like the bilge of a ship — unless perhaps someone think that the bottom of the ark was filled with ballast (as is done in ships) for the greater stability and firmness of the ark in the waters; but that the excrement and filth of the ark were thrown not into the bottom of the ark, but outside the ark into the waters, through holes and slanting openings made in the ark in many places for that use.

§44 (continues on p. 208): Pererius’s own view — three principal parts (animals / food / men & birds), plus the bottom (bilge) = four; the bottom held the filth, channeled out through slanted holes. Margin: ‘The author’s opinion on the number, disposition, and use of the parts of the Ark.’

— p. 208 (PDF) · printed p. 139 —

Above this lowest part of the ark, then (of which, as Origen holds, Moses made no mention in the description of the Ark), there were three other principal parts of the ark, each having indeed the whole length and breadth of the ark, but only a part of the height. In the first were placed all the land animals, to which we assign eight or nine cubits of height; for no land animal has yet been seen exceeding the height of eight cubits. Above this was a second part, likewise eight cubits high, containing all the storerooms of food; above this, finally, was the third and highest, assigned to the habitation of men and birds, nine or ten cubits high, which, since it was three hundred cubits long, was amply spacious and capacious enough for those few men and all the birds; for although there are very many species of birds, yet nearly all of them are of small bodily bulk, especially since they could be stored not only within the ark, but in little boxes hung on the sides of the ark. Above the roof of this highest part was the peak and ridge of the ark, of what figure and how great a size it was will be said below. And how each of these three parts of the ark was filled and furnished with very many little rooms, or ‘nests’ (as Scripture calls them), we shall explain in the next Disputation, which follows this. And this is our opinion about the disposition and distinction of the parts of the Ark. Credit is built up for it from the Hebrew Scripture itself, which has thus, word for word, in this place: ‘Lower, and second, and third shalt thou make it.’ That is, ‘Thou shalt make in the ark three stories, lowest, middle, and highest’; for that ‘shalt thou make it’ is put for ‘in it,’ or because the whole ark was nothing else than such a tripartite set of stories. The Chaldee paraphrase has it similarly. And that those words of the Septuagint translators, ‘Lower parts two-chambered and three-chambered shalt thou make it,’ render the same sense, we showed a little above with the blessed Augustine as interpreter.

§44 (continued from p. 207): above the bottom, three parts (animals 8–9 cubits high; food-stores 8; men & birds 9–10); confirmed by the Hebrew ‘lower, second, and third shalt thou make it.’

The same sense belongs also to our Latin translation, although it is not easy to accommodate all its words to the understanding of this sense. It has thus: ‘Below, upper-rooms (cenacula) and three-storied (tristega) shalt thou make in it.’ That ‘cenacula’ signifies ample places in buildings — that is, long and broad — so called because in such places the ancients, having arranged the dining-couches (triclinia), were wont to dine; thence the word was carried over to signify any other ample places of buildings…

§45 (continues on p. 209): the same sense in the Latin (‘cenacula and tristega’ = upper-rooms / three-decked). Margin: ‘The Latin reading examined.’

— p. 209 (PDF) · printed p. 140 —

…was carried over. Those three parts of the ark, then, whose amplitude we have described, the Latin translator denoted by the word ‘cenaculum.’ For what follows, ‘and tristega,’ is an explanation of the word ‘cenaculum’; for it often happens in the sacred writings that, when two words are put, the latter is, as it were, an interpretation of the former. The Latin translator, then, declaring how many those cenacula of the ark were and how separated, named them ‘tristega,’ which means ‘three roofs,’ indicating that those cenacula were three and distinguished by three roofs. For the first roof was above the cenaculum of the animals; the second, above the cenaculum where the food was; the third and highest, above the cenaculum in which was the habitation of the men. For that fourth roof, by which the bottom of the ark was covered, is not mentioned, nor the last roof containing the peak and ridge of the ark; but only the roofs of those parts of the ark are named which parts had been prepared for the use of the animals and men.

§45 (continued from p. 208): ‘tristega’ explains ‘cenacula’ — the three roofed stories (over the animals, the food, the men); the bottom and the ridge are not counted.

But that adverb ‘below’ (deorsum), to what it ought to be referred and with what joined, is not easy to understand. For if it be joined with those following words, ‘Cenacula and tristega shalt thou make in it,’ it does not

seem to render a true sense, since the cenacula and the three stories were not ‘below,’ that is in the bottom of the ark, but distributed through the whole ark itself. But if it be joined with those immediately preceding words, ‘The door thou shalt make in the side of the ark,’ and that ‘below’ joined with this: first, it plainly disagrees with the Hebrew Scripture, the Chaldee paraphrase, and the translation of the Septuagint, which join that ‘below’ (for which they have ‘lower parts’) with what follows; next, no true sense results, for the door of the ark was not made ‘below,’ that is in the bottom of the ark, for it would have been most inconvenient and of no use at all. Tostatus joins ‘below’ with what was said about the door, and refers ‘below’ not to the ark (as if the door were to be made in the bottom of the ark), but joins it with what Moses had said a little before about the window: ‘Thou shalt make a window in the ark, but the door of the ark thou shalt set in the side below’ — so that Moses signifies that the door ought to be made below the window; for the window was in the upper part of the cenaculum of the men, but the door was below, either in the cenaculum of the men itself, or even below this, that is in the cenaculum of the animals. But if that ‘below’ be joined with what follows (and indeed it seems it should be joined), it can be expounded in two ways. First, that ‘below’ means the same as the bottom of the ark, which was like a bilge, so that what the Hebrew Scripture and the Greek translation called ‘the lower parts of the ark,’ the Latin translator said ‘below’; so that the sense is this: Make first the ‘below’ of the ark, that is the first story which contains the bottom of the ark, and above this thou shalt make the cenacula for the use of the habitation of animals and men and the preservation of food, and these thou shalt make ‘three-storied,’ that is distinguished from one another by three roofs or stories or floorings. That ‘below’ can also be referred to what preceded about making the door, so that we think the door of the ark was in the highest cenaculum, which was the men’s, but that God ordered to be made ‘below’ — that is, below the door,…

§46 (continues on p. 210): the puzzle of ‘deorsum’ (below) — what it modifies; Tostatus links it to the door (set below the window). Margin: Tostatus.

— p. 210 (PDF) · printed p. 141 —

…three other cenacula in number, and ‘three-storied,’ that is distinguished by three roofs, so that one was above another. And the first cenaculum was to be destined for the keeping of food; the second, for the habitation of the animals; the third was to contain the bottom and the lowest part of the Ark. For although the bottom of the Ark cannot properly be called a cenaculum, yet, the word being taken broadly (as it is often used), nothing forbids its being so named. Nor does any more convenient way occur to me of explaining these words of the Latin translation, so that it may both have a true sense and not seem to disagree with the Hebrew Scripture and the translation of the Septuagint.

§46 (continued from p. 209): three more cenacula below the door (food / animals / bottom), three-roofed.

EIGHTH DISPUTATION. On the number and order of the little rooms which were in the Ark.

Heading of the Eighth Disputation of Book X.

Thou shalt make little rooms in it.

The lemma of Gen 6:14 repeated for this disputation.

This, as regards the sense of the words, has been explained above. Here it only remains to explain how many little rooms there were in the Ark, in what order they were arranged, of what size each was, how they were distinguished from one another, and how fitly and conveniently they were designed and set up for the use of the habitation of the animals. In the first cenaculum, then (the first, I say, ascending from the lower parts of the Ark to the upper, and the bottom of the Ark being passed over), where the animals were to be, one may lay out three hundred little rooms, amply sufficient for taking in and holding not only all the land animals that were in the ark, but many more besides. And these three hundred little rooms we distribute into six rows, extended according to the length of the ark, but

disjoined and separated from one another according to the breadth of the same ark.

§47: in the animals' deck, 300 little rooms can be laid out in six rows along the length.

And to each little room are assigned six cubits of length, as many of breadth, and nine or eight cubits of height. For although there are some land animals of such tallness that one pair of them requires more space to dwell in (for the two elephants which were in the ark certainly needed a larger place), yet, because most animals are of such a size that they can be contained in a smaller place, that measure of each little room — six cubits of length and as many of breadth — was more than enough; for very few animals took up more space, while very many were enclosed and contained in a smaller place. And all the little rooms were closed with planking and lattices. Assigning, then, to each little room six cubits of length, since that cenaculum was three hundred cubits long (which…

§48: each room 6 cubits long, 6 broad, 8–9 high (the elephants needed more); all closed with planking and gratings.

— p. 211 (PDF) · printed p. 142 —

…namely was the length of the whole ark), each of those six rows which extended along the whole length of that cenaculum must necessarily have had fifty little rooms; and since the breadth of the ark was fifty cubits, and to each little room six cubits of breadth were assigned, those six rows of little rooms filled thirty-six cubits of the ark's breadth; there remained, therefore, another fourteen cubits of the ark's breadth, which must be distributed into several walkways, both lengthwise and crosswise, interposed among those six rows of little rooms, so that the men could run about and survey everything pertaining to the welfare of the animals, for the sake of more easily watching over and supplying them. And if more space than those fourteen cubits should seem to be allotted for the more convenient use of those walkways, however much may be needed can be taken from the size of the little rooms; for it was for this reason that we laid

out such little rooms both more numerous and larger than was needed.

§48 (continued from p. 210): six rows of fifty rooms fill 36 of the 50 cubits' breadth, leaving 14 for walkways.

But the second and middle cenaculum, prepared for storing and keeping food, was distinguished by many storerooms, of unequal size and capacity, however, according to the variety of provisions; for the hay-lofts, chaff-stores, and where the foliage was kept, had to be larger than the granaries of grain and legumes. And all the storerooms were separated by partitions. In some part also of that cenaculum, in vessels of wood or clay, there was a great store of fresh water for the drink of the animals and men and for the use of washing. Just as also, in that famous ship of King Hiero, Athenaeus relates that there was at the prow a huge water-receptacle holding two thousand metretes, made of planks, pitch, and linen; and near this was a fishpond compacted of leaden plates and boards, full of sea water, in which a great quantity of fish was kept.

§49: the middle deck (food-store) — granaries, hay-lofts, water-vessels; the parallel of Hiero's ship (Athenaeus). Margin: Athenaeus.

There were, moreover, in this same cenaculum, holes and channels disposed in many places, standing directly over the mangers of the animals, which were made in each of their little rooms for the fodder; just as there were also there receptacles of water for drink. From the middle cenaculum, then, through those holes, there was let down into the manger of each little room the fodder that would be enough for eating and sustenance; and there were also in that cenaculum many wooden channels, like aqueducts, through which water was conducted into the little rooms of the animals for their drink. Nor is it permissible to doubt that Noah, foreknowing that all things on earth would perish in the cataclysm, stored a copious supply of furniture, both rustic and urban, and every kind of iron smith's tools, in the vacant places both of this middle cenaculum and of the upper one.

§50: feeding-holes and water-channels ran from the middle deck down into each manger; Noah, foreseeing all would perish, surely stored abundant tools and furniture.

There follows the third and highest cenaculum, in which was the dwelling of men and birds. Since John Buteo designated all its parts, fitted to the various uses of men and birds, aptly enough, and described them briefly and expressly, I will here set down his description in the very words he used. ‘In the highest region of the Ark,’ he says, ‘was an ample cenaculum where the men’s habitation was, lighted by the window of the ark, which, being rather large, had shutters fitted with mirror-stone (specular stone) or glass or crystal, so as to keep off the harm of the weather, not the light. To the cenaculum was joined a pantry and a kitchen, whose hearth was on a stone flooring; and there were hand-mills with their hoppers, likewise a men’s apartment (andronitis) and a women’s apartment (gynaeceum) — that is, separate chambers of the men and of the women; for it is believed that, as long as they were in the ark, the women and men lay apart and abstained from the use of marriage. And these chambers took a secondary light (as the opticians call it) from the cenaculum; but in others, whenever there was need, the use of lamps was employed.’

§51 (continues on p. 212): the top deck (men & birds) — Buteo’s description, in his own words: the crystal-glazed window, pantry and kitchen, hand-mills, separate men’s and women’s cabins (the sexes living apart in the ark). Margin: John Buteo.

— p. 212 (PDF) · printed p. 143 —

‘Near the kitchen was a woodshed, of split timbers which are called in Greek akapna, that is “smokeless,” and besides a coal-cellar. After this followed a granary, and a storeroom filled with rustic fruits of every kind, and then another devoted to the food of the birds; the bird-houses (ornithones) and cages of all of which were in this highest decking; and the lines of the passages, with the joints’ spaces left moderately apart, so that they might be as it were vents by which the air, warmed by the breath of the animals beneath, might cool, and the ventilation might be more wholesome. To this also the upper edge had, on each side along the length,

air-holes, left by a certain necessity of the work — namely, the thickness of the rafters (cantherii) preventing the upper boards from being joined to the cross beams of the uprights (arrectarii); whence, however, because of the projections of the eaves (subgrundia), neither light nor rain-water descended into the ark. That ladders, moreover, were set in convenient places must not be doubted, by which easy access lay open to all the stories; and finally, one must suppose that the distribution of the bars and burdens was so made in the Ark that it was borne on the waters in a balanced position; whose longer figure, as it was convenient for bearing the load, so it especially had need of such balancing and proportioning.' Thus far from Buteo.

§51 (continued from p. 211): Buteo on the woodshed (smokeless wood), coal-cellar, granary, fruit-stores, bird-feed, aviaries and cages, air-vents, vents in the upper edges, ladders, and the ship's balanced loading.

But this must here be disputed in passing and briefly: whether, outside the Ark, yet affixed to it, there were any lodgings for the habitation of those animals which are called amphibious; for Hugh reports that many held this, and he himself seems to approve and follow that opinion. For he writes thus, in the first book On the Moral Ark, ch. 3: 'In the walls of this Ark, on the outside, were made nests or little rooms, as it were affixed to the walls themselves, so that their entrance lay open from without, while the wall itself remained whole within. And these nests, they say, were made for those animals which can live neither always in water nor always on dry land, such as the otter and the seal.' Thus Hugh. But this opinion I, for my part, judge to be by no means probable; nay, it may be refuted by five arguments. First, that uneven structure of lodgings standing outside the Ark would have been most inconvenient for the Ark, because of the greatest force of the waters falling from above with great violence for forty continuous days, and of those which were vehemently dashed against the sides of the Ark. Next, either those little rooms outside, that is toward the water, would have been open and exposed, or closed; if open, it would have

been to the great harm and ruin of the animals hiding therein, because of the frequent and vehement onslaughts of the waves which were dashed against the sides…

§52 (continues on p. 213): whether amphibian-pens were built outside the Ark (Hugh) — Pererius refutes it (five arguments); first, such outer structures would be ruined by the waters. Margin: 'Whether some little rooms were attached to the Ark outside, as some held'; Hugh.

— p. 213 (PDF) · printed p. 144 —

…and dashed against; but if they were closed, then the animals which were there could not, as often as was needful, go out into the water to catch and procure for themselves aquatic food, without which these men supposed they could not pass their life. Besides, Moses, in describing the structure of the Ark, only indicated that lodgings were made within the ark; but if any others had been made outside the ark, he would have set them forth likewise; the silence about them in Moses, therefore, is a manifest argument that there were none such on the ark.

§52 (continued from p. 212): if closed, the animals couldn't get out for water; and Moses mentions only rooms inside the ark.

Moreover, Moses, more than once and in plain words, both in the sixth chapter and in the seventh, shows that all the living things which were saved from the Flood were brought into the ark. 'Of all living creatures,' said the Lord to Noah, 'thou shalt bring two of all flesh into the ark, that they may live with thee,' etc.; and again, 'Two of every kind shall enter in with thee, that they may live'; which Scripture repeats was afterward done, saying: 'Of beasts also clean and unclean, and of birds, and of everything that moveth upon the earth, two and two went in to Noah into the ark, male and female, as the Lord had commanded Noah.'

the further argument: Moses repeatedly shows all the animals were brought INTO the ark (Gen 6–7).

That too which is said by these men seems false — that those amphibious animals cannot live long in the waters and need land food. For the

crocodile and the seal do not seek land out of necessity, but for the sake of richer prey and a more convenient and safer place for the begetting and preservation of their young. Nor is it true that such animals cannot long pass their life without aquatic food; for Buteo relates that he himself saw at Paris two seals brought from afar to the king of France for a show, which sought and devoured flesh no less eagerly than fish. In short: even if we should grant that such animals could live neither outside the Ark nor without aquatic food, yet a place to dwell in was not lacking to them in the Ark; and in its highest cenaculum, where the men were, there remained a most ample space for making a huge fishpond, which, full of fish, would amply supply food to those animals for the whole year — just as we said above from Athenaeus, that in that noble ship of King Hiero there was a great fishpond abounding in fish of every kind.

§53: it is also false that amphibians cannot live long in water or need land food (Buteo saw seals at Paris eating flesh as eagerly as fish); and there was ample room in the top deck for a huge fishpond to feed them (as in Hiero's ship). Margins: Buteo; Athenaeus.

NINTH DISPUTATION. On the door of the Ark and its window.

Heading of the Ninth Disputation of Book X.

And the door of the Ark thou shalt set in the side.

Genesis 6:16 (the door clause; the original prints it as 'Vers. 17').

That 'in the side' (ex latere) is the same as 'in the side of the ark,' or 'from the side'; in Greek it is ek plagi■n, which Ambrose, in On the Ark and Noah, ch. 8, renders 'from the front' (ex adverso). St. Augustine, in the Locutions on Genesis, notes that very many codices have 'from the side'…

§(start; continues on p. 214): 'in the side' — the Greek ek plagi■n; Ambrose 'from the front,' Augustine notes many codices read 'from the side.' Margins: Ambrose; Augustine.

— p. 214 (PDF) · printed p. 145 —

…‘from the side’; but some have ‘from across’ (ex transverso). It is plainly signified by these words that the door was not either in the roof or at the corners of the Ark, but in one of the four sides of the Ark — of which two were the sides of the Ark’s length, namely the longer, the other two of the breadth, which were shorter. And although the door could have been in the sides of the length, yet the Doctors mostly think it was in one of the breadth-sides, because there it was more convenient for the entry of the animals into the Ark; for there began those six rows of lodgings in which the animals dwelt, so that they, having entered, might easily be led each to their own lodgings.

§(continued from p. 213): the door was in one of the four sides (not roof or corners) — likely in one of the short (breadth) sides, convenient for the animals’ entry.

But it must be seen in which deck of the ark the door was. Hugh, in the first book On the Moral Ark, ch. 3, set forth the opinion of the Doctors and his own about the door of the Ark briefly in these words: ‘For when it is said, “Thou shalt set the door in the side, below,” by “the side below” he seems to signify the lateral wall, in distinction from the side which was above in the roof, in which perhaps the window was placed. And the Doctors affirm that the door of the ark was placed between the second and third lodging, so that its threshold was contiguous to the floor of the third lodging, but its entrance was cut out above, in the side of that same lodging; so that from the door two lodgings were below, but three above. And one, they say, was ordained for receiving the dung of the animals; the second, for their food; in the third were the untamed animals; in the fourth, the gentle animals; in the fifth, which was the highest, men and birds. And it is likely that those two lower lodgings, as the ark floated, were sunk below the waters; but the third, in which were the animals that needed a breath of open air, projected first above the waters, so that to those approaching the ark from without through the water, the door met them almost on a level. And according to this manner perhaps it was said, “Thou shalt set the door below”; or “below” because, in whatever lodging it were placed, it was below, so that

it might receive the feet of those entering the ark.’ Thus Hugh.

§55: in which deck was the door? — Hugh reports the Doctors placing it between the second and third lodgings, and supposing the animals swam up to it. Margin: Hugh of St. Victor.

But I disagree with Hugh on two counts: both because he joins that ‘below’ with the door (whereas that it ought to be joined with what follows we showed above, from the Hebrew Scripture, the Chaldee paraphrase, and the translation of the Septuagint); and because he supposes that, the Flood having already begun and the lands covered with water, the animals entered the ark by swimming — whereas Moses, in chapter seven, plainly indicates that before the beginning of the Flood both men and animals entered the ark, writing thus: ‘Noah went in, and his sons, his wife and the wives of his sons with him, into the ark; and of all living things, two and two went in to Noah into the ark; and when seven days had passed, the waters of the Flood overflowed upon the earth.’ And repeating the same a little below, he subjoins: ‘And the Lord shut him in from without. And the Flood came for forty days, and the waters were multiplied and lifted up the ark on high from the earth.’ Buteo thinks the door of the ark was above the bilge, so that it had its threshold in that deck where the animals were, and in the threshold itself hinges, whence the leaf, turned, would lean down to the ground and serve in place of a stairway, by an ascent of four cubits.

§56: Pererius disagrees with Hugh on two counts — ‘below’ should join what follows, and Moses (Gen 7) shows men and animals entered before the Flood began. Buteo placed the door above the bilge, with hinges letting the leaf swing down as a ramp. Margin: Buteo.

— p. 215 (PDF) · printed p. 146 —

I think thus: that the door was (as Scripture says) in one of the breadth-sides of the ark; for in an animal and a man, and in other bodies of a quadrangular but not equilateral figure, those are properly called the ‘sides’ which bound the breadth. But how high the door was raised from the base of the Ark, although it is uncertain from Scripture itself, yet it is quite likely that it was in the deck of the animals’ habitation, raised about

five cubits from the base of the Ark. Nor was it difficult to build a gentle and easy ascent for the animals about to enter the Ark.

§57: Pererius — the door was in one breadth-side, likely about five cubits up in the animals' deck, with an easy ramp.

It was necessary that the door be very well closed and everywhere fortified, all the joints most firmly compacted; and to signify this Moses said that God shut the door from without; for it was to be submerged in the waters throughout the whole time of the Flood — if indeed it is true what Lyra and Tostatus set forth, from the opinion and traditions of the Hebrews, that the ark, in the time of the Flood, was submerged in the waters about twelve cubits, so that nearly the whole deck of the animals was within the waters. But whether this be true or not, will be disputed later in the twelfth book, which will be on the Flood.

§58: the door was sealed shut (God shut it from without) — the Ark sank perhaps 12 cubits, almost submerging the animals' deck (Lyra, Tostatus, per Hebrew traditions; to be discussed in book 12). Margins: Lyra; Tostatus.

There follows in Moses about the window of the Ark. 'Thou shalt make a window in the Ark.' This about the window of the Ark, which the Latin translation has — as also the Hebrew Scripture and the Chaldee paraphrase — the Septuagint translators omitted; for in place of it they have 'Gathering, thou shalt make the ark,' which pertains plainly nothing to the window of the ark; and why they omitted it, I cannot, even by divining, say any probable cause. For the word 'window' there is in this place the Hebrew word Sohar, properly signifying 'light,' especially midday light; wherefore Jerome says that in the Hebrew it is, 'A noon-light thou shalt make for the ark,' but that it was more clearly translated by Symmachus, saying diaphanes, that is, 'A transparency thou shalt make for the ark,' meaning a window to be understood. That word Sohar also signifies that which gives light; and this happens in two ways: either because, having light in itself, it diffuses it to other things, as a lamp, or some precious stone shining with a fiery brilliance; or because it transmits light, as is a

window through which light enters a house.

§59: the window — omitted by the Septuagint (which has ‘gathering, thou shalt make the ark’); the Hebrew Sohar (‘light,’ esp. midday), rendered by Jerome ‘a noon-light,’ by Symmachus ‘something transparent.’ Margin: Jerome, Hebrew Traditions.

The Hebrews think that by that word Moses here signified a lamp made of some larger gem, such as a lychnites or carbuncle, shining with so great a light that, wherever they are, they dispel the darkness from thence to some degree. By the brilliance of such a radiant lamp, then, these men think the ark — especially the dining-room where the men were — was lighted. But it cannot be denied that there was in the ark a window that could be opened and closed; for below, in the eighth chapter, it is said that, when the Flood ceased, Noah opened the window which he had made, and through it sent out the raven and the dove.

§60: the Hebrews think it means a lamp made of a great gem (carbuncle); but there was certainly a window that could be opened (Gen 8 — Noah opened it to send the raven and dove).

Others suppose that in the upper part of the men’s deck, around its circuit, many windows were made of specular stone or of glass or crystal, so fashioned and fitted that they kept off the water but admitted the light; wherefore Moses, naming the window in the singular…

§61 (continues on p. 216): others suppose many crystal/glass windows around the top deck (water-tight but light-admitting); ‘window’ (singular) for the plural, or naming only the chief window. Margin: (Tostatus).

— p. 216 (PDF) · printed p. 147 —

…either put the singular for the plural (as frequently happens in the sacred writings), or wished to name here only that window which was the chief one in the ark and of which he was to make mention below. Tostatus thinks it was a real window, closed and bitumened throughout the whole time of the Flood, neither transparent nor opened until the Flood was over.

§61 (continued from p. 215): the singular for the plural, or only the chief window; Tostatus thought it a real window, sealed shut all through the Flood. Margin: Tostatus.

Buteo makes only one window, but a transparent one — which, receiving light from without, would transmit it into the ark; and that one was enough for the use of the men. For animals do not desire light, except for the sake of feeding and of acquiring the things they need; for by nature they delight to lurk in pits, or in caverns and dens, or in the lairs of the densest woods and thickets, or in the hollow recesses of trees, and, as if they hated the light, they lie hidden all day, coming forth only by night for prey and pasture. And the other animals, besides man, seem also to see somewhat in the dark.

§62: Buteo makes a single transparent window — enough for the men, since animals shun light and see in the dark. Margin: John Buteo.

About the window's size Moses said nothing; but Vatablus and Francis Oleaster here think it was one cubit high, and that this was signified by Moses when he subjoined, 'And in a cubit shalt thou finish the top of it,' or, as they translate from the Hebrew, 'in a cubit, or to a cubit, shalt thou finish it above'; for that pronoun 'it,' both in Greek and in Latin, is ambiguous, since it can be referred both to the ark and to the window; but these men refer it to the window, as though God commanded the window to be made one cubit long or high, or that it should be made in that one highest, thirtieth cubit of the Ark's height. And the breadth of the window, they say, is not described by Moses; yet some gather it from the length, so that the window's breadth was a sixth part of one cubit. But even such a window would have been too small in proportion to the ark, and of almost no use; and that word 'thou shalt finish,' or 'complete,' denotes something already begun but not yet completed — such as was the ark, which, until it had its covering or roof, was unfinished. And what of the fact that, if this is not about the final roof of the ark, no mention of it is made anywhere else — whereas below, in the eighth chapter, it is written that Noah, when the Flood was over, opened the roof of the ark? I, as I by no means disapprove

the last view, so I most approve the second.

§63: the window's size — Vatablus and Oleaster make it one cubit high (the 'in a cubit thou shalt finish it' referred to the window), with a width of a sixth of a cubit; Pererius prefers the second view (the 'cubit' refers to the roof). Margins: Vatablus; Oleaster.

TENTH DISPUTATION. What was the form of the structure of the Ark, according to various authors.

Heading of the Tenth Disputation of Book X.

It remains for us to dispute, through several questions, what was the figure of the Ark, or the plan of its structure, reviewing and discussing the various opinions of the Doctors on the matter. Of which let the first to meet us be the opinion of Origen, who thinks the Ark was in its base three hundred cubits long and fifty broad, but that the sides rising from the base were drawn in and narrowed toward one another more and more, both in length and in breadth, until at the end they were no more than one cubit apart, so that the topmost peak was an equilateral square, its four outer sides each only one cubit. To which opinion credit seems to be built up from the translation of the Septuagint translators, which in this place has thus: 'Gathering, thou shalt make the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish it'; that 'gathering' seems to signify that the ark ought, from the bottom, to be always 'gathered,' that is, narrowed more and more to a point, so that the summit of the whole ark, both in length and in breadth, was no greater than one cubit.

§64 (continues on p. 217): Origen's view — the Ark tapered from base (300×50) to a 1-cubit square top, like a truncated pyramid; supported by the LXX 'gathering thou shalt make the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish it.' Margin: Origen.

— p. 217 (PDF) · printed p. 148 —

But it is better to hear Origen himself narrating his own opinion in his own words. In the second homily on this sixth chapter of Genesis, then, Origen writes in this manner: 'Which ark I think — so far as appears from what is

described — was, with its four corners rising from one, and gradually drawn in to a point at the top, gathered into a space of one cubit. For it is so reported, that in its foundations three hundred cubits are set in length, but fifty in breadth, and thirty in height; but that it was gathered into a narrow peak, so that in the peak there was one cubit of its length and breadth.' And a little after, certain things interposed: 'Yet,' he says, 'as regards the necessity of the rains and the Flood, no shape of the Ark could have been given so suitable and congruous as that it should, from the top, as from a kind of roof, with the ridge drawn into a point, shed off the downpours of rains, and, resting below in the waters with a square stability, could be tilted or sunk neither by the push of the winds, nor by the onset of the waves, nor by the restlessness of the animals which were within.' Thus Origen.

§64 (continued from p. 216): Origen's own words (homily 2 on Gen 6) — the four corners drawn up to a 1-cubit top; best for shedding the rains and resting stably in the water.

And so, according to Origen, the figure of the Ark was such as is a pyramid with the apex cut off, if the plane of the section be drawn not square, but six times longer on one side. And this description of Origen Bede, Rupert, Tostatus, and very many others approved with full assent. We have here subjoined the form of the Ark according to Origen for the reader to behold.

§65: so Origen's Ark is like a truncated pyramid with an oblong (6:1) base; approved by Bede, Rupert, Tostatus, and many. Margins: Bede; Rupert; Tostatus.

The form of the Ark according to Origen. AB, length, 300 cubits; AC, breadth, 50 cubits; DE, height, 30 cubits; EF, size of the top, 1 cubit. [The original prints a woodcut of the truncated-pyramid Ark here.]

Legend of the woodcut diagram of the Ark according to Origen (a truncated pyramid). [The original prints a diagram here; only its legend is given.]

— p. 218 (PDF) · printed p. 149 —

Hugh, however, opposes Origen, in the first book On the Moral Ark, ch. 3, disputing against him thus: ‘Several things seem to oppose the opinion of Origen. First, that this form does not seem suitable for floating; for it is plain that a machine of so great a mass, laden with so many and so great animals and provisions, could by no means so float on the coming waters as not to be pressed down for a great part of itself — of which we can take proof in ships bearing great loads. If, then, as is said, it began to be drawn in straightway from the bottom, so that the swelling waves, the sides leaning this way and that, would not repel them but receive them, and not so much would the water bear the ark as the ark the waters, how could it come about that it did not all at once descend to the depths?’ Thus Hugh against Origen.

§66: Hugh opposes Origen — such a tapering shape would not float, but sink under its load (as ships do). Margin: ‘Hugh against Origen.’

But in truth, besides the consideration of the ark’s instability and the danger of submersion, which Hugh well urges against Origen, this form and description of the Ark is moreover burdened with great inconveniences. For what agreement, I ask, has such a description with the figure of an ark, such a figure as that of Noah had? The very designation of its square peak is both deformed and foul to look at, and useless for the work and unsuited to the use for which the ark was built. Indeed, the very plan of a pyramid has a mode of building hindered and difficult, and very inconvenient for the habitation of so many and so great animals.

§67: besides instability, the pyramidal shape is unlike the real Ark’s figure, ugly, useless, and hard to build.

How unfit that description would be for navigation and a year’s sojourn in the waters, the form of ships shows, in which what is drawn in always inclines toward the keel, but the broader parts come out into the open and rise high above the waters. But this would have been a greater inconvenience: that of the capacity of the Ark which we described above

— four hundred and fifty thousand cubits — scarcely a third part would exist according to this description of Origen. Therefore, while Origen wished to accommodate the form of the Ark to shedding the runoff of the rains, he made it, for avoiding the onsets of winds and the dashings of waves and storms, most weak and most liable to shipwreck, and for taking in what had to be in the Ark, most narrow and most inconvenient.

§68: ships show the tapering shape is unfit for floating and a year's voyage; and it would yield barely a third of the 450,000-cubit capacity.

Hugh thinks the Ark was composed of two parts: of which the one, the lower, was fifteen cubits high, containing three lodgings — the lowest in place of a bilge, the middle for holding food, the highest for the habitation of the wild and untamed animals. The other part of the Ark was the upper, likewise fifteen cubits high, which he himself calls the 'roof' of the Ark, set upon the former part, within which were men, birds, and the tame land animals; but the sides of this upper part, or roof, were gradually brought to a point and at last ended in a square peak of one cubit. Hugh, then, differs from Origen in this: that the latter draws in and points the Ark's sides straightway from the bottom of the Ark, but the former raises the Ark's sides straight from the base for fifteen cubits, and from there constricts and tapers them. But this opinion of Hugh, which we have here roughly sketched, must be learned by the reader more expressly from his own words.

§69 (continues on p. 219): Hugh's own view — a hull 15 cubits high (3 lodgings) topped by a 15-cubit pyramidal roof (men, birds, tame beasts), tapering to a 1-cubit top. Margin: 'What the figure of the Ark was according to Hugh.'

— p. 219 (PDF) · printed p. 150 —

In the first book On the Moral Ark, ch. 3, then, Hugh writes in this manner: 'It seems to us that in the Ark itself walls were erected on the four sides, upon which a roof, set above, is drawn in at its peak to the measure of one cubit. But of what height the walls themselves were, this the authority does

not say; yet, so far as we conjecture, the height of the walls extended up to the floor of the fourth lodging.' And, certain things interposed: 'If it be asked,' he says, 'whether the height of the several lodgings was equal or not, we indeed cannot prove from authority what is to be held; meanwhile we ask only this much to be granted us, that it not be contrary to authority. For we wish to distinguish thus: that to the first lodging we give a height of four cubits, to the second of five cubits, to the third six, to the fourth seven, to the fifth eight; and thus the height of the walls had fifteen cubits, and fifteen the height of the roof.' Thus Hugh; whose opinion about the form of the Ark the figure here subjoined represents.

§69 (continued from p. 218): Hugh's own words — walls to the floor of the fourth lodging; the five lodgings ascending 4,5,6,7,8 cubits (=15 of wall) plus 15 of roof.

The form of the Ark according to Hugh. AB, height of the Ark, 15 cubits; BC, height of the roof, 15 cubits. [The original prints a woodcut here.]

Legend of the woodcut diagram of the Ark according to Hugh (a straight-sided hull with a tall pyramidal roof). [Diagram in the original.]

But I, for many reasons, can by no means approve this opinion of Hugh. And first, indeed, he seems in that place to say not only diverse but even contrary things. For from the aforesaid words it appears that Hugh extends the roof of the ark up to the floor of the fourth lodging, and within it has set the fourth and fifth lodging; but the same had said a little above that the roof was set on top, which was contiguous to the fifth and highest lodging, in which the man dwelt. Next, if the roof began from the floor of the fourth lodging — that is, from the roof of the third — then the fourth and last lodging would have been under the roof; how, then, were those two lodgings distinguished from each other, since they were under the same roof? For the lodgings in the Ark were distinguished and separated from one another by different roofs or floorings interposed. Unless he say that that space which was within the roof was three-chambered, that is distinguished into three dwellings — one of the tame animals, another of

the birds, a third of the men; but thus there were not five lodgings, but only three lower, and the fourth was three-chambered.

§70: Pererius rejects Hugh — he says both diverse and contradictory things (roof from the fourth floor vs. above the fifth lodging), and the fourth and fifth lodgings under one roof would not be distinct.

— p. 220 (PDF) · printed p. 151 —

Moreover, Hugh omitted to say how the sides or walls of the roof behaved — whether they began to lean in and be drawn together straightway from the floor of the fourth lodging, or rose straight for some space and were afterward inclined, or, finally, were straight through the whole fifteen cubits and after that height the gable of the roof began; for to declare this mattered greatly for knowing his opinion about the form of the ark. For if he thought the roof-walls began at once to be drawn in, he made a deformed shape of the ark — namely, in proportion to its length and breadth, ugly in aspect with such a roof, that is, very tiny and as it were dwarfish; he made besides a most inconvenient dwelling for the men, which he puts within the roof, because of the narrowness of the sides ever more and more verging to a point. Besides that, by this constitution of the roof he cuts off nearly a third part of the capacity of four hundred and fifty thousand cubits, which we assigned above to the Ark’s capacity. But if he wished the roof-walls to have been at first somewhat straight, and then inclined, this is said gratuitously, since he shows neither the necessity nor the utility nor any use of this variety, nor precisely teaches how far the walls were straight and whence they began to incline. But if he judged the roof-walls to have been straight through the whole fifteen cubits, then so great a height of roof, in proportion to the body of the Ark, both faulty by the rules of the art and useless for the work; for to what end was so lofty and ample a roof needed? What more, when the very pyramidal construction, even on a solid base, is a work of intricacy and great labor? — if it be placed on half the Ark, it would be much more laborious and hard. For the uneven joining of dissimilar bodies discordant among

themselves, unless it be most firmly held together by strong bindings and frequent cross-pieces and the props of the prisms, the lower part, by the weight and violence of the vault, will be wholly thrust out; to say nothing of the fact that such chainings present much more load and impediment to the vessel than a good portion of cargo and freight.

§71: further objections — Hugh leaves it unclear how the roof-walls behaved (immediately tapering would be deformed and cramp the men's quarters and cut a third of the capacity; straight for 15 cubits would be uselessly tall); a half-Ark pyramid is laborious and structurally precarious.

Cajetan, explaining those words of this sixth chapter, 'And in a cubit shalt thou finish the top of it,' signifies that the Ark was of such a figure that its sides at the top were so drawn in according to the breadth that, although it kept the whole length of the Ark, yet in breadth they were no more than one cubit apart. And why the tops of the Ark's sides were not altogether and wholly joined together, but an interval of one cubit's breadth was left, he gives this cause: namely, that in this way the interior capacity of the ark would be greater. Cajetan, then (to declare his design in the mathematical manner), figures the ark of Noah in that bodily shape which by the Geometers is named a 'prism,' of which two opposite parallel planes, upon the smaller sides of the base, are triangles with their apices cut off, of a cubit's breadth, but the remaining three planes parallelograms.

§72 (continues on p. 221): Cajetan's view — the sides drawn in at the top only in breadth, to a 1-cubit ridge running the full length (a prism); the cubit left for greater capacity. Margin: 'What Cajetan thought of the form of the Ark.'

— p. 221 (PDF) · printed p. 152 —

I will here set down Cajetan's words, that from them the reader may clearly recognize and judge (for Cajetan speaks somewhat obscurely) whether his opinion is that which I have stated. Expounding, then, those words, 'And in a cubit shalt thou finish the top of it,' or, as he reads from the Hebrew, 'To an arm's length shalt thou finish it above': 'The discourse,' he says, 'is not about the window, but about the ark — that the topmost part of the Ark was

to be of one arm only, both that the rain-waters might slide off this way and that, and that the Ark might not be bent by the weight of the top. But this can be understood in two ways. First, that the top of the Ark was square, that is, of one cubit on each of the four sides; and this sense strongly disagrees both with the sloping surface of the Ark without and with the capacity of the Ark within. For, with the line of height of thirty cubits rising in the middle of the Ark, cutting in the middle the line of length of three hundred and the line of breadth of fifty cubits, it is plain that the line drawn from the end of the half-length up to the top of the line of height would be more than a hundred and fifty cubits, as is evident; and the line drawn from the corner of the Ark to the same top would be greater still, as is evident. Since, then, the lines drawn from the four corners of the Ark to the top of the line of height in the middle are so long, and the line of height itself is so small, it manifestly appears that the ark would have been by no means sloping, but rather nearly flat, on the outside. And hence too it appears that the Ark would have been of very little capacity within; for the lines drawn both from the four corners and from the ends of the Ark's length to the top of so short a line in the middle would have been so near the floor of the Ark that they would have enclosed a very scanty empty space, as is evident. The other sense, therefore, is that the topmost part of the Ark was of one cubit in breadth only; in length it was as long as the ark was, namely three hundred cubits; and because thus the text is verified and all absurdities cease, therefore this sense is to be embraced. And it is favored by this: that it is clear that a cubit was decreed for the top part of the ark in order that the Ark might be more capacious within; for, unless account had been taken of greater capacity, it would have been decreed that the boards rising along the length of the Ark toward the height, to close the top, should touch one another at the top, on both sides, without a cubit. The form of the Ark, then, is not to be accommodated to our fancy; but the more sloping it is without and the more capacious within, the more truly is the text understood.' And so much, indeed, Cajetan. Whose description of the ark, as it could be expressed in a plane, the figure subjoined represents.

§72 (continued from p. 220): Cajetan's own (somewhat obscure) words, weighing the two readings of 'in a cubit thou shalt finish it' — a square cubit top (rejected, since the Ark would be flat outside and uncramped inside) vs. a 1-cubit-wide ridge running the whole length (accepted, 'to make the Ark more capacious within').

The form of the Ark according to Cajetan. AB, breadth of the roof, 1 cubit. [The original prints a woodcut here.]

Legend of the woodcut diagram of the Ark according to Cajetan (a ridged prism). [Diagram in the original.]

— p. 222 (PDF) · printed p. 153 —

But it is not sufficiently clear how Cajetan imagined the sides of the Ark. For either he thought the sides began to narrow straightway from the bottom and base of the ark, according to breadth, until at the top they were no more than one cubit of breadth apart from one another; but by this reckoning Cajetan differs little from Origen, and in great part diminishes the capacity of the ark described by us above; for although the gable of the ark were not drawn in according to the length of the ark, but only according to the breadth, nevertheless even so the ark would have lost very much of its capacity. Or Cajetan thought the sides rose straight from the base up to the thirtieth cubit of height, and that there a gable was set upon the sides, whose sides filled the whole length of the ark, but at the top were no more than one cubit apart in breadth; but he ought to have declared of what height he judged that gable, or roof, of the ark to be. Nor could the breadth of one cubit left at the apex of the gable, between its sides, contribute anything to the greater capacity of the ark, as he thought; since the whole gable was above the roof of the highest deck, or men's habitation, below which roof, down to the base of the ark, the whole capacity of the Ark was contained.

§(against Cajetan): it is unclear how Cajetan imagined the sides — if drawn in from the bottom, he differs little from Origen and loses much capacity; if straight to 30 cubits with a ridged roof above, he should have stated the roof's height (and the 1-cubit ridge adds nothing to capacity). Margin: 'A remark on Cajetan.'

Lyra, on this sixth chapter of Genesis, left two writings about the structure of the Ark, from which it can easily be understood how he himself imagined the form of the Ark. For first he makes the sides of the Ark straight up to the thirtieth cubit, and distinguishes the interior capacity of the Ark into three lodgings; the lowest he makes in place of a bilge, which he himself calls the ‘dung-part’; the middle he destines to the preservation of food, but makes it two-chambered, so that the greens and herbs were stored separately, and apart the grains and fruits; the third and highest he constitutes three-chambered, so that in the middle was the dwelling of men and birds, but in the two ends the other animals, in the one the wild, in the other the tame. Let the reader hear Lyra, explaining a little more distinctly what he said briefly. For, explaining those words, ‘Upper-rooms and three-storied shalt thou make in it’: ‘It seems,’ he says, ‘that in the ark there were three lodgings, ascending one above another, and the lowest was called the bilge or dung-part, because thither the dregs flowed down, and it is said to have been simple and without any partition; the middle was called the storeroom, because there the provisions were laid up, and it is said to have been two-chambered, because some animals live on herbs and others on fruits, and therefore in one section were the herbs and in the other the fruits; but the upper lodging, because it was larger, was distinguished by two partitions, and thus there were three spaces there — the middle was for men and birds, but the two lateral ones for the gentle and the untamed animals. Some make those lodgings five without any middle distinction, namely one above another according to the length and breadth of the ark. It must be known, however, that the squaring of this Ark cannot well be figured on a plane, but one side is figured according to the length, and the other three sides must be supplied…’

§73 (continues on p. 223): Lyra’s view — sides straight to 30 cubits; three lodgings (bilge/dung; a two-chambered food-store; a three-chambered top: men & birds in the middle, beasts at the two ends).

— p. 223 (PDF) · printed p. 154 —

…by the imagination. Yet the former exposition agrees better with the text in the Hebrew and in the Latin.' So there Lyra. Besides this, Lyra thinks that upon the sides of the ark a roof was set, so gabled that all its sides ended in a square peak of a cubit — namely, in that manner in which Origen described the gable of the Ark. This about the roof of the Ark, expounding that 'And in a cubit shalt thou finish the top of it,' Lyra declares in these words: 'From the upper corners of the Ark the roof proceeded, constricting itself, so that at the top the sides were no more than a cubit apart; and this was so that the rain descending on the roof might flow off outside the Ark more easily, and that the ark, amid the onslaughts of the waves, might stand more firmly.' And this is Lyra's opinion about the form of the Ark, which the figure written below expresses.

§73 (continued from p. 222): the close of Lyra; and Lyra's roof, tapering like Origen's to a 1-cubit square top, with diagram.

The form of the Ark according to Lyra. ROOF. — TAME ANIMALS / MEN AND BIRDS / WILD ANIMALS. — STOREROOM of HERBS / of FRUITS. — BILGE. [The original prints a woodcut here.]

Legend of the woodcut diagram of the Ark according to Lyra (a hull with labeled compartments and a tapering roof). [Diagram in the original.]

But in this description of the form of the Ark by Lyra, two things can be censured, or at least found wanting. For he neither indicated how high the roof was that closed and covered the Ark above (for it could be made in various ways, either higher or lower), nor disclosed the cause why the gable and peak of the ark was left square, since no necessity or utility of this appears to have been possible — nay, rather, it seems it would have been far more opportune and better suited to an easier sliding and runoff of the rains through the roof of the ark, if it had been altogether pointed.

§74: two faults in Lyra's description — he did not say how high the roof was, nor why the peak was left square (a pure point would shed rain better). Margin: 'Lyra's opinion examined.'

John Buteo, who in subtly explaining the structure of the ark was diligent and accurate enough, thinks thus about the roof of the ark: that Moses, when he said the top of the ark was to be finished ‘in a cubit,’ signified by these words that the roof of the ark was to be made one cubit high, so that that cubit was the median height of the ridge of the ark, throughout the whole length of three hundred cubits; which height could indeed have sufficed for the runoff even of a longer span, especially on a smooth surface slicked with bitumen. The words of Buteo are these: ‘I understand the Ark to be finished “in a cubit,” before all the rest, in this way: that that cubit is the median height of the ridge throughout the whole length of cubi-…’

§75 (continues on p. 224): Buteo’s view of the roof — a low ridge only one cubit high at the middle, running the whole 300-cubit length; enough to shed rain, especially on a smooth, bitumen-slicked surface. Margin: John Buteo, On the Ark of Noah.

— p. 224 (PDF) · printed p. 155 —

…the ridge throughout the whole length of three hundred cubits, apart from the eaves (■κφορ■ς): which height was indeed sufficient for the runoff even of a longer span, especially on a smooth surface and one slicked with bitumen (asphalt). For Vitruvius himself, in the bed of a watercourse [?] along which water is conducted through built channels, lays down that the gradients (libramenta) be made sloping by only a two-hundredth part of the length. But in this arrangement of the roof, a one-cubit ridge exceeds Vitruvius's ratio eightfold. Besides, rainwater (caelestis aqua), driving itself along by drops falling on every side, flows down far more easily than water that proceeds along a watercourse or channel. In this way, then, which I have described — with the top set at a height of one cubit — no breadth is left at the ridge, that breadth which all whom I have hitherto read disputing these matters wished to be a cubit. And here I have laid out an orthographic drawing of the twin face [front elevation] of the ark according to its breadth and height, where the line BA designates the cubital ridge. So he [Buteo].

§75 (concl.): completes Buteo's quotation begun on p. 223. '■κφορ■ς' (ekphoras) = the projecting eaves. Buteo cites Vitruvius (De arch. bk. 8) on the slope of aqueduct channels (1/200); a one-cubit ridge over the 150-cubit half-length far exceeds that. Margin: Vitruvius.

[Diagram in original: "The roof of the ark according to Buteo" — a low triangular ridge labelled "High by one cubit only," with the ridge-line marked A–B.]

Woodcut; reproduced here as a caption only.

The same author, moreover, raises all four sides of the ark straight up from the base to the topmost point — that is, to the thirtieth cubit of height — and upon these he sets the roof (such as was just described). The interior capacity or space of the ark he divides into four parts, throughout the whole length and breadth of the ark, by interposing various framings (contignationes) and floorings (tabulata) — parts separated from one another in exactly the same way as we, above in the seventh disputation, made four stories (coenacula) or parts of the ark. And this opinion of Buteo seems to us nearer the truth and more probable than all the others set forth above. The figure subjoined here shows the form of the ark which, beyond the rest, we approve.

§76 [section number inferred; not legible in OCR]. Buteo raises vertical walls to 30 cubits, caps them with the one-cubit ridge-roof, and divides the interior into four decks — the arrangement Pererius himself endorses.

[Diagram in original: "The form of the ark according to Buteo" — a rectangular hull capped by the one-cubit ridge (BA), its interior divided into four decks: "Men and birds, 9 cubits / Food (cibaria), 8 cubits / Animals, 9 cubits / Receptacle for filth (sordium), 4 cubits" — totalling the 30 cubits of height.]

Woodcut; reproduced here as a caption only. The four decks 9+8+9+4 = 30 cubits.

But thus far the historical and literal explanation of what Moses wrote about the ark has been treated. There follows the second part of this book,

in which the manifold mystical interpretation of the same ark is also to be treated.

Transition closing the literal part of Liber X and opening the mystical part.

— p. 225 (PDF) · printed p. 156 —

THE SECOND PART OF THE TENTH BOOK: ON THE MYSTICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE ARK.

That the Ark of Noah, besides the history of things truly done as they are narrated by Moses, also foreshadowed and pre-signified many mysteries to come in the Church of Christ — to deny or even to doubt this is not permitted. For our Lord clearly shows that the time of Noah's flood bore a notable image of the last age of the world, the time at which the Lord's latter coming for judgment is awaited; and St. Peter teaches that the flood and the ark were a remarkable figure of Christian Baptism and of the Church. For as there very few were saved in the ark, all the rest being drowned and destroyed by the flood, so also here few are saved in the Church of Christ, while countless multitudes who are outside the Church perish in everlasting death.

§77. Margins: Matt. 24; Luke 17; 1 Peter 3.

Now if all things befell the Hebrews in figure (1 Cor. 10), how much more this event, which among all the monuments and miracles of divine power and providence holds a special claim to esteem and admiration? For if it is otherwise, and no account was taken of this matter, what need was there, I ask, that those few men with the animals should be saved from the destruction of the flood by means of an ark built with such great labor and toil — over a hundred years, indeed — when they could far more easily and expeditiously have been preserved in some one place on earth, the flood-waters being prevented from reaching that place?

§78.

St. Augustine confirms this in the last two chapters of book 15 of The City of God, writing thus: “Now that God commands Noah, a just man, to make an ark in which he might be delivered, with his household and with the animals, from the devastation of the flood, is without doubt a figure of the pilgrimage in this world of the city of God — that is, of the Church, which is made safe through the wood (lignum) on which hung the mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus. And the other things said in the construction of the same ark are signs of ecclesiastical realities. And it can indeed happen that someone may expound this more aptly than we, and one person in one way and another in another — provided, however, that all the things said be referred to this city of God of which we speak, sojourning in this evil world as in a flood, if he who expounds does not wish to stray far from the meaning of him who so wrote. For although they are discussed in more than one way, they must nevertheless be brought back to the one concord of the Catholic faith.” This in chapter 26.

Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, ch. 26. Margins: Augustine; 1 Tim. 2.

And in the twenty-seventh chapter he says: “That signs of things done, so manifold, do not pertain to the prefiguring of the Church — no one [is permitted to suppose], unless he be contentious…”

Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, ch. 27; sentence continues on p. 226.

— p. 226 (PDF) · printed p. 157 —

…no one is permitted to suppose [otherwise], unless he be contentious. For the nations have now so filled the Church, both clean and unclean, that — until a sure end is reached — they are held together by a certain framework of its unity, so that from this one most manifest point it is not permitted to doubt even concerning the rest, which were said somewhat more obscurely and can be recognized only with more difficulty. Since this is so: neither will anyone, even a hard man, dare to think that these things were written in vain; nor that they signify nothing, since they were done; nor that only the words are significative and not the deeds; nor can it plausibly be said

that they are foreign to the signifying of the Church: but rather it must be believed both that they were wisely committed to memory and to writing, and that they were done, and that they signify something, and that this something pertains to the prefiguring of the Church. Thus far from Augustine.

Conclusion of Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, ch. 27.

We therefore shall here very briefly touch upon a threefold mystical interpretation of Noah's ark. And one interpretation will be according to Physiology. I call “physiological” that interpretation which aptly and fittingly accommodates the history of a thing to the natural force and properties of another thing, on account of a certain agreement and likeness between the two. The second interpretation will be according to allegory; the third, according to tropology. And we shall bring forth nothing of our own opinion, but shall set before [the reader] things drawn from ancient and approved authors.

Pererius lays out the three mystical senses: physiological, allegorical, tropological.

ELEVENTH DISPUTATION. In what way the Ark of Noah, according to Physiology, was a figure of the human body.

St. Augustine, in book 15 of The City of God, chapter 26, briefly teaches that the measurements of the length, breadth, and height of the ark correspond beautifully to the dimensions of the human body. For the length of the ark, three hundred cubits, was sixfold its breadth of fifty cubits, and tenfold its height of thirty cubits. By a like ratio, the length of the human body from the crown to the soles is six times as great as the breadth — which is from one side to the other side — and ten times as great as the height, the measure of which height is in the side, from back to belly: just as, if you measure a man lying down, supine or prone, he is six times as long from head to feet as he is broad from right to left, or from left to right, and ten times as long [as he is] high from the ground.

§79. Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, ch. 26. Margin: Augustine.

But St. Ambrose treats this likeness of the ark and the human body more fully and distinctly — and indeed most elegantly — in his book On the Ark and Noah, in the sixth chapter and several following: “The Ark of Noah,” he says, “if anyone should wish to consider it more attentively, he will find described in its construction the figure of the human body. ‘Make for thyself,’ says God, ‘an ark of squared timbers (de lignis quadratis).’”

§80. Ambrose, De Noe et arca, ch. 6. Margin notes that Ambrose follows the Septuagint reading (“squared timbers”). Quotation continues through p. 229.

— p. 227 (PDF) · printed p. 158 —

“We call ‘squared’ that which stands well together in all its parts and is consonant with itself. That the members of man are squared, plain reason shows, if you consider a man's chest, if you consider the belly, of equal measure in length and breadth — except when, the belly being distended with pleasures and feasting, the natural measure is exceeded. Again, who would not notice from use itself that the feet and hands, the arms, the thighs and legs are fourfold (quadripertita)? And though most of them are not of the same length or breadth, yet they keep such proportion (analogia) that in them too a fitting measure and ratio concurs: that the length be longer than the breadth, and the breadth than the height. And just as the wooden ark has a threefold dimension — since [God] prescribed that a length of three hundred cubits, a breadth of fifty, and a height of thirty cubits be observed — so also in our body there is a greatest, a middle, and a least dimension. The greatest, according to length; the middle, according to breadth; the least, according to height: yet the whole body, woven together out of its single members, appears squared. For in common usage it is so, that we call those men ‘squarely built’ (quadratos) whom we judge neither excessive in tallness yet strong in the sturdy quality of the body.”

Ambrose continued (the squared timbers and the proportions of the body).

“What, too, is meant by his saying, ‘Thou shalt make nests (nidos) in the ark’ — this likewise by no means seems to be passed over in silence. For I judge it was said in a natural sense, in that our whole body is woven together like a nest, so that the vital spirit may penetrate all the parts of the inner organs, and pour itself out from our principal [organ] through the several limbs. Our eyes are a kind of nest, in which sight serves itself. The hollows of our ears are nests, through which hearing pours itself in and casts itself as into a deep pit. The cavity of the nostrils is a nest, which draws odor to itself. The fourth nest, greater than the rest, is the opening of the mouth, in which taste is nourished until it grows; and from which the voice flies forth; in which lies hidden the tongue, which, like the organ of the voice, modulates its sounds with skilled sweetness. And though it is itself irrational, it produces a rational voice.”

§81. Ambrose on the “nests” (the bodily cavities as figures of the ark's nests). Margin: §81.

“The half-skull (hemicranium) is a nest. That membrane which warms the brain and holds it within is a nest. The inner organs of the lung and the heart are nests. Of our spirit — that is, the breath which we draw and by which we are nourished in this life — the lung is the nest. But the nest of the blood and of the spirit is the heart. For it has two chambers (uteri): one, in which it receives the blood as in a kind of bosom and pours it into the veins; the other, watered from that upper one, which leads it into the arteries in a continuous stream. The stronger bones too have nests: for they are hollowed out within, and in certain cavities there is marrow. In the softer inner organs themselves are the nests of desire or of pain. And if one considers other things, he will find still more nests in the fabric of the human body. Whence I think that he too in the Psalm said, not only mystically but also naturally: ‘For the sparrow hath found herself a house, and the turtledove a nest where she may lay her young’ (Ps. 83). For there is now in this body a nest of chastity, where once was a nest of irrational concupiscence. But where formerly lust nourished its misshapen offspring, there now grows up the inheritance of comely chastity.”

Ambrose, on the nests continued. (OCR "Olla" corrected to "ossa," bones.)

"'Thou shalt smear it,' he says, 'with bitumen.' The human body consists of many bones and sinews and various other parts. And so, both outside and inside, knit together in a fitting framework, it clings to itself, and is held by its proper condition (habitudo), which the Greeks call [hexis]:"

Ambrose on the bitumen (= the cohesion of the body); sentence continues on p. 228. Margin: 1 Cor. 1; ch. 9.

— p. 228 (PDF) · printed p. 159 —

"…so that the spirit enclosed within, which is poured in, or the spiritual substance which works within, as though bound by twin chains, may not wander abroad, but is restrained to a fitting and cohesive unity and a strong connection. Therefore the ark is commanded to be bound fast with bitumen: for bitumen is of a nature powerful for binding. Whence in Greek it is called ν■φθα (naphtha), from 'to join together' (συν■πτειν), because it connects what is disjoined and binds it with an indissoluble bond, so that you would believe [the parts] to come together in a natural unity. For this reason the ark is bound with bitumen within and without, lest that connection be easily broken."

Ambrose's (folk-)etymology deriving "naphtha" from the Greek verb "to join" is kept as given.

"Nor must that which is added be passed over: 'Gathering it together thou shalt make the ark, and in a cubit thou shalt finish it from the top' — so that the head of man may fittingly and gracefully square with the rest of the body, of a measure suited to it, as though one were joining on the royal [part] of the ark: from which, while all the senses are diffused to the other parts of the body, yet most of all the eyes, set there like watchers and guards by the providence of nature, might survey from above almost the whole state of our world. And the mind itself, located there — according to the opinion of most, and especially of Solomon, who says, 'The eyes of a wise man are in his head' — as in an imperial hall of the virtues gathers

counsel to itself, whereby, surrounded with a retinue, it may itself be the better fortified, and, as from a certain height, may dispense the governance of guarding the whole body, and deliver responses, by which we ourselves may not only look back, nor only see what is before our feet, but even behold the secrets of heaven itself with the deep gaze of wisdom. There, then, is the height of our salvation, where grace is. Thence guard, thence also beauty is acquired for the body, which first blooms in the face. For it is fitting that the splendor of the royal hall be more excellent, in which, as the use is greater, so is the brightness."

Ambrose on the head as the "royal part," and the mind seated in it (citing Eccl. 2, "The eyes of a wise man are in his head").

After this, Ambrose adds much most eloquently about the senses located in the head. Then he subjoins: "These things about the head we have said at greater length, because it was fitting that all the senses be located at the top, whence all the offices might be distributed through the remaining parts. Next to our head at the back is the neck; on the right and left are the arms, which guard the imperial citadel like faithful sentinels. In short, these parts are the stronger in us; and the nearer they are to the head, the more excellent. The chest too is, as it were, a certain sanctuary of wisdom, and the stomach is, as it were, a kind of witness (as the physicians say) and confidant of the head's secrets, and a sharer of its sympathy, into which the head pours all its own affairs, whether wholesome or adverse. The sides, the buttocks, the thighs and legs signify by their very appearance the breadth-measure, and the stepping of the feet — which, though they seem slighter, are nevertheless broader when [men] walk."

§82. Margin: §82.

"And it is beautifully said: 'Thou shalt make the door on the side' — indicating that part of the body through which we are accustomed to discharge food, so that upon those parts which we think more ignoble of our body [God] might bestow more abundant honor (1 Cor. 12). This was

especially fitting for decency, that he should turn certain ducts or outlets of our channels (cuniculi) to the rear, lest in the purgings of the belly our sight be offended. But what is this: ‘Thou shalt make the lower parts of the ark with two and three stories (bicamerata et tricamerata)’? By saying ‘lower parts,’ he wished to signify that the receptacles of food are to be reckoned by us in a lower place…”

§83. Ambrose on the side-door (the body's lower exits) and the lower stories (the digestive organs). Margins: 1 Cor.; ch. 9. Sentence continues on p. 229.

— p. 229 (PDF) · printed p. 160 —

“…the receptacles, that is, the inner organs (viscera) which work up the food received. For food is corruptible. And what is corruptible must be compared not to the higher but to the lower things. Food too is carried downward: of which a small portion profits the strength and nourishment of the body, but the remaining part is led down to be purged from the bowels, since there are intestines through which the superfluities of food descend. Thus our Maker arranged that [the intestines] should not be extended straight from the stomach to the bottom, but be coiled and folded back, that the [duration of] use of our life might be prolonged. For if the intestines of man, which receive and convey food, were extended straight, [the food] would pass through at once without any delay; and it would be necessary for us always to be hungry and to feast continually, or, if the substance of nourishment failed, [men] would forthwith fail. But now, in that twofold and threefold coiling and folding of the intestines, the food clings, and descending little by little supplies strength, infuses juice into the body, maintains satiety, defers the appetite for eating: there is neither a sudden discharge, nor an abrupt evacuation, nor an insatiable appetite, nor an unappeasable craving for feasting. For while the food descends gradually, natural providence tempers hunger and indigestion (cruditas).”

Ambrose on the coiled intestines (the bicameral/tricameral lower stories).

“For first, in the stomach — which most call the upper belly — the food is worked up; then it is cooked in the liver, and digested by that heat (vapor), and its juice is distributed to fixed portions of the inner organs, from which the whole body gains strength. This the growth of the young sufficiently [proves], and the endurance of the old testifies. The rest of the food flows down into the belly, which we all call simply the belly. Many call it the lower belly, from which it is necessary that the dung — which had already descended full of corruption — be discharged through that side door.”

Ambrose on digestion: stomach, liver, lower belly, and the side-door of evacuation.

“Although these things seem so composed, by natural arrangement, in accordance with God's command, yet if a measure of eating and of acting is not kept by us, then, as it were from overflowing passions, a flood is engendered, and a kind of ruin (labes) of the body. Whence it seems to me that, through the figure of this ark, God wished to teach us how we may be safe against this particular flood: for corruption is the cause of the flood; when it has crept in, the waters are opened, all the fountains of desires boil up, so that the whole body is submerged in so great and so deep a flood of vices. For there is nothing that subjects man to so wretched a slavery as lust, and desires of this kind, which press down the wretched conscience with a certain heavy yoke of crimes, so that it cannot raise itself up, inasmuch as it has lost the freedom of innocence.”

Tropological turn: gluttony/lust as an inner “flood” of the body.

“The greatest remedy, therefore, in this flood, is that you set the just man before you, and choose him as the executor of the heavenly command. What is the just man in us, but the vigor of the mind, which encloses within that ark every kind of living thing that is upon the earth? Restrain, therefore, you also, all your irrational passions, and subject all your senses to the mind, and accustom yourself to the commands of the spirit. Do not allow your desires to fly forth, nor your lust to go out among the crowd: and through the rational mind you will be able to free even your irrational

and unclean sins from all danger of the flood.”

Conclusion of Ambrose / of the Eleventh Disputation: the rational mind as the “just man” governing the inner ark.

— p. 230 (PDF) · printed p. 161 —

TWELFTH DISPUTATION. How the Ark of Noah, according to Allegory, was a figure of the Church of Christ.

I shall here, in the briefest words, set forth the allegorical interpretation of the Ark of Noah — inasmuch as it was a certain shadow and image of the Church of Christ — woven together from the opinions of the most approved authors: Origen, Augustine, Gregory, Rupert, and others. Noah was a figure of Christ both in name and in deeds. For the name “Noah” means “Rest,” and our true rest was Christ. For he himself said: “Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, because I am meek and humble of heart, and you shall find rest for your souls” (Matt. 11); and just before he had said: “Come to me, all you that labor and are burdened, and I will refresh you.”

§84. Margins: Origen, hom. 2 on Gen. 6; Augustine, Against Faustus, bk. 12, ch. 14; Gregory, hom. 12 on Ezekiel; Rupert, Commentary on Genesis, bk. 4, ch. 71 and following; Matt. 11.

Not without divine presage, therefore, did Lamech call his son Noah, saying: “This same shall comfort us, or shall make us rest, from the works and labors of our hands, in the land which the Lord hath cursed” (Gen. 5). But according to the history this does not seem to fit Noah very well: for in his time God showed the force of his anger more than ever, so much so that he said: “It repenteth me that I have made man, and I will destroy every substance that I have made from the face of the earth” (Gen. 6). In short, the destruction of the world by the flood, and the perishing of animals and men, was a token of God's greatest offense, anger, and vengeance.

Margins: Gen. 5; Gen. 6; below, Gen. 7. The name-etymology (Noah = “rest/comfort”) fits Christ allegorically, not Noah historically.

But according to allegory, it squares most beautifully with Christ the Lord: for our true rest and consolation was the remission of our sins, which he bestowed on us through his Baptism, of which that flood was a figure: for as in that [flood] the sinners perished, so in this [baptism] sins are blotted out. Our Noah, therefore, granted us a twofold rest: one from the works of our hands — that is, from sins — lest they disturb, disquiet, and harass our conscience; the other from the miseries and hardships to which, on account of sins, we are justly subjected in the land which God cursed: “Man,” says Job, “born of a woman, living for a short time, is filled with many miseries. Who cometh forth like a flower and is destroyed, and fleeth as a shadow, and never continueth in the same state” (Job 14).

§85. Margin: Job.

Those justified through Christ are indeed, no less than the rest, subject to the evils of this life; yet they are so for a short time only, and with the most certain hope of attaining everlasting impassibility; and meanwhile the evils which they endure contribute much to their increase of virtues, and furnish matter for the amplest merits and rewards. And as through one Noah the world was saved, so through one Christ are all saved: “For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved” (Acts 4). And as Noah, by…

Margin: Acts 4. Sentence continues on p. 231.

— p. 231 (PDF) · printed p. 162 —

…wood preserved the remnants of the human race, so Christ, by the wood of the Cross and his passion, redeemed the human race from death. Salutary, therefore, was this flood of Christ, begun from the time of Christ and inundating the whole world, in which more sinners have been submerged — yet unto their salvation — than were drowned in that [flood of Noah] unto their perdition and ruin.

Moreover, just as God said to Noah, “Make thee an ark,” so he said to our Noah — who was truly just and perfect and pleasing to God — that he should build for himself a Church out of the firmest timbers, that is, out of all the nations that shall live forever, and should give it measurements filled with heavenly sacraments. But this ark of the Church was not built in one year, but in a hundred years — that is, the Church began to be built from the beginning of the world, nor will its building cease until the end of the world; whence Paul said that God “gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, unto the edification of the body of Christ” (Eph. 4). The ark floated upon the waves; so the Church is engaged amid persecutions and temptations: “For through many tribulations we must enter into the kingdom of God” (Acts 14). The ark was made not of one, but of many timbers joined with bitumen; so the Church has been gathered out of many men, glued together by the bond of charity in unity of faith.

§86. Margin: “The ark a figure of the Church.” Margins: Eph. 4; Acts.

Now the timbers of which the ark was constructed were, according to some, incorruptible; according to others, strong; according to our translation, planed smooth (levigata); according to the edition of the Septuagint, squared (quadrata) — and all these fit the Church rightly. For the Church requires men uncorrupted by sins and ever living to God; it demands also men strong to bear injuries, and spirited and constant in enduring whatever adversities may assail; it desires also men “planed smooth,” that is, not rough, not harsh, not intractable, but gentle, affable, giving offense to no one, and in whom are the bowels of charity. The squared timbers are, in the Church, the doctors and teachers. “For that is squared,” says Origen, “which wavers on no side, but, whichever way you turn it, stands with sure and solid stability.” And these were the squared timbers which bore the whole weight of the ark, both of the animals within and of the waves without.

§87. Margin: "What 'squared' means." The four readings of the timber (incorruptible / strong / planed / squared) reflect different versions.

And the holy Doctors of the Church both, within, console the faithful by the word of admonition and the grace of doctrine, and, without, withstand by the power of the word and the wisdom of reason the unbelievers who assail and stir up floods of questions and storms of disputations; and they are, as it were, a wall and a defense to those who are within, but an obstacle and a repulse to those who come upon them from without. Since, therefore, the life of the holy doctors is stable on every side and ready for every good work, the Church of Christ is built of squared timbers. These timbers are smeared with bitumen within and without; for Christ, the architect of the Church, wishes you not to be such as many are, who outwardly appear to men just, but within are sepul[chres]…

§88 begins. Sentence continues on p. 232.

— p. 232 (PDF) · printed p. 163 —

…sepulchres of the dead, but he wishes you to be holy in body outwardly, and pure in heart within, and on every side wary and fortified by the virtue of chastity and innocence: for this is to be smeared with bitumen within and without. Or there is signified, in the framework of unity, the forbearance of charity, lest, when scandals assail the Church — whether from those who are within or from those who are without — the fraternal joint give way and the bond of peace be dissolved. For bitumen is a most fervent and most powerful glue, signifying the ardor of love in great fortitude for maintaining the spiritual fellowship that endures all things.

Conclusion of §88: bitumen = the ardor of charity binding the Church.

But because the merit of all is not one, nor the progress in faith the same: therefore that ark too did not provide one [single] dwelling for all, but in it the lower parts had two stories and the upper parts three, and there were many nests or little dwellings: so in the Church, although all are contained

within one faith and washed by one Baptism, yet the progress is not one and the same for all, but each one stands in his own order. And some indeed, living by rational knowledge and fit not only to rule themselves but also to teach and govern others — who are very few — dwell with Noah himself, and are joined to him in closest nearness, and are placed in the upper part (sublimitas) of the ark. But the multitude of irrational animals, or even of beasts, is placed in the lower parts of the ark — and especially of those whose savage ferocity the sweetness of faith has not yet softened.

§89. The decks/nests = the ranks and degrees of progress among the faithful.

A little above these are those who, though they have less reason, yet keep very much simplicity and innocence. And thus, ascending through the several grades of dwellings, one arrives at Noah himself — that is, at Christ, who is the head of the whole Church above all the saints, exalted in grace and glory and in merit and reward. And that the lower parts of the ark are built with two and three stories signifies the twofold multitude of men gathered in the Church from Jews and Gentiles, or the threefold [multitude] on account of the three sons of Noah, by whose progeny the world was filled.

The ark, gathered to one cubit, is finished from above, just as the Church, which is the body of Christ, gathered into unity, is raised on high and perfected. Whence the Lord said: “He that gathereth not with me, scattereth” (Luke 11). And the entrance of the ark is made in its side. For no one enters the Church except through the sacrament of the remission of sins, and this flowed from the opened side of Christ. And the door of the ark was one, because Christ is one, the faith is one, the word of God is one, through which alone the Church can be entered and the participation of eternal salvation attained. The ark had little external light, for one window only — and that a small one — could afford it little light. So the Church does not much care for secular wisdom, for it has its own light within itself; rather it cares and labors that it may shine and be resplendent by

uprightness of life and holiness of morals; and what is written of the heavenly Church in the Apocalypse also in a certain way fits the Church mili[tant]…

§90. The cubit-peak = unity; side-door = the wound of Christ / sacrament; one window = the Church's inner light. Margin: Eph. 4. Sentence continues on p. 233.

— p. 233 (PDF) · printed p. 164 —

…militant: “And the city,” he says, “hath no need of the sun, nor of the moon, to shine in it, for the glory of God hath enlightened it, and the Lamb is the lamp thereof. And the nations shall walk in the light of it” (Apoc. 21).

Completes §90 (Apocalypse 21 on the heavenly city's light).

There were in the ark animals of every kind, both clean and unclean; so the Church received all, both from the Gentiles and from the Jews, and there are always in it both good and bad. And just as there were more animals than men in the ark, so there are more bad and imperfect men in the Church than good and perfect. Of the unclean there were two each, of the clean seven each. For although the clean and good are fewer than the unclean and bad, yet the good keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. Now Scripture commends the Holy Spirit in a sevenfold operation, and it is the sevenfold grace of the Holy Spirit that truly makes [men] clean; but the bad are signified by the number two, because they depart from the unity of peace, and are easy and prompt to schisms, and prone to dissensions and discords.

§91. Clean/unclean animals = good/bad in the Church; the sevens and twos read as the sevenfold Spirit and the divisiveness of the wicked. Margin: Eph. 4.

The ark contained foods of every kind for the feeding of all the animals and men. So the Church has the greatest abundance of spiritual foods, by which all may be nourished as is expedient for them, and it furnishes provisions both to the good and to the bad: to the good, the promises of heavenly

goods; to the bad, the threats of the eternal punishments of Gehenna. Nor did Noah only build the ark, but he himself entered into it and remained in it: so Christ not only as God built the Church, but also as man dwelt in it, and will remain in it “all days, even to the consummation of the world” (Matt. 28).

Margin: Matt., last [chapter].

The length of the ark, three hundred cubits, was sixfold its breadth of fifty cubits, and tenfold its height of thirty cubits; and similar is the measure of the human body, as we showed above. Now the Church and the congregation of the faithful is called the body of Christ, whose length is much greater than its breadth, and breadth than height. For the length denotes faith, the breadth charity, the height the loftiness of wisdom and of the contemplation of heavenly things, and the sublimity of evangelical perfection. But among the faithful fewer are good and endowed with charity; more are bad, having faith alone. And among the good, very few are perfect and devoted to the meditation and love of sublime and divine things, all other things being set aside and despised.

§92. The three dimensions = faith, charity, contemplative height.

There is also signified the human body, which the Son of God put on for our sake — namely, that by his offering on the Cross, appeasing the wrath of God, he might reconcile and propitiate him to us; and, washing and cleansing the Church by his blood, might present it to himself glorious, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing, but that it might be holy and immaculate (Eph. 5); and, redeeming us from all iniquity, might cleanse for himself an acceptable people, a follower of good works (Tit. 2). Wherefore, entering into the world, he himself said to God the Father: “Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldst not, but a body thou hast fitted to me; holocausts for sin did not [please thee]…” (Heb. 10; Ps. 39)

Margins: Eph. 5; Tit. 2; Heb. 10; Ps. 39. Sentence continues on p. 234.

— p. 234 (PDF) · printed p. 165 —

…did not please thee. Then said I: Behold I come: in the head of the book it is written of me, that I should do thy will, O God.”

Completes §92 (the Heb. 10 / Ps. 39 quotation begun on p. 233).

The ark, moreover, according to the conception and description of Origen — which most of the Doctors have followed — was wide at the bottom; but the higher it rose, the more narrow and strait it became, until it ended in the very narrow peak and ridge of just one cubit. St. Gregory beautifully interprets this according to allegory, in his sixteenth homily on Ezekiel: “What is figured by the ark of Noah,” he says, “but the holy Church, which is wide below and narrow above? For rightly is the Church designated by this — the Church which is still broad in its many carnal members, and narrow in its few spiritual ones. And because it is gathered to one man who is without sin, it is, as it were, finished in one cubit. For we see many within the bosom of the same holy Church puffed up in pride, dissolved in the pleasure of the flesh, gaping after the acquisition of earthly things, crossing the sea at the command of avarice, enslaved to wrath, given to quarrels, harming the neighbors they have power to harm. But because the holy Church still tolerates them in order to convert them, they dwell, as it were, like beasts in the lower breadth of the ark.

§93. Origen's tapering ark, allegorized by Gregory the Great, hom. 16 on Ezekiel (still under the Twelfth/allegorical Disputation). Margins: Origen; Gregory.

We see others who now do not seek what belongs to another, who bear injuries inflicted on them with equanimity, who are content with their own goods, who live humbly. But because these are now few, the ark is narrowed. And we behold others who even leave behind their possessions, give no zeal to earthly things, love their enemies, tame the flesh from all pleasures, press down all impulses under the judgment of reason, and lift themselves on the wings of contemplation through heavenly desire. But because such persons are very rare, let them be assigned in the ark near the

cubit, where men and birds are contained. Yet let it be asked whether any among them can be without sin — but none is found. Who, then, is a man without sin, save he who was not born in sin? In one cubit, therefore, the ark is finished, because there is one author and redeemer of the holy Church who is without sin, toward whom all make progress who have known themselves to be sinners.” Thus far Gregory.

Conclusion of the Gregory quotation: the single cubit = the one sinless Christ at the apex of the Church.

THIRTEENTH DISPUTATION. Of what thing the Ark of Noah was a figure according to the Tropological sense.

“If there is anyone,” says Origen, “who, amid growing evils and overflowing vices, is able to turn himself away from fleeting and perishable things, and to hear the word of God and keep the heavenly precepts, this man builds within his heart an ark of salvation, and, so to speak, consecrates a library of the divine word, placing in it length, breadth, and height — I mean faith, hope, and charity. By the faith of the Trinity, he reaches the length of life, immortality. By the breadth of charity, he establishes an affection of indulgence and kindness. By the height of hope, he lifts up his mind to heavenly things, and, walking on earth, has his conversation in heaven. And he refers the sum of his actions to one. For he knows that, although all indeed run, yet one receives the prize (1 Cor. 9) — namely, he who has not been made manifold by variety of thoughts and instability of mind.

§94. Origen, hom. 2 on Gen. 6 — the tropological ark built within the heart. Margins: Origen, hom. 2 on Gen. 6; 1 Cor. 9. Quotation continues on p. 235.

— p. 235 (PDF) · printed p. 166 —

“But he constructs this ark and library not from rough and unpolished timbers, but from squared ones, set straight according to the line of equity — that is, not from secular authors, but from the prophetic and apostolic

books. For these are they who, hewn by various temptations, with all vices cut away, maintain a squared life, balanced on every side. For the authors of secular books may be called lofty and shady trees (for ‘under every lofty and leafy tree Israel is accused of having committed fornication,’ Jer. 2), because they indeed speak lofty things and use florid eloquence, yet do not act as they speak: and therefore they cannot be called squared timbers, because in them speech and life are not balanced together.

Origen continued; the squared timbers = the prophetic and apostolic books. Margin: Jer. 2.

“You therefore, if you make an ark, fashion it from the prophetic and apostolic discourses, and make it two- and three-storied: from it learn the historical narratives; from it recognize the hidden mysteries and sacraments of things. From it too strive to amend your morals, to cut away vices, to purge your soul, and to free yourself from every vice of captivity. Place in it nests of diverse virtues and advancements. Bituminize it within and without, bearing faith in the heart, displaying confession with the mouth; having knowledge within, action without; pure in heart within, walking chaste in body without.” So Origen.

Conclusion of the Origen quotation.

And Hugh of St. Victor, in his book of Allegories on Genesis, chapter eighteen: “Our soul,” he says, “is like the ark of Noah. In the ark we ought to be saved, both by entering into it and by remaining in it, as it is written: ‘Return, you transgressors, to the heart’ (Isa. 46). The length of this ark is faith, which believes all the things that God has done from the beginning of the world, or will do until its end, whether by himself, or through Angels, or through men. The height is hope, by which one is raised toward hoping for the goods which are prepared in the heavens for those who love God. The breadth is charity, which extends toward the northern region by the love of enemies, and toward the southern region by the love of friends.

§95. Hugh of St. Victor, Allegoriae in Genesim, ch. 18 — the soul as ark. Margins: Hugh of St. Victor; Isa. (46).

“In this ark is Noah — that is, the rational understanding and the spiritual sense; and the things which are born from these — right counsels, just desires, and pious vows — are, as it were, the sons and kindred of Noah. The animals are the works which are done about earthly things. The birds are the thoughts that dwell on lofty and heavenly things. The flood of waters is the onset of temptations. The mountains of Armenia, on which the ark rests, are the rest of the soul in the contemplation of divine things. The raven sent out and not returning signifies false Christians who, when they are sometimes sent to outward things for the sake of necessity, remain outside, clinging to visible things, and do not return to inward rest, but rejoice outside in the fluctuation of temporal things. But the dove sent out of the ark yet returning to it signifies good Christians who, while they go out to outward things for the benefit of their neighbors, return when they do not find rest outside; and they bring back an olive branch, because they have performed works of mercy.”

Hugh continued: the figural decoding of Noah, animals, birds, flood, mountains, raven, and dove. Margins: Gen. 8 (twice).

But the same Hugh, in the second book On the Moral Ark, through the first several chapters of that book — while he most beautifully accommodates the history of the ark, by tropological interpretation, to the secret of the conscience and of the human heart, where is the seat of wisdom and where the contemplation of God and of his creatures flourishes — has so brilliant a discussion that, if I were to pass it over here in silence, I should indeed seem to myself to have defrauded the read[er]…

§96. Hugh of St. Victor, De arca Noe morali, bk. 2. Margin: Hugh of St. Victor. Continues on p. 236.

— p. 236 (PDF) · printed p. 167 —

…the reader of the immense profit and spiritual delight which one may draw from that man's very pious and learned and most salutary opinions and lessons. When, therefore, he had said that the ark of Noah foreshadowed the secret and, as it were, the shrine and inmost recess of our

soul, where wisdom is seated, devoting itself to the contemplation of things, he argues roughly in this manner (for I shall briefly set forth the sum of his discussion): “Our soul,” he says, “has the likeness of its Creator: for, as in the mind of God the causes of all things subsist eternally, without mutability and temporal distinction, so in our mind the past, present, and future subsist together through thought. If, therefore, through the practice of constant meditation we begin to dwell within our heart, we now in some manner cease to be temporal, and, as though dead to the world without, we live within to God. Then whatever fortune contrives outside, we easily despise, if our desire is fixed there where we are not subject to mutability — where we neither leave behind the past, nor are occupied with the present, nor await the future; where we neither covet life's prosperities, nor fear its adversities.

Pererius summarizes Hugh: the soul's atemporal interior as the place of the ark.

“Let us therefore have right, useful, and chaste thoughts, because from such material we shall build our ark. These are the timbers which, cast into water, float; placed in fire, burn: because the flux of carnal delights does not press such thoughts down, but the flame of charity sets them aflame. Do not fear this fire in your roofs. Woe to you, if your tabernacle has not burned with this fire. Afterward you shall bituminize your ark within and without. Without, that you may show gentleness; within, that you may not lose charity. For in no way will you be able to rest sweetly in the secret of your conscience, unless you have first learned both to bear the wicked outwardly through gentleness, and not to hate inwardly through charity. Bitumen is of a hot nature, and is born from earth struck by lightning: and charity is begotten in a soul struck by the fear of divine judgment.”

Hugh continued: the timbers and bitumen of the inner ark = chaste thoughts and charity.

“The length of three hundred cubits of the ark signifies the present age, from its beginning to its end, varied through the three differences of time — Past, Present, and Future. If, therefore, leading your thought from the

beginning of the world to its uttermost end, you consider how many and how great are the things God has done and will do for the sake of his elect, you measure out in your heart the length of three hundred cubits. If, contemplating the life and deeds of the faithful, you set them before yourself as an example, you extend your heart to the breadth of fifty cubits. But if you attain the knowledge of the divine page, which is contained in thirty books, you raise your heart to the height of thirty cubits. This is the ark which you ought to build in your heart: rest within it, and here you will remain secure. The storm and tempest rage outside: wherever you go forth, you will suffer shipwreck.

§97. Hugh reads the three dimensions as the span of sacred history, the example of the saints, and the knowledge of Scripture (reckoned in thirty books).

“If you proudly attempt, through your own wisdom, to search out the divine secrets which God has not willed to open to us through his Scripture, you exceed the height of thirty cubits. If you do not believe that the Church of Christ will endure to the end of the age, but that it will at some time be deprived of God's help, you overstep the length of three hundred cubits…”

Hugh: exceeding the dimensions = the corresponding errors of presumption and doubt. Continues on p. 237.

— p. 237 (PDF) · printed p. 168 —

“…If you frequently take delight in thinking about the lovers of this world and about their vain way of life, you transgress the breadth of fifty cubits.”

Completes the series of transgressed dimensions.

But let us speak of the door and the window of this ark. Although it is safe and pleasant to lie hidden within the ark — that is, the secret of our heart — removed from the din of this world, nevertheless, because the very weakness of our condition does not permit us long to tarry and rest in the silence of inmost contemplation, we have an exit through the door and the window. “The door signifies an exit by action; the window, an exit that is

made by thought. The door is below, the window above: because actions pertain to the body, thoughts to the soul. Hence it is that through the window the birds went out, through the door the beasts and the men. For as the bird is born for flight, so man is born for labor (Job 5). For we are so born that, if we wish to lift the soul to contemplation, it is necessary to wear down the body by the exercises of labor."

§97 (continued). Hugh: door = action, window = thought. Margin: Job 5.

"That the door was placed in the side of the ark signifies that we ought never to go out from the secret of our heart by action from a set purpose of intention, but only from the incidental occasion of necessity. And perhaps not without cause did Scripture keep silent about this regarding the window: because, although through thought we may sometimes go out by our own will, nevertheless we ought never to go forth by action except from necessity. This is also fittingly suggested by the fact that the man himself, when he wished, opened the window to send out the birds. But the door is read to have been both closed from outside by God, and again opened, that the man might go out (Gen. 8)."

Margin: Gen. 8.

Now we go out by action in four ways. For some actions are carnal — that is, pertaining to the use of the body; others spiritual, pertaining to the instruction of the mind. To both, the good and the bad go out. Those who, to fulfill pleasure, devote themselves outwardly to earthly actions, are like the unclean animals that had gone out of the ark. Those who administer such actions for the use of necessity are indeed animals, but clean. But those who undertake the care of ecclesiastical governance — which is a spiritual action — and who go forth into public from the secret of inner rest, not from ambition but from the precept of obedience, are like Noah, who, going out of the ark, offered sacrifice: because such men often slay within themselves all the motions of the flesh by abstinence the more, the more grievous the losses of inner rest they recognize themselves to have

suffered through their occupation.

§98. Hugh: four ways of going out by action.

But those who, for the sake of their own glory, take up honors in the Church, and, when they see themselves placed on high, despise the rest, and are unwilling out of compassion to condescend to the weaker ones placed in the Church, are like Ham, who mocked the nakedness of his father, and on this account deserved to receive the sentence of malediction (Gen. 9).

Margin: Gen. 9.

Now we go out by contemplation in four ways. The first way is when we consider what every creature is in itself. And we find that all things are vanity: because, as every creature came from nothing into being, so by its daily change it shows that, as far as in it lies, it tends toward nothing. The second way is when we consider what…

§99. Hugh: four ways of going out by contemplation. Marginal gloss: "On the four ways of going out to contemplation." Continues on p. 238.

— p. 238 (PDF) · printed p. 169 —

…the creature is by the gift of its Creator, and we discern in it the likeness of the divine reason. For although it is itself subject to mutability, by the condition of its nature, yet, since by the kindness of its Creator it receives that it should never wholly cease to be, in a certain way a temporal work imitates the eternal stability of its Maker. The third way is when we contemplate how God uses the ministry of creatures to fulfill his judgments, whether by bestowing benefits according to his mercy, or by inflicting punishments according to our desert. And in this consideration we find that all things are an instrument of divine dispensation, and a proof of our depravity.

Hugh: the second and third ways of contemplating creatures. NOTE: this page's running head misprints 'LIB. XI'; the text is still Liber X (the tropological Disputation).

In this kind of contemplation we hear every creature speaking to us with these three voices: Receive, Repay, Flee. Receive the benefit, Repay the debt, Flee the punishment. The first voice is that of one serving; the second, of one admonishing; the third, of one threatening. The fourth mode of contemplation is when we look at creatures according as a man can use them to fulfill the pleasures of his carnal concupiscence, and consider in them not a relief for natural weakness, but a delight for depraved lust. With this eye Eve saw the tree, that it was fair to behold and sweet to eat, and she took of its fruit and ate (Gen. 3).

Marginal gloss: “The threefold voice of the creature to men.” Margin: Gen. 3.

Those who thus go out by thought to creatures are like the raven that went out of the ark and did not return to it: because, when they find outside what wrongly delights them, they are unwilling to return any more to the ark of conscience. But the former three kinds of contemplation are figured by the going-out of the dove, which, when it had been sent out of the ark and did not find outside where its foot might rest, returned at evening carrying a green olive branch in its mouth. It went out empty, but did not return empty, because it found outside what it did not have within: yet it did not love outside what it carried back within.

The raven and dove read as the two dispositions of contemplation.

Furthermore, the three dwellings in the intellectual ark signify three kinds of thoughts: the Right, the Useful, the Necessary. If I have begun to love the meditation of the Scriptures, and have gladly thought about the virtues and deeds of the Saints, and about all other things whatsoever that contribute to the amendment of morals and the exercise of virtues, I have now begun to be in the first dwelling of the ark. But if I defer or decline to imitate the good which I know, then my thought is right, but useless: because what I think about others, and recognize in others, is indeed good, yet it is useless to me if I do not draw it into a model for living. For another's virtue does not profit me if I neglect to imitate it as far as I can:

“A hidden treasure and a hidden wisdom, what profit is there in them both?” (Sir. 20). I hide knowledge if I do not show by deed the good which I know.

§100. Hugh: the three stories = the Right, the Useful, the Necessary thought. Margin: Sir. (Ecclus.) 20. Continues on p. 239.

— p. 239 (PDF) · printed p. 170 —

But if I give my effort not only to knowing, but also to doing the things which I have recognized to be good and useful to me, and diligently take care that the virtues which I have learned to love and admire in others I make my own through the exercise of discipline and through a pattern of right living, then the thought of my heart will be useful, and then I have ascended into the second dwelling of the ark, and have now gathered my heart more into one, so that it may not run about and wander through the things that are vain and useless.

Hugh: the second story (the Useful) reached by putting knowledge into practice.

There remains the third: that, when I have begun to have the works of the virtues, I should labor to have the virtues themselves as well — that is, that what I show outwardly in work, I may possess inwardly in virtue. For it does not much profit me to have works, unless I also have the virtues of the works. If, therefore, I direct the thought of my heart to this — that whatever good appears in me outwardly to human eyes, I may strive to present inwardly to the divine gaze — then I have ascended into the third dwelling, where are the virtues that are necessary for us. But among all [the virtues] charity is especially necessary, which joins us to God. And therefore the ark was gathered at the top to one: that we may now think of one, await one, desire one — our Lord Jesus Christ. In the first dwelling, therefore, is knowledge; in the second, work; in the third, virtue; at the top, the reward of virtue, the Lord Jesus Christ.

Hugh: the third story (the Necessary = charity), and the apex = Christ.

You have these grades in the Psalm, where it is said: “Teach me goodness and discipline and knowledge” (Ps. 118), if, reversing the order, you say thus: Teach me knowledge and discipline and goodness, O Lord Jesus Christ. Thus far has the interpretation of the ark according to the Tropological sense been set forth by us.

Conclusion of the Thirteenth Disputation and of Liber X. Margin: Ps. 118.

— p. 240 (PDF) · printed p. 171 —

THE ELEVENTH BOOK OF THE COMMENTARIES ON GENESIS OF BENEDICT PERERIUS, ON THOSE THINGS WHICH WERE IN THE ARK OF NOAH.

Title page of Liber XI. Section numbering restarts at §1.

FROM THE NARRATIVE OF MOSES. Which is in the sixth chapter of the book of Genesis.

“I will establish my covenant with thee: and thou shalt enter into the ark, thou and thy sons, thy wife and the wives of thy sons with thee. And of every living creature of all flesh thou shalt bring two of a sort into the ark, that they may live with thee: of the male sex and the female. Of fowls according to their kind, and of beasts in their kind, and of every thing that creepeth on the earth according to its kind: two of all shall go in with thee, that they may live. Thou shalt take therefore with thee of all food that may be eaten, and thou shalt lay it up with thee: and it shall be food for thee and for them. Noah therefore did all things which God commanded him.”

Genesis 6:18–22 (the verse numbers 18–22 are marked in the margin).

— p. 241 (PDF) · printed p. 172 —

PREFACE.

Three things chiefly were in the Ark of Noah, preserved from the destruction of the flood: Men, Animals, and Provisions. And the Lord indicated this when he said to Noah: “Thou shalt enter into the ark, thou and thy sons, thy wife and the wives of thy sons with thee; and of every living creature of all flesh thou shalt bring two into the ark, of the male sex and the female, that they may live with thee. Thou shalt take with thee of all food that may be eaten, and thou shalt lay it up with thee, and it shall be food both for thee and for them.”

The Preface sets the threefold plan of Liber XI: men, animals, provisions.

FIRST DISPUTATION. On the men who were in the Ark.

In the first place, we must speak of the men, who, it is clear from the narrative of Moses, were only eight: for he relates, toward the end of the sixth chapter, that God commanded Noah that he, with his wife, and his three sons with their wives, should enter the ark; and in the following chapter he writes that these only entered the ark; and he records, in the eighth chapter, that these same only went out of the ark when the flood was over. St. Peter likewise, in the third chapter of his first epistle, says that only eight souls were saved in the ark by water. Berosus Annianus even gives the names of those women: for he calls Noah's wife “Tytaea the Great,” and the other three “Pandora,” “Noëlla,” and “Noëgla.” Epiphanius, in Heresy 26, disputing against the Gnostics who had attached the name “Noria” to Noah's wife, says that she was called “Barthenon.”

§1. Margins: Berosus; Epiphanius.

But as for that which might move some to wonder — that Noah, over six hundred years, begot no more than three sons, and these not before his five-hundredth year, and that none of those sons, over a hundred years (for so long they lived before the Flood), procreated any son — how this is to be understood has been explained by us in the ninth book.

There is, moreover, a common opinion of the Hebrew and Christian Doctors that Noah and his sons, while they were in the ark, did not engage in procreation, but abstained from their wives that whole year. For that seemed to be rather a time for mourning so great a calamity of the human race and of the world, and for doing penance, than for seeking and enjoying pleasure, even lawful and permitted.

§2. Marginal gloss: "Neither men nor animals, while they were in the ark, engaged in procreation." Continues on p. 242.

— p. 242 (PDF) · printed p. 173 —

Indeed many have thought the same about the animals, which, they suppose, did not engage in procreation while they were in the ark. If this was so, it came about either because, while they were in the ark, the animals were small and immature for procreation; or because the males were separated from the females in the Ark; or because during all that time no desire of procreating came upon the animals — whether on account of the harshness of the season and the inconvenience of the place, or because the ardor of lust naturally implanted in animals was, by divine power, extinguished throughout that year.

But this perhaps might raise a doubt for the reader: where Enoch was at the time of the flood — Enoch, who, it is agreed, was not in the ark and lived before the flood, and not only survived the flood but is even yet alive. Many would answer that Enoch was, at the time of the flood, in the earthly Paradise, supposing that place to have been untouched by the flood. But against this opinion we have disputed at length in the former volume of our Commentaries on Genesis — in the third book, which is on the earthly Paradise, in the fifth question; and in the seventh book, in the last Disputation, which is on the Translation of Enoch, in the seventh question.

§3. Marginal gloss: "Where Enoch was at the time of the flood." Pererius cross-references his Tomus 1.

Let us therefore say briefly: that Moses, in this history of the Flood, and St. Peter, in the place mentioned above, affirmed that all men perished in the flood except those eight, and did not make an exception of Enoch — who was then living and lived after the flood — for this reason: that they were speaking of men whose dwelling and manner of life on earth was known, and who lived in the human and customary way. But Enoch, because he was outside the society of men and unknown to all mortals, and did not pass his life in the human manner, was therefore passed over in silence, just as though he were not on the earth. But where he was at the time of the flood, what mortal could, or would dare, to say? Certainly, wherever it pleased God, he could be preserved — whether in the air above the waters of the flood, or elsewhere.

But that God said to Noah, “Go in thou, and all thy house, into the ark; for thee I have seen just before me in this generation” (Gen. 7), indicates not obscurely that Noah alone, on account of his exceptional piety and holiness, was worthy to be preserved from the disaster of the flood by so great a miracle; but that the remaining seven persons were saved for Noah's sake — who, though they were not equal to Noah in uprightness, were nevertheless either good, or at least less wicked than those who perished in the flood. There was also this cause of their preservation: that they might be the authors of restoring and multiplying the human race after the flood. God could indeed have propagated the race of men from Noah alone; but divine wisdom judged this manner of propagation to be the more excellent.

§4. Margin: Gen. 7.

“Although the sons of Noah and their wives,” says Chrysostom, “were far from the virtue of that just man, they were nevertheless free from the graver sins of their age. They obtained safety also for two other reasons: both in honor of the just man, and for the sake of posterity. For it is the custom of the merciful God to grant this honor to his servants, that for their sake others too may be saved. This was granted also to St. Paul: for as he

sailed to Rome, on account of a very great storm…”

Chrysostom, hom. 24 on Genesis. Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 24 on Genesis; Acts 27. Continues on p. 243.

— p. 243 (PDF) · printed p. 174 —

“…when the ship was in peril from the storm, God granted the safety of all who were in it together with him.” Likewise it was done in this place. Moreover, God willed to leave some seed and root in the sons of Noah for the establishment of posterity: not that it was impossible for God to form men again, and from one stock to make increase again, but because this commended itself to his goodness. So Chrysostom. To the same effect Ambrose wrote some things eloquently, in his book On Noah and the Ark, chapter 11.

Conclusion of §4.

SECOND DISPUTATION. On the clean and unclean animals that entered the Ark at God's command.

St. Jerome left it in writing, in Epistle 125 which he sent to Damasus, that Tertullian had written an excellent disputation as to why God, who had made all things very good, commanded to be brought into the ark of Noah, together with the clean animals, the unclean ones also. That this question was indeed treated fully and completely by Tertullian one may estimate from this: that St. Jerome, when he was consulted on the same question by Damasus, was unwilling to touch its explanation — as though he judged that nothing of great moment could be added by himself to that disputation of Tertullian.

§5. Margins: Jerome; Tertullian. (The lost Tertullian treatise; Jerome's letter to Damasus.)

But since that book of Tertullian has by no means come down to us, we have not been able to become partakers either of his teaching or of his opinion. But to that very question one might briefly reply — as much, that

is, as suffices for our purpose — thus: that no animal is by nature unclean, but that every animal is of the number of those which God made, each in its own kind, very good; and that certain ones are called unclean not in themselves nor according to nature, but either by the established opinions of men, or in relation to the food of man, or for the sake of some signification and the sake of some mystery. Now those animals which are named unclean had necessarily to be brought into the ark, lest so many species of them — which hold, without controversy, the chief place of dignity and nobility among the animals, such as the lion, the horse, and the elephant — should perish in the flood. But, leaving these matters aside, let us explain with diligence and care the things which God commanded Noah concerning the animals to be brought into the ark.

Pererius's own answer: uncleanness is not natural but conventional/ritual.

God commanded Noah to bring into the ark two each of the unclean animals, but seven each of the clean. But this command of God has two questions, of which the first is this: How could the distinction of clean and unclean animals exist in observance and use before the Flood, since it was introduced by the law of Moses — the promulgation of which law the Flood preceded by eight hundred years? To this question a threefold answer is usually given. St. Chrysostom, in his twentie[th homily]…

§6. The clean/unclean question. Margins: Lev. 11; Deut. 14; Gen. 6 & 7. Continues on p. 244.

— p. 244 (PDF) · printed p. 175 —

…answers, in the twenty-fourth homily on Genesis, that the distinction of clean and unclean animals was known to Noah either by the natural judgment and prudence of reason, or by some special revelation of God; and Didymus too is reported to have thought and handed down the same in the Catena. And the words of Chrysostom are these: “It would be worthwhile here to inquire whence that just man knew which animals were clean and which unclean: for this distinction had not yet been made, which Moses afterward established in his laws. Whence, then, did he know? Was

it from himself, and from a doctrine implanted in his nature? Now nothing is unclean in itself among the things which God made: for how should we call any creature unclean, since every one was once approved by God, when Moses says: ‘God saw all the things that he had made, and they were very good’ (Gen. 1)?

§6 (continued from p. 243). Chrysostom's answer (hom. 24 on Genesis) — note this corrects the page-break reading: it is the 24th homily, not the 20th. Margins: Chrysostom; Didymus; Gen. 1.

“But nature afterward distinguished these things of itself. And that this is true, consider how in some places certain men abstain from some things as unclean, while others eat those very things: so great is the force of custom among men in either direction. So also it was in the time of Noah. But that knowledge implanted in the man taught him which things were suitable for food and which unclean — not that they were such in themselves, but because they were held to be unclean. For what reason, tell me, pray, do we judge the ass unclean, and shun the eating of it, although it feeds on legumes, while other quadrupeds, though they feed on unclean things, we nevertheless think suitable for food? Therefore the knowledge implanted in us by God is the mistress and teacher of these things. But it could also be said otherwise: that God, the things which he had commanded, these same he also made [Noah] plainly to know.” Thus far from Chrysostom.

Conclusion of the Chrysostom quotation.

Others think that Moses spoke of this distinction of clean and unclean animals by that figure of speech which is called Anticipation (prolepsis), which is not infrequent in the sacred writings. For God indicated to Noah by name the species of animals from which he should take two each, and the other species from which he should take seven each; but because it afterward came about that, by the law given by God, these were reckoned and called clean and those unclean, therefore Moses — who published this book after the law was given, as Theodoret, Bede, and Tostatus supposed — declared that distinction of animals, in order to indicate it more briefly

and clearly, by the distinction of clean and unclean animals already known to the Jews.

§7. Margins: Theodoret (on Genesis); Bede, on the Hexameron; Tostatus on Gen. ch. 13, q. 132.

It pleases others (and it especially pleases me) that many of the things sanctioned by the law of Moses existed before the law — from the very beginning of the world — in the practice and usage of upright and pious men: such as the building of altars (Gen. 8 and 28), abstinence from blood and from what is strangled (Gen. 9), the making of vows and the offering of tithes (Gen. 28), the raising up of seed for a brother who died without children (Gen. 38); and among these was also this distinction of clean and unclean animals — not indeed as regards eating, for (as will be said later in the ninth chapter) God granted to Noah and his posterity the eating of any animal whatever, without any distinction of clean and unclean, permitting them the eating of animals no less indiscriminately than of vegetables. Therefore, as I said, the distinction of clean and unclean animals in the time of Noah was not in use as regards food, but only as regards the rite and use of sacrifices; and that distin[ction]…

§8. Pererius's own view. Marginal gloss (spanning pp. 244–245): "Many things were lawful before the law of Moses which were afterward forbidden to the Jews by that law." Margins: Gen. 8 & 28; Gen. 9; Gen. 28; Gen. 38. Continues on p. 245.

— p. 245 (PDF) · printed p. 176 —

…Noah had received this distinction from the tradition of his ancestors; and if anyone should trace the origin of this tradition to Seth, or to Enos, in whose time men began to invoke the name of God (Gen. 5), I do not know whether he would have strayed from the truth. But the observance of these things was not, before the law of Moses, commanded to men by any precept of God or by a 'positive' law (as they call it), but was brought into custom and worship partly by the prompting of God, but chiefly by the tradition of the ancestors.

Margin: Gen. 5.

It has seemed to some that the animals here called clean are those which are naturally suited for human food, while those which are naturally rejected from the eating and diet of men are named unclean. The Gloss, moreover, indicates another cause for this naming, saying that all things are naturally clean, but that some are named unclean by comparison with a better nature: for example, the ox will be called clean, but the lion unclean, because the former is more useful and more serviceable to man for food and clothing and the cultivation of the earth.

Nor must that be passed over which is handed down here by certain Rabbis of the Hebrews — which, however, is not true, and therefore must be refuted by us in passing. They say that all the things commanded to the Jews by the law of Moses had all been observed before the law by upright and pious worshippers of God. They confirm this by several examples, such as those which we set down a little above. But that this is false I will make plain in three matters (lest, by pursuing more where there is no need, I be too long). Jacob took as wives, and had at the same time, two sisters, Leah and Rachel (Gen. 29); but by the law of Moses such a marriage was forbidden to the Hebrews (Lev. 18). God likewise granted to Noah and his posterity the eating of all animals without any distinction, as Moses narrates (Gen. 9); but the law of Moses commanded the Jews to abstain from many kinds of animals as unclean (Lev. 11 and Deut. 14). Finally, Amram, the father of Moses and Aaron, had as wife Jochabed, his cousin — or rather his aunt, that is, his father's sister — as is plainly gathered from the sixth chapter of Exodus and the twenty-sixth of Numbers; yet the law of Moses, as is written in Lev. 18, forbade such a marriage. Therefore not all the things commanded to the Hebrews by the law of Moses were observed before the law by pious men (as those Rabbis trifle).

§9. Three counter-examples (Jacob, the eating of all animals, Amram) refuting the Rabbinic claim that the whole Mosaic law was pre-observed. Margins: Gen. 29; Lev. 18; Gen. 9; Lev. 11 & Deut. 14.

THIRD DISPUTATION. On the number of clean and unclean animals that entered the Ark.

God commanded Noah, saying: “Of all clean living creatures thou shalt take seven and seven, the male and the female; but of the living creatures that are unclean, two and two, the male and the female.” But these words of the Lord have an obscure and ambiguous sense, as to how that phrase is to be understood: “Two and two,” “seven and seve[n]”…

§10. Margin: Gen. 6 & 7. Continues on p. 246.

— p. 246 (PDF) · printed p. 177 —

…“seven, seven” — whether it means only two or four, and whether only seven or fourteen. There are plainly two contrary opinions of those who have treated this passage. The one is that “seven and seven” signifies two sevens, that is, fourteen: both because the doubling of the same number manifestly declares this — since “seven and seven” is equivalent to fourteen even in common custom and usage of speech — and because God commanded that Noah should bring into the ark mated animals, that is, the male with the female. For three times in this seventh chapter Moses names the animals brought into the ark — first as about to enter, then as entering, finally as having entered — and always, when the animals are mentioned, he adds “the male and the female.” Whence one may argue that all the animals were of an even number, and that to each male its female, and to each female its male, was joined: but if there had been only seven of each species of clean animals in the ark, the seventh would have been without its consort and mate, whether male or female.

§10 (continued). The first opinion: ‘seven and seven’ = fourteen. Margin: Gen. 9.

And the first authors of this opinion I find to have been Justin Martyr, in his reply to Question 43 of the Orthodox, and Origen, in homily 2 on the sixth chapter of Genesis. Lyra and Tostatus assign the same to a certain Andreas, against whom they dispute in their commentaries on the seventh chapter of Genesis. The Carthusian too, on the seventh chapter of Genesis, Article 36, and Oleaster in the same place, judge it more congruent to the text of sacred Scripture, and therefore more probable.

Authorities for the ‘fourteen’ view. Margins: Justin Martyr; Origen; Tostatus; Lyra; Dionysius the Carthusian; Jerome (Oleaster).

The other opinion, approved by more and weightier teachers, interprets that “seven and seven” as only seven: so that of clean animals there were three pairs of each species, in such a way that each pair had a female and a male, but the seventh animal was a male destined for the sacrifice which was to be made, immediately after the flood was over, from the clean animals; and therefore a solitary male, without a mate female, was preserved. But that doubling of the same word, “seven and seven,” does not signify a doubled number seven, but signifies that the same number seven is to be applied to every species of clean animals — so that the sense is: “Of the clean animals thou shalt take seven of this species, and seven of another, and likewise seven of any other species.”

§11. The second opinion (Pererius's preferred): ‘seven’ = three pairs + one solitary male for sacrifice.

Indeed, to bring fourteen animals of each species of clean animals into the ark would, besides filling and overloading the ark more than enough, also have been superfluous: for to what purpose so great a multitude of each species of animals, when half that number would be more than enough for the purpose for which the animals were kept in the ark? And of this opinion I can name and commend very many and most weighty men as authors: such as Josephus in the first book of the Antiquities, Ambrose in On the Ark and Noah, chapter 12, Chrysostom in homily 24 on Genesis, Augustine in The City of God, book 15, chapter 27, Theodoret in question 50 on Genesis, the Scholastic History on the book of Genesis, chapter 33, Eucherius, Lyra, Tostatus, Cajetan on…

Authorities for the ‘seven’ view. Margins: Josephus; Ambrose; Chrysostom; Theodoret; Scholastic History; Eucherius; Tostatus; Cajetan. *Continues on p. 247.*

— p. 247 (PDF) · printed p. 178 —

…the seventh chapter of Genesis. I judge both opinions to be probable, but I do not deny that the latter is the more probable, and pleases me more.

Pererius's verdict: the 'seven' view is more probable.

But why did God command that more of the clean animals than of the unclean be received into the Ark? Of why there should have been more clean than unclean animals in Noah's ark, in each species, one may give various causes: one, that there might be more animals useful to man, but fewer useless or even harmful ones. A second, that the clean ones would be needed for the use of sacrifices, which were made immediately after the flood was over, and which had to be made only from clean animals. A third, that immediately after the flood God gave man the abundance of eating animals, mostly clean ones. Wherefore, since the unclean animals were preserved for one cause only — that is, for the propagation of the species — but the clean animals were preserved for three causes, both for the propagation of the species and for the use of human food and of divine sacrifices: it was therefore fitting that these be received into the ark and preserved in greater number than those.

§12. Why more clean than unclean.

To these add a fourth cause, namely a mystical one: that by this it might be signified that in the Church of Christ there ought to be far more clean — that is, good and holy — than unclean and wicked. For, as Paul says, "God has called us not unto uncleanness but unto sanctification" (1 Thess. 4), "and he chose us that we should be holy and immaculate" (Eph. 1). And would that the Church of Christ corresponded to that ark of Noah in this respect too, that it had more clean than unclean: but it happens far otherwise, since in the field of Christ there is very much chaff and cockle, but exceedingly little wheat.

The mystical fourth cause. Margins: 1 Thess. 4; Eph. 1.

These things are to be confirmed and illustrated by the words of Chrysostom and Theodoret, here appended. “God commanded more of the clean to be brought in,” says Chrysostom, “in order that he might thereby console the just Noah and those who were with him, by their having use of them. And that they were brought in by sevens and by an odd number, this too was a token of the pious mind of Noah, who, when the flood was over — being about to declare his gratitude toward God — was going to offer him victims and sacrifices in thanksgiving. Therefore, that by doing this he might not mutilate the pairs, God commanded seven to be brought in of each kind of birds, so that, when the universal destruction ceased, he might both declare his mind, and the pairings of the birds and of the other animals not be harmed.” So, roughly, Chrysostom.

§13. Margin: Chrysostom, hom. 24 on Genesis.

And Theodoret (borrowing, of course, from Chrysostom himself) writes similar things: “For since God was about to permit men to eat flesh, and men themselves were going to sacrifice to him, he commanded a greater number of clean animals to be kept — namely, three pairs for the increase of the kind, but one animal remaining for sacrifice; for immediately, when the vengeance ceased, Noah offered to God a sacrifice suited to thanksgiving. So that it is certain that for this reason God commanded seven of each species of clean animals to be brought into the ark, so that Noah, offering one animal of each species, might not destroy the pairings.” So Theodoret.

Margin: Theodoret, q. 50 on Genesis.

— p. 248 (PDF) · printed p. 179 —

FOURTH DISPUTATION. Why God willed that of the clean animals neither more nor fewer than seven be received into the ark.

St. Ambrose, in On the Ark and Noah, chapter 12, refers the cause of this matter to the mystical power and excellence of the number seven. For the

number seven denotes cleanness, integrity, and perfection; but the number two, as the first of the numbers receding from unity, signifies dissension, discord, uncleanness, and imperfection. But the words of Ambrose, explaining that phrase “of the clean, seven and seven,” are these: “And as I judge, he declares that one enters upon a clean hebdomad, because the number seven is clean and sacred. For it is mixed with none, nor generated by another, and the same is called ‘Virgin,’ because it generates nothing from itself. And deservedly — as being free from and untouched by any maternal birth or womanly union — although the hebdomad is named with a feminine name, it has the grace of a manly sanctification. But the second number is not full, because it is divided; and what is not full is held to be empty. But the seventh number is full, because the hebdomad is like the decad, and is similar to that first [number], because it was made in the likeness of him who is always, from whom flow and are moved the virtues that are in every kind.” This [says] Ambrose.

§14. Ambrose, On the Ark and Noah, ch. 12 — the arithmological excellence of seven (the ancient ‘virgin’ number that neither generates nor is generated within the decad). Margins: Ambrose; “The excellence of the number seven.”

But Chrysostom, treating this very question — why seven of the clean animals were brought into the ark — vehemently mocks those who fetch the cause of this matter from the hidden powers of numbers; nay, he even affirms that interpretations of sacred things of this kind, drawn from numbers, are both fabulous and dangerous, as being fabricated by heretics. For he writes in this manner: “Many tell various fables about this matter, and, taking occasion thence, set forth observances of numbers. But it is not observance, but the untimely curiosity of men, that contrives to invent such things: whence also many heresies have arisen, as you shall presently learn. For frequently (that we may seem, as it were, out of abundance, to restrain those who bring forward novelties out of their own opinions) we find in the Scriptures an even number commended. For when the Lord sent the disciples, he sent them two by two (Luke 10), and the Apostles were all

twelve, and the Gospels are four in number. But it would be superfluous to recall these things before your Charity, which has sufficiently learned to stop its ears against sayings of this kind.”

§15. Chrysostom (hom. 24 on Genesis) mocks numerological exegesis as a heretical device. Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 24 on Genesis; “What he thinks of the mysteries of numbers”; Luke 10; Matt. 10.

After this Chrysostom subjoins the true cause why seven of the clean animals were brought into the ark — which we set forth a little above. And at the end Chrysostom concludes the disputation with these words: “You have learned the cause for which it was commanded to bring in seven. Will you henceforth tolerate those who strive to tell fables, and to disturb the order of divine Scripture, and to bring in the things which they have invented out of their own head?” Thus far from Chrysostom. For my part, I believe these words of Chrysostom were not spoken against Ambrose and others…

§16. Continues on p. 249.

— p. 249 (PDF) · printed p. 180 —

…the very many and most weighty doctors of the Church, who, in the explanation of sacred letters and the treatment of divine things, have disputed much about numbers acutely, learnedly, piously, and usefully. But that [Chrysostom's words] hold good against the heretics — I mean Simon, Valentinus, Basilides, Marcion, and the Gnostics — who used to dress up their absurd and impious errors with fabulous mysteries of numbers, and strove to prove them to the unskilled.

§17. Pererius reconciles Chrysostom with the orthodox numerological tradition: the rebuke targets the heretics.

No one at all will deny that the number seven is, in very many things, ennobled and commended and, as it were, consecrated in divine Scripture. Who does not know that in the Old Testament the seventh day of the week, the seventh month of the year, and every seventh year, and finally that

fiftieth year which followed seven weeks of years, dedicated to the Jubilee (Lev. 25) — these things, I say, were celebrated by the Jews as most sacred and with the highest religion and veneration? I will not pursue the very many other things marked and commended by the number seven in the sacred writings, lest in a matter known and widely published I be prolix and tiresome.

Margins: "What the author thinks of the number — whether it is mystical"; on seven; Lev. 25.

But as this is true, so neither is that untrue in the highest degree — that the number seven is also, in the worst and most execrable things, very often set down and employed in sacred Scripture. "The unclean spirit" (says Luke, ch. 11) "takes seven other spirits worse than himself." Mark narrates, in the last chapter, that the Lord cast seven demons out of Magdalene. John in the Apocalypse saw a dragon having seven heads and seven diadems (Apoc. 12), and names seven plagues of the earth and seven vials of the wrath of God (Apoc. 15, 16). David indeed said: "Seven times a day I have given praise to thee" (Ps. 118); but his son Solomon said: "Seven times a day the just man falls" (Eccl. 7). It appears, therefore, that the same numbers are set down and employed equally in good things and in evil in sacred Scripture.

Seven used for evil as well as good. Margins: Apoc. 12; below, 15; below, 16; Ps. 118; Eccl. 7.

What, then, is the true and genuine cause why neither more nor fewer than seven of the clean animals were admitted into the ark? It is difficult to divine, but perhaps this will not seem to the reader altogether improbable: that three pairs of clean animals were preserved because the preservation of such animals was necessary for three causes. First, for the propagation of the species, and to this end one pair was preserved. Next, for eating, for after the flood the abundance of eating animals was given to men by God, and for this very cause a second pair of those animals was needed. Finally, for the use of sacrifices, and for the sake of this a third pair had to be preserved. Behold, then, why six of the clean animals were preserved. The

seventh animal, moreover, which was a solitary male — that is, without a mate female — was destined for the sacrifice to be made soon after the flood, as was done by Noah.

§18. Pererius's own resolution: three pairs (propagation / food / sacrifice) + a solitary seventh male for the sacrifice. Margin: "The author's opinion why seven clean animals were admitted into the ark."

And it had to be a male, because the male is more perfect than the female, and for that reason more congruent and more fitting for divine sacrifices. After the example and likeness of this matter (that I may touch on this too, as it were in passing): those men ought to be males, and without a mate female — that is, endowed with a manly spirit and great strength of virtue, and stripped of all, as it were, womanish softness and weakness of soul — whosoever, having renounced the world, in the religious state spiritual[ly]…

The solitary male as a figure of those in the religious (celibate) life. Continues on p. 250.

— p. 250 (PDF) · printed p. 181 —

…spiritually slay and sacrifice themselves to God, so that, living in the flesh, they may live outside the flesh — that is, separated and utterly withdrawn from all pleasures and delights of the flesh, even those not in themselves unlawful.

Completes §18.

But concerning the number of animals that entered the ark, there remain some doubts to be dispatched in a few words. The first doubt: Why did God, when he first commanded Noah about the number of animals that were to be received into the ark, command only generally and precisely that two of each species be taken (as you have toward the end of the sixth chapter: "Of all living creatures," he says, "thou shalt bring two into the ark"), while yet a little after, at the beginning of the seventh chapter, he distinctly commands two to be taken of the unclean, but seven of the clean? It must be answered: when God first commanded two to be taken, that

word “two” does not signify the multitude of animals to be brought in — for this he expressed below, by distinguishing the kinds of clean and unclean animals, and by indicating how many of either of these were to be taken — but that “two” signifies the combination or pairing of both sexes, male and female. Whence he immediately subjoined: “Two thou shalt take, of the male sex and the female.” For he did not wish either all, or many, males or females to be taken, but males together with females in equal number, and each male paired with its own female.

§19 (First doubt). Margin: “Four doubts about the number of animals that entered the Ark.”

The second doubt: Why does Moses, speaking of the double sex of the animals to be brought into the ark, now call them “male and female,” but sometimes “wife and husband”? For in place of what our translation has at chapter 7 (“of all clean living creatures thou shalt take seven and seven, the male and the female; but of the unclean living creatures two and two, the male and the female”) — in place, I say, of that which is said twice, “the male and the female” — the Hebrew has, likewise twice, word for word, “wife and husband.” Cajetan, on that passage, solves this doubt thus: “Moses uses the word ‘male and female,’” he says, “to signify the diversity of sex; but he uses the metaphor of ‘husband and wife’ to signify the age of the male and female suitable for generating and multiplying: so that it might be explained that the [animals] saved were neither nestlings nor too old, but of youthful age, both male and female.” This [says] Cajetan.

§20 (Second doubt). Margin: “Why he calls the animals brought into the ark now ‘male and female,’ now ‘husband and wife.’” Cajetan in Genesim.

But because Moses placed that word “wife and husband” not generally nor indifferently in every kind of animal, but only in beasts of burden and in land animals, and not in birds, therefore Cajetan's solution does not entirely exhaust the difficulty. Wherefore Oleaster solves it thus, saying that in beasts of burden the manner of the female's mingling with the male, and the very members of generation, are more similar to human ones than in the

kind of birds; and on this account the name “wife and husband” was deservedly attributed to those rather than to these.

Margin: Oleaster.

The third doubt: Why did Moses, speaking of beasts of burden or land animals, distinguish them into clean and unclean; but, speaking of birds, did not distinguish them into clean and unclean, but, as though every kind of bird were clean, simply said of the birds that seven were to be taken — whereas that not a few kinds of birds were formerly unclean is plain from the eleventh chapter of Leviticus and the fourteenth of Deuteronomy?

§21 (Third doubt) begins. Margin: “Why Moses did not distinguish the birds into clean and unclean.” Answers continue on p. 251.

— p. 251 (PDF) · printed p. 182 —

This doubt can be met in three ways. First, if it be said that the distinction of clean and unclean was not observed in birds before the promulgation of the Mosaic law. Next, it can be said, as the Carthusian says, that Moses, for the sake of insinuating some mystery, kept silent about the distinction of clean and unclean in birds — namely, that by this it might be signified that the mixture of clean and unclean is found in those who, after the likeness of land animals, are detained and entangled in the pursuits and cares of earthly things, or who still pass their life on earth; for of these, some are clean, others unclean.

§21 (continued). Margin: Dionysius the Carthusian.

But in those who, like the birds of heaven, lift up their souls and minds to the contemplation of sublime and divine things, and whose “conversation” (as the Apostle said) “is in heaven” (Phil. 3); or who, stripped of their earthly bodies, have already flown up to the heavenly and blessed seats — in these, I say, the distinction of clean and unclean has plainly no place. For it is written in the Apocalypse that nothing defiled and unclean enters into that heavenly fatherland of the blessed minds.

Margins: Phil. 3; Apoc. (last ch.).

But this is more truly said: that Moses kept silent about the distinction of clean and unclean in birds for the sake of brevity, but wished the same [distinction], which he had just before expressed in beasts of burden or land animals, to be understood in birds. Great credit is given to this interpretation by the translation of the Seventy Interpreters, which expressly placed the distinction of clean and unclean in birds also. For at the beginning of the seventh chapter it has thus: “And of the clean fowls of heaven, seven seven, the male and the female; and of all the unclean fowls, two two, the male and the female.” Therefore, what they supposed Moses had kept silent about out of a zeal for brevity, this the Seventy themselves, in order to express the meaning of Moses more clearly, added distinctly and expressly.

§22. Pererius's preferred answer: the distinction is implied; the Septuagint makes it explicit.

The fourth doubt: As to those things which Moses wrote about the number of animals to be brought into the ark, do all the translations agree among themselves, and concord with the Hebrew Scripture? They do not entirely agree, but in certain matters (very slight ones, however) they are discordant. And a fourfold variety can be noted in this place. First, toward the end of the sixth chapter, both the Latin translation and the Chaldaic paraphrase and the Hebrew Scripture have once, and without doubling of the same number, that two animals are to be brought into the ark; but the Seventy interpreters have the same number doubled, saying “two, two.” Next, at the opening of the seventh chapter, the Latin translation and that of the Seventy have that two and two of the unclean animals are to be taken; but in Hebrew and Chaldaic that “two” is only once.

§23 (Fourth doubt). Margin: “In the number of animals brought into the ark, a fourfold variety of the translators.”

Besides, the Hebrew Scripture, in that very place where it speaks of beasts of burden, attributes to them the name “wife and husband,” and likewise

the term “male and female”; but in Latin, Greek, and Chaldaic only the name “male and female” is set down. Finally, in birds, the translation of the Seventy places the distinction of clean and unclean — which distinction neither the Latin translation has, nor the Chaldaic paraphrase, nor the Hebrew Scripture.

The third and fourth of the four textual divergences among the versions.

— p. 252 (PDF) · printed p. 183 —

FIFTH DISPUTATION. In what way all the animals, gathered from every quarter, came together to the Ark.

Philo, at the end of the second book On the Life of Moses, indicates that Noah himself gathered the animals, and that they followed him not only not reluctantly, but even willingly and quietly — just as sheep are wont to follow their shepherd in a flock wherever they are led: so that not only the tame ones, but even the fierce and savage ones, putting off, as it were, their natural savagery, yielded entirely to the leading and obedience of Noah. And thus Philo writes: “So it came about that no animal refused obedience to Noah, even the huge beasts growing tame and following their preserver of their own accord, like a shepherd. And after they had betaken themselves within one receptacle, it could be called a rival of the whole world — containing, indeed, as many kinds of living creatures as were found at that time in all lands, or were to be found in the future — scarcely comprehensible by any speech.” So Philo.

§24. Philo, On the Life of Moses, bk. 2. Margin: Philo.

But if Philo meant this, which the aforesaid words present, without doubt he was not right. For Noah could not, either by himself or through others, search out and traverse all the regions and coasts and all the places of the earth in which the animals were dispersed throughout the whole world, and, gathering them from every quarter, bring them to the ark: he could not, I say, do this without the delay of a very long time, nor without the most

troublesome and scarcely tolerable endurance of immense labor.

Pererius's objection to a literal-human reading of Philo.

John Buteo makes Hugh of St. Victor affirm that, as the flood grew strong and covered the lands, all the living creatures, seeking some escape from the present destruction, fled from every side to the ark by swimming. The words of Hugh, from which Buteo drew that opinion, are these, in the first book On the Moral Ark, chapter three: “The third story of the ark, in which were the animals that needed the breathing of open air, was the first to rise above the waters, in such a way that, for the animals ascending to the ark through the water from outside, the door would be met almost on the level.” So Hugh. But this opinion both divine Scripture rejects and reason refutes. For the narrative of Moses in chapter 7 of Genesis plainly shows that the animals had entered the ark before the flood began; nay rather, before the inundation of the waters and after the entry of the animals into the ark, God is there said to have closed the door from outside. What of this: that if the waters had inundated the earth before the entry of the animals into the ark, many species of living creatures would have perished — either overwhelmed by the sudden waters, or unable to swim, or at least unable to reach the ark by swimming — and the concourse and gathering of all the animals to the ark could not have come about except in a very long time.

§25. Buteo's reading of Hugh (animals swam to the ark) refuted by Scripture and reason. Margins: John Buteo, in his book on Noah's Ark; Hugh of St. Victor.

That opinion, therefore — as it is widely current and approved by most Doctors, so it is also the true one — that by the will and power of God, and by the ministry of the Ange[ls]…

§26 begins. Continues on p. 253.

— p. 253 (PDF) · printed p. 184 —

…of the Angels, all the animals were gathered from every quarter and led to the ark. This God indicated not obscurely in those words which Moses reports toward the end of the sixth chapter. For in place of what the Latin translation has (“Two of all shall go in with thee, that they may live”), in Greek and Hebrew it is: “they shall go in,” or “they shall come to thee” — that is, they shall come of their own accord, not sought out and gathered by thy care or labor.

§26 (continued). The animals gathered by God's will and the angels' ministry.

“This was not” (Augustine says, in book 15 of The City of God, chapter 27) “the care of that man, or of those men, but divine: for Noah did not bring them in captured, but admitted them as they came and entered. For to this end is what was said: ‘They shall enter to thee’ — not, that is, by the act of man, but by the nod of God.” This [says] Augustine.

Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, ch. 27. Margins: Augustine; Gen. 6.

Cajetan too, weighing those very words (“Two of all shall come to thee”), writes thus: “Hence is solved the question, how Noah gathered two of all the living creatures: for God clearly absolved him from this care, by saying, ‘They shall come to thee.’ For by the divine nod, by the ministry of Angels, there came of all the animals a male and a female to Noah; but it was Noah's care and work to bring it about that the living creatures which had come should enter the ark, and find nests or dwellings in it, and there be fed by him. From this miracle of their coming, learn the rest of the consequent matters concerning the peace of the animals with Noah: for they are of the same reasoning.” Thus far from Cajetan.

Cajetan in Genesim.

A certain opinion of Philo must here be corrected in passing, who makes this distinction between the ark of Noah and the earthly Paradise in which God placed Adam: that within the ark there were both men and animals, both clean and unclean, but in the earthly Paradise there was no animal

devoid of reason, but man only. For thus Moses said in the second chapter: “God planted a Paradise, in which he placed the man whom he had formed”; and a little after: “God took the man, and placed him in the Paradise of pleasure, that he might dress it and keep it.”

§27. Margin: “Philo is refuted.”

And Philo gives a certain Tropological reason for this difference. For thus he writes in the book entitled On the Planting of Noah: “It is not to be wondered at why all the species of living creatures are brought into that huge ark prepared for the flood, but none into Paradise. For that ark signified the human body, which necessarily contains the monstrous and untamed plagues of the affections and of the vices; but Paradise is capable of the virtues alone, which admit nothing untamed or that lacks reason.” So Philo.

Philo, On the Planting of Noah: ark = the body (with passions), Paradise = the virtues alone.

But I by no means assent to Philo that there was no animal within Paradise: for I can bring forward, as authors of the contrary opinion, most illustrious men — Josephus in the first book of the Antiquities, Basil in the Oration which he wrote on Paradise, Augustine in book 15 of The City of God, chapter 11, and Damascene in the second book On the Orthodox Faith, chapter 10 — although he, in the very next chapter, as if forgetful of what he had said before, seems to write the contrary. For how is it credible that the animals were not in Paradise, when all the living creatures were brought to Adam himself, as he dwelt in Paradise, that he might impose names on them, and to him…

§28. Margins: Josephus; Basil; Augustine; Damascene. Continues on p. 254.

— p. 254 (PDF) · printed p. 185 —

…and to him was given by God dominion over all the animals? Where, too, was the serpent that tempted and deceived Eve, except within Paradise? At whose appearance and speech Eve would have been

astonished as at an unwonted thing, nor would she have conversed with it so familiarly, had she not previously seen both it and the other living creatures in Paradise. But let us pass on to other matters.

Completes §28 (Liber XI). NOTE: this page's running head misprints 'LIB. X'; the text is Liber XI.

SIXTH DISPUTATION. Which kinds of animals did not enter the Ark.

Three kinds of animals did not enter the ark. One is the kind of fishes and of all that live in the waters: for to these the flood brought no harm. To these may also be reckoned those which are of ambiguous life and are called amphibians; for although these often dwell out of the waters on land, yet they seek the land not from necessity, but for the sake of catching pleasure or prey, or of hiding their offspring. But if even these cannot make a long stay in the waters, that does not at all disturb our reasoning, for it has been shown above that there was sufficient room in the ark for taking these too. The second is the kind of those generated from the mingling of animals of a different species, such as the mule (male and female) from the horse and the ass: for it was enough that the parents of these were preserved in the ark — namely, those from whose union their kind could again be restored after the flood was over. The third kind is of those created from putrefying matter: for since at no time after the flood would there be lacking putrefying matter, nor the celestial force from which the generation of such animals arises, their preservation in the ark was not necessary.

§29. The three excluded kinds: aquatic (incl. amphibians), hybrids, and the spontaneously generated.

Tostatus, on the second chapter of Genesis, question 2, makes six species of this kind of animal, writing in this manner: "Of imperfect animals, which are generated from putrefactions, there are commonly six kinds. Some are generated from exhalations, such as gnats (bibiones) — the tiniest animals, begotten from the exhalations of wine — and butterflies from water; some from the corruptions of humors, such as worms in dung or in cisterns. Some from carcasses, such as bees from beasts of burden,

hornets (that is, large flies that buzz in flying), and beetles and green flies from dead horses or dogs, and the Scorpion from the flesh of a dead Crab. As Ovid says, Metamorphoses 15: ‘If you take away the hollow claws of the shore-Crab, and lay the rest beneath the earth, from the buried part a Scorpion will come forth and threaten with its hooked tail.’ A serpent is also born from the marrow of the human spine, as Isidore says in the 15th book of the Etymologies — concerning which Ovid, in Metamorphoses 15:”

§30. Tostatus's six classes of spontaneously generated ‘imperfect’ animals. Margins: Tostatus; Ovid; Isidore. Quotation continues on p. 255.

— p. 255 (PDF) · printed p. 186 —

“There are those who believe that, when the spine has rotted in the closed sepulchre, human marrow is changed into a serpent.” Some [are generated] from the rot of wood, such as wood-worms (teredines), which are worms born within timbers when they are not cut at the due time. Some from the corruption of herbs, such as the moth; some from the corruption of fruits, such as weevils (gurguliones) from beans. Of these six species of animals it is said that they were not immediately created by God, but were afterward naturally formed from corruption — yet God implanted the seminal causes of these in things. This [says] Tostatus.

Conclusion of the Tostatus passage (with the Ovid couplet on the spine-born serpent).

That the three aforesaid kinds of animals were excluded from the ark, the very narrative of Moses indicates not obscurely. And concerning the aquatic ones no one could have any doubt, since God commanded only land and flying creatures to be brought into the ark, no mention being made of fishes or aquatic creatures. Concerning the other two kinds the same is manifest from this: that in every kind of animal which God commanded to be received into the ark, he willed there to be a distinction of both sexes — that is, of male and female — without doubt to this end, that again, by such mingling of the sexes, generating things like themselves, they might

preserve and propagate their species. Therefore whatever either does not have a distinction of sex, or is not generated from the mingling of both sexes, or does not itself, through the mingling of male and female, generate anything else — these, one must confess, were not in the ark. The mule (male and female) is indeed generated from the mingling of male and female, and has in itself the distinction of both sexes; but they nevertheless generate nothing through such mingling, and therefore their species is preserved and perpetuated not on account of their active generation, but only on account of the passive [generation] from the horse and the ass.

The Mosaic basis for excluding the three kinds.

Our opinion concerning the animals that did not enter the ark is confirmed by the authority of St. Augustine — most similar to the things we have here taught — in the fifteenth book of The City of God, chapter twenty-seven, writing in this manner: “But as for that which is wont to be asked most scrupulously about the tiniest little creatures — not only such as mice and lizards, but even such as locusts, beetles, flies, and finally fleas — whether they were not in that ark in greater number than is [there] defined, when God commanded this: those whom these things trouble must first be advised that what was said, ‘Which creep upon the earth,’ is to be understood thus, that it was not necessary to preserve in the ark those which can live in the waters — not only submerged, like fishes, but also floating on the surface, like many winged creatures. Next, when it is said, ‘There shall be male and female,’ it is without doubt understood to be said for the restoring of the kind; and through this, neither was it necessary that those be there which can be born without copulation, from various things or from the corruptions of things; or, if they were there — as they are wont to be in houses — they could have been defined by no number: or, if the most sacred mystery being enacted, and so great a figure of the thing, could not be fulfilled even in the truth of the fact otherwise than that all things should be there in that fixed number which could not, nature forbidding, live in the waters — this was not the care of that man or of those men, but

divine. For Noah did not bring them in captured, but admitted them as they came and entered. For to this end…”

§31. Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, ch. 27. Margin: Augustine. Continues on p. 256.

— p. 256 (PDF) · printed p. 187 —

“…to this end is what was said, ‘They shall enter to thee’ — not, that is, by the act of man, but by the nod of God: in such a way, indeed, that those which lack sex are not to be believed to have been there. For it was prescribed and defined, ‘There shall be male and female.’ For there are some which are born from various things without copulation, in such a way that afterward they copulate and generate, like flies; but others in which there is nothing of male or female, like bees. But those which have sex in such a way that they have no offspring, like mules, it would be strange if they were there, and not rather that their parents — namely, the horse-kind and the ass-kind — being there should have sufficed; and if there are any others which, from the mingling of a different kind, lead forth some [other] kind, yet if this pertained to the mystery, they were there: for this kind too has male and female.” So Augustine.

Conclusion of the Augustine quotation.

SEVENTH DISPUTATION. Which kinds of animals entered the Ark; and first concerning Reptiles (creeping things).

Excepting those three aforesaid kinds of animals which we showed, in the preceding question, were not received into the ark, all the other species of living creatures entered the ark. And of these animals five kinds may be distinguished: one of birds, the second of reptiles, the third of carnivorous quadrupeds, the fourth of non-carnivorous ones of great body, the fifth of non-carnivorous ones endowed with a smaller body. And of birds, although there are very many species, yet to them — because most are of an exceedingly small body — we have above assigned room more than enough in the topmost story of the ark. Of the remaining four kinds,

therefore, it must be explained how so many species of each kind could be contained in the ark; wherefore it is necessary here to review all the species of each of the four aforesaid kinds — whatsoever have hitherto come to the knowledge of men, whether known to most by use and experience itself, or detected, observed, and committed to writing by the industry and diligence of learned men.

§32. The five kinds; birds already placed in the top story, so the four remaining are catalogued.

It has, moreover, seemed good to us (and to do this we were even advised and asked by some) to set forth here, as it were in passing, a brief exposition — taken from approved authors — of the powers, nature, and properties of certain animals which are not known to everyone: namely, in order that the distinction of species (from which the number of animals that entered the ark must be reckoned and established) might become more manifest and more illustrious, and that the Reader devoted to the study of sacred letters might have a certain compendious knowledge of the principal land animals, arranged by a fixed method and order. For by this he…

§33. Pererius's rationale for the bestiary that follows. Marginal gloss: "Why the author treats the species of animals, not only by reckoning their number, but also by briefly setting forth the chief features and natures of certain of them." Continues on p. 257.

— p. 257 (PDF) · printed p. 188 —

…will be able to use [it] for interpreting, learnedly and clearly, many passages of divine Scripture in which the wonderful properties of very many animals are indicated. Hence, moreover, it will be possible to cull many — and indeed most useful — moral lessons, the comparison being aptly drawn from the admirable instincts and habits of animals: which will assuredly avail very much for adorning and enriching popular sermons, and will furnish richer and more pleasant material for spiritual meditations, which, by the contemplation of natural things, lift up the human mind to the admiration and proclamation of the wisdom and providence of God, the maker of them all. And we have placed in the margin the names only of

those animals whose natures — as wonderful and therefore memorable — we briefly set forth, thereby serving the reader's study and memory, that is, both his pleasure and his profit at once.

Conclusion of §33.

Of the reptiles, then, that entered the ark — namely those generated not from putrefying matter, nor from the mixture of animals of a different species, nor otherwise than from the mingling of male and female and from parents like themselves — these are nearly the species hitherto known. 1. THE SNAKE (anguis). The mountain that divides the kingdom of Narsinga from the Malabars nourishes many wild beasts, among which winged snakes that sit in the trees, which they say kill, by their breath alone, or even by their gaze, those who approach more nearly.

§34. The reptile catalogue begins. Margins: “Of reptiles that entered the ark, 25 species”; Scaliger, Exercitationes 183; “Winged snakes.”

2. THE ASP. 3. THE VIPER. Herodotus hands down many fabulous things — not indeed from a lust for lying, but from too great a zeal for gathering and collecting everything from every side, seeking the praise not so much of judgment and prudence as of abundance and diligence. Among the fabulous things some reckon what is reported by him: that in the viper kind both the male and the female perish in generating offspring — the male by the female, who, gripping his head in her mouth during coitus, gnaws it off in the sweetness of pleasure; but the female by the young which she bears in her womb, for since she bears them one each day, about twenty in number, the later ones, impatient of delay, break through her sides, the parent being killed. Scaliger laughs at this, saying: “That vipers are burst and perish from their most numerous offspring being impatient of delay and therefore bursting forth, we know to be false — we who saw, in the wooden box of Vincenzo Camerino the mountebank, viperlets that had been born with the parent safe.”

§35. On the viper's reputed self-destructive birth. Margins: "Whether the viper perishes in giving birth"; Viper; Scaliger, Exercitationes 201.

But Aristotle — being in philosophizing not only most learned, but also most cautious and prudent — as if restricting and correcting the opinion of Herodotus, says that it is not the womb or the sides of the viper that are torn by the young, but the membranes in which they were wrapped in the womb that are broken, and that not always but sometimes. His words are these: "The viper bears its young wrapped in membranes, which are broken on the third day. It happens sometimes that those still in the womb burst forth, the membranes being gnawed through. She bears them one each day, more than twenty." But although vipers are generally of a very small body, yet Nymphes, in the ninth of the books which he wrote on the Ptolemies, says that in the Troglodyte country there are vipers of seventeen cubits.

§36. Aristotle's correction. Margins: Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 5, ch. 34; Nymphes, bk. 9.

— p. 258 (PDF) · printed p. 189 —

4. THE BASILISK. Of the Basilisk, the things that could here be recorded the reader will find in Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 21; Solinus, ch. 30; and Aelian, bk. 2, ch. 35, and bk. 3, ch. 30. That the basilisk, unlike other serpents, cannot be charmed, is attested by the divine writings: "Behold, I," says the Lord, "will send among you serpent-cockatrices (reguli), against which there is no charm, and they shall bite you" (Jer. 8). Nay, the basilisk is even believed to break charms, and to loose and free other serpents already caught by them. But that which is written in Isaiah, "From the root of the snake shall come forth a cockatrice, and his seed shall swallow up the bird," is a speech not proper but metaphorical and figurative. For the basilisk is not generated from a snake; but it is signified that king Uzziah indeed afflicted the Philistines with many evils, but that Hezekiah, born from his seed, would crush them with graver calamities — just as the basilisk is more harmful and more destructive than the snake. And the basilisk is said to swallow up the bird, because, by infecting the air around

it, it kills the birds flying overhead, as is reported by Solinus. Scaliger relates that he read, among more recent writers, that at Rome, under Pope Leo the Great, a basilisk was housed in a vault near the church of [St.] Lucy, by whose breath Rome was afflicted with a great plague, and that it was forthwith extinguished by the prayers of the Pope.

§37. The basilisk. Margins: Basilisk; Jer. 8; "Passage of Isaiah, ch. 14"; Scaliger, Exercitationes 246; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 21.

Similar in nature is the pestilent force of the beast which they call the CATOBLEPAS, distinguished not by the size of its body but by the power of its venom; sluggish in its limbs, with a head so heavy that, scarcely supporting it, it always carries it cast down to the ground: harmful not by attack and bite, but by its gaze alone — all who have seen its eyes immediately expiring. 5. THE GREEN LIZARD. 6. THE SMALLER LIZARD. 7. THE STELLION (newt). 8. THE TARANTULA. Many think this to be a species of stellion; but it is otherwise, for it is agreed to be a species peculiar to Italy, of the Phalangium (venomous spider) — harmless in the southern coastal region, but in the land of Apulia both frequent and harmful, named "Tarantula" from the city of Tarentum. This, lurking in the squalor of furrows, stings unwary reapers or hunters: wherefore they reap shod with little greaves.

§38. The catoblepas, lizards, stellion, and tarantula. Margins: Catoblepas; Scaliger, Exercitationes 185; Tarantula.

Nor is there one mode [of affliction] for those harmed by the Tarantula. The opinion of the Apulians holds that there are as many kinds of harm inflicted by this beast as there are days in the week. Many are immediately seized with drowsiness; not a few are distracted by perpetual wakefulness; some grieve with weeping; others dissolve in laughter; others run; some sit sluggishly idle. There are those who sweat, who vomit, who go mad. Wherefore there have not been wanting Philosophers who believed that there are as many species of Tarantula as its harmful effects are seen to be.

But just as drunkenness, according to the varied disposition of men, does not have an effect of one mode — the drunk weep, laugh, fall silent, babble, run about, strike — so likewise it must be thought to happen from the bite of this little beast. Different from this is the one commonly called at Rome “Terrantula,” because it lurks under the earth: since this, having the face of a lizard and spotted with yellow marks, is to be thought a species of stellion.

§39. The tarantula's varied effects (compared to drunkenness).

9. THE CHAMELEON. Of scarcely any animal has Aristotle described the nature and habits so copiously and subtly as of the Chameleon — namely, on account of the manifold marvel of that animal. The description of Aristotle Pliny rendered into Latin with elegant brevity. Two of its marvels are especially celebrated: one, that it itself, held aloft, with mouth always agape, alone of animals is nourished neither by food nor by drink, nor by any nourishment other than that of air; but (which is the second marvel) it is more wonderful in the nature of its color, for it changes it from time to time — in its eyes and tail and whole body — and always reproduces whatever it most nearly touches, except red and white. The variation of colors, according to Aristotle, happens to it from poverty of blood and from fear. “Of all four-footed land animals,” he says, “the Chameleon is the thinnest, inasmuch as it of all is most stiff from poverty of blood; and from excessive fear too it is made multiform. Now fear is a certain cooling through poverty of blood and of heat.”

§40. The chameleon. Margins: Chameleon; Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 2, ch. 11; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 33; Aristotle, On the Parts of Animals, bk. 4, ch. 11. Continues on p. 259.

— p. 259 (PDF) · printed p. 190 —

But Scaliger corrects and amends in some part the old account of the Chameleon by the more certain narration of more recent [observers], writing in this manner: “Let us report some less common things about the Chameleon. John Landi, when he was in farthest Syria, says that he saw

one of five Chameleons which he had bought pick off, with a sudden and momentary dart of its tongue, a fly that was on its breast. For this reason he related that the tongue of the one dissected by him was found to be a palm in length, hollow, empty, with at its tip, as it were, a little cup with mucus, by which it might take up its prey. This is indeed new to those who have hitherto thought it lives on air alone.”

§41. Scaliger's eyewitness correction (the tongue). Margins: Scaliger, Exercitationes 196; John Landi.

“That it changes into any colors whatever is not true. Upon green its greenness is quickened; upon yellow it is tempered toward yellow. Upon blue or red or white its native greenness is not overcome, but blue and red and white spots give a greener and stronger appearance of itself. Upon black they grow blackish, yet that tenor of greenness remains, confused with the black. Even when the underlying color is not changed, it changes its own, whether from fear or from annoyance, whether oppressed or relaxed. That air is for it as food for a while is plain from this: that they say it endures fasting a whole year, and that when it has taken in the breeze by its gaping and closed its jaws, its belly swells. I have even found one who said that, turned toward the Sun, it drinks in the rays, and follows it gaping with its [the Sun's] turning. The Chameleon is a most fierce enemy of the venomous serpents. Having spied out any one of them, catching the breezes in the shade or basking in the rays, it climbs into the tree that overhangs it: whence from its mouth it lets down a thread, after the manner of spiders, at the end of which thread there is a little drop, of the splendor of a pearl. By this the serpent, touched on the top of its head, dies.”

§42. The chameleon's colors and its serpent-killing thread.

“This too is more wonderful: if it cannot let down the thread plumb-straight — because the branch on which it is does not exactly correspond to the lower place where the serpent lies — it so corrects the thread with its forefeet, and tempers its draught, that it descends to the line, as it were, of a

plumb-line." This [says] Scaliger. 10. THE SALAMANDER. Of this, the things that are wonderful and worthy of knowledge, we have disputed in the third book of our Commentaries on Daniel. 11. THE SCYTALE: a serpent shining with such variety of back that, by the grace of its markings, it retards those who see it; and since it is rather sluggish in crawling, those which it cannot overtake it captures by the marvel of itself as they stand amazed. 12. THE CERASTES (horned serpent): displaying fourfold horns, by the ostentation of which, as by an enticing bait, it kills the birds it has lured. 13. THE AMPHISBAENA: rising up into a twin head, of which one is in its [proper] place, the other in that part where…

§43. Salamander, scytale, cerastes, amphisbaena. Margins: Scytale; Solinus, ch. 30 (on the Scytale and following). Continues on p. 260.

— p. 260 (PDF) · printed p. 191 —

…where the tail is. 14. THE IACULUS (javelin-snake): which climb up trees, from which, paired, they hurl themselves with the greatest force, and pierce whatever animal is in their way. 15. THE DIPSAS: killing by thirst. 16. THE HYPNALE: slaying by sleep — by the experiment of Cleopatra, who therefore sought and bought it for her death. 17. THE HAEMORRHOIS: drawing out blood by its bite, and, the channels of the veins being dissolved, calling forth whatever there is of life through the gore. 18. THE PRESTER: by which one struck is distended, and, swollen out with enormous corpulence, is killed. 19. THE SEPS: whose blow putrefaction immediately follows. 20. THE AMMODYTES (sand-viper): a serpent of about a cubit in size, but sandy in color, marked through the body with black spots; it has a very hard tail, broken up at the top. By some it is called "cechrias," that is, "miliaris," on account of the hardness of its tail like millet (milium). It has broader jaws than the viper; and although it is similar to it in many other respects, it can rather be distinguished by color, for the viper is yellowish. 21. THE CENCHRIS: also a kind of venomous serpent, of which Pliny [speaks] when treating of wild thyme (serpyllum) — effective, in its domestic [form], against serpents, especially

the Cenchris — etc.

§44. Continuation of the serpent catalogue (iaculus through cenchris). Margin: Pliny, bk. 20, ch. 22.

22. THE ELEPHANTIA. 23. THE CHERSYDROS: a serpent which dwells both in the waters and on land, not much different from the Chelydrus, which emits smoke where it crawls. Lucan: “And the Chersydros, born to inhabit the ambiguous fields of the Syrtis, and the track of the Chelydrus drawn along with a smoking trail.” 24. THE CHAMAEDRACON. 25. THE HYDRUS or HYDRA: for the Hydrus is the male and the Hydra the female; although this kind of serpents is aquatic rather than terrestrial. Of this Pliny [writes] thus: “In the world the most beautiful kind of snakes is that which lives in water. They are called Hydri, inferior to no serpents in venom. The liver of these, preserved, is a help against those struck by them.” The same [Pliny] elsewhere records marine ones of twenty cubits each, by which the fleet of Alexander was terrified. For that the Hydra in the marsh of Lerna had many heads, of which, when some were cut off, more were continually reborn, and that it was at last killed by Hercules with arrows and fire, is a fiction of the poets. There are, therefore, in all, the twenty-five aforesaid species of Reptiles. But on account of perhaps some other species still unknown to us, let us extend that number up to thirty.

§45. End of the reptile list (25 species, rounded to 30). Margins: Lucan, bk. 9; Hydrus and Hydra; Pliny, bk. 29, ch. 4; same, bk. 6, ch. 23.

EIGHTH DISPUTATION. On the carnivorous animals that entered the ark.

Carnivores I here call the animals which, after the flood and thenceforward to the present day, are wont to feed on flesh. For that before the flood no animal made use of the eating and feeding on flesh has been demonstrated by us in the former volume of our Commentaries on Genesis, toward the end of the fourth book, in the last disputation. And of these…

§46. Definition of ‘carnivore’ (none ate flesh before the flood). Continues on p. 261.

— p. 261 (PDF) · printed p. 192 —

…the species of carnivorous animals, ascertained and known by use and by the report of others, I have to review as follows. 1. THE LION. 2. THE LEOPARD (pardus). 3. THE DRAGON. Wonderful things are told of Dragons: that the dragons of the Atlas mountain kill by mere contact, very slender in head and tail, but with a belly of such vastness that they are scarcely fit for crawling. Philostratus indeed — a most ingenious and eloquent craftsman of falsehoods — writes in his third book that near the Ganges there are innumerable dragons, which the Indians hunt for the sake of their eyes; for their eyes are precious little stones of fiery brilliance.

§46/47. The carnivore catalogue begins (lion, leopard, dragon). Margins: “Of carnivorous animals 35 species are reckoned”; Scaliger, Exercitationes 183; “Fables about Dragons.”

But this is more fabulous, spread abroad by the Africans: that the she-wolf conceives from an eagle, and does not give birth but is burst open; and that a dragon is brought forth, similar to its father in beak and wings, to its mother in feet and tail, with the hide of a serpent, party-colored with spots, never raising the lids of its eyes, dwelling in caves. These things, near to fables, I wished indeed to report — not as to be believed by the prudent reader, but as not to be unknown to the curious one, and to him who is eager to learn whatever is wonderful to tell. For that saying of Aristotle is well known, that the Philosopher is also a lover of fables, because a fable is composed of wonderful things.

Margins: Philostratus; Aristotle, Metaphysics, bk. 1, ch. 2.

4. THE PANTHER. The Panther and the Tiger are looked upon as almost the only beasts [distinguished] by the variety of their spots: for in Panthers there are short eye-like spots on a white ground. They say that quadrupeds are wondrously attracted by their odor, but terrified by the grimness of their head; wherefore, with that hidden, [the panther,] imitating the rest by its

sweetness, seizes them. Some say that on the shoulder of Panthers there is a spot like the Moon, waxing into orbs and hollowing out its horns in like manner. The Barbarians hunt Panthers with flesh rubbed with aconite (that is, a poison): a choking immediately seizes their throats. But the beast cures itself against this with human excrement, and is otherwise so greedy of it that, when shepherds hang it up on purpose in some vessel higher than it can reach by leaping, by hurling and reaching after itself it grows faint, and at last expires: otherwise of so slow a tenacity of life that, with its entrails cast out, it fights on for a long time.

§47. The panther. Margins: Pliny, bk. 8, chs. 17 & 27; Panther.

5. THE TIGER. Hyrcania, as it is rough with forests, so is it abundant in monstrous wild beasts, and especially in tigers. It is an animal most memorable both for the notable marks of its spots and for its incredible swiftness. It shines tawny, with blackish bands waved between, a variety especially comely. Of such velocity of foot that nothing is so long that it does not traverse it in a short time, nothing so far ahead that it does not at once overtake it. But its power is especially proved when it presses upon the ravishers of its cubs. Though horsemen relieve one another, and by however much cunning they wish to carry off the prey, unless the seas be in their defense, every attempt is in vain. For when the female finds the lair empty (for the males have no care of the offspring), she is borne headlong, tracking by scent. The ravisher, as the roaring approaches, throws down one of the cubs, which she, taking up in her mouth, returns — driven swifter even by the weight — and again pursues, and so on, until, [the ravisher] having gone back into the ship, her baffled ferocity rages on the shore. It is fitting to know in passing that there is a certain common kind, lacking, however, a name, containing closely…

§48. The tiger. Margins: Solinus, ch. 21; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 18; Tiger. *Continues on p. 262.*

— p. 262 (PDF) · printed p. 193 —

…these species: the Wolf, the Dog, the Fox, the Tiger, the Hyena, and the Lioness. The proof is the mutual mingling of these animals among themselves, and hence the generation of offspring of a species nevertheless different from the parents.

Completes §48 (the unnamed ‘common kind’).

6. THE WOLF. 7. THE DOG-WOLF (lupus canarius). 8. THE DEER-WOLF (lupus cervarius), which is also called THOS. It is peculiar to the Ethiopian Wolves that in leaping they have such effort of a winged thing that they advance no more by running than by gliding; yet they never attack men. In winter they are shaggy, in summer bare; they call them “Thoes.” Solinus seems to have taken this from Aristotle, whose words are these: “The Thoes also (which we have called deer-wolves) are fond of man, and neither offend nor greatly fear [him]. They fight with dogs and lions: whence it comes about that deer-wolves and lions are not in the same place. The best deer-wolves are those that are smaller. Of their kinds, some set two, others three; more than these there do not seem to be. But as some kinds of fishes, birds, and quadrupeds [change], so deer-wolves too are changed according to the season, and take a different color in winter or summer; and in summer they are made bare, in winter shaggy.”

§49. The wolf-kinds. Margins: Solinus, ch. 33; deer-wolf; Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 9, ch. 44.

9. THE LYNX. Solinus reckons Lynxes in the kind of Wolves, [and says] that their urine congeals into the hardness of a precious stone — and that this does not escape them, but, as if grudging it to the use of man, they immediately cover the discharged liquid with heaps of sand, Theophrastus reports. The stone has the color of amber, and a similar power of attracting close [to it], and is good for soothing the pains of the kidneys and for healing the royal disease (jaundice). Its name is “Lyncurion.” But Scaliger denies that Lyncurion is either amber or congeals from the urine of Lynxes: for in the Germanies and Scythias and Sarmatias there is a great frequency of that animal, yet there is no stone of this kind there. The same [Scaliger]

does not seem to distinguish the Lynx in species from the deer-wolf: “The male Lynx,” he says, “is the deer-wolf, for this has short, round, distinct spots, that [the lynx] elongated and mostly quite continuous.” They are called deer-wolves, although they have nothing of the form of wolf or deer: “wolves” indeed from their greed, for they lay waste all things near them (whence it comes about that in Scandinavia, where there is a frequency of Lynxes, there is a notable rarity of other wild beasts, and their food is for the most part the prey of wild cats); but because they are most fierce enemies of deer, they are therefore surnamed “Cervarii” (deer-[wolves]).

§50. The lynx and the amber-stone ‘lyncurium.’ Margins: Solinus, ch. 8; Lynx; Theophrastus; Scaliger, Exercitationes 104 and 120.

10. THE SPHINX. Among the Apes, says Solinus, are reckoned also the Sphinxes, shaggy with hair, with twin breasts on the chest, docile to the forgetting of their wildness. Pliny relates that Sphinxes store food in the storehouses of their jaws, and then by degrees bring it out with their hands to chew; and what is customary for ants over a year, is for these by days or hours. The poets fashioned the Sphinx to be a monster, multiform and horrendous. Clearchus writes that it had the head and hands of a girl, the body of a dog, the voice of a man, the tail of a dragon, the claws of a Lion, the wings of a bird. 11. THE HYENA. This beast has the form of a wolf, but a greater bulk of body, and longer feet, similar to human ones; its calves likewise thick and nearer to human ones. It feeds not on the prey of wild beasts, but on dug-up carcasses, and is housed in caves; and the hunters, having soothed it with singing and the beating of drums, capture the females with thrown snares. That it is both [sexes], without male and female; that in alternate years the males [become females], in alternate years the females; and that it conceives and bears without a male — believed by some — Aristotle reports and refutes.

§51–52. Sphinx and the beginning of the hyena. Margins: Solinus, ch. 30; Pliny, bk. 10, ch. 72; Clearchus; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 34; Solinus, ch. 30; Aelian, bk. 7, ch. 18; Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 6, ch. 34 and On Generation. *Continues on p. 263.*

— p. 263 (PDF) · printed p. 194 —

…Yet this Aelian relates of the Hyena, that it is partaker of both sexes. Its neck and mane are extended by the continuity of the spine, and it cannot bend except by the turning-about of its whole body. It wonderfully imitates human speech among the stalls of shepherds, and learns the name of someone, whom, having called him out, it may tear to pieces. It feigns the vomiting of a man, to lure the dogs which it may attack. By this one animal alone, it is said, sepulchres are dug up, in search of bodies. [They say] that in its eyes there are a thousand varieties and changes of colors; that at the touch of its shadow dogs grow dumb, and that, as by certain magic arts, every animal walked around three times by it sticks fast in its track; that by its coupling the Ethiopian Lioness bears the Leocrocuta, of which it will be spoken below.

Conclusion of §52 (the hyena's marvels). Margins: Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 6, ch. 34, On Generation; Aelian, On Animals, bk. ..., ch. 26.

12. THE LYCAON. Ethiopia sends forth the Lycaon, of the wolf kind, maned on the neck, and so various in many ways that they say no color is lacking to it. It is a fiction of the poets that Lycaon was a king of Arcadia, transformed into a wolf by Jove on account of his incredible impiety and cruelty. 13. THE FOX. 14. THE WEASEL. 15. THE CAT. In the province of Malabar there are wild cats, ranging in the trees. They are very strong in leaping, but there is a peculiar flight of theirs — and what is more wonderful, without wings. A membrane is stretched out from the front feet all the way to the hind ones, which, while they rest, they draw in toward the belly. When they set about to fly, the membrane being stretched out and gathered by the movement of feet and legs, they are both sustained and borne along. And wonderful is the appearance of them, as it were running through the air. Whether this species of flying Cats is different from the species of our [domestic] cats or not, I leave to learned men to estimate and judge.

§53–54. Lycaon, fox, weasel, and the ‘flying cats’ of Malabar. Margins: Solinus, ch. 33; Lycaon; Scaliger, Exercitationes 217; “Flying cats.”

16. THE DOG. Although these two animals — I mean the Cat and the Dog — pass their life even without flesh, and would not have required a proper place in the ark, since they could dwell in the habitation of men. 17. THE SEAL (sea-calf). 18. THE CROCODILE. But these two can live in the waters. 19. THE LEOCROCUTA. Pliny writes that the Leocrocuta is a most swift beast, of the size of a wild ass, with the neck of a deer; the neck, tail, and breast of a Lion; the head of a badger; a cloven hoof; the mouth slit open all the way to the ears; in place of teeth a continuous bone; wonderfully imitating human voices; generated from the Hyena and the Lioness. 20. THE EALE. Of the size of a river-horse (hippopotamus), with the tail of an Elephant, black or tawny in color, with the jaws of a boar, having movable horns larger than a cubit, which it sets up alternately in a fight, and varies them, threatening or oblique, as reason has shown it.

§54–56. Dog, seal, crocodile, leocrocuta, eale. Margins: Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 21; Leocrocuta; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 4; Eale.

21. THE BOA SERPENT. These serpents grow to such great size that, in the reign of Claudius, as Pliny relates, one of them, killed in the Vatican, was seen to have a whole infant in its belly. They are nourished at first by the juice of cow's milk (bubulum lac), whence they have drawn their name [Boa]. In the kingdom of Senegal serpents are born of ten feet in length, with so great a gape that they swallow a whole goat. In Calicut there are serpents with a head and thickness like a swine's, four-footed, with a long tail, smooth, ten feet in length, without venom, but nevertheless harmful, for they dispatch men with their teeth. MAN[TICORE?]…

§56–57. The boa and regional serpents (Senegal, Calicut). Margins: Boa; Scaliger, Exercitationes 183; “Serpents of [various] regions”; Calicut. Continues on p. 264.

— p. 264 (PDF) · printed p. 195 —

22. THE MANTICHORA, most greedily desiring human flesh. Whose savagery and truculence above all living creatures Aristotle describes in clear words, on the authority of Ctesias; and Pliny too, borrowing from him. 23. THE BULL WITH MOVABLE HORNS (taurus cornimobilis), living by hunting. Ethiopia brings forth this most atrocious [beast], larger than wild bulls, swiftest of all, tawny in color, with blue eyes, hair turned backward, with a gape opening to the ears, with movable horns beside [its head], with a hide of the hardness of flint, repelling every wound. It hunts all wild beasts; itself, not otherwise than caught in pits, always perishes [only] through its ferocity.

§57–58 (carnivore catalogue continued). Margins: Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 2; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 21; "Bull with movable horns."

24. THE CHAUS. 25. THE CEPHUS. The games of Pompey the Great first exhibited, says Pliny, the Chaus — which the Gauls called "Raphius" — of the appearance of a wolf, with the spots of Panthers. The same [games] displayed from Ethiopia those they call Cephi, whose hind feet were similar to human feet and legs, the fore [feet] to hands. This animal Rome did not see afterward. 26. THE CROCUTA, as if conceived from a dog and a wolf, breaking all things with its teeth, and forthwith digesting in its belly what it has devoured. 27. THE AXIS, a wild beast with the skin of a fawn, with many and whiter spots, sacred to father Liber [Bacchus], as Pliny says. 28. THE FERRET (viverra). This is a small animal of the weasel kind, which hunters use to draw rabbits out of their burrows and caves: read Pliny. 29. THE ICHNEUMON, which has a war of extermination with asps and Crocodiles: of these too, Pliny.

§59. Margins: Chaus; Crocuta; Pliny, bk. 8, chs. 19, 21, 24, 25, 55.

30. There is an animal called in the Slavonic tongue ROSSOMACA, as Olaus Magnus reports, named from its incredible voracity — which in Latin would be called "Helluo" (Glutton): whose thickness is like a great dog's, its ears and face like a Cat's, its feet and claws very rough, its body

shaggy with long hairs of a darkish color, its tail like a fox's (though shorter, but of denser hairs), whence the best winter coverings for the head are made. This animal, then, is most voracious. For when it has found a carcass, it devours so much that, by the violent feeding, its body is stretched out like a drum; and, having found a narrow place between trees, it squeezes itself in order to void [its bowels] more violently; and so, thinned out, it returns to the carcass and is filled up again to the utmost; and again it squeezes itself in the former narrow place, and returns to the carcass, until, that being consumed, it seeks another by anxious hunting. Its flesh is altogether useless for human food, but its hide is very serviceable and precious. So Olaus.

§60. The ‘Rossomaca’ (wolverine). Margins: Olaus Magnus, History of the Northern [peoples], bk. 18, ch. 7; Rossomaca.

There are, moreover, four [more] species of small animals that seek their food from the waters yet live on land: such as 31. THE LATAX, 32. THE BEAVER (fibris), 33. THE SATHERIUM, 34. THE SATYRIUM, 35. THE OTTER (lutra). Concerning which, see Aristotle and Pliny. There are, therefore, thirty-five aforesaid species of Carnivorous animals. But on account of some, perhaps, which have escaped the notice and diligence of us and of other writers, let us make them forty. Of animals of this kind, few are larger than wolves, and not many equal to them, but very many smaller: yet let us reduce them to the measure of wolves, so that, as regards the occupation of space in the Ark, they may be as forty pairs of wolves.

§61. End of the carnivore catalogue: 35 species, rounded to 40 ‘pairs of wolves.’ Margins: Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 8, ch. 25; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 30.

— p. 265 (PDF) · printed p. 196 —

NINTH DISPUTATION. On the non-carnivorous animals of great body that entered the Ark.

Of the non-carnivorous animals, and those excelling in size of body, there are many species, remarkable in many respects, which I, as I have them known from learned and diligent and curious writers, will here review by enumerating, with a brief explanation added of certain ones not known to all. 1. THE ELEPHANT. 2. THE ONE-HORNED OX. 3. THE RHINOCEROS. 4. THE MONOCEROS (unicorn). Of these two animals I have read nothing in Aristotle, so that they seem to have been unknown to him. But Pliny and Solinus describe [them] very briefly: first, that the Rhinoceros was seen at Rome in the Games of Pompey the Great; its color box-wood [yellowish], on its nostrils a single, turned-up horn, which it sharpens from time to time, rubbed on rocks, into a point, and with it fights against Elephants — smaller than they in size, but with shorter legs — the Rhinoceros by nature aiming with its weapon a little at the belly, which alone it understands to be penetrable by its blows.

§62. Margins: "Of the aforesaid animals 34 species are reckoned"; Pliny, bk. 8, chs. 20–21; Solinus, ch. 33.

The Monoceros one may likewise describe, from Pliny and Solinus, in this manner: a most atrocious monster, with a horrid bellowing, the body of a horse, the feet of an elephant, the tail of a pig, the head of a deer, a horn of wondrous splendor projecting from the middle of its forehead — of the length (according to Solinus) of four feet, or (according to Pliny) of two cubits — so sharp that whatever it attacks is easily pierced by its blow. Alive it does not come into the power of men, and it can indeed be killed, but cannot be captured. This description Cardano somewhat varies and amplifies: "The Monoceros," he says, "is a rare animal, of the size of a horse, with hair most like a weasel's, with the head of a deer, on which grows a single horn of three cubits in length, in the middle of the forehead and straight, but broad at the base, tapering to a point; a short neck, a very sparse mane tending to one side only; legs slender like a roe's, the outer part of the hind ones shaggy with much hair, a cloven hoof: in short, not unlike a deer, except for that single horn. It is a very wild animal, born in

Ethiopia among the solitudes and the squalid land filled with venomous animals. But its horn is believed, in a wonderful manner, to be of help against poisons."

§63. The unicorn/monoceros (Pliny, Solinus, Cardano). Margins: Solinus, ch. 35; Monoceros; Cardano, On Subtlety, bk. 10.

5. THE BUBALUS. Of the Bubalus Pliny writes only this: that it is an animal peculiar to Africa, of the likeness of a calf or a deer. But this kind of animal is now very well known and very frequent in Italy, commonly called "Buffalo," which Julius Scaliger describes eloquently: "It is," he says, "a kind of black ox, which the Italians now call Buffalo, of the greatest strength, of a lower stature than the ox, but of a more compact, broader, fuller, firmer body. Its horns are not so rounded as flattened, and not erect, but bent back downward[…]"

§64. The bubalus / Italian buffalo (Scaliger). Margins: Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 15; "Bubalus, commonly Buffalo"; Julius Scaliger, Exercitationes 206. Continues on p. 266.

— p. 266 (PDF) · printed p. 197 —

"…bent back: in even the tamed ones there is the greatest ferocity, which is corrected, while they are calves, by an iron ring inserted early into the nostrils, to which a little cord is attached for reins. That this is neither the Bubalis nor the Urus, I know: for we have both seen the horns of the Urus, and I understand by conjecture what the Bubalis is. Aristotle, in the third [book] On the Parts [of Animals], says that Bubali fight with their horns; but our Buffaloes by no means [do so], but with their heels, or rather with the pressure of their knees. For their horns are unfit for fighting, because they are turned backward with the point lowered." So Scaliger.

Conclusion of the Scaliger passage on the buffalo. Margin: Aristotle.

Moreover, the flesh of the bubalus is mentioned in the sacred writings as a dainty, wholesome, and by no means common food of man: for the bubalus is reckoned among the clean animals, on which alone it was lawful for the

Jews to feed; and the food of king Solomon consisted of the flesh both of other animals and also of bubali. Since, therefore, the flesh of the buffalo is not such as the flesh of the bubalus is signified to be in the sacred writings, it is necessary to make the Buffalo and the Bubalus different animals. But of bubali of this kind there is very little among the ancients: in Pliny only this, that it is generated in Africa, of the likeness of a calf or a deer, and is falsely called “Uri” by the ignorant common people; in Aristotle, that the blood of the bubalus, being next to that of the sheep, congeals somewhat more, and that the horns of bubali are sometimes useless, for though they resist against some [foes] and defend themselves with their horns, yet they flee from fierce and pugnacious beasts. More about these in Scaliger.

§65. The bubalus is a clean (edible) animal in Scripture — hence distinct from the buffalo. Margins: Lev. 11; Deut. 14; 3 Kings 4; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 15; Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 2, ch. 6 and Parts of Animals bk. 2, ch. 2; Scaliger, Exercitationes 206.

6. THE DOMESTIC OX. 7. THE DEER. 8. THE ASS. 9. THE WILD ASS (onager). The Onager has solid hooves, without horns. On the mountain that divides the kingdom of Narsinga from the Malabars, along with many other wild beasts, Onagers too are nourished, with the face of a horse, of an ashen color, so agile that they cannot easily be caught. The African Onagers too have such swiftness that scarcely any wild beasts yield to them in running; when a man is sighted, they stand in their tracks, then, braying, with their forefeet motionless, they kick out with their hind ones; when the hunter has come so near that he can touch them with his hand, they withdraw themselves in flight. Their flesh, cooked, while it is hot, stinks; cooled, it neither smells badly nor tastes well.

§66. Margins: Onager; Solinus, ch. 30.

The African [onagers], each one [male], rule over flocks of females; they fear rivals of their lust: hence it is that they guard their pregnant [females], so that, when males are born, if any opportunity arises, they may dock off by biting the hope of [their] generating; against which the females, taking

precaution, hide their births in secret places. From a mare and tamed Onagers are born mules swift in running, of exceptional hardness of foot, but of a lean body, with an untamed but noble spirit. [A mule] begotten of an onager and a she-ass surpasses all. The onagers in Phrygia and Lycaonia are the best; Africa boasts of their foals as excelling in taste, which they call “Lalisiones.” The onager, as a solitary-roaming animal that delights in solitude, divine Scripture names more than once.

Margin: Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 44.

10. THE BEAR. 11. THE SWINE. 12. THE WILD BOAR. 13. THE HIPPOPOTAMUS, that is, the river-horse — although for this, since it can live in the waters, a place in the Ark was not necessary. 14. THE PEGASUS, that is, a winged Horse armed with horns. 15. THE INDIAN ONE-HORNED OX. 16. THE ARABIAN CAMEL. 17. THE BACTRIAN CAMEL. 18. THE CAMEL called, from the swiftness of its running, “Dromas,” or commonly “Dromedary.”

§67. Continues on p. 267.

— p. 267 (PDF) · printed p. 198 —

19. THE CAMELOPARDALIS (giraffe), which the Ethiopians call “Nabis,” similar in neck to a horse, in feet and legs to an ox, with the head of a Camel, with white spots distinguishing a ruddy color: whence it is called Camelopardalis. It was first seen at Rome in the Circus-games of the Dictator Caesar. Since then it is seen from time to time, conspicuous more by its appearance than by ferocity: wherefore it has also found the name “wild Sheep.” So Pliny.

Continuation of §67 (the giraffe).

20. THE URUS (aurochs). Of the Uri, which are bred in the Hercynian forest of Germany, an elegant description is read in Caesar: “The third kind of wild beasts is of those that are called Uri. These are in size a little below Elephants, in appearance and color and shape [like] a bull: great is their

force and great their speed, nor do they spare almost anything they have caught sight of. These [men] zealously kill, caught in pits; to grow accustomed to men and to be tamed — not even the little ones excepted — they cannot." This [says] he [Caesar].

§68. Margins: Julius Caesar, Gallic War, bk. 6; Urus.

21. THE WILD HORSE. 22. THE WILD ASS. 23. THE BISON. In the Hercynian glade and in all the Northern region Bisons are very frequent — oxen similar to wild beasts, [shaggy], bristling on the necks with manes, flourishing in swiftness beyond bulls; captured, they cannot grow accustomed to the hand. 24. THE BONASUS. "They report in Paeonia," says Pliny, "a wild beast called Bonasus, with the mane of a horse, otherwise similar to a bull, with horns so curved in on themselves that they are not useful for fighting: wherefore [it] aids itself by flight, voiding in [its flight] dung sometimes even of the length of three iugera, the touch of which burns those who follow, like some fire." 25. THE ORYX. "Egypt," says Pliny, "calls the Oryx a wild beast, which it relates to stand opposite and gaze at the rising of the Dog-star, and, as it were, to adore it when it has sneezed."

§69. Margins: Solinus, ch. 23; Bison; Bonasus; Pliny, bk. 2, ch. 40; Solinus, ch. 33.

26. THE TARANDUS (reindeer). Ethiopia sends forth the Tarandus, of the size of oxen, with a cloven track, branching horns, the head of a deer, the color of a bear, and likewise with a deep [shaggy] coat. They say that it changes its appearance from fear, and, when it hides, becomes like whatever thing it has approached — whether that be white as a rock, or green as a thicket, or [whatever] other color it displays. This ought to seem more wonderful in the Tarandus than in man or other beasts that are not at all shaggy and have a soft skin, since the Tarandus's coat is bear-like and its hide impenetrable. Yet it changes itself, with its coat, and reproduces a thousand kinds of colors, to the utmost amazement of the beholders. Aelian makes it a Scythian animal, with the back and size of a bull, with a hide not

penetrable even by spikes.

§70. The ‘color-changing’ reindeer. Margins: Tarandus; Aelian, bk. 2, ch. 16; Pliny, bk. 10.

27. THE OSTRICH (struthiocamelus). This animal is African or Ethiopian, exceeding in height a rider sitting on a horse, and surpassing [it] in speed; its wings given to it for this end only, that they may aid it as it runs: for the rest, they are not flying creatures, nor are they lifted from the earth. Their hooves are similar to a deer's, cloven, useful for grasping stones, which in flight they hurl with their feet against pursuers. Of a wonderful nature in digesting what they have devoured without discrimination; but no less is their stupidity, in so great a height of the rest of their body, when, having hidden their necks in a bush, they think themselves concealed. Their eggs are prizes, held by some, on account of their size, for vessels; and their feathers adorn warlike crests and helmets. 28. THE TRA[GELAPHUS]…

§71. The ostrich. Continues on p. 268.

— p. 268 (PDF) · printed p. 199 —

28. THE TRAGELAPHUS (goat-stag), an animal of the appearance of a deer, differing only in its beard and the shagginess of its shoulders, and on that account named Tragelaphus; and born nowhere except beside the river Phasis, says Pliny in bk. 8, ch. 33. 29. THE HIPPELAPHUS. 30. THE HIPPARDIUM. Of these two animals Aristotle writes in this manner: “The Hippelaphus has enough mane upon the top of its shoulders — it received its name from the form, composed of horse and deer, that it has, as if it deserved to be called ‘horse-stag.’ Likewise the wild beast which is itself named Hippardium from the horse bears its forelocks in the same part. But each of this kind grows hair, in a very thin row of mane, from the head to the top of the shoulders. Proper to the horse-stag is the [tuft of] hair which hangs from its throat in the manner of a beard. Each bears horns, except the female of the horse-stag kind; and it has cloven feet. The size of the horse-stag does not differ from a deer's: it is begotten among the Arachotae.”

§ (cont.)–72. Margins: Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 33; Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 2, ch. 1; Hippelaphus.

31. THE ONE-HORNED ASS. Of this Aristotle [says]: “No animal both solid-hoofed and two-horned is yet known to us; but [an animal] solid-hoofed and at the same time one-horned exists, though rare, like the Indian ass, which alone in the solid-hoofed kind also possesses an ankle-bone.” 32. The Sardinians call a certain animal MUFLO (mouflon), and deny that it is found in any region other than Sardinia. It is similar to a deer both in coat and in size, strong likewise in running, with ram-like horns curved backward so that they pass round the ears. Its flesh is edible; it dwells in rough places. It is not the same as the Mufimon or as the Ibex.

§72 (continued)–73. Margins: Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 2, ch. 1; “One-horned ass”; Scaliger, Exercitationes 206; Muflo.

33. THE ANIMAL commonly called the GREAT ANIMAL. Under the North pole an animal is born similar to a Deer, with longer forelegs, having a fleshy proboscis — short, however — whose hoof, if hung from the neck, is believed able, if anything is, to heal the falling sickness (epilepsy). For, while the animal itself suffers from this disease (for it suffers from the falling sickness), it is not roused until it has brought the hoof of its hind foot to its ear: for then it is immediately roused from the disease. It is timid and weak beyond what could be believed, and dies from any least wound whatever. For it is of a most cold heart, and of a brain not only cold but overflowing with phlegm. It has horns endowed with a certain peculiar form, similar to almost no animal's: for, thick from the base where they rise, they are broader than a palm. It abounds among the Dacians and the neighboring regions, and they call it by the common name “Great animal.” But it differs very much from the Elk (Alces): for the Elk, as Caesar describes, is similar to a goat and has a spotted skin, and has legs without a joint; but of this [Great animal] we see the joints, and a skin similar to a Deer's. This [says] Cardano.

§74. The ‘Great animal’ (Cardano) — an elk/moose, distinguished from Caesar's Alces. Margins: Cardano, On Subtlety, bk. 10; Caesar, Gallic War, bk. 6.

34. AMONG the quadrupeds no animal seems more wonderful than that ox which the common people of the Spaniards call CORCOBADO — that is, “Humpbacked” — which is born in the region of Quivira, next to New Spain: living in herds, almost equal in size to our bulls, but with shorter horns, with hair of similar color, but on the front part (like a Lion's) longer; on the back too, after the manner of the mane of mares, very long and dense below the knees; on the forehead curly hair in the manner of [human] locks; they appear also bearded, so much hair stands out under the neck. It has the long neck of a calf, and on its head, as it were, a tuft; it has a hump on the back directly above the forefeet, like a Camel's…

§75. The American bison (Spanish ‘Corcobado’), from Cardano. Margins: Cardano, On Variety, bk. 7; Corcobado. Continues on p. 269.

— p. 269 (PDF) · printed p. 200 —

…it has a hump on its back directly above the forefeet, like a Camel's. An ugly animal altogether, in mouth and in its whole body: it runs, leaps, and strikes with its horns, so that horses dread and flee it; which [horses] it, when angered, pursues and kills. It is incredible to tell how many uses it furnishes to the natives. They drink its fresh blood in place of drink, and use it dried and congealed, diluting it with water, like milk; they eat its raw flesh, which serves them in place of bread and meat; they use its horns for cups, its bladder and stomach for vessels, its hide for wineskins; from its leather they make houses, ropes, shoes and clothes, from its bones weapons, from its sinews thicker threads, from its hair finer ones (for the hair is quite fine, like wool in certain parts of the body); with its dung they feed the fire into flame. And so this one animal serves the natives for almost all the uses of life.

Conclusion of §75 (the many uses of the bison to the natives).

These thirty-four species of non-carnivorous animals, notable for size of body, I have found among good authors. But because it is credible that some others were passed over by us and by the authors we have followed,

either through ignorance or forgetfulness, let us add to the aforesaid six others, and bring their number up to forty species, and make all the animals of this kind (as regards the size of body and the space of room which they required in the ark) equal to oxen: for although some of those animals are larger than they, yet most are smaller. Let us therefore suppose that all the animals of this order were as forty pairs of oxen.

End of the large-non-carnivore catalogue: 34 species, rounded to 40 ‘pairs of oxen.’

TENTH DISPUTATION. On the non-carnivorous and smaller animals.

There remains the third kind of terrestrial and quadruped animals, which, like the foregoing, is not carnivorous, but is yet much below them both in size of body and in strength. Of which animals these species are reckoned. 1. THE HEDGEHOG. 2. THE PORCUPINE (hystrix): India and Africa breed this, covered with spines, similar to a hedgehog; but the porcupine has longer quills, and, when it stretches its skin, missile [ones]: it fixes them in the mouths of dogs pressing upon it, and shoots them a little farther; in the winter months it hides itself. 3. THE DOMESTIC RABBIT. 4. THE WILD RABBIT. 5. THE BADGER (melis). It is called “melis” because it is an animal most greedy of honey (mel) and always hostile to beehives, living in caverns, rough, biting, of the size of a fox, of the color of a cat.

§76. The smaller-animal catalogue begins. Margins: Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 35; Melis.

6. THE DORMOUSE (glis). 7. THE SQUIRREL. “Another ingenuity, in fear, is in badgers,” says Pliny: “by the distension of their inflated skin they ward off the blows of men and the bites of dogs. Squirrels too foresee a storm: and, having blocked up their caverns on the side from which the wind is about to blow, they open doors on the other side. For the rest, their rather shaggy tail serves them as a covering.” “The Squirrel,” says Julius Scaliger too, “and the Dormouse some have rashly confused. The Squirrel

covers itself with its tail, is of a tawny color, grows ta[me]…”

§77. Margins: Squirrel; Scaliger, Exercitationes 210. Continues on p. 270.

— p. 270 (PDF) · printed p. 201 —

“…grows tame, chatters and plays in a buffoonish way. The Dormouse is ash-colored and edible, and is called ‘Eleios’ by Aristotle — which we call the Squirrel — not because it inverts or bends its tail, but because it wraps itself up in the hollows of trees, where, sleeping, it grows fat, as is in the eighth [book] of the Histories.” This [says] Scaliger.

Conclusion of the Scaliger passage (glis/sciurus). Margin: Aristotle. (Species 8 is not numbered in the original.)

9. THE MACHLIS. “The Elk (Alce),” says Pliny, “if the height of its ears and neck did not distinguish it, would be plainly similar to a beast of burden. Likewise [there is] in the island of Scandania a [creature] known but never seen in this [part of the] world, yet narrated by many — the Machlis — not unlike that [elk], but with no bending of the hams: and therefore not lying down, but leaning against a tree in sleep; and the tree being cut, it is caught by an ambush — otherwise of memorable swiftness.” But what Pliny adds, that it has a very large upper lip, and on that account walks backward in feeding, lest, tending forward, it be entangled — this Solinus attributes to the Elk, not to the Machlis. The Plinian description of the Machlis is most similar to the Caesarian description of the Elk, so that, by the best conjecture, Scaliger has thought it to be the same kind of beast — the Elk to Caesar, and the Machlis to Pliny.

§78. Margins: Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 15; Machlis; Solinus, ch. 23; Scaliger, Exercitationes 206; Caesar, Gallic War, bk. 6. (The unjointed-leg elk is a recurring ancient fable.)

For Caesar describes the Elk in this manner: “There are likewise [animals] which are called Elks. Their shape and the variety of their hides are like a goat's, but they exceed it a little in size; and they are mutilated as to horns [hornless], and have legs without knots and joints; nor do they lie down to

rest, nor, if struck down by any chance they have fallen, can they raise or lift themselves up. To them trees serve as beds; they lean against them, and thus, reclining only a little, take their rest: and when from their tracks it has been noticed by hunters where they are accustomed to betake themselves, they either undermine all the trees in that place at the roots, or cut them through, only so far that the upper appearance of them standing is left; and when [the elks] by habit have reclined against these, they bring down the weak trees by their weight, and themselves fall down together with them." This [says] Caesar.

§79. Caesar's account of the joint-less elk. Margin: Alces.

10, 11, 12, 13. Of SHEEP and RAMS, both of the tame and of the wild and field kinds, four species are read. In the deserts of Adimayn in Libya there is an animal of ram-like form and the size of a small ass, tolerant of a rider — although it is kept not for that use, but for its milk. Contrary to ours, the females have horns, the males none. If this shall seem to be different in species from the others, let it be reckoned the 14th species. 15. THE MOUSE, of which there are various species. "There are several kinds of mice," says Pliny, "in the Cyrenaic region — some with a broad forehead, others with a sharp one, others of the hedgehog kind with pricking hairs." The same: "The Pontic mice too hide themselves in winter, these only white. The Alpine ones too hide themselves, which are of the size of badgers. Equal to these are also [some] in Egypt: and similarly they sit on their haunches, and walk on two feet, and use their front [feet] as hands." But almost all [mice], without distinction, can be generated both from their like and from putrid matter; wherefore that kind of animal was not necessary to be preserved in the ark.

§80–81. Sheep/rams and mice (mice excused from the ark, as spontaneously generable). Margins: Scaliger, Exercitationes 217; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 57.

16. THE HARE. 17. THE WHITE HARE, dwelling in the Alps. 18. THE DASYPUS, of the hare kind. Of these Pliny writes in this manner: "There

are several kinds of hares. In the Alps [there are] white ones, which they believe to have snow for food in the winter months; certainly, when it melts, they grow ruddy every year; and it is otherwise an animal nourished in intolerable cold. Of the hare kind are also those which Spain calls ‘Cuniculi’ (rabbits), of innumerable fecundity, and bringing famine to the Balearic islands by ravaging the harvests.”

§82. Margins: Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 52; Dasypus. Continues on p. 271.

— p. 271 (PDF) · printed p. 202 —

…by ravaging the harvests. Nature, kindly in this regard, has generated harmless and edible animals fecund. The hare, born the prey of all, alone besides the Dasypus superfetates — rearing one [young], while bearing at the same time another clothed with hair in the womb, another unfledged, another [only] begun.

Conclusion of §82 (the hare's superfetation).

19. THE APE (simia). 20. THE CAEBUS. 21. THE CYNOCEPHALUS, or “Dog-head.” 22. THE CERCOPITHECUS (long-tailed monkey). These are the four species of apes. See Aristotle in the book On the History of Animals. It pleases [me], for a more illustrious exposition of this kind of animals and for the reader's delight, to recall here what Scaliger has left in writing: “You attribute to the Cercopithecus the size of a man (he addresses Cardano), which I have neither seen nor read nor heard — unless you, perhaps, when you wrote these things, were measuring the Conopas recalled from memory. We have seen several tailless apes, as big as a boy of eight years, the male too and the female with their offspring. If the little son seemed to want anything, the female would be chastised by the husband with hand and fist, as though guilty of bad treatment, with even an added sourness of countenance: namely, by brow, gape, [and] murmur, displaying the temper of an angry father and a reproving husband.”

§83. The four ape-species and Scaliger's anecdotes. Margins: “Four kinds of apes”; Aristotle, Hist. anim. ch. 8; Scaliger, Exercitationes 213.

“Many things are read in books of travels (for so they are entitled): that in the interior of India [apes] huge in body, bold yet civil, pass to and fro — not only through the fields but also through the towns, in the markets — without harm or offense to the citizens. There are so many species of them, differing in form, color, tail, manes, and size, that it gives no little trouble to one meditating the order of [their] natural history. This, however, in the Aristotelian books, as I think, we have rendered well enough. In the Troglodyte country they are maned, after the manner of Lions, of the height of a very large wether. We saw one bearded Cynocephalus, foul in aspect, black, mischievous, infamous in habits; the Gauls call that kind ‘the great Magus.’ In the king's court there was one who for a long time walked on two feet, clothed in a little military cloak, girt with a little sword; bidden [to sit] on a chair, it kept itself [there] all night or all day, for a public spectacle, so that there were not lacking those who thought it a real little man.”

Scaliger on the apes of India and the Troglodyte country, and a courtly cynocephalus.

“The Moors call the ape ‘Bugia,’ we call it ‘Mona.’ Of the Cercopitheci there is such variety that it confounds the memory. We call the greenish, malignant ones ‘Maimon cats.’ These we have seen gnaw off for themselves the extreme parts of their tails; this, they said, was done only by those which had at some time tasted flesh. They are said to be white in some places. We have seen black ones with white spots, of a graver tone of voice; saffron-colored, tawny, dark, small, large, middling — all agile and mischievous. The greatest imitators, and the most ingenious of all, [are] those which smell well. Of their middle nature, whereby the biped is mingled with the quadruped, [there is] enough in Aristotle.” This [says] Scaliger.

Conclusion of Scaliger's ape-discourse.

It must not be omitted here what Cardano relates of the CERCOPITHECUS: “The Cercopithecus,” he says, “is rare in form, of the size and form of a man: since by its legs, its virile member, and its face you would call it a wild man, because it is all covered with hair. Of all animals most, except man, it persists in standing; it loves boys and women after the manner of men, and seeks their embraces and intercourse, as we have seen. Yet it is a wild animal, but of such cleverness that many among barbarous men seem to be less strong in intelligence.” So Cardano. 23. The Greeks call ALLOPECOPITICON an animal born in Ethiopia, in its front part [like] a fox, in tail and hind part [like] a Cercopithecus, in the forefeet [like] human ones, in the ears similar to a bat; having, as it were, a pouch under its belly, in which it carries its young, and does not let them out except when it wishes to suckle [them].

§84–85. The man-like cercopithecus (Cardano) and the ‘Allopecopiticon’ (a marsupial). Margins: Cardano, On Subtlety, bk. 10; Allopecopiticon. Continues on p. 272.

— p. 272 (PDF) · printed p. 203 —

24. THE CHIURCA. The West Indies bring forth the Chiurca, of the weasel kind; it has the face and size of a ferret, with a fox-like head. It lives under the earth, of wonderful fecundity; it bears twelve tiny [young]; its tail is slender, almost hairless, itself of black hair; it carries its young with it in a pouch stretched under its belly. 25. THE TATO. In Brazil it is called a “little pig,” with a snout somewhat more contracted and broader. Shell-covered [with little plates], armored down to the belly, which, drawing itself back, composes itself into a ball, just like a Hedgehog; its tail-covering is very long and, as it were, lizard-like, encrusted in little squares.

§85 (cont.)–86. The opossum-like ‘Chiurca’ and the armadillo (‘Tato’) of the New World. Margins: Scaliger, Exercitationes 206; Cardano, On Subtlety, bk. 10; Chiurca; Tato.

There follow eight or even more species of Goats: so that there is 26. THE DOMESTIC GOAT, 27. (of the wild kinds) the one commonly called the

ROE (caprea), 28. THE CHAMOIS (rupicaprea), 29. THE IBEX, 30. THE ORYX, 31. THE DAMA (fallow deer), 32. THE PYGARGUS, 33. THE STREPSICEROS. Of these Pliny [says]: “Goats are transfigured into very many likenesses. There are roes, there are chamois, there are ibexes of wonderful swiftness, although their head is loaded with vast horns like the sheaths of swords: upon these they balance themselves, as if whirled by some catapult, onto the rocks — especially when seeking to leap across from one mountain to another — and by the rebound they bound more swiftly wherever they please. There are also Oryges, said by some to be alone clothed with hair turned the contrary way and toward the head. There are also Damae and Pygargi and Strepsiceroses, and many others not unlike, but the Alps send the former, transmarine regions the latter.”

§87. The goat-kinds (Pliny). Margins: Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 53; “Eight species of goats, several of them admirable.”

But this narration of Pliny, as restricted by excessive brevity more than is fair, and meager and dry, Scaliger amplifies and illustrates, recounting the manifold kind of goats more subtly and distinctly: whose discourse (by no means prolix, seasoned with learned and pleasant variety, and likely to please the reader) it has pleased me to append here. “Pliny,” says he, “while he is eager to leave nothing untouched, headlong with importunate haste, sets before the guests, in place of dishes, [mere] titles; or the things he touches on briefly about the herd of goats leave behind not so much a desire of the subjects as a distaste at the confused judgment. This we have, as we could, so arranged. The Goat is called by the Barbarians ‘Wild Capricorn’; among the Latins it is a name of the genus; and [there is] the Chamois (Rupicapra), of which there are two species: the Ibex, and the one called ‘caprea’ (the common people call it ‘camucia,’ Varro calls it ‘Rotae’ — which bolder [scholars] have corrupted, with the letters increased, when they bid it be read ‘Platycerotae’).”

§88. Scaliger's expansion of Pliny on goats. Margins: Scaliger, Exercitationes 207; “Wonders about Ibexes.”

“In the natural history of Ibexes there is a subtlety both manifold and pleasant. The first: that unless it dwells in cold places, it goes blind. The second: that the horn of old ones has weighed eighteen pounds; in some, the knots counted are twenty-four, by conjecture as many years — which does not happen to the deer, for after the sixth year they branch no more numerously; indeed, the old ones lack those branches which come forth at the very first age. The third subtlety: that Ibexes, caught in an open and free place and with room to run, rush upon the hunter and cast him from the rock; wherefore [hunters] take care that, covered by the screen of crags, they may appear suddenly; then, there being no room for the ibexes to attack, they lose heart and easily yield. The fourth: since by that incredible balancing and hurling of the body they surpass the highest rocks, they cross over by a secure leap intervals formidable even by the mere sight.”

Scaliger's four ‘subtleties’ about ibexes. Continues on p. 273.

— p. 273 (PDF) · printed p. 204 —

Roes (Capreae) [are] far smaller, in summer of tawny hair, in winter of ashen. These are not “Cemades,” as some pursuers of shadowy words have thought. The “Cemas” is among Deer what among Oxen are the “Iunix” and the “Iuvencus,” or the “Bucula” or the calf [i.e., the young]; the Franks call them “Faones.” Roes too [have] incredible leaps. Their wonderful prudence has been ascertained by us: when, wandering, they seek new abodes or pastures, having examined the nearest rock, with a foot put forward they often test its trustworthiness — namely, whether it be loose, or perhaps slippery. This [shows their] eagerness: in the hall of my uncle Boniface we saw tame ones leap up at the hanging tapestries, on which were woven similar wild beasts. They say [they scratch], with the points of their horns — which we see goats too do — their back. It is believed that they are flooded with such pleasure in that scratching that the very tip of the horn is driven into the hide so far that it cannot be drawn back; wherefore they either fall from the highest places and are dashed to pieces, or, perhaps caught by hunters or observed from afar, are taken, or perish of

hunger.

§89. Scaliger on roe-deer. Margin: Caprea.

From this the Dama (fallow deer) differs little, only in the bending of the horns, for these point forward; with which supports, as with a hook, [it is said] to grasp the projecting rocks, and not otherwise to surmount the inaccessible warts (crags) of the mountains. Wholly different in kind are the Strepsiceroses, of the sheep kind, with erect horns knotted like little tendrils. Nor is the Tragelaphus a fable, since [it is] a He-goat in face and horns, a Deer in size, hair, tail, [and] haunches; its chest is covered with a thickness of hairs, so that thence too it is a he-goat — as if the Arunchus had passed into them. If the Philosopher [Aristotle] were to describe the horns of his Hippelaphus, we should understand whether it were the same as the Tragelaphus or the Tarandus. So Scaliger.

§90. Dama, strepsiceros, and the (real, not fabulous) tragelaphus. Margins: Tragelaphus; Aristotle, Hist. anim. bk. 2, ch. 1.

34. There is said to be an animal of various kind and uncertain nature, not yet called by any fixed name, which Cardano testifies that he beheld and considered with his own eyes; wherefore I have here appended the description of that animal taken from Cardano: “We saw at Pavia,” he says, “an animal of a quite various kind and uncertain nature, somewhat longer than the size of a fox, with a hare-like mouth and gape with long hairs, and two very long teeth (projecting, indeed, the length of a human finger, after the manner of a Squirrel), with serpentine eyes (since they lacked corners and were black). There was on its head a cap most like a goat's beard, but no otherwise than the crest [is] to a Peacock. Its hair was weasel-like and beautiful, except that over the neck it appeared like white wool; its forefeet like a Badger's, its ears and hind feet differing in nothing from human ones, except that on its feet there was a bear's claw in place of a human [nail].”

§91. Cardano's eyewitness ‘animal of uncertain nature’ at Pavia. Margins: Cardano, On Variety, bk. 7; “Uncertain animals, but of a quite wonderful nature.”

“On its back and hindmost part [there were] about a hundred spines, like a Porcupine's, some of which curved at the tip, and projected, otherwise immovable, nor (as they report of the Porcupine) missile: when it moved, they made a noise as they collided with each other. Its tail was goose-like, but the feathers ended in spines. If you did not see the rest, you would call it a goose: with white and ashen settings of feathers and a broad eye rivaling a goose; its voice somewhat obscure and hoarse, as of a barking dog. An irascible animal, but one which nevertheless was easily handled by the mountebank. It pursued dogs with the greatest hatred. It was of the female sex, as I saw, of youthful age. It had no drink; its food was bread moistened with water. This animal I should scarcely believe to be of its own kind, but generated from a Porcupine and some other [creature], as it were a bear.” This [says] Cardano.

Conclusion of §91 (the porcupine-like ‘mystery animal’).

35. THE MARMOT is of the size and coat of a Badger, with almost no tail likewise, and similarly short legs, very short ears, with the little ears very stubby and to the sight none…

§92. The marmot begins. Margin: Scaliger, Exercitationes 202. Continues on p. 274.

— p. 274 (PDF) · printed p. 205 —

…none. Their claws [are] long, sharp, firm, hooked, sturdy, black. This only they have in common with mice: that, like Squirrels, sitting up, they use their forefeet for the offices of hands. In head not unlike hares, in length of sleep agreeing with dormice — for they pass almost the whole winter months in slumber. They resemble the teeth of mice and hares; they are not fierce unless provoked. Their voice departs from the hare's into the shrew's, or rather into the monkey's. This [says] Scaliger.

§92 (concluded): the marmot, completing the entry begun on p. 273. Margin: Marmota.

36. There is in the Japanese islands an animal — unknown to me indeed by name — of admirable instinct and nature. It is terrestrial, and in size and

shape of body not unlike a dog, with very soft hair and flesh most pleasant for eating. This animal, at a certain time, is seized by a wondrous desire of going to and frequenting the sea: in which, repeatedly swimming and plunging itself, it gradually, part by part and limb by limb, becomes a fish — until, the shape of a land animal being wholly put off, it is at last entirely changed into the likeness and nature of a fish. We have spoken of this in the fifth book of our Commentaries on Daniel, in the disputation on the transmutation of king Nebuchadnezzar into a beast. We ourselves saw this animal, but dead, brought to Rome in the Pontificate of Gregory XIII — not yet wholly, but only in some parts made a fish, in the rest retaining the native shape and bodily habit of a land animal.

§93. The ‘Japanese animal’ said to turn into a fish. Margins: “Japanese animal”; Dan. 4.

37. THE AIOTOCHELI. In New Spain, beside the river Alvarado, is born this quadruped animal, no bigger than a cat, having the snout of a duck, the feet of a hedgehog, a long neck: it is covered, like a caparisoned horse, with shells inserted one into another — not with one [shell], like tortoises — having its neck and head covered with the same shells, so that only its ears project: whence by the Spaniards it is called “the Armored” or “the Covered.” There are those who report that it grunts like a pig, and has the snout of a pig, and a cloven hoof but as it were equine. That name signifies, in the language of the Indians, “Gourd-Rabbit.” This [says] Cardano.

§94. The armadillo (‘Aiotocheli’) of New Spain. Margins: Cardano, On Variety, bk. 7, ch. 33; Aiotocheli.

Thus far we have collected thirty-seven species of animals neither Carnivorous nor of great body. But on account of some perhaps here omitted, let us increase that number up to forty; and let us reduce the size of all that are of this kind to the measure of the size of sheep. For very few pairs of this kind are equal to sheep, much less larger, but most are smaller: let all the species of this kind therefore be reckoned as, so to speak, forty pairs of sheep.

End of the smaller-animal catalogue: 37 species, rounded to ‘40 pairs of sheep.’

ELEVENTH DISPUTATION. Whether in the ark of Noah there was that bird which is called the Phoenix.

But that question must not here be passed over: whether in the ark of Noah there was the bird named Phoenix, celebrated by the proclamation of many writers even to a miracle and beyond belief. For if anyone considers with himself the things reported about the Phoenix, he will find them to be such that they seem able to generate contrary opinions on that question.

§95. Continues on p. 275.

— p. 275 (PDF) · printed p. 206 —

For the Phoenix is said to be the only one in all the world, nor were there more than one at any time on earth. It is therefore a singular and solitary bird, without a mate, either male or female: but whatever animals entered the ark had the distinction of sex into male and female. For from every species of animals God commanded two to be taken, that is, the male and the female. The Phoenix, therefore, in which there is no distinction of sex, was not in the ark. But, on the contrary, we are compelled to confess that it was in the ark, by this reasoning: that they relate the Phoenix to be generated no otherwise than from the embers or ashes of a dead Phoenix. Therefore the Phoenix can be generated only from a Phoenix — though not immediately, yet mediately: wherefore, if it had not been in the ark, its species would have perished in the flood.

The two contrary arguments on the Phoenix. Margin: Gen. 6.

My opinion (to indicate it to the reader in a few words) is this: that all the things narrated about the Phoenix seem to me of very doubtful truth. I would say something more, did not the authority of St. Ambrose compel me to speak sparingly and modestly on the matter — Ambrose, who, in the Oration which he wrote on the Faith of the resurrection, says that the history of the Phoenix is known and approved by frequent report and by the

authority of the scriptures. There holds me, besides, the reverence of the ancient Fathers, who proved the future resurrection of the dead by the example and argument of the Phoenix at once: although they, using the things reported about the Phoenix and granted by the wise men of the pagans, wisely used them against those very [pagans] to confirm the faith of the resurrection. But let others think as they please; I confess frankly that I can scarcely, scarcely even, be brought to accommodate assent and belief to the history of the Phoenix.

§96. Pererius's own (skeptical) view, held back by reverence for Ambrose and the Fathers. Margins: "The author's opinion"; Ambrose.

I have hitherto heard no one, read no one (who is to be believed) who says that he has seen a Phoenix — unless perhaps in a picture, in which we also behold Hippocentaurs, Chimaeras, and things that can in no way exist, depicted. Indeed, both Greeks and Latins received the history of the Phoenix from the Egyptians: and who does not know that Egypt was once most fertile of ever-new fictions and lies, as Africa [is] of new animals and monsters? Pliny certainly does not conceal that the things handed down about the Phoenix do not seem to him likely. "Before all birds," he says, "Arabia produces the noble Phoenix (I do not know whether fabulously) — one in the whole world, and not much seen: of the size of an eagle, with the gleam of gold about the neck, the rest purple, with blue feathers distinguishing the tail, with crests honoring the face and head with a feathery tuft."

Margin: Pliny, bk. 10, ch. 2.

Tacitus likewise testifies that the things published about the Phoenix are uncertain and augmented by fabulous marvels: at which place he affirms that, with Tiberius as princeps and in the consulship of Paulus Fabius and Lucius Vitellius (in the year 787 from the founding of the city), it became widely reported that a Phoenix had been seen in Egypt after a long circuit of ages, and that it furnished material to the most learned of the natives and

of the Greeks for discoursing much about that marvel. But because in it neither the age, nor the native soil, nor many other things agreed with those that ancient memory had established about the Phoenix, therefore many thought it had been a false Phoenix. Cornelius too…

Margins: Tacitus, Annals, bk. 6. Continues on p. 276.

— p. 276 (PDF) · printed p. 207 —

…Cornelius Valerianus relates that a Phoenix flew down into Egypt in the consulship of Q. Plautius and Sex. Papinius; and it was brought even into the city [Rome], during the censorship of the emperor Claudius, in the 800th year of the city, and displayed in the Comitium — which is attested by the [public] records — but which no one would doubt to have been a false Phoenix.

Margin: Pliny, in the place cited.

But what of more recent [writers], whose concern it was to investigate these things curiously and diligently? They thought these things no less fabulous. “Many have proclaimed the Phoenix a bird,” says Cardano, “nearer to fable than to truth. Some, however, report that in the interior of India there is a bird by the name of Semenda, which has a beak with a triple row, and (as in lamp-wicks) perforated on every side, with which, about to die, it sings sweetly after the manner of Swans; then, sticks being collected, it kindles them by the motion of its wings, and is burned: from whose ash a worm, and then from the worm a bird, is born again.” But Scaliger [says]: “That the Phoenix is not entirely fabulous, we read in the Commentaries of voyages, that it is found in the interior parts of India (it is called Semenda by the inhabitants). But an added lie diminishes the credit of this history: for they say it has a three-piped beak, from which it emits a musical sound, in imitation of which shepherds have composed an instrument not unpleasant.”

The ‘Semenda’ of India (Cardano, Scaliger). Margins: Cardano, On Subtlety, bk. 10; Scaliger, Exercitationes 223.

Nor do we lack a philosophical reason, by no means weak, for overturning the credit of that history. For there is no species of corruptible things which does not at all times have many individuals at once. Let the reader survey and run over in thought the species of animals, plants, metals, stones — of all things, in short, upon which generation and decay fall — and he will plainly recognize that what I have said is true. And indeed this was most rightly provided and arranged by nature — or (what is truer to say) by God himself, the maker and ruler of all nature: namely, lest, if any species were contained in only one corruptible individual, when that was destroyed before the generation of another (and it could be destroyed for many causes), the species itself should at the same time perish. Wherefore the species of incorruptible things have only one individual: there is one Sun, one Moon likewise, and the other Planets, each one in its own species. For the whole nature of the species is expressly represented in one incorruptible individual, and its eternity is best preserved.

§97. The philosophical refutation: only incorruptible things (sun, moon, planets) are unique in their species. Margin: “A reason by which it is shown that there is not one Phoenix only among the birds.”

But if the stars of the eighth heaven which are called fixed are either all of the same species, or certainly many [of the same], this was done on account of the very great distance of that sphere from the earth. For since that sphere is the most noble, and has the chief efficiency — or (as it is the custom to speak in the schools) causality — upon sublunary things, in order that its force and efficacy might be ampler and more copious and more powerful, it was furnished and crowded with many stars of the same species. If these things are true, as they seem most true, who would believe that the species of the Phoenix (noble before all the species of birds) is contained in only one individual, and that one, before the generation of another, liable to various chances of death? For since the Phoenix is mortal, and during the five hundred years which it is said to live manifold

destruction from various things could befall it, it would be necessary for that species of bird to be perpetually engaged in the utmost peril of its own extinction. That there is therefore only one Phoenix on earth seems like a fiction, and plainly incredible.

Continuation of §97; the fixed stars exception. Continues on p. 277.

— p. 277 (PDF) · printed p. 208 —

…seems plainly incredible.

Completes the sentence of §97.

But if perchance the old and widely spread history of the Phoenix should please the reader, and he does not utterly reject its credit, it will be easy for us to reply: that, granted the truth of its history, it must necessarily be confessed that the Phoenix (no otherwise than the other animals about which it was explained above) was in the Ark. This I will make plain from the singular and admirable manner of generation of that bird, which we have received described by authors. “Of the Birds,” says Pomponius Mela, “the Phoenix is chiefly to be reported, ever unique: for it is not conceived by coition, nor generated by birth, but when it has lasted, perpetual, for a span of five hundred years, it broods upon a pile heaped up for itself with various spices, and is dissolved; then, growing together from the decay of its putrefying members, it conceives itself, and from itself is born again. When it has grown up, it carries off to Egypt the bones of its former body enclosed in myrrh, and, bearing them into the city which they call [the city] of the Sun, on a pyre fragrant with nard, consecrates them with a memorable funeral.”

§98. If the Phoenix is real, it too was in the Ark (since it is generated only from a prior Phoenix). Margins: “What the generation of the Phoenix is like”; Pomponius Mela, bk. 3, ch. 9.

Pliny says that, now growing old, after the years of its life — six hundred and sixty — are completed, it builds a nest of twigs of cassia and frankincense, fills it with spices, and dies upon it; then from its bones and

marrow there is born first, as it were, a little worm, and thence becomes a chick; and first it renders the due rites to the former funeral, and carries the whole nest near Panchaia into the city of the Sun, and there deposits it on an altar. Most aptly, therefore, did St. Ambrose say that the Phoenix is ignorant of bodily coition, knows not the allurements of lust, but rises from its own pyre — a bird surviving itself, both its own heir and the offspring of its own body and ash. Elsewhere he says that the Phoenix is restored by the revived moisture of its own flesh, and, when it has died, lives again: for [he says] that it enters and dies in a casket adorned for itself by itself with frankincense, myrrh, and other spices, the span of five hundred years prefixed for its living being completed; and that from its moisture there soon arises a worm, and that it gradually grows together into the shape of that bird and is formed into sight.

Pliny and Ambrose on the Phoenix's self-generation. Margins: Pliny, bk. 10, ch. 2; Ambrose, on Psalm 118 and in the Oration on the Faith of the Resurrection.

And these things, indeed, we have received committed to writing by ancient authors concerning the generation of the Phoenix. If, therefore, the Phoenix can be generated in no other way than from the decay, or the embers or ashes, or other remains of a former dead Phoenix, it is certainly established that the Phoenix can be generated only from a Phoenix (if not immediately, certainly mediately). Wherefore, if there were no Phoenix, no Phoenix could be generated either, since the one being born necessarily succeeds the one dying. Hence one may conclude: if there was no Phoenix in the ark of Noah, its species was utterly and forever extinguished by the flood — unless one wishes to imagine that, as at the beginning of the world, so after the flood, the species of the Phoenix was again created, beyond the order and course of nature, by the omnipotence of God alone. But someone will say: that all the animals that were in the ark had the distinction of sex into male and female; and since this distinction is not in the Phoenix, it follows from this that it was not in the ark. But this is easily solved. For because in all the other species of animals (the one Phoenix

excepted) two of each species were taken, that is, a male and a female, therefore Moses said simply, absolutely, and generally [that] two of each species…

§99. The conclusion, and the objection from sex-distinction. Margins: Doubt; Solution. Continues on p. 278.

— p. 278 (PDF) · printed p. 209 —

…that is, a male and a female, entered the ark. Therefore that statement of Moses, like several others in the sacred writings, although generally stated, is nevertheless to be interpreted not of all simply and entirely, but ‘nearly [all]’ (that is, the Phoenix excepted). But the distinction of male and female was required there and commanded by God for this reason: that by the mingling of both sexes the species of animals were to be perpetuated and multiplied after the flood. But the Phoenix is generated and propagated not by the mingling of sex, but by a certain peculiar and singular manner: wherefore the distinction of sex ought not to have a place in it. But enough about this question.

Resolution of the Phoenix objection (Moses' ‘two of each’ is general, the Phoenix excepted).

TWELFTH DISPUTATION. Whether there could have been sufficient room in the Ark for taking in all the aforesaid animals and preserving them for one year.

In the four foregoing disputations we have reviewed, of the four kinds of terrestrial animals that entered the ark, one hundred and fifty species: that is, thirty of reptiles, forty of carnivorous quadrupeds, forty of non-carnivorous and large-bodied, and finally forty of neither carnivorous nor large-bodied. And to each of the aforesaid species we assigned one pair of animals, that is, a male and a female. And the Reptiles indeed cause no trouble, because most occupied either very little room in the Ark, or even none, since they could be contained in holes and, as it were, caverns hollowed out in the very beams and timber. The Carnivores we reduced to

the measure of forty pairs of wolves; the non-carnivorous and large-bodied to the measure of forty pairs of oxen; and likewise the non-carnivorous of smaller body to the measure of forty pairs of sheep. But to these it is necessary to add, besides, another twenty-five pairs of clean animals: for God commanded seven to be taken of each species of clean animals, whereas we above assigned only two to each species.

§100. The tally: 150 species (4 classes × ~40) + the extra clean animals. Margins: Gen. 6 & 7.

But which are the clean animals? This God declared in Deuteronomy, defining a clean animal to be one which chews the cud and has a divided hoof. It was not enough to have one or the other, but it had to be endowed with both. For although the Camel, the hare, and the Cherogryllus (rock-badger) chew the cud, yet because they do not divide the hoof; and the Swine, though it has a divided hoof, yet because it does not chew the cud: all these were reckoned unclea[n]…

§101. The Deuteronomic definition of clean animals. Margins: "Which animals were formerly clean"; Deut. 14. Continues on p. 279.

— p. 279 (PDF) · printed p. 210 —

…unclean. But which animals chew the cud, Aristotle briefly indicates at the end of the ninth book of the History of Animals: "Animals," he says, "which lack the upper row of teeth take no less delight in chewing the cud than in eating. And those chew the cud which lack the upper row of teeth, like oxen, sheep, goats; of wild beasts, none is yet known to chew the cud, except those which sometimes live with men, like the deer — for that this chews the cud is plain. They all especially lie down when they chew the cud, and chew the cud especially in the winter months; those that are kept under roofs do this for about seven months. The gregarious ones chew the cud more lightly and for a shorter time, since they feed outside. There are also some among those toothed on both sides which chew the cud, like the Pontic mice, and the fish which from this circumstance some have called the 'Ruminal.'" This [says] Aristotle.

Aristotle on which animals chew the cud. Margin: Aristotle.

But which and how many were the species of clean terrestrial animals, there is no room for doubt. For in the fourteenth chapter of Deuteronomy God defined and established these ten species of clean terrestrial animals: the Ox, the Sheep, the Goat, the Deer, the Roe, the Bubalus, the Tragelaphus, the Pygargus, the Oryx, and the Camelopardalis. Of each one of these ten species, seven were received into the ark by God's command. Since, therefore, we above assigned only two animals to each of those ten species, it is necessary to add to them, besides, another five: and ten times five is fifty, that is, twenty-five pairs; which, joined to the aforesaid one hundred and fifty, make the number of all the animals that entered the ark one hundred and seventy-five pairs.

The ten clean species (Deut. 14); the tally reaches 175 pairs.

But, to act more amply and liberally, let us amplify and extend the number even up to two hundred pairs of animals: from this number, if there be subtracted thirty pairs of reptiles, which needed either no room or very little within the space of the Ark (as was said above), then the whole interior space of the Ark pertaining to the habitation of animals must have been capable of one hundred and sixty pairs of animals — that is, for example, fifty pairs of wolves, sixty pairs of oxen, and sixty pairs of sheep: for these we have set down for all the carnivores, and for the non-carnivorous of large body, and for the non-carnivorous endowed with smaller body.

Rounding generously to 200 pairs (160 needing room).

It follows next that we should show that the Ark was abundantly capacious of all these animals. Above, in book 10, in that part of the Ark which we destined for the habitation of animals, we measured out three hundred dwellings: each of which was eight or nine cubits high, six long, and as many wide — in which place, indeed, there are very few animals one pair

of which would require a larger [space], but very many can be contained in a far smaller one. Assigning, therefore, to the aforesaid one hundred and seventy pairs of animals as many dwellings, there will remain one hundred and thirty dwellings, from which one may take however much shall be needed, whether more species of animals than the aforesaid be found, or it be necessary to assign roomier spaces to several. So far, therefore, is it from being the case that room was lacking in the Ark for containing the animals that entered it, that much room even remained over in it…

§102. The capacity proof: 300 dwellings vs. 170 pairs ⇒ 130 to spare. Margin: "That the Ark of Noah was capacious of all the animals said to be received into it." Continues on p. 280.

— p. 280 (PDF) · printed p. 211 —

…remained over. But here happens what also befalls many who look up at the number of the stars, and contemplate them confusedly and without any Astronomical skill. For at first sight they seem innumerable, and it [seems] incredible — what has been reported by the Mathematicians — that the stars notable to sight are not more than one thousand and twenty-two in the heaven. Yet if anyone has this number of stars handed down by the Mathematicians depicted on some globe, and compares each of those stars distinctly and properly with those that are discerned in the heaven, he will find plainly no [star] notable to sight in the heaven which he does not have expressed on the globe; nay, even the smallest ones marked on the globe he will scarcely discern by sight in the heaven — as was disputed by us in the former volume of our Commentaries on Genesis, in book 2, question 8.

The astronomical analogy: the stars seem countless but number 1,022; likewise the Ark's beasts seem too many but are countable.

Similarly it happens to many concerning the Ark of Noah, which — to those who have neither well understood its capacity, nor [grasped] the species of animals that entered it, arranged in a fixed order and comprehended in some fixed number — seems to have been by no means capacious of so many and so great animals: although, nevertheless, it has

been demonstrated by manifest reasoning that it was more than sufficiently capacious not only of those animals, but even of far more.

Conclusion of §102.

On the provisions brought into the Ark for the year's sustenance of the animals.

Section heading (not numbered as a Disputatio in the original).

Now for the numerous multitude and variety of animals it was necessary to provide and procure the kind of provisions that would be needed for each species of living creatures — and that not for one or another day, but for one whole year. And concerning provisions of this kind for the animals to be stored in the ark, we read only this, that God commanded Noah: “Thou shalt take with thee of all food that can be eaten, and thou shalt lay it up with thee, and it shall be food both for thee and for them.” Hence one may understand that Noah — whether by so long a use and observation of six hundred years, or taught by his grandfather Methuselah (who, having lived more than two hundred and fifty years with Adam, had learned very much from him for the profit of posterity, to be handed down, as it were, hand to hand to his descendants), or even by some singular revelation of God — had well examined and known what kind of food was suitable for each species of living creatures, and how much would be needed for one year's sustenance.

Margin: Gen. 6:21. (Methuselah's overlap with Adam is given as ‘more than 250 years.’)

That phrase, “Thou shalt take of all food,” refutes the vain opinion of certain ones who say that Noah found some one kind of nourishment suitable for all living creatures; for it is plainly said that Noah took of all foods for the feeding of the animals. That phrase, “which can be eaten (mandi),” is said for “eaten (comedi),” for “mandi” [chewed] is properly said of what is ground by the teeth; but it is not common to all living creatures to work up their food by the grinding of teeth. That phrase, “and

thou shalt lay it up with thee," does not signify [that] the provisions [ought to be]…

Word-by-word exposition of the provisions command. Continues on p. 281.

— p. 281 (PDF) · printed p. 212 —

…[ought to be] in the same part of the Ark where the men were to dwell — since the provisions were in the third part of the Ark, but the men in the fourth and uppermost. But that phrase, "with thee," signifies either "in the Ark in which thou shalt be," or "that they may be ready to thy hand," so that he might dispense them, as often as need be, for the feeding of the individual living creatures. Finally, that phrase, "and it shall be food both for thee and for them," does not signify that any kind of food whatever would be indifferently suitable for the sustenance of any animal or man, but that in all that abundance of provisions there would be what would serve for the feeding of man and of any animals.

Conclusion of the exposition (food on the third deck, men on the fourth/top).

THIRTEENTH DISPUTATION. On the food of the carnivorous animals while they were in the Ark.

But this is not, in this place, beyond controversy: what food did the animals that are only carnivorous use while they were in the Ark? For they seem to have been able to be fed and nourished by no other food than the flesh of other animals, and yet no other animals beyond the number defined by God seem to have been brought into the Ark. This very question St. Augustine poses and most briefly solves, in the first book of Questions on Genesis, question six: "It is asked," he says, "how in the Ark the lions and eagles, which are accustomed to live on flesh, could be fed. Whether animals beyond that number were also brought in for the food of others; or whether something (besides flesh — which is rather to be believed) was provided by Noah, a wise man, or by God's showing, which would suit the food of such living creatures." So there.

§103. The carnivore-food question, with Augustine's brief solution. Margin: Augustine.

But the same [Augustine] unravels this very question a little more distinctly and clearly in book 15 of The City of God, the last chapter: “It is wont,” he says, “to trouble some, the kinds of food which the animals that are thought to feed only on flesh could have had there — whether [animals] beyond that number were there, without transgression of the command, which the necessity of nourishing the others had compelled to be shut in there; or whether (which is rather to be believed) there could have been, besides flesh, some foods that would suit them all. For we know how many animals, to which flesh is food, feed indiscriminately on crops, and especially on figs and chestnuts. What wonder, then, if that wise and just man, even divinely admonished what would suit each one without flesh, prepared and stored up for each kind a suitable nourishment? And what is there which hunger would not compel [them] to eat? Or what could God not make pleasant and wholesome — who could even grant by his divine facility that [they] should live without food — except that [the fact] that they were fed was also fitting for the fulfilling of the figure of so great a mystery?” This [says] Augustine.

Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, last ch., on the carnivores' food.

By which words he touches on four solutions of the proposed question: One, that even the animals which are called carnivorous sometimes also feed on crops, but especially on figs and chestnuts — for these both fill and nourish much. A second, that Noah, through the knowledge of natural things which he excellently understood…

Augustine's four solutions, enumerated by Pererius. Continues on p. 282.

— p. 282 (PDF) · printed p. 213 —

…understood, or by a singular revelation of God, knew some kinds of food by no means known to us, on which even carnivorous animals would gladly feed and be wholesomely nourished. The third, that although

carnivores feed more gladly on flesh, yet when these [flesh-foods] fail, they are wont, hunger compelling, to feed even on crops and fruits. The fourth, that by the omnipotence of God it came about that the carnivores, without the eating of flesh and the food of other things, could sustain life as long as they were in the Ark. Therefore, just as the assembling of all the animals to the Ark, and their peaceful sojourn in the Ark, and their obedience toward Noah [are held to be miracles], so this too ought to be held in the place of a miracle.

Augustine's four solutions completed.

This opinion of Augustine is nearly common to all the Doctors, even of those who think that the animals which are now carnivorous were carnivorous also before the flood and at the beginning of the world. Yet these deny that they ate flesh while they were in the Ark, but [say] that, either by compelling hunger or by a special providence of God, they used the food of other provisions. Cajetan certainly, thinking that carnivorous animals were accustomed to feed on flesh even before the flood, explaining the words of Moses which we expounded a little above [says]: “Either the time of necessity, or the efficacy of the special divine governance then [in force], brought it about that even carnivorous animals fed on vegetable things.”

Margin: Cajetan on Genesis, ch. 6.

But Origen thought the contrary, affirmatively writing in homily 2 on the sixth chapter of Genesis that Noah procured for the carnivorous animals suitable food (that is, the flesh of other animals), by bringing into the Ark a great number of animals pertaining to the feeding and sustenance of the carnivores. Buteo assented to and subscribed to Origen. The one support of this opinion is this: that it is natural to certain animals to be only carnivorous; for no one has seen a lion, an eagle, or a hawk use any other food than flesh; and what is natural to some kind of animals is always suitable to it; those, therefore, that are now only carnivorous were

everywhere and at all times carnivorous.

§104. Origen and Buteo's contrary view (real flesh-food carried in the Ark). Margins: Origen; John Buteo, in his book on Noah's Ark.

But to this argument a threefold answer is given. Some answer that, although it is natural for carnivores to feed on flesh, yet by the omnipotence of God it came about that, as long as they were in the Ark, they lived without flesh and were fed on other foods. For if we believe that certain other miracles were done by God concerning those animals and the Ark itself, why should we not think that this too is to be believed to have then been done by God? Others answer that the food of flesh is called natural to carnivores because it is of all [foods] the most suitable to their nature, and is therefore eagerly and wholesomely taken by them; not, however, that it is called natural because it is simply and entirely necessary to them — just as to breathing animals respiration is called natural, not only because it is most suitable and useful to them, but also because it is plainly necessary, so that without it they cannot lead life. Therefore carnivores, when they can have flesh, feed only on this, other foods being set aside; but if they cannot have it, they feed also on certain other foods to satisfy hunger.

The first two of the three replies to Origen/Buteo.

But to me, beyond the rest, that third answer pleases: that ‘natural’ [is said of] some[thing]…

§105. Pererius's preferred (third) reply begins. Continues on p. 283.

— p. 283 (PDF) · printed p. 214 —

…something is called ‘natural’ in two ways: either [that] which follows of itself from the specific nature and flows from its essential principles — and this is always suitable to the thing, nor can it be changed at any time (as it is natural to man to be capable of laughter); or [that] is called natural which follows the individual nature and the temperament of the body. And

because the temperament of the body is varied, both by change of age and for other causes, hence it happens that what at one age is natural to man is not natural to him at another age. For it is natural to man in infancy not to feed on flesh, but to be nourished with mother's milk; the contrary, however, happens at adult age. Since, therefore, the force and excellence of plants, and the ratio of the temperament of animals, was quite different before and after the flood, it ought to seem strange to no one that, for the animals which are now naturally carnivorous, before the flood the natural food was from crops, herbs, and the fruits of trees.

§105 (concluded): two senses of ‘natural’ — so a diet ‘natural’ now need not have been natural before the flood. NOTE: this page's running folio misprints ‘274’ for 214.

I, therefore, am carried with full assent into the opinion of Augustine (and the same was also that of Basil, homily 11 on Genesis). And I think I can argue in three ways that there was no carnivorous animal in the Ark of Noah. First, because there was no carnivorous animal before the flood, and the eating of flesh, both for men and for animals, began to be in use only after the flood. But because this has been disputed and treated by us not carelessly in the former volume of these Commentaries on Genesis, toward the end of the fourth book, it would be superfluous to repeat what has been once said.

§106. Pererius's own position (no carnivore was carnivorous in the Ark), with the first of three arguments. Margins: Basil; Gen. 9.

Next, we have the number of all the animals that entered the Ark expressly — and more than once — prescribed and defined by God: two, I say, of each species of the unclean, but seven of the clean, namely both for the preservation of each species and for the use of sacrifices. But of animals pertaining to the food of carnivores, no mention is anywhere made. For as to what Buteo, meeting this argument, says — that animals of this kind were comprehended in that general command of God about all foods to be brought into the Ark (when he said to Noah: “Thou shalt take of all foods

that can be eaten, and thou shalt lay it up with thee, and it shall be food both for thee and for them") — this, I say, neither produces conviction nor weakens our argument. For it would have been more fitting for Moses to make mention of animals to be procured for the food of carnivores when the number of all the animals that were to be brought into the Ark was being predefined; especially since in the following chapter 7 mention is more often made, and the number of all the animals that were in the Ark is repeated, and yet nowhere is there any word about those animals [for carnivore food].

The second argument (Scripture never mentions food-animals). Margins: Buteo; Gen. 6 & 7.

To these is added that so great a number of animals as would suffice to feed all the carnivores for one year would have filled and burdened the Ark more than enough, and it would have been a huge — and likewise most troublesome, and especially foul and squalid — labor for those few men, like butchers daily slaughtering so many animals for the food of the carnivores, and carrying and dispensing [them] into the dwellings of the individual [beasts]: especially in an Ark closed on all sides for one year.

The third argument (the impracticality of a year's slaughter). Continues on p. 284.

— p. 284 (PDF) · printed p. 215 —

FOURTEENTH DISPUTATION. Whether the Ark was capacious of all the provisions and foods that would be enough for the year's sustenance of the animals.

There remains, of all those questions which I undertook to treat in this eleventh book concerning the things that were in the ark, that last question, to be explained in a few words: whether the Ark of Noah was sufficient for containing all the provisions that would be enough for feeding all the animals for one year. But without hesitation I would say that the third part of the Ark — above destined and assigned for taking in and preserving the provisions of the animals — was abundantly capacious of all those foods:

and this can be briefly demonstrated in this way. Of the terrestrial and quadruped animals, account must especially be taken as regards the quantity of food, on account of their size and voracity: for, in comparison with these, little food and little room in the Ark for food sufficed for the birds and reptiles. The terrestrial animals that entered the ark we established above as, so to speak, one hundred wolves, one hundred and twenty oxen, and likewise one hundred and twenty sheep.

§107. The provisions calculation begins.

But for the sake of plainer teaching, let us reduce all these (as regards their need of provisions) to the measure of oxen, and reckon each single wolf (as regards its need and consumption of food) as one ox; but of sheep, let us reckon four as one ox: so it will come about that the number of all those terrestrial animals is reduced to two hundred and fifty oxen. Let us see whether, for this number of oxen, that part of the Ark could hold as much provisions as would be enough for them for one year. And because among provisions hay occupies the most room, let the other provisions be reduced to the measure and reckoning of this. That for each ox — since they need the most copious food — forty pounds of hay are more than enough for the daily sustenance, is the testimony of Columella, in the sixth book On Agriculture, chapter three. This measure of hay, well compressed in a loft, scarcely fills one ordinary cubit [i.e., cubic cubit]: let there therefore be assigned, to two hundred and fifty oxen for daily sustenance, two hundred and fifty cubits of hay, which, multiplied by the three hundred and sixty-five days of the year, make ninety-one thousand and, besides, two hundred and fifty cubits.

The terrestrial animals reduced to 250 ‘oxen’; their hay = 91,250 cubic cubits/year. Margin: Columella.

Let us now weigh the capacity of that third part of the Ark which had to contain that hay: the whole Ark (as was said above) was three hundred cubits long, fifty wide, and thirty high; and its whole capacity was four

hundred and fifty thousand [cubic] cubits. But that third part of the Ark was as long and as wide as the whole Ark, but only eight cubits high: wherefore its capacity con[tained]…

Whole Ark = 450,000 cubic cubits; the food deck (8 cubits high) computed on p. 285. Continues on p. 285.

— p. 285 (PDF) · printed p. 216 —

…contained one hundred and twenty thousand solid (cubic) cubits — more, that is, than that whole [quantity of] hay by twenty-seven thousand seven hundred and fifty cubits. Do you see, then, reader, how much more provisions could be contained than was needed? And this reasoning and computation proceeds if we suppose that those animals, during all the time they were in the Ark, used no other food than hay, which occupies the most room. But since whatever animals use fodder feed much more eagerly and wholesomely on grains — such as barley, spelt, vetch, and other similar things — it is more credible that the food was procured for the animals by Noah from these: inasmuch as they, the more freely they are eaten, are contained in the less room.

Food deck = 120,000 cubic cubits, well over the 91,250 needed; and grains take even less room than hay.

But because there will perhaps not be lacking those who obstinately contend that the carnivorous animals, while they were in the ark, could be fed by no other food than flesh: come, the truth which we above followed and defended being for the moment set aside, let us grant this to them — that the capacity of the Ark may be the more manifest — we showing that, even if the food of the Carnivores in the Ark had been of flesh, nevertheless room would not have been lacking in the ark for the animals necessary for their feeding. All the carnivorous animals we above reduced to the reckoning and number of one hundred wolves. For each wolf an eighth part of a sheep is enough for daily nourishment: for the daily feeding of one hundred wolves, therefore, twelve and a half sheep were needed;

which number, multiplied by the three hundred and sixty-five days of one year, contains four thousand five hundred and sixty-two and a half sheep.

§108. Even granting a flesh diet: 100 wolves × ■ sheep/day × 365 = 4,562½ sheep/year.

That the ark was capacious of these sheep — besides the one hundred and seventy pairs of animals which we said above entered the ark — one may understand from this: that of the three hundred dwellings provided for the habitation of the animals, one hundred and thirty were left empty, in which a great part of these provision-sheep could be stalled, since each of those dwellings (nine cubits high, six long, and as many wide) was capacious of many sheep. And the sheep that were left over, those it was possible to place in the various vacant places of the Ark, which were many — but especially in the habitation of the men, as being the most spacious and most free. Nor is this not to be noted here: that the number of those provision-sheep would be much diminished day by day, more than twelve sheep daily failing [being used up], which were consumed in the daily feeding of the Carnivorous animals. And these are the things which seemed to us to be disputed and explained concerning the things that were in the Ark of Noah.

Conclusion of §108 and of Liber XI: room even for a year's flesh-supply, with the stock dwindling daily.

— p. 286 (PDF) · printed p. 217 —

THE TWELFTH BOOK OF THE COMMENTARIES ON GENESIS OF BENEDICT PERERIUS, WHICH CONCERNS THE GENERATION, INCREASE, AND STATE OF THE FLOOD.

Title page of Liber XII. Section numbering restarts at §1.

From the seventh chapter of the book of Genesis.

“In the six hundredth year of the life of Noah, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month, all the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the floodgates of heaven were opened; and the rain fell upon the earth forty days and forty nights. In the selfsame day Noah, and Shem and Ham and Japheth his sons, his wife and the three wives of his sons with them, went into the ark: they and every beast according to its kind, and all the cattle in their kind, and everything that moveth upon the earth according to its kind, and every fowl according to its kind. All birds, and all that fly, went in to Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein was the breath of life. And they that went in, went in male and female of all flesh, as God had commanded him: and the Lord shut him in on the outside. And the flood was forty days…

Genesis 7:11–17 (verse numbers marked in the margin). Continues on p. 287.

— p. 287 (PDF) · printed p. 218 —

…upon the earth; and the waters increased, and lifted up the ark on high from the earth. For they overflowed exceedingly, and filled all things on the face of the earth: and the ark was carried upon the waters. And the waters prevailed beyond measure upon the earth, and all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. The water was fifteen cubits higher than the mountains which it covered. And all flesh was destroyed that moved upon the earth — of fowl, of living creatures, of beasts, and of all creeping things that creep upon the earth: all men, and all things in which is the breath of life upon the earth, died. And He destroyed all the substance that was upon the earth, from man even to beast, both the creeping thing and the fowls of heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained, and they that were with him in the ark. And the waters prevailed upon the earth a hundred and fifty days.”

Genesis 7:18–24 (conclusion of the chapter).

PREFACE.

Moses has set forth the history of Noah's flood so subtly and distinctly and clearly that scarcely anything pertaining to that matter and worthy of knowledge could be sought, even by a curious reader, which has not been either expressed or indicated by him, or cannot easily be conjectured and understood from the things reported by him. For Moses declared when the flood began, in what manner it came about, from what causes it proceeded, how widely it extended and how high it was raised above the earth, how much damage and destruction it brought, for how long it held the earth overwhelmed with waters, when and from what cause it began to diminish, in what place first and after how long from the beginning of the flood the ark settled, how Noah explored and observed the diminution and cessation of the flood, when the flood end[ed]…

Preface to Liber XII: praise of the completeness of Moses' narrative. Continues on p. 288.

— p. 288 (PDF) · printed p. 219 —

…the flood, and [when] Noah with his family and with the animals went out of the ark; how Noah, offering a sacrifice most pleasing to God, was refreshed and confirmed by the most joyful promises [given] by him.

Conclusion of the Preface's summary of the narrative's contents.

The flood began in the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month. The causes of the flood, besides God, were: the breaking-open of all the fountains of the great deep, and the unbarring of the floodgates of heaven, and the continuous and most dense rain of forty days and nights. The breadth of the flood was so great that it covered the whole world; and the height so great that it surpassed the highest mountains of the earth by fifteen cubits. The flood, moreover, held the earth, before it began to diminish, for one hundred and fifty days. Thereafter the flood began to diminish — partly by a drying and burning wind sent upon it, partly by the closing of the fountains of the deep and the

floodgates of heaven, and the rain being checked. The ark rested upon the mountains of Armenia in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month; the tops of the mountains appeared on the first day of the tenth month.

§1. A connected summary of the flood's chronology (the Preface's narrative). Margin: “Of what matters of the Flood Moses treats.”

And to explore the cessation of the flood, Noah sent out a raven, and twice a dove — which, returning the second time and bearing a branch of olive with green leaves, signified that the flood had ceased. In the six hundred and first year, in the first month, on the first day of the month, the earth was dried; and in the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of that month, the earth was utterly dried up, and Noah went out with his family and with the animals. He, an altar being built as soon as possible, offered from all the clean cattle and birds a holocaust most acceptable to God, from whom he received the promise that never thereafter would the whole earth be laid waste and destroyed by a flood. And this is the sum of the Mosaic narrative, in which two chapters of the book of Genesis are comprised — the seventh and the eighth — which are to be explained by us in this twelfth and in the next following thirteenth book. In the seventh chapter is described the beginning and increase of the flood; in the eighth, its diminution and cessation.

Conclusion of the Preface: the plan of Books 12–13 (Genesis 7 and 8).

— p. 289 (PDF) · printed p. 220 —

FIRST DISPUTATION. On the year in which the Flood occurred, upon those words (verse 11): “In the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day of the month,” etc.

By these words is noted the time at which Noah's flood began to occur, just as below is marked the time at which it ended — so that, its beginning and end being noted, how great was its duration, and how long Noah's stay in

the Ark, might be clearly known.

But why was Noah commanded by God, seven days before the beginning of the flood (as Moses teaches in chapter 7), to enter the ark? Here the Hebrews trifle, after their manner, [saying] that those seven days were spent by Noah in mourning for the death of his grandfather Methuselah — who, although it is agreed that he died in the very year of the flood, yet whether he departed only seven days, or many more days or even months, before the flood, is uncertain. This indeed may be credible: that Noah, during those seven days — before the Ark should be tossed and shaken by the storms of the flood — arranged and ordered all the things that were in the Ark, placing each fitly in its own place, so that all things might be most suitably adapted to the habitation and use of men and animals, as the need would be.

§2. The seven days before the Flood. Margins: "Why Noah entered the ark seven days before the flood"; Gen. 5.

There is also that probable cause which St. Ambrose touched on: that Noah, shut up in the ark during those seven days, awaited the flood, in order that the rest — seeing that Noah had shut himself in the ark from fear of the imminent flood — might at least at that last time be moved by dread of the impending destruction and be converted to doing penance; for not even, if they had wished, would they have been unable, in that space of a few days, both to do penance duly and to appease the wrath of God. "It is not idle," says Ambrose, "that neither more nor fewer than seven days were interposed — as many, that is, as there were in the constitution of the world. For in six days the world was made, and on the seventh day God rested from his works: by which token he declared that he himself is the author both of the world and of the flood. The world he founded on account of his goodness; the flood he made by the desert of our offenses. Men were therefore admonished, even by the number of days in which the world was created, that they ought to have reconciled their Creator not by tears and prayer alone, but by the correction of their morals."

Ambrose's reason: the seven days mirror the seven of creation. Margins: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 13; Gen. 1; below, 2.

“Therefore the Lord gave a space for penance, wishing rather to pardon than to punish, that he might compel those held in suspense by the terror of the imminent flood to beg for pardon — whereby, while they dread the peril of coming death, they might renounce impiety and injustice.” So Ambrose. But this raises a question in this place: whether, when the flood began, Noah had completed the six hundredth year of his life, or had only entered it?

§3 begins (the year-reckoning question). Margin: “When the flood began to occur.” Continues on p. 290.

— p. 290 (PDF) · printed p. 221 —

When it is said that the flood began in the six hundredth year of Noah's life, it is asked whether one ought to understand that six hundredth year to have been completed, or only begun. For it can be understood in either way. And that it ought to be understood not completed but begun, there are many authors — Lyra, Tostatus, Cajetan, Oleaster, and others — when in their Commentaries they interpret this passage of Moses. This interpretation is indeed helped by the customary manner of reckoning, both formerly and today. For such is the custom of reckoning the years of Princes, that, if they do anything at the beginning of the third or fourth year of their reign, it is commonly said that they did it in the third or fourth year of their reign, and is recorded in the public monuments or records.

§3 (cont.). The ‘begun, not completed’ view. Margins: “Whether Noah had only begun, or had already completed, the 600th year”; Lyra; Tostatus; Cajetan; Oleaster.

But to me, indeed, it seems the contrary should be thought: for I judge that that six hundredth year was not only begun, but plainly completed, with forty-seven days of the six hundred and first year besides being elapsed. And this interpretation and opinion of mine I can establish by three arguments. First, if that six hundredth year had been begun only by one

month and a little more than half, then the Ark would have been built in one and a half months — since Noah is said to have been five hundred years old before he received the command from God about building the Ark. But neither is it credible that so great a work could have been completed in so brief a time; and most doctors object, by whom it has been reported that about a hundred years were spent in building the Ark. This, moreover, follows: that between the announcement of the flood and its coming less than two months intervened — since the announcement of the flood was made by God after Noah's five hundredth year, as Moses narrated above; and yet God, after the announcement of the flood until its coming, granted to mortals the time of a hundred and twenty years for doing penance.

Pererius's contrary view (year completed + 47 days), with the first argument. Margin: Gen. 6.

But these [authors] would meet this argument: that, since it was said above that Noah was five hundred years old, it ought similarly to be understood of the five hundredth year only begun, not completed; wherefore from the announcement of the flood and God's command about building the Ark up to the flood itself a hundred years passed. But St. Augustine opposes them, affirming that Noah, when God commanded him about building the Ark, was four hundred and eighty years old. Next, if, when the flood began, only the six hundredth year of Noah was begun and not completed, then from the beginning of the world up to the flood there would not have flowed one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years (for so many are reckoned by all the best Chronographers), but, according to these [authors], it would be necessary to count one fewer.

Second argument (and Augustine's 480-year datum). Margins: Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, ch. 24. [The second figure is garbled in the OCR; the point is the standard 1,656-year creation-to-Flood span would be reduced by one.]

— p. 291 (PDF) · printed p. 222 —

Finally, this very thing evidently demonstrates it: that below, in the ninth chapter, it is written that Noah lived three hundred and fifty years after the flood, and that all the days of Noah's life were nine hundred and fifty years. But if, as these [authors] say, Noah, when the flood began, had begun the six hundredth year only by two months, it could not be that, if he lived three hundred and fifty years after the flood, he was nine hundred and fifty years old when he died — but it would necessarily be that he was [fewer]. [The arithmetic of the third argument is corrupt in the OCR; Pererius's point is that the figures only reconcile if the 600th year was complete.]

Third argument, from Noah's total lifespan (Gen 9: 600 + 350 = 950). The OCR's ‘850’ appears to be a printing error.

SECOND DISPUTATION. When it is said that the flood occurred in the second month, of what year one ought to understand that second month to have been.

Moses said that the flood began on the seventeenth day of the second month. But it is asked, of what year that was the second month: whether it was the second month of the six hundredth year of Noah's life, which Moses just before named; or whether it was the second month of the common and customary year which was then being reckoned. There is a twofold opinion of the Doctors. Almost all think that that month was the second of the year which was then being reckoned, and, as we commonly say, of the year then current. And the year, at that time, was reckoned from the beginning of the world: for, just as the Romans counted years from the founding of the city, and we Christians from the birth of our Savior, so it is most likely that the men who lived before the flood were accustomed to count the years from the beginning of the founded world. And from the beginning of the world up to the flood are reckoned one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years: wherefore that month in which the flood began was the second month of the year 1656 from the founding of the world.

§4. The first view: the ‘second month’ of the world-year (creation-to-Flood = 1,656 years).

But just as they agree about this [the year], so they vary in their opinions about the character of this month: some affirming that that month was of spring-time and corresponding to our May; but others contending that that month fell in the Autumnal season and coincided with our November — arguing this from the fact that, although Noah's flood could not have come about without the supernatural omnipotence of God, yet it is not to be denied that many natural things were employed by God for bringing about the flood in some part (such as the breaking-open of all the fountains of the great deep, the unbarring of the floodgates of heaven, and the continuation of rain for forty days). Similarly, therefore, it is reasonable to believe that God chose the most opportune time of the year for bringing about the flood, and for ending the same. Now the time suitable for inundations is winter, not summer; just as, on the contrary, for drying the earth and checking the rains, summer is more opportune than winter. Therefore it is fitting that the flood began at the onset of winter — that is, around November — and lasted through the whole winter; and finally that in the summer-time the earth was dried and the flood ended.

§5. The autumn (November) view, argued from the natural means God employed.

But if the flood had begun in the month of May, it would have been increased and strengthened in the summer-time, but ended in nearly the middle of winter: and all these things would have been done in a most alien and most contrary season of the year. And this indeed is nearly the opinion of the Hebrews, to which subscribe Lyra, Tostatus, and Oleaster in this place.

Margins: Lyra; Tostatus; Oleaster.

— p. 292 (PDF) · printed p. 223 —

The other opinion is of nearly all the Ecclesiastical writers: that the world was created in spring-time and around the month of March; and that the second month, in which the flood occurred, fell in part within our May. And Rupert confirms that that second month was of spring-time, by the

argument of the dove which, returning to the ark, brought a little branch of olive with green leaves. For Rupert writes thus: “And lest that scruple trouble [anyone] — that the beginnings or ends of the years or months may here be reckoned according to the birth of Noah — let it be recalled to memory that, about a month more or less before the completed year of the flood, the dove which Noah sent out returned, carrying a branch of olive with green leaves in its mouth. Therefore, at whatever time of the year Noah's birth occurred, that this year was completed in spring-time is also a token of it.” So Rupert.

§5 (cont.). The spring (May) view of the Ecclesiastical writers (Rupert's dove-argument). Margin: Rupert, Commentaries on Genesis, bk. 4, ch. 25.

But why God willed the flood to occur in spring-time rather than at another time of the year, Rupert offers two causes in the same place. And the one cause was this: that those most wicked men might perish in the flood with a sharper sense of grief — namely, grieving most bitterly that they were thrust out of the world and from life by so dire a punishment of death at that time, at which the world itself is most beautiful and most pleasant and most delightful, inviting and enticing men to enjoy delights and pleasures, of which pleasures the abundance and variety is greatest at that season.

§6. Rupert's first reason (the wicked grieve more, dying amid spring's abundance). Margin: “Why the flood occurred in spring-time: a twofold cause.”

“That the second month was of spring-time is not doubted,” says Ambrose, “when growing things are increased, the field gives birth, and the offspring of the earth and of the living creatures alike pours itself forth. Then, therefore, he made the flood, when the grief of those who were being punished in their own abundance would be greater; then the vengeance [was] more terrible, as of God saying: ‘Behold, rich nature has generated all things according to the grace of the divine liberality and providence; the more fruitful earth has sprouted all things for the use of men; the crops are beheld; the fields are filled with wheat and barley; the foliage of the trees is

clothed with fruits and flowers; the earth is not wanting in its services, the beasts are not wanting in their gifts, which are duly discharged in their birthings, so that nothing may be lacking to man: man alone is wanting to his own duties, knows not his Author from whom all things are supplied to him, neglects his Creator. Let all things, therefore, perish together with the man for whose sake all things were born. In his own riches man is consumed, that he may die with his own grief.’” So Ambrose.

Ambrose to the same effect (the spring setting heightens the judgment). Margin: Ambrose, On the Ark and Noah, ch. 14.

The other cause why the flood occurred in spring-time, Rupert thinks to have been this: that it might be more openly recognized, and believed without any doubt, that that flood of Noah was made not from natural causes alone, but chiefly through the supernatural omnipotence of God. Of this the clearest proof would be that the flood was made in the summer-time, but removed in the winter-time — each season, that is, being most adver[se] both to the creating and to the abolishing of the flood…

§7. Rupert's second reason (the unnatural timing proves the miracle). Continues on p. 293.

— p. 293 (PDF) · printed p. 224 —

…most adverse. “Whence,” says Rupert, “the more to be wondered at [was] the tempest of that flood, which no nature of the season aided, but the contrary: in May, in which month the Sun already advances higher and the sky naturally grows white-hot, an immense force of rains and waters burst forth; but around the time of winter — that is, in the month of November — the waters now being diminished, the Ark rested, shaken by so great and so long-lasting storms; and in the tenth month of the flood at last, which with us is February, on the first day of the month, the tops of the mountains appeared.” So Rupert.

Conclusion of §7 (Rupert's reckoning of the flood across the seasons).

Thus far it has been shown that the month in which the flood occurred is called by Moses the second (as most have thought) in respect of the year which was then being reckoned, the 1656th from the founding of the world. But as to whether that month corresponded to May, as some have said, or to November, as others — according as the opinion of the Doctors differs about the origin of the World, created either in Spring or in Autumn: which controversy we have treated diligently and accurately in the first book of our Commentaries on Genesis, when we explained the work of the third day.

§8. Summary of the month-question (tied to the spring-vs-autumn debate about creation).

But as regards the present question, for my part I would neither dare nor wish to condemn the aforesaid interpretation and opinion, approved by so many and great authors. I will not, however, conceal that to me indeed the interpretation of Cajetan seems very probable, who judges that the second month was so called in respect of the six hundredth year of Noah's life — so that it is signified that the flood began in the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month of that year: that is, that the beginning of the flood occurred in the second month after the completed six hundredth year of Noah.

Pererius's own preference: Cajetan's reading (the 'second month' belongs to Noah's 600th year). Margin: Cajetan.

This interpretation greatly pleases me, because according to it the construction of the words of Moses is plain and easy, and entangled in no difficulties. For if you disjoin the second month from the six hundredth year of Noah's life, and contend that it ought to be referred to another year (namely, of the world), you cannot deny that Moses spoke obscurely — not to say ambiguously — referring the years to one thing and the months to another, without even a word indicating that variation: especially since that is against the custom and usage of reckoning. For when we say that something was done in the third year and second month of some Prince, the

year and month are always referred to the same thing — that is, either to the life or to the reign of that Prince. But that the year should be referred to the life or reign, while the month [is referred] to the common year then current, is new, unusual, and unheard of. Nor let it seem strange to anyone that the times are reckoned from Noah himself, since he was the father of a new age and of a reborn world.

Pererius's reasons for preferring Cajetan; 'TER[TIA]' catchword begins the next disputation on p. 294.

— p. 294 (PDF) · printed p. 225 —

THIRD DISPUTATION. From what things and natural causes Noah's flood was made.

When Moses said in this place, "All the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the cataracts of heaven were opened, and rain fell upon the earth forty days and forty nights," he indicated sufficiently by these words that two natural things were either the sole or the principal causes of the flood: the one, the breaking-open of the fountains of the great deep; the other, the opening of the cataracts of heaven — so that the one was below (whether in the earth or within the earth), but the other above, in heaven itself, that is, either in the air, or in the stars, or in both. But the continuation of the rain for forty days was not a third cause of the flood distinct from the prior two, but was rather, as it were, a certain effect of the unbarring of the cataracts of heaven.

§9. Margin: Gen. ch. 7, v. 12.

Philo, in the second book On the Life of Moses, touches on three causes of Noah's flood: one, the swelling of the sea and, on that account, its overflowing onto the lands; the second, the huge increase of all the rivers; the third, the long continuation of rains. "For," says Philo, "the swelling seas, and the increased rivers — torrents both seasonal and perennial — inundated and overturned all the cities situated in the level regions; but

those that were inhabited in higher places, the continued rains, intermitted neither by day nor by night, utterly undermined.” But in order that this matter of the efficient causes of the flood — which Moses touched on with such brevity — may be better understood when set forth more explicitly and clearly, the discussion being taken up a little higher, it must be briefly recalled what was reported by the pagan philosophers about the origin and generation of a flood.

§10. Margins: “Philo makes three causes of the flood”; “What the pagans thought of the causes of the flood.”

Seneca, in the third book of the Natural Questions, chapter 27 and the two following, disputes much about the efficient causes of a flood: “It is asked,” he says, “when the fatal day of the flood shall come, in what manner the world is overwhelmed by the waters: whether it comes about by the strength of the Ocean, and the external sea rises up against us; or whether frequent rains without intermission, and a persistent winter with summer driven out, cast down an immense force of waters from broken clouds; or whether the earth pours forth its rivers more abundantly and opens new springs; or whether rather there is not one cause for so great an evil, but every principle conspires — at once the rains fall, and the rivers increase, and the seas, stirred from their seats, rush over, and all things press, in one column, to the destruction of the human race. So it is: Nothing is difficult for nature, especially when it hastens to its end. For the origin of things it uses small forces, and dispenses itself by imperceptible increments; suddenly it comes to ruin with its whole force. Whatever nature has turned aside from this state and order of things toward the destruction of mortals is enough. Therefore, when that necessity of time has come, many fates at once set causes in motion: nor will so great a change be without a shaking of the world.”

§11. Seneca, Nat. Quaest. bk. 3, ch. 27ff. Margin: Seneca. Continues on p. 295.

— p. 295 (PDF) · printed p. 226 —

After this, Seneca discourses copiously about the various causes of a flood, which, if anyone should endeavor to gather them — scattered variously in his discussion — and reduce them to some fixed number, he will find that five principal causes of a flood are handed down by him. The first cause is the long continuation of the densest rains. “For at first immoderate rains fall, and the sky is gloomy with cloud without any sunshine, and the mists are continuous from a moist and thick haze, the winds never drying it. After the storm-clouds press on more and more, and the snows heaped up for ages have melted, the torrent, rolling down from the highest mountains, sweeps away the woods, and rolls the rocks, loosened, their structures dissolved; it drags cities, and peoples entangled in their own walls, uncertain whether they seek ruin or shipwreck: so much at once came both what might crush and what might drown.”

§11 (cont.). Seneca's first cause: prolonged torrential rain. Margin: “Five causes of the flood according to Seneca.”

The second cause is the excessive increase of rivers from the frequency and density of rains. “For rivers, increased and overflowing more than enough, having left their natural channel, overflowing, inundate the lands and stagnate, and there happens what the Poet beautifully said: ‘The rivers, spread out, rush over the open fields’ (Ovid, Met. 1). Then everywhere on earth there is an immense depth of water: only on the highest ridges of the mountains are there shallows. Thither, then, will men flee with their children and wives, their flocks driven before them, all exchange and passage among the wretched being cut off, since whatever is lower the wave has filled. The remnants of the human race will cling to the highest points; and to these, brought to the extreme, this one consolation will remain — that fear will pass into stupor, and grief will have no place. For grief loses its force in him who is wretched beyond the sense of his evil.”

Seneca's second cause: rivers overflowing. Margin: Ovid, Metamorphoses bk. 1.

The third cause is the overflowing onto the lands of the sea swelling beyond measure. “For so great a shipwreck cannot come about by the injury of torrents or rains or rivers. When that destruction is at hand, I would grant that assiduous rains flow and that there is no measure to the showers, and that, the north winds being suppressed, clouds and rains and rivers abound. But when there has been a prelude by these things, the seas grow beyond the usual, and the waves send their tracks beyond the utmost mark of the greatest storm. Then the sea is raised to a wondrous height, and goes over those safe receptacles of men. Nor is this difficult for the waters, since they ascend from a level equal to the lands. For if anyone surveys the heights, the seas are level [with them]. But just as, to one beholding the plains, the places which are gradually sloping deceive him, so we do not perceive the curvatures of the sea, and whatever appears seems level; yet that surface of the water is higher than the lands. And therefore, in order to flow forth, it will not raise itself with a great mass: while it is enough for it to rise slightly so that it comes above the level [of the land]; and it will flow down not from the shore, where it is lower, but from the middle, where that heap [of water] is.”

Seneca's third cause: the sea overtopping the land.

The fourth cause is celestial, and is placed in the meeting and conjunction of all the stars which have a rain-bringing and flood-bringing power. “Berosus indeed, who interpreted Belus, assigns a fixed time both to the conflagration of the world and to the flood, referring the cause of each to the stars: for he judges that earthly things will burn when all the stars, which now keep diverse courses, shall meet in Cancer, so placed under the same track that a straight line could pass out through their orbits; but that a flood is to come when the same throng of stars shall meet in Capricorn — there the [summer] Solstice, here the winter solstice is brought about.”

Seneca's fourth cause: the conjunction of all the planets (Berosus on the world's burning in Cancer, its flooding in Capricorn).

The fifth cause is the dissolution of the earth, in great part, into water. “For the earth itself will furnish the greatest cause for its own inundation — the earth which we have said to be mutable and to be dissolved into moisture. The earth will therefore begin to putrefy, then, loosened, to go into moisture, and to flow down with a continual decay. Then the rivers will leap out beneath the mountains, and will shake them by their very force. All the soil will give back waters, the mountain-tops will gush; and just as healthy parts pass into disease, and the parts neighboring an ulcer sympathize, so whatever things shall have been nearest to the flowing lands will be washed away, will drip, and then will run, and, the rock gaping in many places, [the waters] will leap through the strait, and will join the seas among themselves.” Thus far from Seneca: whose discussion we have recalled almost in his own words — but, lest we be too long, with many things that did not pertain to our subject deliberately pruned and cut off.

Seneca's fifth cause: the earth itself dissolving into water.

But in this discussion of Seneca, some things are not to be disapproved, but some are to be rejected. For those five efficient causes of a flood which are handed down by Seneca are by no means to be despised, nor is it removed from reason and faith that they concurred to bring about Noah's flood. But three other things which Seneca said are in no way to be approved. First, he said that a flood is brought about from natural causes alone, and indeed by a certain necessary and immutable law of nature, by which a fixed time is set for a flood, which, when it comes, the flood must necessarily occur. This is false. For a flood can be brought about by no necessity, but only by the will of God; nor by the power of nature alone, nor except by the supernatural omnipotence of God, as we shall show a little below.

§12. Pererius examines Seneca: the five physical causes are acceptable, but three claims are rejected. Margin: “Seneca's opinion on the causes of the flood is examined.”

He says, besides, not only that a flood will at some time occur, but that it has often occurred before this, and will often occur hereafter. For, following the teaching of his Stoics, Seneca thinks that the world frequently arises and perishes — yet at very long intervals of time — and perishes indeed by alternating turns, either by conflagration or by flood. But this is not only contrary to divine Scripture, which denies that there has been, or ever will be, more than one flood, but also plainly opposes the doctrine and decrees of the two Princes of Philosophy, Plato and Aristotle. Finally, that is false which is reported by the same Seneca in that very place: that by a flood all animals and all men are utterly destroyed, and, the world being reborn, are regenerated by natural causes alone. For nature does not allow that perfect animals — but especially men — can be naturally procreated in any other way than from efficient causes of the same species and from parents like themselves. Wherefore, if all things should perish in a flood, they could not be naturally regenerated again. But let us dismiss Seneca.

Pererius rejects the Stoic eternal-recurrence (alternating conflagration/flood) and the natural regeneration of all life. Margin: "The error of the Stoics about the origin of the world."

Ovid, in the first book of the Metamorphoses, although he expressly narrates the flood of Deucalion — which was not general over the whole world, but happened in only one region of Greece called Thessaly — nevertheless described that flood just as if it had been a general inundation of waters, flooding and overwhelming the whole world except Mount Parnassus. And he indicates in plain words that that flood had two chief causes: the immense force of rains, and the immoderate increases of rivers and of terrestrial waters. To these he seems to add a third cause: the overflowing onto the lands of the sea swelling beyond measure. And these causes he set forth in those verses: "A different penalty pleases [him]: to destroy the mortal race beneath the waves, and to send down storm-clouds from all the sky."

§13. Ovid (Met. 1) on the flood of Deucalion. Margins: "What Ovid wrote of the causes of the flood"; "The first cause of the flood, from rains." Continues on p. 297.

— p. 297 (PDF) · printed p. 228 —

"There comes a crash, and the dense storm-clouds pour from the upper air. Iris, the messenger of Juno, clothed in varied colors, draws up waters and brings nourishment to the clouds. The crops are laid low, and the prayers lamented by the farmers lie [ruined], and the vain labor of a long year perishes. Nor is the wrath of Jove content with its own heaven, but his sea-blue brother [Neptune] aids him with auxiliary waves. He calls together the rivers; who, after they had entered the halls of their tyrant [Neptune]: 'There is no need now,' he says, 'of long exhortation; pour forth your strength: so it must be. Open your homes, and, the barrier removed, give your rivers all the reins.'"

Ovid, Met. 1 (the rains and Neptune summoning the rivers).

"He had commanded: these return, and loosen the mouths of their springs, and roll into the seas with unbridled course. He himself [Neptune] struck the earth with his trident, and it trembled, and by its movement laid open the ways of the waters. The rivers, spread out, rush over the open fields, and sweep away — together with the crops — the orchards and flocks and men, and the houses and the inner shrines with their sacred things. If any house remained, and, not cast down, could resist so great an evil, yet a higher wave covers its roof, and the towers, overwhelmed, lie hidden under the flood. And now the sea and the land had no distinction: all was sea; the sea, too, lacked shores."

Ovid, Met. 1 (the rivers unleashed; sea and land merge). Margins: "The second cause of the flood, from the increase of terrestrial waters"; "He signifies the overflowing of the sea onto the lands."

These things were reported by the pagans concerning the causes of the flood. But let us [now] weigh the words of Moses on the matter.

Transition from the pagan accounts to the exegesis of Moses' words.

— p. 298 (PDF) · printed p. 229 —

FOURTH DISPUTATION. What that great abyss was, whose fountains Moses said were broken up to bring about the flood.

"Abyss" is a Greek word, about which Suidas writes thus: "The Abyss was a temple of Proserpina, in which much gold, untouched in every age, was kept; the name was made from this, that that gold was not commonly seen, being hidden in the ground." The sacred writings call the abyss [something] aqueous by nature. St. Basil, in the second homily on Genesis: "Abyss," he says, "signifies a copious [body of] water, to whose bottom one cannot easily penetrate downward." St. Augustine, on the forty-first Psalm, defines it thus: "The abyss is a certain impenetrable and incomprehensible depth, and is especially wont to be said of a multitude of waters; for where there is height, there is depth, by which it cannot be penetrated to the bottom."

§14. The meaning of 'abyss.' Margins: Suidas; "What the word Abyss signifies"; Basil; Augustine.

The Hebrew word "thehom," which Moses uses in this place, properly signifies a chasm, or water of great depth: so that that depth of the waters which are beneath the earth seems here to be signified by Moses, whence, through certain channels of the earth, the springs and rivers flow forth. And in the time of the flood, the earth being broken open with many and great clefts, so great a force of waters flowed out thence that they covered the whole earth.

The Hebrew 'thehom' = the subterranean deep.

But what that subterranean water is which Moses named the abyss must be inquired into and declared. There was an old opinion, and one widely and much celebrated, that among the many clefts of the earth there is one within the earth that is the greatest, traversing and open through the whole earth: which Homer and the Poets called the "Barathrum" and "Tartarus"; and that here there is an immense force and mass of water agitated about

the very center [of the earth]. For because that force of water has no foundation and support on which to rest and be made firm, therefore it fluctuates and is agitated this way and that; and by this fluctuation, according as it has leaned toward various parts, it sends up rivers from various parts of the earth too. And this Tartarus is the origin and end of all terrestrial waters — both of the sea and of rivers and of any waters whatever: for thence the rivers flow out, and thither again, their courses completed, at last flow back.

§15. The old ‘Tartarus’ theory: a central subterranean reservoir as the source of all waters. Margins: “What Tartarus is among the poets”; Homer.

Therefore neither the sea nor the Ocean is the beginning of the waters, but Tartarus, from which both the sea itself and the Ocean take their origin. This opinion of the ancients Socrates recalls, in Plato, in the Phaedo; and according to it some think that Moses spoke from this [view], so that what they named Tartarus, he called the abyss. Certainly from that opinion either nothing, or very little, do Vatablus and Oleaster seem to differ in this place, and Franciscus Georgius in the first volume of the Problems, problem 88.

Margins: Plato; Vatablus; Oleaster; Franciscus Georgius.

— p. 299 (PDF) · printed p. 230 —

But because that opinion is false, it is in no way credible that Moses, in so weighty a history, wished to misuse the false opinion of the common people regarding the origin of the waters of the flood. And that that opinion is false, Aristotle argues in the second book of the Meteorology in this manner: If all rivers, and all the waters flowing on the earth, draw their origin and flow forth from Tartarus, which is around the center, then the rivers ascend from the center of the world to the surface of the earth — a height, that is, of three thousand five hundred miles. But it is against the nature of water to ascend higher than its origin, much less to raise its courses to so great a height.

§16. Aristotle's refutation of the Tartarus theory (water cannot rise above its source). Margins: "That Tartarus is not the origin of the flood-waters"; Aristotle.

And so, according to that opinion, that common and well-worn proverb would be true, says Aristotle: "RIVERS UPWARD" — which proverb is said against those who say or do something which, because it is against the nature of the thing, cannot happen. Of this kind is "Rivers ascending upward": for because it is against the nature of rivers to ascend, neither can it happen; and those who think it can happen, think falsely, ridiculously, and absurdly. But to bring about Noah's flood, it would have been necessary for the waters to be raised not only from the center to the surface of the earth, but moreover above the highest mountains of the earth by fifteen cubits.

Margin: Proverb.

Others think that by the word "Abyss" Moses signified the sea, or the Ocean, so called on account of its immense depth, impenetrable to mortals. It cannot at all be denied that divine Scripture often uses the name "abyss" when it speaks of the sea: which one may perceive from the fifteenth chapter of Exodus, and Psalms 103 and 106, Proverbs 8, Jonah 2, and Luke 8. But in what way the flood proceeded from the sea or Ocean is explained in two ways. Some think that the sea is far greater and higher than the earth: for although near the shores it seems lower than the lands, yet, gradually swelling, it rises to such a height that in the middle it either exceeds or equals the peaks of the highest mountains of the earth; but that by God's command or will it is prevented from inundating the lands — as Job indicates not obscurely in chapter 38, David in Psalm 103, Solomon in Proverbs 8, [and] Jeremiah in chapter 5.

§17. The view that 'abyss' = the sea/Ocean (first version: the sea higher than the land). Margin: "Whether the abyss of the waters is the Ocean."

And in the time of the flood, the sea, by God's permission, as if the barriers by which it was confined were broken, overflowed onto the lands, even

surpassing any mountains whatever to the greatest height. But this interpretation I can refute by three arguments. First, it is false, what these assume, that the sea is greater and higher than the earth. But because this has been refuted by us with many arguments in the first book of our Commentaries on Genesis, when we expounded the work of the third day, it is not pertinent to say anything about it at present. Next, if the sea overflowing onto the lands brought about the flood, it itself would have been the cause of the flood not only principal but also the one and only [cause]; nor would there have been need, besides, to unbar the cataracts of heaven and to rain for forty whole days. For since the sea — being much higher than any of the highest mountains of the earth (as these think) — the overflowing of the sea alone onto the lands would have been suffi[cient] for bringing about the flood…

Pererius's first two refutations of the 'higher sea' view. Margin: "Whether the overflowing of the sea onto the lands made the flood." Continues on p. 300.

— p. 300 (PDF) · printed p. 231 —

…would have been sufficient for bringing about the flood. To this [the third argument]: Why did Moses, when recalling the efficient causes of the flood, make no word about the sea — which, according to these, was the principal cause of the flood? They will say that the sea was signified by Moses by the word "abyss." But it is easy to refute this. For these want the sea, unloading and pouring out the immense mass of its water, to have made the flood on the earth; but Moses says that the fountains of the abyss were cleft, and that through those clefts of the fountains the water flowed out from the abyss which inundated the lands. Finally, Rupert flatly denies that the flood was made from the inundation and overflowing of the sea onto the lands.

Pererius's third refutation (Moses names the abyss's fountains, not the sea). Margin: Rupert, Commentaries on Genesis.

Others think that the flood proceeded from the sea in this way: that through many channels of the earth, now hidden, then opened, a great deal of water overflowed from the sea onto the lands; for just as the terrestrial waters end in the sea, so they take their origin from the sea, as is written at the opening of Ecclesiastes. And this St. Jerome seems to indicate in the Questions on Genesis, and Rupert in the fourth book of the Commentaries on Genesis, chapter twenty.

§18. The second 'from the sea' version (sea-water rising through hidden channels). Margins: Eccles. 1; Jerome; Rupert.

But Cajetan, explaining those words of Moses about the cleft fountains of the abyss and the unbarred cataracts of heaven, writes that both were said by Moses not properly but metaphorically. "The speech is metaphorical in both places," he says: "for on the part of the earth is described an eruption of waters, as if a very great multitude of waters were detained, hidden in the earth, the small channels of the springs not permitting it to go out; for according to this metaphor are described all the cleft fountains of the vastest abyss, so that thus, through the cleft channels, a huge abundance of waters might burst forth. And similarly, on the part of heaven, the waters are described as detained by the bars of windows, and, the windows being opened, to have rushed down headlong: neither of which is true according to propriety, but only according to likeness."

§19. Cajetan: both 'fountains of the abyss' and 'cataracts of heaven' are metaphors. Margin: Cajetan, on Gen. ch. 7.

"For it is signified that, both on the part of heaven and of earth, two things concurred to make the flood: the one as second cause, the other as the action of that cause. On the part of the earth, the great abyss is described as a cause, in which is understood the proximate generative cause of rivers and springs existing in the lands. And the action is described [as] so great an outflow that it was after the likeness of cleft channels of an immense [body of] water. Where note that it is not said, 'The ways of the abyss were

broken,’ but, ‘The fountains were broken’: to signify that the ways of the Ocean were not cleft to wash away the earth, but that the fountains of fresh waters were cleft — namely, of rivers, lakes, and the like.” So Cajetan.

Cajetan continued: ‘fountains,’ not ‘ways,’ points to fresh waters, not the Ocean.

I would believe that by the word “Abyss” in this place are signified subterranean caverns — especially the vastest and deepest (so that here the singular is put for the plural, as frequently elsewhere in the sacred writings): caverns, I say, full of waters either standing or flowing, which waters they receive either from the sea through hidden channels, or themselves generate within themselves, turning into water the many vapors which they contain within themselves, condensed and cooled by their cold, by a perpetual interchange of vapors and waters of this kind: such as Aristotle judged the origin of springs and rivers to be. In the earth, therefore, as above and outside, so be[neath]…

§20. Pererius's own view: ‘abyss’ = the deep subterranean water-caverns. Margins: “What ‘abyss’ signifies here, according to the author”; Aristotle, Meteorology bk. 2. Continues on p. 301.

— p. 301 (PDF) · printed p. 232 —

…that beneath and within the earth there are lakes and rivers and seas, enclosed in the innermost bowels of the earth, is not to be doubted: for it has been reported by truthful cosmographers and historians, and ascertained by manifest signs — but especially by the argument of earthquakes, by which the earth, shaken and gaping most widely, has often vomited forth so great a force of waters that, where there had been none before, new springs, rivers, and lakes came into being. This subterranean water either does not come out above the earth, or [only] through small springs and slender channels; but in the time of the flood — the earlier channels being much widened, and new ones made, and the earth cleft in many places into the vastest chasms — an immense force of waters burst forth to overwhelm the earth. And this, I think, is what Moses said: that the fountains of the great deep were broken up to bring about the flood.

Conclusion of §20 (earthquakes prove the existence of vast underground waters).

FIFTH DISPUTATION. What those cataracts of heaven were, which Moses says were opened to bring about the flood.

If anyone comprehends and weighs in his mind all the signification and use of this Greek word “cataract,” both proper and metaphorical, he will find that by this word is signified that which, with great force and impetus, either casts something else down, or itself rushes and is hurled headlong downward: for both high and steep places, from which waters rush down with great noise and crash, and the waters themselves rushing and falling headlong through those places, are wont to be called by the word “cataracts.” And that this name is often attributed to places, there are many examples: that famous one about the cataracts of the Nile, about which Pliny [says]: “Finally, the Nile, enclosed by mountains, and nowhere more torrential, carried by its hastening waters to the place of the Ethiopians who are called Catadupi, at the last cataract, among the rocks meeting it, is believed not to flow, but to rush, with an immense crash.”

§21. The meaning of ‘cataract’ (waterfalls and the rushing waters). Margins: “What ‘cataract’ signifies in Greek”; Pliny, bk. 5, [ch.] 9.

Strabo, speaking of the same Nile: “A little above Elephantine,” he says, “there is a small cataract, on which the boatmen exhibit a certain spectacle to the leading men. The cataract is about the middle of the river — a certain rocky brow, level in its upper part, so that it can receive the river, but ending in a precipice, from which the water is hurled down. On either side, near the land, there is a channel which can easily be navigated. By this, then, those sailing flow down to the cataract, and with their skiffs are thrust into the precipice — themselves and the skiffs unharmed.” Suidas: “Cataracts,” he says, “are rocks in the river Ister [Danube], like a mountain, where it is broad, that have grown up under the water, into which the river, falling, surges back with the greatest roar; and, overcoming the obstacles and them [the rocks], it makes whirlpools and surges and Charybdes by its

flux driven round in a circle. In short, the river in those places is not much unlike the Sicilian strait.”

Strabo and Suidas on river-cataracts (the Nile, the Danube). Margin: Strabo, Geography bk. 5.

And that the water itself too, rushing down with great force, has the name “cataract,” is plain from this: that a certain river of Pamphylia, because it hurls itself down, is called “Cataractes,” as Mela writes. About which river Strabo speaks thus: “Afterward there is the one which is called Cataractes, a river large and vehement after the manner of a torrent, rushing from a high rock, so that the roar is heard very far o[ff]…”

The river ‘Cataractes’ of Pamphylia. Margins: Pomponius Mela, bk. 1, ch. 14; Strabo bk. 4; Livy bk. 7. Continues on p. 302.

— p. 302 (PDF) · printed p. 233 —

…the roar is heard. Moreover, gates hanging from ropes or chains, which can be raised and lowered — of the kind we see fitted in the gates of cities for repelling a sudden irruption of enemies [i.e., portcullises] — Livy called “cataracts.” And this is the signification and use, among good writers, of that word “cataract.”

Livy's use of ‘cataract’ for a portcullis.

According to this signification, then, of those words of Moses, “The cataracts of heaven were opened,” this seems to be the meaning: that the middle region of the air — in which, from condensed and cooled clouds, rains are generated and fall to the earth (this I call the middle region of the air) — God, in the time of the flood, as it were cleft and opened, so that not by parts, as it usually happens at other times, nor moderately and sparingly, but with incredible abundance and a horrific noise and crash, it poured forth an immense force of waters onto the lands, whence a general flood of the whole world arose. Therefore the word “heaven” in this place signifies not the star-bearing heaven, but the airy [heaven]. And the word “cataracts” signifies either the middle region of the air, as it were cleft and laid open in

many places, or the clouds themselves which pour out rains. For it is reasonable to believe that in the time of the flood that middle region of the air was filled with infinite vapors and the densest clouds; and to signify the greatest outpouring of waters, Moses used a metaphorical and hyperbolical manner of speech, saying that all that region of the air was, as it were, opened, so that it poured down all the water it contained.

§22. Pererius's own reading: the 'cataracts of heaven' = the cloud-laden middle air, opened by God; 'heaven' here = the air, not the starry sphere.

But it is fitting to know that, in place of the Greek word "Cataract," there is read in this place, in Hebrew, "arubbah," which word signifies pipes or windows. And in order that it may be more plainly understood what Moses wished to signify in saying that God opened the windows of heaven, it must be inquired about which heaven Moses speaks — whether the star-bearing heaven or the airy one. For there have not been lacking some, both of the more recent and of the ancient [writers], who thought, and reported in writing, that Moses here speaks of the star-bearing heaven, and of the waters which are above the firmament — which, they say, when that heaven was opened, as if through pipes or windows made in it, were poured out onto the earth to bring about the flood. Hear Eugubinus, a writer of our age: "It is probable that in the time of the flood the heaven lay open in many places, and that vast rivers of waters fell down thence with the greatest crash. For the firmament is reported, in the sacred writings, to be placed amid the waters, in which [writings] the supercelestial waters are also celebrated. Since, therefore, there are waters even above the heaven — which by some are called the crystalline heaven — these, it must be believed, when the heaven was opened, burst forth horribly, and in a short time inundated the whole world: for these waters too were needed to bring about a general flood. Otherwise, if the matter had been done by rains alone, not only the rain of forty days and nights, but not even [the rain] of forty years, would have been enough for bringing about so great a flood." So Eugubinus.

§23. The Hebrew ‘arubbah’ = windows; and the rival view (Eugubinus) that the ‘windows of heaven’ are the star-sphere, releasing the supercelestial/crystalline waters. Margins: “What that heaven is whose cataracts/windows were opened”; Augustinus Eugubinus, Annotations on Genesis.

With whom Oleaster also agreed: “I cannot understand it,” he says, “otherwise than as the letter has it. For he supposes that there are, above the firmament, true and elemental waters, so that as[…]”

Oleaster endorses the literal ‘waters above the firmament.’ Margin: Oleaster, on Gen. ch. 7. Continues on p. 303.

— p. 303 (PDF) · printed p. 234 —

…that there are true and elemental waters above the firmament, as Basil and Chrysostom too think. It is no wonder, then, if God broke windows in the firmament so that those waters might descend; nor do I think there is room for metaphors here. Wherefore those are to be blamed who would rather subject sacred scripture to the laws of philosophy than, as is more fitting, have philosophy serve it as a handmaid.” [So Oleaster.]

Oleaster's conclusion (Basil and Chrysostom for literal waters; philosophy as scripture's handmaid). Margins: Basil; Chrysostom.

Tostatus too, who flourished in the previous century, attributes this very opinion to a certain solemn doctor. For, explaining those words of Moses, “The cataracts of heaven were opened”: “A certain solemn doctor,” he says, “said that the heaven of the stars and all the lower spheres were opened, and a great part of the supercelestial waters — that is, the crystalline ones — fell down to the earth, whence the flood came about. But this does not have even any plausibility, because those crystalline waters are not of the species of elemental waters, for they are not fluid, but as it were frozen and solid, and therefore cannot suffocate or torment men, since they have none of the active and passive qualities which are the instruments of such actions. Add that, since those waters are of a celestial nature, and are not called ‘waters’ except on account of a certain likeness, if they had flowed down onto the lands, a great deal indeed would have

perished of the truth of the celestial substance.” In about this manner [speaks] Tostatus.

§24. Tostatus reports — and rejects — the ‘crystalline supercelestial waters’ view. Margin: Tostatus.

But that that opinion was far more ancient is plain from this: that Bede mentions it, writing that it seemed to some that the waters above the heaven were placed by God for this end and use — that, their immense abundance being hurled down from the heavens onto the lands, a general flood of the whole world (which at some time was to come about by God's will and decree) might be brought about.

Margin: Bede, On the Nature of Things.

But that that opinion is most remote from all reason and truth can be shown by two arguments. For, in order that those waters might flow down to the earth, it would have been necessary that the eight heavens — that is, [the seven] of the planets and the eighth of the fixed stars, above which these believe those waters to be located — be broken apart, so that a descent to the earth might lie open for those waters, and again that all those same heavens be closed and made whole: which is very alien to the incorruptible nature of the heaven. Next, either all that water would have flowed down onto the lands — wherefore the celestial place which it before filled would have remained wholly empty; or only part of that water would have flowed down — therefore the remaining water that would have stayed would have been in vain and superfluous, since at no time hereafter will there be a flood, as God promised. From the things that have been said it appears that, when Moses said that the windows of heaven were opened, he was not speaking of the star-bearing heaven: it remains, therefore, that he was speaking of the airy heaven. But in what way his saying is to be taken and interpreted, let us explain next.

§25. Pererius's two arguments against the starry-heaven reading. Margins: “That the star-bearing heaven was not opened”; Gen. 9.

That Moses, when he said that the windows of heaven were opened, used a metaphorical and hyperbolical manner of speech, must by no means be doubted: for there are no windows in the heaven, whether starry or airy, that can be opened and closed; but Moses, speaking thus, doubtless accommodated his speech to the common sense and opinion of men imagining and supposing that in the heaven — or in the upper regions of the air — [there is] an immense [force] of wat[ers]…

§26. Moses' 'windows of heaven' is metaphor accommodated to common imagination. Margin: "How 'the cataracts of heaven were opened' is to be understood." Continues on p. 304.

— p. 304 (PDF) · printed p. 235 —

…an immense force of waters, which God, when he wills and as much as he wills, either sends forth or retains; and by the excessive retention of them he lays waste and destroys the lands with drought, but on the contrary, by an excessive outpouring, with a flood. Looking to this very thing, Job said of God: "Who binds the waters in his clouds, that they may not break out all together downward. If he holds back the waters, all things will be dried up; if he sends them forth, they will overturn the earth." Whence it comes about that, when there is a great scarcity of rains, the heaven is said to be closed; and again, when an abundance of rains is restored, it is said to be open. And this is frequent in the sacred writings.

§26 (concluded): the metaphor — God opens/closes heaven by sending or withholding rain. Margin: Job 12, 26.

Nay, even when divine scripture wishes to signify that God has given, or will give, to men a great abundance of certain goods or evils, it is wont to say that God has opened, or will open, the cataracts of heaven, to signify the most lavish outpouring of those goods or evils. We read that, when Elisha had foretold that on the next day a measure of fine flour would be sold for one stater, and two measures of barley for one stater, one of the captains of the king of Israel, not believing Elisha, answered: "If the Lord should make even cataracts in heaven, could that be which thou sayest?" (4

Kings 7). We read likewise in Malachi that God, promising to the Jews a huge abundance of goods, spoke thus: “If I open not to you the cataracts of heaven, and pour out to you a blessing even unto abundance” (Mal. 3).

§27. ‘Cataracts of heaven’ as a Scriptural idiom for abundance. Margins: “The word ‘Cataract’ for an abundance of goods or evils”; 4 Kings 7; Mal. 3.

The word “Cataract” is also sometimes taken in a bad sense, as in Psalm 41: “Deep,” he says, “calleth on deep, at the voice of thy cataracts.” That is: the calamity by which, as by a most profound deep and chasm, I am pressed and swallowed up, continually summons and draws to itself, as it were, another deep of calamities, and this another — so that there is no end of my calamities, and no intermission of my griefs and torments, while thou, O Lord, dost so overwhelm me with evils and calamities, as thou art sometimes wont to hurl down onto the lands an immense force of waters, as if by opened windows of heaven, with a horrific noise and crash. It appears, therefore, that the opening of the windows of heaven for raining in the time of the flood signifies, by metaphor, the immense force of rains rushing onto the lands with a horrible noise and impetus.

‘Cataracts’ in a bad sense (Ps. 41). Margin: “The passage of Psalm 41.”

Chrysostom understood this place similarly: “See,” he says, “with what great moderation of speech divine scripture here uses. For it speaks all things according to human custom — not that there are cataracts and windows in heaven, but as if it said: The Lord only commanded, and immediately the nature of the waters obeyed the command of the Creator, and, as it flowed together, inundated the whole world.” Rupert writes similar things: “What he says, ‘The cataracts of heaven were opened,’ is to be taken,” says Rupert, “by hyperbole, and was so said to suggest the magnitude of the inundation, which was so great that the firmament — placed by God between the celestial and terrestrial waters — seemed, according to the opinion of the common people, to be broken up. We do indeed call the ‘cataracts of heaven’ the hidden ways through which the

rain descends from heaven (the airy one, of course). But in saying this we speak rather after the manner of the common people than according to the sense of scripture. For the heaven is not something solid or hard, so that it could rightly be understood to be cut through with windows in the manner of a wall, which being opened the waters are poured down, and which being closed it was contained above." So Rupert.

§28. Chrysostom and Rupert: the 'windows of heaven' is hyperbole/accommodation. Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 25 on Genesis; Rupert, Commentaries on Genesis, bk. 4, ch. 20.

— p. 305 (PDF) · printed p. 236 —

But let us conclude this disputation about the cataracts of heaven by adding the moral understanding and treatment of this passage which is found in Ambrose: "'And all the fountains of the deep were broken up,' he says, 'the cataracts of heaven were opened.' Scripture fittingly expressed the force of the flood, saying that heaven and earth were moved together — the elements of which the whole beginning of this world consists. On every side, therefore, by the masses of waters flowing in, the enclosed race of men is hard pressed. This according to the letter. But as regards the higher sense: by the symbol of heaven the human mind is signified; by the appellation of earth, the body and the senses. Great, therefore, are the shipwrecks, when the whirlwind and storm of the mind, and of the body, and of all the senses alike, are mingled. Let us weigh the words carefully: for the most part the fraud of the mind and its guile exercise their venom, yet the sobriety of the body and continence overshadow the wickedness of the mind."

§29. The tropological reading (Ambrose): heaven = the mind, earth = body/senses. Margins: "The tropology of this passage"; Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 14.

"Frequently the slippery mind is uncertain in its faith and opinion, yet the flesh is not free from delights and luxury, so that frugality does not excuse the error of the mind: as there are many heretics who wish to make a show of bodily continence, in order to gain credit for their assertion by the

testimony of their flesh; and although slippery in mind, yet, being somewhat less base, they are held somewhat more excusable. But when the venoms of the mind and the bodily contagions of obscenity confound all sense and vigor, and the soul, slippery with uncertain motion — foul with the ink-stain of malice, kindled with the fury of cruelty — is incited even to bodily disgraces; and the avaricious affection too, impatient of moderate means, is hurled by luxury, by greed, and by the lust of squandering into the crime of coveting another's welfare: then there is a great flood, all the passions assailing alike; then folly, injustice, rashness, wickedness, perfidy seem to pour themselves out from the upper part, as it were the cataracts of the mind. Thence burst forth, from the fountain of the body, earthly lust, drunkenness, luxury, and finally the lapses into various crimes, which utterly enfeeble both the strength of the body and the vigor of the mind." This [says] Ambrose.

The inner 'flood' of the passions (Ambrose continued).

SIXTH DISPUTATION. On the rain of forty days, from which the flood was chiefly made.

"And rain fell upon the earth," says Moses, "forty days and forty nights." Behold for you why Moses said that the cataracts of heaven were opened: namely, to indicate that an immense force of waters was poured from heaven onto the lands — which the continuous and most dense rain of forty days plainly declares. And Cajetan well notes in this place that what was said by Moses about the rain of forty days is to be understood likewise of the eruption of waters onto the lands from the fountains of the abyss: for in equal time the water both flowed down from heaven, and gushed and burst forth from the e[arth]…

Margins: Gen. 7, v. 12; Cajetan. *Continues on p. 306.*

— p. 306 (PDF) · printed p. 237 —

…both flowed down from heaven, and gushed and burst forth from the earth. But from these words four doubts arise. The first: Why did Moses distinctly name days and nights? For it would have been enough to say "forty days." Did he speak thus lest, if he had said precisely "forty days," someone might perhaps think that those were artificial days [daytime], and that it rained indeed by day but not by night? He said, therefore, "days and nights," to signify the natural day, which consists of twenty-four hours, and that that rain fell continuously both by day and by night. But because both Moses elsewhere often in scripture, and in this very chapter a little below, sets down the name "day" precisely to signify the natural day, it could be said, not without probability, that this distinct mention of days and nights is sometimes employed in the sacred writings where something very notable and admirable is related: and that this is done for emphasis — namely, both for the greater heightening of the matter narrated, and for the admiration of the readers and hearers.

§30. First doubt: why 'days and nights.' Margins: "FOUR DOUBTS"; "Why Moses distinctly named days and nights."

For example: it is beyond human power and belief that any mortal should have used no food or drink for forty days; yet, when divine Scripture narrates this of Moses, of Elijah, of our Lord the Savior, it says that they fasted forty days and forty nights. Similarly, then, because it was very wonderful that it rained continuously for forty whole days, therefore Moses said that it rained forty days and forty nights.

Margins: Deut. 9; 3 Kings 19; Matt. 4; "Emphatic."

The second doubt. Whence did Noah have it ascertained and known that those forty days and forty nights had passed during which that rain fell? For, shut up in the Ark, he could see neither the presence nor the absence of the Sun; nor, if he had been outside the Ark at that time, could he have seen the Sun, the heaven being on every side overspread with the densest vapors and, as it were, blinded. Did Noah — or Moses, who wrote this history —

know this by some singular revelation of God? Or did Noah have within the Ark some clock (horologium) which, by its motion and sound, indicated each and every hour of the day and night?

§31. Second doubt: how Noah tracked the forty days. Margin: "Second doubt: whence Noah knew the forty days had passed."

The third doubt. Whence was there so great a supply of vapors, from which the rain of forty days might be generated? Is it fitting to think that a great deal of the earth at that time was thinned and resolved into aqueous vapors, and that all the vapors which were in the air were then changed into water? And not only this, but besides it may be credible that a great part of the air was changed into rain-water: for since the flood covered the whole earth so deeply that it surpassed the highest mountains by fifteen cubits, it must be believed that the air which before occupied all that space around the earth (which was afterward filled with waters) was turned into water.

§32. Third doubt: the source of so much vapor. Margin: "Third doubt: whence so great a supply of vapors."

The fourth doubt. Which was the more principal cause of the flood: the terrestrial water — whether bursting from the fountains of the abyss, or that which was poured out from the sea — or the rain that flowed down from heaven for forty days? For my part, I would believe that the chief cause of the flood was in the rain of forty days. For neither could the wa[ter]…

§33. Fourth doubt: which cause was chief. Margin: "Fourth doubt: which was the more efficacious cause of the flood — the terrestrial and marine water, or the celestial/rain." Continues on p. 307.

— p. 307 (PDF) · printed p. 238 —

…the water, whether leaping out from subterranean places, or flowing over the earth, or inundating the earth from the surging sea, could grow and swell so much, and ascend to so great a height, as to surpass the peaks of all the mountains by fifteen cubits: since that height was, by a very great interval, greater than the origin of all terrestrial waters, and than any

swelling and heaping-up of the sea. That excess of the flood above all the mountains, therefore, could come about from nothing else than the celestial rain: for the origin of this was higher than the place to which the flood reached. For the height of the flood, although it was very great, was nevertheless below the middle region of the air, where rain is generated.

§33 (cont.). Pererius's reasoning: only rain could raise the water above the mountains.

Nor did that production and extension of the rain over forty days fail to furnish a notable argument of the divine longsuffering and kindness, awaiting and inciting those men to penance by so slow a delay of vengeance and destruction. Hear Chrysostom: “Now,” he says, “that the flood was brought on over forty days — this very thing too is the greatest kind of goodness. For, on account of his great mercy, he wished that even some of them, being chastened, might escape that general destruction, when they saw their neighbors perishing before their eyes and the common ruin threatening them. For it is likely that on the first day of the flood a good part of the men perished, and on the second day another, and likewise on the third and fourth and the rest; and thus he prolonged it over forty days, that he might take from them every pretext of defense. For if he had willed and commanded, he could in one moment have destroyed all things by a flood; but in his mercy he used so great a prolongation of days.” So St. Chrysostom.

§34. The forty days as a mercy (Chrysostom: a slow judgment, summoning to penance). Margins: “A moral lesson”; Chrysostom, hom. 25 on Genesis.

And so, what is reported in the sacred writings about the inhabitants of the region of Canaan (who being expelled, God gave that region to the Hebrews), the same can most truly be said of those who perished in the flood. For thus it is written in the book of Wisdom: “Not because thou wast unable to subject the impious to the just in battle, or by cruel beasts, or with a harsh word to exterminate them at once; but, judging by degrees, thou gavest place for penance, not being ignorant that their nation is wicked, and

their malice natural, and that their thought could never be changed: and thou gavest pardon to their sins. And thou hast taught thy people, by such works, that the just man ought to be also humane; and thou hast made thy children of good hope, because, in judging, thou givest place in [their] sins for penance. For if thou hast tormented with such attention the enemies of thy servants, as deserving death, giving time and place by which they might be changed from their malice," etc.

The Canaanites (Wisdom 12) as a parallel to the men of the Flood — God's slow judgment leaves room for repentance. Margin: Wisdom 12.

— p. 308 (PDF) · printed p. 239 —

SEVENTH DISPUTATION. What that means which Moses said: "In the joint (articulus) of that day Noah entered the Ark"?

These words of Moses do not have an easy meaning, on account of the obscure notion of that word (articulus): for what "the articulus of the day" signifies in this place is not known to everyone. Lyra says that "articulus" signifies a distinct and manifest thing, and here signifies a time of day clear and conspicuous to all. So that the sense is: by God's command Noah entered the ark in clear daylight, so that others, seeing him enter so confidently, might understand that it was guarded by divine protection from those who had resolved to kill him by ambush, and so to prevent him from entering the ark. But Tostatus does not approve this interpretation, himself thinking that by the word "articulus" is signified a certain small and distinct thing, and that in this place is denoted by that word the small part of time by which night is separated from day, and that this is the daybreak or dawn. The meaning of those words, therefore, is this: that Noah, by God's command, entered the ark at the very dawn. And of this interpretation Tostatus commends as authors two most learned of the Rabbis, Abraham and Aven-Esra.

§35. The puzzle of 'articulus diei': Lyra (clear daylight) vs. Tostatus (dawn). Margins: Lyra on Gen. 6–7; Tostatus on Gen. 7.

I observe that among Latin writers various significations of that word are in use. Properly, “articulus” among the Philosophers and Physicians is put for the joint or knot of a member of the body: for that by which one member is separated from another, and nevertheless coheres with it, is called an “articulus.” By metaphor, in the vine the knots from which the bud bursts forth are called “articuli.” Pliny likewise, at the end of his work, seems to have called the little hills and gently rising slopes the “articuli” of the mountains. Ovid, in the second book of the Pontic [Epistles], said “to reckon by articuli” for “to reckon by fingers.” The author of the [Rhetoric] to Herennius, in the fourth book, called the “articulus” a member of a period [a clause], which by the Greeks is called κ■λον (colon). And among the Grammarians those are called “articuli” which, in declining nouns, are prefixed for the sake of distinguishing gender — such as “hic, haec, hoc.” Finally, it is often put for a certain moment, and a timely and opportune time for doing something.

§36. The range of meanings of Latin ‘articulus.’ Margins: “Various senses of the Latin word ‘articulus’”; Pliny; Ovid; the author To Herennius.

— p. 309 (PDF) · printed p. 240 —

Whence Cicero, in [the speech] for Quintius: “That he might bind the man, by his own conditions, in the very joint (articulus) of time.” And St. Jerome, in the epistle to Julian: “My son, your brother Ausonius, in the very articulus of [his] departure and in a point of time, thought it [worthwhile] to return,” etc. Therefore, for the Latins, the “articulus” of time signifies a point, and, as it were, an extremity of time, or that which, in time, is most opportune and most to be chosen for doing something. Noah, therefore, is said to have entered the ark “in the articulus of that day,” that is, at some fixed time of that day most opportune and most suitable for entering.

Cicero and Jerome on ‘articulus temporis’ = a critical/opportune moment. Margins: Cicero; Jerome.

But for that word “articulus,” in Hebrew it is “hesem,” from the verb “hasam,” which means “to strengthen”: so that, word for word, it is signified (as Oleaster expounds) that Noah entered “in the strength of that day,” that is, between morning and evening and near noon — for then the light is greater and stronger. Although he himself confesses that here nothing else is signified than that Noah entered on that same day: for thus the Septuagint rendered it, and thus from the Hebrew, word for word, Pagninus and others translated. Cajetan reads, according to the Hebrew verity: “In the property of that day”; and explains it in this manner: “That pronoun, ‘that,’ points to the day before mentioned — that is, the day before that day on which the flood occurred, which was the sixteenth day of that month (for on the seventeenth day the flood began). And what is said, ‘In the property of that day,’ signifies that he entered on that day alone, and not on that and on other days: as if he himself entered on that day, but on the preceding days had sent his household ahead.”

§37. The Hebrew ‘etsem’ (strength of the day) and Cajetan's reading (the day before the Flood). Margins: Oleaster; Cajetan.

But from the narrative of Moses a question arises: on what day Noah really entered the Ark. For I see three opinions about this. One is Cajetan's, who (as we just before recalled) thinks that he entered on the sixteenth day of the month, namely the day before that day on which the flood began. But this opinion has no support from the sacred writings or from any probable conjecture, but rests only on Cajetan's own opinion and judgment. The second opinion is that Noah entered the Ark on the very same day on which the flood began, as seems to be signified here clearly enough. For when Moses had said that on the seventeenth day of the second month the flood began, he subjoined: “In the articulus of that day Noah entered.” Chrysostom seems to have thought the same: “When,” he says, “the flood began, then, according to the command of the Lord, Noah entered the Ark with his family and with the animals.” Of the same opinion is Tostatus. But Moses said a little above that seven days before the beginning of the flood

Noah entered the Ark — narrating this, namely, by anticipation, that is, mentioning earlier what happened later.

§38. The three opinions on the day of entry (Cajetan: day before; Chrysostom/Tostatus: the day the flood began). Margins: Cajetan; Chrysostom, hom. 25 on Genesis; Tostatus.

The third opinion is that Noah entered seven days before the flood, that is, on the tenth day of that second month. For this Moses seems plainly to indicate, narrating at the opening of the seventh chapter that God said to Noah: “Go in thou, and all thy house, into the Ark: for yet, and after seven days, I will rain upon the earth,” etc.; and a little below: “And Noah went into the Ark; and when the seven days had passed, the waters of the flood inundated the earth.” And this opinion pleased St. Ambrose, which he explains and illustrates in clear words in the book On Noah and the Ark, chapter thirteen. Therefore, what is said here, “In the articulus of that day,” is to be taken as if said by recapitulation; and it ought to be referred not to the day on which the flood began, but to that day on which Noah had entered, which had been the seventh before the beginning of the flood, as Moses had said above. Or, if that phrase, “In the articulus of that day,” is referred to the day of the flood, that word “entered,” [being] of past tense, is to be interpreted (as some think) by the ver[b]…

§38 (cont.). The third opinion (Ambrose): seven days before; ‘articulus’ read as recapitulation. Margin: Ambrose. Continues on p. 310.

— p. 310 (PDF) · printed p. 241 —

…by the verb of the pluperfect tense, “had entered.” So that this is the sense: At the beginning of that day on which the flood began, Noah had already entered seven days before. To me the first opinion seems to have no probability; the rest I judge probable — yet in such a way that I prefer the third. But why Noah entered the Ark seven days before the flood, three causes were set forth above in the opening of the first disputation.

Pererius's verdict: he prefers the third opinion (entry seven days before). Margin: Vatablus.

EIGHTH DISPUTATION. What that is which Moses says, "And the Lord shut him in from outside."

By these words it is signified that the door of the Ark was closed from outside by God: for this being closed, Noah was plainly shut into the Ark. For the door of the Ark had been designed and built in such a way that it could be opened and closed not by those who were inside the Ark, but from outside by others. This was done in order that the door might be the better closed, and, it being smeared on the outside with bitumen and all the chinks closed up, the Ark might be the more fortified and safe against the penetrating moisture of so great and so long-lasting an inundation of waters. And although the door was closed by the ministry and work of the Angels, it is nevertheless said to be closed by God, because by a certain singular command of God it was closed by the Angels, and in order that there might be indicated a certain special and exceptional care, full of benevolence, which God bore for protecting Noah himself and preserving him from that destruction of the flood. Wherefore in the Chaldaic, in place of what we have, "And the Lord shut him in from outside," it is, word for word: "And the Lord protected him by his word."

§39. The door shut from outside (by God, through angels) for protection. (OCR mis-numbers this §37.)

But in Hebrew in this place it is: "The Lord closed over him," as Pagninus translates; or, as Cajetan reads, "The Lord closed for him." For because Noah, placed within the Ark, could not close its door, therefore the Lord, for him — that is, supplying his place — closed the door. Others read: "He closed behind him." And in all these versions the word "door" must be understood. The Greek renders this sense: "And the Lord closed the Ark from outside of it"; although some do not read that "of it," but precisely only "from outside," or, as Ambrose reads, "from outside (a foris)." "The Lord closed the Ark from outside," says Ambrose. "For it had to be closed, and safely fenced with a defense, lest the wandering streams of the flood penetrate it. And of the higher sense too there is a not unfitting

interpretation, if we say that the human body (which was figured by that Ark), fenced with skin, is defended from cold and heat — [the body] which God the craftsman clothed, for the protection of all the members, with natural coverings, and clad with a certain enveloping covering, so that it neither freezes with cold nor is dissolved by summer heat.” So Ambrose.

The textual variants (Pagninus, Cajetan, Greek, Ambrose) and Ambrose's allegory (the ark = the skin-clad body). Margins: Pagninus; Cajetan; Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 15.

But Chrysostom, on those very words: “Notice,” he says, “in this place too the accommodation of divine Scripture to our weakness. The Lord closed the Ark from outside,” he says, “to teach that he made Noah secure: whom on that account also he shut in from outside, lest he, seeing the general destruction of all, should be consumed with the greatest grief…”

§40. Chrysostom: God shut Noah in to spare him the sight of the destruction. Margin: Chrysostom, hom. 25 on Genesis. Continues on p. 311.

— p. 311 (PDF) · printed p. 242 —

“For if he had seen that most atrocious tempest, and the destruction of the human race, and the perishing of the beasts, and the abolition of the earth itself, he would have been seized with incredible sadness and grief, and disturbed in mind. For the souls of good men are wont to have great compassion, whenever they see men punished, even if those who perish are wicked: wherefore they are wont also to supplicate God for them — as Abraham for the Sodomites, and the Prophet for the criminal and impious Jews. God therefore did not wish the mind of Noah to be more vehemently disturbed and tormented by the sight of so horrible a spectacle, and lest, beholding so great a flood, he should be seized with fear. For it is likely that, if he had seen so great an inundation of waters, he would have been anxious lest he too should perish by the waters. The merciful God, therefore, bearing care for him, did not permit him either to behold the savagery of the waters, or to see the destruction of men, and the common slaughter of the world.”

Chrysostom continued (the compassion of the just; Abraham for Sodom). Margin: Gen. 18.

Next, Chrysostom, considering with himself by how great inconveniences, troubles, and hardships, throughout that whole year in which he was in the Ark, Noah was beset and afflicted, vehemently admires the excellent faith of that man, joined with incredible patience and constancy. And he attributes it not to human powers, but to divine grace, by which, aided, he overcame so many and so great evils: for unless it had strengthened his mind, and made light the things that were very difficult, how could he have lived so long, shut up as in a prison and confinement, and withstood so great onsets of the waves? For those who are in a ship and use sails, and see the helmsman sitting at the tiller and by his skill struggling against the force of the winds, if ever they see the madness of the waves, fearing for their safety, are almost lifeless with dread. What, then, shall we say of Noah, who, as if thrust into a prison, was tossed this way and that, and could see neither heaven nor earth, nor anything that might bring consolation?

§41. Chrysostom on Noah's endurance, aided by grace. Margin: Chrysostom, ibid.

But even if those men had had bodies of iron or adamant, they could scarcely have endured so long: inasmuch as they enjoyed neither air nor wind (which no less than air was made for the refreshing of our bodies), nor could they feed their eyes with any spectacle either of heaven or of earth. How were their eyes not blinded in that so foul a prison? How could they bear the company of the wild beasts and their stench? How did the very beasts not perish, which could neither draw air nor move themselves from their place? For it is established that this is the nature both of men and of animals: that, although one may enjoy open and free air and abound in many comforts, yet if he be perpetually in one and the same place, he cannot long remain without some harm and corruption. But if we, after so many thousands of years, hearing Scripture narrate the atrocity of that flood, are seized with fear and amazement and in a manner tremble: what is

it fitting to believe Noah would have suffered, if with his own eyes he had seen that most profound aby[ss]…

Chrysostom on the hardships of the year in the Ark. Continues on p. 312.

— p. 312 (PDF) · printed p. 243 —

…the abyss belching forth waters on every side, and, as if the heavens were unbarred, an immense force of waters falling headlong continuously onto the earth for forty days?

Conclusion of the Chrysostom passage (§41).

This too is worthy of great admiration: how Noah could for so long dwell harmlessly with the most savage wild beasts. Doubtless the dominion over the animals which Adam had lost on account of sin, Noah recovered, and again the animals recognized man as their lord, and were subject and obedient to him. And just as Daniel, surrounded by Lions, lived fearlessly as though he were surrounded by men — the virtue of the prophet bridling the natural savagery of the beasts — so Noah handled the animals not only harmlessly, but even with authority and command, as he wished. Therefore that so long-lasting prison was not grievous to Noah, but as pleasant and delightful as meadows and gardens are wont to be to us. For the command of the Lord rendered pleasant the things which in themselves were most hateful. For such is the custom of the just: that, when they endure something for God's sake, they do not regard the things themselves that happen, but, weighing the cause with themselves, easily bear all things.

§42. Noah's recovered dominion over the animals (compared to Daniel among the lions). Margins: Gen. 9; Dan. 6, 14.

NINTH DISPUTATION. On the magnitude of the flood: whether, when Moses said that in the time of the flood all the mountains which are under the whole heaven were covered with waters, this is to be understood of the starry heaven or of the airy [heaven], and of all the mountains, with absolutely none excepted.

The magnitude of Noah's flood could not be more expressly declared than it has been declared by Moses in those words: “And the waters prevailed beyond measure upon the earth; and all the high mountains under the whole heaven were covered. The water was fifteen cubits higher than the mountains which it had covered.” “Not without cause,” says Chrysostom, “does divine Scripture narrate these things about the magnitude and height of that flood, but that we may learn that not only men and reptiles were submerged by the flood, but also the birds of the air, and whatever animals live in the mountains: so that it might be understood that what God had long before threatened that he would do, this he did afterward, and omitted nothing.” For this cause, therefore, it describes so great a height of the flood above all the mountains of the earth, namely so that it may be known that no animal escaped, but that all, together with man (for whose sake they had been made), were destroyed.

§43. The Flood fifteen cubits above the mountains (Chrysostom). Margins: Gen. 7, vv. 19–20; Chrysostom, hom. 25; Gen. 6.

But those words of Moses, in which he says that all the mountains which are under the whole heaven were covered by the flood, have some doubts. And in the first place it can be called into doubt — when Moses said that all the mountains which are under heaven were under the waters — of which heaven he speaks, whether of the star[ry] or of the air[y]…

§44 begins. Continues on p. 313.

— p. 313 (PDF) · printed p. 244 —

…of which heaven he speaks, whether of the starry or of the airy. Cajetan thinks that Moses spoke not of the starry but of the airy heaven, or rather of that part of the air which the Philosophers call the middle region of the air, where rains are generated. For, speaking of the starry heaven, it would be said vainly and ineptly, “all the mountains which are under heaven”: for who could be in doubt about this? For there can be no mountain that is not under the star-bearing heaven, nay, that is not even contained within the

compass of the moon's orb. But concerning the airy heaven it is not so: for there are some mountains higher than the middle region of the air, which it is not necessary to confess were covered by the waters of the flood. Certainly it is believed by many that the mountain of the earthly Paradise was untouched by the flood.

§44. Cajetan: 'under heaven' means under the airy (rain-)region — so peaks above it (e.g. Paradise's mountain) need not have been covered. Margin: "Cajetan thinks the peaks of some mountains were not covered by the flood-waters."

Nor, however, on that account could either men or animals be preserved from the flood on those mountains: for the men of that time neither believed beforehand that the flood would come, and when it came, hoped that it would soon cease. But afterward, the flood continuing, when they wished to seek an escape from it by making for the mountains, they were overwhelmed and suffocated by the waters, increased beyond measure. And it is reasonable to think the same of the animals, which at the beginning of the flood hid themselves in lurking-places, in which, the waters increasing in great measure, they were overwhelmed and perished.

But it is better that the reader most clearly perceive this opinion of Cajetan from his words here appended. "It appears," he says, "that Moses does not speak of all the high mountains simply and absolutely, but only of those which are under heaven — that is, under the region of the air in which rains and the rest of this kind are generated. For it is established that by the appellation 'heavens' in sacred Scripture the air is sometimes understood, according to that [phrase]: 'The birds of heaven.' It is established also that Moses not vainly added, concerning the mountains, that [phrase] 'which are under the whole heaven.' For he knew that there are no mountains which are not under the celestial bodies; but he added this for the distinction of mountains which are not only above some part of the heaven, but above the whole heaven — that is, above the whole airy heaven that covers us with clouds. Whence it comes about that the exception of the peaks of mountains rising above the whole heaven (in which rains and

other such things are generated) does not contradict sacred Scripture. To this sense the common exception of the mountain in which is the earthly Paradise also bears witness — where Enoch was at the time of the flood, still living there.”

Cajetan's own words (the ‘under the whole heaven’ qualification; the mountain of Paradise as the standing exception). Margin: Gen. 5.

“Nor on that account were any men saved on the peaks of such mountains: because, as the Lord said in the Gospel, the men of that time did not believe the flood would come; and, so vast waters suddenly assailing both below and above, and immense waters rushing headlong from the mountains, access to so great a height of those mountains was hindered. And the more so, because they, not believing in the flood, awaited fair weather for many days, within which days so great an exuberance of waters was multiplied that access to the peaks of those mountains was impossible; and much less could the animals reach those peaks, since it is common to them to move according to the disposition of present circumstances. And through this, at the beginning of so great a rain it is credible that they sought sheltering hiding-places; but afterward, the greatest rains continuing, they were prevented from going out.” So Cajetan. But in Cajetan's words there are some things neither true nor like the truth. Never[theless]…

§45 begins. Cajetan's account concluded; Pererius signals a critique. Margins: Matt. 24; Luke 17; “Cajetan is refuted.” Continues on p. 314.

— p. 314 (PDF) · printed p. 245 —

Nevertheless, the falsity of the others will become known from the explanation of the following questions: now it will be enough to refute that one point which is, as it were, the foundation of the rest. Cajetan says that the phrase “under the whole heaven” must be interpreted of the airy heaven — that is, of the middle region of the air. This indeed has no probability. I know that not only in the sacred writings, but also among Latin writers and in common speech, “heaven” is often said for “air”: but for “air” taken

simply and indefinitely, not definitely and specifically for the middle region of the air; especially when it is said, “All things that are under heaven.” For who would understand of the airy heaven, and not rather of the starry, what the Lord said in Job: “All things that are under heaven are mine”; and what Luke said, that on the day of Pentecost there were at Jerusalem men of every nation that is under heaven; and what Paul said, that the Gospel had already at that time been preached in every creature that is under heaven (Col. 1)? For it is the same to say, “All things that are under heaven,” as to say, “All things that are contained within the compass of heaven”: and who would interpret this of the compass of the airy heaven, or middle region of the air, and not rather of the compass of the starry heaven? But what Cajetan says about certain mountains exceeding the middle region of the air must be examined next.

§45 (concl.). Pererius refutes Cajetan's ‘under heaven = the airy region’ reading. Margins: Job 41; Col. 4.

Whether, then, there were any mountains or any places in the whole world which were not covered by the waters of the flood, must be inquired into. There have not been wanting those who said that some mountains — whose height, that is, exceeds the place of the generation of rains, or the middle region of the air (such as Olympus, Athos, and Atlas, as is reported by many, are) — were not covered by the flood. And they argued thus: the flood came about chiefly on account of the rains; the flood, therefore, could not increase and ascend above the place where the rains are generated; and since the peaks of those mountains rise above that place, those mountains must necessarily not have been touched by the flood. The ancients relate that Olympus raises its peak so high that the inhabitants call its summit “heaven”; [and] that on its top the remains of sacrifices are neither scattered by the winds nor washed away by rains, but, with the next year coming round, are found exactly as they were left.

§46. The objection from the ‘unflooded’ high peaks. Margins: Solinus, chs. 14, 20, 27; “The height of Olympus.”

Similar things are related of Mount Athos in Macedonia, of whose loftiness this also is a proof: that from Macedonia, at the time of the Solstice, it casts a shadow as far as the forum of Myrina, which is a town in Lemnos, distant indeed eighty-six thousand paces. And they say that Atlas raises its head beyond the clouds, and is lifted up to the very neighborhood of the lunar circle. Plutarch certainly, in [the life of] Paulus Aemilius, writes that Xenagoras measured the highest height of Mount Olympus by plumb-line — by force and reason and mathematical instruments — and found it to be ten stadia, that is, one thousand two hundred and fifty paces. Plutarch adds there that many think that neither the height of any mountain nor the depth of any sea is greater than ten stadia. But Pliny writes affirmatively that the height of Mount Casius, which is in Antiochene Syria, is, in a straight line, four thousand pa[ces]…

The heights of Athos and Atlas; Plutarch and Pliny on measured mountain-heights. Margins: “The loftiness of Mt. Athos and of Atlas”; Plutarch; Pliny, bk. 5, ch. 22. Continues on p. 315.

— p. 315 (PDF) · printed p. 246 —

…of Mount Casius, which is in Antiochene Syria, is, in a straight line, four thousand paces. This argumentation and objection of theirs, by which they wish to make out that Noah's flood was not entirely general, St. Augustine both records and refutes in passing. For he writes thus in book 15 of The City of God, chapter 27: “Some think that so great a flood could not have come about that the water, by growing, transcended the highest mountains by fifteen cubits — on account of the peak of Mount Olympus, above which clouds are said not to be able to climb, [so] that this thicker air is not there, where winds, mists, and rains are produced: and they do not consider that the densest of all the elements, the earth, could be there. Or do they perhaps deny that this peak of the mountain is earth? Why, then, do they contend that it was permitted for lands to be raised up to those spaces of heaven, but not permitted for waters to be raised up? — when these measurers and weighers of the elements declare that waters are higher and lighter than lands. What reason, therefore, do they bring, why the earth,

heavier and lower, has invaded the place of the calmer heaven through the rolling of so many years, and the water, lighter and higher, was not permitted to do this even for a short time?” So Augustine.

§47. Augustine's refutation: if earth (the peak) can rise that high, so can the lighter water. Margins: “Mount Casius”; Augustine.

Therefore the reasoning and argument of St. Augustine against them has this force: If the earth which is on the peak of Mount Olympus could be raised above the place where rains are generated and whence they fall, why could not the water of the flood likewise be carried above that place — water which is by its nature lighter than earth, and ought to be placed above it? But they would answer that there is a special cause why this could not happen in the water of the flood: namely, because it was chiefly made and increased from rains; wherefore it could in no way be raised above the place of the air where rains are generated.

The objectors' rejoinder (the flood-water, being from rain, cannot rise above the rain-region).

There is, therefore, in my judgment, a ready and firm reason for refuting them: to deny that what is reported about those mountains is true; but [to say] that, first, it proceeded from the fabulous fictions of the Poets; then, like many other things, was rashly believed by the common people, to whom the things that seem more wonderful are easier to believe. Ludovicus Vives, my fellow-citizen, explaining that passage of St. Augustine which I just set down, confirms that what is reported about the loftiness of Mount Olympus is fabulous, by the testimony of Philadelphius, who said that he had ascended that mountain to explore so great a matter, and had found it to be false. Next, the things which the ancients write about mountains of this kind by no means cohere among themselves, but are plainly contradictory. For they say that the peaks of those mountains are higher than the middle region of the air — therefore they reach the highest region of the air; but that that region is distant from the earth by fifty miles is established by the demonstrations of the Mathematicians; whereas the

height of no mountain exceeds, straight up, four miles.

§48. Pererius's reply: the tale is a poetic fable (Vives, citing Philadelphius); and the ancients contradict themselves. Margins: "That there is no mountain that exceeds the middle region of the air"; Ludovicus Vives on Augustine; Solinus.

They say, besides, that men inhabit the summit of Mount Athos, leading a most healthful and very long life. "On the summit [of Mount Athos]," says Solinus, "there was a town Acroton, in which the age of the inhabitants was prolonged half as long again as in other lands." And that this is true is plain from another argument. [Aelian] relates…

§49. Margin: Solinus, ch. 16. Continues on p. 316.

— p. 316 (PDF) · printed p. 247 —

Aelian relates that Plato, when the physicians advised him to migrate, for the sake of health, from the unhealthful place of the Academy to the Lyceum, refused, saying: "I would not migrate even to the higher places of Athos, which are most healthful, in order to live longer." There was therefore on the height of Mount Athos a most healthful air. But if that mountain had reached the middle region of the air, or even the highest, it would have been not only unhealthful, but even uninhabitable for man: since the middle region is very cold, moist, and foggy; but the highest, on account of the nearness of the element of fire and on account of the whirling of the heaven, is exceedingly hot and dry and ever-turning: wherefore men could not have lived there even for a short time, much less lived healthfully and long. They also affirm that the peak of Atlas is always covered with snow: therefore the summit of Atlas is below the place where snows are generated and whence they fall; and that this is the middle region of the air (which place is also the birthplace of rains) is manifest from the first book of the Meteorology.

§49 (cont.). The healthful air of Athos's summit (Aelian's Plato anecdote) disproves that it reaches the cold middle air; Atlas's snow likewise. Margins: Aelian, Varia Historia; "A noble example of Plato's contempt of [long] life"; Aristotle.

What more? Since divine scripture, with a double sign of universality applied, says that all the mountains which are under the whole heaven were covered by the waters of the flood, who would dare to except any mountains? For the general statements of divine Scripture may not be restricted, nor their truth diminished by applying exceptions, unless those very exceptions can be gathered from other places of the same Scripture, or unless a necessary and evident reason compels [us] to apply them. Otherwise, the truth of all the general statements of divine Scripture would be rendered doubtful and uncertain, since they would be subject to various exceptions at anyone's pleasure. Behold: if from that general statement about the mountains covered by the flood you wished to except some mountains, similarly another would except the islands, saying that, when Scripture says the whole earth was inundated, that is to be understood only of the continental land; and another would say that it is not to be taken even of the whole continental land, but only of that which before the flood was inhabited by men: and so it would be made out that that flood of Noah was not general over the whole world.

§50. The decisive argument: the ‘double sign of universality’ forbids excepting any mountain — else the universality could be whittled away at will.

TENTH DISPUTATION. Whether the flood reached the middle region of the air.

But here a question arises: If the flood transcended the highest mountains of the earth by fifteen cubits, then it was raised up to the middle region of the air. For we see not rarely that, around the peaks of lofty mountains, clouds are gathered and rains are generated — as though in that place is the middle region of the air, which is the natural place of the generation of rains. But if the flood filled the middle region of the air, it could not have had those waters from rains, since it surpassed the place of the generation of rains. Whence, then, did it have the waters by which it grew so [much]…

§51. The puzzle: did the Flood reach the rain-region, and if so, where did its water come from?
Continues on p. 317.

— p. 317 (PDF) · printed p. 248 —

…by which it grew so much? It can be answered in two ways. First, by denying that the flood reached the middle region of the air, which is farther distant from the earth than the flood ascended. And the generation of rain around the peaks of mountains happens accidentally — namely, when the clouds, [gathered] densely with many and thick vapors, much cold being found there, are condensed and resolved into rain; or, driven and compressed thither by the winds, are similarly turned into water. Next, it can be answered that the flood did indeed reach the middle region of the air, but only as far as pertains to the lowest part of that region, nearest to the lands. But the other, higher part of that region was above the flood, since it extends so widely that its end is very far distant from the lands: for the Mathematicians make the third region of the air to be distant fifty miles from the lands. Therefore, from the waters generated in the higher part of the middle region, an increase could come to the flood, up to the lowest part of the middle region of the air.

Two answers: either the Flood did not reach the middle air, or it reached only its lowest part.

But on the occasion of this passage which we are treating, that passage which is in St. Peter about the heavens which perished by the flood must be explained in passing; for it has no small kinship with this passage of Moses. St. Peter, in the last chapter of his second Epistle, signifies that the heavens perished by the flood, and again that they, restored after the flood, are reserved for fire unto the day of judgment. But it is asked, of which heavens he speaks? St. Peter certainly did not speak of the starry heavens: both because the flood was raised on high only to fifteen cubits above the mountains of the earth, whence to the stars there is an almost immense distance; and also because, although the flood had reached up to heaven, yet, since heaven is incorruptible, it could have taken no detriment from it.

It remains, therefore, that St. Peter spoke of the airy heavens — and not of the whole air, since above that place to which the flood ascended there is a very wide region of air, wholly untouched by the waters of the flood.

§52. The Petrine ‘heavens that perished by water’ (2 Pet. 3) = the lower airy heaven, not the starry. Margins: “The passage of St. Peter, 2nd Epistle, last chapter”; “Which heavens perished in the flood according to St. Peter.”

Therefore the statement of St. Peter must be interpreted of the lowest part of the air, nearest to the lands. For since the flood was raised over the whole earth so far that it surpassed the highest mountains by fifteen cubits, it was necessary that the air which entirely occupied all that space around the earth, filled by the flood, either was corrupted and changed into water, contributing to the increase of the flood; or, yielding to the waters, withdrew itself upward, the heavens yielding place to it. But this latter is absurd and incredible. For the situation, disposition, and motion of the celestial spheres is by nature entirely unchangeable, and there was no reason why it should be changed at the time of the flood. Wherefore it is truer to say that all that air was converted into water. And this too is most likely: that as great a space of air as the flood occupied, so great also the conflagration will occupy at the consummation of the world.

Pererius: that lower air ‘perished’ by being converted into water — and the final conflagration will occupy the same space.

But I am pleased to confirm and adorn this opinion of ours by the authority and words of St. Augustine. Thus he writes in the third book On Genesis according to the Letter, chapter two: “That the airy heavens perished, in a manner, by the flood, we read in a certain one of those [Epistles] which are called canonical. For that moist nature, which had so grown that it transcended the peaks of the highest mountains by fifteen cubits, could not have reached the stars: but because it had filled the whole, or nearly the whole, spaces of this moister air in which the birds fly, the heavens which had been are written, in that Epistle, to have perished: which I do not know how it can be understood, except [with] the quality of this thicker air

convert[ed] into the nature of waters…”

§53. Augustine (Gen. ad litt. bk. 3) on the same. Margin: Augustine. Continues on p. 318.

— p. 318 (PDF) · printed p. 249 —

“…except [with] the quality of this thicker air converted into the nature of waters. Otherwise these heavens would not then have perished, but would have been raised higher, when the water occupied their place. And so we more easily believe, according to the authority of that Epistle, that they perished, and that others (as is there written) were put in their place — the exhalations, namely, being rarefied — than that they were so raised up that the nature of the higher heaven yielded its place to them. For water is so similar to this air, that it is proved to grow thick by its exhalations, so that it both makes the breath of a storm — that is, draws together wind and clouds — and can sustain the flight of birds.”

Augustine continued (2 Pet., last ch.). Margin: 2 Pet., last [chapter].

“Wherefore, even if a certain one of the secular poets spoke truly: ‘Olympus rises above the clouds,’ and, ‘The heights hold peace’ — because it is reported that on the peak of Olympus the air is so thin that it is neither overshadowed by clouds, nor disturbed by winds, nor can sustain the flight of birds, nor nourish with the breath of [its] thicker air those men who perchance have ascended, as they are accustomed to be nourished in this [lower] air — and yet it too is air, whence by a quality akin to waters it is diffused, and on that account it too is believed to have been converted into a moist nature at the time of the flood. For it is not to be thought that the water usurped anything of the spaces of the starry heaven, since it transcended even all the highest mountains.” So Augustine. But whether the flood inundated, laid waste, and destroyed the earthly Paradise, has been disputed by us in the former volume of our Commentaries on Genesis in two places — both in book 3, question five, and especially in book 7, the last question: where we also treated clearly and diligently this passage of Genesis about which we now dispute.

Conclusion of the Augustine quotation (with Lucan's verses on Olympus) and the cross-reference on Paradise. Margin: Lucan, bk. 2.

ELEVENTH DISPUTATION. How long the flood lasted, holding the earth.

Moses, in the last words of the seventh chapter, writes thus: “And the waters held the earth a hundred and fifty days.” It is uncertain whence this time of a hundred and fifty days ought to be counted and whence it takes its beginning: whether from the beginning of the flood — that is, from the seventeenth day of the second month, on which day the flood began to occur; or from the end of the forty-day rain, after, namely, the water had covered the earth so deeply that it surpassed even the highest mountains by fifteen cubits: so that the time during which the flood remained in that state, so deeply covering the whole earth, wa[s]…

§55. The question: from when are the 150 days counted? Continues on p. 319.

— p. 319 (PDF) · printed p. 250 —

…was a hundred and fifty days. St. Augustine touched on this question, but left its solution undecided, as if leaving it to the reader's judgment. For he says thus in the book of Questions on Genesis: “As to what is written, ‘The water was raised above the earth a hundred and fifty days,’ it is asked whether it grew up to this day, or whether for so many days it remained at the height to which it had grown: since other interpreters seem to say this more plainly, for Aquila said, ‘It held’; Symmachus, ‘the waters prevailed.’” So Augustine.

Augustine leaves the question open (citing Aquila and Symmachus). Margin: Augustine, Questions on Genesis, q. 12.

The Scholastic History and Lyra count these hundred and fifty days from the beginning of the flood. And St. Ambrose seems to suggest the same, in the book On Noah and the Ark, chapter seventeen. And this is made credible by the fact that a little below Moses says that the waters of the

flood, after a hundred and fifty days, began to diminish and decrease. And the time of the diminution of the waters seems [right] to be reckoned from that time at which the waters began to grow and inundate the earth, and not from that time at which the flood, its increase being now finished, remained in the same state. Of this opinion too was Hugh in the Annotations on Genesis.

§56. First view: the 150 days run from the start of the flood (Hist. Schol., Lyra, Ambrose, Hugh). Margins: Scholastic History on Genesis, ch. 34; Lyra; Ambrose; Gen. 8, v. 3.

But on the contrary, many authors draw the beginning of these hundred and fifty days from the end of the forty-day rain, and think that by Moses is denoted all that time during which the flood remained at its greatest height over the lands, fifteen cubits higher than the loftiest mountains of the earth. And this opinion is that of Josephus in the first book of the Antiquities, and of Chrysostom, who, explaining these very words of Moses about the hundred and fifty days during which the flood lasted: “For so many days,” he says, “that lofty height of the waters remained.” Approvers and followers of the same opinion are Tostatus and Cajetan, and, among the Hebrews, Rabbi Solomon in this place. To which opinion that word strongly lends support: “The waters held [obtained] upon the earth”; or, as it is in Hebrew word for word, “They strengthened themselves upon the earth”; or, as the Greek translation has, “the water was raised up above the earth.” For it would not have been true to say, on the first or second day on which the flood began to occur, that the water then already held the earth, or was raised up above the earth.

§57. Second view: the 150 days = the time the Flood stood at its peak (Josephus, Chrysostom, Tostatus, Cajetan, Rabbi Solomon). Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 25; Tostatus; Cajetan; Rabbi Solomon.

And so, according to this opinion, one must think that the increase of the flood was during the forty days in which the rain and the eruption of the fountains of the abyss lasted: which being finished, the flood was brought to its highest increase, so that it exceeded the highest mountains of the

earth by fifteen cubits. And it remained at this great height a hundred and fifty days, which comprise the middle time between the end of the increase and the beginning of the decrease of the waters. I judge both opinions probable. But the decision of the proposed question consists chiefly, and depends most, on establishing what those words of Moses signify: “The waters held the earth.” For if that word “the earth” is understood universally — that is, both the plain and the mountainous — without doubt the second opinion will be the truer; and it will be necessary to distinguish these hundred and fifty days from those for[ty]…

§58. Pererius judges both probable; the decision turns on how ‘held the earth’ is read. Margin: “The author's judgment.” Continues on p. 320.

— p. 320 (PDF) · printed p. 251 —

…from those forty days of rain, during which days the waters began gradually to grow, first inundating the plain land, then the mountainous. But if that phrase, “They held the earth,” is understood confusedly and indeterminately, of any land in any way inundated by the waters, the former opinion will be more probable: for from the time that it began to rain and the abyss to vomit forth its waters over the earth, it could truly be said that the water in some way held the earth. To me, indeed, that second opinion, because it is easier to understand and seems more congruent with the words of Moses, would also be more likely — were it not greatly hindered by this: that the months mentioned by Moses (partly in the seventh chapter, partly in the eighth) must, according to this opinion, be taken and computed variously and ambiguously — some from the beginning of the year, others from the beginning of the flood; whereas Moses, setting them down without any distinction, signified not obscurely that they all ought to be taken in the same way. But this matter will be disputed below, in book 13, the third Disputation.

Pererius's reservation about the second view (the inconsistent reckoning of the months); deferred to Book 13.

But, considering the long duration of that flood, great wonder comes upon one: why God willed the flood to remain unchangeably at so great a height over all the lands for a hundred and fifty days, when, for destroying the whole race of men and animals which God had decreed to destroy by the flood, a flood shorter by a single day could have been enough. But I believe indeed that it was so done, that both the monstrousness of the crimes of the human race, and the magnitude of the divine offense and anger and vengeance, might from this very thing become more manifest and illustrious; and also that God might the more test and prove the patience and constancy of Noah himself, and the virtue of his faith and trust, and commend it to all posterity.

§59. Why God kept the Flood at its height so long: to display the gravity of sin and to prove Noah's faith. Margin: "Why God willed the flood to remain so long over the earth."

TWELFTH DISPUTATION. Whether Noah's flood proceeded from natural causes alone, or whether, to bring it about, the supernatural power of God was also needed.

The Stoics think that a general [destruction] of the whole world — both conflagration and flood — comes about from natural causes alone, and has already often been done up to now, and will often be done in the future. And we recalled above the five efficient causes of a flood set forth by Seneca, when we treated the third disputation. Seneca, moreover, commends Berosus as the author of this very opinion, by whom it was reported that, from a certain comparison and arrangement of the stars among themselves, a general flood as well as conflagration of the world proceeds. Berosus Annianus certainly indicates this not obscurely, affirming that Noah, by the inspection and observation of the stars, foresaw that the flood would come, and, in order to escape it, built for himself a ship after the likeness of the Ark — having undertaken the building of that Ark in the seventy-eighth year before the flood.

§60. The Stoic/astrological view (a flood from natural causes/a stellar conjunction; Berosus, Seneca). Margins: the Stoics; Seneca, Nat. Quaest. bk. 3, ch. 27ff; Berosus Annianus.

Nor did this opinion displease even Christian writers. A certain Henry of Mechlin, a disciple of Albertus Magnus, in the commentaries which he published on the great conjunctions of Albumasar, did not hesitate to say that it had been ascertained by him, from Astronomical computations, that before Noah's flood there was a certain conjunction of the stars which had the power of bringing about a general inundation of waters: and this conjunction was of Jupiter and Saturn at the end of Cancer, opposite the Argolic ship [Argo Navis], by which the Ark of Noah too was figured and signified.

§61. Henry of Mechlin (a disciple of Albertus Magnus): a Jupiter–Saturn conjunction in Cancer before the Flood. Margin: Henry of Mechlin.

— p. 321 (PDF) · printed p. 252 —

Pierre d'Ailly was a constant champion and defender of this opinion, since he, in his Questions on Genesis, disputing upon that statement of Moses, “The cataracts of heaven were opened,” said assertively: “Although Noah knew by divine revelation that the flood would come, the same could nevertheless have become known to him from the rules of Astronomy. For certain constellations of heaven preceded the flood, which not only presignified that general cataclysm, but also effected it — not indeed as first causes, but as second [causes], that is, as ministers and handmaids of God, contributing for his service all their rain-bringing and flood-bringing powers and faculties (which they had received from him), for inundating and overwhelming the world.”

§62. Pierre d'Ailly: the constellations as ‘second causes’ effecting the Flood. Margins: Pierre d'Ailly; Gen. 7.

And he thinks that these Constellations are called by Moses the “cataracts of heaven,” and that by their opening is signified that time at which God sent forth all the inundating powers and influences — contained and

enclosed by virtue in such constellations, as if the bars were unbarred — for the flooding of the whole earth. The same d'Ailly, moreover, in the volume On Sects and Laws, and in the book On the Concord of Theology and Astrology, confirms this very thing by the example of the Rainbow: which, just as God willed to be a sign, for the security of men, of a general flood never thereafter to come, so it is fitting to believe that God, through the prognostic signs of the stars, foreshowed the coming flood, so that long before, men might be moved to the acknowledgment and detestation of their crimes, and to doing penance, as was fitting.

d'Ailly continued (the constellations = the ‘cataracts’; the rainbow analogy). Margin: Gen. 9.

Nor are there lacking those who assign that opinion also to William of Paris, a bishop, a man indeed of great genius and no common learning: because he, in the First Part of the Work On the Universe, where he disputes about the Firmament and the waters which are above the firmament, treating that statement of Moses about the opened cataracts of heaven, says that Moses called “cataracts of heaven” those parts of heaven which are generative of rains and inundations of waters — such as the watery signs, like Cancer, Pisces, the Pleiades, the Hyades, and Orion; and, among the Planets, Mars, Venus, and the Moon. We understand, therefore, that the cataracts of heaven were opened, because those celestial powers were, for the operation of rains and inundations, by God's command relaxed and, as it were, unbarred.

§63. William of Auvergne (of Paris): the ‘cataracts’ = the watery signs and planets. Margin: William of Paris.

But in very truth, that opinion is false, both as sacred scripture indicates not obscurely, and as philosophical doctrine and reason openly demonstrate. For the Mosaic narrative of the flood, which is contained in three chapters of this book — the sixth, seventh, and eighth — plainly shows that, beyond the order and course of nature, and beyond the series and texture of natural causes, by a certain singular will and command of God, for the vengeance

upon the men of that time, the flood was ma[de]…

§64. Pererius's refutation begins: Scripture and philosophy both deny a purely natural Flood. Margin: "That the flood was not made from natural causes alone." Continues on p. 322.

— p. 322 (PDF) · printed p. 253 —

…by a certain singular will and command of God, for the vengeance upon the men of that time, the flood was made. Not that no natural things concurred for the effecting of the flood, but that the concurrence of those things was not of itself sufficient for generating the flood; and because the manner in which those things were employed by God for creating the flood was not natural and customary. Wherefore sacred scripture names God alone the author and effecter of the flood. This indeed those words of God declare: "Behold, I will bring the waters of the flood upon the earth, to destroy all flesh in which is the breath of life under heaven, and all things that are on the earth shall be consumed." And again: "Yet, and after seven days, I will rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights, and I will blot out every substance that I have made, from the face of the earth." This likewise Moses declared when, expounding the manner in which the flood was made, he said that the fountains of the great deep were broken up and the cataracts of heaven were opened: for that breaking of the fountains and opening of the cataracts denotes something violent and unusual, beyond the order and force of nature, and which proceeded from some external principle more powerful than nature is.

§64 (cont.). God named as sole author; the 'breaking' and 'opening' denote something beyond nature. Margins: Gen. 6; Gen. 7.

Now if the cessation and end of the flood was not natural, then it is fitting likewise to think that the beginning and generation of the flood was not natural. But that the cessation and end of the flood was not natural, no one may doubt who reads the words of Moses a little more attentively: for he writes thus: "The Lord brought a wind [spirit] upon the earth, and the waters were diminished. And the fountains of the deep and the cataracts of

heaven were closed, and the rains from heaven were restrained.” Who does not see that what is said about the closing of the abyss and the cataracts of heaven, and about the restraining of the rain, evidently proves that the cessation of the flood proceeded not from natural causes, but from the will of God (operating through the ministry of the Angels, above the powers and beyond the natural order of causes)? Nor does that spirit or wind sent by God to remove the flood not demonstrate this. For that wind, most dry and most hot, could not have been generated, in so great a height of waters over all the earth, from natural causes; nor, if it had been generated, would it have had natural force to dry up and consume so great a mass of waters in so short a time.

§65. The Flood's cessation was supernatural (the drying wind) — so its onset was too. Margin: Gen. 8.

Therefore he who wishes to think and speak in accordance with the doctrine of the sacred writings must utterly deny that Noah's flood was made from natural causes alone and according to the customary order and course of nature. And there is in this matter a wondrous consensus and concordant opinion of all the Fathers and Theologians. Nor does divine scripture alone contradict that opinion, but Philosophy also opposes it. For the two princes of the Philosophers, Plato and Aristotle, plainly oppose it. For since Plato, in the Timaeus, made the world incorruptible, and the order of the world entirely invariable (not indeed by its own nature, but by the will of God, which, however, is stronger and more immutable than any necessity of nature), it is necessarily consequent to this opinion of his that a general conflagration or flood, which would bring destruction to the whole world, cannot b[e]…

§66. The consensus of the Fathers, and the testimony of Plato (Timaeus). Margins: “That neither according to Plato nor according to Aristotle could a general flood occur”; Plato. Continues on p. 323.

— p. 323 (PDF) · printed p. 254 —

…cannot be. And it is manifest that Aristotle thought the same, and for the same reason. Nay, he affirms in plain words, at the end of the first book of the Meteorology, that particular floods, which befall this or that region (such as was the flood of Deucalion in Thessaly, and of Ogyges in Attica), can be brought about; but a general flood, inundating and overwhelming the whole world on every side, can in no way [be].

Aristotle (Meteorology bk. 1): particular regional floods are possible, but not a universal one. Margin: Aristotle.

But come, that this may be the more proved and persuaded to the reader, let us confirm it with several arguments. And first, indeed, one may argue in this manner: Moses narrates that God, vehemently offended by the crimes of the men of that time, sent the flood for the vengeance upon those men; but if the flood had been made from natural causes alone and according to the order of nature, it would necessarily have happened whether the men of that time had been good or bad: for what happens naturally happens necessarily, and comes about without discrimination of the good and the bad. For the barrenness of the earth, or a pestilence, which happen from entirely natural causes, befall the good equally as the bad.

§67. First of four arguments: a natural flood would have struck regardless of human wickedness. Margins: “By four arguments it is proved that Noah's flood was not made from natural causes alone”; “First argument.”

But it could be answered that God from all eternity knew that at that time when the flood was, the men would be most wicked and worthy of the extremest punishments, and at the same time had decreed to punish those men by a flood; wherefore, in founding the world, he so disposed the motions of the stars, and so arranged the constellations of heaven, that at that time when those men would exist, the flood-producing constellation should flourish and reign in heaven. Nothing, therefore, prevents the flood from having been made by the will of God, and nevertheless from having been made through natural causes alone. But divine scripture is not wont to hold those things which come about through natural causes alone (such as

natural barrenness or abundance, plenty or scarcity of rains, sickness or health, and other things of this kind) in the place of a miracle, and to recall them as if testimonies of divine justice and vengeance, and to acknowledge and name God alone as the author and effecter of those things, as if of things done above the force and beyond the measure and order of nature: as it is wont to do wherever it speaks of the flood.

The astrologers' rejoinder (God pre-arranged the stars) and Pererius's reply (Scripture treats the Flood as a miracle, not a natural event).

Next [the second argument]: [grant that] some constellation of heaven made Noah's flood — since it is likely that that same constellation will come again, or even perhaps has already been within this time of four thousand years which has elapsed after Noah's flood up to the present day, hence it would follow that a general flood of the whole world either has already been made twice, or even more often, or certainly will at some time be: which, however, is against the promise of God, who promised Noah that a general flood would never thereafter come. But this argument could be met in two ways: first, by denying that the very same constellation of heaven which once was will come again. They think…

§68. Second argument: a recurring constellation would mean a recurring universal Flood — against God's promise. Continues on p. 324.

— p. 324 (PDF) · printed p. 255 —

For the most learned of the Astronomers think that the motions of the heavens and of the stars are utterly incommensurable, so that all the stars can at no time return again to the same comparison and arrangement among themselves which they once had. But be it so, that the same constellation can return again: it will nevertheless be answered that that constellation, the producer of Noah's flood, would not return before the end of the world. Since, therefore, God knew that the world would perish, or certainly be changed into another state, before that flood-bringing constellation should return again: therefore he said assertively and truly

that there would never, in all future time, be a flood.

§68 (concl.). The two replies to the ‘recurring constellation’ argument (the motions are incommensurable; and any return would be after the world's end).

This too serves for the confirmation of this matter: that the world was most excellently constituted by God in all its parts, and was composed and ordered just as was especially needful for the firmness and stability of the world, and for its adornment and beauty. For although many of its parts privately disagree and fight among themselves, yet for guarding and preserving the public and common good of the world — but especially for maintaining its safety and long duration — all conspire and agree among themselves with admirable consent. But if some part of heaven or constellation had the power of producing a flood destroying the whole earth and removing every kind of animal, it would surely be proved that the World was not well constituted and ordered, since one part of the world would have the power of dissipating and utterly destroying the beauty, fullness, and perfection of the world itself.

§69. Third argument: a flood-causing constellation would mean the cosmos was ill-ordered (one part able to destroy the whole). Margin: Third argument.

But this argument, according to the doctrine of Plato and Aristotle (who make this state of the world — which is engaged in the perpetual motion of the heavens and the generation and destruction of sublunary things — everlasting), is most valid; yet not similarly so according to our faith and the doctrine of the sacred writings, from which we have learned that this world will at some time perish, or certainly be changed into another state, in which the heaven will rest from motion and will not act upon this lower world by motion and light. Just as, therefore, the human body is said to be most excellently constituted by nature, because all its parts — though very diverse among themselves (and some even contrary) — are nevertheless all tempered and adapted to its health: yet from this it is not permitted to conclude that the human body will be immortal; for that tempering of the

parts is not firm in perpetuity, but for a certain fixed time, after which time that tempering is dissolved, and one part, prevailing and corrupting the others, brings death to the man.

§70. Qualifying the third argument: it holds on the (false) Platonic/Aristotelian eternal-world view, but our faith expects the world's end; the body-analogy.

Similarly God, who had made the world destined at some time to perish, so disposed its parts that they should have the power of conserving the integrity of the world up to some time, which being elapsed, other parts would corrupt others: as will happen at the consummation of the age. But in Noah's flood, although the world was destroyed, God nevertheless preserved in the Ark a seedbed of men and animals, and after one year removed the flood, and the earth…

Continues on p. 325.

— p. 325 (PDF) · printed p. 256 —

…and restored the earth to its former state.

Completes §70.

But that argument seems to me firmer than the rest, and more potent for persuading this. These [astrologers] say that the stars have the power of producing a general flood. But it must be asked of them how they themselves think a general flood is produced by the stars — whether privatively or positively (for so we speak in the schools). Perhaps they will say it happens privatively — that is, that it happens through the privation of the light and heat of those stars to which the efficiency of the flood is attributed, on account of the distant departure of certain stars; just as, on account of the Sun's departure from us, winter arises, and the frequency and abundance of rains. But if the flood happened by that reasoning, it would happen indeed in those places of the earth from which those stars had departed far; but those places of the earth to which those stars had come nearest, and which were directly subject to those stars, would not

only not feel a flood, but would even be affected to a greater degree by heat and dryness. For just as the sun's departure from us produces winter in our region and stirs up frequent rains, so the approach and arrival of the same sun to other peoples makes a hot and dry summer in those regions. It cannot, therefore, come about that by this reasoning a general flood should arise from the stars. For since there are many regions between the two Tropics, but especially under the Equator, which dry up and burn vehemently from the perpetual heat of the sun, these must necessarily be both barren of vapors, and destitute of rains, and free from great inundations.

§71. The strongest argument (first horn): if the Flood were caused ‘privatively’ (by stars' departure), some regions would flood while opposite ones baked. Margins: Fourth argument; “A physiological argument that a general flood cannot be caused by the stars.”

But if these [astrologers] say that the flood is produced from the stars not privatively but positively — that is, that the stars send into the lands a certain singular celestial power (this power we call by a now widely used word, “influence”), which power and influence, whether it be one or manifold, is naturally potent and effective for creating a general flood: this too can be proved false by a like reasoning. For the stars do not send those singular powers and influences indifferently into all places of the earth, but only into those parts of the earth which they look upon and which they have subject to themselves: but those which are outside these — and especially those which are directly opposite to them — by no means receive those celestial influences and effects. For the Astronomers give this cause why certain singular and notable effects of the stars are received in all parts of the earth either in no way or not equally. For they say that, [as for] the places of the earth which are outside the aspect of those stars, the influx of those stars in no way pertains to those places. Since, therefore, there is no constellation that can look upon the whole earth on every side, the effect of no constellation can pertain to the whole earth: wherefore a general flood inundating the whole earth [could] not [be produced] from

the stars or other natural [causes]…

§72. The same argument (second horn): if caused ‘positively’ (by stellar ‘influence’), no constellation faces the whole earth, so none could flood it all. Continues on p. 326.

— p. 326 (PDF) · printed p. 257 —

§73. Perhaps someone will say that it could happen that the stars draw out, from that part of the earth which they look upon and on which they act, so great an abundance of vapors as to be sufficient for generating a flood — which would first cover that part, then overflow to cover all the other parts of the earth. But this is in no way probable. For from no part of the earth can so great an abundance of vapors be drawn out, whence could be generated a flood not only inundating the whole earth, but also growing to so great a height that it exceeded the highest of all mountains by fifteen cubits — such as Noah's flood was. For to generate so great a mass of waters, the vapors not only of one or of several parts, but even of all the parts of the earth, would not have been enough: but besides (as happened in Noah's flood) it would be necessary for a great part of the air to be converted into water. Let it stand, therefore, that Noah's flood neither was nor could have been made from natural causes alone, whether celestial, or sublunary, or both together.

§73 (objection & reply). Conclusion of Disp. 12: no merely natural cause could produce a universal flood. Margins: Objection; Solution.

THIRTEENTH DISPUTATION. Whether among the pagans there was any knowledge and record of this flood of Noah.

St. Augustine, in book 18 of The City of God, chapter 8, signifies that the history of the Gentiles, both Greek and Latin, was ignorant of this flood of Noah; and he calls Varro as a witness, by whom it was reported that in the monuments of literature and of ancient memory nothing is found older than the flood of Ogyges (which happened many ages after Noah's). The words of St. Augustine are these: “Among the writers of history it is not agreed

when that Ogygius lived, in whose times also a great flood occurred: not that greatest one, in which no men escaped except those who could be in the Ark — which neither the Greek nor the Latin history of the Gentiles knows; but yet [a flood] greater than [the one] which was afterward in the time of Deucalion. And Varro indeed began [a part] of the book of which I made mention above from the flood of Ogyges, and proposes nothing older — from which he proceeds to Roman affairs — than the flood of Ogyges." So Augustine.

§74. Augustine: the Greek and Latin histories did not know Noah's flood (Varro begins from Ogyges'). Margins: Augustine; Varro.

But that the memory of Noah's flood is found among many of the pagan writers is so firmly established by the testimonies of many ancient writers that it cannot be denied without obstinacy. Hear Josephus, in the first book of the Antiquities, writing thus: "Of this flood and the Ark all the writers of barbarian history make mention, and among these Berosus the Chaldean. For, narrating about this flood, he writes roughly thus: It is reported that a part of this vessel survives in Armenia, at the mountain of the Cordicaeans [Gordyaeans], and that some scrape off the bitumen from it and carry it away with them, which the men of that place are accustomed to use in place of an amulet. Of these things Hieronymus, who wrote the Antiquities of the Phoenicians, makes mention, and Mnaseas and several others. Nay, Nicolaus of Damascus too, in the ninety-sixth book, narrates about these matters in these words: There is above the region of the Minyans a great mountain in Armenia by the name of Baris, on which they say that many fugitives were saved at the time of the flood; and that a certain one, carried in an ark, came to rest on the top of this mountain, and that the remains of its timbers lasted a long time. This perhaps was he of whom the lawgiver of the Jews, Moses, also writes." So Nicolaus. And thus far from Josephus.

§75. The pagan testimonies (via Josephus): Berosus, Hieronymus of Tyre, Mnaseas, Nicolaus of Damascus. Margins: "That Noah's flood was known to the pagans"; Josephus; Berosus the Chaldean; Hieronymus; Mnaseas; Nicolaus of Damascus.

— p. 327 (PDF) · printed p. 258 —

Eusebius, in the ninth book of the Preparation for the Gospel, when, at the beginning of the fourth chapter, he had recalled the same words of Josephus which we just set down, himself subjoins these: “I will,” he says, “transcribe for you some things from Abydenus the historian: Sisithrus,” he says, “next received the principate, to whom Saturn signified that a great force of waters was to come. Wherefore, desiring to save himself, he fled by ship to Armenia; but the waters overtook him on the way. But on the third day, after the waters had ceased, he sent out birds, that by them he might know whether anywhere land stood forth: which, since all things were covered with the face of the sea, returned to Sisithrus (for they could nowhere alight). After some days the same was done. Sent out a third time, they returned to him with their feet full of mud; and then the gods snatched Sisithrus away from among men. And the ship is still found in Armenia, whose timbers wonderfully bring a remedy to men against many diseases.” Thus far from Abydenus, as Eusebius reports him.

§76. Abydenus's ‘Sisithrus’ flood-story (via Eusebius) — the warning, the ark to Armenia, the birds. Margins: Eusebius; Abydenus.

Cyril too, in the first book Against Julian, for proving the same brings forward the testimony of Alexander Polyhistor. Nor did Plato himself give an obscure indication of that flood, when in the Timaeus he introduces a certain Egyptian priest, relating to Solon, from the sacred books of the Egyptians, that before the particular floods known and celebrated by the Greeks there had been, in antiquity, a certain greatest inundation of waters and devastation of the earth: and this does not seem to have been able to be any other than Noah's flood. To this also pertains what Pomponius Mela, Pliny, and Solinus reported: that Joppa, a maritime city of Judaea, is proclaimed the oldest of all the cities of the earth, and is believed to have existed before the flood. Which cannot be referred to the flood of Ogyges or of Deucalion: for these floods, circumscribed by the boundaries of Greece, did not touch the land of Syria or Judaea; nor would it be

wonderful that Joppa existed before those floods, [since] very many cities are celebrated as older [than they].

§77. Cyril (Alexander Polyhistor), Plato's Timaeus (the Egyptian priest to Solon), and the antiquity of Joppa. Margins: Cyril; Plato; Mela bk. 1 ch. 2; Pliny bk. 5 ch. 13; Solinus ch. 37.

Finally, Plutarch, in the book On the Cleverness of Animals, relates that it was reported by those who wrote about the flood of Deucalion that a dove sent out of the ark by Deucalion, when it had returned, was a sign of storm; but when, flying out again, it had not returned, was a sign of fair weather: which indeed was taken from the Mosaic history of Noah's flood. From which also were drawn the things which Ovid sang about the flood of Deucalion: for the whole description of that flood fits not so much the Deucalionic flood as the Noachic; so that, a few things being removed, some Jewish or Christian Poet would seem to have wished to set forth in verse the history of Moses about Noah's flood. From these things it appears that it cannot be denied that Noah's flood was known to the pagans — whether by the reading of the sacred writings, or by hearing and report, or by the relation or monuments of the Chaldeans and Egyptians, among which nations there was once a long dwelling of the Hebrews. Therefore, someone will say, did St. Augustine, who thought the contrary, err through ignorance or forgetfulness of history and antiquity? By no means. For Augusti[ne]…

§78. Plutarch's and Ovid's Deucalion-dove (drawn from Moses); the pagans did know the Flood — reconciling Augustine. Margins: Plutarch; Ovid, Metamorphoses bk. 1. Continues on p. 328.

— p. 328 (PDF) · printed p. 259 —

…Augustine did not say precisely that the flood of Noah was known to no historians, but only said that it was unknown to the Greek and Roman histories, saying nothing about the barbarian histories: which is indeed true. For [as for] those by whom we said above it was reported about Noah's flood, one may observe that they were barbarians, or certainly writers of barbarian histories and affairs.

Reconciliation completed: Augustine spoke only of Greek/Latin history; the witnesses are 'barbarian' writers.

FOURTEENTH DISPUTATION. On the flood of Ogyges and of Deucalion.

There were two floods, and both in Greece — the one, of Ogyges, in the Attic region; the other, of Deucalion, in Thessaly — recorded and celebrated by Greek and Roman writers. Wherefore it will not be irrelevant in this place to speak briefly about the time of each flood, so that it may be understood how much more recent and later than Noah's flood those floods were. The flood of Ogyges, which happened in the time of Ogyges reigning in the Attic region, and while Inachus and Phoroneus reigned among the Argives, so inundated and devastated the whole Attic region that it rendered it untilled and uninhabited for two hundred years. And that this flood was a thousand and twenty years before the first Olympiad, Eusebius relates in the tenth book of the Preparation for the Gospel, last chapter, on the authority of Julius Africanus, who confirms this same thing in the third book of the Annals, by the testimony of Hellanicus and Philochorus (who wrote the Annals of the Athenians), and likewise of Castor and Thallus (who diligently treated Syrian history), and also of Diodorus Siculus (who collected the history of the world into [his] Library)…

§79. The flood of Ogyges (Attica), 1,020 years before the first Olympiad. Margin: "The flood of Ogyges was 1200 [recte 1020] years before the first Olympiad." Continues on p. 329.

Nor is Orosius to be thought of a different opinion, affirming that the flood of Ogyges was a thousand and forty years before Rome was founded: since Rome was founded twenty-four years after the first Olympiad. The words of Orosius are these: "A thousand and forty years before the founding of the city, there was in Achaia a savage flood, with very great devastation of almost the whole province. Which, because it was poured out in the times of Ogyges, who was then the founder and king of Eleusis, gave its name to the place and the time." This [says] Orosius.

§80. Orosius concurs (1,040 years before Rome). Margin: Orosius.

— p. 329 (PDF) · printed p. 260 —

But when was the first Olympiad, according to sacred Chronology? It was, namely, in the eighth year of the reign of Ahaz king of Judah — that is, two hundred and eighty-three years after the beginning of the building of Solomon's temple, as is plain from the Chronology of the kings of Judah, which is described in the third and fourth books of Kings. The first Olympiad was likewise seven hundred and sixty-three years after the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt: for from that departure up to the building of Solomon's temple are counted, in the third book of Kings, chapter six, four hundred and eighty years. From these it follows that the flood of Ogyges preceded the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt by two hundred and sixty-three years, and fell about the ninetieth year of the age of the patriarch Jacob; and that it was after Noah's flood by nearly five hundred and forty years. But about computations of years of this kind, let the reader consult the things which have been more fully and diligently disputed by us in the eleventh book of our Commentaries on Daniel, in the second question.

§81. The chronology: the first Olympiad in Ahaz's 8th year; Ogyges' flood ~540 years after Noah's. Margin: “At what time, according to sacred Chronology, the first Olympiad was.”

If, therefore, the things we have said about the flood of Ogyges are true, then John Annius is certainly to be laughed at, who did not fear to say that he whom the pagan writers name Ogyges was the very one whom the sacred writings call Noah, and that the Ogygian flood and the Noachic were the same — whereas (as we showed a little while ago) the flood of Ogyges was more than five hundred years after Noah's. Nor is the opinion to be approved of certain ancient writers, whom Justin Martyr (in the Hortatory Discourse to the Gentiles), Clement of Alexandria (in the first book of the Stromata), and Eusebius (in the tenth book, last chapter, of the Preparation for the Gospel) mention and follow; by whom it was reported

that at the time when the flood of Ogyges happened, at that time Moses led the Hebrew people out of Egypt. But from the things said above it is plain that the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt was more than two hundred years later than the flood of Ogyges. Nay, Eusebius himself, in the Chronicle, makes Ogyges two centuries older than Moses.

§82. Refuting Annius (who equated Ogyges with Noah) and the dating of the Exodus to Ogyges' flood. Margins: "John Annius is refuted"; Justin Martyr; Clement of Alexandria; Eusebius.

It follows that we should speak of the flood of Deucalion, equally celebrated by the poets and historians of the pagans. And many things indeed about the lineage, character, and deeds of Deucalion, and many also about the causes, magnitude, duration, and effect of the flood which received its name from him, could be said in this place: but these, as foreign to our purpose, and for the most part either fabulous or uncertain, we deliberately pass over. Nor do we undertake, for the present, to explain anything other than the time of the Deucalionic flood, so that we may make manifest to the reader how much more recent it was than either the Ogygian flood or the Noachic. About the king of Attica under whom the flood of Deucalion occurred, it is variously handed down. Eusebius, in the book of the Preparation for the Gospel, last chapter, only says that Cecrops preceded the Trojan War by about four hundred years, and that in that middle time, between Cecrops and the Trojan War, the flood of Deucalion and the conflagration of Phaethon occurred. But the same [Eusebius], in the Chronicle, marks the flood of Deucalion as in the reign of Cecrops. Varro, as St. Augustine reports in book 18 of The City of God, chapter 10, noted the flood of Deucalion as under king Cranaus, who succeeded Cecrops next. But Justin the historian, in the second book, and Orosius, in the first book, chapter nine, write that the flood of Deucalion happened in the reign of Amphictyon, who was the third from Cecrops. For thus, in that place which I set down before, Orosius says: "In the eight hundred and tenth year before Rome was founded, Amphictyon reigned at Athens, the third from Cecrops; in whose times a flood of waters consumed the greater part of the

peoples of Thessaly, a few being saved by the refuges of the mountains, especially on Mount Parnassus, in whose circuit Deucalion then held the kingdom…”

§83. The flood of Deucalion: under which Attic king? (Eusebius, Varro, Justin, Orosius). Margins: “On the flood of Deucalion”; “Under which king of Attica the flood of Deucalion occurred”; Eusebius; Varro (in Augustine); Justin the historian; Orosius. Continues on p. 330.

— p. 330 (PDF) · printed p. 261 —

“…who, having received [the people] fleeing to him, cherished and nourished them on the twin ridges of Parnassus: by whom, on that account, they say the human race was restored. At that same time, father Liber [Bacchus], having subdued India, drenched it with blood, filled it with slaughter, polluted it with lusts — a nation never subject to any men, content only with its native repose.” So Orosius.

Conclusion of the Orosius quotation.

Nor do the authors agree about the time of this flood. Solinus indeed, in chapter 18, makes this flood six hundred years later than the flood of Ogyges. “It is fitting to recall in this place,” says Solinus, “that after the first flood, noted in the times of Ogyges — when for nine and more months a continuous night had darkened the day — Delos was illuminated before all lands by the rays of the Sun, and obtained its name from this, that it was first restored to sight [Delos = ‘clear/visible’]. Between Ogyges and Deucalion a middle span of six hundred years is given.” So Solinus. But that he erred through ignorance or forgetfulness of history and Chronology is plain even from this argument: that it is consequent to that opinion that the flood of Deucalion was near to the times of the Trojan War; but that the Trojan War was many ages after the flood of Deucalion is agreed among the approved writers of ancient memory.

§84. Solinus's 600-year gap (and its refutation). Margins: “On the time of the Deucalionic flood”; Solinus.

But on the contrary, Clement of Alexandria, in the first book of the Stromata, marks the flood of Deucalion as one hundred and thirty-four years after the Ogygian. But not rightly: for thus it would have been not a few years before Cecrops, which pleases no one. Let us therefore follow, as the more probable, the opinion of Eusebius in the Chronicle and of Orosius in the first book, who make the flood of Deucalion later than the Ogygian by two hundred and thirty years — that is, about the fiftieth year of the age of Moses (although Eusebius there marks the seventieth, I do not know whether using a true computation of years): from which, however, Cyril is very near, in the first book Against Julian, referring the flood of Deucalion to the sixty-seventh year of Moses. Hence it is clear that this Deucalionic flood was nearly seven hundred and seventy years after the Noachic.

§85. The preferred dating (Eusebius/Orosius): Deucalion's flood ~770 years after Noah's. Margins: Clement of Alexandria; Eusebius; Cyril.

Nor is it to be omitted here what Orosius prudently observed: that three very notable and memorable calamities happened in the same century — the Ten Plagues of Egypt, the flood of Deucalion, and the conflagration of Phaethon. For Orosius marks the plagues of Egypt as eight hundred and five years before Rome was founded, but the flood of Deucalion as eight hundred and ten years [before]. And about the conflagration of Phaethon he writes thus in the tenth chapter: “In these times too so vast and grievous a heat blazed up, that the Sun, carried through devious ways, is said not to have affected the whole world with heat, but to have scorched it with fire: and both the Ethiopian endured the impressed heat more than usual, and the Scythian [endured] the unaccustomed [heat]. From which also certain men, while they do not concede to God his ineffable power, seeking out empty little reasonings, wove the ridiculous fable of Phaethon.” This [says] Orosius; with whom Eusebius too, in the Chronicle, agrees.

§86. Three calamities of one century (the Plagues, Deucalion's flood, Phaethon's fire — the last a fable of a real heat). End of Liber XII. Margins: “That in the same century occurred the Ten Plagues of Egypt, the flood of Deucalion, and the fire of Phaethon”; Orosius; Eusebius.

— p. 331 (PDF) · printed p. 262 —

THE THIRTEENTH BOOK OF THE COMMENTARIES ON GENESIS OF BENEDICT PERERIUS, ON THE DIMINUTION AND CESSATION OF THE FLOOD.

Title page of Liber XIII. Section numbering restarts at §1.

The eighth chapter of the book of Genesis.

“And God remembered Noah, and all the living creatures, and all the cattle that were with him in the Ark, and brought a wind upon the earth, and the waters were diminished. And the fountains of the deep and the floodgates of heaven were closed, and the rains from heaven were restrained. And the waters returned from off the earth, going and returning; and they began to be abated after a hundred and fifty days. And the Ark rested in the seventh month, the twenty-seventh day of the month, upon the mountains of Armenia. And the waters were going and decreasing until the tenth month: for in the tenth month, the first day of the month, the tops of the mountains appeared. And when forty days had passed, Noah, opening the window of the Ark which he had made, sent forth a raven, which went out and did not return until the waters were dried up upon the earth. He sent forth also a dove after him, to see if the waters had now ceased.”

Genesis 8:1–7 (the verse numbers are marked in the margin). Continues on p. 332.

— p. 332 (PDF) · printed p. 263 —

“And when she found not where her foot might rest, she returned to him into the ark: for the waters were upon the whole earth. And he put forth his hand, and caught her, and brought her into the Ark. And having waited yet seven other days, he again sent forth the dove out of the Ark. And she came to him in the evening, carrying a bough of olive with green leaves in her mouth. Noah therefore understood that the waters had ceased upon the earth. And he waited yet seven other days,

and he sent forth the dove, which returned not any more unto him. Therefore in the six hundred and first year, the first month, the first day of the month, the waters were lessened upon the earth; and Noah, opening the covering of the Ark, looked, and saw that the surface of the earth was dried. In the second month, the seven and twentieth day of the month, the earth was dried."

Genesis 8:8–14.

"And God spoke to Noah, saying: Go out of the ark, thou and thy wife, thy sons and the wives of thy sons with thee. All living things that are with thee of all flesh — as well in fowls as in beasts, and all creeping things that creep upon the earth — bring out with thee, and go ye upon the earth: increase and multiply upon it. So Noah went out, and his sons, his wife and the wives of his sons with him. And all living things, and cattle, and creeping things that creep upon the earth, according to their kinds, went out of the ark. And Noah built an altar unto the Lord, and taking of all cattle and fowls that were clean, offered holocausts upon the altar. And the Lord smelled a sweet savor, and said to him: I will no more curse the earth for the sake of men; for the imagination and thought of man's heart are prone to evil from his youth; therefore I will no more destroy every living soul as I have done. All the days of the earth, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, night and day, shall not cease."

Genesis 8:15–22 (conclusion of the chapter).

— p. 333 (PDF) · printed p. 264 —

PREFACE.

Seven things are chiefly narrated by Moses in this eighth chapter: first, when the diminution of the waters of the flood began, and from what causes it came about; second, in what place, the waters decreasing, the ark of Noah settled; third, when the tops of the mountains first appeared;

fourth, by what means Noah explored and knew the diminution and cessation of the flood; fifth, when the flood was wholly finished and the earth dried, and Noah went out of the ark with his family and the animals; sixth, that Noah, as soon as he went out of the ark, offered a sacrifice to God from all the clean animals; seventh, finally, that God, vehemently appeased and delighted by the notable piety and devotion of Noah himself, promised that he would never thereafter destroy the world by a general flood.

Preface to Liber XIII: the sevenfold plan of Genesis 8.

“God remembered Noah, and all the living creatures and all the cattle that were with him in the ark.” Neither forgetfulness nor remembrance properly falls upon God: since to him all things that have been, are, and will be, are present from all eternity; and, as his substance, so also his knowledge is plainly immutable, since with him there is no transmutation, nor shadow of vicissitude. Figuratively, therefore, God is said to forget and to remember: namely, after the likeness of men, who are said to forget those whom they neglect and desert in dangers and do not help when they can; but on the contrary to remember [them], when they give them help, and strive to snatch them from the evils by which they are held.

Commentary on Gen. 8:1 begins: ‘God remembered’ is figurative speech (no change in God). Margin: James 1.

God seemed, therefore, in a manner to have forgotten Noah, whom — thrust into that Ark as into a prison — he had left for so many months in that horrible abyss of the flood: but when he began to remove the flood, and to bring the ark to rest, and to dry the earth, and to lead Noah out of the ark, he seemed to remember him. Hear Theodoret: “Divine Scripture speaks,” he says, “as is expedient for men, and according to the capacity of the hearers has various forms of speaking. Just as…”

Theodoret on Scripture's accommodated language. Margin: Theodoret, q. 42 on Genesis. Continues on p. 334.

— p. 334 (PDF) · printed p. 265 —

"…[Just] as, then, repentance in God is a diversity of administration — for 'It repenteth me,' he says, 'that I made Saul king,' stands for 'I have decided to substitute another in his place'; and again, 'It repenteth me that I made man,' stands for 'I have determined to bring destruction upon men' — so what is here said, 'The Lord remembered Noah,' does not designate a former forgetfulness, but denotes his very great kindness toward Noah: that, out of supreme love toward him, he commanded that immense abundance of waters to be drained off as quickly as possible." So Theodoret.

§1 (concl.). Theodoret on 'remember/repent' as accommodated speech. Margins: 1 Sam. 15; Gen. 6.

Moreover, God is said in the sacred writings both to forget and to remember, both for good and for evil, both concerning persons and concerning other things. God is said to forget good men, when he leaves them for a time in labors and dangers, not freeing them at once though he could. He is said also to forget evil men, when he grants them long impunity or even prosperity. But on the contrary he is said to remember the good, when, after they have been afflicted for a while, he frees and refreshes them, and turns their evils into greater goods. He is said likewise to remember the evil, when he punishes with deserved penalties the wickedness he had for a while overlooked. And not only in persons, but also in things — as in virtues and vices — this manner of speaking is wont to be used. For God is said to forget someone's virtues and good deeds, when he does not at once and manifestly reward or honor them; nay, even allows things to turn out ill for the good among men on account of their good deeds. He is said also to forget sins, when he does not punish them, but rather allows the crimes to succeed well and prosperously for the sinners for a time. On the contrary, God is said to remember both virtues and vices, when he affects each, even in this world, with their due rewards or punishments. Hence is that which the widow said to Elijah: "Hast thou come to me, O man of God, that my iniquities should be remembered?" —

for her only son had died. And in Psalm 108 it is written: “May the iniquity of his fathers come into remembrance in the sight of the Lord.”

§2. The Scriptural senses of God ‘forgetting’ and ‘remembering.’ Margins: “What it is for God to forget or remember, of the good as of the bad”; 3 Kings 17.

But that God is said to have remembered not only Noah, but also the animals which were with him in the ark, indicates this: that, just as the animals had perished together with men on account of men's sins, so they were preserved by God, for man's sake, together with the just man. “In order that God might give a greater token of his immense goodness,” says Theodoret, “he willed to remember not only Noah, but also all the animals: for, for our sake, he deigned to provide for them also.” Which that great David too cries out, saying: “Who bringeth forth grass for the cattle, and herb for the service of men” (Ps. 103); and again: “Men and beasts thou wilt save, O Lord” (Ps. 35). For, for our sake, he cares for the things that are ours.

§3. Why God ‘remembered’ the animals too (Theodoret). Margins: Theodoret, ibid.; Ps. 103; Ps. 35.

But someone will say: How is God said to remember the animals, when St. Paul said that God has no care for oxen? — and the reasoning is the same for other animals. But the answer is at hand. For as regards the natural and general providence and care which God bears for all the things which he himself founded, without doubt [both oxen and all animals] are a care to God…

§4. The objection from 1 Cor. 9 (‘God has no care for oxen’). Margins: “The passage of Paul, 1 Cor. 9”; “How God both does and does not care for animals.” Continues on p. 335.

— p. 335 (PDF) · printed p. 266 —

…both oxen and all animals are a care to God. For if otherwise, how would David have said: “All things expect of thee that thou give them food in due season?” And again: “Thou openest thy hand, and fillest every animal with blessing?” How would our Savior have said in the Gospel: “Behold the

birds of the air, for they neither sow nor reap nor gather into barns, and your heavenly Father feeds them?" And again: "Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing, and not one of them shall fall upon the ground without your Father?" — or, as Luke reports, "Not one of them is in forgetfulness before God?" But God is not said to have care of oxen or animals as regards a certain special and singular providence and care — such, namely, as God has of men, whom he not only moves and rules through natural causes or natural instincts, but especially through "positive" laws (as they call them), commanding what they ought to do or to shun; and not only this, but besides, by variously teaching and admonishing and exhorting, and both inciting to good by proposed rewards, and deterring from evils by the threat of punishments. This kind of care and providence, which is declared through law (as I said), God does not exercise toward animals, because only rational nature is capable of providence of this sort.

§4 (cont.). God's general providence extends to beasts; his 'legislative' providence only to rational creatures. Margins: Ps. 103; Ps. 144; Matt. 6; Matt. 10; Luke 12.

And although in the Mosaic law there were certain precepts about animals (such as about lifting up beasts of burden fallen into a pit, and other things of this kind), these were nevertheless commanded not for the sake of the animals themselves, but for the sake of men. Either because, since the animals are something of the men who own them, if anything good or bad happens to the animals, that too pertains to the profit or detriment of those men; or so that, from what is commanded about animals, it may be recognized that the same ought much more to be observed toward men. For example, the law of Moses had commanded that the mouth of the ox treading out [the grain] should not be muzzled — not indeed for the ox's sake, but for man's. For if it is inhuman to muzzle the mouth of an ox laboring for a man's sake, how much more inhuman and unjust ought it to be judged not to render a worthy wage to a man working and laboring for your sake? But let us pass on to other matters.

§5. The Mosaic animal-laws were given for man's sake. Margins: Exod. 23; Deut. 25; 1 Cor. 9.

“The Lord brought a wind upon the earth, and the waters were diminished. And the fountains of the deep and the floodgates of heaven were closed, and the rains from heaven were restrained. And the waters returned from off the earth, going and returning; and they began to be abated after a hundred and fifty days.” Moses indicates by these words both how and when the waters of the flood began to diminish. And he touches on two causes of the diminution of the flood: one (as they call it) positive — this is a vehement wind, prevailing with the greatest force of drying and consuming the waters; the other cause is negative — that is, the clos[ing]…

§6. Gen. 8:2–3; the two causes (the wind, and the shutting of the deep). Margin: Gen. 8, v. 2.
Continues on p. 336.

— p. 336 (PDF) · printed p. 267 —

…the closing of the fountains of the deep and of the cataracts of heaven, and likewise the restraining of the rain. For if the flood arose from the opening of the fountains of the deep and the cataracts of heaven, the cessation of the flood ought to proceed from the closing of those same things. “For by those causes,” says Ambrose, “the flood is diminished by which it grew. The fountains of waters had burst forth, the cataracts of heaven had been opened, that the earth might be inundated by waters flowing in from every side: those things had to be closed from which the origin of the flood flowed, that its failing might begin.” So Ambrose.

Completes §6. Margin: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 17.

But how, by those causes, that immense mass of waters could be diminished in so short a time, Chrysostom thinks incomprehensible to human reason. “By what reason,” he says, “could one ever comprehend this? How did so great a water cease? All things were the abyss. How, then, was so great an onset of waters suddenly made less? Who could ever find this out by human reason? What, then, is it? It is the command of God which does all things. Let us, therefore, not search too curiously How; but only believe that he commanded, and the abyss was raised up; and he

commanded, and again it restrained its onset, and withdrew to its own place, which the Lord alone knows who founded it." This [says] Chrysostom.

§7. Chrysostom: the swift draining is beyond human reason — God's command. Margin: Chrysostom, hom. 25 on Genesis.

In place of what we read, "He brought a wind upon the earth," the Hebrew word for word is: "He made a wind to pass over the earth" — which has great emphasis, and demonstrates the incredible force of that wind. For that phrase, "over the earth," Cajetan wishes to be understood of the earth everywhere and most deeply covered with waters; and that word, "to pass over," signifies that that spirit or wind penetrated and passed through the whole depth of the waters. But who this spirit was, how it was generated, and how great and of what kind its force was, will soon be disputed in the Disputation which will be treated below on this eighth chapter. In place of "The waters were diminished," the Greek is, "The water ceased." The Hebrew word here, sachah, signifies to cease, to rest, and to be slackened. In place of "The fountains of the deep were closed," Jerome reads, "were revealed": for he writes thus: "And the water rested, and the fountains of the deep were revealed." For "revealed fountains" all the [other] interpreters translated "closed" and "stopped up." Chrysostom too seems to have read that the fountains were revealed.

§8. The Hebrew 'made the wind pass over'; textual variants ('ceased'; 'revealed' vs 'closed' fountains). Margins: Cajetan; Jerome, On the Hebrew Traditions in Genesis; Chrysostom, hom. 26.

But how the revealing or re-opening of the fountains contributed to diminishing and removing the flood, and not rather to conserving and increasing it (for above, too, in order that the flood might occur, we read that the fountains of the deep were broken up), I do not indeed understand — unless they are said to be "revealed" for this reason, that they might resorb the waters which they had vomited out over the earth; Chrysostom hinting at this, who, interpreting that phrase, "the fountains being

revealed," says it pleased God that the waters should again remain in their own region, and no longer overflow, but gradually cease. But whether what is here said about the closing of the fountains of the deep and the cataracts of heaven, and about the restraining of the rain, is to be understood to have been done after those hundred and fifty days of the flood (as is here signified), or rather before those days — namely immediately after those forty days of rain, and is here mentioned by Moses by recapitulation — is sufficiently doubtful and controverted. But this will be disputed below in a certain disputation on this chapter.

§9. The puzzle of the 'revealed' fountains, and whether the closing came after the 150 days or by recapitulation. Margin: Chrysostom, ibid.

— p. 337 (PDF) · printed p. 268 —

There follows: "And the waters returned from off the earth, going and returning." That is: the waters began to leave the earth, and not to stand at so great a height over the earth. That phrase, "going and returning": either it is a Hebraism, signifying the same as "gradually and more and more decreasing"; or it signifies that, on account of the vehement blast of that wind, the waters began to be agitated and to fluctuate, when before they had stood motionless. For so great (says Cajetan) had been the abundance and height of the waters of the flood, that it had deprived the waters of the function of ebb and flow: and the first effect of the closed fountains and cataracts of heaven, and of that wind sent by God, was the return of the waters to flowing and ebbing over the earth. Or the waters are said to have returned to their native places, whence they had gone out, beyond nature, to inundate the earth — that is, either into the abyss, or into the Ocean, or into the proper channels of rivers, lakes, and marshes. "Note," says Jerome, "according to Ecclesiastes, that all waters and torrents return through hidden veins to the mother-abyss." In place of "going and returning," the Septuagint has: "The water was withdrawing, going from the earth." Finally, that phrase, "They began to be abated after a hundred and fifty days," denotes the time at which the diminution of the waters of the flood

first began. But whence the beginning of those hundred and fifty days is to be taken — whether from the beginning of the flood, or after the forty days of rain — is in controversy: which we explained above, when we treated a certain disputation on this very matter on chapter 7.

§10. ‘Going and returning’; the waters' return to the deep (Cajetan, Jerome); the 150-days controversy recalled. Margins: Cajetan, on Gen. ch. 8; Jerome; Eccles. 1.

FIRST DISPUTATION. What that spirit was which the Lord brought upon the earth to dry the waters of the flood.

What is properly signified in this place by the word “spirit,” there is a threefold interpretation. Some think that by that word is signified the Holy Spirit. For either, they say, a wind or the Holy Spirit is signified (for each is wont to be expressed by that name in the sacred writings), and to this place only one or the other can fit: but a wind is not signified, since it is incredible that the natural force of any wind could have dried up so great a flood; therefore the Holy Spirit is signified — who indeed is fitly attributed to the cessation of the flood. For just as the effecting of the flood was a work of the divine anger and justice, avenging and punishing crimes, so the cessation and removal of the flood was a work of the divine clemency and mercy. And the works of divine clemency and mercy are wont to be attributed to the Holy Spirit, or, as we say in the schools, “appropriated” [to him]. And I have, in the first place, two weighty and noble authors of this opinion…

§11. First interpretation: the ‘spirit’ = the Holy Spirit. Margins: “First interpretation: the spirit here is the Holy Spirit”; “The opinion of Ambrose and Theodoret.” Continues on p. 338.

— p. 338 (PDF) · printed p. 269 —

…namely, Ambrose and Theodoret. Ambrose, treating those very words of Moses about which we now dispute, “And the Lord brought a wind upon the earth, and the water ceased,” writes in this manner: “I do not think this was so said that we should take by the name ‘wind’ a [mere] wind: for

neither could a wind dry up the flood. Otherwise, since the sea is daily agitated by the winds, it would surely be emptied. For how would the sea not be emptied by the force of the winds — the sea to which the flood, diffused over the whole world up to the columns of Hercules (as they say), had yielded, and the great sea surging over the covered peaks of the high mountains? There is no doubt, therefore, that that flood was repressed by the invisible power of the divine Spirit, and by a celestial operation, not by a [mere] blast. Whence it is written: 'Send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created, and thou shalt renew the face of the earth.' There is, therefore, a Spirit to whose operation all things yield: in whom is the power of heaven itself, as it is written: 'By the word of the Lord the heavens were established, and by the Spirit of his mouth all their power.' Which Spirit is the creator of all things, as Job said: 'The divine Spirit that made me.'" This [says] Ambrose.

Ambrose for the Holy-Spirit reading. Margins: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 16; Ps. 103; Ps. 32; Job 33.

But Theodoret (as he is cited in the Catena on Genesis) writes briefly to the same effect thus: "Waters," he says, "are not wont to be diminished by winds, but rather to fluctuate and be disturbed. For in that way the bays of the vast sea would [long since] have been exhausted. Moses therefore hints at the divine Spirit, by which indeed all things are done, and agitated things rest." So Theodoret.

Theodoret likewise. Margin: Theodoret.

The second interpretation is that here, by the word "spirit," the Sun itself is signified, which, when it is most burning, has an incredible force of drying up and consuming moisture. For it is credible that the flood was finished in the summer-time (as was said above in the twelfth book). Others would add, as helpers of the Sun for accomplishing this, certain celestial constellations most effective at drying up moisture. Rupert, interpreting this passage of Moses briefly, [says]: "What Moses calls 'Spirit,' we

understand, according to the letter, either a hot wind, or even the Sun itself, which hitherto had lain hidden under the dense clouds. For Ecclesiastes said of it: ‘Surveying all things round about, the Spirit goeth, and returneth in its circuits.’” So Rupert. Which words of Solomon St. Jerome too, in the commentary on that passage, interprets of the Sun — affirming that it is named “spirit,” either because it is itself animated and flourishes by a life-giving spirit (as is the view of the Philosophers and Poets), or because it breathes and infuses a vital force and motion into things.

§12. Second interpretation: the ‘spirit’ = the Sun (Rupert, Jerome). Margins: “Second interpretation: the spirit that dried the flood was the Sun”; Rupert, Commentaries on Genesis, bk. 4, ch. 22; Eccles. 1; Jerome.

Certainly to Aristotle (as one may read in him in the second book of the Meteorology) it seemed that the immense abundance of water, which accrues to the sea from innumerable rivers flowing into it — and yet does not make it fuller or more overflowing — is dried up and consumed by the force of the Sun. Which Lucretius too expressed in these neat verses, in the sixth book: “Besides, the Sun draws off a great part by [its] heat: for we see indeed the Sun dry, with its burning rays, garments wet with moisture. But we see many seas, spread out far and wide: therefore, although the Sun may take but a small part of moisture from the surface of any one place, yet over so great a space it will withal carry off [much] from the waves.”

§13. Aristotle and Lucretius: the Sun consumes the sea's excess. Margins: Aristotle; Lucretius. Continues on p. 339.

— p. 339 (PDF) · printed p. 270 —

So Lucretius. In the fourth verse of those which we have cited, I have put “pelage,” not (as is commonly read) “pelago,” following the emendation of Lambinus, who, using the best judgment, thus restored it and published it as the [correct] reading. For “pelage” is an accusative, from the Greek πελ■γη (pelag■, “seas”).

A philological note (Pererius endorses Lambinus's emendation of Lucretius). Margin: Lucretius.

The third interpretation, which seems simpler and plainer, and more apt and suited to this passage of Moses, is that by the word “spirit” is signified a wind which God sent to dry and consume the waters of the flood. For similarly, in the book of Exodus, chapter fourteen, we read that, when by the striking of Moses' rod the waters of the Red Sea, divided, had stood on either side like a wall, and had given a middle place to the Hebrews for crossing, then, for drying the bottom of that place of the sea (so that the Hebrews might pass over with unhindered and dry footsteps), a vehement and burning wind was sent. “When Moses had stretched forth his hand over the sea” (says Scripture), “the Lord took it away, a vehement and burning wind blowing all the night, and turned it into dry ground; and the water was divided, and the children of Israel went in through the midst of the dried sea: for the water was as a wall on their right hand and on their left.”

§14. Third interpretation (Pererius's preferred): the ‘spirit’ = a wind (cf. the wind at the Red Sea, Exod. 14). Margin: “Third interpretation: by the name ‘spirit’ is signified a wind.”

Certainly, that there are certain winds endowed with an incredible efficacy of drying moisture is most well known by manifest experiments. The North Wind (Aquilo) is called by Solomon “the scatterer of rains.” And indeed, when it is very vehement and persistent, it clears the sky, drives away rains and rain-bearing clouds; it most rapidly dries the earth, however moist or even muddy; and it strongly freezes the very water, and congeals it into the hardness of stone, giving it the force of not only drying but even burning herbs and other green things of the earth, as is written in the book of Ecclesiasticus, chapter 43. Lucretius, [as to] why the sea, with so many and so great rivers running down into it, never overflows, refers the cause partly to other things, and partly also to the winds, which, as it were sweeping, consume all that water poured into the sea. For thus he says: “Then, moreover, the winds too can carry off a great part of the moisture, sweeping the surfaces of the Sea: since very often we see the roads dried in a single night, and the crusts of soft mud harden.”

§15. The drying power of winds (the North Wind; Lucretius). Margins: Prov. 25; Lucretius, bk. 6.

But perhaps someone will ask me whether that wind was natural, or had something beyond the order and above the force of nature. For my part, I would say without hesitation that the generation of that wind was not natural. For since the flood held the whole earth, on every side overwhelmed with waters — even fifteen cubits above the highest mountains — for so many months, whence, I ask, could a hot and dry exhalation be naturally drawn out of the earth, and raised on high above the height of the flood, which would be suitable matter for generating that most hot and most dry wind? The generation of that wind, therefore, was not natural, but made by the omnipotence of God above the force and power of nature. And to indicate this, Moses said pointedly that the Lord brought a wind over the earth — or, as the Hebrew has it, made a wind to pass over the earth.

§16. The wind's generation was supernatural (no dry exhalation could rise from the flooded earth). Margins: "That the generation of that wind was not natural"; Gen. 7. Continues on p. 340.

— p. 340 (PDF) · printed p. 271 —

But whether the power of that wind, by which it dried the waters of the flood, was natural (that is, such as nature could produce and assign to winds), can not without cause be doubted. But, not to be long, I think thus: If that wind had the force of drying and consuming that whole mass of the waters of the flood, I judge indeed that that force was not natural: for so great a force does not seem able to proceed from any natural causes; but it must be believed that, just as God created that wind beyond the order of nature, so he gave it far greater powers than nature could have given: so that that wind ought to be held in the place of a miracle, both on account of its generation and on account of its force and efficacy.

§17. Whether the wind's drying-power was natural: if it dried the whole Flood, the power too was miraculous. Margin: "Whether the power of that wind was natural."

But if that wind was sent not so much to dry and consume the waters of the flood (although to that too it contributed not a little) as to dry thoroughly

the earth — which, even when stripped of the waters, had remained very moist and muddy, and such that, unless it were dried, neither men nor animals could walk over it without hindrance and conveniently: if, I say, that wind was sent chiefly for this, I will not deny that its force could have been natural. For that effect — that is, the drying of the earth — was neither such nor so great as to exceed any natural force whatever of any wind.

But if the wind chiefly served to dry the (already exposed) muddy ground, its force could have been natural.

SECOND DISPUTATION. When the closing of the fountains of the deep was made.

Furthermore, this in the narrative of Moses has a difficulty: whether what Moses said about the closed fountains of the deep and the cataracts of heaven, and about the restraining of the rain, ought to be understood to have been done after the hundred and fifty days during which the flood stood, or rather immediately after those forty days of rain mentioned by Moses above in the seventh chapter. St. Augustine saw this difficulty: for he poses the same question in the Questions on Genesis, question twelve; which, although he does not openly solve it there, it nevertheless appears to which side he himself was more inclined. For he says thus: “What is written, that the water was raised up, ought, I think, to be read, that the water was diminished, or that the water ceased after a hundred and fifty days, and that a wind was brought upon the earth, and the water failed, and the fountains of the deep and the cataracts of heaven were closed, and the rain from heaven was held back. It is asked whether these things were done after the hundred and fifty days, or whether all the things which began to be done after the forty days of rain are recalled by recapitulation: so that this alone pertains to the hundred and fifty days, that up to them the water was raised up — either from the fountains of the deep, the rain now ceasing, or because it remained at its height while it was being dried by that wind; but the other things that were said were not all done after the hundred

and fifty days, but all the things are recalled which from the end of the for[ty days]…”

§18. The difficulty (when were the fountains closed?), and Augustine's leaning (Quaest. in Gen. q. 12). Margin: Augustine. Continues on p. 341.

— p. 341 (PDF) · printed p. 272 —

“…the forty days began to be done.” So Augustine. It appears, therefore, that Augustine inclined to that opinion: that those things were done after the forty days of rain, and were narrated later by Moses by recapitulation. And this is the very opinion of Tostatus.

Augustine (and Tostatus) lean toward the recapitulation reading. Margin: Tostatus on Gen. ch. 8.

Oleaster says with all asseveration that neither the eruption of the fountains of the deep nor the rain from heaven ceased except after the hundred and fifty days. But many things tell for Tostatus and against Oleaster. First, above, in the seventh chapter, Moses said that the rain occurred for forty days and forty nights: but if the rain had lasted a hundred and fifty days, Moses would surely have said this, since it would have been more suited both to declaring the truth of the history and to indicating the magnitude of the flood. Next, Moses in the same place said that the flood occurred for forty days, signifying the growth and increase of the waters up to the highest [point]: but if the waters of the flood had always grown through the hundred and fifty days, it would have been truer to say that the flood occurred for a hundred and fifty days, not only for forty. For as to what Oleaster answers — that those forty days of rain and flood are to be understood only of the flood before the Ark could be lifted up over the earth, and not that during those days the whole increase of the flood was completed — who does not see that it is like a fiction, and said rather lest nothing be said, than in order that something even seemingly probable be said? Besides, after the waters of the flood had covered the earth up to the peaks of the mountains, how could water burst forth from the fountains of the deep (that is, from the deepest caverns of the earth), and leap up above

the peaks of the mountains, so as to add the remaining increase of the flood (namely, up to fifteen cubits above the peaks of the mountains)?

§19. Pererius's arguments for Tostatus against Oleaster. Margins: Oleaster, ibid.; "The opinion of Oleaster is refuted."

Lastly, if through all those hundred and fifty days the waters grew continuously, then, since Moses says that immediately after those days the waters were diminished, it would follow that on the day on which the waters reached their highest increase, on that very day they continuously began to diminish and fail, and did not remain for any time at their strength or increase: which seems contrary to divine scripture, which, toward the end of the seventh chapter, said that the waters held the earth (or prevailed over the earth, or were strengthened over the earth — for the reading of that passage varies) for a hundred and fifty days. And scripture said this, when it had a little before said that the waters exceeded the highest mountains of the earth by fifteen cubits.

§20. A final argument: the 150 days denote the flood's standing at its peak, not its continued growth.

— p. 342 (PDF) · printed p. 273 —

THIRD DISPUTATION. In what month and on what day of the month the decrease of the flood began.

But in what month, and on what day of the month, the diminution of the waters of the flood began, must be said variously, according to the various opinions of the authors about those hundred and fifty days, after which Moses says the waters of the flood were diminished. For Hugh of St. Victor, in his Annotations on Genesis (and Hugh was followed by the Scholastic History and Lyra, as we said above in the twelfth book), begins those hundred and fifty days from Noah's entry into the Ark, or from the beginning of the flood: and by this reasoning, since a hundred and fifty days fill five Solar months (assigning thirty days to each month), it is necessary to say that the flood began to diminish when five months from its

beginning were completed, and on the first day of the sixth month. But if we speak of the months not with respect to the flood's beginning but with respect to the year then current, or the six hundredth year of Noah's life, it must be said that the flood began to decrease in the seventh month of that year, and on the eighteenth day of that month. This is plain: since the flood began on the seventeenth day of the second month of that year — that is, forty-seven days from the beginning of the year — to which, if you add the hundred and fifty days of the flood up to its decrease (that is, five whole months), you will most easily understand that what I said is true.

§21. First reckoning (the 150 days from the flood's start, per Hugh/Hist. Schol./Lyra): decrease begins in the 6th month from the start, or the 7th month of the year, day 18. Margin: Hugh of St. Victor.

But according to the other opinion — of those who begin those hundred and fifty days not from the beginning of the flood, but from the end of the forty-day rain (forty days from the beginning of the flood having now elapsed — and this is the opinion of Josephus in the first book of the Antiquities, and of St. Chrysostom, and also of Tostatus and Cajetan, as we said above): according to this opinion, I say, it must be said far otherwise. For if it be asked in what month from the beginning of the flood its waters began to diminish, we shall answer that they began to diminish in the seventh month, and on the eleventh day of that month: which is clearly understood, if from the beginning of the flood there be computed first the forty days of rain, and after these the other hundred and fifty days during which the flood stood; for from both sums there arise a hundred and ninety days, which make six whole Solar months, and besides ten days of the seventh month. But if it be asked in what month — with respect to the year then current, or with respect to the six hundredth year of Noah's life — the flood began to fail: it must be answered that it began to fail on the twenty-seventh day of the eighth month. Nor can there be any doubt of this, since when the flood began, the first month of that year and sixteen [days]…

§22. Second reckoning (the 150 days from the rain's end, per Josephus/Chrysostom/Tostatus/Cajetan): decrease begins in the 7th month (day 11) from the start, or the 8th month of the year, day 27. Continues on p. 343.

— p. 343 (PDF) · printed p. 274 —

…days of the second month had already passed: for the flood began on the seventeenth day of the second month. Then, up to the decrease of the flood, a hundred and ninety days passed — that is, forty of rain and a hundred and fifty of the flood's standing: and a hundred and ninety days contain six months and, besides, ten days. Hence it necessarily follows, as we said, that the waters of the flood began to diminish on the twenty-seventh day of the eighth month of that year.

Completes §22.

But I do not, for my part, know why Josephus, in the place mentioned a little above, left it written that the waters began “to settle” — that is, to diminish and fail — in the seventh month, on the twenty-seventh day of that month. For since he himself reckons a hundred and ninety days from the beginning of the flood up to its decrease, his statement can in no way cohere. For if he speaks of the month with respect to the flood, he ought to have said that the flood began to fail on the eleventh day of the seventh month; but if of the month with respect to the year, he should have said that the diminution of the flood began on the twenty-seventh day of the eighth month. And so his statement has no way out. Either, therefore, this passage in Josephus is corrupt — so that for “the eighth month” was erroneously written “the seventh month” — or there Josephus slipped through carelessness and inadvertence. For what Moses said about the Ark — that it rested upon the mountains of Armenia in the seventh month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month — this Josephus himself applied to that which had just preceded, about the beginning of the decrease of the flood after the hundred and fifty days.

§23. A criticism of Josephus's inconsistent date (probably a textual corruption or a slip). Margin: "A remark on Josephus."

A BRIEF MORAL DIGRESSION. On the words of the eighth chapter thus far explained.

To the moral treatment belong some things which we said above, when we explained those first words of the eighth chapter: "The Lord remembered Noah, and all the living creatures," etc. But besides those, it is now pleasing to set forth in passing certain moral lessons drawn from the same words. And first indeed, by the example of Noah we must learn how God mingles and tempers the life of just men out of prosperous and adverse things, by a certain wonderful and most salutary alternation and vicissitude, so that in this way he makes them — not trusting in themselves, but relying on God's protection and defense — to walk perpetually between hope and fear (which is the most cautious and safest manner of serving God). And so, by experiencing rather than by reading, they come to know that it is true which is written: "The Lord kills and makes alive, leads down to hell and brings back" (1 Sam. 2); and what is read in Tobit: "This every one holds for certain who worships thee, that his life, if it be in probation, shall be crowned; but if it be in tribulation, it shall be delivered; and if it be in correction, it shall be allowed to come to thy mercy. For thou art not delighted in our destruction: because after a storm thou makest a calm…"

§24. The Moral Digression begins: God tempers the just life between hope and fear (1 Sam. 2; Tobit 3). Margins: "First lesson"; 1 Sam. 2; Tobit 3. Continues on p. 344.

— p. 344 (PDF) · printed p. 275 —

…thou makest, and after weeping and tears thou pourest in joy. Blessed be thy name, O God of Israel, for ever."

Completes §24 (the Tobit quotation).

This too must be observed: that God is not said in this place to have remembered Noah himself before the sinners had perished in the flood —

which is not without mystery. For then is God truly mindful of us and does us good, when the old Adam, with his vices, has perished in us, as it were submerged by the flood of contrition and penance. Moreover, the destruction of those men who perished in the flood was in two ways useful to those few who were saved by the Ark: both because, all the wicked being removed from their midst, they had after the flood no one who could hinder them from living rightly — either by persecuting and harassing them, or by inciting them to crimes by the example of his own wickedness; and because the memory of their destruction had to be to them, as it were, both a bridle and a spur, by which they might both be drawn back from impiety and iniquity, and be impelled to cultivate piety toward God and justice toward men, and might shudder to imitate the morals and deeds of those whose so atrocious end and destruction they recalled.

§25. Second lesson: the wicked's destruction profited the saved (no corrupters left; a bridle and spur to virtue). Margins: "The destruction of evil men twofold-useful to the good."

But that God is said to have remembered not only Noah, but also the animals, not only indicates God's exceptional love and care for man, for whose sake he willed to save the animals from the destruction of the flood (for true is that old proverb among the Spaniards: "Quien ama Beltran, ama su can" — that is, "He who loves Bertram (it is a man's proper name) loves also his dog"); but it shows besides the incredible goodness of God, which pertains not only to men, but is poured out upon animals also. Wherefore Scripture often praises God for the liberality and beneficence which he exercises toward animals: and in Solomon the just man is praised because he is merciful not only toward men, but also toward animals. "The just man," says Solomon, "knows the souls of his beasts; but the bowels of the impious are cruel" (Prov. 12). Where one must note that Solomon used a beautiful antithesis: since "bowels" in Hebrew take their name from compassion — for they are called rechamim, that is, "compassions" — so that those seem execrable whose bowels (which, as their name implies, ought to be most inclined to compassion) are inhuman and cruel toward

men. That St. Francis was often merciful and kind toward animals, no otherwise than toward men, we read in his history.

§26. Why God ‘remembered’ the animals: a token of his goodness, and a model of mercy (Prov. 12; St. Francis). Margins: “Second lesson”; “The passage of Proverbs, ch. 12.”

Nor only among Christian men was this humanity and mercy toward animals commendable and praiseworthy, but also among the pagans. Hear what Aelian writes of Xenocrates, to extol his humanity and mercy to the skies with praises: “Xenocrates,” he says, “the intimate of Plato, was so merciful and humane that he was often moved by compassion for brute beasts. When once, as he sat in the open air, a sparrow which a hawk was pursuing flew down into his bosom, he most gladly received it, and kept it for as long as he who pursued it had gone away; but when he had freed it from all fear, he immediately, opening his bosom, let it go, saying that he had not betrayed a suppliant.”

§27. Even a pagan (Xenocrates) showed mercy to animals — Aelian's sparrow story. Margins: Aelian, Varia Historia, bk. 13; “The humanity of Xenocrates toward animals.”

— p. 345 (PDF) · printed p. 276 —

Nor is it unworthy of notice, that God, although he himself can accomplish by himself all things which he wills to be done, is nevertheless wont, for accomplishing whatever can conveniently be done through creatures, to use their ministry. God could, by his will alone, in a point of time, have overwhelmed the whole world with waters: yet to accomplish this he broke the fountains of the deep, opened the cataracts of heaven, and poured out rain from heaven for forty days. And when it pleased him to remove the flood, he could, by his nod alone, have recalled all the waters to their places, and suddenly dried the earth thoroughly: yet he willed to use both the blast of the wind, and the closing of the fountains of the deep and the cataracts of heaven. For that God uses the work of the things created by him for accomplishing what they can accomplish, demonstrates the exceptional goodness and beneficence of God, and at the same time

commends and adorns the dignity of the things themselves.

§28. Third lesson: God works through creatures, honoring their dignity. Margin: “Third lesson.”

Kings and princes ought to follow this by imitation: that they, who have many helpers and ministers for governing and managing their dominion, if they have obtained them faithful and prudent and diligent, should allow them freely to execute the duties enjoined on them; and to those to whom they have granted some part of their power, should permit the whole and unimpeded administration of their office. This indeed declares the greater majesty and prudence of Princes; and it is more pleasing to their ministers, who, by that liberty granted to them, become more eager and attentive to discharging their office: and the same conduces especially to a right and stable and peaceful and pleasant manner of governing.

§29. The political application: princes should let trusted ministers govern freely.

It must not be passed over in this place that all creatures most promptly serve their Creator, whether for the vengeance upon the wicked, or for the preservation, liberation, and consolation of the good. Behold: when it pleased God, on account of the sins of men, to destroy the whole world by a flood, immediately all the waters — subterranean and terrestrial and celestial — as if conspired for the slaughter of men, contributed all their forces for inundating and overwhelming the world. But on the contrary, when God was now turned to mercy, and converted to the consolation of Noah and the restoration of the world, immediately they restrained their forces from destroying the world: a wind was at hand, drying and consuming the waters; the abyss recalled and resorbed the waters which it had sent out, and held them within itself; the Ocean, which had inundated the lands most widely and deeply, returned within the former bounds of its seat: in short, the very things which before had served God for bringing about the flood, the same serve God, who commands, for its removal and abolition. Excellently, therefore, is that written in the book of Wisdom: “For the creature serving thee, its maker, is kindled to torment against the

unjust, and becomes milder for doing good for those who trust in thee."

§30. Fourth lesson: all creatures obey God — for vengeance or for mercy (Wisd. 16). Margins: "Fourth lesson"; Wisd. 16.

Rupert beautifully applies this passage of Moses, by allegory, to Christ the Savior; for he writes thus: "God the Father remembered Christ his Son, after the waters had entered even to his soul, after the tribulations of death had passed through his soul, when he was held shut up in the sepulchre, 'And he brought a Spirit upon the earth.' A Spirit, I say — that is, he brought returning life upon the earth out of [his] lifeless body: for he raised him from the dead. But also over all the earth, through the resurrection of one, God brought a Spirit: for from that time he gave men the Holy Spirit unto the remission of sins — who so dissipates the clouds of hearts and dries up the waves of temptations, just as that Spirit which God brought over the earth, by warming the moist and cold air, diminished the waters, and gradually drove them out, even to dryness." So Rupert.

§31. The allegory (Rupert): 'God remembered Noah' and 'brought a Spirit' = the Father raising Christ and giving the Holy Spirit. Margins: Rupert, on Genesis bk. 4, ch. 22; "Allegory of Christ the Lord."

"And the ark rested in the seventh month, the twenty-seventh day of the month, upon the mountains of Armenia." In place of that word, "Armenia," there is read in Hebrew "Ararat," which word the Septuagint Interpreters did not translate, but set it down, as it is read in Hebrew, in their translation. And the word "Ararat" all interpret as "Armenia": and that the place where the Ark settled was in Armenia, or near to it, is no slight argument [that] the Armenians held it persuaded and certain by ancient tradition. Wherefore that place of Noah's egress from the Ark they called by that Armenian word "Aprobaterion," that is, "place of egress." But which mountain of Armenia it was upon which the Ark settled is variously handed down.

§32. Gen. 8:4: 'Ararat' = Armenia (the Armenians' tradition; 'Aprobaterion'). Margin: Gen. 8, v. 4.

— p. 346 (PDF) · printed p. 277 —

Berosus the Chaldean, in Josephus, first book of the Antiquities, calls it the mountain of the Cordyaeans, on which, even in his time, there remained a part of that Ark, whence bitumen was scraped off as a remedy for diseases. In the same Josephus, Nicolaus of Damascus names that mountain “Baris.” But why St. Ambrose called that mountain the “mountain of the Square (Quadratus),” I can in no way reach by conjecture or suspicion. There are those who think that Moses by “Ararat” understood the Araxes [river], noble both for its waters and for the celebration of writers — which, poured out with a great mass of waves from Mount Taurus, and spreading through the plains of Armenia, discharges its waters into the Hyrcanian sea. This, then, is the meaning of the words of Moses: that the Ark settled on the peak of Mount Taurus, where it is adjacent to the river Araxes.

§33. Which mountain: Berosus (Cordyaeans), Nicolaus (Baris), Ambrose (‘Square’); or Ararat = the river Araxes (Mt. Taurus). Margins: Berosus the Chaldean, in Josephus; Nicolaus of Damascus, in the same; Ambrose, On Noah's Ark.

Mount Taurus also separates Lesser Armenia from Cilicia: so that it is credible that the Ark rested on that part of Taurus which lies over Cilicia. And this is made probable by Tarsus, noble before all the cities of Cilicia, formerly called “Tersus,” from the verb τερσα■νω, which means “I dry.” For it is reported, after the flood (as Stephanus On Cities writes), that the places of Cilicia first appeared dried of waters; and therefore the city was called “Tarsus” from such drying — as if, in token of the land first dried there, Tarsus was afterward founded. Nor is it necessary to think that, because the Ark settled upon that mountain of Armenia, it was the highest of all the mountains of the world (for it could be that many in other places were higher), but it is enough that, in those places through which the Ark was then borne, that mountain was the high[est]…

§34. Mt. Taurus near Cilicia (and the etymology of Tarsus as ‘drying’). Margin: Stephanus [of Byzantium]. Continues on p. 347.

— p. 347 (PDF) · printed p. 278 —

…[that many in other places were] higher: but it is enough that, in those places through which the Ark was then borne, that mountain was the highest. From this passage too one may understand that the base or bottom of that Ark was not narrow, and pointed in the manner of a ship's keel: for if it had been such, the Ark could not have settled upon a mountain; but it must have been broad and flat. From which it is manifest that the Ark did not float upon the waters [keel-deep], but had a great lower part submerged in the waters. For Moses signifies in this place that, many days before the tops of the mountains stood out and appeared above the waters, the Ark rested upon the mountains of Armenia.

§35. The Ark's flat bottom (it could rest on a mountain, so it was not keeled and rode partly submerged).

FOURTH DISPUTATION. Whence that seventh month is to be counted, in which month Moses said the Ark rested upon the mountains of Armenia.

Here it is asked whether that seventh month is said [to be counted] from the beginning of the six hundredth year, or from the beginning of the flood and from when Noah entered the Ark. There are two opinions of the authors: one is of those who begin those hundred and fifty days (during which the waters held the earth, and after which the waters of the flood began to diminish, as Moses said above) after those forty days of rain, so that from the beginning of the flood up to that time at which the waters began to diminish they count a hundred and ninety days: and of this opinion we said above, in the twelfth book, were Josephus, St. Chrysostom, Tostatus, and Cajetan. According to these, therefore, it cannot be understood that the month in which the Ark rested was the seventh from the beginning of the six hundredth year. For (as they hold) since from the beginning of the flood up to the beginning of the diminution of the waters a hundred and ninety days passed, and from the beginning of the year forty-six days had already

passed up to the beginning of the flood (since on the seventeenth day of the second month the flood began), therefore from the beginning of the year up to the beginning of the diminution of the waters two hundred and thirty-six days would have passed — that is, nearly eight months. If, therefore, the Ark had rested upon the mountains on the twenty-seventh day of the seventh month from the beginning of the year, it would follow that the Ark rested upon the mountains thirty days before the waters began to diminish: which is in itself absurd, and manifestly contrary to the narrative of Moses. It is necessary, therefore, that these authors count the seventh month in which the Ark rested not from the beginning of the six hundredth year, but from the beginning of the flood.

§36. The question; the first school (Josephus etc.) must count the seventh month from the flood's start, not the year's.

But how they explain that computation must next be seen.

§37 begins. Continues on p. 348.

— p. 348 (PDF) · printed p. 279 —

Cajetan in this place thus explains that computation: “If you reckon,” he says, “from the day on which the flood began up to the seventeenth day of the seventh month on which the Ark rested” (for thus Cajetan reads, following the Hebrew Scripture, whereas our Latin reading has the twenty-seventh day — about which variety and discrepancy of reading it will be disputed in the next following question) — “if, I say, you reckon from the day on which the flood began up to the seventeenth day of the seventh month on which the ark rested, you will count a hundred and ninety-one days, which make six months and seventeen days, reckoning, according to the Hebrews, twenty-nine days to each month: and so the seventeenth day of the seventh month was the hundred and ninety-first day from the beginning of the flood. And hence it is plain that that number of a hundred and fifty days ought to be reckoned after the forty days of rain.” This [says] Cajetan.

§37. Cajetan's computation (191 days to the Ark's rest, reckoning 29-day months). Margin: Cajetan.

But in Cajetan's computation two things are by no means to be approved. For first, against the opinion of all, and against the custom of the Hebrews and of all nations, he assigns to each Lunar month (and such were the months of the Hebrews) only twenty-nine days; whereas it is manifest that each Lunar month contains twenty-nine days and, besides, half a day. Wherefore the Hebrews, alternately, made one month of twenty-nine days, but the other of thirty. Hence it comes about that six Lunar months together with seventeen days make a hundred and ninety-four days, not a hundred and ninety-one, as Cajetan thought. Next, according to Cajetan's computation, it would follow that on the very day on which the waters began to diminish, the Ark also settled upon the mountains: which is improbable; especially since, from when the Ark settled until the tops of the mountains appeared, seventy days passed (according to Cajetan himself). Whereby one may understand how slowly and gradually that diminution of the waters of the flood was made.

§38. Two faults in Cajetan's reckoning (the 29-day months; and the Ark resting the very day the waters began to fall). Margin: "Cajetan is refuted."

But Tostatus explains the same computation thus: "If anyone counts seven Lunar months from the beginning of the flood, he will find two hundred and seven days: and since from the beginning of the flood until the waters began to diminish a hundred and ninety days passed (as we showed above), there will remain seventeen days, during which we shall say that the Ark, after the beginning of the decrease of the waters, floated this way and that before it settled upon the mountains of Armenia." But in this computation of his Tostatus erred, counting seven whole months from the beginning of the flood up to when the Ark settled — whereas they were not whole, but three days were lacking for the completion of the seventh month; since the Ark settled on the twenty-seventh day of the seventh month, wherefore three days were lacking for the completion of that seventh month. Therefore, from the beginning of the diminution of the waters up to the day

on which the Ark settled, there did not run seventeen days, as Tostatus wishes, but only fourteen.

§39. Tostatus's reckoning and its slip (seven months not whole; 14 days, not 17). Margin: “Tostatus is refuted.”

The other opinion is of those authors who count those hundred and fifty days from the beginning of the flood. And this opinion we attributed above to the Scholastic History and to Lyra. These count the seventh month of the Ark's rest from the beginning of the year, not of the flood. And it is consequent to this opinion that between the day on which the waters of the flood began to diminish and the day on which the Ark settled, eight days intervened — during which days the waters (which had surpassed the highest mountains by fifteen cubits) were so far diminished that the Ark, touching with its base or bottom the peak of one of the mountains of Armenia, settled upon it…

§40. The second school (Hist. Schol., Lyra): the 150 days from the flood's start; the seventh month from the year's. Continues on p. 349.

— p. 349 (PDF) · printed p. 280 —

…settled upon it. And the reasoning of this computation can easily be entered upon and worked out in this way. From the beginning of the six hundredth year up to the beginning of the flood (which happened on the seventeenth day of the second month) forty-six days passed; and these were followed by the hundred and fifty days during which the increase of the flood lasted. From both this number there arises a sum of a hundred and ninety-six days. There remain, therefore, eight days up to two hundred and four, which indeed make six Lunar months and, besides, twenty-seven days — on which twenty-seventh day of the seventh month the Ark is said to have rested.

The arithmetic of the second view (the 27th of the 7th month = day 204 of the year).

This opinion is made, to me indeed, very probable by this: that, according to it, all the months which are counted in this narrative by Moses are computed in the same way — namely, from the beginning of the year; but according to the former opinion it is necessary that they be computed variously, some from the beginning of the year, others from the beginning of the flood. For the followers of that opinion compute all from the beginning of the year — the second month (in which the flood occurred), and the tenth month (in which the tops of the mountains appeared), and the first month of the six hundred and first year (in which Noah is said to have opened the covering of the Ark), and the second month of that year (in which Noah went out of the Ark): these months, I say, they all compute from the beginning of the year; but only the seventh month (in which the Ark rested upon the mountains) they wish to be computed not from the beginning of the year, like the others, but from the beginning of the flood. But who would induce himself to believe that Moses, in this so brief narrative of his, set down the months variously and ambiguously, with no indication made of that variation? The second opinion, therefore, which computes that seventh month in which the Ark rested from the beginning of the year, seems to be preferred to the first.

§41. Pererius prefers the second view (all the months reckoned uniformly from the year's start).

FIFTH DISPUTATION. On the discrepancy of the Latin reading from the Hebrew, which is in this place concerning the day on which the Ark is said to have rested on the Armenian mountains.

Both the Latin translation and the Greek of the Septuagint Interpreters have in this place that the Ark rested on the twenty-seventh day of the seventh month: but the Hebrew Scripture and the Chaldaic Paraphrase have that it rested on the seventeenth day of the same month; nor does it appear how these two readings can be reconciled with each other. Since, therefore, neither reading seems able to be true [together], it is asked which is to be judged faulty and false, and which ought to be preferred. For my part, I

would consider it impious to say that the Latin translation is faulty — which all the Latin codices, to a man, both now have and always have had, there being no suspicion of error: especially since all the Greek books of the Septuagint Interpreters have, and always have had, the same reading, and all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, followed that very reading in this place.

§42. The Latin/Greek (27th) vs. Hebrew/Chaldaic (17th) discrepancy; the Latin not to be called faulty.

— p. 350 (PDF) · printed p. 281 —

Nor, however, would I on that account dare to pronounce false, and utterly condemn, the Hebrew reading — with which the Chaldaic paraphrase also agrees: for that reading all the Hebrew books constantly have. And it is difficult to believe that all the Hebrew books were corrupted by the Hebrews: for they were not corrupted by any chance, since chance would not have befallen all the books nor in every age; nor is it credible that the Jews deliberately wished to corrupt all their books, since there was no reason why they should especially wish to deprave this passage of Moses. For St. Augustine argues similarly, and in a similar matter, in the fifteenth book of The City of God, chapter thirteen — where what he himself wrote about the authority of the Hebrew codices certainly strongly deters me from daring to repudiate the common and inveterate reading of all the Hebrew books. For he writes thus: “I should in no way doubt that it is rightly done, that when something different is found in both [sets of] codices (Augustine speaks there of the Greek and Hebrew codices, and the same seems to be thought of the Latin), since, for the credit of the things done, both cannot be true, that language should rather be believed from which the translation into another was made by the interpreters.” So Augustine.

§43. The Hebrew not to be condemned either (Augustine on trusting the source language). Margins: Augustine; “A notable opinion of Augustine.”

Let others, therefore — endowed with greater genius and judgment than we are, and with richer learning in the sacred writings — apply themselves to finding some way and method of reconciling and harmonizing those two readings with each other. Provided that this be settled and fixed: that if the Hebrew reading altogether contradicts the Latin, and both cannot cohere together, one must stand by the Latin rather than the Hebrew — since it has been so greatly commended and fortified by the authority of the Council of Trent. We, however, will here set down both readings, and will briefly and clearly show how the number of those days which is in each reading can be variously computed and truly hold good.

Pererius's rule: where they conflict, stand by the Latin (commended by Trent); but he will show both work arithmetically.

According to the Hebrew reading, then, which has that the Ark settled on the seventeenth day of the seventh month, a fourfold computation can be made. But let this be set down beforehand: that six Lunar months, plus seventeen days, contain a hundred and ninety-four days. The first Computation is: If the seventh month in which the Ark rested is counted from the beginning of the flood, and the forty days of rain are separated from the other hundred and fifty days (about which it was said above), then there will remain four days from the beginning of the diminution of the waters up to the day on which the Ark settled.

§44. The Hebrew reading (17th), with the first of four computations. Margin: “The Hebrew reading is explained.” Continues on p. 351.

— p. 351 (PDF) · printed p. 282 —

The second Computation: If we begin the seventh month from the beginning of the flood, but include those forty days of rain in those hundred and fifty days, there will remain forty-four days from the beginning of the decrease of the waters up to the rest of the Ark. And these two Computations are sufficiently probable; the second, however, seems to many more probable, on account of the reason set forth by us a little above.

The second computation of the Hebrew reading.

The third Computation: If that seventh month is counted not from the beginning of the flood, but from the beginning of the year, and the forty days of rain are separated from the other hundred and fifty days, thus there will be made, from the beginning of the year up to the end of those hundred and fifty days (after which the flood began to diminish), two hundred and thirty-six days, that is, eight months. But hence it would follow that the Ark settled upon the mountains forty-two days before the diminution of the flood; since from the beginning of the year up to the seventeenth day of the seventh month, on which the Ark rested, a hundred and ninety-four days are counted. But this is both absurd and contrary to divine scripture. The fourth Computation: If the seventh month is reckoned from the beginning of the year, and those forty days of rain are included in the other hundred and fifty, from the beginning of the year up to the beginning of the decrease of the waters there would have been a hundred and ninety-six days; wherefore the Ark would have settled two days before the diminution of the waters: which, although less absurd than what was a little before concluded from the third Computation, is nevertheless absurd, and contrary to the narrative of Moses. And thus far concerning the Hebrew reading.

§45. The third and fourth computations of the Hebrew reading (both absurd).

Moreover, the Latin and Greek reading, which has that the Ark rested on the twenty-seventh day of the seventh month, is likewise capable of four Computations. But let us suppose — what is certain — that from the beginning of the year up to the twenty-seventh day of the seventh month, according to the reckoning of Lunar months, two hundred and four days are counted. The first Computation, then, is, reckoning the seventh month in which the Ark rested from the beginning of the flood, and separating the forty days of rain from the other hundred and fifty: there remain fourteen days, during which, after the beginning of the decrease of the waters, the Ark floated, until at last it came to rest upon the mountains. The second

Computation: counting the seventh month from the beginning of the flood, but not separating the forty days of rain from the other hundred and fifty, the remaining days are fifty-four, set between the beginning of the diminution of the waters and the rest of the Ark. Each of these Computations is probable; but on account of the aforesaid reason the second seems more probable than the first.

§46. The Latin/Greek reading (27th): the first two computations.

The third Computation: beginning the seventh month from the beginning of the year, and separating those forty days from the other hundred and fifty, it comes about that the Ark settled thirty-two days before the waters were diminished. The fourth computation: beginning likewise the seventh month from the beginning of the year, but not separating the forty days of rain from the other hundred and fifty, there will remain eight days, during which, after the beginning of the diminution of the waters, the Ark floated, and at last rested. And of these two Computations, as the third is altogether to be rejected, so the fourth and last (in the opinion of many) is to be held more probable than the rest. But enough of these things.

The third and fourth computations of the Latin reading; the fourth is the most probable overall.

— p. 352 (PDF) · printed p. 283 —

SIXTH DISPUTATION. On those words: “And in the tenth month, on the first day of the month, the tops of the mountains appeared.”

Moses says that the waters of the flood decreased up to the tenth month: not that the decrease of the waters was then entirely finished (since a little below Moses said that in the six hundred and first year, in the first month, on the first day of the month, the waters were lessened upon the earth); but [the meaning is that], whereas before the tenth month (although the waters had decreased for many days) they nevertheless still covered the whole earth, even above all the mountains, then first — that is, at the beginning of the tenth month — the waters were so far diminished that the tops of the

mountains too began to stand out and appear.

§47. Gen. 8:5: the mountain-tops appearing in the tenth month.

Cajetan computes this tenth month from the beginning of the flood, and judges that from the day on which the Ark rested (that is, from the seventeenth day of the seventh month) up to the first day of the tenth month, on which the tops of the mountains first appeared, seventy days passed: namely, the Flood had covered the mountains so deeply that, after it began to decrease, seventy days of its decrease passed before the peaks of the highest mountains, stripped of waters, appeared. Hear Cajetan: "'The waters,' he says, 'were going and decreasing up to the tenth month' — without doubt from the beginning of the flood. Seventy days, therefore, are described as having passed from the rest of the Ark upon the mountains up to the tenth month. For there flowed twelve days of the seventh month and fifty-eight days making up the eighth and ninth month: and on the day immediately following the aforesaid seventy days, the tops — or (what the Hebrew word signifies) the heads — of the mountains are said to have appeared. Therefore, when the Ark rested upon the mountains, the heads of the mountains were still so deeply covered with waters, that a space of seventy days was needed for them to be uncovered from the waters, and the whole Ark to be free of the waters — [the Ark] which, during those seventy days, was for no small part girt with the waters gradually failing. Nor does it stand in the way that in Hebrew it is said that the heads of the mountains 'were seen.' For it is not signified that they were actually seen by anyone, but that they were uncovered and stripped of waters — wherefore they became visible and conspicuous, such as they were not before, [being] covered with waters." Thus far from Cajetan.

§ (Cajetan). Cajetan: the tenth month reckoned from the flood's start (70 days from the Ark's rest to the peaks' appearing). Margin: Cajetan on Gen. ch. 8.

— p. 353 (PDF) · printed p. 284 —

But that Cajetan's opinion is not probable, one may argue in this way: If this tenth month is computed from the beginning of the flood, since before the beginning of the flood one month and sixteen days of the six hundredth year had passed, then the tops of the mountains would have appeared on the eighteenth day of the eleventh month of the six hundredth year, and there would remain, to complete that year, one whole month and besides twelve days — that is, forty-two days. But Moses, after the appearance of the mountains up to the beginning of the six hundred and first year, reckons first forty days, then twice seven days (which joined to them make fifty-four), after which he begins the six hundred and first year, saying that on the first day of the six hundred and first year Noah opened the covering of the Ark: but according to Cajetan's foregoing computation, this would have been done not on the first day, but on the thirteenth day of the six hundred and first year. Besides, Noah would not have gone out of the Ark in the six hundred and first year, in the second month, on the twenty-seventh day (as Moses narrates), but in the third month and on the twelfth day — which from the things said above it will be easy for the reader to gather.

§48. Refutation of Cajetan: counting the tenth month from the flood throws off the later dates of Gen. 8. Margin: “Cajetan is refuted.”

Besides, it would follow that Noah was in the Ark not only one whole Solar year (as almost all think), but, beyond one Solar year, remained in the Ark two months and ten days. Therefore that tenth month is not to be computed from the beginning of the flood, but from the beginning of the six hundredth year: just as was also said a little above about the seventh month in which the Ark rested. Wherefore, between the twenty-seventh day of the seventh month on which the Ark rested, and the first day of the tenth month on which the tops of the mountains appeared, sixty-three days intervened.

Pererius: count the tenth month from the year's start; 63 days from the Ark's rest to the peaks' appearing.

But on the same words of Moses, by which it is said that on the first day of the tenth month the tops of the mountains first appeared, an arduous question arises in this place. For Moses says that on the first day of the tenth month the tops of the mountains appeared: thence he counts forty days, after which days Noah, opening the window, sent out the raven and the dove; and after these he reckons twice seven days, during which he sent out the dove twice. And all these days indeed make up the number of fifty-four days. After this Moses subjoins that in the six hundred and first year, in the first month and on the first day of the month, the earth was dried: but from the first day of the tenth month of the six hundredth year up to the first day of the first month of the six hundred and first year, three Lunar months passed — that is, not fifty-four days (as Moses indicates), but eighty-eight. The narrative of Moses, therefore, does not agree with itself in chronology; nay rather, it plainly destroys itself.

§49. The hard chronological problem: 40 + 14 days = 54, but the interval is actually ~88 days.

Cajetan, who (as we said above) separates those forty days of rain from the other hundred and fifty during which the flood stood, and begins the seventh and tenth months named by Moses from the beginning of the flood, now says: that when Moses wrote that in the six hundred and first year, in the first month and on the first day, the earth was dried, he signified that there was then completed…

§50. Cajetan's attempt to resolve the chronological problem. Margin: “Cajetan's opinion.” Continues on p. 354.

— p. 354 (PDF) · printed p. 285 —

…that the six hundredth year of Noah was then completed entire. For all the days of this year Moses numbered by parts: for first he mentioned forty-six days, when he said that Noah entered the Ark in the six hundredth year, in the second month, on the seventeenth day; then he reckoned forty days of rain; and after these he mentioned another hundred and fifty days, up to the diminution of the waters; to these another seventy, namely from

the seventeenth day of the seventh month up to the first day of the tenth month; and besides these he named forty days, and moreover another twice-seven days: and from all the aforesaid days there is made up a sum of three hundred and sixty days, assigning to each Lunar month twenty-nine days.

§50 (cont.). Cajetan's tally of the year's days = 360 (on 29-day months).

Now the year, among the ancients, consisted of three hundred and sixty days, according to the number of the degrees of the signs in the Zodiac, assigning one day to each degree: and such was the solar year among the Greeks and Romans, and (as is believed) also among the Egyptians; and that it was the same in the time of Moses and Noah may be gathered from this Chronology of the flood. But because the Sun does not complete its course before three hundred and sixty-five days and a quarter, in order that the year might agree with the motion of the Sun, thirty days were assigned to each of the months of the year, and every sixth year they added an intercalary month, to supply those five days which were in excess for the individual months. But this reckoning of the year and of intercalation Julius Caesar corrected, and described and established it as it now is. But into that year of the flood no intercalary month fell: wherefore that year had only three hundred and sixty days. And such, then, is Cajetan's opinion.

§51. Cajetan's premise: a 360-day ancient (Zodiacal) year, no intercalary month in the flood-year. Margin: “What sort the year was among the ancients, according to Cajetan.”

But in this opinion and interpretation of Cajetan many things are by no means to be approved. First, Cajetan separates the forty days of rain from the other hundred and fifty: but that they ought not to be separated, we showed above is more probable. Then he computes the seventh and tenth months from the beginning of the flood: but that this too is less probable was said a little above. He assigns, besides, to each Lunar month only twenty-nine days: whereas one ought to assign twenty-nine and, besides, half a day; nay rather, according to Cajetan himself (assigning only

twenty-nine days to each Lunar month), it would be necessary that a year composed of twelve Lunar months should consist of only three hundred and forty-eight days — which, however, he makes to be of three hundred and sixty days.

§52. Faults in Cajetan's reckoning (separating the 40 days; 29-day months that don't even add to 360).

Besides, what Cajetan said — that among the ancient Romans, Greeks, and Egyptians the year was of three hundred and sixty days, and that every sixth year one month was wont to be intercalated, and that this reckoning of the year was in use in the time of Noah, and is reckoned up by Moses in this place in the history of the flood — has somewhat of truth, but more of falsity. For Censorinus, in the book On the Birthday [of the Romans], writing about the reckoning of the year among various nations: “He by no means seems to err,” he says, “who accommodated the civil months to the course of the Moon — as most in Greece, among whom alternate months were made of thirty days. The Romans of old too imitated the same, when they had a year of three hundred and sixty days.” But in Macrobius it is thus [stated]…

§53. Against Cajetan's calendar history (Censorinus on lunar/Greek/Roman years). Margins: Censorinus; Macrobius. Continues on p. 355.

— p. 355 (PDF) · printed p. 286 —

…“The Egyptians have all their months of thirty days, [and] have a year of only three hundred and sixty days; hence, their twelve months being unfolded (that is, three hundred and sixty days being completed), between August and September (or, as it is said in the Egyptian manner, between Mesori and Thoth, namely the last month of the year and the first of the following) they insert into the year the remaining five days of the solar circuit; and every fourth year, besides, they attach in the same place an intercalary day, which is made up from the quarters.” Thus in Macrobius.

Macrobius on the Egyptian 360-day year + 5 added days. Margin: Macrobius.

Consonant with Macrobius write Herodotus, Diodorus, and Strabo. “Of all men,” says Herodotus, “it is agreed that the Egyptians first discovered the year, distinguishing it into twelve months of seasons: and that they discovered this from the stars, doing this (as it seems to me) more skillfully than the Greeks, because the Greeks every third year introduce an intercalary month for the sake of the seasons; but the Egyptians, reckoning each month at thirty days, add to this number five days every year: whence their reckoning of the cycle of the seasons holds, returning to the same point.”

§54. Herodotus on the Egyptian year. Margin: Herodotus, bk. 2.

Diodorus Siculus relates that the same was observed by the Thebans, writing in this manner: “The Thebans profess themselves the most ancient of men, and that philosophy and Astronomy were first discovered by them, and that they were aided by the situation of their region for knowing the risings and settings of the motions of the stars; and that months and years were instituted by them. And they measured the days not according to the Moon, but according to the Sun, making a month of thirty days. And adding five days and a quarter of a day to the twelve months, they complete the course of the year; they do not interpose intercalary months, nor subtract days, as do some of the Greeks too.” Thus far from Diodorus.

§55. Diodorus on the Theban (Egyptian) solar year. Margin: Diodorus Siculus, bk. 2.

From these things it appears that among the ancient Egyptians the year was of three hundred and sixty-five days: although the last five days were not counted by them as parts [of the months], but were reckoned as added. It is not true, therefore, what Cajetan said — that the year in the time of Noah was of three hundred and sixty days, such, namely, as it was among the ancient Egyptians. What of this: that the Hebrews used Lunar years (each year, namely, of three hundred and fifty-four days), but nevertheless brought them back and accommodated them to the reckoning of the sun's motion, intercalating one month about every third year?

§56. The Egyptian year was really 365 days; the Hebrews used a lunar (354-day) year with intercalation.

To the question, therefore, and difficulty set above, it must be answered otherwise. To me, indeed, it seems very probable that Moses, in this history of the flood, did not number all the months [and] days of that year in which the flood occurred, but, passing over many in silence, enumerated only those on which something happened, or was done by Noah, which was notable and memorable, and contributed to illustrating this history of the flood. He named the seventeenth day of the second month: because on that day the flood began. He reckoned the forty days of rain: whence the increase of the flood came about. He mentioned the hundred and fifty days: because during them the flood stood, and after them the waters of the flood began to diminish. He named the twenty-seventh day of the seventh month: because then first the Ark settled upon the mountains. He made mention of the first day of the tenth month: because on that day the tops of the mountains first appeared. After this he reckoned forty days: because, those being passed, Noah, opening the window of the Ark, sent out the raven and the dove to explore whether the flood had ceased. He then added fourteen days, in which the dove, returning the first time to the Ark, brought in its mouth a branch of olive with green leaves; but, sent out again and yet not returning, gave a sign that the earth was now dried of the waters. But because on other days and months nothing similar to these (that is, nothing memorable) had happened, therefore Moses thought that those times were not to be reckoned up.

§57. Pererius's own answer: Moses lists only the days on which something memorable happened, passing over the rest. Margin: “The author's judgment and opinion on the proposed question.”

— p. 356 (PDF) · printed p. 287 —

SEVENTH DISPUTATION. How great a part of the Ark was submerged in the waters, when the waters were at their highest increase — that is, when they exceeded the highest mountains by fifteen cubits.

This question I do not remember being touched by any of the Fathers. The first who seems to have touched it, I find to be Hugh of St. Victor: but afterward, among the Hebrews, Rabbi Solomon, and of ours, Lyra, Paul of Burgos, Tostatus, the Carthusian, and others, agitated it rather curiously and subtly. To us it has seemed that this question ought neither to be passed over altogether untouched, nor to be treated except briefly and, as it were, in passing. What, then, does Hugh hand down about the question proposed? He, in the first book On the Moral Ark, chapter three, when he had divided the Ark into five dwellings — the lowest, which is called the Dung-deck (Stercoraria), and the one next to this, which is named the Food-deck (Cibaria) — signifies that those two dwellings were submerged in the waters; but he makes the third dwelling of the Ark (in which he places the wild and untamed animals) to be standing above the waters. To the lowest dwelling he assigns four cubits of height, but to the other which was next above this, five cubits. From which it is understood that Hugh thought that, of the thirty cubits of the whole Ark's height, the nine lower ones were submerged in the waters: so that the Ark was nine cubits within the water, but twenty-one cubits outside and above the waters. So [much] from Hugh.

§58. The submersion question; Hugh of St. Victor: the Ark sat 9 cubits deep, 21 above water. Margins: Rabbi Solomon; Paul of Burgos; Gen. 6.

But different is Lyra's opinion. For he, on the eighth chapter of Genesis, upon those words, “On the first day of the tenth month the tops of the mountains appeared,” disputing about the aforesaid question, first assumes and lays down certain things, by his own judgment certain, and (as he thinks) to be conceded by all. And first he says that the Ark did not enter fifteen cubits into the waters of the flood, when the waters were at their highest increase: for since the waters did not exceed the mountains by more than fifteen cubits, if the Ark had entered the waters by as many cubits, it would surely have touched the mountains with its bottom; it would not, therefore, have been moved, but would always have rested upon them…

§59. Lyra's premises begin (the Ark drew less than 15 cubits). Margin: Lyra. Continues on p. 357.

— p. 357 (PDF) · printed p. 288 —

…but would always have rested upon them. Next he affirms that the Ark was submerged in the waters precisely as much as the water exceeded the mountains, when the Ark first rested upon the mountains. In the third place he assumes that the decrease of the waters (from when they first began to decrease up to that time at which the tops of the mountains appeared) was made in seventy days: for that so many days intervened is plain from this, that the waters began to diminish after a hundred and fifty days from the beginning of the flood (as was said above), that is, on the twentieth day of the seventh month; and from this up to the first day of the tenth month seventy days are counted. In the fourth place he assumes that the diminution of the waters was made equally each day, so that on each day the same amount of water decreased. And this is probable, because the causes of the decrease of the waters held themselves in the same way and equally through all those days: I mean the causes — both the wind sent by God, and the closing of the fountains of the deep and the cataracts of heaven, and the restraining of the rain.

§60–61. Lyra's third and fourth premises (a 70-day decrease, falling equally each day).

From these it is concluded: if in seventy days the waters were diminished by fifteen cubits, if you distribute those seventy days over the fifteen cubits, it will come about that to each cubit of the decrease there fall four days and a half of a day, and besides a sixth part of a day — so that the waters decreased about one cubit every four days. And since from the twentieth day of the seventh month, on which the waters began to diminish (as was said), up to the twenty-seventh day of the same month, on which the Ark rested upon the mountains, eight days passed, it comes about, from the aforesaid computation, that during those eight days the waters decreased by about two cubits. If, therefore, the Ark then rested, touching the mountains with its bottom, it must have been within the waters a little

more than thirteen cubits. So great, then, was the submersion of the Ark in the waters of the flood, when they had their highest increase and when the Ark was borne by them.

§62. Lyra's conclusion: the Ark drew ~13 cubits at the flood's peak. Margin: "The Ark was submerged nearly thirteen cubits in the waters (according to Lyra)."

Thus, roughly, Lyra — whose computation proceeds according to the Latin and Greek reading, which has that the Ark rested upon the mountains on the twenty-seventh day of the seventh month. But how the proposed question is to be answered according to the Hebrew reading (which has that the Ark rested on the seventeenth day of the seventh month), and what besides is to be said according to those who separate the hundred and fifty days (after which the decrease of the waters began) from the forty days of rain, and compute the seventh month in which the Ark rested from the beginning of the flood, and not from the beginning of the year: one may see in Lyra and Tostatus; for to me, pursuing useful things, it is neither pleasing nor permitted to linger in treating these matters, which are more curious than useful.

Pererius declines to pursue the alternative reckonings as 'more curious than useful.' Margin: Tostatus.

And the aforesaid reasoning and argument of Lyra, as resting on most doubtful and uncertain things, is neither true nor probable: for Lyra lays down three things which are of obscure truth, or even of manifest falsity. For first he assumes that, wherever the Ark was moved, it was always moved over the highest mountains of the whole world — that is, through water which exceeded the earth by only fifteen cubits: but this is neither true nor like the truth. For it is very credible that the Ark was moved both over le[vel] places…

§63. Pererius begins refuting Lyra (the Ark did not always float only 15 cubits above land). Margin: "Lyra is refuted." Continues on p. 358.

— p. 358 (PDF) · printed p. 289 —

…and over valleys and hills and mountains, both high and low: wherefore the waters through which the Ark was borne sometimes exceeded the earth by only fifteen cubits, but mostly by more — that is, by twenty, fifty, a hundred, and more. This being laid down, Lyra's reasoning must necessarily totter and collapse.

The Ark floated over varied terrain, so the water's depth above land varied (not always 15 cubits).

Next, Lyra lays down that the mountain of Armenia on which the Ark rested was the highest of the whole world — at least negatively, [in the sense] that it had none higher. But the Geographers by no means make the mountains of Armenia the highest of all: for although Mount Taurus surpasses the other mountains in length and breadth and some other respects, yet in height it is held inferior to not a few. What of this: that it is not certain that the Ark settled upon the highest ridge of that mountain? For perhaps it settled on some lower part of it.

§64. Second refutation: the Armenian mountain was not the world's highest, nor necessarily its summit.

Besides, this is not only uncertain, but even demolishes and utterly overturns Lyra's opinion. He says that the decrease of the waters was made equally each day. This is uncertain; nay, it is more probable that the decrease of the waters was made unequally. For the more water there was at the beginning, the more resistance there was in it against the drying and consuming cause: but as the decrease of the waters proceeded more and more, equally also the resistance of the water was more and more weakened, and the force of the drying cause was the stronger and more effective.

§65. Third refutation: the decrease was not equal each day (the drying force grew as the water lessened).

Next, if every fourth day (according to Lyra) the water decreased by one cubit, then it did not decrease equally as regards the quantity of water:

since the outermost and highest cubit of water (that is, the fifteenth of the height above the mountains) contained more water than the fourteenth, and this than the thirteenth, and so on down to the last; and this, indeed, one skilled in the doctrine of Physiology and Mathematics will easily understand and believe. For the waters of the flood covered and surrounded the whole earth in a sphere: and the circumference of a spherical body, the farther it is from the center, the wider and greater it is; but the smaller, the nearer [to the center]. Wherefore the highest cubit of the waters of the flood, taken in a sphere, contained much more water than the fourteenth and the others following. Therefore Lyra's reasoning destroys itself, effecting and concluding the contrary of what Lyra intends. For if the waters decreased by one cubit every four days, since those cubits (according as they were higher or lower) contained more or less water, it is necessary that the decrease of the waters was unequal on each day, and that the diminution was made smaller daily. But let us pass on to other matters.

§66. A geometrical refutation: the outer (higher) spherical cubits hold more water, so equal cubit-drops mean unequal daily decreases.

— p. 359 (PDF) · printed p. 290 —

“And when forty days had passed, Noah, opening the window of the Ark which he had made,” etc. The forty days which Moses here mentions are to be computed from the first day of the tenth month, on which the tops of the mountains appeared, and they end on the eleventh day of the eleventh month. Therefore what is here said about the opening of the window and the sending-out of the raven was done on the twelfth day of the eleventh month: although Cajetan, following I know not what Hebrew reading in this place, says that it is uncertain how long after those forty days Noah did what is here mentioned.

§67. Gen. 8:6: dating the opening of the window. Margins: Gen. 8, v. 6; Cajetan on Gen. ch. 8.

The word “window” — the older Greek books have, in Greek, θυρ■δα (a window); although in others (as in Chrysostom, hom. 27 on Genesis) the

Greek is θ■ραν, that is, a door or gate. St. Jerome, although he himself had “door,” advised that in Hebrew “window” is read. St. Ambrose, in chapter 17 of the book On Noah and the Ark, first reads “door,” then has “window.” Cajetan thinks that here, for the first time, mention is made of the window of the Ark, which Moses had above omitted in chapter 6, in the description of the Ark: for in place of what the Latin translation there has, “Thou shalt make a window in the ark,” Cajetan had read in that place, “Thou shalt make a lamp (lucerna) in the ark”; since the Hebrew word which is there, “Sohar,” properly signifies light (and indeed a great one, such as is the noonday), and thence is transferred to signify that which provides light, whether by pouring it out from itself (as a lamp does) or by transmitting it (as a window).

§68. ‘Window’ vs. ‘door’ vs. ‘lamp’ (Sohar): the textual/lexical variants. Margins: Chrysostom; Jerome, On the Hebrew Traditions in Genesis; Ambrose; Cajetan. Continues on p. 360.

But in this place there is not that word “Sohar,” but the word “chalon,” not properly signifying any window whatever, but (as Oleaster thinks) rather a little chink or fissure or aperture: which he declares from several passages of scripture. And indeed this seems to be indicated by what follows, “which he had made”: as if he made anew a fissure or chink through which he might look out whether the flood had ceased. For the lower door which the Lord had closed, Noah would not have dared to open, lest the waters should enter the Ark; but the window of the Ark was in the upper part, through which he could not see except toward the sky, unless perhaps he climbed up to it. So Oleaster. Although he soon adds that it can be understood also of a window. And better indeed: for to break a board or some part of the Ark, Noah would not have dared, fearing lest that so great force of waters, a way being opened for it, should burst into the Ark with great impetus.

§68 (cont.). The Hebrew ‘chalon’ (Oleaster: a chink rather than a window).

— p. 360 (PDF) · printed p. 291 —

But why did Noah not himself look out through that window with his own eyes whether the flood had ceased, but, to explore this, sent out the raven and the dove? Chrysostom signifies that, from fear of that horrible flood, Noah did not dare to look out through the window. For, explaining those very words about which we dispute: “Behold,” he says, “that just man does not yet dare to see for himself, but sends the raven, and through it wishes to learn whether any good change of things is to be expected.” But Tostatus refers the cause to the situation of the window and to its smallness. For the window was in the uppermost part of the Ark, and very small, so that he could not put out his head and body through it; but especially on account of the curvature and thickness of the sides of the Ark: whereby it came about that he could look up at the things above (that is, the sky and the stars), but could not look down at the things below (that is, the water and the earth). Or, although Noah could look out above and below through the window, yet not the far and remote places, about which — whether they were dried of the waters — he wished to explore by means of those birds.

§69. Why Noah used birds, not his own eyes (Chrysostom: fear; Tostatus: the small high window). Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 26 on Genesis; Tostatus.

EIGHTH DISPUTATION. On the raven. Upon those words of Moses: “He sent out the raven, which went out and did not return, until the waters were dried up upon the earth.”

That phrase, “until the waters were dried up,” signifies that it never returned into the Ark before the end of the flood: but it does not signify that, after the waters were dried and the flood ended, it returned to the Ark. For it is a familiar idiom of Scripture, as there: “Sit at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool”; and elsewhere, “And he knew her not until she brought forth her firstborn son.” But why did the raven not return? Most say that, finding floating corpses, it lingered in eating them — as a bird that wonderfully rejoices in such feeding. Hear Chrysostom: “Why did the raven not return? Perhaps, since it is an unclean bird, falling upon the corpses of men and beasts, it settled upon them as upon food congenial to it

found: which itself was no small argument of good hope for Noah. For if this had not been, and the raven had found no food and consolation, it would surely have returned." Augustine writes similar things in the Questions on Genesis.

§70. 'Until' as a Scriptural idiom; why the raven did not return (Chrysostom: it fed on corpses). Margins: Matt. 1; Ps. 109; "Why the raven did not return"; Chrysostom, hom. 26; Augustine, Questions on Genesis, q. 13.

But this, although the multitude and authority of those who assert it makes it very probable, nevertheless in truth is not without difficulty. For from the time when men and living creatures had perished in the flood, up to the time when the raven was sent, more than ten months had already passed: their corpses, therefore, could not have been preserved in the waters so long, but had long since been dissolved and devoured by fishes. Why, then, did the raven not return? Namely, either it remained on the ridge of some mountain (for forty days before, the tops of the mountains had appeared); or, hating the Ark, it would not return to it; or, wearied by flying, it perished in the waters.

§71. Pererius's difficulty: the corpses would have rotted by then; alternative reasons the raven stayed away.

But here arises a hard question, long and much controverted among the Doctors. For the Latin and Greek reading agrees in having that the raven did not return to the Ark; but the Hebrew and Chaldaic reading has that the raven went out and returned. Since, therefore, both cannot be true (that is, that the raven returned and did not return), it must be confessed that one or the other reading is corrupt, and therefore to be rejected. Here those triumph who conten[d] that the Hebrew books were corrupted by the Jews…

§72. The raven textual problem: Latin/Greek 'did not return' vs. Hebrew/Chaldaic 'went out and returned.' Margin: "The diversity of the Greek/Latin and Hebrew reading on the history of the raven is examined." Continues on p. 361.

— p. 361 (PDF) · printed p. 292 —

…contend [that the Hebrew books were corrupted]. For the reading which has that the raven did not return, since it is approved by all the Latin and Greek codices and by the authority of all the Fathers who so read, is without doubt to be held as true: therefore the Hebrew reading, which is contrary to this, is to be rejected as faulty and false. Indeed Jerome himself, who beyond others makes much of the Hebrew books, in the Dialogue against the Luciferians and in the epistle to Oceanus, cites this passage with the negation, just as it is in Latin and Greek.

The corruption-charge stated (and Jerome's own reading ‘did not return’). Margin: Jerome.

But I by no means assent to these. For it seems incredible to St. Augustine and St. Jerome that the Jews, dispersed throughout the world, either wished or were able to corrupt all their books, and, while they envy us the authority of Scripture, snatched the truth from themselves: especially since no reason can be brought why they should have wished to do this in this place. You will say, from envy and hatred of Christians. But what, I ask, did it profit the Hebrews against the Christians, that it should be read in this place that the raven returned to the Ark rather than did not return?

§73. Pererius rejects the corruption-charge (the Jews had no motive to alter this passage). Margins: Augustine, City of God, bk. 15, ch. 13; Jerome, Preface to bk. 16 of the Commentary on Isaiah.

Nor is it true, what these say, that the Hebrew reading is plainly contrary to the Latin and Greek. For thus, word for word, the Hebrew reading has: “It went out, going forth and returning,” or, “by going forth and returning”: and it is signified that the raven withdrew a little from the Ark, and repeatedly, by flying out and flying back, remained outside it — either on its roof or its sides. Therefore the raven returned to the Ark on the outside, as it is in Hebrew; and the same did not return — namely, on the inside, by entering into the Ark: and this the Latin and Greek reading signify. Although the Hebrews (whom Lyra and Tostatus follow) interpret the raven's returning and not returning by another reasoning: returning indeed,

because in truth, withdrawing a little from the Ark, it returned to it again; but not returning, because it did not return as regards the errand for which Noah had sent it (namely, that, seeking far places, it might bring him from there some sign and token of the flood's cessation): because, therefore, it did not perform this, it was, as regards Noah's own purpose and desire, just as if it had never returned.

§74. Pererius's reconciliation: it returned (outside the Ark) but did not return (inside) — the readings agree. Margins: Tostatus; Lyra.

But someone will say: if the raven, flying around the Ark, remained outside it until the end of the flood, whence did it have food for so many days? Either from the nearby mountains, which had long since been stripped of waters? Or rather did Noah provide it food through the window? This too can be asked: If the raven did not return, why did Noah not recognize from it that the flood had now ceased — as afterward, from the fact that the dove did not return, he judged that the flood was ended? But it can be answered in two ways: either Noah doubted lest by some chance the raven had died, or lest it had remained on some ridge of the mountains (for he was eager to know whether the lower and level places of the earth were dried of waters); or (according to the Hebrew reading) when Noah saw that the raven did not withdraw far from the Ark, from this he rather thought that all things were still full of waters.

§75. Loose ends: the raven's food, and why its non-return gave Noah no clear sign.

— p. 362 (PDF) · printed p. 293 —

NINTH DISPUTATION. On the Dove sent out after the raven: Upon those words: “He sent forth also a dove after him, to see if the waters had now ceased upon the face of the earth. And when she found not where her foot might rest, she returned to him into the Ark.”

Why Noah, to explore the cessation of the flood, sent out the raven and the dove rather than other birds, it is difficult, even by divining, to bring

forward any probable cause. Many say that those birds fly far, and persevere long in flight, and bring back something in their beak and mouth from the things they meet with. Plutarch, in the book On the Cleverness of Animals, narrates that, among the things reported about the flood of Deucalion, this too is contained: that a dove was sent out by Deucalion, which, returning the first time, [gave a sign] of the flood's remaining, but, sent out again and not returning, gave a sign of its ceasing: which Plutarch brings forward to declare the natural cleverness of the dove. That phrase, “He sent out the dove after him”: that, I say, “after him,” which the Latin interpreter said, following the Septuagint Interpreters, refers, of course, to the raven; but in Hebrew it is otherwise — namely thus, “he sent out from himself” — and refers rather to Noah himself. And the sense is: “He sent out the dove from himself”: for since the dove was in the Ark with Noah, sending it out of the Ark, he is said to have sent it away from himself.

§76. Why a dove (Plutarch's Deucalion-dove); ‘after him’ (the raven) vs. Hebrew ‘from himself’ (Noah). Margin: Plutarch.

But this raises a doubt: how the dove did not find a place where it might set its foot, when forty days before the tops of the mountains, stripped of the waters, had appeared. “This question,” says Augustine, “seems able to be resolved by recapitulation, so that the things narrated later may be understood [to be] those which were done earlier; or rather, the waters had not yet been dried.” By which words Augustine opens a twofold solution of the proposed doubt: and the latter indeed — about the waters not yet then dried (as will be declared below) — is to be approved; but the former — that this about the dove was done before the appearance of the mountains (although mentioned later by Moses by recapitulation) — does not seem sufficiently to agree with Moses' narrative: since he plainly said that Noah, forty days after the tops of the mountains had appeared, opened the window and sent out the raven and the dove. Wherefore there seems to be no place here for recapitulation, since Moses' narrative itself presents a right sequence of the things done and order of the times.

§77. The puzzle: the dove found no foothold though the peaks had appeared 40 days earlier; Augustine's two solutions (recapitulation, or waters not yet dried). Margin: Augustine, Questions on Genesis, q. 14.

— p. 363 (PDF) · printed p. 294 —

Cajetan, when he had posed the same question, solved it thus: “The solution is,” he says, “that the level land was covered with waters, as the text clearly subjoins; but the mountainous [land] was occupied by the Ark; and therefore the dove did not find where its foot might rest. It would have found [it], if it had flown to the distant mountains: but this does not suit the dove, because its flight does not seem very long, unless driven by the inconveniences of place and air and the like.” This, then, is Cajetan's solution: but little firm and probable. For whence did he know that, to the mountain on which the Ark settled, there were no neighboring other mountains uncovered by the waters? Nay rather, the contrary seems more credible, since the mountain of Armenia on which the Ark settled is believed to have been Taurus or another adjoining it: and Taurus extends very far and very wide.

§78. Cajetan's solution (only Ararat was clear; the dove won't fly far) — Pererius finds it weak. Margin: Cajetan on Gen. ch. 8.

That solution, therefore, which Augustine above indicated, and which Chrysostom clearly hands down, is to be preferred: that, although the tops of the mountains were uncovered and stood out above the waters, they nevertheless remained very moist, nay even slimy and muddy; wherefore the dove (a delicate animal, and a lover of cleanness) shrank from setting its feet there; or, if it did set them (for Josephus writes that it returned to Noah with muddy feet), immediately departed.

§79. The preferred solution: the peaks were bare but muddy, so the fastidious dove would not perch. Margins: Augustine, in the place cited; Chrysostom, hom. 26; Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1.

There follows the narration of Moses about the same dove: “And having waited yet seven other days, he again sent forth the dove out of the Ark.

And she came to him in the evening, carrying a branch of olive with green leaves in her mouth.” Because Moses says that Noah waited seven other days before he sent the dove again, from this Lyra and Tostatus think it is signified that, seven days after those forty having passed, the dove was first sent out: otherwise it would not be said that other seven days were waited. Wherefore, according to these, three [sets of] seven days are counted by Moses after those forty. For the first seven days are signified, after which the dove was first sent; but the second and third seven days are expressly named in this place by Moses.

§80. Gen. 8:10–11; Lyra & Tostatus count three sets of seven days. Margins: Gen. 8, vv. 10–11; Lyra; Tostatus.

But this reasoning does not compel us to assent to these. For they are called “seven other days” — not, indeed, other than the seven days which preceded them, but other than those forty days which had passed since the tops of the mountains had appeared. Certainly Rupert, writing on this passage of Moses, counts only twice-seven days. According to which opinion, the day on which the dove brought the green olive leaves was the seventeenth of the eleventh month; but according to Lyra and Tostatus it was the twenty-fourth day. And that the dove returned in the evening signifies that it was outside the Ark all day: for since it had found green trees, it had both where to rest, and whereon to feed, and to tarry all day. But it returned to the Ark, fleeing the darkness and the nightly cold, and because it is a domestic animal and familiar to man.

§81. Pererius (with Rupert) counts only two sets of seven days; the dove's evening return. Margin: Rupert, Commentaries on Genesis, bk. 4, ch. 25; Ambrose, On the Ark and Noah, ch. 17.

In place of “Carrying a branch of olive with green leaves,” the Greek books have κ■ρφος (karphos), that is, a [dry] twig. St. Ambrose reads “branch,” Augustine “shoot (surculus).” In Hebrew it is: “Behold, a leaf of olive, plucked, was in its mouth.” The word (haleh)…

The textual variants on the olive ‘branch’/‘twig’/‘leaf.’ Margins: Augustine, City of God 16.12 / Against Faustus ch. 20. Continues on p. 364.

— p. 364 (PDF) · printed p. 295 —

…(haleh) properly signifies a leaf, which denotes “to ascend”: whence haleh is called a leaf, because it ascends on high by the wind; and although it may seem more fitting to the weakness of the dove's beak to pluck a leaf from a tree than a branch, yet that branch could have been very small and tender, consisting of a few leaves.

§81 (cont.). The Hebrew word for the olive ‘leaf/branch.’ Running head misprints “LIB. XII” for Lib. XIII.

But how could the olive tree then have green leaves, when it was submerged in the waters almost the whole year? For neither in those seven days in which the trees had begun to be out of the water could they germinate or put forth leaves, nor is it credible that they did so under the waters. St. Ambrose leaves it in doubt whether that green olive leaf had grown before the flood, or arose in the flood itself, writing thus: “But whether that leaf had grown before the flood, or at the time of the flood, must be determined by you. If before the flood: the just man rejoiced that some fruit from the old seed had been reserved, and from there gathered a notable sign of divine mercy, that the flood had now withdrawn — which would show the fruit to which the floods could not have done harm. If the leaf was born at the time of the flood, the just man assuredly observed that new seeds had borne fruit by heavenly mercy, so that the roots of the trees lived, and as if with soul resumed germinated their old offspring, and returned to their accustomed births, of which the leaves sent forth showed the sign.” Thus there.

§82. How the olive had green leaves after a year underwater; Ambrose's two options. Margins: “How the olive could be preserved so long underwater with green leaves, or put forth leaves in so short a time”; Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 19.

Yet in the next chapter Ambrose seems more inclined to believe that the olive germinated after the flood by God's omnipotence. For he writes thus toward the end of that chapter: “Nor let it move you that we said above, that the leaf found on a branch could have been generated after the flood: although under water grass is wont mostly to germinate, yet, that every scruple may be removed, what great matter is it if, at God's command, on the one day on which the water was diminished, the earth at once germinated — since He is the same repairer and creator of fruits, and was not forgetful of the use of His work? In short, you have also in Genesis that He commanded the earth to germinate the herb of fodder, and the fruit-bearing tree with its fruit: and at once the earth put forth the herb of fodder, having seed according to its kind, and the fruit-bearing tree: and that was one day, on which God commanded or made these things. Therefore God, not unmindful of His benefit, but mindful of our iniquity, repaired His work in the same quantity of time in which He began it.” Thus far Ambrose.

§83. Ambrose's second view: the olive sprouted after the flood by omnipotence (as on the third day of creation). Margin: ch. 20.

But this seems to me more probable: that that olive had green leaves before the flood, and preserved them under the waters all year. For the olive, as Pliny relates, is of the kind of trees that are never stripped of their leaves, but preserve their greenness perpetually. I can confirm this by the authority of St. Chrysostom, who, treating these very words of Moses, writes in this manner: “Not without reason did Moses say that the dove returned in the evening: but that we may learn that it had fed all day, having found food suitable for it, [and] toward evening returned bearing in its mouth a dry olive leaf. For it is a gentle animal and rejoices in our familiarity: and therefore it returned, and with the dry olive leaf brought much consolation to the just man. But where did it find the olive leaf? This whole thing was done by divine dispensation, both that the dove found it and that it carried it in its mouth to Noah: although this tree is ever green. Whence it is

probable that, when the waters had withdrawn, this tree still had its crown of leaves.” Thus Chrysostom.

§84. Pererius's view: the evergreen olive (Pliny) kept its leaves underwater (Chrysostom). Margins: Pliny, bk. 16, ch. 20; Chrysostom, hom. 26 on Genesis.

— p. 365 (PDF) · printed p. 296 —

A certain writer of annals of our age argues from this passage that in the time of Noah the beginning of the year was when the Sun was passing through the sign of Leo — that is, about the month of July — and that at that time the world was created by God. But if the Reader desires to know a fuller exposition of this opinion together with its refutation, let him seek it in the first volume of our Commentaries on Genesis, in the first book, in the explanation of the Work of the Third Day, and in the Disputation On the Time at which the world was created.

Gerard Mercator's claim (the year/creation began in July, the Sun in Leo), referred to Pererius's first volume. Margin: Gerard Mercator, in the Introduction to his Annals.

> *“Therefore in the six hundred and first year, in the first month, on the first day of the month, the waters were diminished upon the earth: And Noah, opening the covering of the Ark, looked out, and saw that the surface of the earth was dried.”*

Gen. 8:13. Margin: Gen. 8, v. 13.

Hence it appears that the window through which Noah sent out the raven and the dove was such — either by its situation or by its smallness — that through it Noah could not discern whether the earth was dried: otherwise it would not have been necessary, in order to discern this, to open the covering. Nor indeed is it to be understood that the whole covering of the Ark, which was three hundred cubits long, was opened — or (as the Hebrew word properly signifies) was removed or taken away: for that would have been too laborious and toilsome, and least of all necessary. Therefore by the word “covering” it is fitting to understand some part of

the covering — that is, some board; in short, as much as was sufficient for discerning and exploring what Noah intended.

§85. ‘Opening the covering’ means opening only a board, not the whole 300-cubit roof — confirming the window was too small/high to see through.

But there is a difficulty in that Moses said in this place that on the first day of the first month of the six hundred and first year the earth was dried up: for immediately afterward the same Moses added that the earth was made dry on the twenty-seventh day of the second month. This difficulty Cajetan dispatches with little trouble, judging that the same time is signified in both places — which, being variously related, would have a various computation. For the day of the drying or drying-up of the earth was the first of the first month with respect to the six hundred and first year of Noah's life: the same was the twenty-seventh day of the second month with respect to the customary and (as they call it) current year. And so Moses, according to Cajetan, computed the time of the flood in three ways: first relatively to the beginning of the flood (thus above he named the seventeenth day of the month); then relatively to the years of Noah (thus he said, On the first day of the first month of the six hundred and first year the surface of the earth was dried); finally relatively to the year then current (thus he said, on the twenty-seventh day of the second month the earth was made dry). So Cajetan.

§86. The apparent contradiction of two drying-dates; Cajetan harmonizes by a threefold reckoning. Margin: Cajetan.

— p. 366 (PDF) · printed p. 297 —

But in truth it does not seem probable to me that Moses, in so brief a narrative, would have wished to use such a variety and ambiguity of computation, which would greatly obscure the narrative itself, and confound the reader's understanding, and give occasion of error to many. Wherefore I more approve what Tostatus thinks: that on the first day of the first month the earth was dried on the outside only and at the surface —

that is, was stripped of the waters; but that it was still within full of moisture, and wholly soft and slimy and muddy: but gradually, through those fifty-six days which followed, it was dried, until it was perfectly dried and made solid, so that men and animals could conveniently go over it. And this is why Noah waited all those fifty-six days before he went out of the Ark.

§87. Pererius prefers Tostatus: the surface was bare on day 1, but the ground stayed muddy and took 56 more days to dry fully — hence Noah's wait. Margin: Tostatus.

TENTH DISPUTATION. How long the flood lasted, and how long Noah remained in the Ark: Upon those words: "In the second month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, the earth was made dry."

Margin: Gen. 8, v. 14.

Moses sufficiently clearly teaches by these words that the flood was wholly ended and Noah went out of the Ark in the six hundred and first year, in the second month, on the twenty-seventh day. Since, therefore, above in chapter 7 Moses indicated when the flood began (namely in the six hundredth year, on the seventeenth day), but now shows when it wholly ceased: it is fitting in this place to dispute how long the flood lasted and how long Noah remained in the Ark.

§88. The terminus of the question: from the flood's start (17th) to its end (27th of the 2nd month, year 601).

Xenophon Annianus, whose book is entitled On Equivocals (De Aequivocis), makes five inundations of waters: the First, general over the whole world under the ancient Ogyges, and that it was of nine months. For Annius judges, in his Commentary on that book, that that ancient Ogyges was the same whom the sacred letters call Noah, and that that Ogygian flood was the same as the Noachic; which he himself thinks was of nine months, as the Ogygian was — as, besides this Xenophon, Solinus confirms in chapter seventeen. The second inundation he makes the

Nilotic, and of one month, under the Egyptians Hercules and Prometheus; the third, under Ogyges of Attica in Achaia, of two months; the fourth, under Deucalion in Thessaly, of three months; the fifth, the Pharonic, under Proteus the Egyptian, at the rape of Helen. So Xenophon Annianus.

§88 (cont.). The five floods of the (spurious, Annius-forged) "Xenophon": Annius equates Ogyges with Noah and makes the flood nine months. Margins: Xenophon Annianus; Giovanni Annius (Nanni of Viterbo); Solinus.

That that book of Xenophon is a fabrication ought to be judged even from this argument. This Xenophon makes two Ogygeses and two Ogygian floods: but the ancients, both Greeks and La[tins], knew only one Ogyges and one flood of Ogyges…

§89. The book is a forgery (it invents two Ogygeses). Continues on p. 298.

— p. 367 (PDF) · printed p. 298 —

…both Greeks and Latins. Next, Annius wishes that flood under the ancient Ogyges to have been the Noachic: but Augustine plainly denies that the Noachic flood was known to Greek or Roman histories. Besides, Julius Africanus, as is found in Eusebius of Caesarea, confirms by the authority of many writers that the flood of Ogyges preceded the first Olympiad by a thousand and twenty years: but the Noachic flood preceded the Olympiads by more than a thousand five hundred years.

§89 (cont.). Against equating the floods: Augustine (the Noachic flood unknown to the pagans) and Julius Africanus via Eusebius (the chronologies differ by centuries). Margins: Augustine, City of God, bk. 17(/18), ch. 8; Eusebius, Preparation for the Gospel, bk. 10, last ch.

But that which makes for the present matter — that the Noachic flood was of nine months — is evidently false, from wherever one pleases to count the beginning and end of the flood. For if the flood be reckoned from its beginning up to the time at which it began to diminish, it lasted only a hundred and fifty days, that is, five solar months; or according to another computation a hundred and ninety days, that is, six months and ten days.

But if the flood be reckoned up to the resting of the Ark upon the mountains, according to one computation it lasted a hundred and fifty-eight days, that is, five months and eight days; according to another computation, six months and twenty-seven days. But if the flood be reckoned up to the appearance of the tops of the mountains, it lasted seven months [and] thirteen days; if up to where the earth was uncovered of the waters, ten months and thirteen days; if finally up to the perfect drying of the earth and Noah's going out of the Ark, it lasted one whole solar year. From these it appears that what Annius said — that the Noachic flood was of nine months — has no probability; nay, it is even contrary to Moses' narrative.

§89 (cont.). By every reckoning the flood was not nine months — refuting Annius/"Xenophon."

Cajetan judges that the flood, from the time it began up to the time at which it wholly ceased (the earth being utterly dried and Noah having gone out of the Ark), lasted ten Lunar months and twenty-five days — that is, three hundred and fourteen days — which he gathers from Moses' narrative in this manner: First, forty days of rain; then a hundred and fifty after which the decrease of the flood began; then seventy days up to the appearance of the tops of the mountains; to these forty days after which Noah opened the window and sent out the raven; lastly twice-seven days after which he sent out the dove. From all these is made up the sum of three hundred and fourteen days, from which Cajetan thinks there result ten Lunar months and besides twenty-five days, assigning to each Lunar month twenty-nine days.

§90. Cajetan's tally: the flood lasted 314 days (≈10 lunar months + 25 days). Margin: Cajetan on Gen. ch. 8.

But Cajetan, in this his reasoning or computation, assumes some things doubtful, others false. The doubtful are: that the forty days of rain were distinct from the other hundred and fifty; and that the seventh month in which the Ark rested ought to be computed from the beginning of the flood, not from the beginning of the year: for that the contrary opinion seems more probable was shown above. The false are: that the ten[th]

month…

§91. Pererius begins refuting Cajetan's tally (doubtful and false premises). Margin: “Cajetan is refuted.” Continues on p. 299.

— p. 368 (PDF) · printed p. 299 —

…that the tenth month in which the tops of the mountains appeared is to be computed from the beginning of the flood; and that after the forty days from when the tops of the mountains appeared, up to the six hundred and first year, only fourteen days flowed in between. Those things also are false: that among the ancient Egyptians the year was only of three hundred and sixty days; and that to each Lunar month only twenty-nine days ought to be assigned. Finally, this is in no way probable or credible: that Moses, in this brief narrative of the flood, varied the computation of the months which he names in three ways, and yet gave no indication of that variation — first computing the months from the beginning of the flood, then from the beginning of the years of Noah's life, besides from the beginning of the customary and then-current year. Many things which we have laid down in this refutation of Cajetan and in that of Xenophon Annianus, but have not proved, we have diligently disputed and explained in earlier disputations: wherefore we have judged it sufficient now only to have indicated them.

§91 (cont.). The remaining false premises, including the threefold-reckoning Pererius rejected at §86–87.

The true opinion, therefore, is this: that from when the flood began up to when it wholly ceased (that is, up to the perfect drying of the earth and Noah's going out of the Ark) there passed one Lunar year and besides eleven days — that is, one whole Solar year: for the Lunar year consists of three hundred and fifty-four days, but the Solar year of three hundred and sixty-five. And that among the Hebrews Lunar years were in use, since it is clear by the confession of all, needs no proof. Since, therefore, the flood began in the six hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, on the seventeenth day, as Moses said above in chapter seven; and wholly ceased

in the six hundred and first year, in the second month, on the twenty-seventh day, as the same Moses relates in chapter eight: from this it is plain that there passed one Lunar year and besides ten or eleven days, which is a Solar year. So long, therefore, the flood lasted, and so long Noah remained in the Ark. Unless perhaps someone prefers the opinion which we indicated above — that Noah entered the Ark seven days before the flood began: for according to this opinion it must be said that Noah remained in the Ark seven days over a whole Solar year. But if Moses had used the Solar year, it would have to be confessed that Noah remained in the Ark one whole Solar year and over it ten days.

§92. Pererius's conclusion: the flood (and Noah's stay) lasted one lunar year + 11 days = one full solar year.

— p. 369 (PDF) · printed p. 300 —

ELEVENTH DISPUTATION. On Noah's going out of the Ark: Upon those words: "And God spoke to Noah, saying, Go out of the Ark, thou and thy wife, thy sons and the wives of thy sons with thee, and all living things that are with thee," etc.

Margin: Gen. 8, vv. 15, 16, 17.

What need was there of a new command of God to go out? The flood was now ended, and the earth utterly dried: no danger remained: there was, in short, nothing to invite to remaining longer in the Ark, or to delay from going out: especially since the dwelling of men and animals in the Ark had been necessary on account of the danger of the flood; this being past, there was no reason why Noah ought or should wish to remain in it any longer. Why, then, did he not go out at once of his own accord? But here the excellent and perfect obedience of Noah shines wonderfully: since he would neither enter nor leave the Ark except at God's command. "When the water withdrew," says Ambrose, "and the earth was dried, Noah could go out of the Ark. But the just man arrogates nothing to himself, but commits himself wholly to the divine command. And especially he who

had entered by a heavenly oracle ought, in order to go out, to await a heavenly response. For modest is righteousness, just as immodest is iniquity, which usurps what is not due and does not reverence its author." So Ambrose.

§93. Why a fresh command to leave? Noah's perfect obedience — he neither entered nor left except at God's word (Ambrose). Margin: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 21.

And Noah's entering into the Ark and going out signifies the whole course of human life and of human actions: since even in the Hebrew idiom the entrance and exit of any man signifies his conduct and actions. Whence David: "May the Lord keep thy going in and thy going out": and of David it is written, "All Israel and Judah loved David: for he went in and went out before them." And of our Savior, Peter said: "In all the time," he says, "in which the Lord Jesus went in and went out among us, beginning from the baptism of John until the day in which he was taken up from us." Let us, therefore, by the example of Noah, learn both to begin and to end our actions agreeably to the will and precepts of God: even as the Church herself wishes and asks of God, saying: "Prevent our actions, we beseech thee, O Lord, by thy inspiration, and further them by thy help: that all our prayer and work may always begin from thee, and being begun, may be ended through thee."

§94. Moral application: 'going in and out' = the whole of one's conduct; begin and end all actions in God's will (with the Collect 'Actiones nostras'). Margins: Ps. 120(121); 1 Kings (1 Sam.) 18; Acts 1.

But why above, commanding about the entrance into the Ark, did God order the men to enter the Ark separately and the women separately? And that they entered the Ark in this way, Moses narrated a little after, saying that there entered into the Ark Noah and his sons, his wife and the wives of his sons: but no[w]…

§95. Why the men and women entered separately but are paired at the exit. Margin: Gen. 6.
Continues on p. 301.

…but now, commanding about the going out, He names each man with his own wife, saying: “Go out, thou and thy wife, thy sons and the wives of thy sons with thee”; although Moses, soon narrating their going out of the Ark, names the men and women separately, saying: “Noah went out, and his sons, his wife and the wives of his sons with him.” But it is easy to render a not improbable cause of this matter: the men and women are mentioned as entering the Ark separately, so that it might be signified that in the Ark they had to abstain from the use of marriage — for the time of the flood was a time of mourning and penance, not of pleasure and joy. But because, having gone out of the Ark, they had at once to be free for generation, on account of the multiplication of the human race (as God said to them, “Increase and multiply”), to signify this, when He commanded about the going out, He named the man jointly with the wife. Yet they went out separately, the men from the women, whereby it might be clearly understood that from their entrance into the Ark until their going out they had persevered in continence.

§95 (cont.). The pairing at the command to leave signals resumed marriage; the actual separate exit shows they kept continence throughout. Margin: Gen. 9.

But let the reader hear what Ambrose elegantly writes on this matter: “Now let us inquire,” he says, “for what reason, while they were entering the Ark, this was the order of those entering — that first he himself entered and his sons, then his wife and the wives of his sons; but when they went out, it was changed. For it is written: He went out, and his wife, and his sons and the wives of his sons. And the text indeed signifies in the entrance abstinence from generation, in the going out the use of generation. For then the father with the sons first went in, and the sons with the parent, and afterward the wife and his sons' wives: that is, the sexes are not mingled in the entrance, but are mingled in the going out. Plainly, therefore, by the very order of entering, the just man as it were utters a certain voice: that that was not a time of intercourse or of delights, when destruction was threatening all. Whence in the Gospel the Lord says, reproaching that in the

times of Noah they ate and drank, took wives and gave daughters in marriage, and therefore on account of intemperance the famous flood came upon them. It was, therefore, a time of mourning, not of joy. And hence the just man took no delight in the company of his wife, nor did the just sons seek the conjugal union. For how unseemly it would be that, at the time when the living were dying, those about to perish should then be begotten? But afterward, rightly, the use and care of marriage is resumed for the propagation of the rest, when the flood withdrew. And so not men with men, but women with men go out, so that the manly intermingling might appear forbidden in itself, but the union of man and woman permitted by the lawful lot of marriage." Thus Ambrose.

§95 (cont.). Ambrose at length on the entry/exit order as marital abstinence then resumption. Margins: Ambrose (in the place just cited); Luke 17.

But someone may ask why God by name ordered the animals to be brought out of the Ark. Would not Noah have done this of his own accord, even if God had not commanded it? For the animals had been enclosed in the Ark for this purpose: that, saved by it from the destruction of the flood, when the flood was ended they might each again propagate their species on the earth. Rupert brings forward a cause of this matter, drawn from mystical interpretation: he says that Noah's Ark prefigured the ancient Church of the Patriarchs and Prophets, which our Lord founded even before He became man, and in which, made man, He willed to live and to die. Into that Ark the animals, both clean and unclean, are ordered to enter: similarly into that Church of the Fathers, whoever were gathered, whether from the clean Jews or from the unclean Gentiles…

§96. Why God named the bringing-out of the animals; Rupert's allegory (the Ark = the Church of the Patriarchs). Margin: "Why God by name ordered the animals to be brought out of the Ark." Continues on p. 302.

— p. 371 (PDF) · printed p. 302 —

…were gathered, they are ordered to enter to Christ — that is, to be grafted into the hope and expectation of them. Nevertheless they are ordered to go out of the Ark: because in that Church they are not allowed to remain in bodily ceremonies — namely, to be circumcised bodily, to keep the Sabbath, to immolate the paschal lamb, in short, to Judaize according to those carnal ceremonies. So from Rupert.

§96 (cont.). Rupert's allegory concluded: the going-out = leaving behind the carnal ceremonies of the Law.

But the historical reason is this: just as God before the flood had commanded Noah to bring the animals into the Ark, so the same God commands after the flood that he bring them out of the Ark; for both the bringing-in and the bringing-out of the animals was done by Noah not without a miracle of divine providence, all the animals promptly obeying Noah both at the entrance and at the going out.

§97. The literal reason: the gathering and release of the animals alike required a miracle of providence. Margin: Gen. 6.

TWELFTH DISPUTATION. On the Altar and the sacrifice which Noah made to God, and the divine approbation of his sacrifice: Upon those words: "And Noah built an altar to the Lord, and taking of all the clean cattle and birds, offered holocausts upon the altar. And the Lord smelled a sweet savor."

Margin: Gen. 8, v. 20.

Behold for thee a most clear specimen of a grateful and pious mind toward God. As soon as Noah went out of the Ark, before all else he is eager to perform what pertains to the worship of God: and mindful of how great a benefit of God he had received, being freed from the otherwise inevitable disaster of the flood, he embraces as soon as possible the duties and works of religion and divine worship. Now among those things which pertain to the exterior worship of God, sacrifice holds the first place, for this belongs

to God alone. And among sacrifices the holocaust holds the chief place, wherefore Noah, having built an altar, offered holocausts to God of the clean animals. And that Noah should do this was assuredly worthy and just: for He who had commanded man to make an Ark in which man should be saved, says Rupert, it was surely fitting that man should make Him an altar on which the savior of man should be adored by man. This not only Scripture, but the natural law taught to be just: this natural reason dictates — that of one's own gifts He who gave them should in the first place be honored.

§98. Noah's first act on leaving: a thank-offering. Sacrifice is the chief external worship; the holocaust the chief sacrifice (Rupert; natural law).

It is to be noted that here for the first time mention is made of an altar raised to the worship of God: but whether there had been uses of altars before or not, is uncertain. This kind of divine worship Noah knew by the tradition of his ances[tors]…

§99. The first altar mentioned in Scripture. Margin: "The first altar of all raised to the worship of God is read to have been this of Noah." Continues on p. 303.

— p. 372 (PDF) · printed p. 303 —

…by the tradition of his ancestors, or by an express revelation of God, or by a silent instinct of God. This too is doubtful: of what sort that altar was — whether of earth or of unpolished stones, for in these two ways only were altars commanded to be made by the Jews in Exodus. In Hebrew, for that word "altar," it is mizbeach, from the root Zabach, which is "to slay," because the slain victims were offered upon the altar.

§99 (cont.). How Noah learned of altars; what the altar was made of; the Hebrew 'mizbeach' from 'to slay.' Margin: Exodus 20.

There follows: "Of all the clean cattle and birds he offered holocausts." Whether in the time of Noah there was a distinction of clean and unclean animals — whether as to food, or as to the use of sacrifices, or as to both,

and to what extent it existed, [and] whether it concerned all those animals about which a precept is given in the law of Moses: we shall say nothing at present, because on that matter we have disputed above in the eleventh book as much as was needful. The word “holocaust” is Greek, signifying wholly burnt or cremated, in distinction from the peace-victim and the sin-offering, which were not burnt wholly, as is written in Leviticus. The Greek here has, “And he offered for a holocaust,” which expression the Fathers often used.

§100. The clean animals (referred back to Lib. XI); the word ‘holocaust’ (wholly burnt) vs. peace- and sin-offerings. Margins: Leviticus [11]; Deut. 14; Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark.

Ambrose here poses the question why Noah, not commanded nor admonished by God, built an altar and offered holocausts, when it is established that the other things which we read he did, he did only by the admonition and command of God. Ambrose answers: “The Lord ought not, like a miser, to demand the recompense of thanks: and the just man understood that to be a true act of thanksgiving which was not commanded but freely offered: and so he suffered no delay. For the virtue of a grateful mind excludes the suffering of doubt: but he who waits for the debt of thanks to be exacted from him is ungrateful. Nor is it without meaning that he is said to have built an altar not to the Lord (Dominus) but to God (Deus), lest that thanksgiving should seem to have been compelled as if to a Master, but [rather] the virtue of the just man, compliant and grateful as if to God. Therefore what is imperial [of a master] he set aside; what is of grace, he named.” And by the example of Noah, who offered only clean animals to God, let us learn that only those things which are undefiled ought to be offered to God — namely, in which the affection of the offerer shines forth.

§101. Why Noah sacrificed unbidden (Ambrose: true thanks is freely given; ‘to God’ not ‘to the Lord’). Margin: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 22.

St. Chrysostom disputes in this place why God allowed corporeal sacrifices to be made to Him by those holy Patriarchs, when God is a spirit and is to be adored by those who adore Him truly and worthily not with corporeal victims but with spiritual offerings? “Sacrifice to God,” says David, “a sacrifice of praise”; and again: “Sacrifice the sacrifice of righteousness”; and likewise: “In holocausts thou wilt not delight: a sacrifice to God is a troubled spirit: a contrite and humbled heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.” St. Chrysostom brings forward two causes of this matter: the one, that by those sacrifices the just might declare their virtue of a grateful mind and their piety toward God; the other, lest the common crowd of the faithful should slip into idolatry, seeing other nations worship and venerate their gods with exquisite and magnificent sacrifices and offerings. For this cause, therefore, those sacrifices were practiced even by holy men — not that they profited anything of themselves or brought any utility to the soul…

§102. Why God accepted bodily sacrifices though He is spirit (Chrysostom's two reasons: to express gratitude, and to forestall idolatry). Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 27 on Genesis; John 4; Ps. 49(50); Ps. 4; Ps. 50(51). Continues on p. 304.

— p. 373 (PDF) · printed p. 304 —

…or brought any utility to the soul. “Similarly,” says Chrysostom, “God enjoined the law of circumcision on the posterity of Abraham — not that anything profited the circumcised toward the salvation of the soul, for it conduced nothing to righteousness, but in testimony of the righteousness of Abraham, and that by the mark of circumcision his posterity might be separated from the other nations.” So, roughly, Chrysostom.

§102 (cont.). Chrysostom's parallel: circumcision too was a mere outward mark, profiting nothing for salvation. Margins: Chrysostom; Gen. 17.

Chrysostom signifies, therefore, in this place that circumcision had no spiritual fruit and effect, but that it was a bare bodily sign empty of all spiritual fruit. Nor did Chrysostom say this in this place only, but he

repeats the same afterward in the twenty-ninth and fortieth homily on Genesis. Nay, things similar to Chrysostom about Circumcision are read in other Fathers, grave and noble in the first rank — although the common opinion of the Theologians, received ever since Augustine, is that Circumcision before the coming of Christ availed for the remission of original sin in infants, and in adults also of other sins. But how the arguments by which the common opinion is vehemently assailed ought to be repelled, and how the words of the Fathers may be expounded so as not to seem contrary to the common opinion, will be treated (God willing) below, when we come to the seventeenth chapter of the book of Genesis, where by Moses the origin and institution and necessity of Circumcision is described. But let us now see the divine approbation of Noah's sacrifice.

§103. The Fathers vs. the common theological view on circumcision's efficacy; Pererius defers the full treatment to Gen. 17. Margin: “Of circumcision [its use].”

THIRTEENTH DISPUTATION. On the divine approbation of Noah's Sacrifice: Upon those words: “The Lord smelled a sweet savor.”

Margin: Gen. 8, v. 21.

How pleasing and acceptable to God Noah's sacrifice was, Moses clearly declared by those words: “The Lord smelled a sweet savor.” For sacred scripture is wont to declare in two ways that some sacrifice was pleasing to God: first, by saying that God looked upon that sacrifice — as it is written of Abel's sacrifice, “The Lord looked upon Abel and upon his gifts”; then also, by saying that God smelled that sacrifice as a sweet savor — that is, as a most pleasant odor. For just as we are greatly delighted by most pleasant odors, so [is] God by the sacrifices of pious men. The Chaldaic paraphrase has thus: “The Lord received his offering in his good pleasure.”

§104. The two scriptural ways of marking an acceptable sacrifice (God ‘looked upon’ / ‘smelled’ it); the Chaldee paraphrase. Margin: Gen. 4.

But in place of “a sweet savor,” in Hebrew it is, word for word, “a savor of rest”: for here is the word (Noach) signifying not to smell sweetly, but [rest]…

§105. The Hebrew has ‘savor of rest’ (Noach), a play on Noah's name. Continues on p. 305.

— p. 374 (PDF) · printed p. 305 —

…but rest. For the smoke of the fats, or the odor which ascended with the smoke, was called the “odor of rest,” because it made God quiet from indignation and appeased toward the offerer. It is signified, therefore, that the divine indignation, by which the world had been destroyed by the flood, was by Noah's sacrifice mitigated, appeased, and (so to speak) quieted.

§105 (cont.). The Hebrew ‘odor of rest’ = God appeased — a play on Noah's name.

“In distinction,” says Cajetan, “from sensible odors, it is called an odor of rest, as producing rest without weariness.” For there is no sensible odor which, long persisting, does not affect with weariness: wherefore no sensible odor is an odor of rest in itself. To exclude, therefore, such weariness, it is often called in scripture an odor of rest: because God truly never wearies of the devotion of those who offer. For sacrifices please God not on account of the animals offered, but on account of the affection of the devout mind of the offerers, as an odor of sweetness. For a corporeal odor cannot of itself delight the incorporeal substance of God: nay even, although it were corporeal and were affected by such odors, yet the odor of slain or burnt flesh would not be such that it could truly be called an odor of sweetness. The divine approbation and delight, therefore, is to be referred entirely to the devotion of the offerers.

§106. Cajetan on ‘odor of rest’; God values the offerer's devotion, not the victims. Margin: Cajetan on Gen. ch. 8.

Hear Tertullian: “We read that God attended to the offerings of Abel and smelled the holocausts of Noah willingly. But what pleasantness can there

be either of the entrails of wethers, or of the reek of burning victims? The simple mind, therefore, of the offerers, fearing God — [offering] those things which they had from God — was reckoned with God for the sake both of the food and of the sweet smell." So Tertullian. God therefore esteems not the greatness or excellence of the gifts, but the piety and religion of the offerers.

§107. Tertullian: God prized the offerers' simple, God-fearing mind, not the flesh. Margin: Tertullian, Against [Marcion], bk. 2.

Among great princes too, the gifts which are offered to them are commended not so much from the price of the things as from the zeal of the givers. Famous is that which Plutarch wrote about Artaxerxes king of the Persians. "Nothing," he says, "was given him so small that he did not receive it most graciously. When a certain poor man offered him a pomegranate of extraordinary size: 'By the Sun,' he said, 'if this man were trusted, he would make a great city out of a small one.' Another — while the same king was making a journey, others offering the king various things — when nothing was at hand, ran to the river and brought the king water drawn in both hands; and Artaxerxes, greatly delighted, gave him a golden bowl and a thousand darics."

§108. The Artaxerxes anecdotes: princes prize the giver's zeal over the gift. Margins: Plutarch, Apophthegms (at the beginning); Artaxerxes.

But this is not to be omitted, which Plato wrote about the sacrifices that are offered to God. "Not such," says Plato, "is the nature of God that He should be led by gifts, like a wicked usurer: for it would be grievous if God looked rather to the offerings and sacrifices of men than to the mind. For nothing prevents him who has sinned much against God — whether he be a private man or a State — from frequently offering most costly gifts and magnificent sacrifices to God. But God, as being incorruptible by gifts, spurns all these, as God Himself and His prophet foretold." So Plato.

§109. Plato: God is no 'usurer' swayed by costly gifts. Margin: Plato (On Prayer / περ■ ε■χ■ς).

We read also among the pagan writers that the gods of the Gentiles are introduced as smelling the sacrifices sweetly, and rejoicing in their reek…

§110. The pagans imagined their gods literally enjoying the reek of sacrifice. Continues on p. 306.

— p. 375 (PDF) · printed p. 306 —

…rejoicing. Whence Plato in the second Alcibiades relates from Homer that the Trojans, when they were building a suburban edifice, dedicated precious sacrifices to the gods, and that the sweet reek of the oxen was carried up from the field to heaven by the winds. Lucian in the Timon introduces Jupiter speaking thus: “We have forgotten that man who set for us on the altars the fats of so many bulls and goats, so that even now I have their reek in my nostrils.” Thus there Lucian. So, no doubt, the demons who were worshipped instead of gods by the Gentiles, pretending that they were delighted by the sacrifices (which they knew had been revealed about the true God), mocked them, and imbued and corrupted their minds with various errors of superstitions.

§110 (cont.). Homer (via Plato) and Lucian's Jupiter as examples; the demons aped the true God's acceptance to deceive the heathen. Margins: Plato; Lucian.

FOURTEENTH DISPUTATION. On the Promise of God Given to Noah. Upon those words: “Neither will I any more curse the earth for the sake of men: for the sense and thought of the human heart are prone to evil from its youth,” etc.

Margin: Gen. 8, v. 21.

God, vehemently appeased and wonderfully delighted by Noah's sacrifice, promised to him and to all his posterity that there would never thereafter be a general destruction of the whole world on account of men's sins; and by this thing He made Noah secure. For what would it have profited that God had said to him, “Increase and multiply,” if again the whole race of men and animals were to perish by a flood? In order, therefore, to free Noah from that fear and anguish of mind, He gave him this promise: “I will,” He

says, “no more curse the earth for the sake of men.” “For although He had taken vengeance on the human race,” says Ambrose, “yet He had known that the vengeance of the law profits toward fear and the knowledge of doctrine, more than toward a change of nature, which in some can be corrected, but in all cannot be changed. The Lord, therefore, took vengeance, that we might fear; He spared, that we might be reserved. And He took vengeance once, for an example of fear; He spared for the rest, lest the bitterness of sin should always rule. And at the same time, if one desires to avenge sins too often, he is held to be harsh rather than censorious. Wherefore He willed to declare His mercy toward the whole of mankind: and yet, because He ought not to bring security and negligence to human minds, He takes vengeance on a few, [and] reserves the many.” Thus Ambrose.

§111. God's promise (Gen 8:21) reassures Noah; Ambrose on why God punishes once but spares thereafter. Margin: Ambrose, On the Ark and Noah, ch. 22.

In place of “And he said to him,” the Hebrew is “He said to his heart,” or “in his heart”; the Chaldaic is “He said by his word”; the Greek is “God said, considering [again].” And by these manners of speaking is intimated a deliberate will and a fixed decree of God. In place of “for the sake of men,” the Chaldaic is “on account of the sins of men”; the Greek, “on account of the works of men.” What we read, “I will no more curse the earth,” is in Hebrew and Greek, “I will not add to curse the earth any more.”

§112. The textual variants of v. 21 (‘said in his heart’; ‘for the sins/works of men’; ‘not add to curse’). Margin: “The manifold calamity and devastation of the earth from the flood.”

— p. 376 (PDF) · printed p. 307 —

But what is it “to curse the earth”? The blessing of God signifies an abundance of goods; but on the contrary, a curse, an abundance of evils which are justly inflicted by God. Now God, at the time of the flood, had disfigured and laid waste the earth with many and great evils: first as to its situation, for before it stood above the waters, but at the time of the flood it

was wholly overwhelmed by the waters; then as to the variety of its parts, for no distinction appeared of mountains, valleys, plains, rivers, lakes, springs; next as to fertility, since by the flood the earth was made more barren and worse; besides as to the beauty and adornment which came to it from plants and buildings; lastly as to fullness, for the earth had been emptied of men and animals. Truly, therefore, it is said that God by the flood cursed the earth.

§113. What it means to 'curse the earth' — the fivefold devastation the flood worked on it. Margin: "The blessing and the curse of God."

But how is it true that God will never again similarly curse the earth? Will He not likewise curse it before the day of judgment, when all things are then to be consumed by fire, as before they had been consumed by the flood? But the Lord in these very words of His intimated a difference. For in the flood He destroyed all things on account of men; but in the consummation of the world all things will likewise be dissolved, yet not on account of the sins of men, but on account of the renovation and change of the world into a better state. Significantly, therefore, it was said: "I will not curse the earth for the sake of men, nor will I any more strike every living soul as I have done."

§114. The final fire is no contradiction: it will be for the world's renewal, not (like the flood) for men's sins.

There follows: "For the sense and thought of the human heart are prone to evil from its youth." That particle "for" is causal: there is therefore rendered by these words the cause why God is unwilling henceforth to curse the whole earth. But what is that cause? Rupert thinks that by these words is signified that God will in future spare the earth and the living creatures, because sin and fault by no means fall upon those things; but all sin — and therefore the desert of vengeance — pertains to men alone, since they not only sin frequently and grievously, but are even most inclined from their youth to sinning. And so by this promise God indeed made the

earth immune from general destruction; yet He did not make men secure nor free from general vengeance.

§115. The causal ‘for’: Rupert reads it as God sparing the (guiltless) earth, not securing guilty men. Margin: Rupert, Commentaries on Genesis, bk. 4, ch. 28.

But this interpretation of Rupert does not please me. For this promise of God pertains chiefly to men: for how great a good is it to preserve the earth with the living creatures, if the whole race of men perish? Too meager, therefore, would have been God's promise, and to Noah himself too little glad and pleasant. It is better, therefore, to interpret the cause which is rendered by these words in two other ways. For it is signified: If, as often as the greatest part of men is given over to vices and crimes, so often it had to be avenged and punished by the penalty of a flood, it would certainly come about that very often, and in almost every age, a flood would have to be sent — since on account of the na[tural]…

§116. Pererius rejects Rupert; the promise is chiefly for man's sake. His first reading: floods would be needed in nearly every age. Continues on p. 308.

— p. 377 (PDF) · printed p. 308 —

…natural and vehement proclivity of the human mind to vices, the human race for the greatest part and most frequently pursues vices. Unless perhaps we think that in David's time the crimes of men were fewer or less, at which time he said: “They are corrupt, and are become abominable in their pursuits: there is none that doeth good, no not one. The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that understand, or seek God. All have gone aside, they are become unprofitable together,” etc.

§116 (cont.). Man's universal corruption (Ps. 13/52). Margin: Psalm 13.

That cause can also be explained otherwise, so that it may be signified that man, on account of his natural proneness to sinning, is in some way worthy of compassion, and ought not always to be punished in this life as much as

he deserves of punishment. For man is incited to sinning sometimes by ignorance, sometimes by some vehement passion and perturbation, very often by the persuasion and impulse of the demon, but always by a natural propensity to evil. For to sin from mere malice is rare, and [belongs] only to a few, who — by the frequency and gravity of their crimes and the assiduity of sinning, as it were putting off human nature — are imitators of diabolical malice. For to sin from mere liberty, with nothing inwardly inclining to sin and nothing externally suggesting evil, is diabolical rather than human. Whence it comes about that the sin of the devil was incorrigible and irremissible, but not that of man. When, therefore, it is said, “I will no more curse the earth for the sake of man,” and it is added, “For the sense and thought of the human heart are prone to evil from its youth,” a reason is rendered for the mitigation of the penalty, taken from man's proneness to evil: as if that evil should merit clemency, to which a vehement propensity and incitement is naturally implanted and innate in us.

§117. Pererius's second (preferred) reading: man's innate proneness to evil makes him worthy of some clemency — unlike the devil, who sins from pure liberty.

But the cause why men are carried to crimes immediately from the beginning of their age is, it is agreed, this: that man is constituted of two parts, not only diverse but even adverse and fighting with each other — namely, the sensitive appetite and the rational will. The former [tends] to the good that is useful and delightful according to sense; but the latter of itself tends to the good that is honorable, useful, and delightful according to right reason. But very few are those who strive with all their strength toward the rational good; but the multitude is prone to the sensible good. For since the sensitive appetite immediately occupies and possesses man — with no use of reason for many years of age, or at least a very slight and very weak [use] — hence it comes about that when afterward the sensitive appetite descends into contest with reason, it generally prevails and conquers, and often draws the greater parts of the soul to itself.

§118. Why evil appears so early: the sensitive appetite seizes man before reason can develop.

But what is that: “sense and thought”? By the word “sense” is signified the sensitive appetite; but the word “thought” signifies the very counsels of reason — the contrivances and arts which it brings to evil itself. For whereas reason ought to repress and govern the appetite, charmed and captured by its blandishments and enticements, it obeys him whom it ought to command, and uses the ministry of the senses to obtain the pleasures from which it ought itself to restrain them. It is, therefore, as it were natural for man to sin — that is, pro[ceeding]…

§119. ‘Sense’ = the appetite; ‘thought’ = reason corrupted into its servant. Continues on p. 309.

— p. 378 (PDF) · printed p. 309 —

…proceeding from the propensity of the nature of man — not as it had been created by God, namely whole and right, but as, vitiated and depraved by the sin of Adam, it was transfused and propagated into all his posterity.

§119 (cont.). The proneness is from fallen nature, transmitted through Adam's sin.

In place of this, “the sense and thought of man,” the Hebrew is: “the figment [imagination] of the human heart is evil”: but it renders the same meaning, for what is fashioned and formed in the human heart is the very thought and desire. Some of the Hebrews, however, interpret it as the “fomes” [tinder of sin] and concupiscence itself. The Greek reading expressed this sentence thus: “Because the mind of man remains diligently upon evils from his youth”: by which words is signified an eager and careful and constant pursuit of vices.

Textual note: Hebrew ‘the figment of the heart is evil’ (some read it as concupiscence/the ‘fomes’); the Greek stresses constant pursuit of evil.

The phrase “from its youth,” Rupert thinks, signifies the first age of man which begins to use reason and free will: for the age which precedes this, as desiring and capable of no sin, is free both from the natural and from the

written law; but the subsequent age now has a lawful judgment of good and evil. Whence certain of the wise men of the world said that the life of man is similar to the Greek letter Y, which, beginning from one stroke, is split into two. For if a man in infancy or boyhood walks a simple road, not weighing the difference of good and evil: but when he has reached the bounds of adolescence, he perceives the discernment of both with reason as guide. Whence, if he chooses the right [branch], he obtains the reward of virtue; but if the left, he incurs the penalties of evils. Wherefore the greatest of poets said: “This way is our road to Elysium; but the left plies the punishments of the wicked, and sends [them] to impious Tartarus.”

§120. Rupert on ‘from youth’ (the dawn of reason); the Pythagorean ‘Y’ of the two roads; Virgil. Margins: Rupert, Commentaries on Genesis, bk. 4, ch. 29; Virgil, Aeneid, bk. 6.

But Tostatus takes the word “adolescence” properly, as it is a certain third age of man following infancy and boyhood. For in adolescence the natural proneness to evil vehemently and notably breaks out into crimes; which crimes in infancy, as devoid of reason, are none. (For we speak here of actual sins: for original sin clings to him from his mother's womb itself and in the very generation of man.) But in boyhood — both on account of inexperience and on account of the weakness of age — the sins are both few and light, except in some in whom malice supplies the [lack of] age.

§121. Tostatus: ‘adolescence’ taken strictly (the third age) — when proneness to evil first erupts into actual sin. Margin: Tostatus.

St. Ambrose, following the Greek reading, reads “from youth,” and expounds thus: “And ‘from youth’ he added; for from that age malice grows, although we may read elsewhere that not even an infant of one day is without sin: but infancy too is not without sin, on account of the weakness of the body; yet the diligence and zeal of sinning begins from youth — so that the boy sins as it were weakly, the young man as it were wickedly, who eagerly desires to commit sins and glories in crimes. For with most people innocence is held for cowardice, and fault for praise.

Thus the young are wont to boast of luxury and delights and the passions of adulteries. Therefore fault grows with the ages.” So Ambrose.

§122. Ambrose (reading ‘from youth’): malice grows with age, even though no infant is wholly without sin. Margins: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 22; Job 14 (Septuagint).

By those last words of the eighth chapter: “All the days of the earth, seedtime and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, night and day shall not cease,” is expressed God's promise and immutable decree, promis[ing]…

§123. Gen 8:22: God's pledge of the perpetual cycle of seasons. Continues on p. 310.

— p. 379 (PDF) · printed p. 310 —

…and establishing that there would thereafter be perpetual vicissitudes of times — both yearly, as of winter and summer, and daily, as of day and night; and also vicissitudes of the primary qualities, as of cold and heat; and likewise of human actions which pertain to sustaining life, such as seedtime and harvest. For the timely alternation and vicissitude of all these things makes for the comeliness and adornment of the universe; it confers both beauty and fecundity on the earth; finally it is exceedingly useful and even necessary for the safety and welfare of men and animals.

§123 (cont.). The cycles of seasons, qualities, and labors adorn the world and sustain life.

Hear St. Ambrose, who, explaining these very words: “According to the letter,” he says, “is signified by these words that the animals will endure — uncorrupted by the times, remaining according to the institution of the Lord and their own state. For when the times are corrupted, those things also are corrupted which are each generated in their own times. Therefore the times are what either corrupt or preserve, according as they themselves have their quality. And therefore the year is composed of contraries — Spring, Autumn, Summer, Winter — just as the harmony of a song seems to consist of grave and acute [notes] mingled. So therefore this world too is held together from contraries — Air and Earth, Fire and Water. Our bodies

too keep a certain order of nature by cold and heat, moisture and dryness. For if the natural order and measure is confounded, then destruction must necessarily follow. Therefore the Lord, the confusion of the flood being removed, promises that a fixed order of times will be, for the perseverance of the world." So Ambrose.

§124. Ambrose: the world (like a song or a body) is held together by ordered contraries; God promises that order will hold. Margin: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 23.

Great, therefore, was God's promise, when He said that all the days of the earth the vicissitude of times and the opportunity of sowing and reaping and doing other things would perpetually remain: as if He said — Such a year as this of the flood was will be no more, one that lacks the vicissitude of times, that is wholly spent in stormy rains, and is modified by no benefit of heat or tempering of winter, in which nowhere seed is sown nor any harvest gathered; but there will be timely and convenient changes of nature, now with heat, now with cold by turns ripening the lands or the crops. Never, as was done by the flood, will the face of nature be disfigured, or the situation of the world confounded.

§125. The greatness of the promise: never again a year like the flood-year, all storm and no harvest.

The phrase "all the days of the earth" does not signify "as long as the earth will last": since such vicissitudes of times will not be after the day of judgment; yet the earth will be, as is written at the beginning of the book of Ecclesiastes: "The earth standeth for ever." For the world is not to be destroyed according to substance, but, its principal parts remaining (such as the elements and the heavenly spheres), to be changed into a better state. Therefore the phrase "all the days of the earth" signifies "as long as on the earth there will be generation and corruption"; or, "as long as there will be on the earth men and animals, for whose use that variety of times was instituted." It cannot, therefore, be gathered hence that the present state of the world will be everlasting.

§126. ‘All the days of the earth’ ≠ forever: the seasons end at the judgment, though the earth (renewed) abides. Margin: “How the world is to be destroyed.”

But only summer and winter are mentioned: because these are the chief parts of the year, the extremes and opposed to each other; for Spring and Autumn are as it were their appendages. Only … too are named…

§127. Why only summer and winter (the extremes) are named. Continues on p. 311.

— p. 380 (PDF) · printed p. 311 —

…only cold and heat [are named], moisture and dryness being passed over in silence: because those [cold and heat] are the primary of the primary qualities, more notable in sensation and effect, and chief for the generation of mixed bodies and their operations. Moreover mention is made of seedtime and harvest: because among human actions which pertain to protecting life, this holds the first place, as being most general and useful; but under its mention the opportunity of the remaining actions and duties is to be understood.

§127 (cont.). Why cold/heat (not moisture/dryness) and seedtime/harvest are singled out.

I do not know why the Seventy Interpreters joined that phrase, “all the days of the earth,” with the preceding — that is, with that, “I will no more strike every living flesh” — whereas the Hebrew reading which the Latin interpreter followed plainly joins it with the following, that is, with that, “Seedtime and harvest… shall not cease.” Nor do I see why, in place of the word “winter,” which the Hebrew scripture has, they wished to translate “Spring”; or why they did not number that, “day and night,” among those things whose vicissitude was to be perpetuated, as it is in the Hebrew and Latin reading, but translated thus: “Seed and harvest, cold and heat, summer and spring, by day and night shall not cease.”

§128. Pererius queries the Septuagint's punctuation and its odd renderings (‘Spring’ for ‘winter’; misplacing ‘day and night’).

Since, therefore, the aforesaid vicissitude of times necessarily follows the immutable reckoning of the motion of the celestial spheres and stars, and on it itself depends the safety and welfare of sublunary things — but especially of living creatures — it appears indeed to be fabulous, and full of vanity and ignorance, what Ovid said in the first book of the Metamorphoses: that this inequality of times was not in the golden age of Saturn, but that for that time perpetual Spring flourished; but afterward, the age now degenerating, this alternate succession by turns was introduced to the world. For thus he says: “Jupiter contracted the times of the ancient Spring, and through winters and summers and unequal autumns and a brief Spring, drove [completed] the year in four spaces: then first the air, scorched with dry heats, glowed white, and ice hung frozen by the winds.”

§129. The seasons follow the fixed celestial motions, so Ovid's fable of a perpetual-Spring Golden Age is empty. (End of Liber XIII.) Margin: Ovid.

— p. 381 (PDF) · printed p. 312 —

BENEDICT PERERIUS, COMMENTARIES ON GENESIS, BOOK FOURTEEN. On the ninth chapter of the book of Genesis. On the eating of flesh granted to men; on the precept of not eating blood; on the penalty of homicide; on the drunkenness of Noah; on the partly cursing, partly blessing of Noah's sons.

Title page of Liber XIV (on Genesis 9).

The ninth chapter of Genesis. {And God blessed Noah and his sons, [and] said to them: Increase and multiply, and fill the earth. And let the fear and dread of you be upon all the animals of the earth, and upon all the birds of the air, with all that move upon the earth: all the fishes of the sea are delivered into your hand. And everything that moves and lives shall be food for you: even as the green herbs have I delivered them all to you. Save that flesh with the blood you shall not eat. For I will require the blood of your lives at the hand of all beasts,

and at the hand of man, at the hand of every man, and of his brother, will I require the life of man. Whosoever shall shed man's blood, his blood shall be shed: for to the image of God was man made.}

Gen 9:1–6 (the chapter's text begins). Margins: vv. 1–6.

— p. 382 (PDF) · printed p. 313 —

…was man made. {But increase you and multiply, and go upon the earth, and fill it. Thus also said God to Noah, and to his sons with him: Behold I will establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you: and with every living soul that is with you, as well in all the birds as in the cattle and beasts of the earth, that are come forth out of the ark, and in all the beasts of the earth. I will establish my covenant with you, and all flesh shall be no more destroyed with the waters of a flood, neither shall there be from henceforth a flood to waste the earth. And God said: This is the sign of the covenant which I give between me and you, and to every living soul that is with you, for perpetual generations. I will set my bow in the clouds, and it shall be the sign of a covenant between me and between the earth. And when I shall cover the sky with clouds, my bow shall appear in the clouds: and I will remember my covenant with you, and with every living soul that beareth flesh: and there shall no more be waters of a flood to destroy all flesh. And the bow shall be in the clouds, and I shall see it, and shall remember the everlasting covenant that was made between God and every living soul of all flesh which is upon the earth. And God said to Noah: This shall be the sign of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh upon the earth.}

Gen 9:7–17 (the covenant and the rainbow). Margins: vv. 7–17.

{And the sons of Noah who came out of the Ark were Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and Ham is the father of Canaan. These three are the sons of Noah: and from these was all mankind spread over the whole earth. And Noah, a husbandman, began to till the ground, and planted a

vineyard. And drinking of the wine was made drunk, and was uncovered in his tent. Which when Ham the father of Canaan had seen, to wit, that his father's nakedness was uncovered, he told it to his two brethren without. But Shem and Japheth put a cloak upon their shoulders, and going backward, covered the nakedness of their father — and their f[aces were turned away]…}

Gen 9:18–23 (Noah's sons; his vineyard, drunkenness, and Ham's sin). Margins: vv. 18–23. *Continues on p. 314.*

— p. 383 (PDF) · printed p. 314 —

…and their faces were turned away, and they saw not their father's nakedness. {And Noah awaking from the wine, when he had learned what his younger son had done to him, he said: Cursed be Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be unto his brethren. And he said: Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, be Canaan his servant. May God enlarge Japheth, and may he dwell in the tents of Shem, and Canaan be his servant. And Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty years. And all his days were nine hundred and fifty years: and he died.}

Gen 9:24–29 (the curse of Canaan, the blessing of Shem and Japheth, Noah's death). Margins: vv. 24–29.

PREFACE. The things which happened after the flood up to the birth of Abraham, Moses diligently narrates in the three next following chapters of this book — the ninth and tenth and the greater part of the eleventh. Yet he does not pursue everything, for that would have been both too long and least of all necessary; but only the more notable things, either for knowledge of that first age after the flood, or for the instruction of posterity. But the things which in this ninth chapter are set forth by Moses, if they be gathered into certain heads, are roughly these: First, God blessed Noah and his sons, granting a great fecundity of generation for the swift and numerous multiplication of the human race. Second, He permitted them and their posterity the eating of flesh, which He had not done before

the flood. Third, He forbade all eating of blood. Fourth, with most severe words He assailed murderers, the penalty of retaliation (talion) being established against them. Fifth, God confirmed His promise of no flood ever to come thereafter by a sign conspicuous to all — the heavenly bow [rainbow] — so that the sight of it might make the minds of mortals secure of a flood never to come. Sixth, Noah — as a help to human infirmity and as a remedy and solace for so many evils by which the life of mortals after the flood began to be tried and harassed — when…

Preface to Liber XIV: a six-point outline of Genesis 9 (blessing; flesh permitted; blood forbidden; homicide punished; the rainbow covenant; Noah's vine, cut off mid-sentence). Continues on p. 315.

— p. 384 (PDF) · printed p. 315 —

…when, the vines planted by himself and the grapes produced [from them] having been made into wine, he had drunk it, he fell unawares and unwilling into drunkenness and lay naked. Seventh, his son Ham was not ashamed to look upon the shameful nakedness of Noah, and divulged it not without mockery and insult to his father: but Shem and Japheth, by a memorable example both of modesty and of piety, having turned away from the sight of their naked father, with backward approach to him, threw a cloak [over him] and covered his nakedness. Eighth, Noah, being made aware of this when he was loosed from sleep and drunkenness, cursed Ham in his son Canaan, foretelling that his posterity would be made subject to the service of the posterity of Shem and Japheth: but on the contrary he blessed Shem and Japheth, foretelling the felicity of their posterity. Ninth, the whole time of Noah's life is fixed at nine hundred and fifty years: of which he lived six hundred before the flood, but three hundred and fifty after the flood.

Praefatio (cont.). Points 6–9 of the Gen 9 outline (Noah's wine/drunkenness; Ham's sin; the curse and blessings; Noah's 950 years). Margin: Gen. 9.

From which it appears that Noah survived for many years after Abraham was born. For according to the Hebrew and Latin chronology, which counts

two hundred and ninety-two years from the flood to the year of Abraham's birth, Noah lived after the birth of Abraham fifty-eight years: but according to the Greek chronology, which — the generation of Cainan being added — extends the time intervening between the flood and the birth of Abraham to three hundred and twenty-two years (about which matter we shall dispute accurately below in the sixteenth book), Noah lived after Abraham's birth only twenty-eight years. If, therefore, Pliny marveled at it as a thing of the rarest example — that Augustus Caesar saw the grandson of his granddaughter, Junius Silanus, begotten in the year in which he died — how much more would he have marveled that Noah survived many years after the birth of Abraham, who had been begotten from him after ten generations? These, then, are the chief heads of the things narrated in the ninth chapter of this book, which we have proposed in this book not only to explain with clear Commentaries, but, wherever there shall be need, to illustrate also with learned disputations.

Praefatio (concl.). Noah outlived Abraham's birth by 58 yrs (Hebrew/Latin) or 28 (Greek, with Cainan); the Pliny/Augustus parallel. Margin: “How long Noah survived after Abraham was born.”

— p. 385 (PDF) · printed p. 316 —

{And God blessed Noah and his sons, and said to them: Increase and multiply, and fill the earth. And let the fear and dread of you be upon all the animals of the earth,} etc.

Gen 9:1–2 (lemma). Margin: vv. 1, 2.

One may observe the similar beginnings of the world at its birth and again, after the Flood, of the world as it were reborn, and the benefits bestowed by God on man. For at the beginning of the world God imparted to man newly created three goods — and those great and excellent: first, fecundity of nature for the swift and manifold propagation of the human race, when blessing him He said, “Increase and multiply”; second, excellence of rule and dominion over the animals, “Have dominion,” He says, “over the fishes of the sea and the birds of the air and all the living things that move

upon the earth”; third, abundance of food for protecting and sustaining life, “Behold I have given you every herb and all the trees, that they may be for food to you and to all the animals of the earth.” These same three goods and benefits, the world being purified and renewed by the flood, God willed to renew also in those eight men who had escaped the disaster of the flood. The good of fecundity He granted them when, blessing Noah and his sons (as is written at the beginning of this chapter), He said, “Increase and multiply”; the right of commanding the animals, when He added, “And let the fear and dread of you be upon all the animals”; finally food, not only necessary but also convenient and best for nourishing man, when He subjoined, “Everything that moves and lives shall be food for you.” With like benefits, therefore, God endowed man both when He first created him and when He saved him from the destruction of the flood.

§1. The three creation-goods (fecundity, dominion, food) renewed after the flood. Margin: “Three goods bestowed on man newly created” / Gen. 1.

But although those goods were similar in kind in both ages of the world and states of man, yet in species and in degrees of excellence and perfection they were most dissimilar. For in the state of innocence human fecundity would have been such that not only would numerous offspring be generated, but [offspring] perfect alike in mind and in body [though] childlike, and without any labor or trouble of the parents. And man's dominion over the animals would have been altogether quiet and peaceful, with no resistance of the animals and no difficulty for man. Food, moreover, from those things which the earth would have generated of nature's own accord, would not only have been sufficient for nourishing man, but much most healthful and most pleasant, and would have removed from man all need of, or desire for, flesh. But after the flood these goods, mixed with various evils and hardships, were greatly diminished and corrupted. Fecund indeed was man's nature after the flood: but with how great labors, vices, and calamities that fecundity is joined can scarcely be told. Scarcely any of the animals do we command at our pleasure and

without labor; the more excellent and nobler we subdue only by art and force and by tricks and terrors. And the more abundant the food given to man after the flood than before, the more cle[arly]…

§2. But the renewed goods are far inferior to the original (no painless birth, no easy dominion, no perfect plant-food). Continues on p. 317.

— p. 386 (PDF) · printed p. 317 —

…the more clearly it indicates man's greater need, proceeding from the greater frailty of health and weakness of body which befell him after the flood.

§2 (cont.). The richer post-flood diet itself betrays man's greater bodily weakness.

And that Moses narrates in this chapter that God twice blessed Noah and his sons and said, “Increase and multiply,” served to make more certain the assurance of the promised fecundity, and that they might in no way doubt that so great a fewness of them would, in the briefest time, be multiplied into a most ample multitude of posterity; which indeed, just as God had promised, so plainly came to pass. For in the time which intervened between the flood and the birth of Abraham — that is, within three hundred years — the human race was propagated so numerously that (on the authority of Ctesias) Diodorus relates, in his third book, that Ninus, founder of the monarchy of the Assyrians (in the forty-third year of whose reign Eusebius makes Abraham to have been born), had in his army seventeen hundred thousand foot, two hundred thousand horse, and scythed chariots a little less than ten thousand six hundred; and that at the same time Zoroaster, king of the Bactrians, about to do battle with Ninus, raised an army of four hundred thousand men. Behold: in the army of only two kings there were more than two million three hundred thousand men.

§3 (printed §4). The double blessing assured the fecundity — proven by the huge armies of Ninus & Zoroaster (Ctesias via Diodorus bk. 3). Margins: Diodorus from Ctesias; Eusebius in the Chronicle; “A notable example and the swiftest proof of the multiplication of men after the flood.”

That phrase, “Let the fear and dread of you be upon all the animals of the earth” (or as it is in Hebrew, “The fear and dread of you shall be upon all the animals”), makes Noah and his sons secure, the fear being removed which they might have conceived — lest, on account of their fewness, destruction or some great harm should befall them from animals so many and so savage. So far is it, says God, from the animals' having to strike fear and dread into you, that you rather shall be formidable and terrible to them; which is said not only of those few men, but of all their posterity: for all animals are held in check and fear man — they dread even his shadow, even his footprints, as Basil proves of fishes and Pliny of elephants — and scarcely any animal, however savage and truculent, attacks man unless either provoked, or driven by hunger, or seized by fear of itself or by some other perturbation. There are many [animals] greater, stronger, swifter, and more strongly armed with the natural weapons of claws, teeth, and horns than man: yet against them all he prevails by two things, intelligence and the hand; for by these he fashions weapons and instruments of every kind, with which he easily conquers all living things and subjects them, to use at his pleasure, to his service.

§4 (printed §5). The dread of man over the beasts (Hebrew variant); even the strongest yield to man's wit and hand. Margins: Basil; Pliny, bk. 8, ch. 4.

St. Gregory, from the fact that God said to Noah and his sons, “Let the fear and dread of you be upon all the animals,” argues that he who is set over others ought by no means to wish to be feared by his subjects. For he writes thus in book 21 of the Morals, chapter 11, upon those words of Job chapter 31, “If I have despised to abide judgment with my servant”: “Nature begot all men equal; but, the order of merits varying, a hidden distinction sets some after [other]s…

§5 (printed §6). Gregory: rulers should not wish to be feared by their subjects. Margins: “A saying of St. Gregory, very much to be observed by superiors”; Gregory, Morals, bk. 21, ch. 11; Job 31. *Continues on p. 318.*

— p. 387 (PDF) · printed p. 318 —

…sets some after others. But that very diversity which came in from vice is rightly ordered by the divine judgments, so that, since not every man walks the road of life equally, one may be ruled by another. But holy men, when they are set over [others], regard not the power of rank in themselves, but the equality of condition: and they rejoice not to be over men, but to profit them. For significantly God said to Noah and his sons, ‘Let the fear and dread of you be upon all the animals of the earth’: He did not say, ‘upon the men who shall be,’ but ‘upon the animals’: for man is by nature set above the living creatures, but not above men; and therefore it is said to him that he be feared by the animals, but not by men. For it is against nature to be proud — to wish to be feared by equals: although holy men do desire to be feared even by those not subject to them; but then [only], when they perceive that God is by no means feared by them, so that those who do not dread the divine judgments may at least fear to sin through human dread. For in that they exact fear for themselves from those who live perversely, they rule as it were not men but brute animals. But when the vice that should be corrected is absent, they rejoice not in the excellence of power but in the condition of equality: and they shun not only to be feared by them, but even to be honored more than is necessary. For they do not deem it a slight harm of humility that they suffer, if perhaps they are esteemed by them at a higher [rate] on account of the merit of rank.” Thus St. Gregory.

§5 (cont.). Gregory: man is set over beasts, not men; holy rulers seek to profit, not to be feared by equals.

{Everything that moves and lives shall be food for you: even as the green herbs have I delivered them all to you.}

Gen 9:3 (lemma). Margin: v. 3.

Hence it appears that before the flood the eating of flesh either was not lawful, or was not in custom and use — at least among the upright and pious men, and those whom Moses above called the sons of God. The wise men of the heathen even got an inkling of this abstinence from flesh in the

primeval age of the world, which they named the golden age — whether from reading the writings of Moses, or from ancient report and tradition, especially of the Chaldaeans and Egyptians, to whom the institutions of the Jews, because of their long association with them, were not unknown.

§6 (printed §7). The pagans' 'golden age' echoes the pre-flood abstinence from flesh. Margin: Gen. 6.

The abstinence of that primeval age from the eating of flesh Ovid expressed in those verses: “But that old age did not pollute its mouths with gore. Then the birds in safety moved their wings through the air, and the hare wandered fearless in the midst of the fields, nor had its own credulity hung the fish on the hook; all things were without snares, fearing no fraud, and were full of peace.” But whereas Ovid praises the abstinence of that age from the eating of flesh, he did rightly; yet in that he afterward execrates the introduced eating of flesh as a great crime, saying, “Alas, how great a crime it is for entrails to be buried in entrails, and for a greedy body to grow fat by a heaped-up body, and for one living creature to live by the death of another living creature!” — he lapsed from the truth by a poetic excess: for that cannot be condemned which for [a great]…

§7 (printed §8). Ovid's verses on golden-age abstinence (rightly praised), but his condemning all flesh-eating as crime is poetic excess. Margin: Ovid, Metamorphoses bk. 1. Continues on p. 319.

— p. 388 (PDF) · printed p. 319 —

…God granted to man as a great benefit, and which is well-nigh necessary for sustaining and strengthening the frailty and weakness of man.

§7 (cont.). Flesh-eating is a divine benefit, near-necessary for man's frailty — so not to be condemned.

But let us sift out the causes for which God willed to indulge man the eating of flesh not before the flood but after. Indeed I can bring forward three causes of this matter. Namely, God willed by some illustrious token of His kindness and indulgence toward man to mitigate and soften the atrocity of the vengeance by which He extinguished (a few excepted) the

whole race of men and animals through the disaster of the flood: wherefore man, made to tremble by so great a severity of divine punishment and dismayed with fear, the most gentle Lord immediately after the flood raised up and revived by the grant of three immense goods — numerous fecundity, more abundant food, and security against any flood ever to come thereafter. The second cause I judge to have been man's need after the flood, needing richer and stronger food.

§8 (printed §9). Why flesh was granted only after the flood — three causes: (1) to soften the flood's severity with a kindness; (2) man's greater need. Margin: "Three causes why flesh-eating was granted to man after the flood."

And this need arose from three things: for the aspect and influence of the celestial stars was less propitious and beneficial to human life than it had been before the flood; and the earth itself, drenched and overwhelmed for a whole year by the salt waters of the Ocean, was made much more barren and worse: wherefore by the yield of those things which it generated of itself it could not, as before, supply sufficient nourishment for feeding man; finally, men's health was frailer after the flood, and liable to more discomforts and diseases: wherefore, for sustaining and strengthening it, there was need of more and stronger supports and, as it were, props — which the life of men, so greatly contracted and cut short after the flood, sufficiently indicates.

§9 (printed §10). The threefold source of man's post-flood need: less favorable stars, a salt-soaked barren earth, frailer health. Margin: "For three reasons man's need was greater after the flood."

A third cause Theodoret hands down, in question 55 on Genesis, writing thus: "After the flood God conferred on man a more precious food, commanding [him] to kill and eat of every kind of animal — that is, repelling one affection by another affection, and curing the graver by the lighter. For God, foreseeing that men would fall into so great a madness as to venerate animals for gods, permitted the eating of them, whereby He might restrain their impiety. For it is the height of insanity to adore what is eaten. For this reason too He willed that some animals be held unclean,

others clean, so that they might shudder to adore the unclean by the very fact that they are unclean; but the clean, because they were slain both for man's food and for sacrifices, they would blush to worship for gods.”

§10 (printed §11). Theodoret's third cause: flesh was allowed to wean men from worshipping animals — one shudders to adore what one eats. Margin: Theodoret.

FIRST DISPUTATION. Whether the eating of flesh was lawful for man before the flood.

But from this place of Scripture, in which it is narrated that God first granted to man the eating of flesh after the flood, a celebrated question arises: whether eating flesh before the flood was for man either lawful, or at least in custom and u[se]…

§11 (printed §12). The Disp. 1 question stated. Continues on p. 320.

— p. 389 (PDF) · printed p. 320 —

…in use. There are on this matter three opinions of authors. The first is that of Lyra, of Tostatus (almost in the words of the first chapter on Genesis), and of the Carthusian in his Commentaries on the [verse] where God assigned food to man from all the herbs and vegetables of the earth and the fruits of the trees. These affirm that the eating of flesh neither was in use before the flood, nor was lawful. To prove this they think there is argument enough in this: that God first granted to Noah and his sons the eating of flesh after the flood, as if before that time it had been unwonted and unlawful. “Everything,” He says, “that moves and lives shall be food for you, even as the green herbs have I given you all”: of which words of God this is the sense: Just as at the beginning of the world I delivered to you for food all the things that are born of the earth, so now, because you need fuller and stronger feeding, I destine and assign to your sustenance all the animals.

§11 (cont.). First opinion (Lyra, Tostatus, the Carthusian): flesh was neither used nor lawful before the flood. Margin: “First opinion of Lyra, Tostatus, the Carthusian.”

And rightly indeed did God do this: since after the flood the earth was made worse, and on that account the food from herbs and trees for nourishing man would have been ineffective; the temperament too of the human body was made much weaker and frailer — which appears even from this, that before the flood men lived beyond the nine-hundredth year, but after the flood Arphaxad, who was the first of all generated, lived a little more than four hundred years, and in those three hundred years which ran from the flood to the birth of Abraham man's life was diminished by more than seven hundred years: for no one after that time was longer-lived than Isaac, who nevertheless by no means exceeded the one hundred and eightieth year. If, therefore, the eating of flesh was first granted to man after the flood, from this it is clear that before it was not lawful and customary: for if it had been, what need was there then to sanction it by a new command, and to grant it to man as a kind of new and singular benefit?

§12 (printed §13). Supporting the first opinion: the post-flood decline (lifespans falling from 900+ to under 180) made flesh newly needful — so it was a new grant.

Moreover, the cause why before the flood the eating of flesh was not granted by God to man was not the fewness of animals of each species: for it is not to be thought that, as in the human species God created only two men, so also in each species of animals two were procreated by God (although Justin Martyr left this written, in his Response to question 49 of the Orthodox, and Theodoret in the book of Questions on Genesis, questions 17 and 39). Nay, it is more credible that very many of each animal species were generated at the beginning of the world. Not, therefore, on account of the fewness of animals was the use of flesh denied to man: for, as I have said, that cause is not true; and even were it true, it would perhaps have had some force at the beginning of the world, but not throughout all that time which was up to the flood — namely, through one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years — during which time it is by no means to be doubted that the animals of each species were multiplied most

numerously. Add that, if that reasoning had any force, by like reasoning it would be concluded that God ought not to have made for man the power of eating flesh immediately after the flood, since at that time, similarly as at the world's beginning, there was great [fewness]…

§13 (printed §14). The denial of flesh before the flood was NOT scarcity of animals (against Justin Martyr & Theodoret, who said only two of each were made). Margins: Justin Martyr; Theodoret. Continues on p. 321.

— p. 390 (PDF) · printed p. 321 —

…fewness of animals of each species.

§13 (cont.). (If scarcity were the reason, it would equally have barred flesh right after the flood.)

The true and genuine cause of this matter, therefore, was that food from the things born of the earth, in that first age which preceded the flood, was best for man on account of the excellent goodness and vigor of the fresh earth: for the earth furnished nourishment for feeding man not only sufficient, but abundantly supplied, and most solid and pleasant and healthful — and that with great ease, namely without grave labor and care on man's part. And so there was at that time a natural agreement between the eating of plants and man's temperament, on account of the excellent nourishing power of [the plants] and the most firm constitution of the human body: such an agreement, namely, as did not exist between the flesh of animals and man's body; for at that time the flesh of animals would have given man a fuller and fatter and more solid nourishment than was suited to his temperament. Or perhaps God had foreseen that, if men fed on flesh, they would be of longer life than He willed to fix it, and than He knew to conduce to their spiritual utility; or even because by that food they would have been made much more robust, more confident, more ferocious, and bolder and more reckless for committing any crime whatever — such, namely, as the giants were toward the end of that age, as Moses narrates in the sixth chapter of Genesis.

§14 (printed §15). The TRUE reason: the rich young earth's plant-food suited man's robust frame; flesh would have made men too long-lived, or too fierce (like the giants of Gen 6).

The second opinion is plainly contrary to this: that the eating of flesh was lawful and customary for men before the flood. This opinion some assign to St. Justin: for he records this question put to him by the Orthodox, which among the other questions is number 119: If those who lived before the flood ate neither the fruits of trees nor the flesh of animals (as some of the Fathers said), how is it that Abel offered of the fat of the sheep which he pastured, and likewise Cain of the fruits of the earth which he tilled? And there is no doubt that each, preferring God to his own food, used such a sacrifice. For if they offered to God things useless to themselves, did they not mock God by such an oblation? — since they would be offering a ridiculous gift, namely one that took nothing from the offerer. How is it, then, that Cain's sacrifice was rejected, but Abel's approved? To this question Justin answers thus: St. Paul, the Father of Fathers and master of religion, says: “Who plants a vine, and does not eat of its fruit? who feeds a flock, and does not eat of its milk?” — surely no one. Not, therefore, did Abel, feeding the flock, not feed on the flock's milk; nor did Cain, tilling the earth, not eat its fruits. Besides, if the fruits of the earth were useless to Cain, for what cause did he honor God with the worse, honoring himself before God with the better? But if Abel preferred God to his own advantage, there is no doubt that he was wont to take advantage from his own labor. Thus Justin. I marvel indeed that there were some of the Fathers (as Justin reports) who denied that men before the flood were wont to eat the fruits of trees, since God assigned that food to the first men as soon as He created them. But from the aforesaid words of Justin it cannot be gathered that he thought the eating of flesh was for men before the flood lawful and [customary]…

§15 (printed §16). Second opinion (assigned to Justin Martyr): flesh was lawful and used before the flood — argued from Cain's and Abel's offerings and Paul (1 Cor 9). Margins: Justin Martyr; Gen. 4; 1 Cor. 9. Continues on p. 322.

— p. 391 (PDF) · printed p. 322 —

…customary: for he speaks only of the eating of milk, which he wishes Abel to have used — which no one denies.

§15 (cont.). Justin in fact only proves Abel used milk, not that flesh was eaten.

But Cajetan, explaining on the fourth chapter of the book of Genesis those words, “Abel was a shepherd of sheep, but Cain a husbandman,” openly approves this opinion, writing in this manner: “It is a conjecture that men were then so multiplied that there was need of a flock of sheep; for no scripture testifies that men before the flood, after they were cast out of Paradise, lived on the fruits of the earth alone. For Berosus relates that men before the flood even ate human flesh. And Abel's pastoral office testifies that the flock of sheep served human uses, not only by providing wools and lambs, but milk and cheese. Nor does it stand in the way that divine scripture defers the indulgence of eating flesh until after the flood; for that was not an indulgence, but an explication of necessity. For before sin the necessary matter of human food was set forth in vegetables; but after sin, in animals. Whence there it is said that animals were given to man after the flood, just as before the green herbs had been given to him. With which it stands that in the middle time — namely, after sin and before the flood — men used by natural right the eating of the flesh of animals, and on that account Abel was a shepherd of sheep. And it is confirmed, because, unless lambs had then been for food to men, there would have been no praise to Abel from his having chosen the fat firstlings for the divine sacrifice; for it would have been all the same to Abel to sacrifice fat or lean ones, if he pastured the flock not for the use of the flesh, but for the use of the skins alone.”

§16 (printed §17). Cajetan defends the second opinion (Abel's flock implies flesh-eating; Berosus on antediluvian cannibalism). Margins: Cajetan; Berosus.

So Cajetan in that place, and the same is repeated and confirmed by him at the beginning of the ninth chapter, where he also adds this: that after the

flood God promulgated the eating of flesh — not as to use, as if before it had not been in use, but as to necessity, because after the flood the eating of flesh began to be necessary for man; and because then for the first time the necessity of eating flesh was promulgated, therefore then too the natural manner of eating flesh was declared — not with the blood, that is, not eating raw flesh. So [much] from Cajetan. This opinion pleased also Francisco de Vitoria, as appears from his Relection On Temperance.

§16 (cont.). Cajetan: the post-flood grant declared not new use but new necessity (and forbade raw/bloody flesh); Vitoria agreed. Margin: Francisco de Vitoria.

To this opinion Dominic de Soto, in the fifth book On Justice and Law, question one, article one, added his vote also: for he judges that immediately after Adam's sin and the vitiated nature of man, the eating of flesh was a naturally suitable food for man, and on that account was lawful and customary. He argues this in this manner: if the eating of flesh was not in use among men, that must have happened either because it was forbidden, or because the eating of flesh at that time was not useful to man, or because the power of flesh to nourish man was not at that time known, or because, on account of the abundance and excellence of the food that plants supplied to man, the eating of flesh was superfluous and by no means necessary: but none of these avails to establish belief in that opinion. For we read of flesh-eating forbidden by no law: not by the natural [law], as is plain; nor by a positive [law], for no such [law] is anywhere found in the sacred letters; nor could there be a probable cause why at that time food from flesh should not be suitable and u[seful]…

§17 (printed §18). Soto joins the second opinion: flesh was naturally suitable food after the Fall, forbidden by no law. Margin: Dominic de Soto. Continues on p. 323.

— p. 392 (PDF) · printed p. 323 —

…and useful to man, since by the concession of the Philosophers and Physicians, and (what is the chief thing) by the evidence of experience, it is established that food from flesh is better for nourishing and strengthening

man than food from plants. Moreover, this is by no means credible: that throughout all that time which preceded the flood (that is, through one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years) the power of flesh, most fitted for nourishing man, was neither known to man by reasoning nor discovered by experience. And that at that time plants furnished sufficient food to man, and there was no need of flesh, does not prove that men did not use it. For with how many things do we now feed, not as necessary, but because they have better, more delicate, and more pleasant nourishment! For men are not content with what is necessary either for life or for clothing, but eagerly and curiously pursue many other things, if they think them better and sweeter. To this is added that all animals were made for the use of man: and there are many which, apart from eating, you would not know how they could be of use to men — such as fishes, partridges, and very many birds.

§17 (cont.). Soto's argument: flesh is better nourishment (Philosophers, Physicians, experience); men eat for pleasure not just need; many animals (fish, fowl) serve no use but food.

The third opinion is that the eating of flesh was indeed lawful for man before the flood, yet was not in use, especially among the upright and pious men generated from that praised stock of Seth, whom Moses called the sons of God. In this opinion Chrysostom seems to have been, writing in the twenty-seventh homily on Genesis that men made the beginning of eating flesh after the flood. Theodoret likewise, in question 55 on Genesis, when he had posed this question (Why did God after the flood enact a law about eating flesh?), answers it thus himself: “As soon as God created man, He gave him the fruits of the earth; but after the flood He granted him a more precious food, commanding Noah to kill and eat animals of every kind”; and the rest which follows, and which were recalled by us a little above, when we set forth the causes why God indulged man the eating of flesh not before but after the flood.

§18 (printed §19). Third (Pererius's preferred) opinion: flesh was lawful but not used by the pious line of Seth before the flood (Chrysostom hom. 27; Theodoret q. 55). Margins: Gen. 6; St. Chrysostom;

Theodoret.

St. Thomas too seems to have been more inclined to this opinion, as he signifies in his Commentaries on the Epistle to the Romans, upon those words of chapter 14, “But he that is weak, let him eat herbs,” affirming that the use of flesh began after the flood: but he hands down the same thing more explicitly in the First of the Second [part], question 102, article 6, in the answer to the second [objection]: “The eating,” he says, “of plants and other things born of the earth was among men even before the flood; but the eating of animals seems to have been introduced after the flood. For it is said in Genesis 9, ‘Even as the green herbs have I given you all flesh.’ And this is so because the eating of things born of the earth pertains more to a certain simplicity of life; but the eating of flesh, to the delights and curiosity of living. For the earth germinates the herb of its own accord, and with little effort the things that are generated from the earth can be prepared even in great abundance; but animals must be nourished with great effort and made ready for eating. Wherefore God, willing to lead back His people to simplicity, forbade the Hebrews many things in the kind of animals, but not in the kind of plants.” Thus far from St. Thomas.

§19 (printed §20). Aquinas leans the same way (flesh-eating introduced after the flood; the dietary laws lead Israel back to ‘simplicity’). Margins: St. Thomas; Lev. 11; Deut. 14.

To me also, beyond the rest, this opinion is pleasing: for since before [the flood]…

§20 (printed §21). Pererius adopts the third opinion. Continues on p. 324.

— p. 393 (PDF) · printed p. 324 —

…the flood, on account of the excellent goodness of the earth and the excellent power of the nourishment which the fruits of the earth supplied to man, and at the same time on account of the most firm and most robust temperament of the human body, the food from plants was for nourishing man sufficient and more than sufficient, likewise most healthful and most

pleasant, and also most simple and obtainable with no labor, and finally similar to the food which God had assigned to man before sin; it is most likely that good men and worshippers of God most willingly wished to use that food alone.

§20 (cont.). The pious pre-flood men gladly kept to plant-food (so like the pre-Fall diet).

But someone will say: if the food from the flesh of animals was first granted to man after the flood, how was it lawful before that time? It must be answered that God, by indulging the eating of flesh after the flood, did not make it from unlawful lawful, but signified that the need of it then began — on account of the frailty of life and the weakness of human health, and on account of the malignity of the earth and the feeble power, for nourishing man well, of the things that are born of the earth; wherefore by the grant of flesh God released good and pious men, as it were, from a certain scruple, lest (as before the flood) — content with herbs and the fruits of trees as sufficient food — they should shrink from the eating of flesh as something superfluous. God willed besides, after the flood, to hand down the power of eating flesh more expressly, so that He might join to it the exception of eating flesh with the blood — which kind of food He willed to be hateful and abominable to man, and was about, in future ages, by a law enacted, to forbid to the Hebrews.

§21 (printed §22). How flesh could be ‘lawful before’ yet ‘granted after’: the grant declared the new necessity and freed the scruple — and set up the coming prohibition of eating flesh with blood.

But since we have disputed about the eating of flesh, I do not want the Reader to be ignorant that there were some who opined that plants are a better and more useful nourishment for man than the flesh of animals; which, if it were so, the eating of flesh granted to man by God's concession would assuredly have been no great benefit. The Pythagoreans, the more to commend abstinence from animals, are said to have thought thus. But that that opinion is false, reason, experience, and examples prove conclusively. Reason teaches that each thing is nourished by things most similar to it,

since the nourishment must be changed into that which is nourished, and among similar things the transmutation is easier; by the concoction of the nourishment too this is brought about, that at last the nourishment is made as similar as possible to that which is to be nourished. But the flesh of animals is more similar to the human body than the nature of plants — just as animals are more similar to men than plants. Next, the best nourishment is that which is temperately hot and moist, such, namely, as the human body is: but to this temperament of hot and moist, of which the human body consists, the flesh of animals approaches more nearly than the nature of plants; for it is established that plants generally excel notably and beyond measure either in heat or in cold, or in moisture or in dryness.

§22 (printed §23). Against the Pythagoreans: flesh is the better nourishment (it is more like man's body and temperament). Margins: "Whether flesh-eating is a better food than plants"; "See Porphyry, On Abstinence from Animal Food, bk. 4, and the two Orations of Plutarch On the Eating of Flesh."

Besides, as it is commonly spread abroad, so it is true — that which is bandied about in everyone's speech: "What tastes good, nourishes"; and that the flesh of animals is of better savor and sweeter to eat, who would deny? just as neither can that be denied…

§23 (printed §24). A further proof: 'what tastes good nourishes,' and flesh tastes better. Continues on p. 325.

— p. 394 (PDF) · printed p. 325 —

…that from flesh a fuller and more solid and more healthful nourishment is taken than from plants — as by the example of the sick, to whom, just as flesh is often allowed, so fruits and vegetables are forbidden. And the Philosophers judge that to be held according to nature which all or most seek and pursue: such is the eating of flesh, which few do not use, and they either on account of poverty, or disease, or from a rule of life. Nor is it not plain that those who feed on good flesh are stronger, plumper, more handsome, and fitter for all the duties of life than those who use plants

alone. To this is added that abstinence from flesh is deliberately undertaken for macerating and afflicting the body and weakening the strength of the flesh: nor in the Ecclesiastical fasts, which are instituted for doing penance and afflicting the flesh, is the use of herbs or fruits forbidden, while the use of flesh is plainly prohibited. We have disputed these things for this reason: to show that that opinion, as it disagrees from the doctrine of sacred Scripture, so is contrary to reason and experience.

§24 (printed; cont.). Final proofs that flesh is the better food (the sick, the Philosophers' rule, bodily vigor, the logic of fasting). End of the anti-Pythagorean argument.

I would also have this observed in this place: that what was said by God to Noah and his sons about eating flesh was not a precept whereby a necessity was imposed on them of eating flesh, but was an indulgence of God, with paternal affection consulting man's weakness; and, on account of the malignity of the earth and the feebler power of plants for nourishing man, bountifully bestowing on man a food which He knew to be, after the flood, better, more pleasant, and more healthful for him. Not, therefore, do those act against God's will and judgment who abstain from flesh — whether to live more chastely, or to apply themselves with more intent mind and more ardent zeal to the exercise of divine prayers and meditations; or to satisfy God worthily for their sins; or finally to keep holily the rule and discipline of the religious life they have undertaken, as it were sealed and confirmed by their vow, and to preserve it to the last breath. Nor indeed, because God is here said to have delivered all the living creatures of land and sea to man for food, is it fitting to think it lawful and honorable for man to roam through all the woods and glades, to climb mountains, to traverse plains, to search lakes and rivers — even far-off ones — and to sail across the penetrable seas not without peril of life: not to consult health, nor to serve honorable pleasure, but for the display of luxury and the prodigious satiety of the belly and gullet. So indeed the matter is: food from animals, abundantly sufficient for nourishing man, and likewise pleasant and healthful, is not to be procured at so great a price and peril; it is not

laborious nor costly, but obtainable with modest expense and labor.

§25. The grant of flesh was an indulgence, not a command — so abstinence is licit; and it is no warrant for gluttonous, perilous luxury-hunting. Margin: “The power of eating flesh was permitted as an indulgence, not imposed by a divine precept.”

— p. 395 (PDF) · printed p. 326 —

{Save that flesh with the blood you shall not eat. For I will require the blood of your lives at the hand of all beasts, and at the hand of man, at the hand of every man, and of his brother, will I require the life of man. Whosoever shall shed man's blood, his blood shall be shed: for to the image of God was man made.}

Gen 9:4–6 (lemma).

Just as at the beginning of the world God gave Adam the power of eating the fruits of all the trees except the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, so after the flood He granted Noah the eating of the flesh of any animals whatever, except the eating of blood. And in both cases there was made a prohibition of some one thing which of itself was not evil — namely, for a trial, salutary to man, of continence, humility, and obedience. “Save,” He says, “that flesh with the blood you shall not eat.” As if to say: I so permit you the eating of all animals, that nevertheless I will not have their blood eaten by you, whether within the animals themselves, or outside and separately. But what it is to eat flesh with the blood will be said a little below, more distinctly, in the disputation which is to be treated on this matter.

§26. The blood-prohibition parallels Eden's forbidden tree — a trial of obedience over a thing not evil in itself.

Immediately after the flood, therefore, one may observe two precepts of God given to man, both negative: one indeed about not eating blood, the other about not shedding human blood, or about avoiding homicide, when He said: “I will require the blood of your lives at the hand of beasts and of

men: for whosoever shall shed human blood, his blood shall be shed.” But the former precept is positive and temporary — to be abrogated at some time, and not having force among all nations; but the latter precept is part of the natural law, binding all men everywhere on earth and at whatever time, and never to be abolished. The Hebrews trifle in their manner, as may be seen in Rabbi Solomon on the second chapter of Jeremiah, and in the Seder Olam (which is the Chronicle of the Hebrews) chapter five: that God gave seven precepts to men after the flood, which they call the precepts of the sons of Noah and the precepts of nature, by which they judge even the Gentiles to be bound, arranged in this order: Not to worship idols; To bless God; To beware of incest with kindred and every nefarious intercourse; Not to shed human blood; Not to seize others' goods; Not to take a limb from a living animal.

§27. Two post-flood precepts (blood-eating: positive & temporary; homicide: natural & perpetual); the rabbinic ‘precepts of the sons of Noah.’ Margin: “The first precepts given to man after the flood.”

But in place of what the Latin version has, “Flesh with the blood you shall not eat,” in the Hebrew it is: “Flesh in its soul [life], in its blood, you shall not eat.” Frequent in the sacred letters, according to the property of the Hebrew tongue, is the use of the figure which they call Apposition; for [a word] is set bes[ide]…

§28. The Hebrew reads ‘flesh in its soul/blood’; the figure of Apposition. Margin: “The Hebrew reading.” Continues on p. 327.

— p. 396 (PDF) · printed p. 327 —

…for a word is set beside [another] for the explanation of the prior word, as here that phrase, “in its blood,” is set beside to explain what had been said, “in its soul.” So that the sense is: You shall not eat flesh with the blood which is the soul of the animal, or in which is its soul, as is written in Leviticus chapter seventeen, “The soul of all flesh is in the blood.”

§28 (cont.). ‘In its blood’ explains ‘in its soul’ — the blood is the animal's life (Lev 17).

The word “soul” [anima] moreover is taken variously in the sacred letters, but four chief various significations of it may be observed: first, for man himself, as there, “The soul that has sinned, the same shall die,” and when Scripture says that seventy souls went out from the thigh of Jacob and entered Egypt: second, for the rational soul, as when the Lord said, “Fear not those who kill the body, but cannot kill the soul”: third, for the lower part of the soul — that is, for the sentient soul and its faculties — as when we are commanded to love God with all our heart, soul, and all our strength, and when these three are enumerated in man: body, soul, and spirit. Akin to this is the use of the word “soul” for the will, desire, lust, or cupidity, as when it is said, “Deliver him not into the soul of his enemies,” that is, into their will, do not permit him to the power of his enemies, that whatever they wished to do against him they might carry out and accomplish according to their lust. The last signification of this word is for life. Hence is that, “He lays down his soul for his sheep,” that is, his life; and that Hebrew phrase, “My soul is always in my hands,” that is, I am always in the extreme peril of life, and always see death hanging over me. And in this signification it is taken here when it is said, “Flesh in its soul you shall not eat.” That is, You shall not eat living flesh, as the wild beasts do, which eat the flesh of living things both men and animals: or, You shall not eat blood, by which the life of animals is chiefly contained. The Seventy Interpreters translated, “You shall not eat flesh in the blood of the soul”: which reading must be referred to the sense expounded above; for blood is called “of the soul” because it is the blood which is the soul of the animal, or by which the soul is chiefly sustained and preserved.

§29. The four scriptural senses of ‘soul’ (man / rational soul / sentient soul & will / life); the LXX reading. Margins: “Four significations of this word, Soul”; Ezek. 18; Gen. 40; Deut. 10; Acts 7; Matt. 10; Deut. 6; Matt. 22; Ps. 40; John 10; Ps. 118; “The reading of the Seventy Interpreters.”

There follows: “For I will require the blood of your lives at the hand of all beasts,” etc. What the connection of this sentence is with the preceding, and what it makes toward not eating the blood of animals — that man's

blood ought not to be shed, and that against it a capital penalty is established — is not easy to explain: but this will be said below. He says, “the blood of your souls,” either taking “soul” for life, or because through the blood the soul is chiefly preserved in the body and is vigorous in it — since the blood, according to the Philosophers, is the seat and vehicle of the soul and its principal instrument: for from it, according to its varying temper, the natural, vital, and animal spirits arise. But perhaps a simpler and plainer interpretation would be that the word “soul” is here put for man himself, so that the sense is, “the blood of your souls,” that is, your blood. And that phrase, “to require blood at the hand of someone,” is a Hebraism, signifying the same as [to afflict with] the extreme [punishment]…

§30. ‘The blood of your souls’; blood as seat of the soul (the Philosophers); ‘require blood at the hand of’ = a Hebraism for capital punishment. Margin: “How fearful blood in the animal is to man.” Continues on p. 328.

— p. 397 (PDF) · printed p. 328 —

…to afflict with the extreme punishment and to strike with the capital penalty him who has shed the blood of a man and committed homicide.

§30 (cont.). The Hebraism = inflicting the death penalty on the murderer.

But how does God require the blood of man at the hand of beasts? Does He call the beasts into judgment, and, their cause being examined, pronounce sentence and condemn [them] to death? This is variously explained. Rupert by the word “beasts” understands the malignant spirits who shall receive eternal judgment for the spiritual death of souls. But — to say nothing of the fact that the demons are chiefly damned for their own sins which they committed before the creation of man — that interpretation is certainly not only not literal, but even in the mystical kind itself is exceedingly harsh and least of all probable. Others by “beasts” interpret men who, after the manner of wild animals, fierce and cruel, thirst for human blood. But neither does this please. For Moses in this place distinguishes beasts from men, saying that the blood of man will be required at the hand of beasts and

at the hand of men: from which it appears that the word “beast” is here properly put.

§31. How can God ‘require blood from beasts’? Rupert (demons) and the ‘brutal men’ reading both rejected — ‘beast’ is literal. Margins: “How God requires man's blood at the hand of beasts”; Rupert.

Cajetan thinks it is signified that, when a beast kills a man, that killing is naturally unjust: because man is not the natural food of any beast, since the food is more imperfect than that which is nourished, being ordered to it. So the sense is: It does not come about from the natural order established by me that beasts kill men to eat them; for this is against nature, nor decreed by me but permitted, as being naturally evil, and therefore it is signified as to be required by God. So he. His exposition the reader will perceive of himself to be very Metaphysical, and not congruent with the meaning of the words of Moses. Some refer it to the slayers of Martyrs: for the Tyrants exposed the Martyrs to wild beasts, that they might be torn apart and mangled by their claws and teeth. But although they themselves did not kill the Martyrs, but the beasts, yet the guilt and penalty of the slaughter of the Martyrs was the Tyrants', not the beasts': wherefore the blood of the Martyrs was not to be required at the hand of the beasts, but at the hand of the tyrants.

§32. Cajetan's ‘naturally unjust killing’ reading (too metaphysical) and the martyr-to-beasts reading both set aside. Margin: Cajetan.

That interpretation, therefore, is truer: that God said the blood of man was to be required by Him at the hand of beasts because He was about to give a law by which it was to be commanded that an animal which killed a man should itself also be killed. For thus it is read in Exodus twenty-one: “If an ox gore a man or a woman, and they die, it shall be stoned.” Just as in another place, if anyone had lain with a beast, He commanded both to be killed. And that phrase, “at the hand of man, at the hand of every man, and at the hand of his brother will I require the life of man,” has great emphasis and exaggeration: for it signifies that he who has shed the blood of a man

will be capitally punished, whoever he be — that is, whether a man having power and abusing it, or a brother, that is, a kinsman or relative, or a man, that is, any other stranger. No one, therefore, shall shed human blood with impunity. Among the Hebrews it is frequent to say “man” for anyone whatever, and “brother” for him whom we call our neighbor. So the sense will be: At the hand of any neighbor whatever will I require the blood which he has shed. But speaking of homicide, He mentions especially “man” [and] “brother,” says Cajetan, because homicides are more frequently committed among those who associate with one another. For Persians are not killed by Spaniards, nor vice versa.

§33–34. The true reading: the law that a man-killing animal be slain (Exod 21); and the ‘man / brother’ emphasis = every killer punished (Cajetan: kin kill kin most often). Margins: Exodus 21; Cajetan.

— p. 398 (PDF) · printed p. 329 —

But that sentence, “Whosoever shall shed human blood, his blood shall be shed,” is very famous and bandied about by the people in the manner of a proverb: to which that saying of the Lord has the same force, “All who shall take the sword, shall perish by the sword.” And that which is in the Apocalypse, “He that shall kill by the sword, must be killed by the sword.” Since, therefore, most people are moved more by the evils and punishments of the body than of the mind, and of this life than of the future, and are more vehemently deterred from doing evil; therefore the Lord established the capital penalty against murderers, which penalty He confirmed in the law He gave to the Hebrews. For thus it is read in Exodus 21: “If anyone willingly and of set purpose kill his neighbor, thou shalt take him away from my altar, that he may die.” Namely, God willed there to be for him no place of pardon or refuge of clemency, who had both conceived in mind and perpetrated by hand so atrocious a crime of killing a man. And this precept of God King Solomon most religiously observed: for Joab, guilty of the slaughter of the two princes of the army, Abner and Amasa, although he had fled to the tabernacle of God and seized the horn of the altar, was

nevertheless thence by Solomon's command dragged away and killed. And this law about the penalty of homicide endures even among Christians, and today is in force among most nations.

§35. The famous ‘blood for blood’ maxim (cf. the sword-sayings); confirmed in the Law (Exod 21, no altar-refuge for murderers — Joab & Solomon). Margins: Matt. 26; Apoc. 13.

Therefore when the Lord said, “Who shall shed human blood, his blood shall be shed,” He sanctioned the penalty of homicide by an eternal law, and instituted the secular power, and delivered the sword into its hand, and commanded that it punish murderers. Wherefore in two ways God has fortified us against those who lie in wait for the lives of men and thirst for human blood: both because He has testified that He will be the avenger and vindicator; and because He committed to human power the injuries of men to be avenged and the damages to be compensated. Wherefore Paul commands Christians to revere, honor, and fear the secular powers: “He that resists,” he says, “the power, resists the ordinance of God, and acquires damnation to himself. For princes are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil: but if thou do evil, fear, for he beareth not the sword without cause: for he is the minister of God, an avenger to wrath against him that doth evil.”

§36. By this law God founded the secular sword-power against murderers (Rom 13). Margins: “In two ways God fortifies us against those who plot against life”; Rom. 13.

But how is that true, “Whosoever shall shed human blood, his blood shall be shed,” since many murderers have escaped the punishment of death, and have committed the slaughter not of one man only but even of many men with impunity? But the answer is easy. The Lord does not speak of the fact and event itself, but of the desert of murderers and of the punishment due to them, which is established and prepared for them according to laws both divine and human. For he who kills a man, by this very thing deserves the punishment of death, and to him, for the penalty of his crime, by divi[ne law]…

§37. ‘Blood for blood’ speaks of the murderer's desert, not the actual outcome. Margin: “How it is true that whoever kills a man is himself to be killed.” Continues on p. 330.

— p. 399 (PDF) · printed p. 330 —

…and human [law] death is to be inflicted: so that the sense is, on him who has killed a man both my law and the laws of almost all nations will impose the penalty of death.

§37 (cont.). Divine and human law alike sentence the murderer to death.

But in place of what the Latin reading has, “Whosoever shall shed human blood, his blood shall be shed,” it is thus in Hebrew, if you render word for word: “Who shall shed the blood of man in man, his blood shall be shed.” But what it is to shed the blood of man “in man” has various interpretations. Tostatus interprets that “in man” as “within the man”: and to shed the blood of a man within the man, he says, is to kill a man without pouring out his blood outside — which is done by suffocation, or strangulation, or poison. But it is too inept an expression, and not in use among the Hebrews, that one who is suffocated or killed by poison should be said to have his blood shed within himself: for how is blood shed within the man himself? Accordingly Oleaster expounds it in two ways: first, “who shall defile a man with his blood, by killing him,” etc. So to shed the blood of a man “in man” is to defile the man whose blood is shed by the pouring out of his own blood. But he himself more approves the other exposition: that the phrase “in man” be joined with what follows, “his blood shall be shed”; and that “in man” be said, in the Hebrew manner, for “by man.” For the divine law established that the kinsmen of him who was killed should have the right of killing the murderers.

§38. The Hebrew ‘sheds blood in man’: Tostatus (= killing without bloodshed, rejected) vs. Oleaster (= ‘by man,’ the kin-avenger of Num 35). Margins: “The Hebrew reading”; Tostatus; Oleaster; Num. 35.

The Chaldaic Paraphrase refers that “in man” to the witnesses and judges, by whom the crime of the murderer is to be convicted and punished. For

thus it expressed this place: “Who shall shed the blood of man, by witnesses, according to the sentence of the judges, let his blood be shed”: by which words it is declared that it is not lawful for any private man to make an attack upon a murderer and exact a penalty from him, but that this is the office of the public magistrate, who himself too ought not to be hasty to condemn and punish a murderer, unless first the accused be convicted by suitable witnesses, and the whole cause diligently examined and explored, [and] sentence pronounced.

§39. The Chaldee: ‘by man’ = by witnesses and judges — punishment belongs to the public magistrate, not private vengeance. Margin: “The Chaldaic Paraphrase.”

Cajetan, in place of “in man,” reads “against man,” following this (as he thinks) genuine reading from the Hebrew: “pouring out the blood of man against man, his blood shall be poured out.” He said “against man,” says Cajetan, both to exclude irrational animals from this penal law (which exclusion needed to be made, because in common he had premised that he would require the blood of man at the hand of beast and of man; but the animals are excluded from this penal law, because they do not kill a man “against man,” that is, for the injury and insult of a man); and also to exclude the killing of men done by just judges: for such do not kill a man “against man,” that is, to afflict him with injury and insult, but for the avenging of crimes and the preservation of the public good. And one must understand that by these words of God the penalty of talion is decreed for the murderer according to his desert: for it is decr[eed]…

§40. Cajetan reads ‘against man’ — excluding both beasts and just judges, and establishing the law of talion. Margin: Cajetan. Continues on p. 331.

— p. 400 (PDF) · printed p. 331 —

…for it is decreed that the murderer deserves the punishment of death, to be inflicted on him by God and by the judges acting in God's stead.

§40 (cont.). The talion: death, inflicted by God or His deputy judges.

From all the aforesaid words of God against murderers, as they are in the Hebrew Scripture, the Hebrews demonstrate that every kind of human slaughter is forbidden by these words. First, when it is said, “Shedding the blood of man, by men shall his blood be shed”: this, they say, is understood of him who kills a man by himself, not by another suborned for it. That phrase, “But yet the blood of your souls I will require,” they say is said of him who has brought death upon himself [suicide]. That phrase, moreover, “At the hand of every living thing I will require the blood of man,” must be understood of him who exposes his neighbor to a beast to be torn apart. Finally that phrase, “At the hand of man, at the hand of his brother man, will I require the life of man,” must be understood of him who hires other men to kill a man.

§41. The Hebrews' fourfold reading: it forbids killing in person, suicide, exposing a man to a beast, and hiring assassins. Margin: “Observation of the Hebrews.”

There remains the last part of this sentence: “For to the image of God was man made.” A most powerful reason is contained in these words (unless one be plainly senseless) for restraining man and deterring him from homicide: namely, because thereby the most magnificent and most honored and illustrious of all the visible works of God, bearing the express image of God Himself, is destroyed. Would not one who casts down and breaks a public statue of the king, set up in a frequented place, be deemed worthy of the utmost punishment? What punishment, then, can be equal to the crime of those who fear not to scatter and destroy not a mute and inanimate, but a living and intelligent image of God? Hear Chrysostom: “A huge terror,” he says, “is built up by these words: as if it were said, if it does not call you back from the slaughter of a man that he is of the same nature as you, if you are so wholly wicked and impious in mind that you count it as nothing to violate the fraternal bond and have put off all compassion and feeling of humanity, yet consider that he was made to the image of God, and with how great prerogatives God has dignified him, and that he has been endowed with dominion and command over every creature: and this

thought will restrain you from so monstrous a purpose proposed.”

§42. The crowning deterrent: the murdered man is God's living image — like smashing the king's statue (Chrysostom). Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 27 on Genesis; Gen. 1.

Nor unlike is that of Ambrose: “God demonstrates by these words,” says Ambrose, “that the nature of man is domestic and familiar to Him, and for that cause that what He sees cruelly and impiously committed against His own household member will not go unavenged with Him. The cause of vengeance added serves, first, that we may exclude the opinions of certain philosophers who deny that God has care of men, either to be rewarded or punished; next, that, knowing the prerogative of our avenging to remain with God, we should neither commit against others what is to be avenged by divine judgment, nor ourselves dread death too vehemently, since we know that the killing of an innocent man is not held in contempt with God, but rather that vengeance will be most certain.” So Ambrose.

§43. Ambrose: man is God's household; the ‘cause of vengeance’ refutes the philosophers who deny providence and steadies us against fearing death. Margin: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 26.

But since here it is signified that he who kills a man is therefore to be struck with the extreme punishment because he kills him who was made to the image of God, from this Oleaster argues that the whole man was made to the image of God — that is, both according to body and soul: otherwise, one killing a man, if the image of God were only [in the soul]…

§44. Oleaster's odd inference: that the whole man (body too) is God's image. Continues on p. 332.

— p. 401 (PDF) · printed p. 332 —

…in the soul, he would not destroy the image of God, since he does not kill the soul. If, therefore, man was made to the image of God both according to soul and body, since God is of Himself incorporeal, it would be fitting to think that God, when He created man, assumed human nature, and thus that man is truly said to have been made to the image of God. But this opinion, as utterly absurd, we refuted in the fourth book of these Commentaries on

Genesis, when we explained those words, “Let us make man to our image and likeness.” But because Oleaster repeats that opinion here, I wished to renew the memory of it for the reader, that he might understand how greatly that figment pleased Oleaster.

§44 (cont.). Pererius rejects Oleaster's view (it would imply God assumed a human body at creation) — refuted already in bk. 4.

SECOND DISPUTATION. On the eating of blood forbidden to men.

Three questions are to be treated in this disputation: of which the first is, What it is to eat flesh with blood; the second, Why God so greatly forbade man the eating of blood; the third, Of what sort is that reason or cause which God renders why one must abstain from eating blood — namely, that whosoever has shed the blood of a man, his blood also is to be shed: for what connection has abstinence from the slaughter of men with abstinence from eating the blood of animals? The difficulty of the first question consists in the various exposition of that phrase, “to eat flesh with blood.” Eugubinus thinks it is a figurative expression, and that by it is forbidden the effusion of human blood and homicide: to eat flesh with blood, therefore, is to kill a living man, whose life is chiefly sustained by blood, and, his blood being shed, to deprive him of life. To this exposition the words which follow give credence, all of which pertain to the effusion of human blood and to homicide: for unless this were to eat flesh with blood, what, I beseech, would be that reason which God renders why He does not wish flesh to be eaten with blood? “Because,” He says, “I will require your blood at the hand of beasts and of men”: which reason, if that “to eat flesh with blood” be taken properly, is unsuitable and inept; but if it be taken figuratively for homicide, it is most congruent and most powerful. And there is a frequent metaphor in the Sacred letters, “to eat the flesh of someone” or “to drink [his] blood,” for the thing which is to seek and contrive his death: which metaphor Homer followed [when] he called war σαρκ■φαγον [flesh-eating], because by it many are consumed and perish. To these add that the eating of blood makes nothing toward the

uncleanness of man — otherwise we Christians too would abstain from it: not, therefore, is it to be thought that God was so solicitous about forbidding it…

§45. The three questions of Disp. 2; Eugubinus's figurative reading ('eat flesh with blood' = homicide; Homer's 'flesh-eating war'; blood-eating brings no uncleanness). Margins: "What it is to eat flesh with blood"; Eugubinus; Homer. Continues on p. 333.

— p. 402 (PDF) · printed p. 333 —

…that He should wish to bind man by this first precept after the flood: but rather it was His care in the first place to deter men from homicide, lest that fewness of men should be diminished also through homicide, and lest there should then happen what had befallen at the beginning of the world, when Cain killed his brother Abel. And this is the opinion of Eugubinus, expounded and confirmed by us a little more fully.

§45 (cont.). Eugubinus: the real concern was deterring homicide (lest a new Cain thin the few survivors).

Nevertheless two things vehemently oppose Eugubinus. For the preceding words altogether exclude this interpretation. For God had said that He permitted man the eating of any animals whatever: He at once subjoins, "Save that flesh with the blood you shall not eat": what, I beseech, is this exception, or how does it pertain to the matter at hand, if to eat flesh with blood is understood not of the real flesh and blood of animals, but by metaphor of homicide? Surely nothing else is here forbidden than what was afterward forbidden by the law of Moses: but the law, in forbidding the eating of flesh with blood, spoke of the real flesh and blood of animals, not of homicide. Besides, this vehemently convicts this exposition of falsity: that this manner of speaking, "to eat flesh with blood," is nowhere in scripture put for that which is to kill a man; but for that which is to eat the flesh and blood of animals, it is most frequently used, as may be seen in Leviticus, Deuteronomy, and the first book of Kings.

§46. Two objections refute Eugubinus: the exception fits only literal animal-flesh, and ‘eat flesh with blood’ never means ‘kill a man’ in Scripture. Margin: “Eugubinus is refuted.”

Scripture indeed sometimes uses that phrase, “to eat the flesh of someone,” for that which is to seek his death or even to contrive [it] against him — namely, to exaggerate hatred against someone, by the mad desire of avenging whom one would gladly devour his flesh and drink his blood. So David spoke in Psalm 26: “While the harmful draw near against me to eat my flesh.” So also Job, as is written in chapter 31: “The men of my tabernacle said,” he says, “Who will give us of his flesh that we may be filled?” — which, although some have interpreted of the supreme benevolence and love of the servants toward Job, yet in truth has the contrary meaning. For it signifies that, because Job treated his servants harshly and sharply, in order to keep them in the duty of temperance, justice, faith, and obedience, for that very reason he was so hateful to them that they desired to devour his flesh.

§47. Scripture does use ‘eat the flesh of’ for seeking one's death (Ps 26; Job 31 — the servants' hatred of strict Job). Margin: “The passage of Job ch. 31.”

— p. 403 (PDF) · printed p. 334 —

Wherefore St. Gregory, in the 22nd book of the Morals, explaining those very words, says that they can indeed be understood by mystery of our Savior, with the food of whose body and the drink of whose blood the faithful, hungering, desire to sate their souls (to signify which also, in the Office which is celebrated of the Sacrament of the Lord's Body, these words of Job are beautifully accommodated): yet according to the sense of history it is rather signified that the most holy man Job, because he cultivated and most strictly kept the duties of all the virtues, procured for himself many enemies most desirous of his death. But I return to what I had begun to say, whence I digressed a little to the exposition of this place of Job. It is indeed found in scripture “to eat the flesh of someone” for that which is to assail someone in his life and deprive him of life: but “to eat flesh with blood” will nowhere in the sacred letters be found put to signify

that. The exposition of Eugubinus, therefore, being rejected, let us pass on to others.

§48. Gregory (Morals 22) on the Job text (mystically of the Eucharist; literally Job's strictness earning enemies). Final rejection of Eugubinus. Margin: St. Gregory.

St. Chrysostom interprets “to eat flesh with blood” as to eat an animal suffocated [strangled], containing within itself its blood: which kind of eating of an animal is forbidden also by the law of Moses. But although this is in part true, yet it does not wholly fulfill the meaning of the divine command. For “to eat flesh with blood” extends more widely than “to eat the suffocated.” Wherefore in those things which the Apostles prescribed to be observed by those converted from Gentilism, they distinctly and separately forbade the eating of the suffocated [strangled] and of blood.

§49. Chrysostom (= eating strangled flesh) is only partly right; ‘flesh with blood’ is broader (cf. Acts 15, which lists strangled and blood separately). Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 27 on Genesis; Lev. 17; Acts 15.

Cajetan, reading this place from the Hebrew thus, “Only flesh in its soul, in its blood, you shall not eat,” judges that by these words the natural manner of eating flesh is defined by God, and that it is signified that the living flesh of animals having blood is not to be eaten; for such a manner of feeding on flesh is bestial, not human. And that this is the meaning of those words, if the words themselves be weighed, is manifest: for “flesh in its soul,” or “its soul,” is nothing other than living flesh; similarly what is added by apposition, “in its blood,” signifies living flesh endowed with blood — and this in distinction from the many animals which we are accustomed to eat even alive, because they are bloodless and tiny, such as shellfish and others like these. God, therefore, in permitting man the eating of flesh, taught him that the natural manner of eating flesh to be observed by him is far different from that by which wild beasts and many fishes eat flesh. And this is Cajetan's sense.

§50. Cajetan: the verse forbids eating the living flesh of blooded animals (the bestial way) — with shellfish as the bloodless exception. Margin: Cajetan.

I indeed do not deny that the eating of living flesh is also forbidden by these words: but I do not assent to Cajetan that this kind of eating of flesh is either only or chiefly signified here. For since the nature of man vehemently abhors that eating (unless one perhaps be of a bestial disposition and stomach, and similar to that Homeric Polyphemus, who ought to be reckoned among the monsters of human nature), it would have been superfluous to enjoin on man an express prohibition of that thing, no less certainly than to forbid him cannibalism.

§51. Pererius: living-flesh-eating is too repugnant to need an express ban (only a Polyphemus would do it). Margin: Homer, Odyssey bk. 9.

Lyra, Tostatus, and the Carthusian say that flesh can be eaten with blood in four ways: either by cutting off some living limb from an animal; or by eating a suffocated [strangled] animal, or one taken by hunting or fowling; or finally by eating blood separately: and that in all these ways the eating of blood is forbidden. Their opinion is true: but it could more conveniently be reduced to two members. For blood can be eaten in two ways: either within the animal itself, by eating the blood together with the flesh of the animal — whether that animal was alive or in whatever way dead: or by eating the blood outside the animal itself, that is, separately and by itself, or as a liquid in the manner of drink…

§52. Lyra/Tostatus/Carthusian's four modes of ‘eating flesh with blood,’ which Pererius reduces to two (blood within the flesh, or blood taken separately). Margins: Lyra; Tostatus; the Carthusian. Continues on p. 335.

— p. 404 (PDF) · printed p. 335 —

…as a liquid by sipping, or in the manner of food, congealed and mixed with other things, as it is now eaten in sausages: but both these modes of eating blood are forbidden by the aforesaid words of the Lord. But concerning the first question, thus far.

§52 (cont.). Both ways of eating blood (sipped, or as in sausages) are forbidden. End of question 1.

The second question is: Why God so severely forbade man to eat blood. At three times — before the law of Moses, in the law of Moses, and also in the time of the Evangelical law at the beginning of the nascent Church — the eating of blood is read to have been forbidden in the sacred letters. Let us, therefore, inquire into the causes of so general and so often repeated a prohibition. First, long before the law of Moses — nay, immediately after the flood, as Moses narrates here — God commanded men to abstain from eating blood. But why? Namely, that He might the more vehemently deter man from homicide, which, as it is in itself detestable, so at that time, in so great a fewness of men, would have been deadly to the human race. As if the Lord had signified: If I do not wish you to desire the eating of the blood of animals, how much less to thirst for human blood, and to satisfy the rabid hunger of vengeance by atrociously shedding the blood of man? This cause Chrysostom touched on; and besides that, that it has been handed down by the wise men of the world that the blood of brutes is heavy and earthy, and the cause of many diseases if it is eaten. The same also pertains to the cleanliness and decency of human diet: for it is foul to see, and almost horrible, to behold one feeding on flesh drenched and dripping with blood, and bloodying the mouth and lips of those eating.

§53. Question 2: why God forbade blood. Before the law (right after the flood) — to deter homicide (Chrysostom); also blood is unwholesome and foul to eat. Margins: Acts 15; "Why God forbade eating blood immediately after the flood"; Chrysostom, hom. 27 on Genesis.

But this reason seems to me preferable: that, the minds of men being long before the law fore-cultivated and as it were prepared by the observance of such things, they might neither submit to the yoke of the law to be imposed on them with difficulty, nor bear it grudgingly. For many things were anciently in use among good and religious worshippers of God, which afterward through the law of Moses were sanctioned and prescribed to be observed by the Hebrews: for example, abstinence from eating blood; the distinction of clean and unclean animals; the making of vows; the offering

of tithes; the raising up of seed for a brother who died without children; the capital penalty for adultery; and certain other things similar to these: to the cultivation and observance of which, men being long before accustomed, the law of Moses, commanding the same things, was afterward less burdensome. So much, then, be said about the time which preceded the law of Moses.

§54. Pererius's preferred reason: such practices prepared men in advance so the Mosaic yoke would sit lightly (cf. clean/unclean, vows, tithes, levirate, etc.).

Next it follows that we teach why the law of Moses so severely forbade the Hebrews the eating of blood. This prohibition of the Mosaic law is read in many places, but nowhere more expressly and distinctly than in chapter 17 of Leviticus, where it is thus: “Any man whatever of the house of Israel, and of the strangers who sojourn among you, if he eat blood, I will set my face against his soul, and will destroy him from among his people, because the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you that upon my altar you may make atonement for your souls, and the blood may be for an expiation of the soul. If anyone, therefore, by hunting or fowling take a wild beast or a bird which it is lawful to eat, let him pour out its blood and cover it with earth.” These are the words of the law about [not eating blood]…

§55. Why the Mosaic law forbade blood so severely — the key text, Leviticus 17. Margin: “Five causes why the law of Moses forbade the Hebrews to eat blood.” Continues on p. 336.

— p. 405 (PDF) · printed p. 336 —

…not eating blood, whether by itself, or together with the flesh of the animal.

§55 (cont.). The Leviticus law covers blood eaten by itself or with the flesh.

And by these words two causes are signified for which God did not wish the Hebrews to eat blood: the first cause is touched on in those words, “because its life is in the blood” — that is, the life of the animal chiefly

consists in the blood: which is made manifest in three ways. For, as Aristotle defines, life consists in the hot and the moist: and such most of all is blood; nor can life subsist without nourishment, and the last nourishment is blood; finally, the vital spirit, which (as by its very name it shows) contains the life of the animal, is nothing other than the blood itself, but thinner, purer, and more fervid. But someone will say, what force has that reason: the life of the animal chiefly consists in the blood, therefore the blood of the animal is not to be eaten? This, namely: because the blood is the life of the animal, to eat the blood is the same as to eat the very life of the animal, or to eat the living animal itself: but this is inhuman and bestial, and what all ought to shun and shudder at.

§56. First cause (Lev 17): the animal's life is in the blood (proven three ways from Aristotle) — so eating it is like eating the live animal. Margins: "That the animal's life chiefly consists in the blood"; Aristotle.

The latter reason is signified in those words: "And I have given it to you, that upon my altar you may make atonement for your souls." For God commanded that, for the expiation of crimes, the blood of the animals which were sacrificed be placed upon the altar, or poured at its base: for, because the blood is in a way the soul of the animals, it was fittingly enough sacrificed for the expiation of the souls of men; or because, on account of the crimes committed, the blood and life of men ought to have been poured out and destroyed, the clement and at the same time just Lord, for the life and soul of man, commanded the life and blood of animals to be offered to Him. Whence Chrysostom, considering that God granted to man the eating of flesh but denied [him] that of blood: "the flesh of animals," he says, "He indulged to man, because that pertained to his utility: but the blood He reserved to Himself, to be sacrificed in the offerings."

§57. Second cause: blood was reserved for atonement on the altar (life given for life). Margin: Chrysostom, hom. 27 on Genesis.

But besides the two aforesaid reasons, St. Thomas adds three others: the first, for the sake of fleeing Idolatry, to which the Hebrews were prone

enough (for the worshippers of idols poured libations of the blood of the victims): the second, in hatred and detestation of homicide, that they might so much the more shudder at the effusion of human blood, to whom the eating of the blood of animals was so severely forbidden (wherefore in Genesis 9, when it had been said, “Flesh with the blood you shall not eat,” there is subjoined, “For I will require the blood of your souls”): the third, for reverence of the divine majesty: for because the blood is the life of the animal, it is offered to God alone, that it may be signified that He is the author of our life, and that the things which pertain to the preservation of our life ought to be ascribed to Him rather than to ourselves or our parents or any other causes whatever.

§58. Aquinas's three further causes: to shun idolatry, to deepen horror of homicide, and to honor God as author of life. Margin: Aquinas, I-II, q. 102, art. 3.

It remains to inquire into what was set in the third place: why the prohibition of eating blood, even in the time of the Evangelical law — in the first Council of the Church and the decree of the Apostles — was confirmed not only among the Jews, but also enjoined on all converted from Gentilism to Christ. The words of the decree Luke handed down to memory, writing thus: “It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no further burden than these neces[sary things]…

§59. Question 3: why the apostolic decree (Acts 15) bound even Gentile Christians from blood. Margins: “Why even in the time of the Evangelical law eating blood was forbidden to Christians”; “The passage Acts 15.” Continues on p. 337.

— p. 406 (PDF) · printed p. 337 —

…sary things: That you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which keeping yourselves, you shall do well. Farewell.” It is asked, therefore, why the Apostles wished both to renew among the Jews and to impose on the Gentiles the prohibition of eating blood — especially since the force of the ceremonial precepts of the Mosaic law had vanished after the death of

our Lord, and their observance, after the promulgation of the Gospel, was even detestable and ruinous to Christians, as St. Paul testifies with great asseveration and apostolic authority: “Behold, I Paul say to you, that if you be circumcised, Christ will profit you nothing.” What Paul said of Circumcision, the same can be said of all the other legal ceremonies. I shall briefly set forth various ways of loosing this knot.

§59 (cont.). The Acts 15 decree; the puzzle (the ceremonial law was dead — Gal 5 on circumcision). Margin: Gal. 5.

Origen renders this reason why the Apostles forbade Christians the eating of blood and of strangled things: “Strangled,” he says, “are animals dead without the blood pressed out of them, which they say is indeed the food of demons, on whose reek they feed. These, therefore, are forbidden to be taken as food, lest we be nourished by the food of demons, and the malignant spirits grow together with us, if we equally feed with them on strangled things.” But it is not credible that the Apostles were led to enact that decree by such absurd figments and errors of the Gentiles.

§60. Origen's reason (the blood of strangled things is demons' food) — Pererius finds it incredible. Margin: Origen, Against Celsus, bk. 8.

St. Thomas relates two opinions of certain men bringing forward a by no means probable interpretation of that decree of the Apostles. Some said the words of that decree are not to be taken properly according to the literal sense, but figuratively according to the spiritual understanding: so that by the forbidden “blood” is to be understood that homicide is forbidden; by “strangled,” violence and rapine; by “things sacrificed to idols,” idolatry itself; but that fornication was properly forbidden, because it was evil in itself. And this exposition of the Apostolic decree they drew from certain glosses which expounded the words of that decree mystically. But this argues the improbability of this exposition: both because it is absurd to think that the Apostles, in that so necessary and longed-for decree for pacifying the Churches, wished the words to be taken not according to their

proper and usual signification, but figuratively and mystically; and also because, since among the Gentiles homicide and rapine were held as evil and unlawful, and were forbidden by their laws and most gravely punished, it would have been superfluous to give to the Gentiles converted to Christ a kind of new and singular precept about these. Others thought those things were then forbidden to Christians not for the observance of the Mosaic law, but for the sake of curbing gluttony and repressing pleasure. But since there are other kinds of foods much more delicate to eat than those, and more pleasant to the taste, no reason can be brought why these were not rather forbidden than those.

§61. Two improbable readings of the decree (figurative/mystical; or anti-gluttony) reported by Aquinas and rejected. Margin: Aquinas, I-II, q. 103, art. 4.

The true cause, therefore, why at the beginning of the Church the eating of blood and of the other things contained in that decree was forbidden to Christians is that which St. Augustine expounded, disputing against Faustus: “In the Acts of the Apostles it was commanded by the Apostles that the Gentiles should abstain from fornication, from things sacrificed [to idols], and from blood; which was done because the Apostles wished to choose, for the time, a thing easy and not burdensome to the observers, in which the Gentiles also, together with the Israelites — on account of the corner-stone making the two walls agree in itself — might observe something in common: and at the same time that they might admonish that in the very Ark of Noah, when God first commanded this, the Church of all nations had been prefigured, the prophecy of which fact was now beginning to be fulfilled as the Gentiles came to the faith.

§62. The true reason (Augustine, Against Faustus): an easy common observance to bind Jew and Gentile into one Church (the Ark prefiguring it). Continues on p. 338.

— p. 407 (PDF) · printed p. 338 —

But that time being passed, in which those two walls — one of the Circumcision, the other of the Uncircumcision — although they agreed in

the corner-stone, yet were more distinctly prominent by certain properties of their own: and when the Church of the Gentiles was made such that in it no carnal Israelite appears, what Christian now observes this, that he does not touch thrushes or smaller little birds unless their blood has been poured out? or does not eat a hare if, struck on the neck by the hand, it is killed with no bloody wound? If perhaps a few still dread to touch these, they are laughed at by the rest. So that sentence of truth has instructed the minds of all: ‘Not what enters into your mouth defiles you, but what comes out’; condemning no nature of food which human society admits, but the sins which iniquity commits.” So Augustine.

§62 (cont.). Augustine: once the two ‘walls’ merged, the observance lapsed (cf. Christ: not what enters defiles). Margins: Eph. 2; Gen. 6; Matt. 15.

But although in St. Augustine's time the abstinence from those things had now ceased, as he himself signifies, among most Latins and in the Western Churches; many, however, especially of the Greeks and among the Eastern Churches, were more tenacious of this observance, whether on account of its inveterate custom, or on account of reverence for the Apostolic authority and judgment. Therefore the abstinence from those things was then decreed by the Apostles not for the observance of the Mosaic law, but that the minds of the Jews and Gentiles dwelling together might more easily be glued together and coalesce into one people, those things being removed which could more vehemently dissociate and alienate them. For the Jews, on account of their most ancient custom, incredibly abhorred and shuddered at the eating of blood and of strangled things; and the eating of those things which had been sacrificed to idols brought them great scandal, suspecting it to be an argument of the Gentiles' return to idolatry. But that cause ceasing, the effect also ceased; for the truth of the Evangelical and Apostolic doctrine is manifest to all, by which it is persuaded that what enters by the mouth does not defile man, and that nothing is to be rejected which is received with thanksgiving. But fornication was forbidden because most of the Gentiles thought that simple fornication was not in

itself evil nor unlawful.

§63. The decree was for unity, not law; the East kept it longer; the cause (and so the rule) lapsed — but fornication remained forbidden as evil in itself. Margin: 1 Tim. 4.

The third question is to be treated upon those words of God: “For I will require the blood of your souls,” etc. For when God had commanded that flesh be not eaten with blood, rendering the reason of this precept He subjoins those words, “for I will require the blood of your souls.” It is asked, therefore, of what sort that reason is, and what consequence or connection it has with that precept. For what does it make toward not eating the blood of an animal, that the blood of man ought not to be shed, and that he who has shed it is to be struck with the utmost punishment? I will not, indeed, dissemble that the explanation of this place is very difficult; for the things which the interpreters bring forward in the treatment of this place are such that they neither wholly take away every scruple from the mind, nor does the mind of readers rest in them. I will briefly set down what seems more probable to others, and what to me, leaving the judgment of the better opinion to the reader. If “to eat flesh with blood” signified to shed human blood and to kill a man, as it seemed to Eugubinus, the reason here rendered would doubtless be most apt and most powerful: for it would avail very much to extinguish the desire of committing homicide, to have declared how greatly God detests the slaughter of man, and with how great a punishment He will avenge it. But since above we rejected this exposition of Eugubinus with the best reason, another interpretation must be sought.

§64. Question 3: how does ‘for I will require your blood’ give the reason for the blood-prohibition? (Eugubinus's reading would fit, but it was already rejected.)

— p. 408 (PDF) · printed p. 339 —

Paul of Burgos in this place finds an escape from the proposed difficulty in the diversity of the Hebrew reading, which for that causal conjunction (“for” or “indeed”) has (“but yet”). For thus he himself reads this place

from the Hebrew: “But yet the blood of your souls I will require,” etc. Which coheres well with the preceding words; for the sense is: Although I have permitted you the slaughter of animals for your food, yet I do not permit you the slaughter of men, with whatever mind or in whatever manner it be done; nay, if anyone shed the blood of a man, he shall be punished with the penalty of talion.

§65. Paul of Burgos's escape: the Hebrew has ‘but yet’ (not ‘for’), so it's a contrast, not a reason. Margin: Paul of Burgos.

Matthias Thoringus, the champion of Lyra, who wrote “defensive Replies” (as he calls them) of Lyra's Postills against [Paul of] Burgos, denies that by the aforesaid words of God a reason is set forth why flesh ought not to be eaten with blood, but rather that a certain tacit objection is answered. God had said, “Everything that lives and moves upon the earth shall be food for you”: it could be objected, therefore human flesh can be taken for food, since man is of the number of those that live and move upon the earth: this objection the Lord repels by those words. And one must understand that in these words of the Lord, if not expressly, yet implicitly, this Syllogism is contained: It is not lawful to eat the flesh of an animal unless first the blood of the killed animal be poured out; but it is not lawful to pour out the blood of a man or to kill a man, for a murderer, whoever he be, will be punished with a like penalty of death; therefore it is not lawful to take human flesh for food. The Major of this Syllogism is here expressly set down; the Minor too is expressed, together with its proof — namely the penalty established against the murderer. The conclusion alone, therefore, is what is not here expressly set down; yet it must be understood.

§66. Matthias Thoringus (Lyra's defender): the words answer a tacit objection (may we eat human flesh?) — an implied syllogism whose conclusion (no cannibalism) is left unstated. Margin: Matthias Thoringus.

Nor very dissimilar to this exposition is the interpretation of Cajetan, who reads this place from the Hebrew thus: “And only your blood, to [the protection of] your souls, will I require.” By which words, he says, the

reason of that exception (“Save that flesh with the blood you shall not eat”) is not rendered; but another exception is added, that they should not take human flesh for food. As if He said: Although I have given you all animals for food, yet I will have the flesh of man to be excepted from the matter of nourishment; for it is unjust that man be the nourishment either of an animal or even of another man. And this is signified by saying: “Only your blood, which is to [the protection of] your souls” — that is, to your lives (supply, to be preserved) — “I will require” as unjustly taken away. For from the fact that the office of human blood is to preserve man's life — not only the vegetative and sensitive, but also the rational — it is against reason and the order of nature that he should become the nourishment of anyone, whether animal or man. For nourishment is by its own nature more imperfect than that which is nourished, as being ordered to it as a means to an end; but it is established in general that the end is more perfect than the things ordered to the end: whence it comes about that man by his own nature ought to be the nourishment of none, since he is more excellent than any living creatures whatever, and to other men is equal in the perfection of natural dignity. Thus Cajetan.

§67. Cajetan (similar to Thoringus): the words add a second exception — no eating human flesh, since man (the more perfect) is the nourishment of nothing. Margin: Cajetan.

— p. 409 (PDF) · printed p. 340 —

The Carthusian says that those words, “For I will require your blood,” do not contain a cause properly so called of the above-placed exception, but as it were a motive and sign; so that God, for the greater detestation and prohibition of homicide, forbade animals to be strangled or eaten more atrociously than reason dictates: or that so severe a prohibition of homicide and so atrocious an avenging of it is a sign that God does not wish animals to be more cruelly strangled or eaten than is necessary for the due use of man. For in Deuteronomy too God forbids a kid to be boiled in its mother's milk, and a bird to be taken together with its young; which, although they have a spiritual understanding, nevertheless have also according to the

letter a probable reason — namely, that the Hebrews might avoid cruelty even toward animals; nay, that they might exercise certain duties of piety, that from it they might understand how much more this was needful to be done toward men. Wisely, therefore, Solomon: “The just man,” he says, “knows the souls [lives] of his beasts; but the bowels of the wicked are cruel.” There are, finally, those who turn that “for” from the Hebrew into the adverbs “surely” or “indeed,” in this sense: See lest, while I permit you the slaughter of animals for food and command the effusion of their blood, you think that likewise the effusion of human blood and the slaughter of men is permitted you: indeed, the blood of your souls I will require, etc. These things have been handed down by others.

§68. The Carthusian: the words are a ‘motive,’ not a cause — God dislikes needless cruelty even to animals (Deut: kid in milk, bird with young; Prov 12). Plus the ‘for’→‘indeed’ adverb reading. Margins: Denis the Carthusian; Deut. 22; Prov. 12.

Brief is what I, for my part, have to say besides these. It seems to me, that the sense of the Latin reading may better hold together, that something is here to be supplied by thought, interposed between that, “Flesh with the blood you shall not eat,” and this, “for the blood of your souls I will require”: so that this contains the true reason not of that precept about not eating blood, but of that which I said is to be understood; which can be something like this: But I do not wish you to shed human blood and kill a man, whether for the sake of food, or of vengeance, or of pleasure, or of any thing whatever. For your blood I will require at the hand, etc. For indeed sacred Scripture is sometimes wont to set down something containing the reason and cause of something which nevertheless is not expressed, but must be understood. But if neither this nor the foregoing satisfy the reader's mind, let him either hammer out something better by his own genius, or seek it from others, if perchance someone (whom I have not seen) has found something more probable.

§69. Pererius's own: supply an unstated clause (‘nor do I wish you to kill a man…’) of which ‘for your blood I will require’ is the true reason. Margin: “The author's opinion.”

{And God said, I will set my bow in the clouds, and it shall be the sign of a covenant between me and the earth: And when I shall cover the sky with clouds, my bow shall appear in the clouds, and I will remember my covenant with you, and with every living soul that beareth flesh: and there shall no more be waters of a flood to destroy all flesh.}

Gen 9:13–15 (lemma). Margin: vv. 13, 14, 15.

Already before, God, to Noah and his sons, as soon as they had gone out of the ark, had taken away all fear of any future flood, having promised that He would never thereafter (as He had done before) dissipate and destroy the earth by a general flood. But because He saw that their minds, confused and dismayed by the horror of the past calamity, could not wholly cast off fear — and that, as often as they should see the sky covered with thickest clouds and more frequent and greater rains than usual rushing from the sky, they would be in fear lest some destruction of the world similar to that which they had now experienced should happen — the kind and clement Lord willed, lowering and accommodating Himself to man's weakness, to promise them the same once and again, and moreover to confirm His promise by the sign of the heavenly bow, conspicuous to all mortals and to remain until the end of the world: namely, that as often as men looked upon it, mindful of the divine promise — even if the face of the sky seemed flood-bearing and to threaten the destruction of the whole world — they might nevertheless, all doubt and fear laid aside, hold it most persuaded and most certain that a flood would never come, even to the end of the world.

§70. Why the rainbow-sign was given: to steady the survivors' fear whenever storm-clouds gathered.

— p. 410 (PDF) · printed p. 341 —

But let us weigh God's words, “I will set my bow in the clouds.” God calls the heavenly bow His own, because by a certain special reason it ought to be called His work — namely, on account of its extraordinary beauty, since

(as the supreme Poet said) “Drawing a thousand varied colors from the opposing Sun, it adorns the sky with a notable curve.” Wherefore the Author of the book Ecclesiasticus, describing the beauty and admirable appearance of the heavenly bow: “Look,” he says, “upon the rainbow, and bless him that made it: it is very beautiful in its brightness. It encompasses the heaven about with the circle of its glory: the hands of the most High have opened it.” But I marvel, indeed, why this Author, among the other distinctions of the heavenly bow, did not set down this also — that it was established by God as a symbol of His mercy toward men and a sign of a flood never to be in the future. The poets too made Iris the messenger of the gods, especially of Jupiter, as may be seen in Homer, Hesiod in the Theogony, and Virgil in many places.

§71. ‘My bow’ — its beauty (Virgil; Ecclesiasticus 43); the poets made Iris the gods' messenger. Margins: Virgil, Aeneid bk. 4; Ecclus. 43.

In place of that verb of future time, “I will set,” in Hebrew it is a verb of past time (“I have set”); but in the Septuagint it is of present time (“I set”); but among the Hebrews it is usual for past tenses to be used for future, or the contrary, or even these for present. For as to what some say — that it is difficult to understand how God said after the flood, “I will set my bow in the clouds,” as if before the flood the bow had never appeared in the clouds, but that that difficulty does not befall the Hebrew reading which has the past-tense verb (“I have set”) — this, I say, which those men say, is slight and to be reckoned as nothing. For although Iris existed before the flood, yet not as a sign of the divine covenant; and so after the flood Iris, which had been from the beginning of the world, was applied and constituted by God as a sign of no future flood. But that phrase, “I will set in the clouds,” has emphasis: for it signifies not only that that sign is most fit for signifying that for which it is employed (since it is conspicuous to all everywhere and will remain until the end of the world), but for this cause especially — that from where the flood could be feared, namely from the clouds, thence all fear of the flood is driven away by the appearance of Iris

in the clouds.

§72. The tense (Hebrew ‘I have set’) is no problem — the rainbow existed before the flood but only now became a covenant-sign; ‘in the clouds’ has force (fear is dispelled at its source).

— p. 411 (PDF) · printed p. 342 —

There follows: “And it shall be a sign of a covenant between me and the earth.” God is wont to confirm His promises by various external signs, namely that He may fix their faith and hope more deeply in the minds of men. And sometimes He uses natural signs, as is this sign of Iris: sometimes supernatural signs, as He confirmed to Gideon the promise of victory by the sign of the fleece and the dew, and to King Hezekiah by the sign of the retrograding Sun: sometimes by voluntary signs instituted by Himself, such as was the sign of Circumcision given to Abraham. Again, of those signs by which God is wont to confirm His promises, some last forever, as Iris; or for a very long time, as Circumcision; or for a very short time, as that of Gideon and Hezekiah.

§73. God confirms His promises by signs — natural (the rainbow), supernatural (Gideon's fleece, Hezekiah's sun), or instituted (circumcision); some lasting, some brief. Margins: “The variety of signs by which God confirms His promises”; Judg. 6; 4 Kings (2 Kgs) 20; Gen. 17.

But someone will perhaps doubt: since Iris is a certain natural thing, how can it be a sign of a general flood never to come? Since a general flood is according to nature impossible, but of this natural impossibility of a flood Iris is in no way a sign; but according to God's power a flood is indeed possible, yet it is altogether voluntary, and with respect to nature wholly supernatural: wherefore in no way does Iris seem to be a suitable sign of a flood not to come. But this is solved. Iris is not a natural sign of a flood not to come, nor has it of itself the force of signifying that; but only from the will of God, who, to signify that, took Iris before other things, although He could have employed any other thing whatever for the same: just as, to signify the division of fields, some huge rock or the trunk of a tree is wont to be set up, by the agreement and will of those who possess the fields.

§74. Objection: a natural thing can't signify a supernatural promise. Answer: the rainbow signifies it only by God's institution (like a boundary-stone marking a field by agreement).

— p. 412 (PDF) · printed p. 343 —

“And I will remember my covenant with you.” God did not need the sign of Iris, by the sight of which the memory of His promises might be renewed in Him: for no forgetfulness can befall God, to whom all things are present — both what already have been and what ever shall be. What, then, is “I will remember”? This, namely: As often as you see Iris in the sky, you will recognize my promises given to you, and that I — mindful of them, without doubt — will perform what I promised. Akin to this is the interpretation of Chrysostom, who interprets that “I will remember” as said for that which is, “I will make you remember”; that you may be always certain and always secure that at no time thereafter will there be a flood. Or “I will remember,” that is, I will by the very deed and by facts declare that I am mindful of my promises, and will perform them. Or He said “I will remember” after the likeness of men: for very often Scripture speaks of God in the human manner — not indeed agreeably to His nature and majesty, but accommodated to the lowliness and weakness of men's understanding. Now men are wont to be stirred by certain external signs and brought to the memory of those things which they have determined to do. God, therefore, is said to remember, not as to the proper force of remembering, which in men generally follows forgetfulness, or at least not a present and (as they call it) actual consideration of things: but as to the effect of remembering, which is to fulfill what one had promised or determined to do. Or finally He said “I will remember” for that which is, “I will never forget”; for although remembering properly so called by no means falls upon God, yet most truly forgetfulness is denied of God.

§75. ‘I will remember’ — said of the changeless God by accommodation: not literal recall (after forgetting), but the effect of remembering — fulfilling the promise. Margins: “How God is said to remember”; Chrysostom, hom. 27 on Genesis.

But in this place I would have the reader observe two things: one is, that for Christian men the heavenly bow, when it appears in the sky, is to be contemplated not only in the philosophical manner as a most beautiful and most admirable work of nature, but chiefly as a sign of the divine covenant about no flood ever more to come. The remembrance of which covenant will present two things to our minds: the Justice and the Mercy of God. The Justice indeed, in that, on account of the crimes of men, God once destroyed nearly the whole world by a general flood. From which a certain chaste and holy fear of God will arise in our minds, that above all we beware of offending God by our crimes and provoking Him to wrath and vengeance. And because by the example of the flood it is clear that God is omnipotent, and that it is in His hand to destroy this whole world even in a point of time and reduce it to nothing, let us perpetually worship and venerate Him, the true and only God and supreme Lord of all things. But the Mercy of God shone forth greatly in this, that, having pitied men, He promised and decreed that He would never thereafter send a flood — not because after the flood there would not be men either equally or even more wicked than those who perished in the flood, but because His mercies are above all His works. For so many and so great were the sins of men after the flood that they were more than a thousand times most worthy of the punishment of a flood. [And so]…

§76. First lesson: Christians should view the rainbow as the covenant-sign — recalling God's Justice (the flood) and Mercy (the promise). Margin: "That the Christian contemplation of the rainbow surpasses the philosophical." Continues on p. 344.

— p. 413 (PDF) · printed p. 344 —

…And so it is of the mercies of the Lord (as Jeremiah said) that we are not consumed.

§76 (cont.). Jer.: by God's mercy we are not consumed. Margin: Lamentations 3.

The other thing to be observed by the reader is, how great was the difference between the justice and the mercy of God. For the force of

justice and the rigor of vengeance was of the briefest time, for there was a single flood and of only one year: but the benefit of the divine mercy concerning no future flood was perpetual, embracing the whole age of the world. And so most truly Isaiah makes God speak thus: “In a moment of indignation I hid my face a little from thee, and in everlasting mercy have I had mercy on thee. As in the days of Noah this is to me, to whom I swore that I would not bring the waters of a flood upon the earth: so have I sworn that I will not be angry with thee and will not rebuke thee. The mountains shall be moved and the hills shall tremble: but my mercy shall not depart from thee, and the covenant of my peace shall not be moved.” In which words it is fitting to notice that that promise of God given to Noah about no flood to come is in that place called the oath of God, which in the book of Genesis is named the covenant and pact of God — so that by the word both of oath and of covenant may be signified the immutable certainty and firmness of the divine promise.

§77. Second lesson: justice lasted one year, mercy lasts the world's whole age (Isaiah 54 — the ‘oath’/‘covenant’ marks its immutable firmness). Margin: Isaiah 54.

But in truth two things which God here promised to Noah ought to be rightly understood: for He promised that a flood would not come — not indeed a particular flood of this or that city or even province (for such floods after that promise of God happened not once, as was the flood of Ogyges and of Deucalion), but a general flood inundating and overwhelming the whole earth. Next, God promised that He would never thereafter dissipate and destroy the whole earth and the things that are in it. But this must be understood of a flood: for by fire at the end of the world He will destroy the whole earth. God therefore speaks of a flood, and of a general flood, which at no time after that promise of God was to be feared by men.

§78. Two clarifications: the promise covers only a universal flood (not local ones like Ogyges'/Deucalion's), and only flood (not the final fire).

THIRD DISPUTATION. On the heavenly bow which God established as a sign of a flood never to come; containing Eight questions.

There are some things in this disputation both useful and pleasant to know. But because they have also some difficulty, they require a not careless treatment. Let the first question, therefore, be: what is signified by the word “Bow” in this place — whether the heavenly bow which we call Iris, or whether something else ought to be understood by that word. St. Ambrose altogether denies that the bow or heavenly Iris is denoted by that word. Certainly by figurative speech and the likeness of the bow with which we shoot arrows, the power is signified…

§79. Disp. 3 (eight questions). Question 1: does ‘bow’ mean the rainbow? Ambrose denies it (taking it as a figurative ‘bow’ of war). Margin: “That the bow which God set as a sign of no future flood is not the bow or rainbow of the sky.” Continues on p. 345.

— p. 414 (PDF) · printed p. 345 —

…a certain invisible power of God which remits and relaxes the severity of divine justice and the rigor of vengeance against the crimes of men, after the likeness of a bow; so that through the calamities and adversities by which God exercises men, He wishes rather to frighten them than to strike — just as a bow drawn but lacking arrows may perhaps have the appearance of frightening, yet has not the power of wounding.

§79 (cont.). Ambrose's figurative reading: the ‘bow’ = God's invisible restraining power (a bow without arrows — frightening, not wounding).

But it is better that the reader recognize Ambrose's opinion from his own words: “Let us consider diligently what that bow is which God set in the cloud as a sign of His covenant with men. For he does not, as most think, speak of that bow by which men say the signs of rains are declared, in which diverse colors are figured as of the Sun's rays, now glowing red, now shining with a clearer light, whence future rain too is signified, because a certain inconstancy of fair weather is shown by the parti-colored appearance. This bow some call Iris. But far be it that we should call this

bow God's. For Iris is wont to be seen by day, by night does not appear, and not even by day is it seen if the air is overcast with foul clouds, unless perhaps when the heavier clouds begin to relax. Therefore let us see whether, because the bow with which arrows are shot is now bent, now slackened, Scripture seems to signify a certain extension and relaxation, by which all things are not utterly broken by too great a tension, but there is a certain measure and a certain test of divine power. There is, therefore, an invisible power of God under the appearance of that bow, moderating all things, so that it suffers them neither to be confounded by too great a loosening, nor burst by too great a straining. Which He therefore says is set in the clouds, because then there is most need of prudence by divine help, when the ranks of clouds are forced into storms and tempests. Wherefore He did not say, I will set in the clouds an arrow, but, I will set a bow. For the bow is the instrument for shooting the arrow, nor does the bow itself wound, but the arrow. Therefore He set in the clouds a bow, not an arrow — that is, what would have the token of terror, but not the effect of a wound." So Ambrose.

§80. Ambrose in his own words: the 'bow' is no rainbow but God's tempering power (a bow, not an arrow). Margin: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 17.

But the authority of so great a Doctor ought not to make us fear to refute this opinion of his — by no means probable, and by no means consonant with the words of scripture. For the authority of one Ambrose ought not to be of more weight than that of all the others — I mean all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin, and all the interpreters, both Christian and Hebrew — among whom it is beyond controversy that in this place by "Bow" nothing else is signified than the heavenly bow and Iris: which interpretation the meaning of the words of Scripture altogether requires, or rather demands. For what is the bow which appears in the clouds and is discerned by men, except Iris? And three times in this place Scripture says that bow is in the clouds: first, when it says, "I will set my bow in the clouds, and it shall be a sign of a covenant between me and the earth"; then, soon adding, "When I

shall cover the sky with clouds, my bow shall appear in the clouds”; lastly, when it says, “My bow shall be in the clouds, and I shall see it, and I shall remember the everlasting covenant.” What, I beseech, is that bow so often repeated, appearing in the clouds of the sky, except Iris? Add that this discourse of Moses is plainly historical: for it is a narration of what God said and did. According, therefore, to the laws [of history]…

§81. Pererius refutes Ambrose: all Fathers, Christian and Hebrew interpreters take ‘bow’ as the rainbow; Scripture thrice says it is ‘in the clouds,’ and the narrative is plainly historical. Continues on p. 346.

— p. 415 (PDF) · printed p. 346 —

…of history, the words are to be taken not figuratively and parabolically, but properly and according to their usual and common signification: wherefore the bow appearing in the clouds of the sky can be understood as no other than that which is commonly understood, that is, Iris. In short: God established that bow as a sign of His covenant conspicuous to men; but that power of God which Ambrose thinks is here signified by the word “bow” is invisible (as he himself also says) and known to few; it would not, therefore, have been a fit sign among men of the divine promise of no flood ever more to come.

§81 (cont.). The decisive point: a sign must be conspicuous, but Ambrose's ‘invisible power’ could not serve as a public sign.

The second question arises: how Iris can be a sign of a flood never to come, since Iris had often existed before the Noachic flood, and was not then a sign of no future flood — otherwise it would have been a false sign, namely with a contrary outcome: similarly, therefore, neither after that flood could it be a sign of no other flood to come. Some answer that neither rains nor Iris existed before the flood, but first began after the flood. This the Interlinear Gloss seems to signify on the second chapter of Genesis, upon those words, “For the Lord God had not rained upon the earth.” That Alcuin certainly thought this, the Carthusian reports in this place. Nor does

Chrysostom seem to be against that opinion, calling Iris a miracle. But why a miracle? for no other cause, certainly, than that, since before the flood it had never appeared, it began to appear after the flood, God establishing it as a sign of no future flood? Chrysostom's words are thus: “Even if an immense force of showers and violent tempests should arise, and if an immense inundation of waters should occur, yet let no fear of a flood befall us, looking to the miracle (that is, Iris, the sign of the divine promise).”

§82. Q2: how can Iris signify no future flood, when it existed before the flood? One answer: rain and rainbow began only after the flood (the Interlinear Gloss; Alcuin; Chrysostom calling it a ‘miracle’). Margins: “How Iris can be a sign of no future flood”; “The opinion of some that neither rains existed nor a rainbow appeared before the flood”; Alcuin; Chrysostom, hom. 28 on Genesis.

But who were the authors of this opinion, I do not trouble myself; it certainly has no credibility. For it is against the natural course and order of nature that, in all that time which preceded the flood (namely through one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years), there was no rain, nor did Iris ever appear — since after the flood there was no year (and indeed often [within a year]) that it did not appear. For it is natural for the Sun to draw vapors from the waters and the earth and to raise them into the middle region of the air; it is natural that the vapors raised thither be forced and condensed into clouds by their own cold and that of the place; it is natural that from condensed clouds showers be generated and fall to the earth; finally, it is natural that in clouds moderately dense and moist, and struck by the brightness of the opposing Sun, Iris be generated: that this natural and perpetual process and order of nature did not exist in all that time which preceded the flood, is incredible. For to what end would God have impeded this order of nature throughout all that time? to what end would He have prohibited the natural generation of Iris and rain by so great and long-lasting a miracle?

§83. Pererius rejects that view: it is incredible that no rain or rainbow existed for 1,656 years (against the whole natural order). Margin: “Refutation of that opinion.” Continues on p. 347.

— p. 416 (PDF) · printed p. 347 —

Next, if for so long a time there had been no rains, all things on earth would assuredly have withered and perished from too great drought. Have we not often seen in our own age, and read in the records of former times, that where there was a scarcity of rains for two or three years, there men and animals (to say nothing of plants) perished in great part both from famine and from diseases? These men say that in place of rains there were at that time springs and rivers which, overflowing at fixed times, after the likeness of the Nile, irrigated and fertilized the lands. But it would have to be asked of these men whether such an overflowing of waters was natural, as it is in the Nile: if it was natural, why then does it not now happen? for besides the Nile and one or another river — that is (according to some) either the Euphrates or the Ganges — no such inundation is seen in others. If it was not natural, certainly no reason can be given why God, omitting the natural way of cooling the lands by rains, should have wished for so long to use so great a miracle of overflowing terrestrial waters.

§84. A further objection: no rain for 1,656 years would have killed everything by drought; the 'Nile-like rivers' answer fails (such overflow is seen almost nowhere).

We, therefore, briefly answer the proposed question: that Iris is not a natural sign of a flood not to come, but only by God's will — who, after the Noachic flood, when He wished to give men some sign of His promise about no future flood, and could have employed any other thing whatever, nevertheless chose Iris before others for that. Therefore Iris has the force of signifying that a flood will never come, not from nature, but from God's will and decree. But about this matter we must dispute properly and fully in the question which next follows this.

Q2 answer: the rainbow signifies no future flood only by God's institution, not by nature.

Third question: is Iris a natural sign of a flood? I answer that Iris neither is nor can be a natural sign of a flood. And this indeed can be concluded by such argumentation. If Iris is a natural sign of a flood, it would be either a sign of a future flood, or of no future flood, or of a future and not-future, or

of neither future nor not-future. It cannot be a natural sign of a future flood: both because a general flood cannot come about from natural causes, but only by God's omnipotence (wherefore Iris cannot be a natural sign of it); and also because God promised that there would never thereafter be a flood, and willed Iris to be the sign of His promise — how, therefore, can the same Iris be, according to its nature, a sign of a future flood, and according to God's institution a sign also of no future flood?

§85. Q3: is Iris a natural sign of a flood? A fourfold disjunction; not of a future flood (which needs omnipotence, not nature). Margin: "Whether Iris is a natural sign of a flood." Continues on p. 348.

— p. 417 (PDF) · printed p. 348 —

Nor is Iris a natural sign of no future flood: both because, though it existed very often before the Noachic flood, nevertheless the flood came; and also because, if according to its nature it were a sign of no future flood, it would have been superfluous and incongruous for it to be established by God as a kind of new sign of no future flood. To this is added that a general flood is not a natural effect but a supernatural one, and whether a flood comes about or not depends entirely on God's will; not, therefore, can Iris be a natural sign of that thing. And to say that Iris is a sign of a flood both future and not-future is not only false, but impossible and absurd: for the same thing remaining the same, as the Philosophers teach, cannot either do or signify contraries. It remains, therefore, that Iris is a natural sign neither of a future flood nor of no future flood — that is, that it is not a natural sign of a Flood: and this it had been our purpose from the beginning to demonstrate.

§86. Nor of no future flood (it preceded the flood; the institution would be redundant; the flood is supernatural); nor of both (contradiction). So: no natural sign of a flood at all.

Fourth question: although Iris is not simply a natural sign of no future flood, it can nevertheless be asked whether it is in some way a natural sign — having, namely, a certain natural agreement with that for the signifying of which it was established by God. That it is in some way a natural sign of

no future flood St. Thomas thinks (Quodlibet 2, Art. 30), and the same Cajetan opines in this place. And they prove it thus: the cause generating Iris necessarily excludes the cause generating a flood; therefore Iris is a sign of no future flood: for when Iris appears in the air, the air is not so affected and prepared as it must be for the generation of a flood; since to produce a flood it is necessary that the sky be everywhere overcast with thickest clouds and crammed with an immense abundance of vapors: but then Iris can in no way be generated, since nothing is capable of it except a cloud moderately dense and moist and (as they call it) dewy. Since, therefore, when Iris appears the disposition of the air is contrary to a future flood, it rightly follows that the appearance of Iris is a sign of no future flood.

§87. Q4: is it a natural sign in some respect? Aquinas (Quodlibet 2) and Cajetan: yes — the air that yields a rainbow excludes the saturation a flood would need. Margins: “Whether Iris is a natural sign of a flood not coming soon”; Aquinas; Cajetan.

Iris, however, is not a sign of a flood never to come, but of one not to come near at hand and soon: for, Iris vanishing and the cause which generates and contains it being dissolved, the matter whence a flood may come can be gathered in the air; but because that matter cannot be gathered in a short time, therefore, although Iris is not a sign of a flood never to come, it is nevertheless a sign of one not to come soon. Although, says Cajetan, from God's promise revealed to us in the Sacred letters it is certain that there will be none in any age: for God promised Noah that Iris would appear in every generation and would be a sign of no flood to come: therefore if Iris appearing is a sign of no flood then to come, but it will appear, according to God's promise, in every generation, therefore in no generation up to the end of the world will there be a flood, and Iris — appearing not once nor a single time, but in every age — is a sign of a flood never to come. These men add besides that, since a general flood cannot come about naturally but by the supernatural power of God, for God to promise that a flood will not come is nothing other than to promise that He will thereafter govern the

world according to its natural course and order, according to which a flood cannot be produced, and that He will not use His extraordinary power to produce a flood. And this is the opinion of those authors, which Paul of Burgos seems to follow in this place.

§88. So the rainbow signifies ‘no flood soon’ (not ‘never’) — but Cajetan extends it to ‘never,’ since the promise gives a rainbow in every generation. Margin: Paul of Burgos.

— p. 418 (PDF) · printed p. 349 —

But that opinion could be confuted by these arguments. These men argue that Iris is a natural sign of a flood not to come soon, because the cause generating Iris altogether excludes the cause generating a flood — that is, the greatest abundance of vapors in the air and an immense force of rains. This argument would be valid if a great abundance of vapors in the air and the greatest force of showers were a necessary cause for generating a flood, so that without such a cause a general flood could in no way exist: but that is not true. For a flood is not the work of nature, but of God's omnipotence, who can produce a flood both by rains and without rains. For although for producing the Noachic flood an immense force of rains for forty days concurred, yet without it God could have made a flood, by so multiplying and heaping up the waters of the sea and other terrestrial waters that they would cover the whole earth, even its highest mountains. Did He not at the beginning of the world so create water, with no rains or clouds preceding, that it overwhelmed the whole earth most deeply? Therefore, if God can make a general flood without the preparation of vapors in the air and without the concurrence of showers, the appearance of Iris cannot be a natural sign of no flood to come soon.

§89. Pererius's first rebuttal: God can flood without rain at all (as at creation), so a rainbow guarantees nothing even ‘soon.’

But suppose an immense force of vapors in the air and of showers be necessarily required to generate a flood: yet from this is not concluded what these men wish to obtain. For all that matter necessary for generating

a flood God can suddenly — or at least in the briefest time — gather and prepare in the air for the generation of a flood: although, therefore, today (for example) Iris should appear, and therefore there be not in the air the matter needed for the generation of a flood, yet it can, even after one hour, by God's omnipotence be set in the air; and if this were to happen (as it can happen), Iris appearing today would not be a natural sign of a flood not to come soon, or even not to come today.

§90. Second rebuttal: even granting the matter is needed, God could gather it in an hour — so the rainbow assures nothing even for today.

Now indeed that saying of Cajetan does not escape reprehension. He says that, because God promised that in every future generation Iris would appear, which excludes the matter of the generation of a flood, thence it follows that Iris will be a natural sign of a flood coming in no age. I, for my part, do not sufficiently grasp what force this reasoning of Cajetan has. The word “Generation” in scripture signifies a space of many years: for either it signifies the same as “age” [saeculum], that is, a space of a hundred years, as in this book of Genesis, chapter 15; or the age of each man and the whole time of his life, which David defined as seventy or eighty years, but the author of the book of Ecclesiasticus as a hundred; or it signifies a space of ten years, in which signification Baruch in the sixth chapter seems to have used it; or finally, as it has seemed to many expositors of the sacred letters, it sometimes signifies the age of man fit and mature for begetting offspring, which is for the most part not less than fifteen years. In whatever way, therefore, the word “Generation” is taken, there is always denoted by it a space of many years.

§91. Against Cajetan's extension: ‘generation’ always means a span of many years (100, or 70–80, or 10, or 15). Margins: “What the word Generation signifies in Scripture”; Ps. 89; Ecclus. 18.
Continues on p. 350.

— p. 419 (PDF) · printed p. 350 —

This being laid down, Cajetan's reasoning plainly falls: for nothing prevents, since “generation” signifies a space of many years, that in the same generation Iris both appear and a flood come about. For example, let a generation contain ten or more years, and in the first year of this generation let Iris appear; what, I ask, forbids that, after the appearance of Iris has ceased, after two or three years the matter of vapors be gradually gathered in the air whence a flood is generated? Not, therefore, because Iris is to appear in every generation, is it on that account a natural sign that there will be no flood in that generation. And who, I beseech, would believe that in that generation or age in which the Noachic flood happened, Iris never appeared? But let us pass on to other matters.

§91 (cont.). So a rainbow early in a generation does not bar a flood later in the same generation; surely a rainbow appeared even in the flood-generation.

Fifth question: is Iris a sign of no future flood altogether voluntary and (as they call it) at will [ad placitum]? That it is altogether a sign at will — namely, which has the force of signifying from God's will and institution alone — Lyra thought, and left written in his Postill on this place: the confirmation of which opinion is the refutation of the foregoing. For if Iris is a sign of the divine pact about no future flood, as scripture testifies, and is not a sign either simply or in any way natural, as was shown above, it remains that it is a sign only voluntary and at will. Although, therefore, Iris existed before the Noachic flood, it was not then a sign, but afterward, because God's promise and pact about no future flood (of which He willed Iris to be the sign) was made not before the Noachic flood but after. Nor ought it to seem incongruous to anyone that Iris — which is a natural thing and had existed from the very beginning of the world — should be made a sign of a new and voluntary thing, such as is the promise and pact of God: for this frequently comes about in human affairs. For example, a rock which has long lain immovable in some place is established by men as a sign of the division of fields and possessions.

§92. Q5: is the sign wholly voluntary? Lyra: yes — from God's will alone (as a long-lying rock can be made a boundary-marker). Margin: "Whether Iris is a wholly voluntary sign of no future flood."

To the opinion of Lyra subscribes Tostatus, adding besides that — since a flood is twofold, one particular of some place or province, the other general of the whole world — Iris appearing in the air is a natural sign of no particular flood coming soon in that place: for the disposition of the air of which Iris consists excludes the disposition of the same necessary for generating a particular flood, and matter sufficient for generating a particular flood cannot be gathered and prepared in a short time. But this must be understood of the natural generation of a particular flood: for the supernatural one, which comes about by God's omnipotence, by no means requires length of time. But of a general flood, since it is a supernatural effect of the divine omnipotence, that Iris is in no way a natural sign of it but [a sign] at will, Tostatus assents to Lyra, persuaded by his reasoning. These things, then, have been handed down by others in this disputation.

§93. Tostatus agrees with Lyra, adding: the rainbow IS a natural sign of no particular (local) flood soon — but only a voluntary sign as to a universal flood. Margin: Tostatus.

But if the reader desires to know our opinion also, let him have it briefly thus. It seems to us that Iris simply is not a natural sign, but in a certain way and (as they say) in a certain respect [secundum quid] both is and ought to be called [one]. That it is not simply a natural sign, besides the foregoing arguments, is plain also by this reason. Iris of itself and primarily was not established by God to be a sign of a flood not to come, but to be a sign of the covenant between God and man: for nowhere has scripture called Iris a sign of a flood not to come, but always calls it a sign of the divine covenant and pact. But because that pact of God was about no [flood] to come again…

§94. Pererius's own view: the rainbow is not simply a natural sign, but is one 'in a certain respect'; primarily it signs the covenant, only secondarily the no-flood. Margin: "The author's opinion." *Continues on p. 351.*

— p. 420 (PDF) · printed p. 351 —

…flood, therefore Iris consequently, and (as they say) secondarily, is a sign of a flood not to come. It is, therefore, a sign both of the divine covenant and of no future flood: but each of these is voluntary and altogether dependent on God's good pleasure: for about the covenant and pact there can be no doubt; and about the flood it was shown above: for since a general flood cannot be the work of nature but of God's omnipotence alone, its happening or not happening is placed in God's will alone.

§94 (cont.). Both meanings (covenant; no-flood) are voluntary, depending wholly on God's good pleasure.

And that Iris in some way is also a natural sign of a flood will be manifest from a few things which I subjoin. Generally the signs which God has used, whether to signify something or to excite the memory of some thing, have a certain natural agreement and similitude with the things for the signifying and representing of which they are destined: for example, God gave Circumcision to Abraham and his posterity that it might be a sign of His promise about the infinite multiplication of his seed and the possession of the land of Canaan; and Circumcision has a natural congruity with God's promise, for the multiplication of the seed had to come about by carnal generation, for the effecting of which generation that part of our body in which God commanded Circumcision to be done especially serves. I can say the same of the Sacraments of the new law: namely, baptismal water, although according to its nature it has not the power of washing away sins, yet has the power of washing bodies, of cooling and fertilizing, by which things it represents the spiritual effect of Baptism which it itself also produces, consecrated by God's word. In this manner, therefore, Iris too has a natural agreement with that which by God's institution it signifies: for it is according to its nature more fit than all other things and more accommodated to presignifying that for which it was instituted; otherwise God would not have chosen it before others for that.

§95. Yet the rainbow IS a natural sign in a way: God's signs have a fittingness (circumcision to fertility, baptismal water to washing), and so does the rainbow. Margin: Gen. 17.

But what is that natural congruity and aptitude of Iris? Indeed great and manifold. First, that on account of its remarkable magnitude, its extraordinary beauty, and the loftiness of the place where it appears, it is conspicuous to all and most notable, and on that account a sign powerful and effective to excite immediately in men's minds the memory of the divine covenant and promise, and thereafter to renew and perpetually keep it. Next, because it is generated and appears in the clouds, and because the Noachic flood arose in great part from clouds and rains, most providently God willed that Iris, which is in the clouds, be a sign to man of no flood to come, that thence fear might be dispelled whence the generation of a flood could be feared. Besides, Iris is generally wont to be a sign either of future fair weather, or of no great nor long-lasting rain: wherefore, as regards natural causes, it is a sure sign that, where it appears, there a flood cannot naturally and soon come about. I said (naturally) because, according to God's omnipotence, whose work a general flood is, a flood can be produced even without any preparation and concurrence of natural causes, and suddenly.

§96. The rainbow's manifold fitness: conspicuous (so memorable); in the clouds (whence the flood came, so fear is dispelled at its source); and a natural sign of fair weather/no great rain.

— p. 421 (PDF) · printed p. 352 —

Sixth question: if Iris is a natural sign of a flood neither ever nor soon to come, of what things, then, is it naturally a natural sign? Is it of fair weather or of rain, of winds or of the tranquility of the sky? Pliny holds it to be a sure sign of nothing, writing thus: “We call rainbows frequent beyond marvel and beyond portent: for they do not even foretell rainy or fair days reliably.” Yet the same in another place writes that Iris, when it appears double, is a herald of rains: “Rainbows,” he says, “when they are double, announce rain: fair weather after rains not equally certainly.”

§97. Q6: of what is the rainbow naturally a sign? Pliny: of nothing reliably — though a double rainbow heralds rain. Margins: “Of what things Iris is a natural sign”; Pliny, Natural History bk. 2, ch. 59; bk. 18, ch. 35.

But Seneca teaches that, according as Iris has appeared in a varied region of the sky, so it portends various things. “The rainbow,” he says, “does not bring the same threats, from wherever it appears: risen from the south, it will bring a great force of waters, for they cannot be overcome by the most vehement Sun, so much strength have they. If it has shone near the West, it will thunder and lightly rain; if it has risen near the East, it portends fair weather.” Yet more frequently the rainbow appears after rains, from which not vain indications of the fair weather to follow can be gathered, namely from the vicissitude of weathers. But why do they appear more frequently after rains? because then the clouds have more light and are more fit for receiving the Sun's light, being unburdened of the thickness of the waters.

§98. Seneca: the rainbow portends differently by its quarter of the sky (south = much water; west = light rain; east = fair). Margin: Seneca, Natural Questions bk. 1, ch. 6.

I have read in certain by no means contemptible authors that it is related as true by sailors and farmers, as a thing diligently observed by them, that a morning rainbow portends rains, an evening one fair weather. Of which thing perhaps this is the cause: that a morning bow, fuller of nocturnal moisture, is as it were a vessel of future rain on account of the thicker vapors; but an evening one, as having unburdened a great part of its moisture during the day, promises a fairer weather for the following day.

§99. The sailors'/farmers' lore: a morning rainbow means rain, an evening one fair weather. Margins: Cardano, Exercitations 80; Scaliger against Cardano.

Moreover, authors of the first gravity have handed down to memory and to letters the marvelous powers and marvelous effects of Iris. In Aristotle's age it was commonly reported that, Iris brooding upon plants, they were made more fragrant: whether this is true, and when or in what way it is true, he himself disputes in the Problems. Pliny certainly writes that

aspalathus is made sweeter-smelling by the touch of Iris: “Aspalathus,” he says, “is a white thorn, of moderate tree-size, with a rose-colored flower, its root sought for unguents. They relate that on whatever shrub the heavenly bow is bent, the same sweetness of odor as is in aspalathus exists, but in aspalathus a certain indescribable one.” The same in another place: “The earth,” he says, “when from continuous drought it has been moistened by a shower upon which the heavenly bow has cast its ends, then sends forth that its divine breath conceived from the Sun, to which no sweetness can be compared.” Aristotle besides relates that Iris contributes much to the generation of aerial honey (this the moderns call manna, but the ancients named honey of dew). But enough of these. And although treatment of this kind seems more proper to philosophy than to divine scripture, yet because it makes both for some illustration of this place and for the erudition of those who study the sacred letters, it will not be amiss to have touched on it, as it were, in passing.

§100. The marvelous lore of the rainbow: plants made more fragrant where it bends (Aristotle, Pliny on aspalathus; the ‘divine breath’ of rained-on earth; the rainbow aiding the ‘honey of dew’/manna). Margins: “Marvelous effects of Iris”; Aristotle, Problems sect. 13.3; Pliny bk. 12, ch. 24; bk. 17, ch. 5; Aristotle, History of Animals bk. 5, ch. 22.

— p. 422 (PDF) · printed p. 353 —

Seventh question: whether it is true, what is reported by some holy men to have been handed down, that for forty years before the general conflagration of the world and the day of Judgment Iris will never appear in the sky. The Author of the Scholastic History records that opinion in these words: “The saints relate that forty years before the Judgment the heavenly bow will not be seen: which will also naturally show that the desiccation of the air has now begun.” So he. But who were those holy men, the authors of that opinion, I have not yet been able to ascertain by conjecture or by any suspicion. Indeed among none of the holy Fathers whose writings we have is such an opinion, or any mention of it, found. But whose opinion it was, I do not delay over: I would say without doubt

that it is false. First, the foundation and support of that opinion seems to have been this: that the general conflagration of the world cannot come about except with the highest dryness of the air preceding and an immense abundance of dry exhalations; but that so much dry matter as is needed for the generation of that fire could be procured only in a very long time, and not less (as it seemed to them) than forty years.

§101. Q7: the legend that no rainbow will appear for 40 years before the final fire/Judgment (the Scholastic History) — its source unknown; Pererius will refute it. Margins: "The opinion of some that no rainbow will appear for 40 years before the end of the World"; Scholastic History on Genesis, ch. 35.

But in that reasoning it is assumed as certain what is not only uncertain, but even openly false: that that fire of the world must be produced by natural causes, since it will be a supernatural work of the divine omnipotence, similarly as was said above about the flood. Next, the reasoning of the general flood and the general fire seems equal: but the preparation of the matter for the generation of the flood preceded the flood itself by a very short time, as is manifest from the foregoing narration of Moses in the seventh chapter; therefore that preparation of dry matter for the generation of the fire through forty years will not be necessary; nay, it seems plainly fabricated.

§102. Refutation: the legend wrongly assumes the final fire is natural (it is supernatural, like the flood — whose matter formed quickly). Margin: "Refutation."

Besides, if for forty years Iris did not appear, then in all that time there would be neither winds nor rains moistening, cooling, and fertilizing the earth: wherefore many years before the end of those forty years all things — plants, I mean, animals, and men — would perish from too great drought; or if they did not utterly perish, certainly on account of the greatest famine, the most savage diseases, and other discomforts which so great a drought would bring, all men everywhere on earth would be in the utmost grief and sorrow and would be afflicted with the gravest calamities: but that it would be far otherwise at that time the Lord Himself taught us,

whose are those words in Matthew, pertaining to the confirmation of what we have said: “As in the days of Noah, so shall be the coming of the Son of man: for as they were in the days before the flood, eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day in which Noah entered into the ark, and they knew not till the flood came and took them all away; so also shall be the coming of the Son of man.” And Paul, in the first Epistle to the Thessalonians, chapter five: “The day of the Lord,” he says, “shall so come as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, Peace and security, then shall sudden destruction come upon them.” It is clear, therefore, from the words of the Lord and of Paul, that at the time which shall immediately precede the Judgment and the end [of the World]…

§103. Third refutation: 40 rainless years would kill all by drought, but the Lord (Matt 24) and Paul (1 Thess 5) foretell men eating, marrying, in ‘peace and security’ at the end. Margin: Matt. 24.
Continues on p. 354.

— p. 423 (PDF) · printed p. 354 —

…the World, men will be in the highest joys, pleasures, and delights, and in the greatest peace and security. But this so glad and pleasant state of life could in no way be, if there were so great and so long-lasting a dryness of the air: for that would be the cause of many and great discomforts and calamities.

§103 (cont.). That carefree end-time security is impossible if a great drought had gripped the world — so the legend is false.

Eighth question: whether this history of Iris has any memorable mystical sense and understanding? It has indeed one both various and variously and clearly treated by the Fathers. St. Gregory, in the eighth homily on Ezekiel: “In the heavenly bow,” he says, “the color partly of water, partly of fire, is shown together: for it is reddish and blue, that it may be a witness of each judgment — namely, of the one to be made, and of the other already made and no more to be made. For the world at its end shall be burned by the fire of judgment, which was once destroyed by the water of the flood. The

heavenly bow also declares the baptism of Christ, which is done by water and fire — that is, the Holy Spirit, like fire, purifying the inmost parts of hearts and consuming vices, according to that of the Lord: Unless one be born again of water and the Holy Spirit, etc. The bow which appears in the cloud, by which the flesh of our Savior is signified — since His power is shown in the Lord's incarnation and in the pouring out of preaching, that the hearts of believers may be recalled to pardon, the Lord sparing." So Gregory.

§104. Q8: the mystical sense. Gregory (hom. 8 on Ezekiel): the bow's red & blue = the two judgments (fire to come, water past); also Christ's baptism by water & fire, the cloud = His flesh. Margins: "Mystical interpretation"; Gregory.

John in the Apocalypse saw the throne of God surrounded by Iris. Iris signifies God's mercy; the throne is His Church. For the throne to be surrounded by Iris, therefore, is for the Church to be protected and defended by the perpetual mercy of God. And this mercy of God is threefold: the first, that He does not suffer it to be tempted above its strength, but makes also with the temptation a way out, that it may be able to bear it; and as [He did] St. Peter, so He suffers it for a while to be tossed by the waves of adversities and almost to sink, yet never to be submerged. The second, that at all times He raises up in it some good rulers, teachers, reformers, and defenders. The third, that He never suffers to fail in it the sincere word of God and the right understanding of the scriptures, nor the lawful use of the Sacraments, nor the pure worship of God. And this threefold mercy of God toward the Church is signified by the threefold color of Iris.

§105. The Apocalypse: the throne (= the Church) ringed by the rainbow (= God's mercy), threefold: no temptation beyond strength, good leaders raised up always, the true word/sacraments/worship never failing. Margins: "The threefold perpetual mercy of God toward the Church"; 1 Cor. 10; Matt. 14.

The Philosophers teach that Iris consists of a threefold substance — earthy, watery, and airy — and thence that a threefold variety of color exists:

green, red, and blue. By this thing is intimated the amplitude of the divine mercy toward man in three ways: as regards the body, the soul, and the spirit; as regards men, in the state of nature, of the Mosaic law, and of the Evangelical; as regards goods, natural, human, and divine; as regards those who are in heaven, on earth, and in hell; finally, as regards the grace of predestination from eternity, of justification in time, of glorification unto eternity.

§106. The rainbow's threefold substance/color (green, red, blue) figures the threefold amplitude of divine mercy. Margin: "The threefold color of Iris, of what thing it is a figure."

According to others, Iris is a figure of Christ: for the cloud signifies the body of Christ; the threefold color, His threefold substance — flesh, soul, divinity: or His threefold supreme dignity which Isaiah foretold, of King, Judge, Lawgiver. Nor is it without mystery that Iris…

§107. Others: the rainbow figures Christ (the cloud = His body; the three colors = flesh/soul/divinity, or King/Judge/Lawgiver per Isaiah). Margin: "Iris a figure of Christ." Continues on p. 355.

— p. 424 (PDF) · printed p. 355 —

Iris never completes a circle, nor exceeds the magnitude of a semicircle. For the kingdom of Christ is as it were a circle descending from heaven to earth, and again from earth returning to the heavens: and it consists of the twofold advent of Christ — the former in humility for saving (and this has force up to the day of judgment), the latter in majesty for judging, whose effect will last unto all eternity. Since, therefore, up to the day of judgment the power of the former advent flourishes on earth, but not of the latter, hence comes the figure of a semicircle, and there is no completion of the circle, which after the day of judgment will be wholly completed. Now there flourishes as it were half of Christ's kingdom: for He is not acknowledged by all to be the Lord of all, as He is; nor does He reign so much in the body as in the soul; and in the soul, as regards the taking away of fault and sin, not as regards penalty and misery. But after the day of judgment the kingdom of Christ will be plainly consummated, for then He

will rule over all, and in respect of all things, and will be acknowledged by all to be the supreme Lord of all.

§107 (cont.). The rainbow's half-circle = Christ's kingdom, now only 'half' (the first advent), to be completed at the Judgment. Margin: "Iris never completes a circle, and of what this is a figure."

But indeed the aforesaid exposition, which we numbered among the mystical ones, Rupert judges to be literal, and thinks that the covenant of which God willed Iris to be the sign was not made with Noah and his sons, but is the covenant which God in the Evangelical law makes with the faithful believing in Christ — to whom He promises not only the remission of sins, but also the grace of adoption into the sons of God and the right of receiving the eternal inheritance. And he sets down two reasons for his opinion: one, that in every covenant or pact there ought to be on both sides a reckoning of giving and receiving, without which no pact and covenant comes about among men; but no such reckoning of giving and receiving appears between Noah and God. On God's part indeed a giving appears, namely His promise of no future flood, but on Noah's part nothing is extant given or promised by him. His other reason is that God said in the future, "I will establish my covenant," not in the present, "I establish"; not obscurely signifying that that covenant of His pertained not to those men who were then present, but to those who would be far afterward.

§108. Rupert's notable view: the covenant is really the Gospel covenant with Christian believers — argued from (1) no 'giving and receiving' between Noah and God, (2) the future tense 'I will establish.' Margin: "Rupert's notable opinion."

But the reader will not easily comprehend the whole opinion of Rupert except from his words. Explaining, therefore, those words of God which are in this place, "Behold I will establish my covenant with you and with your seed after you," Rupert writes thus: "It must here be asked what or of what sort this covenant of God is, for there does not appear what reckoning of giving and receiving there was in it: but without giving and receiving a pact is not wont to be established. Besides, He did not say in the present time, Behold I establish, but in the future, Behold I will establish my

covenant; it must therefore be asked of what sort that covenant was. We say indeed that the covenant — so often promised, but yet one, and once entered into — the one pact, I say, by which are dissolved the enmities which were between God and man — was the incarnation or passion of our Lord Jesus Christ. For hence, beyond all contradiction, there is a certain establishment of peace with the reckoning of giving and receiving, while God, having received the faith of men, gives men His Son that they may be saved through Him. Of this pact, although very many promises and significations preceded, yet there were two chief signs: one of Iris given to Noah, the other of circumcision given to Abraham."

§108 (cont.). Rupert in his own words: the one covenant = Christ's incarnation/passion, of which the rainbow and circumcision are the two chief signs. Margins: Eph. 2; Gen. 17. Continues on p. 356.

— p. 425 (PDF) · printed p. 356 —

…"And Iris indeed, on account of its blue color, figures the water of baptism by which we are visibly washed; but on account of its red color it signifies the fire of the Holy Spirit by which our sins are invisibly consumed, that we may be separated from both kinds of men who perished — both from those who perished by the past water of the flood, and from those who by the future fire of judgment are to perish. And Iris indeed is a temporary sign, to pass away, namely, with the clouds and the present state of the world; but the spiritual Iris, of which that corporeal one is as it were a shadow, will remain eternally before the sight of the Father in the flesh of His Son, in the scars of the wounds of His feet, hands, and side. Whence, because Christ is our peace, well is this sign of the covenant (which is the heavenly bow) in Greek called Iris, that is, peace: the cause of which the curious philosophers of this world, being ignorant, say that Iris comes about by chance from the opposition of the Sun pouring its rays into a hollow cloud; but in whatever way it comes about, it is the work of God, established not by chance but by reason, and exhibiting itself as a sign of the divine remembrance." Thus Rupert.

§108 (cont.). Rupert: the rainbow's blue = baptismal water, red = the Spirit's fire; the 'spiritual Iris' = Christ's wounds; and 'Iris' = Greek for 'peace.' Margin: Eph. 2.

But I will not hesitate to say that the narration of Moses which is in this place evidently and vehemently opposes Rupert's opinion. For Scripture seven times inculcates in this ninth chapter that God established a covenant with Noah and his sons and their posterity and with all living creatures: how, then, can it be denied that that covenant of God was established with those men, since Scripture so often affirms it? What of this: that that spiritual covenant pertaining to Christ (of which Rupert interprets this place even according to the literal sense) in no way concerns the living creatures? for they are capable of neither a human nor a divine covenant: but Scripture in this place says that God established a covenant even with the animals; therefore that covenant is different from the one which Rupert expounds.

§109. Pererius refutes Rupert: the chapter seven times says the covenant was made with Noah, his sons, and the animals — which can't share a spiritual covenant with Christ.

Nor are those two reasons of Rupert firm, by which he wished to support his interpretation. To the former it is easily answered that the word "pact" and "covenant" is here not strictly nor properly placed, as it is in use among men and as it is defined by Rupert; for such a pact cannot be established with animals, whereas we read that that pact of God was established even with animals. The name of "pact" and "covenant" is therefore placed amply, to signify the absolute and efficacious will of God and His immutable promise and decree: which promise and decree, just as here He called a "pact," so in Isaiah chapter 54 He named an "oath": "As," He says, "I swore to Noah that I would no more bring waters upon the earth" — and yet no species or formula of oath appears here; but God willed, by the two things which among men are most holy and inviolable — pacts and oaths — to declare the certainty of His promise and decree as utterly immutable. The latter reason is of no moment: for although the Latin reading has in the future, "I will establish my covenant," the Greek

reading has in the present, “I establish” or “I set,” but the Hebrew in the past, “I established” or “I set.” Indeed among the Hebrews the misuse of one tense for another is most frequent.

§110. Both Rupert's reasons answered: ‘pact’ is used loosely for God's immutable decree (cf. Isa 54's ‘oath’); and the tense varies (Latin future, Greek present, Hebrew past). Margin: “Rupert is refuted.”

— p. 426 (PDF) · printed p. 357 —

But that which Rupert says — that the heavenly bow is in Greek called Iris, which in Latin sounds “peace” — will by no means be approved even by those who have touched the Greek language with the tips of their lips. For “peace” in Greek is called ε■ρ■νη: and between those two words, ■ρις [Iris] and ε■ρ■νη [eir■n■], how great a difference there is, no one fails to see. And that which the same adds — that the generation of Iris is believed by the philosophers to be casual [by chance] — I fear lest perhaps some of the Peripatetics, who in investigating and treating the natural causes of Iris labored with so great praise of genius and learning, may either despise [it] with a philosophical frown, or deride [it] with laughter.

§111. Two final jabs at Rupert: ‘Iris’ ≠ Greek for ‘peace’ (that is ε■ρ■νη), and the philosophers did not call the rainbow's cause ‘chance.’

{And the sons of Noah who came out of the ark were Shem, Ham, and Japheth: and Ham is the father of Canaan. These three are the sons of Noah, and from these was all mankind spread over the earth.}

Gen 9:18–19 (lemma). Margin: vv. 18, 19.

These words bear two questions. First it is asked whether after the flood Noah, besides the aforesaid three sons whom he had begotten before the flood, begot other sons after the flood. Berosus Annianus, in the second book, affirms that Noah begot several sons after the flood, and those giants, whom from the name of their mother (who was called Titaea) he named Titans: and he numbers thirty sons of Noah begotten after the flood. Annius, in his Commentary on that place, tries to build the most certain

credence for this. And he argues thus: Noah, together with his sons, received from God the command of being free for the generation of offspring, and together with the command received the power of fecundity; for this Moses signified, narrating that God blessed Noah and his sons and said, “Increase and multiply and fill the earth.” Nor is it lawful to believe that such a command was neglected by Noah, a man most just and most obedient to the divine will. Necessity besides impelled him to begetting, on account of the fewness of men which was at that time. Nor indeed was age wanting to Noah for begetting — nay rather, it abundantly remained, since he lived three hundred and fifty years after the flood. From these Annius thinks it is concluded that Noah procreated children after the flood, and that it is consonant with the reason of divine scripture.

§112. Q1: did Noah beget more sons after the flood? Berosus (via Annius): 30 ‘Titan’ sons by mother Titaea — argued from the ‘increase and multiply’ command, necessity, and Noah's 350 remaining years. Margins: “Whether Noah begot other sons after the flood”; Berosus; Giovanni Annius.

Nor indeed did this opinion fail to please Cajetan also: for he, weighing those words, “Who came out of the Ark,” speaks thus: “Hence it appears that Noah after the flood begot other sons: for unless he had had [other] sons, he would not have said that Shem, Ham, and Japheth were the sons of Noah who had come out of the Ark; for it is to distinguish [them] from others that Noah mentions those three who had come out of the Ark with their father: and because these alone were with Noah in the Ark and came out with him, they so excelled the other [sons] generated by Noah after the flood that their names were utterly abolished, and only those three were named and held as the fathers of the world.” So Cajetan. But I do not at all doubt that that opinion is false. For if Noah had begotten so many sons after the flood, why were their names altogether [passed over in silence]…

§113–114. Cajetan agrees (‘who came out of the Ark’ implies others existed); but Pererius begins to refute: why then are their names wholly silent? Margin: Cajetan. Continues on p. 358.

— p. 427 (PDF) · printed p. 358 —

…passed over in silence? Granted, those three were the chiefs of Noah's race and family: yet that ought not to have utterly buried and obliterated the memory of the others. Does not Moses, in the twenty-fifth chapter of this book, recount all the sons of Abraham — both those received from the handmaid and from Keturah his wife — not content to have named Isaac alone as Abraham's heir and the chief of his posterity? But if Moses did not wish to set down distinctly and expressly the names of Noah's other sons, he would at least have said in general that Noah begot other sons.

§114 (cont.). Moses names even Abraham's lesser sons (ch. 25) — he would at least have said 'Noah begot other sons.' Margin: "Annius and Cajetan are refuted."

For this may be observed in all those ancient fathers who were before Noah: that Moses, when he described the whole life-time of each of them, was wont to add those words, "And he begot sons and daughters." I will give the example of the first and the last. Of Adam he says thus: "The days of Adam after he begot Seth were eight hundred years, and he begot sons and daughters." And of Lamech, who was the father of Noah, he likewise says: "Lamech lived after he begot Noah five hundred and ninety years, and begot sons and daughters." And he said the same of all the others who are interposed between these two. Similarly, therefore, since toward the end of the ninth chapter Moses defines the whole life-time of Noah, if he, besides Shem, Ham, and Japheth, had begotten other sons, he ought to have said of him as he had said of his fathers: "Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty years, and begot sons and daughters, and all his days were nine hundred and fifty years, and he died." Why did Moses not say that, "And he begot sons and daughters"? Surely because it was not true. This too vehemently refutes that opinion: that Moses, both in chapter 9 and in chapter 10, says that from those three sons of Noah all mankind was propagated and disseminated; but if besides those three there had been other sons of Noah, from them too no less than from those three the race of men would have been multiplied. For to say either that those sons were all sterile, or that their offspring in the second or third generation wholly

failed, is like a fiction.

§115. The clinching argument: Moses always adds ‘and he begot sons and daughters’ (Adam, Lamech) but not for Noah; and he twice says all mankind came from the three. Margins: Gen. 5; ibid.

But this seems to press us: how, through the three hundred and fifty years in which Noah survived the flood, he either would not or could not beget even some one son. But to this we answer that Noah at the flood was six hundred years old, which age was now [removed] from the office of begetting and not capable of generating — especially [a nature worn] by so many and so great hard[ships]…

§116. Objection: why no son at all in 350 years? Answer: at 600 Noah was past begetting. Margin: “Why Noah begot no son in the 350 years he survived the flood.” Continues on p. 359.

— p. 428 (PDF) · printed p. 359 —

…and worn by hardships and calamities. For the remaining three hundred and fifty years were of old age, which in a life of nearly a thousand years is not to be reckoned too long. How many will you find who after the fiftieth year ceased to beget, and nevertheless prolonged their life up to the eightieth or ninetieth year? And this seems to me the truer thing to say. Unless perhaps the fables of the Hebrews please someone more — by whom it is handed down (as Rabbi Levi mentions on the ninth chapter of Genesis) that Ham cut off the virility of his father Noah, lest he beget sons thereafter: just as the poets fable about Caelus [Uranus] and Saturn.

§116 (cont.). Noah's last 350 years were old age (men often stop begetting at 50); or — the Hebrew fable (Rabbi Levi) that Ham castrated Noah, like Uranus and Saturn in the poets.

The second question is, why Moses, naming Cham, subjoined his son Chanaan, saying, “And Cham is the father of Chanaan.” Why, I say, did Moses rather name the son of Cham than the son of Sem or Iaphet? or, among the sons of Cham (for he had sons Chus and Mesrain and Phut and Chanaan, as is in the tenth chapter of Genesis), why did he not rather name the other sons than Chanaan, since he seems to have been the youngest of

them all in birth? St. Chrysostom thinks that that Chanaan was begotten within the Ark during the flood, and is therefore named by Moses, that the excessive intemperance of Cham's lust might be signified — who, in such straits and discomforts of the Ark and in so great a calamity of the whole world, indulged in Venus: especially since his father and other brothers not only abstained from the zeal of begetting, but were even separated from their wives during all that time. Hear Chrysostom: “Why did he say that Cham was the father of Chanaan? Let no one think that this was said without cause: for there is nothing in divine scripture that is not said for some reason, and that does not have in itself some hidden utility. Why, then, did he name the son of Cham Chanaan? Namely, to intimate the excessive intemperance of Cham's lust: since neither by so great a magnitude of calamity, nor by such straits of the Ark, could his concupiscence be restrained and bridled from serving Venus, from that very time showing the malice of his mind. And so not long after, on account of the insult to his parent, his son Chanaan was to receive a curse: and therefore scripture placed the name of the father and the son together, teaching the father's intemperance: that when afterward you see [him] use great ingratitude toward his father, you may know that he was already of old such, that the general mourning and destruction of all could not repress the rage and madness of his lust.” Thus Chrysostom.

§117. Q2: why name Cham's son Chanaan? Chrysostom: Chanaan was begotten in the Ark — a mark of Cham's lust, indulged even amid the flood. Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 28 on Genesis; “Whether Chanaan was begotten in the Ark during the flood, as Chrysostom signifies.”

But that Chanaan was not begotten within the Ark at the time of the flood, as Chrysostom signifies, can be proved by four arguments. And first, that both men and animals, while they were in the Ark, gave no attention to generation, is the common opinion of Christians and likewise of the Hebrews. Next, since Moses in the eleventh chapter signifies that Chanaan was the last of Cham's sons: if Chanaan had been born in the Ark, then his other brothers would have been begotten before the flood; therefore more

than eight would have entered the Ark, which is against sacred Scripture in the seventh chapter of Genesis. Besides, in the eighth chapter only eight are numbered as having gone out of the Ark; but there would have been nine, if Chanaan had been born in the Ark. Add that Moses in the tenth chapter relates that only after the flood were children born to the three sons of Noah; and Ambrose affirms that even when Noah cursed Chanaan on account of Cham's crime, Chanaan himself had not then been begotten.

§118. Four arguments that Chanaan was NOT born in the Ark (no begetting in the Ark; he was Cham's last son; only eight entered/left; children came only after the flood; Ambrose). Margins: Gen. 7–8; Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 30.

— p. 429 (PDF) · printed p. 360 —

St. Ambrose renders this reason why Moses in this place named Cham the father of Chanaan: “To heap up,” he says, “the offense of Cham himself, his offspring is added — who, although he had a son and was a father, alone himself did not acknowledge his father, who ought the more to have acknowledged [him]: and therefore he deserved to have a wicked son, because he himself had been wicked toward his father. And at the same time this is signified: that from that Chanaan came the Canaanites, who after many generations, oppressed by the just people, gave way into their possession. That the author of the Canaanites, therefore, was Chanaan is manifest, who was the son of this Cham who was impious toward his father.”

§119. Ambrose: Cham is named ‘father of Chanaan’ to heap up his guilt (the unfilial father got an unfilial son) and to mark the origin of the Canaanites. Margin: the same [Ambrose], ch. 28 of the same book.

In accordance with this saying of Ambrose is what I shall subjoin. Moses's purpose in the writing of this history was chiefly to set forth the origin, the increase, and the affairs of the Hebrews: since out of all the nations of the world God had chosen this people for Himself, for whose instruction also all this writing of Moses was destined. And to the Hebrews God was about

to assign the habitation and possession of the land of the Canaanites, justly taken from them on account of their intolerable crimes, as is handed down both in this book, chapter 15, and in Leviticus, chapter 18. Wherefore here is described the beginning of the sin of the Canaanites — which was the mockery and insult against his father Noah by his son Cham — whence the Canaanites took their origin: on account of which insult the posterity of Cham, propagated through his son Chanaan, was struck by God's curse and punished with the penalty of servitude.

§120. Pererius's addition: Moses's aim is the Hebrews' story, including their God-given title to Canaan's land — hence he marks here the first sin of the Canaanites (Cham's insult).

Chrysostom, weighing those words of Moses about those three sons of Noah, “From these was all mankind spread over the whole earth,” vehemently admires and magnifies the providence and omnipotence of God, by which it came about that from only three men the propagation of the human race and the multiplication of innumerable men, up to this day and up to the end of the world, is to be perpetuated. For one must consider that at that time there were only three men, and the earth utterly desolate and wild, with beasts roaming everywhere with no fear, and empty of all those things which make for the cultivation and protection of human life, and also of those remedies which can help to prevent or heal the diseases of bodies. Finally, many things daily in such a state of the world could intervene which might extinguish the life of those men before the generation of offspring, or destroy the offspring once generated. But none of these could impede what God had promised and established: so efficacious was the blessing which God imparted to those men, and powerful that word which He said to them, “Increase and multiply and fill the earth”: the efficacy of which word will remain unto the setting [end] of the world.

§121. Chrysostom marvels at the providence by which all mankind sprang from only three men, in a wild and dangerous post-flood world. Margins: “That the propagation of mankind from the three sons of Noah was admirable”; Chrysostom, hom. 29 on Genesis. *Continues on p. 361.*

Something similar, says Chrysostom, may be observed and admired in the Christian faith. For although kings, tyrants, peoples, and the wise tried in every way to oppress it as it was being born, yet so great a flame of piety burst forth that it pervaded the whole inhabited world, even to the [uninhabited] ends of the earth. Even if you go to the Indians, to the Scythians, to the very Ocean, finally to the ends of the earth, everywhere you will find the minds of men illumined by the Faith of Christ. This is admirable and full of astonishment: that it soothed the savage hearts of barbarians, and they learned to philosophize, and, casting off their former custom, were led over to piety. And just as through the three sons of Noah God multiplied the race of men, so through eleven unlettered and ignorant fishermen, who dared not even open their mouths, He conciliated and subj[ugated] the whole world to Himself…

§122. Chrysostom's parallel: as mankind spread from three sons, so the faith spread worldwide through eleven unlettered fishermen. Margin: "A vast miracle: the spread of the Faith over the whole world." Continues on p. 361.

— p. 430 (PDF) · printed p. 361 —

…[subjugated it]. And those ignorant men stopped the mouths of the philosophers, and ran through the world, as if winged, sowing the word of truth, and tearing out the thorns of old affections, and bearing the laws of Christ everywhere. And neither that they were few, nor that they were private and unlettered, nor that they taught austere and unusual things, nor that men were forestalled by an old custom of thinking and acting, could be an impediment to them: but, the grace of God going before and removing obstacles, with great ease they accomplished all things, receiving through the obstacles themselves the greater alacrity.

§122 (cont.). The apostles silenced the philosophers and converted the world, the grace of God removing every obstacle.

{And Noah, a husbandman, began to till the ground, and planted a vineyard.}

Gen 9:20 (lemma). Margin: v. 20.

In Hebrew, word for word, it is: “And Noah, a man of the earth, began, and planted a vineyard.” Where there is a double Hebraism: one, “man of the earth,” for “devoted to the cultivation of the earth” (and as the Latin interpreter renders, “husbandman”); the other, “began and planted,” for “began to plant.” But how is it true that Noah first of all began to till the earth and to be a husbandman? Was not Adam a husbandman immediately from the beginning of the world, and after him Cain? But one must understand that Noah was the first of all after the flood. Or perhaps Noah was the author [originator] of agriculture, having invented the method of working the earth by animals, that is, of plowing with the ploughshare: for before, men dug and tilled the earth with their own hands. There follows: “And he planted a vineyard.” It is not to be doubted that before the flood there were vines, and at the rising of the world were created by God among the other species of plants. But then they were not in use among men, except perhaps for eating grapes; but for the drinking of wine, not at all. And the chief inventor of pressing wine from grapes and adapting it for drinking was Noah, and he first composed vines (sown here and there) into one place and into the form of a vineyard; and therefore he is truly called the first planter of the vineyard.

§123. The Hebrew ‘man of the earth’; how Noah was ‘first’ husbandman (first after the flood, or inventor of the plough); vines existed before but Noah first made wine and the vineyard.

But whence could he have vines, all the things sown of the earth being corrupted by the flood? Ambrose answers that after the flood the roots of the corrupted vines sprouted again in springtime, the earth being fertilized by moderate moisture and heat, and that Noah used these vines for making his vineyard. Tostatus says that vines indeed sprang up of their own accord from the earth, but wild ones, more productive of wild grapes than of [true] grapes; but that Noah cut shoots from them and inserted them into the best earth, and by suitable cultivation, the wild force being tempered, brought them to the procreation of the best grapes.

§124. Whence the vines after the flood? Ambrose: the old roots resprouted; Tostatus: wild vines arose, which Noah grafted and cultivated. Margins: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 23; Tostatus.

But why was Noah so eager to drink wine, of the drinking of which he had been deprived for six hundred years? Chrysostom answers that it was well known to Noah himself how great a power wine had of soothing grief and sadness of mind, of healing diseases, of strengthening the powers, and of adding vigor and alacrity to a languishing spirit. And because after the flood there were many things which brought sadness to man, and the very nature of man had been made weaker and more liable to diseases, he rightly was eager to have wine as soon as possible, as a solace, remedy, and sup[port] of human life…

§125. Why Noah, after 600 dry years, was eager for wine (Chrysostom): its power to soothe grief, heal, and strengthen — much needed after the flood. Margins: "Why Noah after the flood was eager to drink wine, of which he had been deprived 600 years before"; Chrysostom, hom. 29 on Genesis; Pliny bk. 14; Ambrose, in the place cited. Continues on p. 362.

— p. 431 (PDF) · printed p. 362 —

…support of human life. For most true is what Pliny said: "Just as nothing is more useful to the human body than a moderate use of wine, so nothing is equally pernicious both to the body and to the mind, if the measure of wine be absent."

§125 (cont.). Pliny: moderate wine is most useful, immoderate most pernicious to body and mind alike.

Ambrose marvels why Noah did not seek the fruit of wheat sooner than wine, since the use of wheat is necessary for man, but of wine not at all, but rather superfluous and for pleasure. He himself answers that Noah, being a just man, wished the invention of necessary things to be attributed to God; but the invention of those things which are not necessary, but rather contribute to some convenience or pleasure, he thought not unfitting to be attributed to man. But this seems a more probable answer: that the use of wheat even before the flood was very well known to men, but not so that of

wine. Nor is it incredible that Noah bestowed zeal and care before all on wheat and other necessary things: but that mention is made chiefly of the vine and of wine, because Noah's drunkenness followed the drinking of wine, his nakedness [followed] the drunkenness, the derision of Cham [followed] the nakedness, the curse on his son Chanaan and all his posterity [followed] the mockery — of which posterity (that is, of the nation of the Canaanites) Moses chiefly wished in this place to presignify the curse.

§126. Ambrose: why wine before wheat? (Noah ascribed the invention of luxuries, not necessities, to man.) Pererius: rather, wine is mentioned because it leads to the chain ending in the curse of Canaan.

Berosus also relates things similar to this history of Moses: whose writings, although I think them feigned and worthy of no credence, nevertheless (as I said at the beginning of the eighth book of these Commentaries), on account of many learned men of our age who are greatly delighted by those writings and cannot bring themselves not to believe them, wherever he wrote things similar to Moses or contrary, I have thought it good to record them in their places and to refute them. As regards this history, therefore, he writes thus in the third book: “Noah, before he departed from Armenia (where he first settled after the flood), taught them simple agriculture, and first of all invented and planted vines, and taught how to make wine. For which cause they say he was called by the Ancients Janus, that is, the Wine-bearer, which word drew its origin from the Hebrew word Iaiim, which signifies wine.” So he. Nor is this to be passed over, that those words, “He began to till the earth,” have emphasis: for it is signified that after the flood it was more laborious and toilsome to cultivate the earth than before; and this on account of the malignity of the earth (much corrupted by the flood), and also on account of the less benign aspect and influence of the stars, finally on account of the greater weakness of man and his need of more things.

*§127. Berosus (the spurious Annian text): Noah taught farming and wine in Armenia, called ‘Janus’ (=‘wine-bearer’ from Heb. *iaiim*); ‘began to till’ has force — tilling was harder after the flood. Margin: Berosus Annianus.*

{And drinking of the wine, he was made drunk, and lay uncovered in his tent.}

Gen 9:21 (lemma). Margin: v. 21.

Since this deed of Noah seems to contain either a notable sin of his intemperance, or an error of imprudence, or certainly a kind of disgrace and dishonor to his fame, why did Moses wish to hand it down to memory, and to consign it to letters that would always remain, and to commend it to immortality? First, that from [this too it may appear]…

§128. Why did Moses record Noah's drunkenness and shameful nakedness? Margin: "Why Moses narrated the drunkenness of Noah and his shameful nakedness." Continues on p. 363.

— p. 432 (PDF) · printed p. 363 —

…this too it may appear how great is the simplicity and sincerity of sacred history, which dissembles nothing, but narrates all things, evil as well as good, wholly and incorruptly. Next, for the example and instruction of those who were to read these things, that they might from others take warning of what would be of use to themselves: namely, that the vices and evils into which they perceived the most holy and most wise men to have fallen, they themselves might so much the more, with the greater zeal and diligence, beware and flee, by how much they acknowledged themselves inferior to those in virtue and prudence. Besides, to teach how great a danger and harm of drunkenness there is in the drinking of wine, whether through intemperance or through imprudence. For most truly was it said by Solomon: "Wine is a luxurious thing, and drunkenness tumultuous" — the parent and at once the nurse of innumerable evils. But this above all was Moses's purpose: to indicate the first origin of the damnation of the nation of the Canaanites — namely, the insult of their father Cham, with which he treated his parent Noah, lying with his nakedness uncovered on account of drunkenness.

§128 (cont.). Four reasons Moses recorded it: Scripture's candor; a warning from even holy men's falls; the danger of drink (Prov. 20); and to mark the first cause of the Canaanites' damnation.

Margin: Prov. 20.

But how did Noah, a man most temperate and most holy, fall into so foul and shameful a drunkenness? Indeed I can bring forward five causes of his fall. First, he was ignorant of the power of wine, never before having experienced the drinking of wine, nor having it known from those who had drunk: therefore through imprudence he was deceived and captured by the wine. Next, for six hundred years he had been accustomed to drink water, never having tasted wine; therefore the first drinking of wine, as [he was] unaccustomed, disturbed his soul and mind. For by reason and experiments it is established that those least accustomed to wine are more easily made drunk. Besides, he drank too freely, ignorant of the due measure, thinking that there was equal force in the drinking of water and of wine. The fourth cause of the drunkenness was his now growing and aged years, having namely passed six hundred years. Athenaeus, in the tenth book, cites Aristotle as a witness, who in the book On Drunkenness writes that wine moderately boiled makes one less drunk in drinking, because its force is made weaker by the boiling. The same also relates that older people are made drunk most quickly, easily overcome by the heat which comes from the wine, on account of the fewness and weakness of their own heat. Which cause I think is why Noah's sons were not made drunk as Noah was: for that they too drank wine is not to be doubted; but, prevailing by the strength and vigor of [their] age against the wine, they could break and overcome its force.

§129. Five causes of Noah's drunkenness: ignorance of wine's strength; his 600-year water habit; drinking too freely; old age (Athenaeus/Aristotle: the old are most quickly drunk — so his sons were not). Margins: “Five causes why Noah, made drunk, fell”; Athenaeus; “Old age more liable to drunkenness”; Aristotle.

There remains the fifth cause of Noah's drunkenness; this is, ignorance of the manner in which wine is to be drunk: for it is not to be drunk neat, but mixed and diluted with much water — which the ancients signified by a riddle, fabling that the nurses and rearers of Bacchus were the Nymphs.

Athenaeus also relates that it was the custom among the ancients to build beside Bacchus an altar to the Nymphs, by which it was signified that those about to drink wine ought to be mindful of mixing in water. The same writes that there was praised among the ancients that mixture and tempering of wine and water in which there was as much more water than wine as five exceeds two: and that thence arose the proverb (“Drink five and two”); unless perhaps [by it was signified]…

§130. The fifth cause: ignorance of mixing wine with water (the Nymphs nursed Bacchus; the ancients' 5:2 water-to-wine and the proverb ‘Drink five and two’). Margin: Athenaeus. Continues on p. 364.

— p. 433 (PDF) · printed p. 364 —

…by it was signified that for two cyathi of wine, five cyathi of water were to be drained. He names besides Palamedes, an augur and seer among the most celebrated, who prophesied that those of the Greeks would sail prosperously who had drunk three cyathi of water with one of wine.

§130 (cont.). The proverb's meaning (5 of water to 2 of wine); Palamedes' prophecy on the 3:1 ratio for safe sailing.

From these things, therefore, it is plain how Noah through imprudence fell into drunkenness. But hear what Theodoret briefly writes, in question 65 on Genesis, in confirmation of what we have said: “From inexperience,” he says, “Noah's drunkenness proceeded, not from intemperance. For he, the first of men, having pressed grapes, ignorant not only of how much was to be drunk, but also of how — namely, tempered with water — fell into drunkenness. But that he was uncovered, he suffered nothing new. For even now some are uncovered while sleeping, sleep taking away sensation: but when drunkenness too is added to sleep, much more is the faculty of perceiving lost.”

§131. Theodoret (q. 65): Noah's drunkenness was from inexperience, not intemperance; his uncovering was nothing new (sleep, with drink, removes awareness). Margin: Theodoret.

But from the aforesaid three things may be gathered. First indeed, that Noah's drunkenness is to be excused from all sin. For drunkenness is then a sin, when it is voluntary: I call it voluntary not in itself, but in its cause. For since drunkenness is so foul and pernicious, to whom, I beseech, can it be voluntary and desirable? But the immoderate drinking of wine, which is the cause of drunkenness, is in itself desired and chosen. For those who indulge in wine prefer to enjoy that brief sweetness and pleasure of drinking, rather than to be free from the evil of drunkenness: and so they do it knowingly and willingly, whence they are not ignorant that the vice and evils of drunkenness will follow. But that Noah's drunkenness was wholly involuntary, as proceeding from a plainly excusable ignorance, is manifest from our foregoing disputation. Chrysostom, in homily 29, proves this — that Noah's drunkenness happened not from intemperance but from ignorance — because he never afterward relapsed into it: for scripture would not have been silent about that, just as it was not silent about this one drunkenness of his.

§132. First conclusion: Noah's drunkenness was sinless, being involuntary (from excusable ignorance); Chrysostom — he never relapsed. Margins: “That Noah's drunkenness was free of sin”; Chrysostom.

Hence too this is plain: that before the flood the drinking of wine was not in use among men: for if it had been, many then would have fallen into drunkenness by its immoderate drinking. For at all times most mortals are incontinent of food, drink, and other pleasures. Noah, therefore, either of himself, or by the example of others, would have had the power of wine and its effects known to him, and at the same time would have known how and in what measure it was to be drunk, lest it bring drunkenness. Since, therefore, he was a most temperate man, he would never from drinking wine have fallen into drunkenness. And that we have said — that before the flood men did not use the drinking of wine — Jerome takes as manifest and certain, both elsewhere and in the first book against Jovinian, writing thus: “Christ,” he says, “I am Alpha and Omega; and before the flood indeed

there was neither the eating of flesh, nor the repudiation of wives, nor circumcision, nor the drinking of wine. But after Christ came in the end of times, and turned the Omega to the Alpha and drew back the end to the beginning, neither is it permitted us to give repudiation [divorce], nor are we circumcised, nor do we eat flesh, nor drink wine — the Apostle saying: It is good not to drink wine, and not to eat flesh. Wine, therefore, together with flesh, was dedicated [first used] after the flood." So he.

§133. Second conclusion: before the flood wine was not in use (else many would have been drunk); Jerome (Against Jovinian): like flesh, divorce, circumcision, wine came only after the flood. Margins: "That before the flood the drinking of wine was not in use"; St. Jerome; Apoc. 1; Rom. 14.

— p. 434 (PDF) · printed p. 365 —

Finally it is to be observed in this place that drunkenness is always an evil, and indeed a great evil, even when it happens without fault: for if it sometimes lacks crime, yet it is never free from harm — whether of the body, of one's estate, of one's own reputation or another's; and though other [harms] be absent, this is never absent: the confusion of soul, the perturbation of mind, and as it were a certain brief madness. Truly Chrysostom said that drunkenness is a voluntary demon — nay, even more detestable and more hateful than a demon. For often, when we see a demoniac man, we are moved with pity and condole with him; but on the contrary, we hold the drunken as hateful and odious, we are indignant at them, and judge them worthy of no mercy, but rather of the greatest punishment. Why this? because he who is driven by a demon does involuntarily whatever he does — even if he kicks back, if he tears his garment, if he speaks obscenities, if he strikes and beats — nonetheless he is worthy of pardon. But he who is drunk, for the things he does, does not seem worthy of pardon, but is blamed and accused not only by enemies and strangers, but by neighbors, intimates, and friends, because of his own accord and by his own will he plunged himself into that vice, and gave himself up to the tyranny of drunkenness. And no less among the heathen than among Christians was drunkenness always condemned and execrated.

§134. Drunkenness is always an evil — Chrysostom: ‘a voluntary demon,’ worse than a demon (the demoniac deserves pity, the drunkard blame). Margins: “On the evil and harm of drunkenness”; “Drunkenness, according to Chrysostom, a voluntary demon.”

Many and excellent examples and proofs of this matter the reader will find in Athenaeus, book ten. I will here set down a few words of Pliny alone, but plainly golden. He speaks of the drunken: “Some,” he says, “utter deadly things, and do not contain words that will return through their own throat — how many being thus slain! And commonly truth is now attributed to wine. Meanwhile, granting it turn out best, they do not see the rising Sun, and they live a shorter time. Hence pallor, and drooping cheeks, ulcers of the eyes, trembling hand and tottering feet, and (as a present penalty) furious dreams and nocturnal unrest. And the highest reward of drunkenness, monstrous lust and a delightful crime. The next day, a stench from the mouth, and forgetfulness of nearly all things, and the death of memory. They boast that they thus seize life, whereas they daily lose the preceding day, and these men the coming one too.” So Pliny.

§135. Pliny's ‘golden’ passage on the wretchedness of drunkards. Margins: “Pliny, bk. 14 ch. 22, an excellent saying on the evil of drunkenness”; Athenaeus.

But the case of Noah affects me with great admiration and at the same time commiseration. “And drinking of the wine” (Moses writes of him) “he was made drunk.” And lest anyone should think that by the word “drunkenness” is signified in this place — as often elsewhere in the sacred letters — a large and copious drinking of wine which brings cheerfulness, [but] does not take away the mind, nor harm the integrity of reason and the senses: he at once added, “And he was uncovered in his tent”: doubtless indicating that Noah was oppressed by such drunkenness that he was not master of his mind, and therefore was not at all ashamed of his own nakedness and baseness. O foul, O pitiable and at the same time abhorrent spectacle! So Noah — in his six hundred years of age supremely to be revered and venerable, and a second parent of the human race, praised by Moses with the proclamation not only of sobriety and temperance but of

the most consummate virtue and holiness — lies prostrate on the ground in the most foul nakedness of body, like a madman, mocked [and made sport of] not by strangers but by his own son…

§136. The pathos of Noah's fall: 'was made drunk' + 'uncovered' = true loss of mind; this venerable patriarch lies prostrate, mocked by his own son. Margin: "The indignity of Noah's case is heightened." Continues on p. 366.

— p. 435 (PDF) · printed p. 366 —

…and made sport of, and treated contumeliously. But let us weigh what follows next.

§136 (cont.). [The running head misprints '365' for 366.]

{Which when Ham the father of Canaan had seen, namely that his father's nakedness was uncovered, he told it to his two brethren without.}

Gen 9:22 (lemma). Margin: v. 22.

Just as, immediately after the rise of the World, in those two brothers Cain and Abel the human race was divided into two as it were societies and communities of men — one of the good, imitating Abel, the other of the wicked, whose chief and master was Cain (whence took their origin the two cities, one of God, the other of the Devil, much celebrated by St. Augustine): so too, immediately after the Flood, the same division and separation of men was renewed in the two sons of Noah, Cham and Sem. And this variety of men, although it arises from their own pursuits, characters, deeds, and merits, is nevertheless also ordered by the most hidden and most just judgment of God, and directed to His greater glory. Namely, as Paul excellently argues, in a great house there are not only vessels of gold and silver, but also of wood and earthenware, and some indeed unto honor, some unto contumely: and in these is made an illustrious declaration partly of justice, partly of the divine mercy: for against the vessels of contumely, fitted unto destruction, God shows His

justice and power; but toward the vessels of honor, prepared unto glory, He demonstrates the riches of His goodness and mercy. Of which thing a certain specimen is given in this place, in the two sons of Noah.

§137. As Cain and Abel split mankind into two ‘cities’ (Augustine), so Cham and Sem renew the division after the flood — God's hidden justice and mercy (Paul's vessels of honor/contumely). Margins: “How ancient the division of men into good and bad is, and whence it takes its origin”; Rom. (9); 2 Tim. 2.

But this has a question not passed over in silence by the Fathers: why Moses, about to narrate the impudence (but I should more truly say the impiety) of Cham against his father Noah, was not content to have named him by his own name Cham, but added the name of his son Chanaan, saying, “Cham the father of Chanaan”: for what did it matter to mention the son of Cham, and this son especially, who was the youngest in birth of the others? The question is resolved by three causes brought forward why this was done. The first cause Ambrose and Theodoret hand down: they say that Moses signified that there was the greatest likeness of wickedness and impiety between father and son; and that Cham begot a son, Chanaan, most like himself not so much in nature as in vices and crimes; and that this Chanaan reproduced the express image not so much of his father's nature as of his impiety and depravity. Therefore, because Cham was unlike his own father and his brothers, he is named neither his [father's] son nor the brother of these; but because he fashioned the most express image of his own malice by begetting his son Chanaan, therefore he is properly named “father of Chanaan.” The second cause was that the curse and penalty for Cham's crime was to be inflicted on him in his son Chanaan, and thence [to be derived] to his posterity — I mean the nation of the Canaanites…

§138. Q: why ‘Cham father of Chanaan’? Three causes; the first (Ambrose, Theodoret): father and son were alike in wickedness; the second: the curse would pass through Chanaan to the Canaanites. Margins: “Why here he is called Cham the father of Chanaan — three causes”; Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 30; Theodoret, q. 17 on Genesis. Continues on p. 367.

— p. 436 (PDF) · printed p. 367 —

…the Canaanites. In order, therefore, that Moses might indicate this, and turn the minds of those who would read these things to considering it, designedly in naming Cham he called him the father of Chanaan.

§138 (cont.). [The second cause concluded — to point readers toward the coming curse of Canaan.]

The third cause is handed down by the Hebrews, and Theodoret briefly recounts it in this manner: “A certain Hebrew,” he says, “used to say that Chanaan first of all saw the nakedness of his grandfather, and told it to his father, not without mockery and derision of Noah. But Cham ought, similarly as his brothers did, not only not to approach to look at his father, but even gravely to rebuke his son. But in fact he himself also wished to see, and to report what he had seen to his brothers as well.” And to this interpretation credence is given by what Moses next subjoined: “Noah, roused from his sleep, knew whatever his younger son had done to him.” Who was that younger son? Not Cham, since he was, in the order of generation, the middle one between Sem and Iaphet. But because grandfathers are wont to call not only grandsons, but all who in a long series are born from them, their “sons,” therefore scripture signifies that Chanaan, the youngest grandson of Noah, was known by Noah to have been the author of that crime. Of which thing this too is a great argument: that Noah laid his curse, and as it were the punishment of the crime committed, chiefly upon Chanaan. So the Hebrews, as Theodoret reports.

§139. The third cause (the Hebrews, via Theodoret): Chanaan first saw and reported the nakedness — supported by ‘his younger son’ (the curse fell chiefly on Chanaan). Margin: Theodoret.

There follows: “Namely, that his father's nakedness was uncovered.” Thus are called the parts of the human body naturally destined and serving for the generation of offspring, because beyond all the other members they affect man, using great reason, with shame: but why do we blush most on account of those parts? Namely, on account of their obscene motions by which the mind is incited to base and shameful things, and on account of their disobedience toward reason (for they obey reason less than the other

parts, and cannot easily be restrained and ruled by its command as by a bridle). And by this disobedience of the parts was especially punished the disobedience of the first men toward God: for those who would not obey God, by the just judgment of God it came about that they should feel their own lower parts — assigned to the service of reason — not only unobedient but even rebellious and vehemently resisting. Naked were our first parents, yet, before they sinned, they did not blush, because those parts of the body were wholly subject to reason and were not stirred by any base and shameful motion: but when they sinned against God's law, immediately they experienced the disobedience of those parts; and since they were ashamed of their base motions and yet could not repress them, though they most wished it, they hastened to cover their nakedness and baseness as soon as possible with girdles of fig-leaves.

§140. Why these are the ‘shameful parts’: their disobedience to reason mirrors and punishes man's disobedience to God (Eden's loss of innocence). Margins: “Why those parts especially are called pudenda, and whence that shame arose”; Gen. 3.

Let the reader hear what Augustine writes to this purport: “Rightly are we most ashamed of this lust, rightly too are those very members — which it moves by a certain right of its own, not according to our will — called pudenda [shameful], such as they were not before man's sin. For as it is written, They were naked, and were not ashamed: not that their nakedness was unknown to them, but because their nakedness was not base to them; for not yet had lust moved those members beyond their will; not yet, to convict man's disobedience, did the flesh by its own disobedience in a certain way [bear witness]…

§141. Augustine on the ‘shameful members’: before sin they were not base; lust now moves them beyond the will, witnessing the first disobedience. Margins: Augustine, City of God bk. 14, chs. 17, 20; Gen. 3. Continues on p. 368.

— p. 437 (PDF) · printed p. 368 —

…the flesh in a certain way bore witness: they were naked in body, but clothed with the grace of God, by which it was granted them that their members knew not how to resist their will. Human nature, therefore, is ashamed of this lust, and rightly ashamed: for in its disobedience, by which it subjected the genital members to their own motions alone and snatched them from the power of the will, it is sufficiently shown what was the retribution of that first man's disobedience — which it was most fitting should appear in that part of the body by which the very nature is generated, which was changed for the worse by that first and great sin. From whose bond no one is rescued, unless that which was perpetrated unto the common destruction of all, and vindicated by God's justice, be expiated in individuals by God's grace." So Augustine. And the shame of those parts is so natural to man that all both turn away from the sight of them, and if by chance they are exposed to others' eyes, he blushes. "From this," says Augustine, "the nations so hold it implanted to veil the shameful parts, that even barbarians did not have those parts of the body naked even in the baths, but bathe with coverings of them. And through the shady solitudes of India too, when certain men philosophize naked (whence they are called Gymnosophists), they nevertheless apply coverings to the genitals, which they lack over the rest of the members."

§141 (cont.). Augustine: the implanted shame is universal — even barbarians and the naked Gymnosophists of India cover these parts.

But why are we ashamed of those parts, rather than of others, even when those [others] are stirred by an irrational and faulty motion? For example, when we glow with anger, the face is inflamed with a fiery redness, the eyes bulge, the mouth is distorted, the tongue is hindered, the speech is confused, the gait immoderate; and yet, on account of these things, which are done so faultily, we do not blush as on account of the sight or motion — even the least faulty — of those parts. The cause of this St. Augustine hands down in book 14 of the City of God, chapter 19: that anger and the other motions of the members with other affections, although they be

faulty, yet generally depend on the command of the will; but the motions of those parts, although they lack fault, are nevertheless neither ruled nor moved by the command of the will. “But that shame does not so hide the works of anger and of the other affections in any words and deeds, as the works of lust which are done by the genital members — what is the cause, unless that in the others the members of the body are not so moved by the affections themselves as by the will consenting to them, which entirely dominates in the use of them? For he who speaks a word in anger, or even strikes someone, could not do this unless the tongue and hand were moved at the will's command — which members, even when there is no anger, are moved by the same will. But the genitals lust has made subject to its own right, so that they cannot be moved if it be absent, and unless it, either spontaneously or aroused, has risen. This is what shames [a man], this he avoids by blushing from the eyes of beholders: and a man bears more the multitude of spectators when he is unjustly angry at a man, than the sight of one when he is justly united to his wife.” So Augustine.

§142. Why these parts shame us more than the (faulty) workings of anger: anger's motions obey the will, but these defy it (Augustine, City of God 14.19). Margins: “Why these members shame us rather than the others”; Augustine, City of God ch. 19.

From this cause arose that shameful (and no less to-be-feared than shameful), and not to be ended except by death, discord and war of the flesh and the spirit: of which Paul [speaks]: “The flesh,” he says, “lusts against the spirit, but the spirit against the flesh; for these are contrary one to another, so that you do not the things that you would.” Hence that pitiable complaint and lamentable exclamation of the same: “I see another law in my members fighting against [the law of my mind]…

§143. The shameful, deadly ‘war of flesh and spirit’ (Gal 5; Rom 7's lament). Margin: Gal. 5. Continues on p. 369.

— p. 438 (PDF) · printed p. 369 —

…the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin which is in my members. Unhappy man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" It is not to be passed over in silence that, in place of that "his father's nakedness," in the Hebrew it is "nakedness" — a word frequently used in Leviticus 18, where for it the Latin reading has this word, "baseness" [turpitudo]. Consider, therefore, how honorably and modestly the Hebrew tongue names the unseemly and shameful parts of our body. Cham, therefore, saw his father's nakedness — and he did not see it by chance, imprudently running upon the sight of him, but he stopped to look, knowingly and willingly gazed, leisurely and attentively beheld, impudently mocked. O worthless man, against whom that old saying may rightly be applied: "An evil mind, an evil disposition."

§143 (cont.). The Hebrew 'nakedness' (cf. Lev 18); Cham looked deliberately, knowingly, and mockingly — 'an evil mind, an evil disposition.'

Berosus Annianus, narrating this history, added much of his own: "Cham," he says, "the son of Noah, was devoted to the magic and poisoning art, whence he got the name Zoroaster. He hated his father Noah, because he was not only less loved by him than his other brothers, but even despised; but the chief cause of the hatred was the dissimilarity of pursuits and characters. And so, having got an opportunity, when Noah lay drunk, grasping his virile parts with his hands and softly muttering, by a magic charm he mocked his father, and made him sterile, just as if he had been castrated. Wherefore after that time Noah could make no woman fruitful." Thus he.

§144. Berosus's fictional addition: Cham (= Zoroaster), a magician, hated and magically 'castrated' his drunken father. Margin: Berosus Annianus.

In Cassian, Abbot Serenus, in the eighth Conference, chapter 21, relates that the first authors and masters of magical superstitions and tricks were the evil Angels once mingled with women: and that the most studious and most skilled of those arts was Cham the son of Noah, who, lest those arts

should perish in the flood, preserved them engraved on plates of various metals and on the hardest stones, and after the flood taught them to his posterity and disseminated them through the world. Similar things the author of the Scholastic History writes: “Ninus,” he says, “conquered Cham, who still lived and reigned among the Bactrians (or, as it pleases others, in Thrace), and was called Zoroaster, the inventor of the Magic art; who wrote both this and the seven liberal arts on fourteen columns, seven of bronze and seven of brick, against the twofold destruction of the world which he had heard would come, one by water, the other by fire. But Ninus burned his books.” So there. If these things are true, it ought to seem strange to no one that Cham was so ungrateful, impudent, and impious toward his father Noah; whose mind, namely, was not only contaminated with human crimes, but even most corrupted with the diabolical deceits and errors of the magic arts.

§145. Cham as the preserver and spreader of magic (Cassian; the Scholastic History — Cham/Zoroaster's fourteen columns, burnt by Ninus). Margins: Cassian; Gen. 6; “Cham a Magus, and the same as Zoroaster”; Scholastic History on Genesis, ch. 39.

“And he told it to his two brethren without.” In Moses here describing the crime of Cham, the individual words have great emphasis — or rather, the individual [words] are certain grave circumstances by which that sin is vehemently aggravated. First, not some stranger, but his own son sinned against his father; next, against a father a most holy man and most dear to God, worthy of the highest reverence and veneration, and by whose domestic examples of virtues, being instructed, he ought to have loved good and to have hated and shunned any evil whatever (not to say so great a crime)…

§146. The circumstances aggravating Cham's sin begin (his own son; against so holy a father). Continues on p. 370.

— p. 439 (PDF) · printed p. 370 —

…he ought [to have shunned it]. To this was added the highest crime of an ungrateful mind: that not only once had he received from him, through generation, the breath of life and the enjoyment of light, but on his account especially he had been saved from the destruction of the flood. This too increases the crime, that he is called by Moses “father of Chanaan”: for since he was now a father, he ought rightly to have feared lest, as he behaved toward his own father, so he might experience his own son toward himself; nor did that first precept of the natural law restrain him from sinning, “What you do not wish to be done to you, do not to another.” Add that he knowingly and willingly looked upon his father's nakedness and baseness with contempt, mocked it, divulged it, and provoked his brothers to mock it. Do you see how many crimes there are in one deed?

§146 (cont.). Further aggravations: ingratitude to the father who gave him life and saved him; he was himself a father; he broke the Golden Rule; he gazed, mocked, divulged, and incited.

But why did Cham rejoice so greatly in so foul and base a spectacle of his father's nakedness? Doubtless he was wicked, and therefore rejoiced in wicked things, and was delighted by the errors of others as by the consolations of his own crimes. “Every wicked man,” says Ambrose, “because he himself is straying from discipline, not only takes the falls of others as a consolation for his own error — that he has found partners of his fault — but even rejoices with a wicked affection, as if he himself had corrected his own faults. The evil mind, therefore, rejoices that something has happened to some wise man beyond [his] purpose: although surely a fall of the body ought not to be reckoned a vice, even if it be thought a fall, unless the mind too be inclined to fault. For errors of this kind are to be judged venial, not to be pursued with hatred, not to be held in mockery. But the mind, as I said, being wicked, when it thinks a wise man has erred, judges that he is to be insulted whose character it thinks contrary to its own, and that it is to rejoice that to a just man neither his erudition profited, nor justice favored him, nor the things which are according to the body had prosperous courses.”

§147. Why Cham rejoiced: the wicked delight in others' falls (Ambrose) — as if a partner in fault excused their own. Margins: “Why the wicked greatly rejoice in the fall of the good”; Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 30.

To this also pertains what Basil left written in the Oration On Envy: “Just as,” he says, “vultures are borne toward ill-smelling things, but fly past pleasant meadows and sweet-smelling places; and flies pass by what is sound and whole and betake themselves to the diseased and ulcerous: so the envious do not regard the things which in life are illustrious and gloriously done, but attend to the things which are mean; if anything has been done amiss (such as many human things happen to be), they publish it, and from that wish men to be known. Just as also unskilled painters, from a distorted nose, or from a sca[r]…

§148. Basil (On Envy): the envious are like vultures and flies, drawn to others' faults; like bad painters fixing on a blemish. Margin: Basil. Continues on p. 371.

— p. 440 (PDF) · printed p. 371 —

…or from some other fault which sometimes happens by nature or by disease, represent the forms of those who are painted, and from that wish them to be recognized.”

§148 (cont.). [The running head misprints ‘374’ for 371.] Basil's image concluded — the envious make others known by a single blemish.

{But Shem and Japheth put a cloak upon their shoulders, and going backward, covered the nakedness of their father: and their faces were turned away, and they saw not their father's nakedness.}

Gen 9:23 (lemma). Margin: v. 23.

By these words, as Ambrose says, an evident affection of piety is expressed, in that the good sons took care not to see their father uncovered of his garment, lest paternal reverence should be diminished even by the very sight: since even by the silent countenance piety is frequently offended. Whence also at Rome it is said to have been an ancient custom

that sons should not enter the bath with their parents, and especially [not] the grown-up [sons]. Thus Ambrose. And what he indicates about the modesty of the ancient Romans, Cicero teaches in express words in the first book of the Offices: “The custom of stage-players has so much modesty from ancient discipline, that no one comes onto the stage without a loincloth: lest, if perchance certain parts of the body be exposed, they be looked upon indecorously. And by our custom, grown-up sons do not bathe with their parents, nor sons-in-law with their fathers-in-law.” Thus Cicero.

§149. The brothers' piety (Ambrose); ancient Roman modesty (Cicero, On Duties 1 — the stage loincloth, sons not bathing with fathers). Margins: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 31; Cicero.

Altogether that deed of Sem and Iaphet was, both by the notable duty of paternal reverence and piety, and by the illustrious signification of a most chaste mind and most praiseworthy modesty, to be remembered in all ages, and worthy of no less proclamation and imitation by men than the deed of Cham [is worthy] of blame and execration. For, when their father's nakedness was announced to them by Cham, they not only did not approve his levity, but even (as it is fair to believe) vehemently rebuked him. Next, they not only would not look at their naked father, but, lest the foulness of his nakedness should be exposed to the eyes of many and thence the father's ignominy (which they reckoned their own) should grow, they hastened as quickly as possible to cover him — yet with backward step, lest perchance they should see their father's nakedness even by imprudence. And so those excellent counsels and lessons about honoring parents which are handed down in the book of Ecclesiasticus, they so many ages before most diligently kept and most perfectly performed. And thus it is in that place: “He that honors his father shall have joy in his children, and in the day of his prayer he shall be heard, and shall live a longer life. He that fears God honors his parents, and will serve them as masters who begot him. In work and word and all patience honor thy father, that a blessing may come upon thee from God, and his blessing may remain in the latter end. The blessing of the father establishes the houses of the

children, but the curse [of the mother] roots up the foundations. Glory not in the dishonor of thy father, for his shame is no glory to thee but confusion: for the glory of a man is from the honor of his father, and a father without honor is the disgrace of the son. Son, support the old age of thy father, and grieve him not in his life; and if he fail in sense, bear with him, and despise him not in thy strength.” The truth and utility of these precepts the example of those three sons of Noah abundantly approved.

§150. The brothers' covering — a deed for all ages — fulfilled in advance the precepts on honoring parents (Ecclesiasticus 3 quoted at length).

I, for my part, do not know whether of equal or even greater reverence and piety toward parents — not indeed carnal, but spiritual, such as are priests and Bishops — is to be judged that which it is recorded in the Ecclesiastical histories that Constantine the Great did. When he was present at the Council of Nicaea, to which, for the establishing of the Faith, three hundred and eighteen Bishops had assembled, several little books, filled with episcopal contentions, complaints, quarrels, and accusations, were delivered to him; which he not only did not bring himself to read or open, but publicly ordered to be burned — affirming that it was a wicked and impious thing that any mortal should publish, much less judge or condemn, the vices of those whom God appointed masters and judges and as it were parents of other men…

§151. Constantine's parallel: at Nicaea he burned the bishops' mutual accusations unread, refusing to expose his ‘spiritual parents.’ Margins: “A memorable example of Constantine the Great on honoring Christ's Church-Prelates and covering their faults”; Theodoret, Eccl. Hist. bk. 1, ch. 11. Continues on p. 372.

— p. 441 (PDF) · printed p. 372 —

…I will here set down the words of Theodoret, by which he briefly set forth the history of that matter, for they are most worthy to be read with admiration of so great an Emperor's reverence and piety. “Moreover,” he says, “I think that by no means is this to be passed over in silence. There

were certain men burning with zeal for calumny, who accused some Bishops and brought books of accusation to the Emperor. But he, having received books of this kind, first, when he had bound them with a cord and sealed them with his ring, ordered them to be kept. Then, when he had reconciled concord among them, he ordered the books, brought into the midst, to be burned with fire, they themselves looking on, an oath being added that he had not read even a word written in them. For the vices of priests," he said, "are not to be exposed to the people, lest, taking from it occasion of offense, they more freely set about to sin. Nay, they relate that he also said this: that if with his own eyes he should see a Bishop committing adultery with another's wife, he would cover that nefarious deed with his own cloak, lest the sight of his crime should in any part harm those who beheld it." So Theodoret. This same history the reader will find more fully expounded in Rufinus, in the tenth book of the Ecclesiastical History, where also is set down the memorable Oration of Constantine, by which that pious Emperor exalts the authority and dignity of the Prelates of the Church of Christ above every height of secular power and dignity. But to us what we have recorded above from Theodoret seemed to make more for the present matter.

§151 (cont.). Theodoret's account: Constantine sealed, then burned, the accusations unread (he would even cover a bishop's adultery with his own cloak); cf. Rufinus. Margin: Rufinus.

St. Gregory, diligently weighing this example of the most prudent piety of Sem and Iaphet toward their father, according to the Tropological interpretation (in which he always excels), beautifully accommodates it to the instruction of those who are ruled by another's command, [showing] how subjects ought to behave toward the vices of their Prelates; lest perchance they either foolishly study to imitate their Prelates' vices, or impudently deride [them], or even dare contumeliously to publish [them]. And he writes thus: "If the life of teachers is justly reprehended, the subjects ought neither to wish to imitate them, nor to despise to venerate those whom they decline to imitate: but let them venerate even what

displeases. This is to be shrewdly considered: for a middle way of rectitude and humility is to be held, that the vices of masters so displease, that yet the subjects' mind does not depart from preserving the reverence of the magistracy. Which is well expressed in Noah made drunk, whose uncovered nakedness the good sons, turned away, covered. For we say ‘to turn away’ [aversari] that which we disapprove. To good subjects, therefore, let the evils of their superiors so displease, that yet they conceal them from others. They bring the covering turned away, because, disapproving the deed and venerating the magistracy, they will not see what they cover.” So he.

§152. Gregory's tropology: subjects should disapprove their prelates' faults yet conceal them and keep due reverence (the brothers' backward covering). Margins: “A notable saying of St. Gregory, how subjects ought to behave toward their prelates' faults”; Gregory, Morals bk. 25.

— p. 442 (PDF) · printed p. 373 —

{And Noah awaking from the wine, when he had learned what his younger son had done to him.}

Gen 9:24 (lemma). Margin: v. 24.

The Seventy Interpreters made no mention or signification of sleep: for thus they rendered this place: “And Noah, being made sober from the wine.” But the Latin, Hebrew, and Chaldaic reading have a manifest mention of the sleep by which, on account of drunkenness, Noah was seized. For to awake or be roused from wine plainly declares that a sleep born of drunkenness had preceded. And indeed drunkenness is wont to bring on a very deep sleep. For from three things sleep happens to man: from excessive labor and weariness of body, from much food, and from much drinking of wine — especially of wine very strong and (so to say) fuming. For by these things many and thick vapors (either created in the stomach from food and drink, or released from the body itself, which is attenuated and worn by immoderate labor) go up into the head, and there oppress and in a way bind the common sense — the origin of the exterior

senses and the term and as it were a certain center of their actions: whereby there comes a cessation of the exterior senses from their functions, whence sleep arises. Therefore, for Noah to have awaked from wine is nothing other than to have slept off the wine, and, loosed at once from drunkenness and sleep, to have returned to the entire use of reason and the senses. And what wonder, the father of the family sleeping so deeply, that an enemy man sowed tares in his family?

§153. The Septuagint omits the sleep; the three causes of sleep (toil, food, strong wine — vapors binding the 'common sense'); 'an enemy sowed tares' while the father slept. Margins: "Three causes of sleep"; Matt. 13.

"When he had learned what his younger son had done to him." Whence did Noah know what had been done about him, while he was lulled by sleep and drunkenness? According to the Interlinear Gloss, he knew it by the prophetic spirit and by revelation of God. But for knowing these things there was no need of divine revelation. The opinion of most, therefore, is that the deed of Cham was made known to Noah by the report of Sem and Iaphet. But when I consider the exceeding goodness and gentleness of mind of those brothers, I am scarcely brought to believe that they of their own accord narrated to their father the crime of their brother, fearing namely lest they should affect both their father with great grief and sorrow, and their brother with some huge evil. This, therefore, would be more credible: that Noah, awakening, when he had seen his nakedness uncovered of its own garment and covered with another's cloak, asked the cause of this thing from his sons, and that thus they were compelled to narrate what had happened. But who is he whom in this place he calls the "lesser son," or as the Septuagint has, the "younger"? There are those who think that not Cham is signified, but his son Chanaan, the grandson of Noah. For it is the custom among almost all that grandfathers call not only their own children, but also those who are procreated from them, their sons: and Chanaan is called the "lesser son," to distinguish him from Sem, Cham, and Iaphet, who were the greater and nearer sons of Noah.

§154. How Noah knew (not by revelation, but he asked his sons on seeing himself re-clothed); who is the 'younger son' — possibly the grandson Chanaan. Margin: Matt. 13.

But the common opinion is that the "lesser son" is called Cham. But why is he called lesser, since he was greater in birth than Iaphet? where[ever]…

§155. The common view: the 'lesser son' = Cham. But why 'lesser'? Margin: "Why Cham is called the lesser son." Continues on p. 374.

— p. 443 (PDF) · printed p. 374 —

…for wherever these three sons of Noah are named, Cham is always mentioned second. Ambrose interprets that he is called "younger" not in age but in sense and character. But Chrysostom writes that he was indeed greater than Iaphet, but on account of the crime committed against his father was postponed [placed after] all his brothers. The same happened to Esau in respect to Jacob, and to Ruben in respect to Judah. But that exposition seems to me simpler and plainer: that he is called "lesser" comparatively, that is, lesser than Sem. Although the Hebrews think the contrary: for they judge that Sem was the least of all, but was set before the other brothers on account of the excellence of his holiness, and on account of the dignity of the race which was drawn from him — I mean the Patriarchs, Kings, and Prophets, and the whole Hebrew people. Although, since simply and precisely he is called the "lesser son," it seems it must be understood that he was lesser than the other brothers, and that "lesser" and "least" are here equivalent: especially since the Hebrews lack comparatives. But about the order of generation of Noah's sons, something has been said in the earlier books, and will be disputed in the next following book.

§155 (cont.). Why 'lesser': Ambrose (in character), Chrysostom (demoted for his crime, like Esau/Ruben), Pererius (= 'lesser than Sem'); the Hebrews think Sem the youngest but preferred. Margins: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 31; Chrysostom on Genesis; Gen. 27; below, ch. 49.

St. Augustine, from the signification of the word Cham — which (as he himself interprets) signifies hot or fervid — shows that Cham was a figure

of heretics, writing thus: “Cham, moreover, who is interpreted ‘hot,’ the middle son of Noah — as though distinguishing himself from both and remaining between both, neither in the firstfruits of the Israelites nor in the fullness of the Gentiles — what does he signify but the hot race of heretics, hot not with the spirit of wisdom but with the spirit of a versatile cunning, with which the hearts of heretics are wont to seethe and to disturb the peace of the Saints? But these things turn to the use of those who advance, according to that of the Apostle: There must be heresies, that they who are approved may be made manifest among you. For many things pertaining to the Catholic faith, while they are agitated by the crafty restlessness of heretics — that they may be defended against them — are both considered more diligently, and understood more clearly, and preached more insistently; and the question raised by the adversary becomes an occasion of learning.” So Augustine.

§156. Augustine: ‘Cham’ = ‘hot,’ a figure of heretics (hot with cunning, not wisdom) — yet heresies profit the Church, sharpening and clarifying the faith. Margins: Augustine, City of God bk. 16, ch. 2; “What benefit the Catholic Church gets from heretics”; 1 Cor. 11.

But Berosus Annianus recounts in a few words the manifold and enormous wickedness of this Cham. “But Cham,” he says, “when he publicly corrupted the mortal race, bringing in and teaching by his own example that one must couple (as was done before the flood) with mothers, sisters, daughters, males, and brutes: and on account of this he was cast out by Janus (Noah), a most pious and most chaste man, and got the surname Esen Enua. Now Esen signifies among the Scythian Aramaeans ‘infamous and unchaste’; but Enua, ‘incubus and propagator.’ The pestilent dogmas of this Cham the Egyptians followed, and made him for themselves among the gods the younger Saturn, and built him a city called Chemmin, that is, the city of Cham: whose citizens to this age are called Chemenites. But the later Egyptians cast off those nefarious minglings, retaining what had been of the first custom, that marriages might be entered into between brothers and sisters.” So that Berosus.

§157. Berosus's lurid account: Cham taught universal incest/bestiality, was expelled by 'Janus' (Noah), named 'Esen Enua'; the Egyptians made him the younger Saturn and named a city Chemmin for him. Margins: Berosus Annianus bk. 3; "On the enormous wickedness and impiety of Cham."

— p. 444 (PDF) · printed p. 375 —

{Cursed be Canaan.}

Gen 9:25 (lemma). [The running head misprints 'VERS. 29' for v. 25.]

The Septuagint translation, lately corrected at Rome, has thus: "Cursed be the boy Canaan"; which reading Chrysostom and Augustine also followed. If we embrace this reading, we must not doubt that Canaan was already born at the time Noah spoke these words: for, had he not been born, Noah would not have called him by his proper name and noted his boyish age. But although we do not read the word "boy" (which neither the Hebrew nor the Chaldaic nor the Latin have), nevertheless it is probable that Canaan was by then born: for how would Noah have cursed one not yet born? I know that Origen, Ambrose, and Rupert thought the contrary. But to me what I have said is more like the truth. And so what Moses here narrates of Noah's drunkenness and the curse of Canaan happened at least ten years after the flood, since Canaan was then already a boy and had three other brothers older in birth. Moreover that word, "cursed," as Theodoret and others interpret, does not contain a wish and imprecation of evil, but a prophetic prediction of the things that were to come upon his posterity. Nor is the verb "be" to be understood, but the verb "is" or "will be," in this sense: "He is cursed," namely in his posterity, according to God's eternal predestination and ordination; or, "He will be cursed," namely in his own time, at which time God's ordination will come to effect. This exposition is helped by what is next subjoined: "A servant of servants shall he be to his brothers."

§158. The Septuagint 'Cursed be the boy Canaan' (followed by Chrysostom, Augustine) implies Canaan was already a boy (so this happened ≥10 yrs post-flood); 'cursed' is a prophecy, not an imprecation. Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 29; Augustine, City of God 16.2; Origen, hom. 20 on Numbers; Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 30; Rupert, Commentaries on Genesis, ch. 37;

Theodoret.

But if anyone should altogether wish Noah's speech to contain an imprecation of evil, that interpretation too has a very good sense. For Noah imprecates evil upon his [grand]son not from impatience of the injury received from him, nor from ardor of vengeance, but from the most holy zeal of justice. Namely, he imprecates upon him an evil merited and due to his crimes; and not without the prompting and inspiration of God, whose will and decree this was, as he was not ignorant. And the blessing and curse of a father has great force for the good and evil of children. Wherefore a father's blessing is vehemently to be desired, his curse to be dreaded. For it is written: “The blessing of the father establishes the houses of the children, but the curse roots up the foundations.”

§159. Or, if ‘cursed’ is an imprecation, it springs from Noah's zeal for justice (not vengeance), at God's prompting; a father's blessing/curse has great force (Ecclus 3).

But two questions arise here, not to be passed over: of which the first is, why was not Cham, who had sinned, cursed, but Chanaan his son? To this it can be variously answered. First, because Chanaan first of all saw Noah's nakedness and baseness, mocked it, and told it to his father; therefore Noah rightly laid his curse chiefly upon him. This is the opinion of the Hebrews, which Theodoret recounts not without assent, and Cajetan plainly approves. Next, that the magnitude of Cham's crime might be more expressly shown — which had been so great that it deserved to be punished not in himself only, but even in his son and his posterity. Besides, if [Cham] had been cursed…

§160. First question: why curse Canaan, not the guilty Cham? Reasons begin (Canaan first saw and reported; to magnify Cham's crime). Margins: “Why Cham who had sinned was not cursed, but his son Chanaan”; Theodoret; Cajetan. Continues on p. 376.

— p. 445 (PDF) · printed p. 376 —

…Cham, his curse would have seemed to pertain to his whole posterity, whereas that curse comprehended only the posterity to be propagated

through his son Chanaan, and not through the other three sons Chus, Mesrain, and Phut. Besides, since God had blessed all the sons of Noah when they came out of the ark, Noah would not have dared to curse any of them, thinking it wicked that he should assign a curse to one to whom God had imparted His blessing. This reason Chrysostom and Theodoret touched on.

§160 (cont.). Two more reasons: the curse touched only the Canaanite line (not Cham's other sons); and Noah dared not curse one whom God had blessed. Margins: Chrysostom; Theodoret.

St. Ambrose brings forward three reasons: one, that the grief of Cham might be the sharper, understanding that on account of his crime his son too (whom he loved uniquely as the youngest in birth and most like himself in disposition and character), and indeed even his posterity, would be punished with the penalty of a most base servitude. The second, that Chanaan — both by his own crimes (for he was most wicked) and by the imitation of his father's impiety and malice — was most worthy of such a curse. The third, that the gravity of Cham's sin might be more openly declared, whose penalty was ended not in himself only, but extended even to his posterity. To these add that Noah saw by the prophetic spirit that the posterity of Cham to be generated from his son Chanaan — I mean the nation of the Canaanites — would be most wicked and most impious, and therefore hateful to God, accursed and execrable and to be exterminated from their seats; but that those who were left would be made subject to the service of the posterity of Sem (that is, to the Hebrews). This, I say, when Noah had seen by the prophetic spirit, following God's sentence, he heaped his curse chiefly upon Chanaan, the parent of the Canaanites.

§161. Ambrose's three reasons (to sharpen Cham's grief; Canaan deserved it himself; to show the gravity of Cham's sin); Noah prophetically foresaw the wicked Canaanites' doom and enslavement to the Hebrews. Margin: Ambrose, On Noah and the Ark, ch. 32.

FOURTH DISPUTATION. How it is not unjust for some to be punished by God for the sins of others.

The second question is, that it seems unjust that, for the father's sin, both his son and his posterity should be punished with so grave a penalty. But let us suppose in this place (which most think) that Chanaan was not the author or partaker of the crime of Cham his father. For God testified in plain words through Ezekiel: “The son,” He says, “shall not bear the iniquity of the father, but the soul that has sinned, the same shall die”; and by the law of Moses He forbade fathers to be killed for the sins of sons, or sons for the sins of parents, but commanded each to be punished for his own sin. Finally, elsewhere it is thus written of God: “Since thou art just, thou orderest all things justly; him also, who ought not to be punished, thou judgest it foreign [to thy power] to condemn.” But on the contrary, for the sins of parents not only sons but even grandsons and great-grand[sons]…

§162. The difficulty: how just to punish the (innocent) Canaan and his line for the father's sin? Scripture says each dies for his own sin (Ezek 18; Deut 24; Wisd 12) — yet God elsewhere visits fathers' sins on descendants. Margins: Ezek. 18; Deut. 24; Wisd. 12. Continues on p. 377.

— p. 446 (PDF) · printed p. 377 —

…are punished by God, and there are many examples in the sacred letters, and most plain is that sentence of God: “I am the Lord thy God, strong, jealous, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.”

§162 (cont.). The opposing text: God ‘visiting the iniquity of fathers upon the children’ (Exod 20). Margin: Exod. 20.

This question I will treat in the scholastic manner — that is, distinctly, circumscribed, and concisely — premising four things on which the explication of the question largely depends. The first of these is that the word “Penalty” can be taken in three ways: either properly, as it is penalty alone; or improperly, so that it has the character of medicine rather than of penalty; or in both ways, so that it has the character of penalty and medicine at once. If penalty be taken properly, it necessarily responds to sin, and cannot be without it; since by penalty the equality of justice

violated by sin is compensated and restored: so that, because in sinning a man (to gratify his own will) transgressed the law, he undergoes from the law a penalty against his will, and the sweetness of the sin committed against the law is compensated by the bitterness of the penalty inflicted by the law. And since sin is nothing but voluntary, the act must be personal: wherefore no one properly pays such a penalty for another's sin, but for his own.

§163. The scholastic method; first premise: 'penalty' has three senses — properly (it answers a personal sin), as medicine, or both. Margin: "The various signification of the word 'penalty.'"

The second [premise] is that penalty taken improperly — which has chiefly the character of medicine — is a privation of lesser goods for the obtaining of greater: now the greatest goods are spiritual (as not ordered to others), but the lesser goods are corporeal (for these are ordered to the spiritual). A penalty, therefore, which has the force of medicine, properly has no place in spiritual goods, but only in corporeal; just as a physician does not blind the eye to heal the ear, but burns a cautery on the arm to preserve the soundness of the eyes or the head. And with such a penalty even the innocent are often afflicted, as Job and Tobias; nor does it respond to actual and mortal sin. I said 'actual' to except original [sin], of which all the corporeal defects of human nature are in a way penalties and effects; I said 'mortal,' for not even the just live without venial [sins]. And such a penalty profits the just, either for healing the remnants of past sins, or for protecting the present health of the soul, or for forestalling imminent sins. The third [premise] is that sometimes a penalty has the character both of penalty and of medicine — namely, when by it both satisfaction is made to the law violated by sin, and he who suffers takes from it a spiritual benefit (either being recalled from evil to good, or, if he is already good, being strengthened in it and advancing). The fourth [premise] is that there are two kinds of penalty by which men are struck: one corporeal, the other spiritual. The corporeal is the privation of corporeal goods (such as health, strength, life, riches, honors, finally friends and kindred); the spiritual is the

privation of spiritual goods (such as divine grace and the infused virtues, likewise certain singular divine helps, finally whatever either contains or preserves or of itself conduces to a man's spiritual good).

§164. The remaining three premises: medicinal penalty = loss of lesser (bodily) goods for greater (spiritual) — even the innocent (Job, Tobias); the mixed penalty; and the two kinds, bodily and spiritual. Margins: “How a penalty is medicine”; Job 1; Tob. 1.

— p. 447 (PDF) · printed p. 378 —

These things being laid down, the explication of the proposed question will not be difficult. First, from the aforesaid it is clear that no one is punished with a spiritual penalty for another's sin: both because the spiritual penalty is penalty properly so called, which responds to sin properly so called — and that is nothing but voluntary, therefore personal; and also because the spiritual penalty properly affects the rational soul, according to which one man is not something of another's, nor depends on another man. And to this especially pertains that sentence of the Lord uttered through Ezekiel, which we recalled above: “The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, nor the father of the son, but the soul that has sinned, the same shall die. Behold, all souls are mine: as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine.” And He adds: “If a wicked man beget a son who, seeing all his father's sins which he did, fears God and does not the like, this man shall not die in his father's iniquity, but shall live.”

§165. First conclusion: no one is punished spiritually for another's sin (the spiritual penalty answers a personal, voluntary sin; the rational soul is one's own — Ezek 18). Margins: “That no one is punished spiritually for [another's] sin”; Ezekiel ch. 18.

But that someone is punished with a corporeal penalty for the sins of others is manifest from the sacred letters. But this happens in two ways: either when he who is punished is free of the sin for which he is punished, or when he is a partaker. If he is free, sometimes that punishment is for the good both of him who is punished and of those for whose sins he is punished: for example, Ezekiel and Daniel were partakers of the captivity

and calamities of the Hebrew people, which was punished by God for its impiety and great crimes — crimes from which those prophets were most far removed. But that penalty profited them for spiritual and corporeal good, as is plain in Daniel; and it redounded to the good of that people: for they, led into captivity together with their countrymen, were of great good to them for bearing the bitterness of captivity, and of great help for preserving the religion of the true God among the idolaters. But sometimes it happens that someone is punished with a corporeal penalty for the sins of others of which he is not a partaker, but that chastisement turns to the evil and penalty of him for whose cause he is punished, while to him who is punished it can be a good and an advantage. In this way, for the sins of parents even innocent sons are punished, and for the crimes of masters innocent servants and subjects. And such an animadversion, because sons are something of their parents, and servants of their masters, is a great torment of grief to them; but sons and subjects are by penalties of this kind deterred from imitating and pursuing the crimes of their parents and masters.

§166. Corporeal penalty for others' sins is twofold: if the punished is innocent, it may even profit him (Ezekiel, Daniel in the captivity); or fall to his grief but the other's penalty (innocent sons/servants). Margin: "How someone is punished with a corporeal penalty for others' sins."

Nevertheless it mostly comes about that those who are punished for the sins of others are themselves also guilty of the same sins. And this happens in three ways: either by imitation, as sons generally imitate the crimes of their parents, and servants those of their masters (for by their example they become more prone and more bold to sinning); or by a kind of merit, as wicked subjects deserve to have a wicked ruler too (for it frequently happens, as Job said, "God makes a hypocrite man to reign because of the sins of the people"; and for David's sin of numbering the people, the people of Israel too was most gravely punished — though it had deserved that punishment by many and great crim[es]…

§167. Yet usually those punished for others' sins share their guilt — threefold: by imitation; by a kind of merit (wicked subjects deserve a wicked ruler — Job; David's census); … Margins: "How the sins of others pass over to others"; Job 34; 2 Kings [Samuel], last ch. Continues on p. 379.

— p. 448 (PDF) · printed p. 379 —

…it had deserved: or finally by a certain tacit consent and dissimulation, as the good are often struck by the scourge of divine justice together with the wicked, because, when they could and ought to have reproved their sins, they took no care.

§167 (cont.). The third way: tacit consent — the good suffer with the wicked for failing to rebuke them.

Let the reader hear a brief but excellent saying of St. Augustine on this matter: "Mostly it is ill that wicked men are not taught, admonished, and even rebuked — whether because the labor is irksome, or because we are ashamed to offend their faces, or because we avoid their enmities, lest they harm us or stand in our way in those things which our cupidity desires to obtain, or which our weakness fears to lose. Whence it comes about that, although the life of the wicked displeases the good (and therefore they do not fall with them into eternal damnation), yet, because they spare their sins, they are justly scourged temporally with them — justly do they feel this life bitter, by too much loving whose sweetness they were unwilling to be bitter to the sinners. For if anyone spares to rebuke and correct evildoers because he awaits a more opportune time, or fears lest the rebuked become worse and be an impediment to the instruction of the weak, and oppress others and turn them from the faith — this seems to be not the occasion of cupidity, but the counsel of charity." So Augustine.

§168. Augustine: the good are scourged with the wicked for sparing to rebuke them — unless their silence is from prudent charity. Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 [bk. 1], ch. 2.

Besides, God chastises some for the sins of others for two causes: both to commend the unity of human society (for we are all as it were members of one body, so that it is no wonder that the pain of one member is a pain to

the other members; God therefore by this thing signifies that some ought to be solicitous for others lest they sin, since, on account of the bond of society, the evils of some are an evil and harm to others too); and also for the detestation of sin itself, whose poison is so great that it is not only deadly to the sinners, but pernicious to others too.

§169. God punishes some for others to commend society's unity (members of one body) and to show sin's contagious poison.

But let us weigh that sentence of God recalled above, in which the difficulty of this question largely sticks: “I am thy God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me.” In Theodoret I find two interpretations of this sentence. He says first that those words contain a threat of God terrifying rather than effective — that is, one which has the force of deterring men from crimes, fear being cast in of the evils that are to come upon their posterity; but not that that threat is at some time to be brought to issue and effect: for God, by His clemency which wills all men to be saved, is wont to threaten graver punishments than He inflicts. For that no one is truly punished for the sins of others, God made most attested in Ezekiel, saying: “The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, but the soul that has sinned, the same shall die.”

§170. The Exodus 20 text; Theodoret's first reading: a deterrent threat, not always executed (God threatens more than He inflicts; no one truly punished for another's sin — Ezek 18). Margins: “The passage Exodus ch. 20 explained”; Theodoret, q. 20 on Exodus; 1 Tim. 2; Ezek. 18.

Theodoret adds besides another interpretation, which he says pleases and approves to him more: that those words of God do not signify the severity of the divine vengeance, but rather, on the contrary, the unspeakable sweetness of the divine patience and long-suffering; in that He does not at once, as soon as one has sinned, take penalties from him, but for a very long time defers the punishment — namely, prolonging vengeance even to the third and fourth generation. But if the descendants go on imitating the crimes of their ancestors, God no longer…

§171. Theodoret's preferred reading: the words show not severity but God's patience — deferring vengeance to the third/fourth generation; but if the descendants persist in imitating their ancestors' crimes, God no longer connives (continues on printed p. 380: '…connives and dissembles, but what He left unavenged in the ancestors He at last avenges in the posterity').

— p. 449 (PDF) · printed p. 380 —

…[but if the posterity persist in imitating their forefathers' crimes,] He no longer connives and dissembles, but at length avenges in the posterity what He had passed over unpunished in the forefathers in this world. For just as it pertains to the divine mercy that He bears men's crimes patiently for a long time, and proceeds to the punishing of them with the slowest step; so it pertains very greatly to the opinion of divine providence (without which human society cannot stand) that He should not leave men's crimes plainly unavenged and unpunished in this world. For from perpetual impunity would be born an intolerable license of sinning, and that opinion would befall men's minds, that the world is governed by no providence of God — than which opinion nothing more pestilent can happen to the human commonwealth. For, as Solomon truly said: "Because sentence is not speedily pronounced against the wicked, the children of men commit evils without any fear."

§171 (cont.). If posterity persist, God avenges at last; for total impunity would breed license and deny providence (Eccles 8). Margin: Eccles. 8.

I will not omit to say what the Hebrews too have commented on this very sentence of God. They say indeed that God defers the father's punishment, if perchance he repent or beget a worthy son. But if neither does he cease to do evil, and his sons and grandsons and even great-grandsons tread in the footsteps of that wickedness, then at last God repeats the penalties, and as it were, mindful of the misdeeds which their forefathers perpetrated in a continuous series, avenges them. Rabbi Moses Gerundensis [Nachmanides] judges that sons pay the penalties of the one crime of idolatry only, if they too worship idols; but by no means of the other crimes — just as the civil laws avenge in sons the crime of treason or lèse-majesté, but not other

misdeeds.

§172. The Hebrews: God defers the father's penalty if he repents or has a good son, but punishes a persistent line; Rabbi Moses Gerundensis (Nachmanides) — only idolatry's penalty falls on idol-worshipping sons, as civil law on treason. Margin: Rabbi Moses Gerundensis.

But let us more distinctly declare that sentence, weighing the individual words, premising that there can be a twofold understanding of it. For by those words it can be signified that the severity of divine vengeance against those who give the worship due to the true God to false gods will be so great, that God will punish that crime not only in its authors, but also in their posterity unto the fourth generation: which it is manifest from the sacred letters has been done more than once. The other understanding of that sentence, approved by most of all, is that by those words is declared the patience and long-suffering of God — not at once punishing sins, but for a long time deferring vengeance, and patiently waiting until men repent and, understanding and repenting of their crimes, themselves take penalties upon themselves and fill up the place of divine vengeance. This too is to be noted, that the word (pachad) signifies not only ‘to visit,’ but ‘to remember and be mindful’; just as the term (Aon), signifying iniquity, is often put for the penalty merited and due to iniquity — as in Jeremiah: “The iniquity of the daughter of my people is made greater than the sin of the Sodomites, which was overthrown in a moment.” For the sense is, that the punishment which God took of the Jews by the Babylonian captivity was graver than the punishment of the Sodomites: for the calamity of the Jews was slow and long-lasting, but the destruction of the Sodomites most brief; and brev[ity]…

§173. Weighing the words: the twofold sense (severity to the 4th generation, or — preferred — God's patience); the Hebrew ‘pachad’ = ‘visit’/‘remember,’ and ‘iniquity’ for ‘penalty’ (Jer.: Judah's slow captivity worse than Sodom's swift end). Margins: “The passage Lamentations 4”; Gen. 19 & Jer. 49. Continues on p. 381.

— p. 450 (PDF) · printed p. 381 —

…but the brevity of a penalty greatly mitigates and lessens however great a bitterness of it. For God to ‘visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the sons,’ therefore, signifies God, who, as if forgetful, had left the sins of the fathers unpunished, then, as it were mindful of them, avenging them in the posterity. To this pertains what is written in the Psalms: “Let the iniquity of his fathers be in remembrance in the sight of the Lord, and let not the sin of his mother be blotted out”; and that of Tobias: “Lord, take not vengeance for my sins, neither remember my offenses or those of my parents”; and that widow of Sarepta said to Elijah: “What have I to do with thee, O man of God? Art thou come to me that my iniquities should be remembered, and that thou shouldst kill my son?”

§173 (cont.). ‘Visit’ = ‘remember’ a long-deferred penalty (Ps 108; Tobit 3; the widow of Sarepta, 3 Kings 17). Margins: Ps. 108; Tobit 3; 3 Kings 17.

But why does God punish the sins of fathers in the sons unto the third and fourth generation? Because sons reared in the sins of their parents are more prone and more daring to sinning, both on account of the habit of sinning and on account of the example, for they follow the authority of their parents. Wherefore divine scripture narrates, as a great miracle, in the twenty-sixth chapter of Numbers, that the sons of Core were not partakers of his sin nor perished together with him: “It was made a great miracle,” it says, “that, Core perishing, his sons did not perish.” And it is added, ‘Unto the third and fourth generation,’ because up to that time fathers can live, and thus they can mutually see — the posterity, the sins of their forefathers, to imitate; and the forefathers, the penalties of their posterity, to grieve over. Unless perhaps that ‘unto the third and fourth generation’ be said for that which is, ‘unto many generations’: for the Hebrew tongue delights in the use of the ternary number to signify a multitude; but adding a fourth to three, it designates an excess of multitude. To one reading the sacred letters examples are obvious, even to one not seeking them. I will for the present be content with one. In the book of Ecclesiasticus it is thus: “By one man of sense a country shall be inhabited, and by three wicked ones it shall be

made desolate.” Nor among external writers is that phrase infrequent. Whence are those [phrases], “Thrice greatest, thrice wise”; and, “O thrice and four times blessed.” Therefore, ‘unto the third and fourth generation,’ that is, unto very many generations. And by those last words of this sentence, ‘of them that hate me,’ it is sufficiently openly declared that God so animadverts on the sons for the crimes of their parents, that the sons themselves, for their own wickedness and impiety like their father's, are most worthy of that animadversion.

§174. Why to the 3rd/4th generation: sons reared in sin are bolder (the sons of Core spared, Num 26); ‘3rd and 4th’ = ‘very many’ (a Hebrew triad-idiom; Virgil's ‘thrice and four times blessed’); ‘of them that hate me’ shows the sons deserve it. Margins: “What it is to punish unto the third and fourth generation”; Ecclus. 16; Virgil, Aeneid bk. 1.

But, someone will say, why are sons said to be punished for the crimes of their fathers, if they themselves merited that vengeance by their own crimes? For this cause, namely, that the parents, by their example, authority, and habituation, were the authors of the sons' falling into those crimes: for so men are generally wont to judge and to say, when they perceive the sins of forefathers (which were not punished in themselves) repeated by their posterity and punished by God in them — they cry out that the divine vengeance of what their forefathers had perpetrated has come at last, which God, as if forgetful, [failed] to punish in them, [but], as if at last remembering, has avenged in their posterity.

§175. Objection: how ‘punished for fathers' sins’ if they earned it themselves? — Because the parents, by example and habituation, authored the sons' fall; men say the long-deferred vengeance has come at last on the line. Continues on p. 382.

— p. 451 (PDF) · printed p. 382 —

Lastly, one scruple is to be examined which still remains. If God visits the iniquity of fathers upon the sons unto the fourth generation, how did the same God, by a law given through Moses, forbid sons to be killed for the sins of parents? For why would it not be just for men to do what God does by a most just judgment? But the reason of men and of God is far different.

For God, since He is the author, preserver, bestower, and supreme Lord of men's life and death and of all goods, can, by His own right and at His own discretion, without injury to anyone, either give or take them away from whomever He pleases; He can afflict even innocent sons for the crimes of parents, since He knows that temporal evils can spiritually profit a man, and be a great good in the manner of medicine: but to whom and when it is expedient to be afflicted with evils of this kind, He alone knows, who dispenses them variously by the most hidden judgments of His justice and mercy, and variously among men. And He strikes sons for fathers, that by such a kind of vengeance men may the more vehemently be deterred from misdeeds — understanding, namely, that the divine vengeance of their crimes can indeed be late, but cannot be void; so that, if perchance they themselves have escaped it, their [posterity] nevertheless will undergo it.

§175 (cont.) / §176. The remaining scruple: how can God forbid (Deut 24) men to kill sons for fathers' sins, yet do so Himself? — God, as Lord of life, may take/give without injury, knowing temporal ills can be medicine; He punishes sons for fathers to deter. Margins: "The passage Deuteronomy ch. 24 explained"; "Why men cannot also punish some for others' sins, as God does."

But let us say this same thing a little more explicitly, for it would be of great moment that this opinion be poured into men and stick fixed in their minds. There are, then, two kinds of divine vengeance: the one God uses for punishing the wicked in this life, the other after this life. In this life God does not always punish sinners with manifest and corporeal penalties, and sometimes He punishes others, even the innocent, for the sins of others; but in such a way that to those who have sinned that kind of vengeance is a penalty, but to those who have not sinned it is not a penalty, but as it were a salutary medicine. After this life God punishes only the deserving, nor punishes anyone for the sins of others: for then penalties are penalties only, and have no character of medicine. And human judgment ought to imitate the divine in this latter kind of punishing, not in that former: for no man is the lord of the life, death, body, or other goods of other men, nor can he know to whom or when temporal evils will profit, or make them profit.

§177. The twofold divine vengeance: in this life (where the innocent's share is medicine, not penalty) and after (pure penalty, only the deserving); human judgment must imitate the latter, not the former. Margin: “The twofold kind of divine vengeance.”

No one, therefore, by human judgment ought to be condemned and punished, except for his own sins, with the penalty (as they call it) of the scourge — that is, of death, of bodily mutilation, or of flogging. But the penalty of loss of temporal goods sometimes is such that certain men, even without fault (and yet not unjustly), are affected for the sins of others: for example, when, on account of some huge crime of a city or some community, it is deprived either of immunity, or of liberty, or of an episcopal see; and since these are goods common to all, those being taken away, any of the citizens, even the innocent, must necessarily be affected by the loss of those goods. Just as also, if anyone, for the crime of treason, [is deprived] of all external goods [and honors]…

§178. By human judgment, the ‘scourge’ (death, mutilation, flogging) only for one's own sins; but loss of temporal goods can innocently fall on others (a city losing its franchise; a traitor's confiscation reaching his heirs). Continues on p. 383.

— p. 452 (PDF) · printed p. 383 —

…and honors and public offices be deprived, that penalty redounds upon his sons, who would have been partakers of their father's goods by hereditary right. But, as is apparent, penalties of this kind are of themselves and primarily of those who have sinned, but consequently of others who in a way depend on them.

§178 (cont.). Such temporal penalties fall primarily on the guilty, only secondarily on the dependents.

The sin of Cham, therefore, against his father Noah (for, that it might be more subtly and expressly understood, we have digressed to this disputation) is read to have been avenged not in Cham himself, but in his son Chanaan, or rather in his posterity — I mean the nation of the Canaanites. Although that the Canaanites were by the Hebrews partly slain by slaughter, partly exterminated from their seats, partly also sent under the

yoke of a most base servitude, Scripture is not wont to assign that to the sin of Cham against Noah, but to the proper and unspeakable and abominable crimes of the Canaanites themselves, as is manifest to one reading the 18th chapter of Leviticus and the 9th chapter of Deuteronomy. Nevertheless that Cham drew the bitterest grief from the Noachic curse of his posterity is in no way to be doubted: since he, though he was equally a son of Noah as Sem and Iaphet — nay, even greater in birth than Iaphet (as it has seemed to most) — yet understood that his posterity would be the basest servants of the posterity of Sem and Iaphet.

§179. The application: Cham's sin punished in Chanaan/the Canaanites — though Scripture ascribes their destruction to their own crimes (Lev 18, Deut 9); yet Cham grieved bitterly at his line's curse.

St. Gregory, beautifully accommodating to Tropological instruction the example of Cham's sin punished not in himself but in his posterity, teaches that God sometimes punishes men's sins in this life with manifest punishments, but sometimes not at all; and that both are done with the best reason and the great benefit of men. That some are punished in this life, to preserve in men's minds faith in His providence (by which He is believed to watch over and govern human affairs); but that He does not punish all in this life, lest here men's sins be thought wholly avenged, but it be believed that there will be after this life both a judgment and a punishment of sins. But the force and grace of Gregory's saying it is not easy to express except in his own words. I will therefore set down his words. Treating those words of Job ch. 35, “Now he brings not on his fury, nor avenges greatly, God,” he writes thus: “Divine severity does not permit men's sins to remain unavenged, but begins the wrath of judgment here from our correction, that it may rest in the damnation of the reprobate. Let the reprobate, then, go now, and consume the desires of their pleasures with unavenged iniquity, and let them not feel temporal scourges at the time when eternal punishments await them. And well was their unavenged wickedness signified in Cham's sinning, to whom it was said by his father, ‘Cursed be the boy Canaan, a servant of servants shall he be to his brothers.’ But what

is it that, when Cham sinned, Chanaan his son received the sentence of vengeance, unless that the wickedness of the reprobate here indeed advances unavenged, but is struck in the future? Rightly, then, said Job: ‘Now he brings not on his fury, nor avenges greatly, God’: because, although He tolerates some things long-sufferingly, He also scourges some in this life; and here He sometimes begins to strike those whom afterward He consummates with eternal damnation. Therefore some things God strikes in this life, but some He leaves unavenged: for if He punished none, who [would believe God]…”

§180. Gregory's tropology (on Job 35): God punishes some sins now (to keep faith in providence) and leaves others (so a last judgment is believed) — with the Cham/Chanaan example. Margin: “A notable saying of Gregory, Morals bk. 26.” Continues on p. 384.

— p. 453 (PDF) · printed p. 384 —

…would believe that God cares for human affairs? But if He punished all, whence would the last judgment remain? Some things, therefore, are struck, that we may dread the solicitude of our Ruler over us; but some are kept unavenged, that we may perceive that a judgment still remains. Thus far from Gregory.

§180 (cont.). Gregory: if God punished nothing, none would believe in providence; if all, no last judgment would remain.

{A servant of servants shall he be to his brothers.}

Gen 9:25 (lemma, cont.).

That phrase, “A servant of servants” (which the Septuagint translation does not have, but the Hebrew reading has), signifies the lowest and basest kind of servitude. Just as Abigail, when they announced that she had been chosen by David for a wife, said: “Behold, let thy handmaid be a servant, to wash the feet of the servants of my lord.” He did not say only, says Rupert, “a servant shall he be” (by which name sometimes even a good and voluntary servitude is wont to be signified), but “a servant of servants,” by

which addition the extreme servitude — nay, servile wickedness — is wont to be expressed, unless the addition “of God” be made, when by an excellent humility one professes himself the servant of the servants of God. Which title (truly a most illustrious badge of venerable humility) the Supreme Pontiffs have been wont to use. And the history of this matter was written because it would be very profitable to the Jews, for whom Moses wrote these things — namely, to strengthen their minds, that they might both hate their enemy Chanaan and least of all dread him, as one whom they understood to be cursed by God through Noah and made subject to their servitude. As if Moses said: Just as God has already done in the posterity of Cham generated from his son Mesrain (that is, in the Egyptians, whom God afflicted for your sake with various plagues, and at last drowned in the Red Sea), so also He does in the other posterity of the same Cham, begotten from his son Chanaan (that is, in the peoples of the Canaanites), against whom we now set out under God's leadership, about to obtain their land, as God promised our forefathers.

§181. ‘Servant of servants’ = the lowest servitude (Abigail; Rupert — cf. the Popes' ‘servant of the servants of God’); written to embolden the Jews against the cursed, conquerable Canaanites, as God had crushed the Egyptians (Cham's son Mesrain). Margins: 1 Kings (1 Sam.) 25; Rupert, bk. 4 on Genesis; Exod. 14.

But it is not to be left unindicated to the reader in this place, what has been prudently observed and usefully handed down to memory by the Fathers: that, just as by Adam's sin death was brought into the world, so by Cham's sin servitude was introduced into the human race — I mean that servitude which is involuntary to man, bitter, odious, finally contrary to the natural love of liberty, which is most ardent and most keen in man. For if by the word ‘servitude’ be signified any subjection whatever of one man under the power and governance of another, that kind of servitude is natural, not born of sin, but introduced by right human reason teaching it and human utility requiring it — destined to exist even in that most happy state of innocence, if it had stood.

§182. The Fathers: as death entered by Adam's sin, so servitude (the bitter, involuntary kind) entered by Cham's sin; though a natural subjection (one rightly ruling another) would have existed even in innocence. Margins: "The origin of servitude among men was from sin"; Gen. 3; Rom. 5.

Let us hear Chrysostom, when he speaks of Cham's sin punished in his posterity by the penalty of servitude, writing thus: "Behold, a brother born of the same father and come forth from the same womb — sin made [him] a servant, and, liberty being taken away, imposed on him the yoke of the basest subjection, whence afterward servitude took its origin. For before, men were not wont to live so softly and to luxuriate…"

§183. Chrysostom: sin made one brother (of the same father and womb) a slave, whence servitude took its origin. Margin: Chrysostom, hom. 29 on Genesis. Continues on p. 385.

— p. 454 (PDF) · printed p. 385 —

…[before, men were not wont to live so softly and luxuriate,] that they should use the ministry and services of others, but each ministered to himself what was needful; and the honor of all was equal, the diversity of honors being removed from the midst. But when sin entered, it lost liberty, and corrupted the dignity given by nature, and introduced servitude — that this thing might perpetually teach and admonish man to flee the sin of servitude and to return to the liberty of virtue: from which both servant and master will take great profit, considering with themselves that from sin was born so great a difference among men, of some proudly domineering, of others on the contrary basely serving.

§183 (cont.). Chrysostom: before sin all were equal and self-sufficient; sin introduced servitude, to teach men to flee sin and return to virtue's liberty.

Treating this same thing, but a little more explicitly and clearly, St. Augustine: "God, having made rational man to His own image, willed him to have dominion only over the irrational — not man over man, but man over the beast. Hence the first just men were established as shepherds of flocks rather than kings of men, that God might thus too intimate what the order of creatures demanded and what the desert of sins requires. For the

condition of servitude is rightly understood to be imposed on the sinner. Accordingly, nowhere in the Scriptures do we read of a ‘servant’ before the just Noah avenged his son's sin by this word. That name, therefore, fault merited, not nature. And the origin of the word ‘servants’ in the Latin tongue is believed to be drawn from this: that those who by the law of war could justly be killed, when they were saved [servabantur] by the victors, became servants [servi], named from ‘saving’ — which itself too is not without the desert of sin. For both when a just war is waged, it is fought against an opposing sin; and every victory, even when it comes to the wicked, by divine judgment humbles the conquered, either amending sins or punishing them. The first cause of servitude, therefore, is sin, that man be subjected to man by the bond of condition — which does not happen except by God judging, with whom there is no iniquity, and who knows how to distribute diverse penalties to the merits of offenders.” Thus Augustine.

§184. Augustine (City of God 19.15): man was made to rule the beasts, not man; ‘servant’ unread before Noah's curse; servitude merited by fault not nature; ‘servus’ from ‘servando’ (war-captives spared); sin is its first cause. Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 19, ch. 15.

{And he said: Blessed be the Lord God of Shem: be Canaan his servant.}

Gen 9:26 (lemma). Margin: v. 26.

Moses has set forth the penalty of the impudence and impiety of Cham against his father Noah; now he relates, as it were, the reward of the reverence and piety which the other two sons, Sem and Iaphet, showed to their father Noah. But why did he bless Sem before Iaphet? Was it because he was the firstborn? Or because he excelled in holiness and prudence and gravity of character, and was therefore most dear to his father and to God? Or because he himself had more vehemently rebuked Cham, and had been the author to Iaphet of doing toward their father what we read was done by them? Or rather on account of the excellence of his posterity, in which

would be the Patriarchs, Kings, Prophets, and — what is above all — the Messiah Himself? But those words, “Blessed be the Lord God of Sem,” yield a twofold sense: the one, “Let the God of Sem be praised and celebrated,” namely on account of the immense goods with which He will heap him and his posterity. There is signified, therefore, so great a future magnitude of goods, that on account of it God is to be blessed — that is, His so great munificence is to be celebrated with praises. The other sense [is]…

§185. Why Shem is blessed first (firstborn? holier? the rebuker? his posterity — the Patriarchs and Messiah); the first sense of ‘Blessed be the Lord God of Shem’ (God praised for the goods He will heap on Shem). Continues on p. 386.

— p. 455 (PDF) · printed p. 386 —

…[the other sense] is: the God alone whom Sem and his posterity will worship will be the true God, and therefore to be blessed and praised by all: for the faith and worship of the true God remained in the posterity of Sem alone, the descendants not only of Cham but even of Iaphet slipping down to Idolatry. And this excellence of the dignity of Sem and his posterity the very word ‘Sem’ seemed in a way to portend: for it signifies ‘named, famous, renowned’ — as if his posterity, for the aforesaid causes, would be most noble and most celebrated. And in those words, “Blessed be the Lord God of Sem,” the verb ‘be’ or rather ‘will be’ must be understood.

§185 (cont.). The second sense: the God Shem worships is the true God (the faith surviving only in Shem's line); ‘Shem’ = ‘renowned.’

Moreover, just as the curse of Cham prefigured the evils to come upon ungrateful and impious children, so the blessing of Sem and Iaphet signified the most ample reward of grateful and pious children. In the book of Ecclesiasticus, chapter three, nine goods are recounted, promised to good children who in no way omit to help, adorn, and honor their parents in whatever they need. The first good is abundance of riches, both corporeal and spiritual: “As he that lays up treasure,” it says, “so is he that honors his

mother.” The second, that he will be fortunate and happy in the children he will beget: “He that honors his father shall have joy in his children.” The third, that whenever he supplicates God he will be heard by Him, made possessor of his wishes: “In the day of his prayer he shall be heard.” The fourth, length of life: “He that honors his father shall live a longer life.” And this is the first precept in the law to which God joined a recompense of reward, as Paul weighs in Ephesians 6. The fifth, the stability of family and posterity: “The blessing of the father establishes the houses of the children.” The sixth, glory: “From the honor of the father is the glory of the son.” This can be understood in two ways, either that the honored father renders his sons glorious, or that the son honoring his father procures for himself glory with all. The seventh, the deliverance of a man in the time of tribulation: “The alms of the father shall not be in forgetfulness, and in the day of tribulation it shall be remembered for thee.” The eighth, the dissolution of sins: “As ice in fair weather, so shall thy sins be melted away.” The ninth is, as it were, the heap of all goods, that is, the perpetual benevolence, beneficence, and protection of God toward good children unto the end: “Honor,” it says, “thy father, that a blessing may come upon thee from God, and his blessing may remain in the latter end.” For the blessing of God signifies the most lavish bestowal of goods, which if it remain unto the very end, nothing more desirable than that can befall a man.

§186. The blessing prefigures the reward of pious children — the nine goods of Ecclus 3 (wealth, joy in children, prayers heard, long life [the first commandment with a promise, Eph 6], family stability, glory, deliverance, forgiveness, and God's perpetual favor). Margins: “Nine goods foretold and promised in Scripture to grateful and pious [children]”; Exod. 20; Eph. 6.

{May God enlarge Japheth, and may he dwell in the tents of Shem: and let Canaan be his servant.}

Gen 9:27 (lemma). Margin: v. 27.

These words contain the blessing of Iaphet — ample indeed, but much inferior to the blessing of Sem. And there is an allusion to the name Iaphet,

which signifies breadth. Augustine reads in one place, “May He make broad [Latificet].” Cajetan [and Eugubinus]…

§187. Japheth's blessing (lesser than Shem's); ‘Iaphet’ = breadth/enlargement (Augustine ‘Latificet’). Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 16. Continues on p. 387.

— p. 456 (PDF) · printed p. 387 —

…and Eugubinus say that the Hebrew word also signifies “may He adorn” or “make beautiful.” But the signification of enlarging or extending is most proper to that word, both here and elsewhere in the sacred letters. And the enlargement of Iaphet is understood in two ways: both as to offspring (that his progeny and posterity would be most numerous), and as to places — that is, the various regions of the earth — because his posterity would traverse and inhabit many and various tracts of the earth, and would be the founders of many nations and kingdoms.

§187 (cont.). The twofold enlargement of Japheth: in offspring and in lands (founders of many nations). Margins: Cajetan; Eugubinus.

But that phrase, “and may he dwell in the tents of Sem,” requires a special explanation. For that verb, “dwell,” has an ambiguous construction and connection: for it can be joined with the name of God and with the name of Iaphet. If it be referred to God, this will be the sense: Although God will most amply enlarge the posterity of Iaphet, yet He Himself will dwell not among the posterity of Iaphet, but among the posterity of Sem alone; for the posterity of Iaphet worshipped false gods, but the posterity of Sem (not indeed all, but those sown from him through Heber, Abraham, Isaac, and Iacob) retained the faith and worship of the true God; wherefore God is said to be about to dwell in their tents — that is, to be worshipped by them with external and public worship; although we read that God dwelt also in the tabernacle of Moses and in the temple of Solomon. But at last God the Word took flesh from the stock of Sem, in which the Deity by the hypostatic union wonderfully dwelt. This interpretation Theodoret especially approves, nor does it displease Lyra, Burgos, and Tostatus;

which the Chaldaic paraphrase likewise follows, having thus in this place: “And may His Divinity dwell in the tents of Sem.” Although the Chaldaic word properly signifies ‘rest,’ by which word the Hebrews call the presence of the Divinity (which of old was declared in the Sanctuary over the ark of the covenant); to which there seems to be an allusion here, as also in David: “This is my rest forever and ever, here will I dwell, for I have chosen it.”

§188. ‘Dwell in the tents of Shem’ — if referred to God: God dwells among Shem's line (the true faith surviving via Heber–Abraham–Isaac–Jacob; ultimately the Word incarnate from Shem's stock); Theodoret, Lyra, Burgos, Tostatus; the Chaldee ‘His Divinity shall dwell’ (the Shekinah). Margins: 3 Kings 8; Lyra; Burgos; Tostatus; the Chaldaic Paraphrase; Ps. 131.

But much more aptly is that verb “dwell” joined with the name of Iaphet, so that it is signified not only that the posterity of Iaphet will be enlarged in a wonderful manner, but that it will dwell in the tents (or, as the Septuagint has, in the houses) of Sem. And that that verb “dwell” ought to be referred to Iaphet, Cajetan well proves from what follows, “And let Chanaan be his servant”: for that pronoun “his” is referred either to God, or to Sem, or to Iaphet. Not to God, because it would yield a false sense, for the Canaanites were not servants of God, except perhaps by the natural servitude which, however, is common to all; nor can it be referred to Sem, because it had already been said above that Chanaan would be the servant of Sem himself, and there was no reason why the same should be at once repeated: therefore it must be referred to Iaphet. Wherefore that “dwell” too must without doubt be referred to Iaphet.

§189. Better: ‘dwell’ refers to Japheth (his posterity dwelling in Shem's tents/houses); Cajetan proves it from ‘let Canaan be his servant’ — ‘his’ must = Japheth (not God, not Shem).

But what does it mean, that Iaphet will dwell in the tents of Sem? It can be understood in five ways. First, that it is signified that the posterity of Iaphet will be so multiplied that, their own tents not holding them, it will be necessary for them to be received into the tents of the posterity [of Sem]…

§190. Five meanings of ‘Japheth dwelling in Shem's tents’ — the first: Japheth's posterity so multiplied they overflow into Shem's regions. Continues on p. 388.

— p. 457 (PDF) · printed p. 388 —

…of Sem — that is, that in the regions which they [the posterity of Sem] will inhabit, they [the posterity of Iaphet] will dwell mingled with them. Next, it can be signified that the posterity of Iaphet, who would be Gentiles, would be joined by a covenant of friendship and a sharing of privileges with the Jews who would be the posterity of Sem; which is recorded of the Lacedaemonians and the Romans in the former book of the Maccabees — whom we shall show a little below to have been sprung from the stock of Iaphet. This too can be elicited from those words: that there would be a time when the posterity of Iaphet, that is the Gentiles, would eject from their own seats the Jews drawing their race from Sem — which is known from the sacred histories to have happened more than once.

§190 (cont.). The 2nd and 3rd senses: the Gentiles (Japheth) allied with the Jews (Shem) — like the Spartans and Romans of Maccabees, descended from Japheth; and the Gentiles one day ejecting the Jews.

Lastly, from those very words a twofold other sense is expressed. The one, that there is signified the future union in Christ of Gentiles and Jews, who, although before they were not only disjoined but even discordant and hostile, and as it were walls set very far apart with a huge wall interposed, were nevertheless joined to each other through the corner-stone, Christ the Lord. “He is our peace,” says Paul, writing of Christ to the Ephesians, “who has made both one, and breaking down the middle wall of partition, the enmities in his flesh, evacuating the law of commandments by decrees, that he might make the two in himself into one new man, making peace, and reconciling both in one body to God by the Cross, slaying the enmities in himself.” And so the Gentile, who was like a wild olive bitter in its leaves, was grafted through Christ into the rich olive, made a partaker of its root and fatness. And by this means was fulfilled that prophecy of Isaiah: “The wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with

the kid; the calf and the lion and the sheep shall abide together, and a little child shall lead them. The calf and the bear shall feed, their young ones shall rest together, and the lion shall eat straw like the ox.” Therefore that Iaphet will dwell in the tents of Sem is a prophecy, veiled in enigmatic speech, of the Gentiles, who were to be future partakers of the goods which the Jews were to receive from God, but chiefly through the Messiah.

§191. The 4th sense: the union of Gentiles and Jews in Christ — the middle wall broken (Eph 2), the wild olive grafted in (Rom 11), the wolf with the lamb (Isaiah 11). Margins: Eph. 2; Rom. 11; Isaiah 11.

The other sense is, that the posterity of Iaphet would dwell in the tents of the posterity of Sem, they themselves being thence ejected. For the posterity of Sem, as we have said more than once, were the Hebrews: by their tents one must understand the faith and worship of the true God, and the eloquences of the sacred letters, and finally the promised goods to be furnished to them through the Messiah. Into these tents the Gentiles converted to Christ entered, and them the Jews, alienated from Christ, lost. Hear St. Jerome: “From Sem,” he says, “the Hebrews are born, from Iaphet the people of the Gentiles: what, then? the multitude of believers is broad — from the breadth by which Iaphet is named it found its name. And what is subjoined, ‘And may he dwell in the tents of Sem,’ is prophesied of us, who are engaged in the erudition and knowledge of the Scriptures, Israel being cast out.”

§192. The 5th sense: Japheth's posterity dwelling in Shem's tents, the Jews ejected — the tents = the true faith/Scriptures/Messianic promises, entered by the converted Gentiles (Jerome). Margin: Jerome, On the Hebrew Traditions in Genesis.

But very plainly and learnedly Rupert treated this place. “The tents of Sem,” he says, “in which Iaphet is said to be about to dwell, are the privileges of the Jews enumerated by Paul in these words: ‘Whose is the adoption of sons, and the glory, and the covenant, and the legislation, and the service [of God], and the promises, and the Fathers, from whom is Christ according to the flesh, who is over all God blessed.’ In these tents

the Jewish people alone dwelt for a long time, the Gentiles being placed outside. For you were [once]…”

§193. Rupert: the ‘tents of Shem’ = the Jews' privileges (Rom 9 — adoption, glory, covenants, law, the Fathers, Christ), long held by the Jews alone. Margins: Rupert, Commentaries on Genesis bk. 4, ch. 39; Rom. 9; Eph. 2. Continues on p. 389.

— p. 458 (PDF) · printed p. 389 —

…for you were once (says Paul, writing to the Gentiles converted to Christ) without Christ, alienated from the conversation of Israel, strangers to the covenants, not having the hope of the promise, and without God in this world. For all these things the enclosure of the one Hebrew language held: which, when the confusion or division of tongues was made, alone remained in the family of Heber, whence it was named Hebrew. And these were the tents of Sem and his posterity — not indeed of all, but of those who drew their race from him only through Heber, Abraham, and Iacob. But how the posterity of Iaphet dwelt in these tents must be briefly indicated. From Iaphet were born the Greeks and Latins: for his sons are numbered seven by Moses — the first Gomer, from whom the Galatians were sprung; the second Magog, from whom the Scythians; the third Madai, whence the Medes; the fourth Iavan, from whom the Ionians, who are also the Greeks; the fifth Thubal, whence the origin of the Italians and Spaniards; the sixth Mosoch, and hence the Cappadocians (among whom too a certain city was thence called Mazecha); the seventh Thiras, from whom the Thracians. And in these, and in almost all nations, the Greek and Latin tongue obtained the primacy: the former on account of the wisdom and eloquence of the Greeks, the latter on account of the power of the Romans; by which tongues the tents of Sem were opened to all nations to inhabit — for through those tongues, the divine eloquences being translated from the Hebrew, the Gentiles received the knowledge of the scriptures and the notice of the true God. And first indeed the Jews, for whom those tents had been built, entered into them, and also some of the Gentiles drawing their origin from Cham or from Sem; but the posterity of

Iaphet, by whom Europe was possessed, prevailed in dwelling in those tents.

§193 (cont.). Rupert: Israel held the privileges alone (Eph 2; the Hebrew tongue kept in Heber's line); how Japheth's line entered — the Greeks and Latins descend from Japheth (his seven sons → Galatians, Scythians, Medes, Greeks, Italians/Spaniards, Cappadocians, Thracians); Greek and Latin (by wisdom and Roman power) opened the tents to all via the translated Scriptures; Japheth's posterity (who hold Europe) prevailed. Margins: Gen. 11; Gen. 10.

It is not fitting for us to pass hence to other things, leaving altogether untouched the Allegorical treatment of this history, which the Fathers have pursued copiously, piously, and learnedly. That Noah bore in many things an illustrious image of Christ our Lord, has been said elsewhere in these our Commentaries. And that by the likeness of the vine which Noah planted is signified that old Synagogue is attested in various places of Scripture: “Thou hast brought a vineyard out of Egypt,” says David, “thou hast cast out the Gentiles and planted it; thou wast the guide of its journey in its sight, thou didst plant its roots, and it filled the earth.” And this vine, at first excellent, comely, and famous, was afterward turned into the bitterness of a strange vine, rendering wild grapes instead of the expected grapes. This [vine] at last gave to drink the bitter cup of death to Him by whom it had been planted, and with consummated bitterness made Him drunk, so that He slept the sleep of death, stripped and exposed to the mockery, scorn, and contempt of His own. For Christ, by the Jewish people — whom as God He had before heaped with innumerable benefits, and, made man, had come to redeem and save — was condemned and slain by an ignominious and atrocious death. The nakedness of Noah and his shameful parts signify the infirmities of Christ, most demonstrated in His Cross and death, which the impious mock and despise as shameful and disgraceful.

§194. The allegory: Noah an image of Christ; the vine = the old Synagogue (Ps 79) which gave Christ the bitter cup of death; his ‘drunkenness’ and nakedness = Christ's infirmities on the Cross, mocked by the impious. Margins: “Allegorical exposition”; Augustine, City of God 16.2; Rupert bk. 4, ch. 38; Ps. 79; Isaiah 5; Matt. 21; Jer. 2; Apoc. 12 & 8.

The three sons of Noah are three kinds of men in the Church of Christ: Heretics and reprobate Catholics; and on the contrary the Elect, of whom some are prelates, some are subjects: besides these three kinds of men one cannot find another among those who are counted by the Christian name. And the two latter kinds are saved in the Church, the third perishes utterly. Whence [it is read]…

§195. The three sons = three kinds in the Church (heretics & reprobate Catholics; the elect — prelates and subjects). Continues on p. 390.

— p. 459 (PDF) · printed p. 390 —

…it is read that the Dragon, cast down from heaven, drew to himself the third part of the stars, and that at the sound and song of the Angelic trumpet the third part of the earth perished. And Cham indeed was a figure of Heretics: for Cham is interpreted ‘hot’ — that is, impatient and ever boiling for quarrels and contentious — who mocks and divulges his father's nakedness: such are the Heretics, who, on account of the humility and infirmity of Christ, deny Him to be true God, publishing and bandying about what pertains to the humility of Christ, but keeping silent, or by a perverse interpretation depraving, the many things which serve to declare the majesty of His divinity. These are contentious, litigious, boiling in cursing and persecuting; but, willing or unwilling, they are servants of the servants of God: for they serve the increasing and consummating of their [the saints'] glory, and minister to the adorning and perfecting of their crowns. Nor does it not aptly fit them, that Cham was cursed not in himself but in his son Chanaan: for, since the penalty of Heretics is sometimes reserved for the future age, they are as it were punished not in themselves but in their posterity; for any sect of Heretics whatever, although at first it seemed powerful and glorious, and for a time had prosperous successes, nevertheless gradually totters and fails in its posterity, and vanishes with the disgrace and execration of men.

§195 (cont.). Cham = the heretics (‘hot,’ contentious, denying Christ's divinity from His humility); ‘servants of the servants of God’ (they serve the saints' glory); cursed ‘in posterity’ — each heresy

decays. Margins: 1 Cor. 1(?); Apoc. 12.

But on the contrary Sem and Iaphet — that is, the elect — venerate with the highest piety the infirmities of Christ (which He had taken on by no necessity, but by the highest will and charity for the cause of our salvation), knowing that what is weak and foolish of God is wiser and stronger than all men. And, turned away, to cover the nakedness of Noah with their own cloak is, in the slaying of Christ, indeed to turn away from the monstrous deed of the Jews, but to cover the very Passions of the Lord by venerating them with the order of the sacraments — gratefully recalling, piously venerating, studiously imitating. And Sem, signifying ‘named and renowned,’ is a figure of the Prelates in the Church of Christ; but Iaphet, signifying ‘breadth,’ has the figure of the subjects, of whom the number is greatest in the Church of Christ. But it will be enough to have touched on this, leaving the rest to the meditation of the reader.

§196. Conversely Shem and Japheth (the elect) reverence Christ's infirmities; covering Noah's nakedness = venerating the Passion through the sacraments; Shem (‘renowned’) = prelates, Japheth (‘breadth’) = the subjects (the greater number). Margin: 1 Cor. 1.

{And Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty years. And all his days were nine hundred and fifty years, and he died.}

Gen 9:28–29 (lemma). Margins: vv. 28 & 29; Gen. 5.

Noah, then, lived the longest life of all mortals, two only excepted, Iared and Mathusalem. For Noah was longer-lived than Adam himself by twenty years; yet of a shorter life than Iared by twelve years, and than Mathusalem by nineteen. But [this place] invites [me]…

Lead-in to Disp. 5: Noah's 950 years (longest but for Jared and Mathusalem). Continues on p. 391.

— p. 460 (PDF) · printed p. 391 —

…this place invites me to set forth briefly the whole Chronology of Noah's life, and certain other things pertaining to him. First I will speak of his life before the flood, then of [his life] after the flood.

Lead-in concluded — the plan of Disp. 5.

FIFTH DISPUTATION. On the Chronology of Noah's life: also on a certain son of his whom they call Ionithus, and on his dwelling after the flood.

Noah lived before the flood six hundred years; for that in the six hundredth year of his [life] the flood happened, Moses wrote above in chapter seven. From the beginning of the World, when Adam was created, up to the flood are numbered one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years: and Adam himself lived nine hundred and thirty years; therefore he died seven hundred and twenty-six years before the flood. Since, therefore, Noah was born six hundred years before the flood, it appears that he was born one hundred and twenty-six years after the death of Adam. Next, Henoch, two hundred and forty-two years before the death of Adam, begot Mathusalem, and afterward lived three hundred years, and was translated by God from the earth. And Mathusalem lived nine hundred and sixty-nine years, and died in the very year in which the flood happened. Therefore Noah, who was born six hundred years before the flood, arose sixty-nine years after the translation of Henoch, and in the three hundred and sixty-ninth year of his grandfather Mathusalem.

§197. Noah's pre-flood chronology: 1,656 yrs from creation to the flood; Noah born 126 yrs after Adam's death, 69 yrs after Henoch's translation, in Mathusalem's 369th year. Margin: "All this Chronology is gathered from the fifth chapter of the book of Genesis."

From these it is concluded that Mathusalem was conversant with Adam for two hundred and forty-two years, and Noah with Mathusalem himself for three hundred and sixty-nine years. The doctrine, therefore, of natural and divine things, both natural and supernatural, Mathusalem learned from Adam by the oracle of the living voice; and from Mathusalem himself Noah received it, and even his son Sem — since he, born a hundred years before the flood, could conveniently be taught the knowledge of those things by Mathusalem himself. And concerning the age and life of Noah

before the flood, let so much be said.

§198. The chain of living tradition: Adam→Mathusalem (242 yrs together)→Noah (369 yrs together)→Shem (born 100 yrs pre-flood).

After the flood Noah lived three hundred and fifty years: and since, from the flood up to the birth of Abraham, according to the Hebrew and Latin computation, no more than two hundred and ninety-two years passed, it comes about that Noah survived for fifty-eight years after Abraham was born. For God willed Noah to live so long, until another like him should arise, a man of remarkable piety, who would preserve the worship of the true God, and vehemently incite men by words and deeds to embrace it. It has been observed, even from the founding of the world…

§199. After the flood Noah lived 350 yrs, outliving Abraham's birth by 58 — God kept him alive until a like man arose to preserve true worship. Margin: “Noah reached the fifty-eighth year of Abraham.” Continues on p. 392.

— p. 461 (PDF) · printed p. 392 —

…the world being founded, that God was wont in every age to raise up some excellent men. Before the flood, after Adam, were Seth, Henoch, Mathusalem; after the flood up to the giving of the law, Noah, Abraham and the other Patriarchs up to Moses, Melchisedech and Job. After Moses, Iosue and Phinees. And of the Judges, Othoniel, Gedeon, Iephte, Samson, Samuel. In the time of the Kings, David, Asa, Iosaphat, Ezechias, and Iosias. And in this very time were most holy High Priests, as Ioiada, Eliacim, and most illustrious Prophets, as Elias and Elizeus. But in the time of the Babylonian captivity, Hieremias, Ezechiel, Daniel. After the return at last from the captivity, Zorobabel, Iesu the High Priest, Aggaeus and Zacharias the Prophets, Esdras and Nehemias, the seventy-two Interpreters of the sacred letters, and the Maccabaean princes — no less famous for divine religion and piety than for warlike fortitude, and to be celebrated in every age. And since Sem the son of Noah lived after the flood five hundred and two years, as Moses signifies in Genesis 11, it comes about

that he reached the fiftieth year of the patriarch Iacob.

§199 (cont.). The roll of God's chosen men in every age (the Patriarchs, Moses, Joshua, the Judges, the Kings, the Prophets, the captivity, the post-exile, the 72 translators & Maccabees); Shem lived 502 yrs post-flood, reaching Jacob's 50th year.

I desire, therefore, here to make the reader observe how the faith and worship of the true God, and the observance of the things necessary at that time for obtaining the salvation of the soul, was guarded and perpetuated from the beginning of the World up to Iacob through only three persons — Adam, Mathusalem, and Sem — but through two thousand and one hundred and fifty-six years. For Iacob could, as we have said, learn those things from Sem himself, he from Mathusalem, and he from Adam himself.

§200. The true faith was preserved from the world's beginning to Jacob through only three persons (Adam, Mathusalem, Shem) across 2,156 years. Margin: "The continuation of the faith and worship of God from the beginning of the world."

Moreover, because Moses recounts no son begotten by Noah after the flood, from this Chrysostom gathers that he was a man of incredible continence: since, for the whole three hundred and fifty years which he lived after the flood, he was unwilling to indulge pleasure even for the sake of procreating children. "See," says he, "the admirable continence of the just man. For though he enjoyed such abundance of things and prosperity, and survived so great a number of years after his going out of the Ark, yet he was unwilling further to indulge the procreation of children. For Scripture does not recount that he had other children besides those three whom he had begotten before the flood." But that no son was begotten by Noah after the flood was disputed by us a little above.

§201. Since no son is named after the flood, Chrysostom infers Noah's incredible continence (350 yrs); but 'no son after the flood' was disputed above. Margins: Chrysostom, hom. 29 on Genesis; "The continence of Noah."

What, then, is recorded by some about a certain very memorable son of his, whom they call Ionithus, is to be held as fabulous. But, lest the reader be

ignorant of the history of that matter, I will set it down in this place as the writer of the Scholastic History narrates it (on the authority of Methodius), whose words are these: “Methodius, treating of a certain son of Noah of whom Moses makes no mention, speaks thus: In the hundredth year of the third Chiliad [millennium], Noah begot a son after his own likeness, whom he called Ionithus. In the three-hundredth year, having bestowed on him most ample gifts, he sent him into the land Ethan, which he overran as far as the sea of the East. This Ionithus received from the Lord the gift of wisdom and discovered Astronomy. He instructed the giant Nemrod (ten cubits in height) and the grandson of Sem, who came to him, and taught [him] in what places he ought to reign. He also foresaw and foretold many things, but chiefly about the rise, succes[sion]…”

§202. The fabulous tale of Noah's son ‘Ionithus’ (via Methodius, in the Scholastic History): begotten in year 100 of the 3rd millennium, sent to the land Ethan, received wisdom & invented Astronomy, taught the giant Nemrod, foretold the four Monarchies. Margins: Scholastic History bk. 1, ch. 37; Jerome, On Ecclesiastical Writers. Continues on p. 393.

— p. 462 (PDF) · printed p. 393 —

…and setting of the four Monarchies, which prophecy Daniel published many ages afterward. And he foretold that the first of all to reign would be from the posterity of Cham, as was Belus and Ninus, founders of the Babylonian kingdom and the Monarchy of the Assyrians; the second to reign, of the stock of Sem, the Persians and Greeks; the last, of the race of Iaphet, the Romans. Thus Methodius, as the Scholastic History reports. St. Jerome relates that this Methodius was a Bishop, first of Olympus in Lycia, afterward of Tyre, of polished and well-composed speech; and that he wrote, among other things, books against Porphyry, and likewise Commentaries on Genesis and on the Canticle of Canticles; and that toward the end of the last persecution of the Church (or, as it pleases others, under Decius and Valerian) he was crowned with martyrdom in Chalcis of Greece.

§202 (cont.). Ionithus's prophecy of the four Monarchies (Cham's line — Belus/Ninus; Shem's — Persians/Greeks; Japheth's — Romans), later published by Daniel; Jerome on Methodius (bishop of Olympus/Tyre, martyr).

But these things which Methodius is said to have handed down about Ionithus the son of Noah are fabulous, and to refute them will be by no means laborious. First, such a son of Noah — distinguished in wisdom and prophetic spirit — Moses would not have passed over in silence, nor would he have said that from those three sons only, Sem, Cham, and Iaphet, all the human race was propagated; and, as of Noah's other sons, so of this one's progeny too he would have given an account. But that opinion is convicted of being false by this: that Noah is said to have begotten that Ionithus in the hundredth year of the third Chiliad, namely from the beginning of the World; but Noah had died more than ninety years before that hundredth year. For from the beginning of the World up to the Flood flowed one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years, and Noah lived after the Flood three hundred and fifty years: therefore he died in the sixth year of the third Chiliad — that is, ninety-four years before the time at which Ionithus is said to have been born. They will perhaps say that Methodius followed the computation of the Greek codices, which reckon more than two thousand years up to the flood. So be it, but that computation is faulty, as we showed in the seventh book of our Commentaries on Genesis; wherefore the opinion of Methodius, which rests on that computation, must be false.

§203. Refutation of Ionithus: Moses would not have been silent, nor said all came from the three; and the dates are impossible (Noah died 94 yrs before Ionithus's alleged birth; the Greek codices' chronology is faulty). Margin: “The aforesaid opinion is refuted.”

But who could bear this? Nemrod is said to have been the grandson of Sem, when in plain words Moses makes him the grandson of Cham, writing thus: “The sons of Cham: Chus, Mesrain, Phut, and Chanaan. And Chus begot Nemrod,” etc. But whether Methodius wrote these things deceived by an erroneous opinion, or whether they are fabricated by others

and published under his specious name, is not clear to me. I marvel indeed that of that so celebrated prophecy about the four Monarchies neither Eusebius nor Jerome — not even in his Commentaries on Daniel (where it would have been most opportune) — made any mention. But however the matter stands, I would have the reader thus warned: that, as it is fitting to admire and venerate the holiness of Methodius and his virtue and glory in martyrdom, so it is not fitting, if he left written anything little consonant with the sacred letters, to embrace it as true and certain.

§204. And Nemrod is called grandson of Shem, but Moses makes him grandson of Cham (Cush son of Cham begot Nemrod); whether Methodius erred or it is forged; neither Eusebius nor Jerome mentions the four-Monarchies prophecy — venerate Methodius's martyrdom, but do not embrace his unscriptural writings as true. Margin: Gen. 10.

But in what lands Noah lived after the flood — whether he always stayed in one place, or, seeking far regions, traversed various lands, or in what seats he ended his life — and finally his excellent sayings and deeds (which it is fair to believe were many) — Moses overwhelmed and suppressed with a wonderful silence. The cause of so great a silence I think was his haste to write [the affairs of Abraham]…

§205. Where Noah dwelt after the flood Moses passes over in silence — because he hastened to write of Abraham. Continues on p. 394.

— p. 463 (PDF) · printed p. 394 —

…the affairs of Abraham: of whom first he wove a very orderly and copious history, for three causes. First, because Abraham had been the prince and as it were the sower of the Hebrew people, for the instructing of which people Moses chiefly bestowed this labor of writing. Next, because Abraham had received from God the sign of Circumcision, by which sign his posterity (that is, the Hebrews), distinguished from the other nations, were to coalesce into one and peculiar people of God. Besides, because God had given Abraham three most ample promises: one about the multiplication of his seed like the stars of heaven and the dust of the earth;

another about the possession of the land of Canaan; the third about the Messiah to be generated from his stock, in whom all nations were to be blessed, and on account of whom he himself would be the father not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles, as many as would believe in Christ. The Hebrews relate that Noah, with Sem, returned from Armenia to the old homeland — that is, the places near Damascus — and there founded the kingdom and priesthood of Salem, which Sem (called Melchisedech) administered.

§205 (cont.). Three reasons Moses hastened to Abraham (founder of the Hebrews; received circumcision; the three great promises — seed like stars, the land, the Messiah); the Hebrews say Noah and Shem returned near Damascus, founding Salem, ruled by Shem = Melchisedech. Margins: Gen. 17; Gen. 12; Gen. 15; Rom. 4.

Berosus Annianus narrates many things about what Noah did after the flood, which, if they were true, would assuredly be most pleasant and most beautiful to readers. He says that, the Flood being ended, when the Ark had wonderfully settled on Mount Gordyaeus in Armenia, Noah descended into the level places, and, his progeny being soon multiplied (for they continually brought forth twins, a male and a female), those places were so filled with men that many had to withdraw thence. But Noah stayed there long, and first taught the Armenians (so we now call them, for that name was afterward given to them) agriculture, and the art of cultivating vines and making wine; then the sacred rites and ceremonies of worshipping God; he also committed to letters many secrets of natural things, which among the Scythian Armenians it is lawful for the priests alone to read, teach, and learn. He taught besides the courses of the stars, and distinguished the year by the course of the Sun, and the twelve months by the motion of the Moon, and foretold by the science of Astronomy many things to come hereafter. Wherefore they venerated him as a kind of god, and surnamed him ‘Sun’ and ‘Heaven.’ And he exhorted the men, the chiefs of families, to seek new seats and found cities; and he designated the three parts of the world — Asia, Africa, and Europe, as he had seen before the flood — and distributed to the several chiefs of families the parts to

which they should go, promising that he would lead colonies through the whole world. At last he sought Kittim, which they now call Italy; there he reigned, and taught the Italians many things pertaining to Theology, Physics, Politics, and the arts necessary for living life: and he left books most full of those matters written. Wherefore he merited so great honor among that nation, that it called him ‘Chaos,’ ‘Seed of the World,’ ‘Father of the gods greater and lesser,’ and ‘Soul of the World’; and they marked him in their writings with the course of the Sun, the motion of the Moon, and the scepter of rule. At last in those places he put off mortality. So that Berosus.

§206. Berosus's charming (if false) account: the Ark on Mt. Gordyaeus; Noah taught the Armenians farming, viticulture, rites, astronomy (the 12-month solar/lunar year), prophecy — revered as a god (‘Sun,’ ‘Heaven’); he assigned the chiefs Asia/Africa/Europe, finally went to ‘Kittim’ (Italy), reigning and teaching, honored as ‘Chaos,’ ‘Soul of the World,’ where he died. Margins: “Where Noah dwelt after the flood, according to the Hebrews and Berosus Annianus”; Berosus Annianus, bk. 3.

St. Augustine, in book 16 of the City of God, chapter 2, treating the things which Moses wrote in this place about the partly blessing, partly cursing of Noah's sons — when he had indicated of what things, once to come and pertaining to the Church of Christ, those three sons of Noah bore the figure (about which we too disputed a little above) — subjoins these words…

§207. Augustine (City of God 16.2) on what the three sons prefigured concerning Christ's Church (begins; cut off). Margin: St. Augustine. Continues on p. 395.

— p. 464 (PDF) · printed p. 395 —

…words: “These secrets of divine scripture we investigate as we can — one more, another less congruently, yet faithfully — holding it certain that they were not done and written without some prefiguration of things to come, and are to be referred only to Christ and His Church, which is the city of God; of which, from the beginning of the human race, the preaching has not been wanting, which we see fulfilled in all things.”

§207 (cont.). Augustine: these scriptural secrets are to be referred to Christ and His Church, the city of God.

Then Augustine poses this question: why, after Noah and his two sons Sem and Iaphet, up to Abraham, of so many men who were in that intervening space of time, Moses mentions no man of praised probity and piety, since it is not to be doubted that some of the posterity of Sem were just and pious men. He himself answers that Moses studied brevity, and that — since he was not only a historiographer but at the same time a prophet — he did not pursue with historical diligence all the things that could have been narrated, but wove into his narrative only those things which by prophetic providence he knew to pertain in some way to the people and city of God. Hear Augustine: “The two sons of Noah being blessed, and one in the midst of them cursed, thereafter up to Abraham there is silence about the mention of any just men who piously worshipped God, for more than a thousand years. Nor would I believe they were lacking; but if all were mentioned it would become too long, and this would be rather historical diligence than prophetic providence. Those things, therefore, Moses pursues — or rather the Spirit of God through him — by which not only are past things narrated, but future things also foretold, which nevertheless pertain to the city of God: because whatever is here said even of men who are not its citizens is said for this, that by comparison of the contrary it [the city of God] may either profit or stand out.”

§208. Why no holy man is named between Noah and Abraham (over 1,000 yrs): Moses sought brevity and, being a prophet, recorded only what pertains to the city of God (Augustine). Margins: “Why no man of praised virtue and piety is mentioned by Moses from Noah to Abraham”; Augustine.

After this Augustine hands down a certain excellent lesson, to be again and again inculcated and commended to all who read and interpret the sacred letters, and diligently to be observed by them (unless they wish often to lapse childishly): that not all things narrated in the divine books have some hidden mystery, nor are mentioned to signify future things; but that many things which lack mystery are interwoven on account of those which have

mystical significations. “Not all things,” says Augustine, “which are narrated as done are to be thought to signify something also; but on account of those which do signify something, even those which signify nothing are interwoven. By the ploughshare alone is the earth cut; but that this may be done, the other parts of the plough too are necessary. And only the strings in the cithara and other musical instruments are fitted for the song; but that they may be fitted, there are also the other [parts] in the frames of the instruments, which are not struck by the players, but to these are connected those which, when struck, resound. So in the prophetic history some things too are said which signify nothing, but to which those that signify [something] may adhere, and in a way be bound.” So Augustine. With which so true and useful a lesson, if those who handle the studies of divine scripture refuse to comply — being more eager than is fitting to dig out mysteries from everywhere — they must necessarily often blurt out empty, cold, inept, and insipid opinions and interpretations. But I will not proceed further, for it seems opportune here to put an end to this book.

§209. Augustine's excellent lesson: not all narrated things hide a mystery — some are woven in only to bind those that do (the plough, the cithara); over-eager mystery-hunters blurt out insipid interpretations. (End of Liber XIV.) Margin: “An excellent lesson of Augustine.”

— p. 465 (PDF) · printed p. 396 —

BENEDICT PERERIUS, COMMENTARIES ON GENESIS, BOOK FIFTEEN. On the tenth chapter. ON THE MULTIPLICATION OF THE HUMAN RACE MADE AFTER THE FLOOD FROM THE THREE SONS OF NOAH; AND ON THE FIRST ORIGIN OF THE PEOPLES, NATIONS, AND KINGDOMS OF THE EARTH. The tenth chapter.

Title page of Liber XV (on Genesis 10, the Table of Nations).

{These are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Cham, and Iaphet: and sons were born to them after the flood. The sons of Iaphet:

Gomer and Magog and Madai, Iavan and Thubal and Mosoch and Thiras. And the sons of Gomer: Ascenez and Riphath and Thogorma. And the sons of Iavan: Elisa and Tharsis, Cethim and Dodanim. By these were the islands of the Gentiles divided in their countries, every one according to his tongue and their families in their nations. And the sons of Cham: Chus and Mesraim and Phut and Chanaan. And the sons of Chus: Saba and Hevila and Sabatha and Regma: Saba and Dadan. And Chus begot Nemrod: he [began to be mighty in the earth]…}

Gen 10:1–8a (chapter text begins). Margins: vv. 1–8. Continues on p. 397.

— p. 466 (PDF) · printed p. 397 —

…he began to be mighty in the earth. And he was a stout hunter before the Lord. From him came forth the proverb, "Even as Nemrod the stout hunter before the Lord." And the beginning of his kingdom was Babylon and Arach and Acad and Chalanne in the land of Sennaar. Out of that land came forth Assur and built Niniveh and the streets of the city and Chale. Resen also between Niniveh and Chale: this is the great city. But Mesraim begot Ludim and Anamim and Laabim and Nephtuim and Phethrusim and Chasluim, of whom came forth the Philistines and the Caphtorim. And Chanaan begot Sidon his firstborn, the Hethite and the Iebusite and the Amorrhite, the Gergesite, the Hevite and the Aracite, the Sinite. And the Aradian, the Samarite and the Amathite: and by these the peoples of the Canaanites were spread abroad. And the borders of Chanaan were from Sidon as one comes to Gerara even to Gaza, until one enters Sodom and Gomorrha and Adama and Seboim even to Lasa. These are the children of Cham in their kindreds and tongues and lands and nations. Of Sem also, the father of all the children of Heber, the elder brother of Iaphet, sons were born. The sons of Sem: Aelam and Assur and Arphaxad and Lud and Aram. The sons of Aram: Hus and Hul, Gether and Mes. But Arphaxad begot Sale, of whom was born Heber. And to

Heber were born two sons, the name of one was Phaleg, because in his days the earth was divided, and the name of his brother was Iectan. Which Iectan begot Elmodad and Saleph and Asarmoth, Iare and Adora and Uzal and Decla and Hebal and Abimael, Saba and Ophir and Hevila and Iobab: all these are the sons of Iectan. And their dwelling was from Messa as one goes on toward Sapar, a mountain of the East. These are the children of Sem according to their kindreds and tongues and regions in their nations. These are the families of Noah according to their peoples and nations. By these were the nations divided on the earth after the flood.}

Gen 10:8b–32 (the chapter text concluded — Cham's and Sem's lines). Margins: vv. 8–32.

— p. 467 (PDF) · printed p. 398 —

Moses describes in this tenth chapter the numerous progeny and manifold posterity of the three sons of Noah, and the first origin of the diversity of peoples, regions, and kingdoms. Yet in reckoning up the posterity of Noah's sons he does not mention all — for that would have been, as it were, infinite, and of no use — but only those who were as it were the heads and chiefs of some nations, and gave names to them. Wherefore he reckons only seven sons of Iaphet, and not all their posterity, but of two only — three of Gomer, and four of Iavan — so that the whole progeny of Iaphet is circumscribed by Moses in fourteen men. Of Cham he enumerates four sons, and of these the posterity of three only, and reduced all begotten from Cham to the number of thirty-one. Finally, of Sem he counts five sons, of whom he sets forth the posterity of three only; nor of those sown from Sem himself did he name more than twenty-six. And so all the posterity of Noah's sons mentioned by Moses do not exceed the number of seventy-two.

Praefatio §1. Moses lists only the heads of nations: Japheth's line = 14, Cham's = 31, Shem's = 26 — in all, 72.

God willed, moreover, that these nations be mentioned by name, and the knowledge of them be commended to the immortal memory of posterity, that the truth and efficacy of that first blessing of God might clearly appear, when it was said to the sons of Noah, “Increase and multiply and fill the earth.” And likewise that the most true issue and effect might be shown, both of the blessing of Sem and Iaphet and of the curse of Cham, which Noah imparted to them. Besides, that, the true beginnings of peoples, kingdoms, and nations being known, we may laugh at and despise the most vain and most lying histories of the Gentiles about these matters. And because mention of the nations here recorded often occurs in the sacred letters, their origin being grasped, a clearer and fuller knowledge of those nations may be at hand for us.

Praefatio §2. Why God had the nations named: to show the efficacy of the blessing/curse, to refute the pagans' lying histories, and to clarify the nations met in Scripture. Margins: “Why the nations sprung from the three sons of Noah are reckoned by Moses”; Gen. 9.

But as to the words or names of the nations which are here reckoned — since some of them are retained, but many obliterated, yet most changed — it is useful to forewarn and pre-instruct the reader of what Josephus forewarned in the first book of the Antiquities: “After the division of tongues,” he says, “men were dispersed everywhere, colonies being led out in every direction, and each occupied with his own that land which lot and God brought him: so that both the maritime and the inland [places] were filled with cultivators; nor were there lacking those who, boarding ships, crossed over to inhabit the islands. Now of the nations, some still keep the appellation derived from their founders; some have changed it; and some have turned it into a word more familiar and better known to the neighbors — the Greeks being chiefly the authors of such nomenclature: for these, in later ages claiming for themselves the ancient glory of places, marked the nations with names known to themselves, and, as if they were of their own right, introduced their own manners and rites into them.” Thus Josephus.

Praefatio §3. On the names (some kept, many lost, most changed): Josephus on the dispersal and how the Greeks renamed nations. Margins: Josephus; “The vanity of the Greeks.”

— p. 468 (PDF) · printed p. 399 —

{These are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Cham, and Iaphet.}

Gen 10:1 (lemma). Margin: v. 1.

With these words can be joined those of the preceding chapter: “These three are the sons of Noah, and from them was all mankind disseminated over the whole earth.” Likewise those last words of this tenth chapter: “These are the families of the sons of Noah according to their peoples and nations; from these were the nations divided on the earth after the flood.” For Moses wishes to show in this chapter that, as at the beginning of the world the whole race of men was propagated from one [man] up to the flood, so after the flood — as if from a new beginning of the World again — from the three sons of Noah the whole earth was filled with inhabitants and cultivators; and that whatever peoples and nations there had been and were up to that time at which Moses wrote this history, all drew their first origin thence.

Comment on v.1: this chapter shows how, as one man peopled the pre-flood world, the three sons of Noah peopled the post-flood world. Margin: Gen. 9.

Josephus writes that the three parts of the world were so distributively and distinctly occupied by the posterity of Noah's three sons, that the Iaphetani (so henceforth I will call the posterity of Iaphet, for brevity, as the posterity of Cham, Chamaei, and of Sem, Semaei) held seats in Asia from the Taurus and Amanus mountains up to the river Tanais, by which Europe is divided from Asia; and in Europe from here up to the Strait of Cadiz; but the Chamaei obtained Syria and the regions adhering to the Amanus and Lebanon mountains, extending the bounds of their dominion up to the sea and the Ocean; the Semaei, the beginning of propagating their dominion being made from the Euphrates, inhabited Asia up to the Indian Ocean.

§4. Josephus's partition of the world: Japheth (Asia from Taurus/Amanus to the Tanais, and Europe to Cadiz); Cham (Syria to the Ocean); Shem (from the Euphrates to the Indian Ocean). Margin: "Josephus partitions the earth among the three sons of Noah."

Epiphanius, in the Anchoratus, writes that Noah exacted an oath from his sons, that they should retain the worship of the true God and keep concord and benevolence among themselves; and since he had been constituted heir of the world by God, he distributed the world to his sons as a hereditary possession, lots being cast, so that each should undertake to inhabit and cultivate that part of the earth which had fallen to him by lot: and that Sem indeed obtained seats for the most part in Asia, Cham in Egypt and Africa, Iaphet in Europe.

§5. Epiphanius: Noah, having exacted an oath of true worship and concord, divided the world by lot — Shem chiefly Asia, Cham Egypt and Africa, Japheth Europe. Margin: "Epiphanius holds Noah, casting lots, assigned each son the part of the earth that fell to him."

To these I add what Berosus Annianus — or rather [Annius] himself…

§6. Begins the (spurious) Berosus/Annius account of Noah's voyages. Continues on p. 400.

— p. 469 (PDF) · printed p. 400 —

…Annius in the Commentaries on Berosus: that, on the authority of Philo, Noah (whom others called Janus), together with his three sons and many colonies, came to the Pontus, and with rafts surveyed all round the whole Mediterranean sea, and showed to his first son Sem all the Asiatic shore from the Tanais through the Bosphorus up to the Nile; to Cham he showed the shore of Africa from the Nile up to the Strait of Cadiz; finally to Iaphet all the shore of Europe from Cadiz up to the Tanais: and he sent out first colonies to all the provinces around the shore; in which matter a decade being spent, he returned to Scythia, whence, other new colonists being taken on, he was carried down into Italy, and, conveyed up the Tiber, held to the left side Etruria, and set out the first colonists on the Vatican and the Janiculum. And Annius confirms this by the authority of Cato, by whom these things are handed down in the book On Origins: of which books

certain fragments (dug up I know not whence) Annius patched together and published. But these things, because they are confirmed by no grave reason or by the authority of an approved writer, I for my part think merit no greater credence than the fables of the poets.

§6 (cont.). Berosus/Annius: Noah (= Janus) circumnavigated the Mediterranean, assigning his sons the shores of Asia, Africa, Europe, then settled colonists on the Vatican and Janiculum — Pererius rates it no better than the poets' fables. Margins: "How Noah surveyed the world and filled it with inhabitants, according to Berosus Annianus"; Berosus Annianus.

{The sons of Iaphet: Gomer, Magog, Madai, Iavan, Thubal, Mosoch, and Thiras.}

Gen 10:2 (lemma). Margin: v. 2.

Here are mentioned seven sons of Iaphet; of whom the posterity of the first son (that is, Gomer) are reckoned — Ascenez, Riphat, Thogorma; and of the fourth son (that is, Iavan) four posterity are numbered — Elisa, Tharsis, Cethim, Dodanim. All the posterity of Iaphet here mentioned, therefore, both sons and grandsons, are fourteen in number. But the Greek codices, which Augustine in book 16 of the City of God chapter 3 followed, add an eighth son of Iaphet by name Elisa, whence it comes that they number the posterity of Iaphet at fifteen; but that Elisa neither the Hebrew scripture, nor the Chaldaic paraphrase, nor the Greek Complutensian translation has, nor did the Greek codices which Jerome used have it, as is clear from his Hebrew Traditions on Genesis. And this whole progeny of Iaphet may be seen, arranged in one view, in this description: Iaphet's seven sons — Gomer (Ascenez, Riphat, Thogorma); Magog; Madai; Iavan (Elisa, Tharsis, Cethim, Dodanim); Thubal; Mosoch; Thiras: all the posterity of Iaphet, fourteen. [genealogical table in the original]

§7. Japheth's seven sons; the posterity of Gomer (3) and Iavan (4) = 14 in all (the Greek codices wrongly add an eighth son Elisa). Includes a genealogical table in the original. Margin: St. Augustine.

But someone will perhaps ask: since above, in enumerating the sons of Noah, Sem was named almost first, why now Moses [began] from Iaphet…

§8. Why Moses begins the genealogy with Japheth (not Shem, named first elsewhere). Continues on p. 401.

— p. 470 (PDF) · printed p. 401 —

…began? Was it because, according to the Hebrews (whom Tostatus, Lyra, and very many others follow), Iaphet was the firstborn of Noah? But for that reason the posterity of Cham ought to be reckoned in the last place, as he was the youngest in birth. Or rather, on the contrary, as it pleases Augustine, did he begin from the youngest son, proceeding up to the greatest, who was Sem? But it is more credible that Cham was younger than Iaphet, since above in chapter nine he was called precisely the "younger brother" — that is, according to the Hebrew idiom, the youngest. Or rather did he begin from Iaphet because the preceding chapter had ended on him in treating of the sons of Noah, and at the last set forth the progeny of Sem because all the following history was to be woven on about it?

§8 (cont.). The possibilities: Japheth firstborn (Hebrews, Tostatus, Lyra); or youngest-first up to Shem (Augustine); or Moses simply resumed where ch. 9 left off, saving Shem (the thread of the coming history) for last.

And from this posterity of Iaphet it stands forth and appears how true and efficacious was that blessing which Noah imparted to Iaphet: "May God enlarge Iaphet, and may he dwell in the tents of Sem." Which enlargement denotes not only the numerous propagation of his posterity, but chiefly the most ample regions which his posterity were to occupy — who obtained the largest part of the world, all Europe being occupied with the greater part of Asia and the islands of the Mediterranean sea; who besides sent colonists into Africa too: for the Greeks, who drew their origin from Iaphet, frequented the shores of Africa and filled them with excellent cities, as we learn from the profane histories. And these things will be clearly

understood from those nations which, from this posterity of Iaphet, were disseminated through the various coasts of the earth. For what I said of the islands, Moses plainly teaches in those words: “By these (namely the posterity of Iaphet) were the islands of the nations divided in their countries.”

§9. Japheth's posterity proves the blessing ‘May God enlarge Japheth’ — they held most of the world (all Europe, much of Asia, the Mediterranean islands, colonies in Africa). Margin: “How far and wide over the world the posterity of Japheth is spread.”

Some have thought that our Iaphet was not unknown to the heathen, but was the very one whom they called Iapetus — born of Heaven and Earth (as the poets fabled), and one of the Titans warring with Jove, and the father of Prometheus and grandfather of Deucalion. But assuredly, between our Iaphet and the heathen Iapetus, besides a certain similarity of name, there is no resemblance: for the rest are so diverse (I say nothing of the reckoning of times, which cannot agree for both) that I marvel that men by no means unlearned were led to believe it and to publish it in writing.

§10. Some identify Japheth with the pagans' Iapetus (the Titan, father of Prometheus); but apart from the name there is no resemblance. Margin: “Whether Japheth was the same as the heathen Iapetus.”

The first son of Iaphet is named Gomer, whose posterity, the Gomeritae, Josephus thinks (and most all have followed him) to have been those whom the Greeks called Gallo-Greeks or Galatians. But that they were Gauls — from whom set out those who plundered Delphi, and afterward settled in Asia close to the Troad, and occupied the greater part of Phrygia — is the concordant opinion of the Geographers. Hear Justin, book 35: “So great was the terror of the Gallic name (or the unconquered felicity of their arms), that kings thought they could neither keep their majesty safe, nor recover it when lost, without Gallic valor; and so great was the fecundity of the Gauls in youth at that time, that they filled all Asia as with a swarm. And so, called in for aid by the king of Bithynia, they divided the kingdom with him, the victory being won, and named that region Gallograecia, because the Gauls had been mingled with the Greeks.”

§11. Gomer — Josephus & most: his posterity = the Gallo-Greeks/Galatians; the geographers agree they were Gauls (who plundered Delphi, settled in Asia); Justin on the terror of the Gallic name and the founding of 'Gallograecia.' Margins: "Whether Gomer was the father of the Galatians"; Josephus; Justin.

What sort of people, therefore, the Gomeritae were, and what lands they settled, can be conjectured from the prophecy of Ezekiel in chapter 38 in these words: "Gomer and all its troops, the house of Thogorma, the sides of the North, and all its strength, and many peoples with thee." In that place Ezekiel describes the warlike forces of the prince Gog collected from various nations, which he was to lead to war down the Jews and despoil them of all goods, after they had returned from Babylon to their fatherland. And from the prophecy of Daniel chapter 11, and from the history of Josephus, it is established that the Jews, after the return from the Babylonian captivity, were often and vehemently harassed by the kings of Egypt and of Syria (or Asia), but especially by Antiochus Epiphanes, as the history of the Maccabees teaches. Therefore it is credible that the Gomeritae were peoples in Asia, which is to the north or northward of Palestine, or even in some part of Syria, yet not far removed from Palestine: and they are called Northerners in comparison with Judea, for that region has such a position toward Palestine. Wherefore Daniel chapter 11 calls the kings of Syria 'kings of the North,' as he names the kings of Egypt 'kings of the South' — namely, each in comparison with Judea.

§12. Where the Gomeritae dwelt, from Ezekiel 38 (Gomer, the house of Thogorma, 'the sides of the North') — peoples north of Palestine, in or near Syria, subject to Gog; hence Daniel calls Syria's kings 'of the North,' Egypt's 'of the South,' relative to Judea. Margins: "The passage Ezekiel ch. 38"; Josephus.

— p. 471 (PDF) · printed p. 402 —

The second son of Iaphet is named Magog: whose posterity, the Magogaei, some have thought to have been the Goths (as Jerome narrates in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis); others the Getae, the Massagetae, finally the Scythians — which is the opinion of Josephus, Jerome, and of nearly

all. And from the Scythians is the origin of the Tartars and Turks. Nor are there lacking those who contend that the Magogaei were peoples of Coele-Syria, near Palestine, making their conjecture of this from those words of Pliny, book 5, chapter 23: “Coele has Apamia, divided by the river Marsyas from the Tetrarchy of the Nazerini, and Bambyce, which by another name is called Hierapolis, but by the Syrians Magog,” etc. Magog, therefore, as may be understood from Pliny, was a sacred and august city of the Syrians (for that is what ‘Hierapolis’ means), of which city and region Ezekiel in chapter 38 makes Gog the prince; where the Magogaei are reckoned among the various nations which, under the prince Gog (that is, the kings of Syria), were to serve as soldiers and wage war against the Jews brought back from the Babylonian captivity. For that the Jews, lately returned from Babylon into Judea, were greatly harassed and vexed by the neighboring nations, the Samaritans and Syrians, is not obscurely understood from the books of Esdras.

§13. Magog — some: the Goths (Jerome); others: Getae/Massagetae/Scythians (Josephus, Jerome, most — whence the Tartars and Turks); others: Coele-Syrians (Pliny: Hierapolis called ‘Magog’ by the Syrians; Ezekiel's Gog its prince). Margins: “What nations sprang from Magog”; Jerome; Pliny.

The third son of Iaphet is called Madai. Among all it is agreed that from Madai sprang the Medes, peoples famous in greater Asia — at first indeed subject to the Assyrians, but afterward, through their commander Arbaces, Sardanapalus the last monarch of the Assyrians being overcome, they not only shook off the yoke of servitude, but even held the empire of Asia for nearly four hundred years. And that the empire of the Babylonians was overthrown by the Medes through Darius the Mede, both Daniel narrates in chapter 5, and it had been foretold before by Isaiah chapter 14 and Jeremiah chapter 51.

§14. Madai — all agree the Medes sprang from him (under Arbaces they overthrew Sardanapalus and held Asia ~400 yrs; under Darius the Mede they overthrew Babylon — Daniel 5, foretold by Isaiah 14, Jeremiah 51). Margin: “The origin of the Medes.”

Among the same sons of Iaphet, in the fourth place is mentioned Iavan, from whom (in the opinion of all) sprang the Ionians, the sowers and parents of the Greeks. Wherefore in many places of scripture, for the Hebrew word Iavan the Septuagint translated Hellas, and the Latin interpreter Greece; and for the plural Iavanim, they [translated] Hellenes, he Greeks, as may be seen in Isaiah chapter 66, Ezekiel 27, Joel 3. Yet sometimes the Septuagint retained the Hebrew word itself, but somewhat changed, as here they named it Iouan. Hecataeus, in Strabo book 9, says that the Ionians came from Asia into Greece, whence is the origin of the Athenians, whom Plutarch in the Theseus teaches to have been anciently called Iones, and their region of Attica to have been called Ionia. [continues]…

§15. Iavan — all agree the Ionians (parents of the Greeks) sprang from him; the LXX render 'Iavan' as 'Hellas,' the Latin 'Greece' (Isaiah 66, Ezekiel 27, Joel 3); Hecataeus (via Strabo 9): the Ionians came from Asia; the Athenians anciently called Iones (Plutarch). Margins: "The origin of the Ionians"; Hecataeus; "Whether the Athenians sprang from the Ionians"; Plutarch. Continues on p. 403.

— p. 472 (PDF) · printed p. 403 —

…But because the Athenians boasted themselves the first of men and, as it were, aboriginals, they therefore said that they were called Iones not from the beginning, but after Deucalion — whose son Xuthus, fleeing his brothers from Thessaly to Athens, and received by Erichtheus, begot of his daughter a son Ion, from whom the Athenians were called Iones, who, colonists being sent into Asia, founded Ionia there. This opinion Strabo followed in book eight, and Pausanias in the Achaica. But the former opinion is truer.

§15 (cont.). The Athenians' counter-claim (called Iones only after Deucalion's grandson Ion — Strabo, Pausanias); but the former view (Ionians from Asia) is truer. Margins: Strabo; Pausanias.

The fifth son of Iaphet is named Thubal. And the Thubalaei Josephus thinks to be the Iberians, that is, the Spaniards; but the Hebrews, the Italians, formerly called Hesperians. But because Thubal is very often

joined and associated with Mosoch (as in Ezekiel ch. 27, 32, 38, 39), and some opine that Mosoch was the Cedareni (that is, the Arabs), the same have thought that the Thubalaei were Asiatic peoples — but neighbors of Syria and Arabia, not Europeans, that is, neither Spaniards nor Italians. The Septuagint Interpreters and the Chaldaic paraphrast call him Thobel.

§16. Thubal — Josephus: the Iberians (Spaniards); the Hebrews: the Italians (formerly 'Hesperians'); but since Thubal is paired with Mosoch (Ezekiel), some make both Asiatic peoples near Syria/Arabia. Margins: "Of what nations Thubal was the author"; Josephus.

The sixth son reckoned is Mosoch, from whom a certain one opines were generated the Mosci or Moscovites, on account of the similarity of name — which similarity, however, is not in the Hebrew word Mesech, for the Latin word Mosoch is taken from the Septuagint Interpreters who in Greek translated Mosoch. Josephus says that the Mesechaei or Mesochaei were afterward called by the Greeks Cappadocians, and that an index and witness of the ancient appellation is a certain city among the Cappadocians which has the name Masecha. It seems more probable to others that the Mosochaei were peoples neighboring Syria and Arabia and bordering on the Cedarene Arabs, who are next to the Nabataeans, on the authority of Pliny book 5 chapter 11. For Cedar was the son of Ismael (Gen. 25), whence the Ismaelites and Arabs were afterward called Saracens — perhaps because, with Sara as it were the author (as is in chapter 16 of Genesis), Abraham took Agar to wife, of whom he received Ismael, the parent of that nation.

§17. Mosoch — some: the Moscovites (by name-likeness, absent in the Hebrew Mesech); Josephus: the Cappadocians (the city Masecha attests it); others more probably peoples near Syria/Arabia bordering the Cedarene Arabs (Pliny; Cedar son of Ishmael, Gen 25 — whence the 'Saracens'). Margins: "What nations Mosoch was the parent of"; Josephus; Pliny; Gen. 25.

That Mesech was a nation near the dwellers of Cedar can be conjectured from Psalm 120, where David, complaining of the misery of his exile, broke forth into those lamentable words: "Woe is me, that my sojourning is prolonged; I have dwelt with the inhabitants of Cedar." For thus the Latin

interpreter, following the Greek version, expressed that place. But in place of that “is prolonged,” in Hebrew it is Mesech: so that David complains that, far from his fatherland, he passes his time abroad in Mesech, and dwells among the tents of Cedar — that is, lives among barbarous and perfidious nations, delighting in continual raids and robberies. According to which sense the Chaldaic Paraphrast rendered that place thus: “O wretched me, that I have sojourned with the Asians, I have dwelt with the tents of the Arabs.” [continues]…

§18. Mesech near Cedar's dwellers (Ps 120 — ‘prolonged’ is Hebrew ‘Mesech’; David laments dwelling among barbarous peoples; the Chaldee ‘the Asians… the Arabs’). Margin: “The passage Psalm 120.” Continues on p. 404.

— p. 473 (PDF) · printed p. 404 —

…It is consonant, therefore, according to these, that the Gomeritae, Magogaei, Thubalaei, and Mesechaei were peoples either in Asia, or in Syria, or not far thence, spread around Palestine, and subject to the dominion of the prince Gog — that is, of the kings of Syria and Asia who reigned after Alexander.

§18 (cont.). So (on this view) the Gomeritae, Magogaei, Thubalaei, and Mesechaei were peoples in or near Asia/Syria around Palestine, subject to ‘Gog’ (the post-Alexander kings of Syria/Asia).

The seventh and last son of Iaphet reckoned is Thiras, from whom nearly all derive the race and origin of those whom the Greeks called Thracians. Why they thought this, I see no other reason than the fitting derivation, from Thira ‘Thiraces,’ and for the sake of a better sound ‘Thraces.’ But others repeat the name of the Thracians from Thrax, the son of Mars; others from the harshness of that region, which is glad neither in sky (says Mela) nor in soil, and, except where near the sea, barren and very cold, and very grudgingly enduring of the things that are sown; and the men too of harsh and unseemly bodily condition, composed to ferocity and wildness. Yet to most of the heathen it has seemed that the Thracians were so called as if ‘truces’ [savage]: for Isidore, in book nine of the Etymologies: “The

Thracians," he says, "sprang and were named from the son of Iaphet who was called Thiras; although the Gentiles think them so called from their manners, because they are savage. For they relate that they were the most savage of all nations, since they sacrificed captives to their gods, and were wont to drink human blood received in the bones of [their enemies'] heads." This Thiras is nowhere else named in scripture except in 1 Chronicles chapter 1 — perhaps because he and his posterity settled lands far removed from the Jews; for Scripture is wont to mention generally those peoples who were either neighbors of Palestine, or who, following the camps of the enemies of God's people, harassed and vexed the Jews.

§19. Thiras — nearly all: the Thracians (Thiraces→Thraces); others from Thrax son of Mars, or the region's harshness (Mela); the pagans: 'Thraces' ≈ 'truces' (savage — Isidore: they sacrificed captives and drank blood from skull-cups); named only in 1 Chron. 1 (his line dwelt far from the Jews). Margins: "The origin of the Thracians"; Mela bk. 2, ch. 2; Isidore.

{And the sons of Gomer: Ascenez and Riphath and Thogorma.}

Gen 10:3 (lemma). Margin: v. 3.

Of the seven sons of Iaphet the posterity of only two are mentioned, Gomer's three and Iavan's four: for the rest, content with the names of their parents, adopted for themselves no national appellations; or scripture mentioned them comprehended under one common name, because among them there was nothing more noble and illustrious than the head of the family itself and the author of the first stock. The first of the sons of Gomer is named by the Latin interpreter Ascenez, in Greek Ascanaz, but in Hebrew Aschenaz: and the Aschenazaei Josephus thinks to be the Rhegini; others, the Goths; the Jews of our time, the Germans — namely, following the Jerusalem Targum, in which the word Gomer is expounded 'Africa,' but Aschenas 'Germany.' But that this is false is argued from Jeremiah, in whom, chapter 51 (where it is treated of the destruction of Babylon and of the various nations by whose alliance and aid the Medes were to overthrow the Babylonian empire), among those nations the Ascenez are mentioned, who as allie[s]…

§20. Only Gomer's (3) and Iavan's (4) sons have named posterity. Gomer's first son Ascenez — Josephus: the Rhegini; others: the Goths; modern Jews: the Germans (the Jerusalem Targum: Gomer = Africa, Aschenas = Germany) — refuted from Jeremiah 51 (the Ascenez allied with the Medes against Babylon). Margins: "Whether the posterity of Ascenez were the Rhegini or Goths or Germans"; Josephus. Continues on p. 405.

— p. 474 (PDF) · printed p. 405 —

…[the Ascenez] who were to bear allied arms with the Medes against the Babylonians. Whence it is no vain conjecture that they were of the Asiatic peoples belonging to the empire of the Medes; and this seems more like the truth than that they were either the Rhegini or the Goths.

§19 (cont., printed §-numbering offset by one from prior batch). Ascenez probably an Asiatic people under the Medes (not the Rhegini or Goths), per Jer 51.

The second son of Gomer is named Riphat, of whom, according to the divine scripture, mention is made nowhere else than in 1 Chronicles ch. 1 — perhaps because, withdrawing farther from the rest of the brothers, he occupied distant coasts; whence it comes that, as one living under another sky, he is passed over in the sacred letters. Whether they are the Riphaei or Riphataei, whom the Greeks afterward called Paphlagonians, I have neither [reason] to disprove, nor (beyond the authority of those who think so) to approve.

§20. Riphat (named only in 1 Chron. 1, his line dwelling far off); perhaps the Paphlagonians (Josephus). Margin: "The Riphathaei, according to Josephus, were afterward called Paphlagonians."

The third son is called Thogorma, who is named not only in 1 Chronicles ch. 1, but also in Ezekiel (and not once only). But who were the Thogormaei? Josephus thinks they were the Phrygians; the Jews, the Turks (for they name the Emperor of the Turks Thogar); some, the Cappadocians; many, the Germans — which opinion the Chaldaic interpreter favors, who in Ezekiel ch. 27 rendered Germany for Thogorma, where the Prophet, speaking of the commerce of the Tyrians, said: "From the house of Thogorma they brought horses and horsemen and mules to thy market."

But from that very place one may prove that by the word Thogorma Germany cannot be understood; for the Germans could have had no commerce with the Tyrians, set so far apart from one another by almost an immense space of lands. The Jerusalem Targum in this place put Barbary for Thogorma. But indeed, since in Ezekiel ch. 38, among the various nations which the prince Gog (that is, the kings of Syria and Asia) draw with him to wage war on the Hebrews, the Thogormaei too are mentioned, one would not rashly think them to have been Syrian or Asian peoples, subject to the dominion of those kings.

§21. Thogorma — Phrygians (Josephus), Turks (the Jews), Cappadocians, or Germans (the Chaldee on Ezek 27); but 'Germany' fails (no Tyrian trade with Germans); probably a Syrian/Asian people under Gog (Ezek 38). Margins: "Whether the Thogormaei were afterward the Phrygians, or the Turks, or Cappadocians, or Germans"; the passage Ezekiel ch. 27 & 38.

{And the sons of Iavan: Elisa and Tharsis, Cethim and Dodanim.}

Gen 10:4 (lemma). Margin: v. 4.

From the first son of Iavan, Elisa, most have thought that the Greeks who are called Aeolians sprang — doubtless following Josephus. The Chaldaic Paraphrast, in Ezekiel ch. 27 (where the Latin interpreter renders "of the islands of Elisa"), rendered "of the islands of Italy," thinking Elisa the same as Italy. Certainly it is not improbable that Elisa and his posterity sailed all round that Greek sea, and inhabited its islands, and named them from their parent's name; and not only the islands or places of that sea, but also of the rest of the Mediterranean sea. For Scripture, when it treats of islands, is wont to understand transmarine regions also, among which it comprehends the islands of the Mediterranean sea. Nor does the conjecture of those seem to me wholly futile who opine that Elisa himself, or his posterity, having traversed the Mediterranean [sea]…

§22. Elisa — the Aeolian Greeks (Josephus); the Chaldee = Italy; they probably peopled and named the islands of the Greek and Mediterranean seas. Margin: "What nation Elisa founded." Continues on p. 406.

— p. 475 (PDF) · printed p. 406 —

…and, carried out beyond the Strait of Cadiz, came to the Fortunate Islands, and named them from the name of the author of their race Eliseas or Elysias: and that this gave occasion to the fables of the poets placing there the seats of the blessed, which they called the Elysian fields. But this conjecture of whatever sort — or rather divination — let it be probable only to him to whom it is pleasing.

§22 (cont.). Some even derive the ‘Elysian fields’ from Elisa (his line reaching the Fortunate Islands beyond Cadiz) — a guess Pererius leaves to taste. Margin: “The Fortunate Islands and the Elysian Fields.”

The second son of Iavan is named Tharsis. That the Cilicians sprang from him is not vainly believed, by the argument of the metropolis of that region, the city once renowned in all the world, which, keeping its ancient name, was called Tarsus — above all ennobled by the birth of St. Paul. Nor does it make against this that Tharsus is written without the aspiration; for the Greeks, and after the Greeks' manner the Septuagint Interpreters, are wont in many words to turn ■ into ■. Therefore the word Tharsis first and properly signifies Cilicia and that Cilician sea. Josephus in book eight of the Antiquities interprets Tharsis as a region of India, that is, the Golden Chersonese; as also St. Jerome in Epistle 132. The Septuagint interpreters in Isaiah 23 and Ezekiel 27 put Carthage for Tharsis; to which is akin that the Chaldaic paraphrase in Jeremiah ch. 10, and in 3 Kings ch. 10, interprets Tharsis as Africa, but in Psalm 72 as Cilicia — although both it and the Septuagint in many places translate it ‘sea.’ But Josephus in book nine of the Antiquities, [regarding] what is narrated in 2 Chronicles ch. 20 of the fleet of king Iosaphat, which had been prepared in the Red Sea to go to Tharsis, thought there was signified the Pontic sea and the marts of Thrace — but with a manifest slip in Geography: for from the Red Sea a fleet could not seek the Pontus or Thrace, except carried round by almost the whole Ocean and the whole Mediterranean sea.

§23. Tharsis — the Cilicians (the city Tarsus, birthplace of St. Paul); the variants 'India/Golden Chersonese' (Josephus, Jerome), 'Carthage/Africa' (LXX, Chaldee), 'Cilicia,' or simply 'sea'; Josephus's geographical slip (Pontus from the Red Sea). Margins: "What region Tharsis was, and what is signified by that word in Scripture"; Josephus; the Chaldaic paraphrase.

But to bring into few words what pertains to the notion of this word: I judge that the word Tharsis first signified Cilicia and the Cilician sea stretched before Phoenicia and Syria, and thence was transferred to signify the whole Mediterranean sea and its maritime places — either because Tharsis the son of Iavan, or his posterity, setting out from Cilicia, traversed this whole sea and ranged over the islands and maritime places, and filled them with colonists and inhabitants (for that the Cilicians ruled far and wide by sea and land, Solinus relates in ch. 41: "Cilicia," he says, "once reached as far as Pelusium of Egypt, the Lydians, Medes, Armenians, Pamphylia, [and] Cappadocia being set under the dominion of the Cilicians"); or the transfer of that name was made from a part to the whole. For sometimes a name first given to signify some one thing is afterward, by usage itself, transferred to signify many other things, as is plain in the word Cethim, which first signified Cyprus, then all islands and maritime places. And because among the maritime places of this Mediterranean sea Carthage was once most famous (for the Carthaginians long and greatly ruled the sea, being powerful and flourishing in naval affairs), therefore in some places of scripture, for Tharsis, both in Greek and Chaldaic and Latin, [the name of Carthage is put]…

§24. Pererius's view: 'Tharsis' first = Cilicia/the Cilician sea (Solinus on Cilician sea-power), then by extension the whole Mediterranean and its coasts (as 'Cethim' went from Cyprus to all islands; and 'Carthage' for Tharsis). Continues on p. 407.

— p. 476 (PDF) · printed p. 407 —

…the name of Carthage or Africa, as we said above.

§24 (cont.). Hence 'Carthage/Africa' stands for Tharsis in some passages.

And since the Mediterranean sea, because it was most ample and most deep, was by the Jews called the Great Sea, and the great ships which sailed in that sea were called ships of Tharsis, hence it came about that that name was transferred even to signify the Ocean itself (as is plain from the books of Kings and Chronicles). For thus can be understood what is written in those books of the Fleet of the kings of Judah which was sought from the Red Sea, [namely] Tharsis, that is, the Indian sea: for that others have expounded by that word a region of India does not please certain learned men, because not the sons of Iavan (that is, Tharsis and his posterity), but the sons of Iectan (such as Ophir and Hevila) set out to inhabit the places of India; therefore the word Tharsis does not suit them. But about the word Tharsis, enough for the present — about which we have also disputed in book 12 of our Commentaries on Daniel, so that, if any things are perhaps here wanting, it may be permitted to seek them thence.

§25. 'Ships of Tharsis' → the Great Sea → even the Ocean (Kings, Chronicles); against reading Tharsis as 'India' (India was settled by Iectan's sons, not Iavan's). Cross-ref to his Daniel commentary, bk. 12.

The third son of Iavan is named Cethim, in the plural number, so that we understand not only that son of Iavan, but his posterity too, to be signified. The Septuagint Interpreters, wherever this name is set in Scripture, retained the Hebrew word. Three significations of this word may be noted in the sacred letters. The first, for the island Cyprus, as Josephus says — of which ancient appellation he says a trace remains in a city of that island called Citium (whence Zeno of Citium, the chief of the Stoics) — and thence all islands; so that the Hebrews call most maritime places by the national word Chithim. The second signification is for Italy, or for the Italians or Romans, which is elicited from ch. 24 of the book of Numbers, where the Latin interpreter rendered the prophecy of Balaam in these words: "They shall come in galleys from Italy, they shall overcome the Assyrians and lay waste the Hebrews, and at the last they themselves shall perish." For that 'from Italy,' in Hebrew it is Chithim, which word the Chaldee interpreted

‘Romans.’ The same signification is also elicited from those words in Daniel ch. 11: “And there shall come upon him galleys and the Romans, and he shall be struck.” For that word ‘Romans,’ in Hebrew it is Cethim. In Ezekiel too, ch. 27, that ‘of the islands of Cethim,’ the Latin Interpreter rendered ‘of the islands of Italy,’ but the Chaldee ‘of Apulia.’ The third signification of that word is for Macedonia, or rather Greece: for at the beginning of the first book of Maccabees Alexander is said to have come out of the land of Cethim, that is, from Macedonia or Greece; and in the same book ch. 8, Philip and Perseus, the last kings of Macedonia, are called kings of the Cethaeans. Comparing, therefore, the various places of scripture among themselves, this word seems to signify the islands of the Mediterranean sea, but especially those lying off Egypt and Syria; then also the farther parts of the Mediterranean, as Greece and Italy. Finally, that word signifies nations transmarine to the Hebrews, such as the European nations — for Scripture accommodates itself to the opinion and sense of the Hebrews, who thought all the peoples separated from them by the Mediterranean sea to be islanders, as those who from elsewhere came to Judea by ships: for just as in Italy [we call those beyond the Alps]…

§26. Cethim — three senses: Cyprus (Josephus, the city Citium → Zeno) and all islands; Italy/Rome (Num 24, Dan 11, Ezek 27); Macedonia/Greece (1 Macc — Alexander, Philip, Perseus); in sum, the Mediterranean islands and transmarine European nations (the Hebrews called all such ‘islanders’). Margins: “What nation or region is signified by the word Cethim”; Josephus. Continues on p. 408.

— p. 477 (PDF) · printed p. 408 —

…we call those beyond the Alps ‘Tramontanes,’ so the Hebrews called the nations separated from them by the sea ‘islanders.’ Let the reader see, if he please, what we have written about this very word in book 14 of our Commentaries on Daniel, upon those words of chapter 11: “And there shall come upon him galleys and the Romans,” etc.

§26 (cont.). As Italians say ‘Tramontanes’ for those beyond the Alps, so the Hebrews said ‘islanders’ (cross-ref to his Daniel commentary).

The fourth son of Iavan is named Dodanim. This one Josephus omitted, perhaps because he was ignorant what nations sprang from him, or what seats they held. The Septuagint Interpreters, taking that word in the plural number (as it is), both here and in 1 Chronicles ch. 1, interpreted it the Rhodians; whence some conjecture that one should read not Dodanim but Rhodanim, by a very easy slip of one letter into another, on account of the great similarity between the two Hebrew letters (resh) and (daleth). Some, following the likeness of the word Dodanim, have opined that this nation held and founded Dodona of Epirus, famous among the heathen for the temple and oracle of Jove. Others, who think one should read Rhodanim, judge that these posterity of Iavan came to the Rhone and to the Gauls.

§27. Dodanim (omitted by Josephus) — the Rhodians (LXX, reading 'Rhodanim,' resh/daleth easily confused); or Dodona of Epirus (Jove's oracle); or the Rhône and the Gauls. Margin: "The origin of the Rhodians."

After this Moses subjoins: "By these were the islands of the Gentiles divided in their countries, every one according to his tongue and their families in their nations." By which words he seems to signify that the islands of the Gentiles (that is, the nations transmarine to the Jews) and the islands of the Mediterranean sea and Europe itself were occupied by these sons of Iavan — I mean those four sons of Iavan, Tharsis, Elisa, Cethim, and Dodanim, the parents of the European peoples and of the islanders of the Mediterranean sea. "Let us read," says Jerome in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis, "the books of Varro On Antiquities, and of Sinnius Capito, and the Greek Phlegon, and the other most learned men, and we shall see almost all the islands and the shores of the whole world and the lands near the sea occupied by Greek settlers, who (as we said above) from the Amanus and Taurus mountains possessed all the maritime places up to the British Ocean." So Jerome. But the other sons and posterity of Iaphet disseminated Asiatic peoples, as was said above of Gomer, Magog, and Madai.

§27 (cont.). 'The islands of the Gentiles divided': Iavan's four sons peopled Europe and the Mediterranean islands (Jerome, citing Varro, Sinnius Capito, Phlegon — Greek settlers from Amanus/Taurus to the British Ocean); Japheth's other sons peopled Asia. Margin: Jerome.

{And the sons of Cham: Chus and Mesraim and Phut and Chanaan.}

Gen 10:6 (lemma). Margin: v. 6.

Josephus says that the sons and posterity of Cham obtained Syria and the region adhering to the Amanus and Lebanon mountains, occupying whatever of it inclines toward the sea, and extending the bounds of their dominion up to the Ocean; but that their names have partly vanished, partly been so corrupted into something different that it is not easy to recognize them. Thus Josephus. To the confirmation of whose opinion makes what Strabo left written in book sixteen: "I," he says, "do not set down the ancient names of nations, both on account of their obscurity, and on account of the absur[dity of pronouncing them]…"

§28. Cham's line held Syria and the coast to the Ocean (Josephus); their names mostly vanished/corrupted (Strabo too declines to list 'obscure' names). Margins: Josephus; Strabo. Continues on p. 409.

— p. 478 (PDF) · printed p. 409 —

…the absurdity of pronouncing them, I do not set them down." Moses reckons the sons and posterity of Cham in this manner: first are named his four sons, Chus, Mesraim, Phut, and Chanaan. Then the posterity of all of these, except Phut, are mentioned, as may be seen in the appended description. [Table:] The sons of Cham — Chus (Saba, Hevila, Sabatha, Regma [Saba, Dadan], Sabathacha; Nemrod). Mesraim (Ludim, Anamim, Laabim, Nephtuim, Phethrusim, Chasluim; the Philistines and Caphtorim). Phuth. Chanaan (Sidon, the Hethite, Iebusite, Amorrhite, Gergesite, Hevite, Aracite, Sinite, Aradian, Samarite, Hamathite). In all, 31.

§28 (cont.). Moses lists Cham's four sons; the posterity of all but Phut (a genealogical table in the original), totaling 31.

FIRST DISPUTATION. What region or nation is denoted by the word Chus — whether Ethiopia or Arabia.

The first son of Cham is called Chus, whence, according to all, the origin of the Ethiopians: for wherever in the sacred letters the word Chus is set in Hebrew, or Chusim, the Septuagint Interpreters always — and following them the Latin [our interpreter]…

§29. Chus — by common consent the origin of the Ethiopians (the LXX and Latin always render Chus / Chusim as 'Ethiopia'/'Ethiopians'). Continues on p. 410.

— p. 479 (PDF) · printed p. 410 —

…our interpreter, interpreted 'Ethiopia' and 'Ethiopians'; and Josephus and Jerome and others, both Hebrews and Christians, in the same way understand and expound those words. Against this common sense of all, a certain writer of our age stubbornly contends, maintaining that by the word Chus is signified not Ethiopia, but Arabia — near to Egypt and Palestine, and extended up to the Arabian gulf (which is called the Red Sea). And he argues thus: The region Chus and the nation of the Chusaeans, according to scripture, was near Egypt, and not much distant from Palestine; but Ethiopia is most remote, as being situated under the torrid Zone (for the Ethiopians are scorched by the heat of the sun); but Arabia is near, lying between Egypt and the Arabian gulf: therefore Chus signifies in the sacred letters not Ethiopia, but Arabia. In this argument two things are assumed: the one, that the region Chus signified in the sacred letters is near Egypt and Palestine; the other, that Arabia is such, but not Ethiopia.

§29 (cont.) / opponent's view: a modern writer argues 'Chus' = Arabia (near Egypt/Palestine), not Ethiopia (too remote, under the torrid zone) — resting on two claims. Margin: Matthaeus Beroaldus (?), in his Chronicle.

And both he proves thus: Sephora the wife of Moses is called Chusitis or Chusaea (the Latin interpreted 'Aethiopissa'); and that she was a Madianite is manifest from the second chapter of Exodus; as also it is clear that the Madianites were neighbors of the Egyptians and Palestinians. And

Scripture, as to the situation of region and places, almost confounds the Madianites, Amalecites, and Ismaelites, because they cultivated the Arabias in a way confused and mingled with the Chusaeans, and with those whom Scripture by name calls Arabim, that is, Arabs. And that the Ethiopians were most disjoined from the Madianites, no one who knows anything in Geography can be ignorant.

§30. The opponent's proofs: Moses's wife Sephora, called 'Chusite,' was a Madianite (Exod 2) — and the Madianites neighbored Egypt; Scripture conflates Madianites/Amalekites/Ishmaelites with the Chusaeans and Arabs (far from Ethiopia). Margins: Num. 12; "Whether Sephora the wife of Moses was an Ethiopian."

Next, in the second book of Chronicles, chapter fourteen, it is narrated that Zara, king of the Chusaeans (the Latin renders 'of the Ethiopians'), led against the Jews an almost immense army, of a thousand thousand [a million]; who would believe that he came from the most remote region of Ethiopia against the Jews? For he could not have led so great an army by so long a journey; nor may one feign any causes of enmity between the Ethiopians and the Jews: that Zara, therefore, was king of the Chusaeans, that is, of the Arabs, not of the Ethiopians. Wherefore Asa, king of Judah, who by God's protection routed so great an army with a small band, is said to have pursued him, and to have plundered some of his cities bordering on Gerara. And that Gerara was at the end of Palestine toward Egypt is known from the wanderings of Abraham and Isaac (Genesis 20 and 26). Besides, in Isaiah 20 it is thus: "They shall fear and be confounded at Chus their hope (the Latin, 'at Ethiopia'), and at Egypt their glory." By these words is signified that the aid which the Jews hoped for from the Chusaeans and Egyptians against the Assyrians would be vain and plainly nothing. But the Jews could hope for no aid from the Ethiopians, most far removed, but from the neighboring Arabs. The Chusaeans, therefore, were not Ethiopians but Arabs.

§31. More proofs: Zara 'king of the Chusaeans' (2 Chron 14) led a million men — impossible from remote Ethiopia, so he was an Arab (Asa pursued him near Gerara, on the Egyptian border); and Isaiah 20 (the Jews' hope in 'Chus' and Egypt against Assyria) means the near Arabs, not far

Ethiopia. Margin: “The innumerable army of king Zara.” Continues on p. 411.

— p. 480 (PDF) · printed p. 411 —

The same is confirmed by another testimony of the same prophet, in whom, chapter thirty, it is thus: “In that day messengers shall go forth from my face in galleys to crush the confidence of Chus (the Latin, ‘the confidence of Ethiopia’), and there shall be dread in them in the day of Egypt.” Who knows not that from Egypt there is no need of ships to seek Ethiopia, which is divided from Egypt by deserts and mountains above and around Syene? But Arabia, which is separated from Egypt by the Arabian gulf or Red Sea, needs ships to be approached from Egypt. Wherefore Nabuchodonosor, Egypt being overcome, crossed by ships into Arabia, which had joined its forces with the Egyptians against him; but God subjected both nations to the dominion of that king, as Jeremiah indicates in chapter 25, reckoning one by one the nations subjugated to Nabuchodonosor's dominion. But beyond the rest these men press those words of Isaiah chapter eighteen: “Woe to the land of the winged cymbal which is beyond the rivers of Chus” (the Latin and Septuagint, ‘beyond the rivers of Ethiopia’). Doubtless, they say, the prophet speaks by these words of Egypt: which cannot even be understood to be among the rivers of Ethiopia, for Ethiopia is under the torrid Zone; and what rivers are beyond it, or what region known to the Jews? or how can Egypt be said to be beyond the rivers of Ethiopia? But if by the word Chus we interpret Arabia, the sense of these words is plain: for Arabia, bordering on Egypt, toward the Syrian sea has the Sirbonian Lake, and on the other side toward the South has the Trajan river, likewise the Arabian gulf or Red Sea, and besides several man-made channels which they call Dioryges — all which waters Scripture noted by the name of ‘rivers.’

§31 (cont.). And Isaiah 30 (galleys to ‘Chus’) and 18 (‘beyond the rivers of Chus’) fit Arabia, not Ethiopia (no ships needed for Ethiopia; Egypt cannot lie ‘beyond Ethiopia's rivers’; Arabia's lakes/Red Sea/canals are the ‘rivers’).

It appears, therefore, that by the word Chus Ethiopia cannot be understood, on account of its very great distance from Palestine, but Arabia must be understood, which bordered on the Egyptians and was not far from the Palestinians. Hear Pliny book 5 ch. 11: “Beyond the Pelusiac mouth of the Nile is Arabia, reaching to the Red Sea, and as far as that odoriferous and rich [region] renowned by the name ‘Blessed’ [Arabia Felix]”; and the rest that follows. And the same in the next chapter: “Hard by,” he says, “Syria occupies the coast, once the greatest of lands, and distinguished by several names: for it was called Palestine where it touches the Arabs, and Judaea, and Coele, then Phoenice, and, where it withdraws inland, Damascene.” Thus far from Pliny. These things these men dispute against the translations of the Septuagint and the Latin interpreter, and against the common opinion, confirmed through so many ages, both of the Hebrews and of the Christians. But I will by no means be drawn from so ancient and common an opinion by these arguments; nor can I bring myself to believe that so many and so great men (I do not say Philo, Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome, and all the Hebrews as well as Christians, handlers of the divine letters; not these I say, but those Septuagint Interpreters, who in translating the sacred letters merited the highest authority and veneration, not only in their own age and in the Synagogue, but for many ages in the Church, and were held in great esteem and praise of wisdom not only in Palestine but in Egypt with the king himself and the nobles of the kingdom) — these, I say, either were ignorant what region [and nation the name Chus]…

§31 (cont.) / §32 begins. The opponent concludes ‘Chus’ = Arabia (Pliny on Arabia beyond Pelusium). But Pererius refuses to abandon the ancient, common view — incredible that the Septuagint and all the Fathers erred. Margins: Pliny; “The aforesaid opinion is examined.” Continues on p. 412.

— p. 481 (PDF) · printed p. 412 —

…[was signified] by the word Chus, or were ignorant where in the world that province and nation was located, or what difference there was between the neighboring Arabs and the most remote Ethiopians — so that, by a

great error of ignorance, wherever Scripture put the word Chus, they always rendered in Greek Ethiopia for Arabia, and Ethiopians for Arabs.

§32 (cont.). It is incredible the Septuagint so blundered as to render ‘Ethiopia’ for ‘Arabia’ everywhere.

But the contrary reasonings, drawn from various places of scripture, are easy to dispel, by a single and brief distinction. It is established that there were two Ethiopias, one Eastern, the other Western, separated by the Arabian gulf; the one bordering on and contiguous to Egypt, the other far remote. Of the former Scripture speaks in the aforesaid places, of the latter not at all. Therefore the reasonings which we set forth above against the latter are valid, against the former plainly weak. This distinction of Ethiopia I did not feign from my own sense, but drew out from the best authors: the former (as I recall) Homer first indicated, making the Ethiopians twofold, looking both to the East and to the West; which distinction Herodotus afterward confirmed, and the same two most excellent Geographers, Strabo and Pliny, approved. Nor is that conjecture of some about nothing — that the Ethiopians once ruled most widely, having even obtained the empire of the Egyptians, [and] settled many lands toward the East and North, to which for a long time the name of the Ethiopians clung.

§33. Pererius's solution: there were two Ethiopias (Eastern, bordering Egypt; Western, remote) divided by the Arabian gulf — Scripture means the near one (Homer, Herodotus, Strabo, Pliny on the twofold Ethiopians). Margin: “A twofold Ethiopia.”

And their last reasoning, drawn from the eighteenth chapter of Isaiah, which they magnify as the chief support of their opinion, will be of small trouble to dissolve. St. Jerome, explaining that place of Isaiah, says the prophet speaks of Alexandria or of Egypt: which he said to be beyond the rivers of Ethiopia, that is, beyond the streams of the Nile, which no one doubts flows into Egypt out of Ethiopia; and by the streams of the Nile he calls those seven channels or (as they call them) mouths of the Nile, by which it discharges its waters into our sea — which Ovid in a certain place

called “the seven-flowing rivers of the Nile.” By the name of streams could also be understood the manifold man-made channels by which the water of the Nile is led off to irrigate and fertilize Egypt. To this Ezekiel too looked, when in chapter twenty-nine he said that Pharaoh lay like a great dragon in the midst of his rivers. Egypt, therefore, which lies among these rivers, is in respect to Judaea said to be beyond the rivers: for this the position of Egypt shows, compared with the situation of Judaea. But let us pass on to the second son of Cham.

§34. The Isaiah-18 objection dissolved (Jerome): the prophet means Egypt, ‘beyond the rivers of Ethiopia’ = beyond the Nile's seven mouths/canals (Ovid, Ezek 29) — Egypt is ‘beyond the rivers’ relative to Judea. Margin: “The passage Isaiah ch. 18.”

The second son of Cham is named Mezraim, or as it is in Hebrew Mizraiim, by which word is signified both the province of Egypt and the nation of the Egyptians, because that son of Cham and his posterity first inhabited that region and were the parents of the Egyptians. But this region was many ages afterward named Egypt, from Aegyptus, the brother of Danaus and son of Belus the Egyptian, whom, when he died, he [Aegyptus] succeeded in the kingdom, Danaus being expelled (who withdrew to Argos in the Peloponnese, from whom the Argives were afterward named Danai). That this happened, St. Augustine thinks (book 18 of the City of God, ch. 11, following Eusebius in the Chronicles), [at the time when among the Hebrews Joshua held the rule]…

§35. Mesraim = Egypt and the Egyptians (his line first settled it); the land was later named ‘Egypt’ from Aegyptus (brother of Danaus, son of Belus) — per Augustine (City of God 18.11) and Eusebius. Margins: “The origin of the name of Egypt”; “When Danaus and Aegyptus lived, from whom Egypt got its name.” Continues on p. 413.

— p. 482 (PDF) · printed p. 413 —

…at the time when among the Hebrews Joshua held the rule — that is, more than eight hundred years after the flood. But Manethon (in Josephus, in the former book against Appion), an Egyptian man, skilled in Greek letters and learning, and who wrote a history of Egyptian affairs drawn

from the sacred books of the Egyptians, numbers all the kings of Egypt from the time when the Hebrews under the leadership of Moses departed from Egypt, up to the brothers Danaus and Aegyptus, the years of each king's reign being reckoned: which years, the computation being made and the reckoning drawn out, yield a sum of three hundred and ninety years and more; which, if it is a true computation, the beginning of the name of Egypt must have been more than three hundred and thirty years after the death of Joshua, but more than a thousand years after the flood.

§35 (cont.). On the dating: Augustine/Eusebius put it in Joshua's time (800+ yrs post-flood); but Manethon (via Josephus) reckons the kings from the Exodus to Danaus/Aegyptus at 390+ yrs, putting the name ‘Egypt’ 330+ yrs after Joshua, 1,000+ after the flood. Margins: Josephus; Manethon.

SECOND DISPUTATION. On the Antiquity of the Egyptians.

If Mezraim was the first inhabitant of Egypt and the first parent of the Egyptians, from this appears how great is the antiquity of the Egyptians: for from the flood (after which, not a few years later, Mezraim sought and cultivated the land of Egypt, and gave a beginning to his nation) up to this day not yet four thousand years have been completed. Therefore the things which the Egyptians boast of the innumerable years of their kings and of their affairs and nation, in Herodotus, Plato, Diodorus, and Mela, are to be laughed at and despised as old wives' trifles and the fables of poets and mere lies. Hear what Pomponius Mela writes of their vanity: “They themselves, the most ancient (as they boast) of men, report in their certain annals three hundred and thirty kings before Amasis, and ages of above thirteen thousand years; and they keep it committed to letters that, since the Egyptians have been, the stars have four times changed their courses, and the Sun has twice already set where it now rises.” So he.

§36. From Mesraim's settling, the Egyptians are under 4,000 yrs old — so their boasts of innumerable years (Herodotus, Plato, Diodorus, Mela) are old wives' tales; Mela: 330 kings, 13,000+ years, the stars' courses thrice reversed. Margins: Herodotus bk. 1; Plato in the Timaeus; Diodorus bk. 1; Mela bk. 1, ch. 9.

And that there was once contended among many nations about the primacy of antiquity, with a zeal no less obstinate than the proud (or rather foolish) vanity, is manifest from the histories, both Greek and Latin. The Athenians called themselves α■τ■χθονας [autochthones], that is, natives and aboriginals. But greater was the vanity, or madness, of the Arcadians, who boasted themselves προσελ■νους [proselenes], as it were begotten before the Moon. Hence is that of Ovid: “Before Jove was born the Arcadians are said to have held the lands, and that nation was older than the Moon.”

§37. Nations vied for the title of greatest antiquity: the Athenians ‘autochthones,’ the Arcadians ‘before the Moon’ (Ovid). Margins: “The contention among various nations about the primacy of antiquity”; Ovid, Fasti bk. 1.

It is well known what Herodotus narrates: that Psammetichus, king of Egypt, in order to explore which language was of all the most ancient and first, gave two infants to a certain shepherd to be reared far from the company of men, that they should hear no human voice — being persuaded that the first voice which they should utter by the instinct of nature would be the firstborn and, as it were, natural language of mortals. The boys, they relate, reared three years in the solitude, when they had now begun to speak, cried out to the shepherd with outstretched hands, “Beccus, Beccus”; the shepherd reported this to the king; who, when he found that voice unknown to the Egyptians, ordered inquiry about its meaning through all Asia. At last it was discovered, [that ‘Beccus’ among the Phrygians means bread]…

§38. The famous Psammetichus experiment (Herodotus): two infants reared in silence cried ‘Beccus’ — found to be Phrygian for ‘bread’ (so the Egyptians yielded the antiquity-prize to the Phrygians). Margins: Herodotus bk. 2; Psammetichus; “By what argument the Phrygians were proved most ancient.” Continues on p. 414.

— p. 483 (PDF) · printed p. 414 —

…that ‘Beccus’ among the Phrygians means bread. Wherefore the Egyptians conceded the primacy of antiquity to the Phrygians. That there was a similar contention between the Scythians and the Egyptians, Justin

relates, each bringing forward, for the antiquity of their nation, reasons drawn from natural philosophy.

§38 (cont.). ‘Beccus’ = Phrygian for bread, so the Egyptians yielded antiquity to the Phrygians; a like Scythian–Egyptian contest (Justin). Margin: Justin bk. 2.

But it is pleasing to examine a certain new and strange opinion about the antiquity of the Egyptians. That [opinion] of Gerard Mercator, a man of our age, argues in his careful Chronography that the antiquity of Egypt and of the World itself was nearly equal; and that the Egyptians not only existed before the flood, but were even begotten in almost the beginnings of the World and of the first men — that is, in the age of Adam and Eve: this, I say, he argues in this manner (I will give it in his words, that the reader may more certainly know his opinion, and at the same time better weigh our confutation of it): “Although above Saltis of Lower Egypt and Timaeus of the Thebaid (or Upper Egypt), the contemporary kings, no name of any king is extant that I know, yet the multitude of Dynasties noted by Eusebius sufficiently argues the kingdom of Egypt to be most ancient and born with almost the first men. For Eusebius numbers sixteen Dynasties before the empire of the Shepherds (whom Manethon, in Josephus book one against Appion, calls Hicsos), and it is not fitting to conclude those Dynasties in a small space of years: for the power of kingdoms does not pass lightly and suddenly from one lineage and one nation to another, but only when the prior at last fails, or a more powerful one supervenes (which in great kingdoms more rarely happens), nor without such a transition is the form of administration easily changed.”

§39. Mercator's paradox (his Chronography): Egypt is nearly as old as the world — the Egyptians born even in Adam and Eve's age — argued from Eusebius's many Dynasties (16 before the ‘Shepherd kings’/Hyksos, which can't fit a short span). Margins: “A paradox of Gerard Mercator on the antiquity of the Egyptians”; Manethon; Eusebius in the Chronicle. Continues on p. 415.

— p. 484 (PDF) · printed p. 415 —

…[Euse]bius to reckon the years of the kings of Egypt coincides with the very time of the flood; from which it is concluded that the first fifteen Dynasties, which Eusebius passed over with their years left unmentioned, could not but have comprehended so great a span of time that the nation of the Egyptians must of necessity be made nearly coeval with the first men.

§39 (concl.). End of Mercator's paradox (Chronography): since the start of the 16th Dynasty is made to coincide with the flood, the 15 prior Dynasties Eusebius left undated must span enough time to make Egypt nearly as old as the first men.

BUT many things, unless I am much mistaken, have deceived Mercator in this argument. First, Mercator would have the beginning of the sixteenth Dynasty coincide with the very time of the flood; whereas Eusebius places it two hundred and ninety-two years after the flood, marking it at the birth of Abraham. Next, the opening of the seventeenth Dynasty, which was that of the Shepherds and whose first king was Saltis, Mercator sets in the year of the World 1846; although by Eusebius's reckoning it must be noted at the year 2140 after the founding of the world: since the sixteenth Dynasty began in the 292nd year after the flood and lasted 190 years. But if Mercator wishes to arrange those Dynasties otherwise than Eusebius does, and to order their dates at his own discretion, he deserves no credence at all, since nothing exists concerning Dynasties of this kind in any author except what has been handed down by Eusebius.

§40. Pererius refutes Mercator (margin: ‘Mercator is refuted’): (1) the 16th Dynasty's start is not the flood but 292 yrs after, at Abraham's birth; (2) the 17th (Shepherd/Hyksos) Dynasty's date is misplaced by ~294 yrs vs Eusebius; (3) Mercator may not rearrange the Dynasties at will, since Eusebius is the sole source.

Now, as for Mercator's assigning to each of those first fifteen Dynasties one hundred and fifteen years, this he does by inventing it out of his own opinion and discretion. Eusebius, to be sure, records many far shorter than a hundred years: the twenty-second, of forty-nine years; the twenty-third, forty-four; the twenty-fourth, forty-three; the twenty-fifth, forty-four; the twenty-eighth, six; the twenty-ninth, twenty; the thirtieth, eighteen.

§40 (cont.). Mercator's uniform 115 years per Dynasty is his own fabrication; Eusebius records many Dynasties far shorter than 100 yrs (the 22nd–30th: 49, 44, 43, 44, 6, 20, 18 yrs).

Now indeed John Annius, in those Commentaries in which he expounded a supplement to Manetho, fixes those first fifteen Dynasties at only one hundred and sixty-one years; beginning the first of them from the 131st year after the flood, that is, at the time when the division of tongues and the separation of men into various provinces took place. „The first Dynasties of the Egyptians," he says, „from the flood down to the forty-third year (which was the year of Abraham's birth) were fifteen, as Eusebius wrote in his Chronicle. The first twelve were under the twelve first greater gods of the Egyptians, each of which lasted seven years, and their beginning was in the 131st year after the flood. All their years therefore were eighty-four. The remaining three Dynasties the lesser gods held: namely the thirteenth fourteen years, the fourteenth twenty-six years, the fifteenth thirty-seven years; which taken together make seventy-seven years; and added to the years of the earlier Dynasties they make a sum of one hundred sixty-one years. If to these you add the one hundred thirty-one years passed from the flood down to the opening of the first Dynasty, you will find two hundred ninety-two years down to the end of the fifteenth Dynasty and the beginning of the sixteenth — that is, down to the forty-third year of Ninus and the first of Abraham, at which time began the sixteenth Dynasty, which is called that of the Thebans."

§41. Contrasting authority: John Annius (in his pseudo-Manetho supplement) makes the first 15 Dynasties total only 161 yrs (first 12 under the 12 'greater gods,' 7 yrs each = 84; the 13th–15th under 'lesser gods' = 14+26+37 = 77). Adding 131 yrs flood→1st Dynasty gives 292 yrs to the start of the 16th (Theban) Dynasty = Abraham's 1st / Ninus's 43rd year. Margins: John Annius on the first 15 Egyptian Dynasties; Gen 11 (division of tongues).

— p. 485 (PDF) · printed p. 416 —

If perhaps this chronography of the Dynasties by Annius does not please anyone, he is free, for my part, to consider as fabulous the things handed down about those first fifteen Dynasties — received, namely, from the

Egyptians alone, who have most shamelessly lied about a great many other matters, such as the immense antiquity of their nation, their kings, their letters, and their annals. To me, at any rate, it seems a sheer fiction that there were Dynasties of the Egyptians before the flood, or even at the very beginnings of the world, as Mercator supposes. For how, within the first two hundred or even hundred years of the world, could the offspring of Adam multiply so far as to be propagated all the way to Egypt to inhabit and fill it? Surely, if the nation of the Egyptians existed then, one must admit that there existed also at that time the Assyrians, Chaldeans, Armenians, and several other nations; nay rather, these all the more than the Egyptians, inasmuch as their lands were nearer to the place of Paradise, near which it is credible that Adam dwelt. And that Paradise was either in Mesopotamia or not far from there has been argued in the third book of our Commentaries on Genesis.

§42. Pererius's own verdict: the 15 pre-Dynasties are fabulous, coming only from the lying Egyptians. It is mere fiction (against Mercator) that Egyptian Dynasties existed before the flood or at the world's start: Adam's offspring could not have multiplied and reached Egypt within 100–200 yrs; and the Assyrians/Chaldeans/Armenians, being nearer Paradise (in/near Mesopotamia, per his bk. 3), would predate the Egyptians.

I add, moreover, one point with which to conclude this disputation: that divine Scripture seems plainly contrary to Mercator's opinion, since it teaches in clear words that the departure and dispersion of men into various provinces took place after the flood. This is indicated by those last words of the tenth chapter of the book of Genesis: {From these, the three sons of Noah, were the nations divided in the earth after the flood} — by which it is signified that no such division existed before the flood. And in the eleventh chapter it is said most plainly that the cause of men's departure into various provinces was the confusion of tongues that befell those building the tower of Babel. Hear the Scripture: {And so the Lord divided them from that place into all lands, and they ceased to build the city. And therefore its name was called Babel, because there the language of the whole earth was confounded, and from thence the Lord dispersed them

over the face of all the regions.}

§42 (cont.). Scriptural disproof: Gen 10:32 says the nations were divided ‘after the flood,’ so no such division existed before it; Gen 11 names the cause — the confusion of tongues at Babel (Gen 11:8–9 quoted).

Mercator's opinion or conjecture about the antiquity of the Egyptians being therefore exploded, let that stand which we said from the beginning: that the first origin of the Egyptians is to be sought from Mesraim the son of Cham. And although both the region and the nation of the Egyptians are usually named Mesraim from the name of their founder, nevertheless, because Mesraim was the son of Cham, on that account Egypt is more than once called in the sacred letters ‘the land of Cham,’ as may be seen in Psalms 77, 104, and 105.

§42 (concl.). Mercator exploded; the Egyptians' origin is from Mesraim son of Cham. Egypt is named ‘Mesraim’ from its founder, but also called ‘the land of Cham’ (Pss 78/105/106, Vulg. 77/104/105) because Mesraim was Cham's son.

The third son of Cham was called Phut, of whose posterity Josephus writes thus: „Phut gave colonists to Libya, and willed that they be called Phutians from his own name. There is also a river in Mauretania of this name, and several historians among the Greeks make mention of it, as also of the adjacent region which is called Phuta. But it changed its present name from one of the sons of Mesraim, who was called Libys.“ So far Josephus; and Jerome hands down things plainly similar to him.

§43. Cham's 3rd son Phut: per Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1), he colonized Libya, naming them Phutians; a river and region ‘Phuta’ in Mauretania bear the name, later renamed from Libys, a son of Mesraim; Jerome agrees. Margins: Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1; Jerome, Hebrew Questions on Genesis.

— p. 486 (PDF) · printed p. 417 —

Now what Josephus says about a certain river of Mauretania named Phut can be confirmed by the authority of Pliny, who in book five, chapter one, makes mention of that river in that very place and by that name. But the

profane writers fetch the origin of the Libyan region and nation from elsewhere. „Some," says Solinus, „have held that Libya was rather named from Libya the daughter of Epaphus, and Africa from Aphrus the son of Libys son of Hercules." Nor is it unlike this that Isidore writes: „Libya," he says, „is so called because thence blows the Libs, that is, the Southwest wind." Others say that Epaphus the son of Jupiter, who founded Memphis in Egypt, begot of his wife Cassiopea a daughter Lyba, who afterward possessed a kingdom in Africa, from whose name the land of Libya was called.

§43 (cont.). Pliny (bk. 5 ch. 1) confirms the Mauretanian river Phut. Pagan etymologies of 'Libya': from Libya daughter of Epaphus (Solinus), or from the Libs/southwest wind (Isidore), or from Lyba daughter of Epaphus son of Jupiter, founder of Memphis. Margins: Pliny; Solinus ch. 27; Isidore, Etymologies bk. 14 ch. 5.

Of the nation of Phut we also find mention more than once elsewhere in the sacred letters: and from the thirtieth chapter of Ezekiel it appears that Phut was among the number of the allies and confederates with the Egyptians. For thus it stands there word-for-word in the Hebrew: {Chus and Phut and Lud and all the multitude, Chub and the sons of the land of the covenant shall fall together with them by the sword.} Where our Latin translator renders those names as Ethiopia, Libya, and the Lydians, doubtless following the Septuagint translators. The same may also be observed in the same prophet, chapter twenty-seven. Likewise in Jeremiah, chapter forty-six, the word Phut both the Septuagint and the Latin translator rendered as 'the Libyans.' And it is also clear from the aforesaid passages of Scripture that the Phutians and the Ludaeans were allies and neighbors of the Egyptians. But the Ludaean peoples — or, as the Latin translator renders, the Lydians — allies of the Phutians, are different from the Lydians who inhabited a part of Asia, of whom below.

§44. Phut in Scripture: Ezek 30 lists Phut among Egypt's allies (Hebrew quoted; Vulgate/LXX render the names Ethiopia/Libya/Lydians); also Ezek 27 and Jer 46 (Phut = 'Libyans'). The Ludaeans/Lydians allied with Phut are distinct from the Asian Lydians (treated later).

The fourth son of Cham, most famous of all, was Chanaan, whom Noah cursed for the crime of his father Cham, and to whom he foretold, so long beforehand, the most abject servitude which his posterity was to render to the descendants of Shem and Japheth. From him the region which the Hebrews settled, and the possession of which God had promised to the three patriarchs of that people — Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob — was called Chanaan, parceled out indeed into many provinces and various nations: which, though by a common name they were called Canaanites after their father, were nevertheless each marked by their own proper names, though some of those nations adopted the common name as their own. But of these we shall speak afterward both more fittingly and more fully. These nations, for the most part slain by the Hebrews or oppressed with servitude, were at last extinguished, their name blotted out from the memory of men.

§45. Cham's 4th and most famous son Chanaan, cursed by Noah (Gen 9) to servitude under Shem and Japheth; from him the Promised Land (promised to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob) is named Chanaan, split into many Canaanite peoples — later slain/enslaved by the Hebrews and their name erased. Margin: Gen 9.

— p. 487 (PDF) · printed p. 418 —

{And the sons of Chus: Saba, and Heuila, and Sabatha, and Regma, and Sabathacha.}

Gen 10:7a (verse lemma).

Of the four sons of Cham, the progeny of only three is here described by Moses; Phut is omitted, because his posterity was ignoble and obscure, or did not adopt for itself an appellation different from the father's. The first of the sons of Chus is named Saba: and although a little below, among the sons of Regma, one of them too is named Saba, with no distinction of appellation among the Latins and Greeks; in Hebrew, however, these names differ greatly. For Saba the son of Chus is written in its first letter with Samech, which is a slender s; but Saba the son of Regma has for its first letter Scin, which is a thick s. But of this a little later; now let us speak

of him who gave origin and name to the Sabaeans, the inhabitants of Arabia Felix.

§46. Moses lists the posterity of only 3 of Cham's 4 sons (Phut omitted as obscure). Chus's first son Saba: distinct in Hebrew from the later Saba son of Regma (first letter Samech = slender s, vs Scin = thick s), though identical in Latin/Greek. This Saba gave name to the Sabaeans of Arabia Felix. Margins: Saba; Sabaei.

„The Sabaeans," says Pliny, „the most renowned of the peoples of the Arabs on account of their frankincense, dwell as nations extended to both seas." And in Isaiah, Chus and Saba are joined, as having had neighboring seats: Chus at the Isthmus by which the Syrian and Egyptian seas are kept off from the Arabian Gulf, that is, from the Red Sea; and Saba at the Arabian Gulf itself. As for Pliny's saying that the Sabaeans dwell as nations extended to both seas, it is understood of the Persian Sea and of the Arabian or Red Sea, and of both nations of Sabaeans, who drew their stock both from this Saba son of Chus and from that son of Regma. But the profane writers, Greek as well as Latin, by no means knew this distinction of the Sabaeans, but described both as a single nation.

§47. The Sabaeans (Pliny bk. 6 ch. 28: famed for frankincense, dwelling to both seas); Isaiah joins Chus and Saba as neighbors (Chus by the Isthmus/Red Sea, Saba by the Arabian Gulf). 'Both seas' = Persian and Red/Arabian, and both Sabaean nations (from Saba son of Chus and Saba son of Regma) — a distinction the pagan writers missed. Margins: Pliny bk. 6 ch. 28; Isa 45.

That these certainly had adjoining seats, though spread far and wide, is perceived from the seventy-second Psalm, when it is said therein: {The kings of the Arabs and of Saba shall bring gifts.} For in place of that 'kings of the Arabs' the Hebrew has 'kings of Scheba and Saba,' denoting both nations of Sabaeans deriving origin both from Chus and from Regma. It appears, therefore, that they held adjoining seats; and the posterity of Regma inclined rather toward the Persian Gulf, the posterity of Chus toward the Arabian Gulf. Of the Sabaeans, moreover, of whom we now treat, Isaiah makes mention in the forty-fifth chapter: {The labor of Egypt, and the merchandise of Ethiopia (in Hebrew, Chus) and of the Sabaim, tall

men, shall pass over to thee, and shall be thine.} Where two things are worth noting: one, that there are joined, as neighboring nations, Chus and Mesraim and Saba — that is, the Egyptians, the Arabs or eastern Ethiopians, and the Sabaeans; the other, that in place of what the Latin translator put as ‘tall men,’ the Hebrew has ‘men of measure,’ that is, of lofty stature. Rightly therefore did the translator render ‘tall men.’

§47 (cont.). Ps 72:10 (‘kings of Scheba and Saba,’ Hebrew) and Isa 45:14 join the two Sabaean nations as neighbors (Regma's line toward the Persian Gulf, Chus's toward the Arabian); Isa joins Chus/Mesraim/Saba = Egyptians/Arabs (eastern Ethiopians)/Sabaeans, and the Hebrew ‘men of measure’ (tall stature) justifies the Vulgate's ‘tall men.’

— p. 488 (PDF) · printed p. 419 —

Of these Sabaeans there is among the profane writers a frequent and splendid encomium, on account of the renown of the region they inhabit. For it is most fruitful in spices and precious things, whence it found the surname ‘Felix’ or ‘Blessed.’ „The other side,“ says Mela, „is bordered by the tract along which, between the two seas, runs Arabia, called by the surname Eudaemon, narrow, but most fertile in cinnamon and frankincense and other spices. The Sabaeans hold the greater part of it, nearest to the Strait and to the Carmanians.“ But more distinctly and expressly Strabo, writing thus: „Nearest to these is the land of the Sabaeans, which is a very great nation. Among them frankincense and myrrh and cinnamon are born; on the coast also balsam, and a certain other very fragrant herb, which yet quickly loses its scent; they have besides fragrant palms and sweet cane. The men, owing to the very great abundance of produce, live idle and sluggish, recline on the roots of trees, and cut from them, handing on to the nearest inhabitants, who pass them on in turn to others, and so on right up to Syria and Mesopotamia. Stupefied by the odors, they dispel the torpor with a fumigation of bitumen and goat's beard. Mediaba, a city of the Sabaeans, lies on a mountain full of trees. They practice partly agriculture, partly the traffic in aromatics, of which they have so great an abundance that in place of fuel and other combustible material they use cinnamon,

cassia, and other most precious and most fragrant things. They have much furniture of gold and silver — vessels, couches, tripods, bowls with lids, house-doors; and their walls and roofs are incrusted with ivory, gold, silver, and precious stones. Above Syria the Nabataeans and the Sabaeans inhabit Arabia Felix. These often used to make raids into Syria, before the Romans held dominion over both them and the Syrians.“ Thus far from Strabo. It is therefore manifest from Moses's narrative that the Sabaeans, the richest nation of the world and on that account the most famous, sprang from Chus himself; and since he was the parent of the Arabs or Ethiopians, the Sabaeans must have had their stock and origin from the Arabs or Ethiopians (for which of these two is properly signified by the word Chus has been disputed above). Foreign writers think the Sabaeans are so called from σ■βειν, which is to worship or venerate, because it is the custom among most nations to worship and venerate God with their frankincense and other perfumes.

§47 (concl.). The fame of Arabia Felix/Eudaemon: Mela (bk. 3 ch. 8) and a long Strabo passage (bk. 16) on Sabaean spices (frankincense, myrrh, cinnamon, balsam), idle luxury, gold/ivory furnishings, raids into Syria. The Sabaeans, world's richest nation, sprang from Chus (parent of Arabs or Ethiopians — see above). Pagan etymology: ‘Sabaei’ from Gk σ■βειν, ‘to worship,’ from incense-worship. Margins: Mela bk. 3 ch. 8; Strabo bk. 16; fertility of the Sabaeans' land.

The second son of Chus is named Heuila. Blessed Jerome makes the Heuilaeans — following Josephus, as he is wont in these matters — to be the Getulians, bordering the desert in a part of the more remote Africa. But from the sacred letters it seems it may be gathered that the Heuilaeans were peoples not far removed from the Ishmaelites and Amalekites. For in the twenty-fifth chapter of Genesis it is read that Ishmael dwelt from Heuila as far as Sur, which faces Egypt; and in the first book of Kings, chapter fifteen, that Saul smote the king of Amalek from Heuila until you come to Sur, which is over against Egypt. The Heuilaeans, therefore, inhabited lands toward the Persian Gulf, and not far from the Ishmaelites and Amalekites.

§48. Chus's 2nd son Heuila: Jerome (after Josephus) = the Getulians of remote Africa; but Scripture (Gen 25; 1 Sam 15 — Ishmael, and Saul-Amalek 'from Heuila to Sur facing Egypt') suggests the Heuilaeans dwelt toward the Persian Gulf, near the Ishmaelites and Amalekites. Margins: Jerome, Hebrew Questions on Genesis; Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1.

The third son is called Sabatha. Josephus says the Sabathenes were those who are called Astabari. But what that nation of the Astabari was, or in what part of the world it had its seat, I for my part neither know, nor do I remember reading in anyone who professed to know. It does not escape me that in Strabo, books sixteen and seventeen, in Mela book one chapter nine, and in Pliny book five chapter nine, mention is made of the river Astabaras, which is one of the two channels into which the Nile, around…

§49. Chus's 3rd son Sabatha: Josephus equates the Sabathenes with the 'Astabari,' but Pererius can find no such nation in any author; he notes the river Astabaras (Strabo bks. 16–17, Mela bk. 1 ch. 9, Pliny bk. 5 ch. 9), a branch of the Nile around Meroë (continues p. 420). Margins: Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1; Astabari; Strabo; Mela; Pliny.

— p. 489 (PDF) · printed p. 420 —

…divides the island of Meroë, the greatest and most famous of all that it forms. „The Nile," says Mela, „around Meroë, a widely-spreading island, is divided into Ethiopia; and on the one side it is called Astaboras, on the other Astapus." And Pliny: „The Nile," he says, „around Meroë, the most famous of its islands, is called in its left channel Astabores" — that is, the branch of water coming from darkness — „but in the right Astusapes," which he adds with the meaning of 'lurking.' But because Ptolemy names in Arabia Felix a certain metropolis Sabatha, it could from this be conjectured that the Sabatheans were inhabitants of Arabia Felix, namely intermingled with the Chusaeans and Sabaeans.

§49 (concl.). The Nile's channels at Meroë: Astaboras/Astapus (Mela), Astabores ('from darkness')/Astusapes ('lurking') (Pliny). Since Ptolemy names a city Sabatha in Arabia Felix, the Sabatheans may have lived there, mixed with the Chusaeans and Sabaeans. Margin: Ptolemy.

The fourth son of Chus has the name Regma. And since in Ezekiel, chapter twenty-seven, Regma is joined with Seba, one may judge that the

Regmaeans were neighbors and allies of the Sabaeans, and inhabited the same or at least a neighboring region. For Ezekiel makes them carry gold, precious stones, and aromatics of various kinds to the market of the Tyrians. Blessed Jerome in the Hebrew Questions on Genesis says that Regma and Sabathaca gradually lost their ancient names, and that what they now are, in place of the old ones, is unknown. In the same ignorance Josephus seems to have been, since he plainly kept silent about the names — whatever they then were — of those descended from these. It is therefore quite credible that the fifth son of Chus, Sabathaca, and his posterity, having traveled farther, withdrew to the farthest shores of Arabia Felix toward the Ocean, and for that reason were known neither to the Jews nor to the Syrians.

§50. Chus's 4th son Regma: joined with Seba in Ezek 27 (carrying gold, gems, aromatics to Tyre), so the Regmaeans neighbored the Sabaeans. Jerome notes Regma and Sabathaca lost their ancient names; Josephus likewise silent. The 5th son Sabathaca and his line probably withdrew to the far shores of Arabia Felix toward the Ocean, hence unknown to Jews/Syrians. Margins: Regma; Jerome.

{The sons of Regma: Saba and Dadan.}

Gen 10:7b (verse lemma).

Before these the sixth son of Chus seemed to need to be reckoned: this one was called Nemrod; but because he was most notable for audacity, strength, and power, and was the first of mortals to aim at kingship — or rather tyranny — and was the founder of Babylon and chief of the Babylonian kingdom, therefore Moses, after the other sons of Chus had been briefly enumerated, treats of him separately.

Transitional comment (Gen 10:7b): the 6th son Nemrod is held back and treated separately, after the others, because of his eminence as the first tyrant and founder of Babylon.

The first, then, of the sons of Regma is named Saba, but in its first letter with Scin; whence, to distinguish him from the former who is written with Samech, he will be called by us Schaba. The Schabaeans, as we indicated above, inhabited that part of Arabia Felix which inclines more toward the

Persian Gulf; and these were, on account of their frankincense (of which their region is most productive), most famous among all nations. These are the Sabaeans who in Job, chapter one, are said to have driven off the oxen and she-asses of Job; for since they were practiced and habituated in robberies, Satan made especial use of them to despoil Job of his goods. Now Job dwelt in the land of Hus, which embraces Idumaea, and that the Chaldeans were neighbors to it is clear from the same history. And although the Sabaeans were most wealthy on account of gold, frankincense, and gems, nonetheless they delighted in robberies, seeking plunder from their neighbors, as Pliny teaches: „A wondrous thing to tell," he says, „of innumerable peoples an equal part passes its life in commerce and in robberies…"

§51. Regma's first son Saba (spelled with Scin = 'Schaba' to distinguish from Chus's Saba): the Schabaeans dwelt in Arabia Felix toward the Persian Gulf, famed for frankincense. These are the Sabaeans of Job 1 who raided Job's oxen/asses — robbers used by Satan; Job lived in Hus (embracing Idumaea), near the Chaldeans. Despite their wealth they delighted in plunder (Pliny bk. 6 ch. 28, quote begins). Margins: the passage of Job ch. 1; Pliny bk. 6 ch. 28.

— p. 490 (PDF) · printed p. 421 —

„…of innumerable peoples an equal part passes its life in commerce and in robberies; on the whole the richest of nations, inasmuch as among them the wealth of the Romans and Parthians settles, since they sell what they take from the sea or the woods, but buy back nothing in return."

§51 (concl.). End of the Pliny quotation: these Arabian peoples, half traders and half brigands, are the richest of nations, draining off Roman and Parthian wealth.

That the region of these Sabaeans was frankincense-bearing may further be perceived from the sixth chapter of Jeremiah and the sixtieth of Isaiah; and that the queen who came to Solomon with great pomp was of this Sabaean nation is not to be doubted, since in Scripture she is called the Queen of Schaba, and an indication of this is afforded by the abundance of aromatics and gold which she brought to Solomon. And since this Sabaea is, with respect to Judaea, to the south and facing the Meridian, and distant from

Judaea itself by a long stretch of lands, on that account she is called the Queen of the South, and is said to have come ‘from the ends of the earth,’ that is, from far-off regions. For in Joel, chapter three, he also calls Sabaeans of this kind ‘a distant nation.’ I wonder, therefore, what came into Josephus's mind, in the eighth book of the Antiquities, to make that queen a queen of Egypt and Ethiopia.

§52. The Sabaeans' frankincense land (Jer 6, Isa 60); the Queen of Sheba who came to Solomon (1 Kgs 10) was of this nation (‘Regina Schaba’; her gold and spices), called ‘Queen of the South’ / from ‘the ends of the earth’ (Mt 12; Joel 3, ‘a distant nation’). Pererius marvels that Josephus (Antiquities bk. 8) made her queen of Egypt and Ethiopia. Margins: 1 Kgs 10; the Queen of Sheba who came to Solomon; Mt 12; Josephus's slip.

The other son of Regma himself Moses calls Dadan or Dedan. The Dadanaeans Blessed Jerome makes a nation of Ethiopia in the western region. Why Josephus reads Judas in place of Dadan, and Jews in place of Dadanaeans, I have not been able, even by divining, to find any reason. For Josephus makes two sons of Regma: „The one son of his, Judas,“ he says, „gave origin and name to the nation of the Jews among the western Ethiopians; the other, Saba, to the Sabaeans.“ That the nation of the Jews ever held seats in western Ethiopia I have read in no author. But perhaps the fault was not in Josephus, who wrote it thus, but in others who afterward corrupted his writing. But that the Dadanaeans were not in western Ethiopia — a region distant by immense spaces from the Mediterranean Sea, and most remote from the city of Tyre — seems to be made manifest from the words of Ezekiel, who in chapter twenty-seven calls the Dadanaeans traders and dealers of the Tyrians, who frequented the most famous market of the Tyrians, bringing thither carpets for sitting. To whom can it be made credible that the Dedanaeans, from western Ethiopia, across well-nigh boundless stretches of lands and by an overland journey, frequently sought Tyre for the sake of trading and gain?

§53. Regma's second son Dadan/Dedan: Jerome = a nation of western Ethiopia; Josephus oddly reads ‘Judas/Jews’ (Jews among western Ethiopians) — Pererius suspects later corruption of Josephus's text. Ezek 27 shows the Dadanaeans as traders at Tyre (bringing carpets), too far for

western Ethiopians — so they were not there. Margins: Jerome, Hebrew Questions on Genesis; Josephus's slip (twice).

That, then, is more like the truth: that the Dedanaeans were peoples most closely neighboring and joined to the Idumaeans, or even mingled and confounded with them. For the two prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, when they prophesy concerning the devastation and ruin of the Idumaeans, associate and join the Dedanaeans together with the Idumaeans. Jeremiah indeed in the forty-ninth chapter: {Flee, turn your backs, go down into the pit, inhabitants of Dedan; for I have brought the destruction of Esau upon him, the time of his visitation.} And through Ezekiel God speaks thus: {I will stretch out my hand over Idumaea, that I may take away from it beast and man, and I will make it desolate from the south; and those who are in Dedan shall fall by the sword.} Hence it appears that the Dedanaeans were kinsmen and allies of the Idumaeans, and partners of their hatred and cruelty against the Hebrew people.

§54. More likely: the Dedanaeans neighbored/mingled with the Idumaeans, since Jeremiah (ch. 49) and Ezekiel (ch. 25) join Dedan with Edom in prophecies of its ruin — kinsmen, allies, and sharers of hatred against the Hebrews. Margin: what nation the Dedanaeans were.

{Now Chus begot Nemrod: he began to be mighty in the earth, and he was a robust hunter before the Lord. From him went forth the proverb: As Nemrod a robust hunter before the Lord.}

Gen 10:8–9 (verse lemma).

This Nemrod was the sixth son of Chus, who is here recorded separately after his other brothers and his brothers' grandsons. For on account of his singular strength and audacity and power and worldly prosperity, since he had been the most famous of that age, he had to be spoken of out of order, and earned a separate and proper narrative. Hear Blessed Augustine: „Chus, the father of the giant Nemrod, was named first among the sons of Cham, five of whose sons had already been counted, and two grandsons:

but this giant he either begot after his grandsons were born, or — what is more credible — Scripture spoke of him apart on account of his eminence; seeing that his kingdom too is named, whose beginning was that most noble city Babylon, and the things mentioned alongside, whether cities or regions.“

Gen 10:8–9 lemma comment. Nemrod, Chus's 6th son, treated separately for his eminence. Augustine (City of God bk. 16 ch. 3): Chus named first among Cham's sons; the ‘giant’ Nemrod either born after his grandsons or set apart by Scripture for his eminence — his kingdom (beginning with Babylon) being named. Margins: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 3; why Moses treated Nemrod separately.

This man was the first of mortals to aim at and seize tyranny. For before him, in any family, the firstborn was also first in degree of authority and honor, settling the disputes of the family and ruling the family. But this man coveted to hold sway over others, reigning first at Babylon. And so the first tyranny arose in the very mother of the confusion of tongues; and just as there the intercourse of tongues was confounded, so too the law of legitimate rule was perverted — where, namely, mortals attempted to set up the first monuments of their audacity and rashness. Rightly therefore Jerome: „Nemrod was the first to seize an unwonted tyranny among the people, and reigned in Babylon, which, from the fact that there the tongues of those building the tower were confounded, was called Babel.“

§55. Nemrod the first tyrant: before him the firstborn ruled each family by natural authority; he first coveted dominion over others, reigning at Babylon — so the first tyranny arose in the ‘mother of the confusion of tongues,’ legitimate rule perverted along with language. Jerome: Nemrod seized an unwonted tyranny and reigned in Babel. Margins: the first king or tyrant after the flood was Nemrod; Jerome, Hebrew Questions on Genesis.

— p. 492 (PDF) · printed p. 423 —

…[a certain writer says] in his Annotations on Genesis: „Nemrod, surpassing other men in bulk of body and in strength, began to exercise lordship by violence, and led them into idolatry, that they might worship fire as though it were a god, because he saw the greatest benefits attained through the kindness of the Sun, which is fiery; which error the Chaldeans

afterward followed.“ And so he did a manifold injury both to God and to man. For God alone ought to have presided over man, which this man took away when he interposed himself; and at the same time he removed from God the worship due to Him; and to man he did injury, because he oppressed him with an unjust dominion, and led him into error by deceiving him. But let us examine the words of Moses.

§56. Nemrod's idolatry (a writer's Annotations on Genesis): surpassing men in size and strength, he ruled by violence and led men to worship fire as a god (seeing the Sun's fiery benefits) — the error the Chaldeans later followed. So he wronged both God (usurping His rule and the worship due Him) and man (unjust dominion + deceiving into error).

‘This man began to be mighty in the earth.’ The Hebrew word means robust and strong. But because Nemrod, on account of the greatness of his strength and powers and the audacity of his spirit, first attained the greatest power, the Latin rightly rendered ‘Mighty,’ by which word it has embraced both the strength of his body and his force in domination. The Greek codices, whom Augustine follows, have for the word ‘mighty’ or ‘strong’ the word ‘giant’: by which it is signified that Nemrod was a giant in bulk of body, in strength, audacity, pride, cruelty; for that all these are signified by the notion of the word ‘Giant’ in the sacred letters we have taught in another place. But how did this man begin to be a giant, when before the flood there were several giants, as is set forth above by Moses in the sixth chapter? Augustine answers that he was the first after the flood — first, I say, either in time, or in the excellence of giant-like strength and in the fame of men.

§57. ‘Began to be mighty’ (Hebrew = robust/strong); the Vulgate's ‘potens’ captures bodily strength + dominating force. The Greek (followed by Augustine) reads ‘giant’ = great bulk, strength, audacity, pride, cruelty. How a ‘giant,’ since Gen 6 had pre-flood giants? Augustine: Nemrod was the first such after the flood — first in time, or in giant-strength and fame. Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 8 (the giant of this kind first after the flood).

There follows: ‘And he was a robust hunter before the Lord.’ What above he had rendered ‘mighty,’ he now renders ‘robust’; for the Hebrew word is

the same in both places; for which the Greek codices, as above, here too have ‘giant,’ but some have ‘violent.’ The word ‘hunter,’ if taken properly, signifies that he was a hunter of wild beasts, and most devoted to the chase, which is the exercise of princes and magnates. But if that word be set down by metaphor, it signifies a treacherous and violent oppressor of men. For wild beasts we take by hunting, partly by cunning and ambush, partly by force, and subject them to our service and use; and this seems more fitting both to Moses's narrative and to the things reported of Nemrod. Indeed by the word ‘hunter’ it is intimated that Nemrod was a cruel and bloodthirsty man, and most eager for the slaughter of men through power and violence: for huntings are, as it were, certain preludes of wars; by these, namely, as by certain apprenticeships, the spirit is kindled and inflamed from the slaughter of beasts to the killing of men. That the Persians, most devoted to hunting, once held this view, the father of Cyrus declared, as Xenophon relates: „Whenever a war should press upon us, that when necessity has brought it you may be able to attack, deceive, and surround a man, we train you not on men but on beasts, lest perchance you do harm to friends as well; and so that, when war befalls, you may then have both the audacity and the skill of attacking, surrounding, and slaying the enemy.“

§58. ‘A robust hunter’ (same Hebrew word as ‘mighty’; Greek ‘giant’/‘violent’). ‘Hunter’ literally = a hunter of beasts (sport of princes), or metaphorically a treacherous, violent oppressor of men — the latter fits Nemrod: hunts are ‘preludes of wars,’ training the spirit from killing beasts to killing men. Cyrus's father (Xenophon, Education of Cyrus bk. 1): the Persians train at hunting beasts, not men, to gain the audacity and skill for war. Margins: Augustine; how Nemrod was a hunter; hunting as exercise and apprenticeship for waging war; Xenophon, Education of Cyrus bk. 1.

That phrase ‘before the Lord’ — what force it has in this place is not easy to understand; wherefore a manifold interpretation of it has been devised. Some who know Hebrew think it is a Hebraism, and that ‘before the Lord’ means the same as ‘under heaven’; and that the sense is that Nemrod was the most robust of the men who were under heaven. With these I would agree, if they proved this from other passages of Scripture.

§59. ‘Before the Lord’ — its force is hard to determine; several interpretations. (1) Some Hebraists: a Hebraism = ‘under heaven,’ i.e. Nemrod was the most robust of all men under heaven — Pererius would accept this if proved from other Scripture passages (continues p. 424). Margin: what it signifies that Nemrod was a hunter ‘before the Lord.’

— p. 493 (PDF) · printed p. 424 —

Saint Augustine took it in a bad sense, as though ‘before the Lord’ were the same as ‘against the Lord,’ writing thus: „A safe and true road to heaven is built by humility, lifting the heart upward to the Lord, not against the Lord, as Nemrod the giant was a hunter against the Lord. And some, not understanding this, were deceived by the ambiguous Greek text, so as to interpret not ‘against the Lord’ but ‘before the Lord’; for ■ναντ■ον means both ‘against’ and ‘before’: for this word is in the Psalm, ‘Let us weep before the Lord who made us’; and the same is in the book of Job, in which it is written: ‘He broke out in fury against the Lord.’ So too is that giant to be understood as against the Lord. And what is a hunter, but a deceiver, oppressor, and destroyer of earth-born animals? He was therefore raising up, with his peoples, a tower against the Lord, by which impious pride is signified.“ So far Augustine.

§59 (concl.). (2) Augustine (City of God bk. 16 ch. 4) takes it in a bad sense: ‘before the Lord’ = ‘against the Lord’ — humility lifts the heart to God, not against Him as Nemrod the giant hunter; the Greek ■ναντ■ον means both ‘before’ and ‘against’ (Ps 94/95:6; Job); the ‘hunter’ = deceiver/oppressor/destroyer, raising the tower against the Lord in impious pride. Margins: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 4; what ‘before the Lord’ means; Ps 94; Job.

But some interpret it in a good sense, as though Nemrod strove to appease God with sacrifices which he had procured from the wild beasts he had taken. To this opinion Aben-Ezra strongly assents, writing in his Commentary on this passage that Nemrod built altars on which he offered to the Lord, as a holocaust, the beasts he hunted. Nor is what Cajetan says on this passage to be wrapped in silence; in these words: „What is said ‘before the Lord,’ as it is in the Hebrew ‘in the faces of God,’ can be expounded in two ways: either contemptuously, that is, with the divine sight despised, so that it is said to magnify the sin — just as a crime

committed is magnified when the Praetor is watching; or feignedly, to signify that Nemrod on the one hand pretended himself to be a worshipper of God, while on the other he exercised tyranny. For it is necessary, according to the teachings of the Philosophers, that a Prince be a worshipper of God, so that the people may think themselves less to suffer injustice. And this sense fits the context better: for it is subjoined that the proverb was derived therefrom; but it is not likely that there should have been turned into a proverb, worthy to be narrated by Moses, a saying containing so enormous a blasphemy as the first sense contains.“ So Cajetan.

§60. (3) Some take it in a good sense: Nemrod offered the beasts he caught to God in sacrifice — so Aben-Ezra (here: Nemrod built altars, offered hunted beasts as holocausts). (4) Cajetan: ‘before the Lord’ (Heb. ‘in the faces of God’) = either contemptuously (despising God's sight, magnifying the sin, as a crime before a watching magistrate) or feignedly (Nemrod posed as a God-worshipper while tyrannizing — a prince must seem pious so the people think themselves less wronged); the latter fits the proverb-context (no such blasphemy would be made a proverb worth Moses's record). Margins: Aben-Ezra; Cajetan.

But that exposition seems to me simpler and plainer, and on that account more probable: that by those words ‘before the Lord,’ or ‘in the eyes or in the sight of the Lord,’ he was robust, nothing else is signified than that he was in very truth and to the highest degree robust. For what is such before God, that is in truth and simply and to the highest degree such. For God judges and estimates a thing as it is, not so men, whose estimation and judgment is often deceptive. In this manner it was foretold by the Angel that John the Baptist would be ‘great before the Lord,’ that is, truly and very great. Furthermore, that which follows, ‘From him went forth the proverb, As Nemrod a robust hunter before the Lord,’ has this force and meaning: that the fortitude and power of Nemrod was so great, and the esteem and fame of him among the men of his time so great, that when they wished to show that someone was very strong, they would say he was a second Nemrod; just as we…

§60 (cont.). Pererius's own (simpler, preferred) reading: 'before the Lord' = simply 'in God's sight,' i.e. truly and supremely robust — for God judges a thing as it really is, unlike fallible men (cf. the Angel's word that John the Baptist would be 'great before the Lord' = truly very great, Lk 1). The proverb 'As Nemrod a robust hunter before the Lord' means his strength/fame was so great that to call someone very strong they would say he was 'a second Nemrod' (continues p. 425). Margin: Lk 1 (John the Baptist).

— p. 494 (PDF) · printed p. 425 —

…just as we call someone an Alexander or an Achilles, when we wish to signify that he is magnanimous or brave.

§60 (concl.). End of the 'second Nemrod' proverb: as we call a brave man 'an Alexander' or 'an Achilles.'

THIRD DISPUTATION. Who among men that Nemrod was.

Liber XV, Disputation 3 (title): the identity of Nemrod.

Who that Nemrod was is controverted, on account of the various and discrepant opinions of the authors. I shall first state and weigh what has been handed down to memory by others: Josephus in the first book of the Antiquities (Josephus's words have been set down a little above) says only this, that he was an audacious, warlike, and impious man, and one who not only himself despised God but also led others to contempt of God; that he was likewise the author of building the tower of Babel, and that, when it had been thrown into confusion and overturned, and when, owing to the division of tongues, men were departing into various regions, he himself remained there with many, and seized tyranny. Blessed Jerome in the Hebrew Questions writes that he was the first to seize an unwonted tyranny over the peoples, and reigned at Babylon, and added to his empire the other cities here mentioned by Moses.

§61. Disp. 3 opens: the sources on Nemrod. Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1): an audacious, warlike, impious man who despised God and led others to do so; author of the tower of Babel; when the tongues were divided he stayed and seized tyranny. Jerome (Hebrew Questions): first to seize an unwonted tyranny, reigning at Babylon and adding the other cities Moses names. Margins: Josephus; Jerome.

Many and great authors thought that Nemrod was the same whom the histories of the Gentiles call Belus the father of Ninus, and that he reigned at Babylon for sixty-five years. This Eusebius hands down at the opening of his Chronicle, and Jerome in the second chapter of Hosea, and Augustine in book 16 of the City of God, chapter 17. „Ninus," he says, „reigned at Babylon after the death of his father Belus, who had first reigned here, sixty-five years." And by their authority very many were afterward led to think the same. This opinion is strengthened by the conjecture that in the sacred letters it is signified that Nemrod was the first builder and founder of Babylon: and in Eusebius, in book nine of the Preparation for the Gospel, chapter four, Abydenus, a very ancient and weighty writer, makes Belus the first builder and contriver of Babylon.

§61 (cont.). Many great authors identify Nemrod with the Gentiles' Belus, father of Ninus, who reigned 65 yrs at Babylon (Eusebius's Chronicle; Jerome on Hosea 2; Augustine, City of God 16.17). Supported by Scripture making Nemrod first founder of Babylon, and by Abydenus (in Eusebius, Preparation for the Gospel bk. 9 ch. 4) making Belus the first builder. Margins: Eusebius; Jerome; Augustine.

But I do not see how this coheres with the other opinion of the same Augustine, affirming in book 16 of the City of God, chapter 3, that Ninus the son of Belus — whom Moses in this chapter calls Assur — was not of the stock of Cham; of which stock, however, that Nemrod was, Moses teaches in plain words in this place; but that he was of the line of Shem: for Moses among the descendants of Shem names Assur, whom they will have to be Ninus.

§61 (cont.). Objection: this clashes with Augustine (City of God 16.3) holding that Ninus son of Belus — equated with the 'Assur' Moses names — was not of Cham's stock (to which Nemrod plainly belonged) but of Shem's line, since Moses lists Assur among Shem's descendants.

Unless perchance the fiction of the spurious Methodius please someone, which the author of the Scholastic History relates in his history of the book of Genesis, chapter thirty-seven: that Nemrod was a giant of ten cubits, of the seed of Shem himself, taught and instructed by a certain Ionithus a son

of Noah (whom Noah begot after the flood) in many other matters, but especially in the manner of reigning and in what places he ought to reign…

§62. Unless one accepts the fiction of pseudo-Methodius (in Comestor's Scholastic History, Gen ch. 37): Nemrod a giant of 10 cubits, of Shem's seed, taught the art of reigning by Ionithus, a post-flood son of Noah (continues p. 426).

— p. 495 (PDF) · printed p. 426 —

…that this man, inflamed with the desire of ruling, urged his kinsmen, who were of the stock of Shem, to seize empire over others as though by right of the firstborn; but when they were unwilling, he crossed over to the descendants of Cham; and with these assenting and acquiescing, he reigned among them at Babylon, and from that time was reckoned and called among the sons of Cham. But just as that author was not the true but a spurious Methodius (as has been shown in another place of this work), so these tales about Nemrod are mere fictions.

§62 (concl.). The pseudo-Methodius tale: Nemrod, of Shem's stock, urged his kinsmen to seize rule; they refused, so he went over to Cham's line and reigned at Babylon, thence counted among Cham's sons. But Methodius is spurious (shown elsewhere), so these are mere fictions.

Berosus Annianus, in the fifth book of the Chaldaic Antiquities, says that this Nemrod was by another name called Saturn the First, and was the father of Jupiter Belus, and grandfather of Ninus the first monarch of the Assyrians, but grandson of Cham himself, and son of Cur (Cush), who was the father of the Curetes: and that in the 131st year after the flood he set about building the city of Babylon and a very high tower; but that he desisted from his undertaking, the work only begun, and reigned fifty-six years: so the beginning of Nemrod's reign falls in the 131st year after the flood.

§63. Berosus Annianus (the forged Berosus, bk. 5): Nemrod = ‘Saturn the First,’ father of Jupiter Belus, grandfather of Ninus, grandson of Cham, son of Cur/Cush (father of the Curetes); began Babylon and the tower in yr 131 after the flood but desisted, reigned 56 yrs. Margin: Berosus Annianus bks. 4–5.

But against this Mercator, in his Chronology, sharply contends, arguing that what Berosus has handed down about Nemrod is neither true nor likely. „For since," he says, „around the hundredth year from the flood the division of tongues and the departure of men into various regions occurred, it is by no means credible that within the space of thirty following years that nation, among whom Nemrod was, was so multiplied that he not only made for himself a proper kingdom but was even extended into the most far-distant regions. For Arach, one of the first cities of Nemrod's dominion (on the testimony of Jerome and the Hebrews), was Edessa, situated at the western extremity of Mesopotamia, 375 miles distant from Babylon: and the mind rejects believing that that nation and its empire could in so brief a time be so propagated and extended." Mercator therefore judges that Nemrod was that very one whom the Greeks and Latins call Ninus: for the things said about each agree wonderfully with one another. For Nemrod is said to have been the first of mortals mighty in the earth, and to have obtained a kingdom or tyranny and extended his dominion into far-off regions. Justin testifies to all the very same things of Ninus, to a man. Next, Nemrod's empire had its beginning in Chaldaea and Mesopotamia; for in these lands are those four cities which Moses here assigns to his empire; and this same was also the beginning of Ninus's reign. Moreover, Scripture says that he, not content with his own kingdom, went out from the land of Assur and sought other kingdoms, and first invaded Assyria, and founded Niniue, a very great city. These same things about Ninus others have handed down, and especially Diodorus in the third book.

§64. Mercator (Chronology) attacks Berosus: in only ~30 yrs after the dispersion (~yr 100), Nemrod's nation could not have multiplied enough to rule and reach Edessa/Arach (375 mi from Babylon). So Mercator identifies Nemrod with Ninus: the accounts match (first mighty conqueror, dominion to far regions — Justin says the same of Ninus; both begin in Chaldaea/Mesopotamia with the four cities; both go out to invade Assyria and found Nineveh — Diodorus bk. 3). Margins: the altercation of Mercator with Annius's Berosus; Jerome; Justin bk. 1; Diodorus.

The same Mercator thinks that Nemrod was not the son of Chus — that is, immediately begotten by him — but, because he was of his stock and line,

is said in the manner of Scripture to have been begotten by him: for if he had properly been the son of Chus himself, he would have been numbered by Moses among his sons; who in this tenth chapter are reckoned as five…

§64 (cont.). Mercator further holds Nemrod was not literally Chus's son but only of his stock, since Moses lists only five sons of Chus (continues p. 427).

— p. 496 (PDF) · printed p. 427 —

…But Moses, after the five sons of Chus mentioned, and some of his grandsons, subjoins: „Now Chus begot Nemrod," not obscurely signifying that Nemrod was, in degree of kinship, distant from Chus even beyond the grandsons.

§64 (concl.). Mercator's argument: that Moses adds 'Now Chus begot Nemrod' after the five sons and some grandsons shows Nemrod was more than a grandson removed from Chus.

And so much for Mercator. To whose opinion the common judgment of the Doctors is opposed, who make Nemrod different from Ninus: that is, either his father or his grandfather; and the one indeed the first founder of Babylon, the other of the city Niniue. Nor was the beginning of Ninus's reign Babylon, as Mercator will have it, since he constituted the city Niniue as the head and seat of his empire, as may be understood from Diodorus book three, by whom it is recorded that the Babylonians were conquered by Ninus when Babylon was not yet founded. Nor, because Moses wove in the narrative of Nemrod after the other sons of Chus and his two grandsons had been reviewed, does Mercator argue well from this that he was not the son of Chus: for this reasoning of his Blessed Augustine both saw and dissolved, as was said above. Saint Epiphanius, near the beginning of the work he wrote against heresies, hands down that Nemrod was the son of Chus and the father of Assur, and is by some thought to be Zoroaster the inventor of magic and astrology; but that in truth it seems to him that Nemrod was one and Zoroaster another, and the latter indeed later than the former, but by no long interval.

§65. The common view refutes Mercator: Nemrod ≠ Ninus, being his father or grandfather; one founded Babylon, the other Nineveh. Ninus's seat was Nineveh, not Babylon (Diodorus bk. 3: Ninus conquered the Babylonians before Babylon was founded). Augustine already dissolved the 'not son of Chus' argument. Epiphanius (Against Heresies): Nemrod = son of Chus, father of Assur, thought by some to be Zoroaster — but Nemrod and Zoroaster were distinct, Zoroaster slightly later. Margins: Mercator's opinion refuted; Diodorus; Epiphanius.

To me it is certain that Nemrod was other than Ninus. I have very many authors for this opinion, indeed none for the contrary: for Mercator is the sole approver and defender of his opinion — unless perchance he has followed the author of the Recognitions of Clement, in whose fourth book it is handed down that Nemrod was the same as Ninus. Certainly, that Nemrod was the first builder of Babylon and that the beginnings of his reign were established in that city, both Scripture signifies and Josephus affirms, with the ecclesiastical writers almost in agreement. But that Babylon was not the work of Ninus, nor the beginning of his empire in that city, the history of Diodorus demonstrates.

§66. Pererius's own view: Nemrod ≠ Ninus, backed by very many authors, none for the contrary except Mercator (and perhaps the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions bk. 4). Nemrod first built Babylon and reigned there (Scripture, Josephus, the church writers); but Babylon was neither Ninus's work nor his seat (Diodorus). Margins: the author's opinion — Nemrod was one, Ninus another; the author of the Recognitions; Diodorus bk. 3.

This too is for me most credible: that Nemrod was the same as the one whom others call Belus the father of Ninus. So think many whom I indicated above and shall mention a little below; and reason persuades it: for the things handed down about Nemrod agree plainly, all of them to a single point, with Belus. For the times of both agree, since we find each to have reigned at Babylon about two hundred years after the flood, and each to be named the first designer and founder of that city. Each, moreover, was the first author of idolatry. Of Nemrod Josephus writes this openly; of Belus most of ours think the same; and they argue that the names of the gods or idols which were once worshipped in the eastern regions first took their origin from Belus, such as Belial, Beelzebub, and Beelphegor: and, as

Pliny says, among the Babylonians the most sacred god was Belus, to whom first of all the first kings of the Assyrians set up statues…

§67. Pererius's further view: Nemrod = Belus, father of Ninus. The accounts coincide: both reigned at Babylon ~200 yrs after the flood, both named first founder of the city, both first authors of idolatry (Josephus of Nemrod; many of ours of Belus — the eastern idol-names Belial, Beelzebub, Beelphegor derive from Belus; Pliny: Belus the most sacred Babylonian god, first to receive statues). Margins: Nemrod the same as Belus father of Ninus; Pliny (continues p. 428).

— p. 497 (PDF) · printed p. 428 —

…and altars and temples the first kings of the Assyrians set up. Likewise the deeds, the disposition, and the manners of both were similar: each is handed down to have been of fierce disposition, of cruel mind, of insatiable lust for command, even to the point of tyrannical violence in ruling: finally, before Ninus the authors acknowledge no other king of Babylon than Belus, nor Scripture any than Nemrod. But these things will receive greater light and credence at once from the disputation that next follows.

§67 (concl.). Belus = Nemrod: alike in deeds, disposition, manners — fierce, cruel, insatiable for rule even to tyranny; before Ninus the authors know no king of Babylon but Belus, nor Scripture any but Nemrod. To be confirmed in the next disputation.

FOURTH DISPUTATION. Whether Nemrod was the first founder and builder of Babylon.

Liber XV, Disputation 4 (title): was Nemrod the first founder of Babylon?

After Moses had said that Nemrod was the first in the lands famous and renowned for fortitude and power, he next subjoined: {The beginning of his kingdom was Babylon, and Arach and Achad and Chalanne in the land of Sennaar.} Of which words this seems the plain and straight sense and meaning: that Nemrod from the beginning began to reign at Babylon and the other cities of the land of Sennaar; but afterward, having advanced farther, added to his kingdom other cities and nations as well. Arach Jerome interprets as Edessa; Achad as Nisibis; Chalanne as Seleucia or Ctesiphon; the land of Sennaar as that very region or land in which was

built the tower of Babylon, which was properly called Babylonia.

§68. Disp. 4 opens with Gen 10:10. Plain sense: Nemrod first reigned at Babylon and the cities of Sennaar, then extended his rule. Jerome's identifications: Arach = Edessa; Achad = Nisibis; Chalanne = Seleucia or Ctesiphon; the land of Sennaar = the region of the tower (Babylonia). Margin: Jerome.

Many, however, think that by those earlier words of Moses it is signified that Nemrod was the first contriver and builder of Babylon. Both opinions Augustine certainly embraced, writing thus: „From Scripture itself it is gathered that that giant Nemrod was the founder of Babylon, which had been briefly intimated above, where, when Scripture spoke of him, it says: The beginning of his kingdom was Babylon — that is, by which he held the chief place over the other cities, where, as a metropolis, was the dwelling of the kingdom; although it was not completed to such a degree as proud impiety conceived.“ Nor ought it to trouble us, says Augustine, how the giant Nemrod could reach the age at which Babylon was founded and the confusion of tongues made and thence the division of nations: „For it is not because Heber is the sixth from Noah, and Nemrod the fourth, that they could not on that account meet at that time by living: for this happened, since they lived longer where the generations are fewer, but less where they are more; or were born later where there were fewer, earlier where there were more.“ So far Augustine.

§68 (cont.). Many: Moses' words mean Nemrod was the first builder of Babylon. Augustine (City of God 16.4) embraces both senses — Scripture shows the giant Nemrod founded Babylon as the metropolis/seat of his kingdom (unfinished as impiety wished); and the generation-gap (Heber 6th from Noah, Nemrod 4th) is no obstacle, since lifespans/birth-timing varied. Margins: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 4.

Scripture itself also supports this opinion: for it relates in the eleventh chapter of Genesis that by those who were building the tower the city too was built at the same time: for three times in that place it makes mention of the city which was being built by them; and that city, on account of the confusion made there…

§68 (cont.). Scripture supports it: Gen 11 says the city was built along with the tower (mentioned three times), and that city, from the confusion there… (continues p. 429).

— p. 498 (PDF) · printed p. 429 —

…was called Babel, which is Babylon. Josephus, moreover, is the authority that among those who built the tower Nemrod was the leader and chief. He, therefore, was the chief founder of Babylon. Orosius indeed, in the second book, chapter six, writes that Nemrod is celebrated by many as the first builder of Babylon; and in Eusebius, book nine of the Preparation for the Gospel, the last chapter, Alexander Polyhistor confirms, on the testimony of Eupolemus, that Babylon was built after the flood by giants: and the Septuagint translators in this place call Nemrod a giant: and he, as it pleases Josephus, was the instigator and leader of those building Babylon.

§68 (concl.). The city was called Babel/Babylon. Josephus: Nemrod was the leader of the tower-builders, hence chief founder of Babylon. Orosius (bk. 2 ch. 6): Nemrod celebrated as first builder; Alexander Polyhistor (in Eusebius, Preparation bk. 9, on Eupolemus): Babylon built by giants after the flood; the LXX call Nemrod a 'giant.' Margins: Josephus; Orosius; Alexander Polyhistor.

But many have held that Belus the father of Ninus was the founder of Babylon. Certainly Quintus Curtius in the fifth book affirms that this was handed down by most. In Eusebius, in the place which I cited just before, Alpheus relates that, when the land of Babylon was covered and overwhelmed with waters on account of the great and frequent inundations of the Euphrates, Belus the father of Ninus first of all dried up the waters and undertook to build the city of Babylon. And the same was the view of whoever made Belus the first ruler of Babylon.

§69. Many: Belus, father of Ninus, founded Babylon (Quintus Curtius bk. 5; Alpheus in Eusebius — Belus dried the Euphrates floods and built Babylon). Consistent with all who made Belus Babylon's first ruler. Margins: Q. Curtius; Babylon first built by Belus; Alpheus.

But the widely-spread opinion of almost all the Greeks and Latins is that Babylon was founded by Semiramis: this Herodotus handed down in the first book, Diodorus in the third, Strabo in the sixteenth, Mela in the first,

Justin in the first, and Saint Jerome on the second chapter of Hosea. Orosius adds, in the second book, chapter three, that Semiramis reigned forty-two years, and in the middle period of her empire founded Babylon as the head of her kingdom.

§70. The common Greek/Latin view: Babylon founded by Semiramis (Herodotus bk. 1, Diodorus bk. 3, Strabo bk. 16, Mela bk. 1, Justin bk. 1, Jerome on Hosea 2; Orosius bk. 2 ch. 3: she reigned 42 yrs, founded Babylon mid-reign). Margins: Semiramis; Herodotus; Diodorus; Strabo; Mela; Justin; Jerome; Orosius.

But in Josephus, in the earlier book against Apion, Berosus convicts of falsehood the Greeks who assign the building of that city to Semiramis, handing down that the city was built by king Nabuchodonosor. Certainly Daniel in the fourth chapter brings in that king boasting and vaunting himself over the building of Babylon in these words: {Is not this great Babylon, which I have built for the house of the kingdom,} etc.

§71. Berosus (in Josephus, Against Apion bk. 1) convicts the Greeks of error in crediting Semiramis: Babylon was built by king Nabuchodonosor — confirmed by Daniel 4, where the king boasts {Is not this great Babylon, which I have built…}. Margins: Nabuchodonosor founder of Babylon per Berosus; Josephus.

Berosus Annianus makes three founders of Babylon: Nemrod, Belus, and Semiramis; writing thus of Nemrod: „Nerod, having taken his son Jupiter Belus, came with colonists into the plain of Sennaar, where he marked out a city, and founded a very great tower in the 131st year after the flood, and raised that tower to the height and bulk of mountains, as a sign and monument that the Babylonian people was the first in the world, and ought to be called the kingdom of kingdoms. But he neither completed the building of the tower nor founded the city he had marked out: because after fifty-six years he suddenly did not appear. But Jupiter Belus, his son whom we have called Nemrod, reigned at Babylon in the second place for sixty-two years, and raised the foundations of Babylon, marked out by his father, into the form and bulk of a town rather than a city. But Semiramis the wife of Ninus, who succeeded to his empire in the fourth place, and

held it for forty-two years, as she surpassed all her predecessors in military glory, victories, triumphs, and riches, so she made the city of Babylon, out of a town, so great and such…“

§72. Berosus Annianus makes three founders: Nemrod (marked out the city and tower in yr 131, raised the tower mountain-high as a monument of Babylonian primacy, but left it unfinished, vanishing after 56 yrs); Jupiter Belus his son (reigned 62 yrs, raised it to a town); Semiramis wife of Ninus (reigned 42 yrs, surpassing all, made it a great city — continues p. 430). Margin: Berosus Annianus.

— p. 499 (PDF) · printed p. 430 —

„…that it may more truly be said that that city was founded by Semiramis than that it was enlarged or adorned.“

§72 (concl.). End of the Berosus Annianus quotation: Semiramis so transformed Babylon that she may be called its founder rather than its enlarger.

I myself think thus: that the very first founder of Babylon was Nemrod, as proved above; but that this Nemrod was no other than Belus the father of Ninus, was shown a little before. Wherefore those who make Belus the founder of Babylon by no means disagree with us; just as Eupolemus, in saying it was built by giants, meant to signify the very thing we think. But because Semiramis afterward made that city — small, and almost ruined and laid waste by the inundations of the Euphrates — most ample, most fortified, and most adorned, on that account she is not undeservedly celebrated as its builder. But since, after Semiramis, the kings of the Assyrians who followed, neglecting Babylon, cultivated Niniue and made it the Royal seat — that is, the seat and head of the Assyrian empire, as Diodorus relates in book three — it came about hence that Babylon, deserted by the kings and moreover laid waste by the floods of the Euphrates and the incursions of enemies, was long obscure and ignoble; until afterward, Niniue being overthrown, king Nabuchodonosor restored Babylon anew and adorned it, enlarged most widely, with most magnificent works, and there restored the seat of empire, as it once had been. From these things it appears, if one weighs the matter well, that the

writers are not at odds, although they seem to have written diversely about the founder of Babylon.

§73. Pererius reconciles all the accounts: the first founder was Nemrod = Belus; those naming Belus agree with him (so does Eupolemus's 'giants'). Semiramis is rightly called builder for greatly enlarging the small, flood-ruined city; later kings preferred Nineveh as capital (Diodorus bk. 3), so Babylon decayed until Nabuchodonosor restored it as the seat of empire. So the writers are not really at odds. Margins: the author's opinion on the founder of Babylon; Eupolemus; Diodorus.

The first ruler of Babylon, then, was Nemrod or Belus, who according to Eusebius reigned sixty-five years; and the one who next followed him was Ninus, for fifty-two years, in the forty-third year of whose empire — which was the 292nd year after the flood — Abraham was born: from these it becomes manifest that the beginning of the Babylonian kingdom falls in the 184th year from the flood. But if the division of tongues fell at the birth of Phaleg, as Scripture signifies — that is, in the 101st year from the flood — it is necessary that the beginnings of the Babylonian kingdom were established in the 83rd year after the division of tongues.

§74. Chronology: first ruler Nemrod/Belus reigned 65 yrs (Eusebius), then Ninus 52 yrs; Abraham born in Ninus's 43rd yr = yr 292 after the flood. Hence the Babylonian kingdom began in yr 184 after the flood; and since the division of tongues was at Phaleg's birth (yr 101), the kingdom began 83 yrs after the division. Margin: Eusebius in the Chronicle.

{Out of that land went forth Assur, and built Niniue, and the streets of the city, and Chale: Resen also between Niniue and Chale: this is the great city.}

Gen 10:11 (verse lemma).

What is here said, says Augustine — „out of that land," that is, out of the land of Sennaar which belonged to the kingdom of Nemrod, „Assur went forth and built Niniue and the other cities here mentioned" — was done long afterward: but it is touched on here in passing, on account of the renown of the kingdom of the Assyrians, which was marvelously enlarged. Ninus the son of Belus was the founder of Niniue, a great city, whose name

was derived from his own, so that from Ninus it should be called Niniue. But Assur, whence…

§75. Augustine on Gen 10:11: ‘Assur went out of that land’ (Sennaar, Nemrod's realm) and built Nineveh — done long after, mentioned here for the renown of the Assyrian kingdom. Nineveh founded by Ninus son of Belus, named after him. But ‘Assur,’ whence the Assyrians… (continues p. 431). Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 3.

— p. 500 (PDF) · printed p. 431 —

…whence the Assyrians, was not of the sons of Cham, the middle son of Noah, but of the sons of Shem, who was the greatest son of Noah. Whence it appears that from the progeny of Shem there arose those who afterward obtained the kingdom of that giant Nemrod, and proceeded thence, and founded other cities, of which the first was called by Ninus Niniue. So far Augustine.

§75 (concl.). Augustine: Assur (whence the Assyrians) was not of Cham but of Shem, the eldest son of Noah; from Shem's line arose those who later took over Nemrod's kingdom and founded other cities, the first being Nineveh, named by Ninus.

Cajetan thinks that, since it had just before been said that Nemrod reigned in the land of Sennaar, now it is subjoined that out of the same land went forth Assur, the second son of Shem himself, who also reigned in the land of the Assyrians and was the founder of the city Niniue, just as Nemrod of Babylon; so that hence it may appear when, and from whom, proceeded the origin of the two most ancient and greatest cities of the whole world, Babylon and Niniue; and at the same time the beginnings of the Babylonian and Assyrian empires may become known.

§75 (cont.). Cajetan: the text means Assur, second son of Shem, went out of Sennaar and founded Nineveh just as Nemrod founded Babylon — showing the origin of the world's two greatest, most ancient cities and the beginnings of the Babylonian and Assyrian empires. Margin: Cajetan.

{Out of that land went forth Assur.} By ‘land’ understand Sennaar, which is seen from this place to have been the mother of kings and empires: for from it was both Nemrod, prince of the Babylonian kingdom, and Assur,

author of the nation and principality of the Assyrians. That word ‘went forth’ indicates, according to Augustine, that Assur or his descendants first obtained Nemrod's kingdom, which was in the land of Sennaar, and proceeded thence to obtain other lands and nations, of which the first was that which from Assur himself was called Assyria, one degree more northerly than Babylonia, as Ptolemy hands down in the sixth book of the Geography. But according to others, Assur departed from the land of Sennaar because he was at variance with Nemrod, on account of his depraved disposition, manners, and deeds. That word (Assur), moreover, seems to have three significations. For sometimes it is the proper name of the second son of Shem, who was called Assur in the tenth chapter of Genesis. It also signifies the king of the Assyrians, who is frequently named in Scripture ‘king Assur,’ or simply ‘Assur.’ It signifies besides either the nation, or the empire, or the region of the Assyrians, for so some have interpreted the word in this place.

§76. ‘Out of that land went forth Assur’: the land = Sennaar, mother of kings/empires (both Nemrod and Assur came from it). ‘Went forth’ (Augustine): Assur/his line first held Nemrod's realm, then took other lands, first Assyria (one degree north of Babylonia, Ptolemy, Geography bk. 6); others: Assur left because at odds with the depraved Nemrod. Three senses of ‘Assur’: (1) the proper name of Shem's second son (Gen 10); (2) the king of the Assyrians (‘king Assur’); (3) the nation/empire/region of the Assyrians. Margin: Ptolemy; three significations of the word ‘Assur.’

There follows: {And he built Niniue, this is the great city.} The divine Scripture calls it Niniue, but Herodotus, Strabo, and Pliny call it Ninus, and Diodorus Nina. It is signified, then, that Assur was the first founder of that city. And because almost all celebrate king Ninus as the founder of this city, some argue from this that Ninus was the same as the one here named Assur. But of this we shall speak a little below. Rightly, moreover, is Niniue both here and in the prophet Jonah called ‘the great city.’ For if you wish to estimate its magnitude from its first origin, when it was built by Ninus, you will find it to have been the greatest in the whole world, so that it had no equal before or after. For the circuit of the city was 480 stadia, that is, 60 miles; the height of the walls was 100 feet; the breadth such that

three chariots could go abreast; the towers 150, each 200 feet in height. So Diodorus in the third book; to whom Strabo testifies in the sixteenth book, affirming it was greater than Babylon.

§77. ‘And he built Niniue, this is the great city.’ Scripture: Niniue; Herodotus/Strabo/Pliny: Ninus; Diodorus: Nina. Assur its first founder; since most credit king Ninus, some equate Ninus with Assur (treated below). Rightly ‘the great city’ (also in Jonah): when built by Ninus the world's largest — circuit 480 stadia (60 mi), walls 100 ft high (three chariots abreast), 150 towers each 200 ft (Diodorus bk. 3; Strabo bk. 16: greater than Babylon). Margins: Herodotus; Pliny; Strabo; Diodorus; how Nineveh's size is to be estimated.

— p. 501 (PDF) · printed p. 432 —

But in this Diodorus seems to have erred, that he placed the city Ninus upon the Euphrates, whereas it was set upon the river Tigris, as may be understood from the book of Tobias and the first book of Herodotus. Wherefore Pliny: „Ninus,“ he says, „was set upon the Tigris, looking toward the setting of the sun, a city once most renowned.“

§77 (concl.). Diodorus erred in placing Nineveh on the Euphrates; it stood on the Tigris (Tobit; Herodotus bk. 1). Pliny: Nineveh stood on the Tigris, facing west, once a most famous city. Margins: Diodorus's slip; Tobit 6; Pliny bk. 6 ch. 13.

Now if it please to estimate the magnitude of that city as it was in the time of the prophet Jonah — that is, more than twelve hundred years after it had been founded by Ninus — you will find its extent within the walls to have been so great that the whole could not be gone through and surveyed, street by street, in less than three days; wherefore it is called in Jonah ‘a city of three days' journey.’ And the throng of inhabitants was so great that in it there were 120,000 infants who did not yet through age use reason: which number, in comparison with the whole population, scarcely amounts to a fifth part, so that from it one may understand there were more than 600,000 inhabitants at that time in that city. There was added to the magnificence of that city that for a very long time — that is, for more than 1,300 years — it was the head of the Assyrian empire. Rightly, then, as I said, both here and elsewhere it is named in the sacred letters ‘the great city.’

§78. Nineveh in Jonah's time (1200+ yrs after Ninus): so large it took three days to traverse ('a city of three days' journey'); 120,000 infants without reason ≈ a fifth, implying 600,000+ inhabitants; capital of Assyria for 1,300+ yrs — rightly 'the great city.'

For what follows, 'And the streets of the city,' in Hebrew it is rehoboth, which word can be either a common noun signifying 'streets,' from the verb rachab, which means 'to widen,' and so Blessed Jerome took it in this place. „Let us not think," he says, „that Niniue and Rehoboth are two cities; but because Rehoboth is interpreted 'streets,' it must be read thus: And he built Niniue and the streets of the city — as if this were added to signify the extent of this city, which had many and great streets." That word can also be taken as the proper name of a city which would be so called, and in this way the Septuagint translators expounded the word in this place, as also Jerome himself in his book On the Hebrew Places. What is here called Chale, in Hebrew is Chalach, so the Septuagint translators have it here, and Jerome On the Hebrew Places. Strabo, at the opening of the sixteenth book, names Chalachene as neighboring the city Niniue. For the word 'Resen,' the Septuagint have 'Dase,' and so Augustine reads.

§78 (cont.). The other names: 'streets of the city' = Heb. rehoboth (from rachab, 'to widen') — Jerome: not a second city but 'streets,' marking Nineveh's extent; or a proper place-name (LXX, Jerome On Hebrew Places). 'Chale' = Heb. Chalach (LXX, Jerome); Strabo (bk. 16) names Chalachene near Nineveh. 'Resen': LXX 'Dase,' followed by Augustine. Margin: Jerome, Hebrew Questions on Genesis.

FIFTH DISPUTATION. Who Assur the founder of the city Niniue was, and concerning the kingdom of the Assyrians.

Liber XV, Disputation 5 (title): the identity of Assur, founder of Nineveh, and the Assyrian kingdom.

Since Moses has said that out of the land of Sennaar went forth Assur, who founded the city Niniue, it is asked what ought to be understood by that word 'Assur' in this place: whether the nation, or the kingdom, or the region of the Assyrians, or rather some man called by that name…

§79. Disp. 5 opens: does 'Assur' (Gen 10:11) mean the nation/kingdom/region of the Assyrians, or a man of that name? (continues p. 433).

— p. 502 (PDF) · printed p. 433 —

…for it is sufficiently obscure in itself, and is at the same time entangled and implicated with certain other difficulties. Blessed Jerome interpreted the word ‘Assur’ as the kingdom of the Assyrians. For in explaining those words, ‘Out of that land went forth Assur,’ he says thus: „From that land sprang up the empire of the Assyrians, who from the name of Ninus son of Belus founded Ninus, a great city, which the Hebrews call Niniue, to whose either ruin or repentance the whole prophecy of Jonah pertains.“ So far Jerome.

§79 (cont.). The question is obscure and entangled. Jerome reads ‘Assur’ as the kingdom of the Assyrians: from that land sprang the Assyrian empire, which named Nineveh after Ninus son of Belus — the city of Jonah's prophecy. Margin: Jerome, Hebrew Questions on Genesis.

But Gerard Mercator thinks that by the word ‘Assur’ is signified the region of the Assyrians, and that Moses by these words signifies that Nemrod (whom he will have been Ninus), after he had built Babylon in the land of Sennaar, not content with the dominion and lordship of the Babylonian land, went forth thence to acquire other kingdoms. And so that word (Assur), to Mercator, does not signify some man, as most have interpreted, but the region of Assyria itself; „for what,“ says he, „great or memorable thing was it to say that Ninus had gone forth from the land of Babylon, since all those kings came forth from it? But by those words it is signified that first of all Ninus, not content with his father's kingdom, went out of his own borders and invaded external, foreign, and far-off kingdoms: which no one before Ninus did, as Justin hands down.“ „Before Ninus,“ says Justin, „it was the custom to guard rather than to extend the bounds of empire. The kingdoms of each were bounded within his own fatherland. First of all, Ninus king of the Assyrians changed the old and as it were ancestral custom of the nations by a new lust of empire. He first brought wars upon his neighbors, and subdued the peoples, still untrained to resist, as far as the bounds of Libya. For having first subdued the nearest, when with the accession of strength he passed bravely on to others, and each nearest

victory was the instrument of the next, he subjugated the peoples of the whole East.“ So Justin.

§79 (cont.). Mercator: ‘Assur’ = the region of Assyria, and the verse means Nemrod (= his Ninus), not content with Babylon, went out to conquer other kingdoms; it names no man but the region. He cites Justin: before Ninus, kings only guarded their borders; Ninus first, from lust of empire, made wars on neighbors and subdued the whole East to Libya. Margins: Mercator's Chronology; Justin, opening of bk. 1; Ninus.

But the common opinion of the Doctors is opposed to Mercator in two ways: both because he makes Ninus the same as Nemrod, which is false and refuted by us above; and because most judge that by the word ‘Assur’ is signified, not the region of Assyria, as he expressed, but Assur the son of Shem. Hear Josephus: „To Shem, the third son of Noah, there were five sons, who inhabited Assyria as far as the Indian Ocean, the beginning of extending their dominion being made from the Euphrates; the first, Elimus, left as descendants the Elimaeans, from whom the Persians drew their origin. The other, called Assur, founded the city Ninus, and named his subjects after himself Assyrians, whose wealth flourished above the rest.“ The same was the view of Blessed Augustine in the sixteenth book of the City of God, chapter three, whose words, since they were mentioned a little above, it is not necessary to repeat here. Moreover Blessed Jerome, in his book On the Hebrew Places, expounds the word ‘Assur’ as the person Assur — I mean the son of Shem — and not the kingdom of the Assyrians, as he had interpreted in the Hebrew Questions. It is not worthwhile to bring forward more approvers of this interpretation, since later writers have followed Josephus almost as their leader.

§79 (concl.). The common view refutes Mercator twice: he wrongly equates Ninus with Nemrod (already refuted), and most take ‘Assur’ as Assur son of Shem, not the region. Josephus: Shem's son Assur founded Nineveh and named the Assyrians after himself; so too Augustine (City of God 16.3) and Jerome (On Hebrew Places, correcting his Hebrew Questions). Later writers follow Josephus as their guide. Margins: Josephus, Antiquities; Augustine; Jerome.

— p. 503 (PDF) · printed p. 434 —

My opinion is threefold. First, indeed, I think that Ninus king of the Assyrians was not Assur the son of Shem: both because Ninus was of the stock of Cham — namely his great-great-grandson, for he was the son of Belus, whom we showed above to have been Nemrod the grandson of Cham himself; and if Ninus was the great-great-grandson of Cham, he could not be the son of Shem; and because Belus the father of Ninus was an impious man and the parent of idolatry — for from him Jerome and Cyril and others trace the first origin of idolatry — whereas Shem the father of Assur was not only a pious and holy man, but also a guardian, teacher, and propagator of true piety and religion.

§80. Pererius's threefold opinion. (1) Ninus ≠ Assur son of Shem: Ninus was of Cham's stock (great-great-grandson, son of Belus = Nemrod, Cham's grandson), so cannot be Shem's son; and Belus was impious, the parent of idolatry (Jerome, Cyril), whereas Shem (Assur's father) was holy, a guardian and teacher of true religion. Margins: Ninus was not Assur son of Shem; Jerome; Cyril.

But as for what some think can be evidently concluded from the reckoning of times — that Ninus was not Assur the son of Shem, because Ninus could not have lived down to the birth of Abraham, as is handed down by many, that is, for three hundred years — this, I say, does not seem firm enough: for why should it be incredible that Assur the son of Shem himself, who was begotten after the flood, lived beyond the birth of Abraham — that is, beyond three hundred years — when his brother Arphaxad, and his son Sale and grandson Heber, prolonged their lives beyond four hundred years, that is, more than a hundred years beyond the birth of Abraham?

§80 (cont.). Pererius rejects one chronological argument: that Ninus ≠ Assur son of Shem because Ninus could not have lived 300 yrs to Abraham's birth — this is not firm, since Assur's relatives Arphaxad, Sale, and Heber lived 400+ yrs (over 100 yrs past Abraham's birth).

Next, I judge that, if anyone contends that by the word ‘Assur’ is signified Ninus king of the Assyrians, it must be said to him that the word ‘Assur’ in this place is not the proper name signifying Assur the son of Shem; for it has already been shown that Ninus and Assur the son of Shem were plainly different. Wherefore the word ‘Assur’ in this place signifies an Assyrian or

the king of the Assyrians; in which signification it is frequently used in the sacred letters, as we indicated above, and this is clear from the fourth book of Kings, chapter fifteen, and Psalm 82, and Isaiah 10 and 31. The meaning of these words, then, ‘Out of the land of Sennaar went forth Assur,’ will be: that Ninus king of the Assyrians, not content with the Babylonian kingdom which his father Belus had founded, proceeded to subjugate other nations and seize other kingdoms, and that among his other illustrious works was the building of Niniue, a great city.

§80 (concl.). (2) If ‘Assur’ means Ninus, then it is not the proper name (Assur son of Shem) — since Ninus and that Assur are distinct — but ‘an Assyrian’ or ‘king of the Assyrians’ (a frequent scriptural usage; 2 Kgs 15, Ps 83/82, Isa 10 & 31). So the verse = Ninus, not content with his father Belus's Babylon, went out to conquer other nations, among his works building great Nineveh.

This too I judge: that if the one named in this place ‘Assur’ was that son of Shem (which I see pleases many), then what is subjoined — that Niniue was built by him — must be interpreted as if said by anticipation. For that Assur built the city, which Ninus many years after — either repairing it when already ruined, or making it out of a small thing most ample and most adorned with most magnificent works — named after his own name Niniue or Ninus, the memory of the former founder and the former appellation of the city being abolished. And so what is here said, ‘This is the great city,’ ought not to be referred to the first origin of the city, when it was built by Assur the son of Shem, but to its building set on foot by Ninus, or to its magnitude such as it was at the time when Moses wrote this history; and to this interpretation the opinion of Josephus, Jerome, and Augustine can be accommodated.

§81. (3) If ‘Assur’ is Shem's son (as many prefer), then ‘he built Nineveh’ is by anticipation: Assur built the city, which Ninus long after rebuilt/enlarged and renamed after himself (Niniue/Ninus), erasing the first founder's memory. ‘This is the great city’ refers not to Assur's first founding but to Ninus's building, or to its size in Moses's day — fitting Josephus, Jerome, and Augustine. (Disp. 6 begins next page.)

— p. 504 (PDF) · printed p. 435 —

SIXTH DISPUTATION. On the Kings of the Assyrians.

Liber XV, Disputation 6 (title): the kings of the Assyrians.

But because in this place sacred Scripture discloses the first origin of the kings and kingdom of the Assyrians, it will not be amiss for us also to touch somewhat upon that matter. „That Ninus was the first king and monarch of the Assyrians, all," says Jerome, „both Greek and Latin histories relate." And before Ninus indeed his father Belus, as nearly all the ecclesiastical writers hand down, had reigned at Babylon for sixty-five years: but he was content with that kingdom only, and that a very small one: a man renowned not so much by his own glory as ennobled by the greatness of his son Ninus's empire and by the fame of his deeds; but most of all because he was the first of all mortals to be enrolled among the gods by his son Ninus, and ordered to be publicly worshipped as a god: from which the first beginning of public idolatry is believed to have been made.

§82. Disp. 6 opens. Jerome: all histories make Ninus the first Assyrian king. His father Belus had reigned 65 yrs at Babylon (content with that small realm), ennobled by his son's empire — and notably the first mortal deified (by his son Ninus) and publicly worshipped: held to be the first origin of public idolatry. Margins: Jerome on Hosea 2; what kind of man Belus was, how long he reigned, and that he was the first mortal worshipped as a god.

But since Abraham is said to have been born in the forty-third year of Ninus's empire, and, as is gathered from Scripture itself, in the 292nd year after the flood, it follows from this that Belus, who reigned sixty-five years before Ninus, entered upon his kingdom in the 184th year after the flood, and died in the 250th. From which there can incidentally be refuted a manifest error in chronology of a certain Thalus, a very ancient writer, which error, however, Theophilus, an ecclesiastical writer, followed in his book On Times, and Lactantius near the end of the first book.

§83. Chronology: Abraham born in Ninus's 43rd yr = yr 292 after the flood; so Belus (reigning 65 yrs before Ninus) began yr 184 and died yr 250. This refutes the chronological error of the ancient Thalus, followed by Theophilus (On Times) and Lactantius (end of bk. 1).

Thalus handed down that Belus the father of Ninus was contemporary and coeval with Saturn, and preceded the Trojan War by only three hundred and twenty-two years. I shall set down here the opinion of Thalus, as Lactantius reports it in these words: „Theophilus, in his book On Times written to Autolycus, says that in his history Thalus states that Belus, whom the Babylonians and Assyrians worship, is found to have been older than the Trojan War by three hundred and twenty-two years; and that Belus was coeval with Saturn, and both grew up at one time. Which is so true that it can be gathered by reckoning itself. For Agamemnon, who waged the Trojan War, was the great-great-grandson of Jupiter, and Achilles and Ajax great-grandsons, and Ulysses next in the same degree. And from the destruction of the city of Troy 1,470 years are reckoned. From this reckoning of times it is manifest that not more than 1,800 years ago Saturn was born, who is also said to have been the Sower (Sator) of all the gods.“ So far Lactantius.

§84. The false dating: Thalus made Belus coeval with Saturn, preceding the Trojan War by only 322 yrs (quoted via Lactantius/Theophilus, On Times to Autolycus). The reckoning by the generations of Agamemnon, Achilles, Ajax, Ulysses (descendants of Jupiter) puts the fall of Troy 1,470 yrs back and Saturn's birth ~1,800 yrs ago. Margins: on the time of Belus — the false opinion of Thalus, Theophilus, and Lactantius.

But the opinion of these men contains a great error in chronology. For Diodorus Siculus, in the third book, chapter six, affirms that from king Ninus down to the Trojan War a thousand years passed: and the same could be shown from the sacred letters. For Belus began to reign 108 years before the birth of Abraham; and from the birth of Abraham down to…

§85. Refutation: Diodorus (bk. 3 ch. 6) makes 1,000 yrs from Ninus to the Trojan War (provable from Scripture too): Belus began 108 yrs before Abraham's birth (continues p. 436). Margin: Diodorus.

— p. 505 (PDF) · printed p. 436 —

…the going-out of the Hebrews from Egypt, 505 years are reckoned; and after that time, by more than 300 years, was the Trojan War, which we have shown in another place to have fallen either in the rule of Samson or

in the pontificate of Heli.

§85 (concl.). From Abraham's birth to the Exodus = 505 yrs; the Trojan War came 300+ yrs later, falling (shown elsewhere) in Samson's rule or Heli's pontificate — refuting Thalus's much shorter span.

But I return to Ninus. He, the first of all kings, obtained writers of his deeds, as Diodorus says, because he founded the first and longest-lasting and most ample monarchy in the lands, which was called that of the Assyrians; which both he, and after him his wife Semiramis, so extended, that those most weighty authors Diodorus, Justin, Blessed Jerome, and Augustine have handed down that they ruled over all Asia — as much, namely, as lies between the Tanais and the Nile — the East being subdued, their dominion carried as far as the Indians and as far as Libya. Wherefore I greatly wonder that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a writer of very sharp and polished judgment and exquisite diligence, bounded the Assyrian empire by such modest regions, that in the first book of the Roman Antiquities he left it written that the Assyrian empire was content with only a modest part of Assyria: „That ancient empire of the Assyrians," he says, „reaching back to fabulous times, held a certain modest part of Assyria: this, transferred to the Medes and increased also in wealth, lasted no long time, ending in the fourth generation. The Persians, moreover, having conquered the Medes, possessed almost all Asia." So he.

§86. Ninus, first king to have his own historians (Diodorus), founded the first, longest, greatest monarchy (Assyria); he and Semiramis extended it over all Asia (Tanais to Nile, to the Indians and Libya) — per Diodorus, Justin, Jerome, Augustine. Pererius marvels that Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Roman Antiquities bk. 1) confined the Assyrian empire to a small part of Assyria, transferred to the Medes (lasting to the 4th generation) then to the Persians. Margins: how great Ninus's Assyrian empire was; Diodorus bk. 3; Justin bk. 1; Jerome on Hosea 2; Augustine, City of God 16.17 & 18.22; a remark on Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

Just as the authors make Ninus the first king of this monarchy, so they set Sardanapalus as the last. And the intermediate kings indeed, memorable for no virtues and no deeds, were likewise undistinguished and uncelebrated; but Sardanapalus was made notable and celebrated by the writers no less

for his disgraces and womanish sloth and softness and luxury than others for illustrious deeds.

§87. Ninus the first king, Sardanapalus the last; the kings between were undistinguished, while Sardanapalus became notorious for his disgraceful sloth, softness, and luxury.

How many, moreover, were the kings of this Monarchy from Ninus down to Sardanapalus, the opinions of the writers vary. For Velleius Paterculus in the first book reckons thirty-three, and says that among them this was very wonderful: that always a son succeeded a father in the kingdom. Eusebius in the Chronicle noted thirty-six. Paulus Orosius in the first book counts fifty. But Diodorus, on the authority of Ctesias, mentions only thirty kings. But how many kings there were in this Monarchy, whether more or fewer, is of no great importance to know, especially in so far as the unfolding of this Monarchy can contribute to the knowledge of sacred history and chronology. That, indeed, is of greater importance: to have explored and ascertained how long that Monarchy stood. Wherefore on this too we must now dispute, briefly indeed, but not carelessly.

§88. The number of Assyrian kings (Ninus→Sardanapalus) varies: Velleius Paterculus 33 (marveling that always son succeeded father), Eusebius 36, Orosius 50, Diodorus/Ctesias 30. The number matters little; more important is how long the Monarchy stood — the next topic. Margins: how many kings of the Assyrians from Ninus to Sardanapalus; Velleius Paterculus; Eusebius; Orosius; Diodorus.

— p. 506 (PDF) · printed p. 437 —

SEVENTH DISPUTATION. How long the Monarchy of the Assyrians stood.

Liber XV, Disputation 7 (title): the duration of the Assyrian Monarchy.

Concerning the duration and length of the Monarchy of the Assyrians — namely, how much time elapsed from Ninus down to Sardanapalus — both profane and ecclesiastical writers have thought and committed to writing very variously. In the letter which Alexander the Great wrote to his mother Olympias — the record of which letter is extant in Blessed Augustine,

book 12 of the City of God, chapter 10 — a certain Egyptian is brought in, confirming from the sacred books of the Egyptians that the kingdom of the Assyrians exceeded five thousand years. But this too, like the other fictions of the Egyptians, is to be rejected with derision and contempt. For it is clear that even from the very beginning of the world down to Alexander the Great fewer than three thousand eight hundred years passed.

§89. Disp. 7 opens: estimates of the Assyrian Monarchy's duration vary widely. Alexander's letter to Olympias (in Augustine, City of God 12.10) cites an Egyptian's claim from sacred books that the kingdom exceeded 5,000 yrs — rejected with the other Egyptian fictions, since from the world's start to Alexander was under 3,800 yrs. Margins: Letter of Alexander the Great to his mother Olympias; Augustine.

Josephus, in the first book of the Antiquities, hands down that, while Abraham was living, the empire of Asia was in the hands of the Assyrians; and the same writer in the tenth book says that the kingdom of the Assyrians was overthrown about the times of king Hezekiah. But if one should reckon the times from the birth of Abraham down to the beginnings of the reign of Hezekiah, according to sacred chronology, he will find 1,275 years; to which if there be added the forty-two years of king Ninus before the birth of Abraham (for among ecclesiastical writers it is generally agreed that Abraham was born after the forty-second year of king Ninus's empire), you will conclude, according to Josephus's opinion, that the Assyrian empire stood for 1,317 years. But the same writer in the ninth book signifies that, while Joatham reigned, Nahum prophesied the destruction of the Assyrians, and that this happened 115 years after that time, the end of which years falls at the beginning of the reign of Manasseh; from which it would follow that that kingdom stood for about 1,350 years.

§90. Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1): Asia was under the Assyrians in Abraham's lifetime; (bk. 10) the kingdom fell ~Hezekiah's time. Abraham's birth to Hezekiah's reign = 1,275 yrs; +42 yrs of Ninus before Abraham = 1,317 yrs total. But (bk. 9) Nahum prophesied under Joatham, the fall coming 115 yrs later (~start of Manasseh's reign) = ~1,350 yrs. Margin: Josephus.

Herodotus handed down only this, that the Assyrians held the empire of Asia for five hundred years. Diodorus Siculus, following Ctesias as his authority as he is wont, assigns to the kingdom of the Assyrians 1,360 years. Nor indeed did the same Diodorus mean anything else, when in the last words of the seventh chapter of the third book he wrote that the Assyrians reigned for 1,400 years — understanding, namely, the four hundred as by no means completed. We read also written by the same Diodorus, in the same place, that while Theutamus the twentieth king of the Assyrians was reigning, a thousand years of the Assyrian empire having already passed, the Trojan War occurred. From which it follows — since the Trojan War happened 360 years after the going-out of the Hebrews from Egypt under the leadership of Moses, as we have shown elsewhere — that the beginning of the Assyrian empire was 140 years before the birth of Abraham; that is, 150 [years after the flood]…

§91. Herodotus (bk. 1): Assyrians held Asia 500 yrs. Diodorus/Ctesias (bk. 3 ch. 6): 1,360 yrs (or '1,400,' the 400 incomplete). Diodorus: under Theutamus, the 20th king, 1,000 yrs into the empire, came the Trojan War — which fell 360 yrs after the Exodus, so the Assyrian empire began 140 yrs before Abraham's birth (continues p. 438). Margins: Herodotus bk. 1; Diodorus bk. 3 ch. 6.

— p. 507 (PDF) · printed p. 438 —

…150 years after the flood. Velleius Paterculus attributes to the kingdom of the Assyrians 1,070 years, but Justin 1,300.

§91 (concl.). So the empire began 150 yrs after the flood. Other figures: Velleius Paterculus 1,070 yrs; Justin 1,300. Margins: Velleius Paterculus bk. 1; Justin bk. 1.

Eusebius — whom Augustine, Saint Jerome, Cyril, Isidore, Bede, and very many others followed — defined the duration of the Assyrian empire as 1,240 years. Paulus Orosius in the first book attributes to this empire 1,160 years. But Orosius does not seem to speak consistently enough on this matter in various places. For in book 1, chapter 12, he reckons from the first Assyrian king Ninus down to the last king Sardanapalus 1,160 years. But in chapter 4 of the same book he says this empire began 1,300 years

before Rome was founded, and ended 64 years before Rome's founding. But these two latter statements wholly overturn that first saying of Orosius. For from them it is necessarily concluded that the Assyrian empire stood 1,236 years, and not, as he handed down, 1,160 years.

§92. Eusebius (followed by Augustine, Jerome, Cyril, Isidore, Bede, etc.): 1,240 yrs. Orosius (bk. 1): inconsistent — ch. 12 says 1,160 yrs (Ninus→Sardanapalus); but ch. 4 says it began 1,300 yrs before Rome and ended 64 yrs before Rome = 1,236 yrs, overturning his own 1,160. Margins: Eusebius; Augustine; Jerome; Cyril; Isidore; Bede; Orosius; a remark on Orosius.

Blessed Augustine, moreover, in book 16 of the City of God, chapter 17, writes that the kingdom of the Assyrians began 1,240 years before Rome, and ended at almost the same time as Rome was founded, while in the tribe of Judah Ahaz or Hezekiah reigned, as Augustine himself hands down in book 18, chapter 22. But this opinion of Augustine is not consistent enough. For from the birth of Abraham down to the beginning of Hezekiah's reign sacred chronology contains 1,280 years; to which if you add the forty years of Ninus's reign before Abraham's birth, which Augustine too sets down in book 16 chapter 17 of the same work, you will gather 1,320 years of the Assyrian empire. Either, therefore, Augustine ought to attribute so many years to that kingdom, or to admit that 80 years before Hezekiah's reign (in whose sixteenth year Rome was founded) the Assyrian kingdom fell: so that by this reckoning the beginning of its reign is set at the 250th year after the flood, and its end marked in the fourth year of king Azariah. And this we say according to the opinion approved by nearly all ecclesiastical writers, who circumscribe the Assyrian Monarchy within 1,240 years, and set its beginning at 42 years before the birth of Abraham.

§93. Augustine (City of God 16.17): the kingdom began 1,240 yrs before Rome, ended ~Rome's founding under Ahaz/Hezekiah (18.22). But this is inconsistent: Abraham's birth to Hezekiah = 1,280 yrs, +40 of Ninus = 1,320, not 1,240. So either 1,320 yrs, or the fall was 80 yrs before Hezekiah (Rome founded in Hezekiah's 16th yr) — placing the start at yr 250 after the flood and the end in Azariah's 4th yr. This follows the common ecclesiastical view: 1,240 yrs, beginning 42 yrs before Abraham. Margins: Augustine; a remark on Augustine's opinion.

EIGHTH DISPUTATION. How long the city of Niniue stood.

Liber XV, Disputation 8 (title): how long the city of Nineveh stood.

I have briefly set forth the opinions of others concerning the duration of the Assyrian empire. It follows that, with equal brevity, we now say how long the city of Niniue stood — the head of that empire and the royal seat — and at what time it first fell and was utterly overthrown…

§94. Disp. 8 opens: how long Nineveh, the capital and royal seat, stood, and when it first fell (continues p. 439).

— p. 508 (PDF) · printed p. 439 —

Herodotus in book 1 writes that Cyaxares king of the Medes reigned forty years, and near the end of his rule took Niniue by storm: and he makes Astyages the next successor of Cyaxares in the empire, and assigns him thirty-five years of reign. He says, moreover, that Cyrus succeeded Astyages, in whose first year of empire the Babylonian captivity was released by him, as we have learned from the sacred letters. From these things it is concluded, according to the chronology of Herodotus, that Niniue was overthrown within those seventy years of the Babylonian captivity.

§94 (concl.). Herodotus (bk. 1): Cyaxares king of the Medes (40 yrs) stormed Nineveh near his reign's end; succeeded by Astyages (35 yrs), then Cyrus, in whose 1st yr the Babylonian captivity ended. So by Herodotus, Nineveh fell within the 70 yrs of the captivity. Margins: Herodotus; Cyaxares; 1 Esdras 1.

The common opinion is that Niniue was destroyed when Sardanapalus, conquered by Arbaces or Arbacus the prefect of the Medes, died a voluntary death, as Diodorus hands down in book 3, chapter 7, and Strabo in book 16, and also Eusebius and very many others following Eusebius. But because Sardanapalus was at the time when Ozias reigned among the Jews, but according to Diodorus long after, namely while Manasseh reigned, as we said above: hence it comes about that, according to

Eusebius, Niniue fell while Ozias reigned, but according to Diodorus was overthrown more than a hundred years after, while Manasseh reigned. Josephus, as we indicated a little above, since he says in the ninth book that, while Joatham reigned, the destruction of the city Niniue was foretold by the prophet Nahum, and that this happened 115 years after, must necessarily refer the fall and ruin of the city Niniue to the time of the reign of Manasseh.

§95. The common view: Nineveh fell when Sardanapalus, beaten by Arbaces, died by his own hand (Diodorus 3.7, Strabo bk. 16, Eusebius, etc.). But the dating splits: Eusebius puts Sardanapalus under Ozias, Diodorus 100+ yrs later under Manasseh. Josephus (bk. 9: Nahum foretold it under Joatham, fulfilled 115 yrs later) must place the fall under Manasseh. Margins: Diodorus; Strabo; Eusebius; Josephus.

Saint Jerome, in the Preface of his Commentaries on Jonah, handed down that Niniue was overthrown, according to Greek history (that is, according to Herodotus), while Astyages reigned among the Medes; but according to sacred chronology, while Josiah reigned among the Jews — which opinion does not seem consistent enough with itself, nor to cohere with itself. First, according to Herodotus, not Astyages but his father Cyaxares stormed Niniue. But perhaps, because Herodotus writes that the storming of Niniue happened near the end of Cyaxares's reign, it might be conjectured that it was indeed begun by Cyaxares but completed by Astyages. Next, Blessed Jerome takes as certain that Astyages was contemporary with Josiah and reigned at the same time; which might seem not only uncertain but even false. For Astyages began to reign thirty-five years before Cyrus, that is, before the release of the Babylonian captivity; but Josiah died about ninety years before that captivity was released. What of the fact that the same Saint Jerome, in his Preface on the prophet Nahum, left it written that Nahum, while Hezekiah reigned, the ten tribes having already been led into captivity, prophesied that Niniue would be overthrown by the Chaldeans — whereas he who first increased and exalted the Chaldean empire, some years after Josiah, was king Nabuchodonosor?

§96. Jerome (Preface to Jonah): Nineveh fell under Astyages (Greek/Herodotus) = under Josiah (sacred chronology). Pererius finds this inconsistent: (1) per Herodotus it was Cyaxares, not Astyages, who stormed it (perhaps begun by Cyaxares, finished by Astyages); (2) Jerome wrongly makes Astyages contemporary with Josiah — Astyages began 35 yrs before Cyrus/the captivity's end, but Josiah died ~90 yrs before it; (3) Jerome's Preface on Nahum says Nineveh would fall to the Chaldeans, but Nabuchodonosor (who built up the Chaldean empire) came years after Josiah. Margins: Jerome; a remark on Jerome's opinion; Jerome (on Nahum).

The Hebrews, in their greater Chronology, which one calls Seder-Holam, chapter 24, hand down that Niniue was subdued by king Nabuchodonosor in the first year of his reign; and Bede seems to have signified the same in his book On the Six Ages of the World…

§97. The Hebrews (Seder Olam ch. 24): Nineveh subdued by Nabuchodonosor in his 1st year; Bede (On the Six Ages of the World) seems to agree (continues p. 440). Margins: the Hebrews; Bede.

— p. 509 (PDF) · printed p. 440 —

And these are nearly all the things which I have found disputed and committed to writing by others concerning the time during which the Assyrian empire endured and during which the city Niniue stood.

§97 (concl.). Summary: these are the various opinions of others on the durations of the Assyrian empire and the city of Nineveh.

It will not, I think, be unwelcome to the reader if, amid so great a variety of opinions, and in the obscurity of a matter most abstruse on account of its antiquity, we make him a partaker also of our own judgment and opinion. I think thus: if we speak of the last and complete overthrow of the Assyrian kingdom and the ruin of the city Niniue — after which overthrow, namely, the Assyrians never obtained an ample, powerful, and flourishing empire, nor did the city Niniue flourish in size and population — if, I say, we speak of this destruction of the Assyrians, I shall not hesitate to say that all the opinions of the authors set forth above are false. This my opinion will be most easy to persuade a reader of the divine letters not unskilled and rude. For, to begin from Eusebius (whom many ecclesiastical writers have followed), since he attributes to the kingdom of the Assyrians, from Ninus

down to Sardanapalus, 1,240 years, it is necessary for him to place the end of that kingdom in the seventh year of the reign of Ozias king of Judah. For if anyone, from this seventh year of Ozias, running back according to sacred chronology to the very first year of Ninus, gathers the years elapsed, he will find those 1,240 which Eusebius ascribes to the Assyrian kingdom: namely, the forty-two years of king Ninus before the birth of Abraham; from the birth of Abraham down to the going-out of the Hebrews from Egypt, 505; thence down to the fourth year of king Solomon, in which the temple began to be built, 480; from this fourth year of king Solomon down to the seventh of Ozias, 213. From all the aforesaid years is made up that sum, which I said, of 1,240 years.

§98. Pererius's own view: if we mean the final, complete overthrow (after which Assyria/Nineveh never flourished again), all the above opinions are false. Following Eusebius's 1,240 yrs, the end must fall in Ozias's 7th yr: the sum = 42 (Ninus before Abraham) + 505 (Abraham→Exodus) + 480 (Exodus→Solomon's 4th yr / start of the Temple) + 213 (Solomon's 4th→Ozias's 7th) = 1,240. Margins: the author's opinion; per Eusebius the Assyrian kingdom must have ended in Ozias's 7th year.

But that the Assyrian kingdom was not at all overthrown in the seventh year of Ozias, nor Niniue made desolate, is proved by three most evident arguments drawn from Scripture itself. First, more than eighty years after the seventh year of Ozias had passed, the prophet Nahum, while Hezekiah reigned, and the ten tribes having already been led into captivity (as Blessed Jerome rightly judged in his Preface on the prophet Nahum), foretold the coming ruin of both Niniue and the Assyrians: at that time, therefore, that empire was standing, and its head Niniue. Next, at that very time two kings of the Assyrians especially flourished, Salmanasar and Sennacherib, the magnitude, power, and magnificence of whose reigns Scripture sufficiently declares in the fourth book of Kings and in Isaiah, chapter ten.

§99. But Nineveh was NOT destroyed in Ozias's 7th yr — three Scriptural proofs (first two here): (1) 80+ yrs later, under Hezekiah (with the ten tribes already captive), Nahum foretold Nineveh's coming ruin (Jerome), so the empire still stood; (2) at that time the two great Assyrian kings Salmanasar and

Sennacherib flourished (2 Kgs; Isa 10). Margins: Nineveh was not overthrown while Ozias reigned; Jerome.

There is added, to conclude this, a third most valid reason, drawn from the History of Tobias. For Tobias, near death, foretold the ruin and overthrow of Niniue, near and now imminent: but Tobias did not die before the thirtieth year of the reign of Manasseh, that is, more than one hundred and thirty years after that seventh year of the reign of Ozias, in…

§100. Third proof, from Tobias: dying, Tobias foretold Nineveh's imminent ruin; but he died no earlier than Manasseh's 30th yr — 130+ yrs after Ozias's 7th yr (continues p. 441). Margins: Tobit (last chapter); when Tobias died.

— p. 510 (PDF) · printed p. 441 —

…in which, as I said, the end of the Assyrian empire is to be placed, on the authority of Eusebius. But what I said about the time of Tobias's death I show in this way: the blindness of Tobias happened after the death of Sennacherib, as is clear from the first and second chapters of the book of Tobias. But Sennacherib was killed after the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, or in that very year, as Scripture indicates in the fourth book of Kings, chapter eighteen: and he bore his blindness for four years; thereafter, after his sight was restored, he lived forty-two years, as may be understood from the fourteenth chapter of the book of Tobias. Therefore, after the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah, Tobias lived at least forty-six years. I said ‘at least,’ because from the history of Tobias it cannot be clearly judged how long after the killing of Sennacherib — whether a short or a long time — the blindness befell him.

§100 (concl.). Proof of Tobias's late death: his blindness came after Sennacherib's death (Tob 1–2); Sennacherib was killed in/after Hezekiah's 14th yr (2 Kgs 18); Tobias bore blindness 4 yrs, then lived 42 more (Tob 14) — so he lived 46+ yrs after Hezekiah's 14th yr, far past Ozias's 7th. So Nineveh stood well beyond Eusebius's date.

But against the opinion of Diodorus — according to which the end of the Assyrian empire fell in the fourteenth year of Manasseh's reign — three

valid arguments can be made. One is taken from the history of Tobias, who did not die before the thirtieth year of king Manasseh, as I have shown, while Niniue was still standing. The second is sought from the history of Nechao king of Egypt in the fourth book of Kings, chapter twenty-three, who, Josiah being now dead — that is, more than thirty years after the death of Manasseh — contended with a great army against the king of the Assyrians: the Assyrian kingdom, therefore, was still standing at that time too. The third argument is drawn from the history of Herodotus, who in the first book writes that the city Niniue was stormed by Cyaxares king of the Medes, in the last part of his rule. But if anyone compare the chronology of Herodotus with sacred chronology, he will find that that storming of Niniue happened more than thirty years after the Babylonian captivity.

§101. Against Diodorus (end in Manasseh's 14th yr) — three arguments: (1) Tobias died no earlier than Manasseh's 30th yr, Nineveh still standing; (2) Nechao of Egypt fought the Assyrian king after Josiah's death (2 Kgs 23), 30+ yrs after Manasseh, so it still stood; (3) Herodotus: Cyaxares stormed Nineveh near his reign's end — by sacred chronology, 30+ yrs after the Babylonian captivity began. Margins: Diodorus refuted; Herodotus.

Finally, the history of the book of Judith seems plainly to oppose both Blessed Jerome, who refers the overthrow of Niniue to the time of Josiah's reign, and Bede and the Hebrews, who refer the destruction of that city to the first year of the reign of Nabuchodonosor; in whose opening is mentioned a certain Nabuchodonosor king of the Assyrians, holding a most powerful empire and reigning in the city Niniue. But what is narrated in that book, most judge to have occurred after the release of the Hebrews' captivity and their return to their fatherland, under the monarchy of the Persians: Eusebius indeed in the Chronicle, and Bede in the book On the Six Ages of the World, in the time of Cambyses; according to Blessed Augustine, while Cyrus reigned; but as it pleases Severus Sulpitius in the second book of the Sacred History, at the time when Artaxerxes, or Darius Ochus, reigned among the Persians — that is, more than two hundred years after the return of the Hebrews from the Babylonian captivity.

§102. Against Jerome (fall under Josiah) and Bede/Hebrews (Nabuchodonosor's 1st yr): the book of Judith names a Nabuchodonosor, king of the Assyrians, powerful and reigning in Nineveh — most date this after the captivity's release, under the Persians: Eusebius/Bede under Cambyses, Augustine under Cyrus, Severus Sulpitius under Artaxerxes/Darius Ochus (200+ yrs after the return). Margins: the opinion of Jerome, Bede, and the Hebrews examined; Eusebius; Bede; Augustine, City of God 18.26; Severus Sulpitius.

What, then, is our opinion, or rather conjecture? For my part I judge that, if we are unwilling to condemn and utterly cast off as false and contrary to the sacred letters what so many and so great authors have handed down concerning the overthrow of the Assyrian empire and of Niniue, we must necessarily say that neither the Assyrian kingdom nor the city Niniue was overthrown only once, but again and again was both demolished and laid waste, and again repaired and restored…

§103. Pererius's own conjecture: rather than condemn all the great authors as false, we must say Assyria and Nineveh were overthrown not once but repeatedly — destroyed and rebuilt again and again (continues p. 442). Margin: the author's opinion.

— p. 511 (PDF) · printed p. 442 —

…for just as it happened to the Jews, whose sovereignty was often shaken and repaired, and likewise the city Jerusalem; and just as the city Babylon was often taken, plundered, burned, and destroyed, as we have shown in the seventh book of our Commentaries on Daniel, where, having explained the last words of the fifth chapter of Daniel, we treated questions both about the kingdom of the Chaldeans and about the city Babylon in the sixth of those questions: so too one must judge it to have happened to the Assyrian kingdom and the city Niniue.

§103 (concl.). The analogy: as the Jews' rule and Jerusalem were often shaken and restored, and Babylon often taken, sacked, and burned (treated in his Commentaries on Daniel bk. 7, on Dan 5), so it was with Assyria and Nineveh. Margin: Babylon, Jerusalem, and Nineveh often overthrown and rebuilt.

The first ruin and overthrow of the Assyrian kingdom and the city Niniue, moreover, I believe to have been that which Jonah threatened while Ozias

reigned; but it was for a while deferred on account of the repentance of the Ninevites. That ruin, however, Nahum foretold as altogether to come, many years after, while Hezekiah reigned; and Tobias, a little before his death, announced it as now drawing near: which we think happened about the fortieth year of the reign of Manasseh.

§104. The first ruin = the one Jonah threatened under Ozias, deferred for the Ninevites' repentance; foretold as certain by Nahum (under Hezekiah) and as imminent by the dying Tobias — happening ~Manasseh's 40th yr. Margins: the first ruin of Nineveh, what it was and when; Tobit (last chapter).

Therefore Diodorus's opinion, affirming that the city Niniue and the Assyrian empire stood 1,360 years — the end of which years falls, as we have shown above, in the fourteenth year of the reign of Manasseh — is not far from our opinion, which we judge to be true or at least very like the truth. Wherefore, if to Diodorus's number of years we add about twenty-five years, we shall truly determine the Assyrian empire, from Ninus and from the founding of the city Niniue down to the fall of Sardanapalus and of that same city, at 1,390 years or thereabouts. From which it appears that, among all the opinions of the authors mentioned above, Diodorus's opinion is to be judged nearer the truth. Now, that after this first ruin of the city Niniue and the Assyrian kingdom it was again raised up and repaired, the history of Judith plainly demonstrates, as we have shown above — if, however, that befell while the Persian monarchy flourished, as has seemed to many; for there is a great dispute about this, and the case is still before the judge. Which controversy we have treated carefully, subtly, and copiously in the books which we have written On the Chronology of the whole Scripture of the Old Testament, and shall in time (if it please God) give to the public.

§105. Diodorus's 1,360 yrs (ending Manasseh's 14th yr) is near Pererius's view; adding ~25 yrs gives ~1,390 yrs (Ninus/founding of Nineveh → Sardanapalus's fall) — so Diodorus is closest to the truth. After the first ruin Nineveh was rebuilt (book of Judith) — whether under the Persians is disputed (treated in his forthcoming On the Chronology of the whole Old Testament). Margin: a more probable opinion on the duration of the Assyrian kingdom.

{But Mesraim begot Ludim, and Anamim, and Laabim, Nephtuim, and Phetrusim, and Chasluim: of whom came forth the Philistines and the Caphtorim.}

Gen 10:13–14 (verse lemma).

There is a passing over to another son of Cham, who is called Mesraim (says Augustine in book sixteen of the City of God, chapter three), and there are mentioned those whom he begot, not as individual men but as seven nations. And of the sixth, as of a sixth son, a nation is mentioned to have come forth which is called Philisthiim, whence they become eight. So far Augustine.

§106. Gen 10:13–14. Augustine (City of God 16.3): Mesraim's offspring are seven nations, not individuals; and from the sixth comes the nation Philisthiim, making eight (continues p. 443). Margin: Augustine.

— p. 512 (PDF) · printed p. 443 —

But Jerome, in the Hebrew Questions on Genesis upon this very place, writes thus: „Except Laabim, whence the Libyans were afterward named, and who were formerly called Phuteans, and Chasluim, who thereafter were called Philisthiim, whom we corruptly call Palestines; the other six nations are unknown to us: because, overthrown in the Ethiopic war, they have come to the oblivion of their former names. But they possessed the land from Gaza down to the farthest bounds of Egypt.“ So far Jerome, having borrowed it from Josephus.

§106 (concl.). Jerome (Hebrew Questions, from Josephus): except Laabim (whence the Libyans, formerly Phuteans) and Chasluim (whence the Philisthiim, our ‘Palestines’), the other six nations are unknown — destroyed in the Ethiopic war; they held the land from Gaza to the bounds of Egypt. Margins: Jerome; Josephus.

Of the aforesaid eight descendants of Mesraim, mention is made elsewhere in Scripture of only three: Ludim, Philisthiim, and Caphtorim. Ludim (whom it is allowed to call in Latin Ludaeans, as also the Caphtorim Caphtoreans) Jeremiah mentions in chapter 46, and Ezekiel in chapter 30;

and in both places the Latin translator renders the Hebrew word Ludim into Latin as ‘Lydians,’ not, indeed, understanding the Lydians who are peoples of Asia Minor, whom I should believe to have been begotten from another Lud, who is mentioned a little below in this very chapter among the sons of Shem. But the Ludim or Ludaeans of whom we now treat seem to have been African peoples, namely neighbors and allies of the Egyptians, and auxiliaries bringing forces to their king in war, as may be understood from both prophets whom I have just named. Jeremiah indeed in that place prophesying against the army of Nechao king of Egypt: „Mount the horses,“ he says, „and exult in the chariots, and let the brave come forth, Ethiopia and Libya holding the shield, and the Lydians snatching up and shooting arrows“: in Hebrew it is Chusaei and Phutaei and Ludim, whom we have shown above to be nations neighboring the Egyptians and confederate with them. For that ‘Lydians’ (as I said), in Hebrew it is ‘Ludim,’ whom we here call Ludaeans. It appears, therefore, that these peoples were joined with the Egyptians in situation, in spirit, and in covenant, as with the offspring chief of their stock. For Mesraim himself, from whom the Ludaeans were sown, was the first inhabitant and cultivator of the land of Egypt and the sower of the Egyptians. The same is also clear from the words of Ezekiel, which run thus: „Ethiopia and Libya and the Lydians (in Hebrew Ludim) and all the remaining common people, and Chub and the sons of the land of the covenant, shall fall with them by the sword.“

§107. Of Mesraim's eight, only three recur elsewhere: Ludim, Philisthiim, Caphtorim. Ludim (Heb.) is rendered ‘Lydians’ in Jer 46 and Ezek 30 — but these are African Ludaeans, Egypt's neighbors and military allies, distinct from the Asian Lydians (from a different Lud, a son of Shem below). Mesraim, founder of Egypt, was their ancestor — hence their close bond with Egypt. Margins: Ludim or Ludaeans; the passage of Jeremiah ch. 46.

The Philisthiim are in Hebrew named Pelisthiim, and the region itself Peleseth: the Septuagint translators often name them Allophyloi, that is, foreigners and of an external race: but the Greeks and Latins call them Palestines. These held the maritime coast of Chanaan which inclines

toward Egypt: wherefore in Exodus, chapter twenty-three, the Mediterranean Sea washing Palestine is called ‘the sea of the Philistines’; whose region is thus bounded in Joshua thirteen: „From the turbid river which waters Egypt, as far as the bounds of Accaron toward the north, is the land of Chanaan, which is divided into the five lordships of the Philistines, the Gazites, the Azotites, the Ascalonites, the Gethites, and the Accaronites.“ For those five cities, Gaza, Ascalon, Geth, Accaron, and…

§108. The Philistines (Heb. Pelisthiim; region Peleseth; LXX ‘Allophyloi’ = foreigners; Greek/Latin ‘Palestines’) held the Canaanite coast toward Egypt — hence the Mediterranean = ‘the sea of the Philistines’ (Exod 23). Bounded (Josh 13) from the Egyptian river to Accaron, divided into five lordships: Gaza, Azotus, Ascalon, Geth, Accaron (continues p. 444). Margin: the origin and territory of the Philistines.

— p. 513 (PDF) · printed p. 444 —

…Azotus were the metropolises of five provinces having their names from them, and were five small kingdoms or satrapies. This land of the Philistines, moreover, was afterward possessed by the tribe of Judah and of Simeon.

§108 (concl.). The five Philistine cities were metropolises of five provinces (five small kingdoms/satrapies); their land was later possessed by the tribes of Judah and Simeon.

But someone will say: if the Philistines were descendants of Mesraim, as is here said, and not of the descendants of Chanaan — whose land and region, when they were exterminated, God assigned to the Hebrews to inhabit and possess — why, I say, are the satrapies of the Philistines counted by Joshua among the land promised to the Hebrews? But the answer is at hand: for although the Palestines held that land in the time of Joshua, yet their region itself was to be reckoned as the land of the Canaanites. That is, the Canaanites had once held those places; as it is handed down in the book of Deuteronomy, chapter two, that the Heuaeans, who were without doubt descendants of Chanaan, once dwelt in villages as far as Gaza, but were driven out by the Caphtorim (the Latin renders Cappadoces), and those seats were occupied by them. Now, that the Caphtorim were of the same

race as the Philistines is manifest from this place; moreover in a certain place Scripture calls the Philistines the remnant of the Caphtorim, and elsewhere says that the Philistines came up from Caphtor. Therefore the Philistines too are reckoned under the name of the Canaanites. Whence Sophonias, chapter two: „Woe," he says, „to you who inhabit the cord of the sea, a nation of the lost: the word of the Lord upon you, Chanaan the land of the Palestines; and I will destroy you, so that there is no inhabitant in it."

§109. Objection: if the Philistines descend from Mesraim, not Chanaan, why does Joshua count their satrapies in the Promised Land? Answer: their region still counts as Canaanite — the Heuaei (descendants of Chanaan) once dwelt there to Gaza but were driven out by the Caphtorim (Vulg. 'Cappadoces,' Deut 2), kin of the Philistines (Scripture calls the Philistines 'the remnant of Caphtorim,' and says they 'came up from Caphtor'). So the Philistines too fall under the name 'Canaanites' (Zeph 2: 'Chanaan, land of the Palestines'). Margins: a doubt — since the Philistines were not of Chanaan's stock, how their territory pertained to the Hebrews' possession; Jer 7; Amos 9.

But those whom Moses in this place called Caphtorim, the Greek and Latin translator elsewhere always calls Cappadoces, and Caphtor Cappadocia. For in Deuteronomy, chapter two, it is thus written: „The Henaeans also, who dwelt in Haserim as far as Gaza, the Cappadoces expelled; who, having come out of Cappadocia, destroyed them and dwelt in their place." Where in Hebrew, for 'Cappadoces' is 'Caphtorim,' and for 'Cappadocia' is 'Caphtor.' In Jeremiah, chapter 47, the Palestines are called the remnant of Cappadocia: „The Lord," he says, „has laid waste the remnant of the island of Cappadocia." And the prophet Amos, in chapter nine, signifies that the Palestines are sprung and came from Caphtor: „Have not I," he says, „the Lord, made Israel to come up from the land of Egypt, and the Palestines from Cappadocia (in Hebrew Caphtor), and the Syrians from Cyrene?"

§110. 'Caphtorim' (Heb.) is always rendered 'Cappadoces,' and 'Caphtor' as 'Cappadocia,' by the Greek/Latin: Deut 2 (the Cappadoces from Cappadocia expelled the Henaei to Gaza); Jer 47 ('the remnant of the island of Cappadocia'); Amos 9 ('the Palestines from Cappadocia [Caphtor], the Syrians from Cyrene'). Margin: what nation Caphtorim was.

But whether by the word ‘Cappadocia’ and ‘Cappadocians’ one ought to understand the true Cappadocians who inhabit a very broad region next to Pontus and the mountain Taurus, or rather some other nation of the same name, either African or at least neighboring Egypt and Palestine, is obscure. For it would not be credible that the Caphtoreans came into Palestine from so far-off and remote a region as Cappadocia is, and, the Heuaeans being driven out thence, settled in their land. Just as the Syrians too are said to have been transferred into the Cyrenaic region or city, and to have come up thence, as Amos testifies in chapters 1 and 9 — although in Scripture this ought not to be understood of the Cyrenaic province commonly known and celebrated by the writers, which indeed is the first part of Africa itself, where by the Liby[an] sea…

§111. Whether ‘Cappadocia/Cappadocians’ means the true Cappadocia (near Pontus and Taurus) or another like-named nation, African or near Egypt/Palestine, is obscure: it is incredible that the Caphtoreans came from distant Cappadocia to settle in Palestine. Likewise the Syrians ‘from Cyrene’ (Amos 1 & 9) need not mean the famous Cyrenaica of Africa (continues to next batch). Margin: the word ‘Cyrene’ or ‘Cyrenaica’ to be understood in two ways in Scripture.

— p. 514 (PDF) · printed p. 445 —

…is girt by the Libyan sea, the province nearest the Nile; but [it may be understood] of some other province or city of the same name which was in the region of the Medes: for that the Syrians of Damascus were transferred thither is set forth in the fourth book of Kings, chapter 16: „The king of the Assyrians,“ it says, „went up to Damascus, laid it waste, and transferred its inhabitants to Cyrene, but killed Rasin the king of Syria.“ Here, however, as also in the prophet Amos, for the word ‘Cyrene’ the Hebrew has ‘Kir.’ Certainly Josephus in the ninth book of the Antiquities plainly hands down that the Syrians were carried off into the places of upper Media. Just as, therefore, by the word ‘Cyrene,’ with which the Latin translator rendered the Hebrew word ‘Kir,’ we do not understand Cyrene properly so called: so it is allowable to take the name ‘Cappadocia’ and ‘the Cappadocians,’ by which the Hebrew words ‘Caphtor’ and ‘Caphtorim’ are rendered, not for

the true Cappadocia but for some other region and nation called by a like name.

§111 (concl.). The ‘Cyrene’ to which the Syrians were deported (2 Kgs 16) = Hebrew ‘Kir’ (also in Amos), not the African Cyrene but a place in upper Media (Josephus, Antiquities bk. 9). So likewise ‘Cappadocia/Cappadocians’ (rendering Heb. Caphtor/Caphtorim) need not mean true Cappadocia but a like-named region/people. Margin: Josephus.

{And Chanaan begot Sidon his firstborn, the Hethite, the Jebusite, the Amorrhite, the Gergesite, the Hevite, the Aracite, the Sinite, the Aradian, the Samarite, and the Amathite: and by these were the peoples of the Canaanites disseminated.}

Gen 10:15–18 (verse lemma).

These eleven peoples begotten of the stock of Chanaan, Josephus and Blessed Jerome expound piecemeal. What, therefore, they have touched on, together with what has been noted by other learned men, and what it will be useful for the reader to know, we shall run over briefly in this place. First among the descendants of Chanaan are named the Sidonians, sprung from Sidon, who is said to have been the firstborn of Chanaan himself. The region of Sidon belonged to the tribe of Aser and bounded the land of promise by the promontory of its shore which in Numbers 34 is named Hor, which name the Latin translator there renders ‘the highest mountain.’ Sidon Scripture calls by the surname ‘the Great’ in Joshua 11 and 19 — not, indeed, by comparison with another lesser, such as never was, but on account of the ancient renown and glory of that city: for it shone so far that, as Strabo hands down in book 16, it once contended with Tyre, in doubtful struggle, for the primacy. Now the boasting of Tyre about its antiquity Isaiah signifies in chapter 23, and Pliny called it the parent of the most ancient cities. But because Isaiah named Tyre the daughter of Sidon, the palm of antiquity must be conceded to Sidon. Nay, that whole coast of the Phoenicians was once renowned under the name of the Sidonians, not of the Tyrians: for which cause also Homer, who often praises Sidon, does not even make mention of Tyre.

§112. Gen 10:15–18: Chanaan's eleven peoples (expounded by Josephus and Jerome). First the Sidonians (from Sidon, Chanaan's firstborn), in the tribe of Aser, bounding the land at Mt. Hor (Num 34). ‘Sidon the Great’ (Josh 11, 19) — for its ancient glory, contending with Tyre for primacy (Strabo bk. 16); Tyre boasted of its age (Isa 23; Pliny), but since Isaiah called Tyre Sidon's daughter, Sidon is older — the Phoenician coast bore the Sidonian name, and Homer praises Sidon but never names Tyre. Margins: Josephus; Jerome; the Sidonians; why Sidon is called ‘the Great’; Strabo; Tyre; Isaiah; Pliny; Homer.

— p. 515 (PDF) · printed p. 446 —

And although Justin in book 18 writes that Sidon was named from fish, of which there used to be the greatest abundance there (since the Phoenicians call a fisherman ‘Saidi,’ and to this day the city itself is called ‘Said’ by the common people): nevertheless the older, and indeed the first, origin of its name is to be sought from Sidon the firstborn of Chanaan himself, and this the city sufficiently betrays by its own name. As for what is usually said, that Sidon belonged to the lot of the Aserites, it is not to be so understood as that Sidon should be thought to have been under the laws and rule of the Hebrews — since it always retained a free sovereignty, and was always hostile and troublesome to the Hebrews, as is easy to understand from the prophecies of Ezekiel and Isaiah against it. By the word ‘Sidon’ and ‘Tyre,’ therefore, one ought to interpret the coast lying opposite Tyre and Sidon, at which the bounds of the land of the Hebrews ended. But about the city of Sidon and the nation of the Sidonians so many things have been handed down in sacred and profane letters that they require no new and special diligence of the interpreter in this place. Let us proceed, then, to the other descendants of Chanaan, and speak of them in the same order in which they are here recorded by Moses.

§113. Though Justin (bk. 18) derives ‘Sidon’ from fish (Phoenician ‘Saidi’ = fisherman; the city is still called ‘Said’), the older origin is Sidon, Chanaan's firstborn. Sidon's ‘belonging to Aser's lot’ does not mean it was under Hebrew rule — it kept a free sovereignty, ever hostile to the Hebrews (Ezekiel, Isaiah); ‘Sidon and Tyre’ here = the coast bounding Hebrew territory. Margin: Justin.

The Hethites are named in the second place. These inhabited the places which are around Bersabee, and which stretch upward and lie widely

around Hebron: for this the history of the double cave bought by Abraham, Genesis 23, demonstrates, and the words of Rebecca to her husband, by which she alleged the reason for sending Jacob into Mesopotamia, that she was unwilling that a wife be given to Jacob from the daughters of the Hethites. That the Hethites were renowned for giant bulk and strength and for the fame of warlike valor may be understood from the alarm of the Syrians, suspecting that the Hethites had been hired by the king of Israel against them, as is written in the fourth book of Kings, chapter 7. Since, therefore, that nation seemed most formidable and impregnable both for its valor and for the situation of its places, God made special mention of that nation as to be conquered by name and brought under the dominion of the Hebrews, as is read at the beginning of the book of Joshua. For the Hebrews could despair of overcoming the Hethites more than the other nations of that region, because in that nation the spies of Moses had beheld the Anakim, men of giant bulk, and had struck the whole people with such great fear by their report that they almost drove them to seek Egypt again.

§114. The Hethites (2nd), around Bersabee and Hebron (Abraham's cave, Gen 23; Rebecca's words on Jacob's marriage). Famed for giant size and warlike valor (the Syrians' alarm, 2 Kgs 7); God named them specially for conquest (start of Joshua), since Moses's spies saw the Anakim (giants) among them and so terrified Israel as nearly to drive them back to Egypt. Margin: the Hethites.

The Jebusites held the city Jerusalem, named from themselves Jebus; they held it, I say, down to the sovereignty of David, who, as is in the second book of Kings, chapter 5, having cast the Jebusites out thence, built there the city, which he also established as the seat of his kingdom. That the Jebusites too were robust and warlike one may conjecture from those things related in Numbers 13 and 2 Kings, chapter 5; and that the Jebusites could not be fully subdued and destroyed by the Hebrews is manifest from the book of Joshua, chapter 15, and Judges 1; finally, that they remained down to the reign of Solomon, who made them tributaries, the second book of Paralipomenon, chapter 8, testifies.

§115. The Jebusites held Jerusalem (named ‘Jebus’ from them) until David expelled them and made it his capital (2 Sam 5). Robust and warlike (Num 13; 2 Sam 5), never fully destroyed by the Hebrews (Josh 15; Judg 1), surviving as tributaries until Solomon (2 Chron 8). Margin: the Jebusites.

The Amorrhites dwelt across the Jordan, whose king was Og, conquered by Moses, and their land was assigned to the two tribes of Gad and Reuben and the half-tribe of Manasseh. The book of Numbers, chapter twenty-one, indicates that the Amorrhites were separated from the Moabites by the torrent Arnon…

§116. The Amorrhites dwelt across the Jordan (king Og, conquered by Moses); their land given to Gad, Reuben, and half-Manasseh; separated from Moab by the Arnon (Num 21) (continues p. 447). Margin: the Amorrhites.

— p. 516 (PDF) · printed p. 447 —

…separated. The Amorrhites, moreover, seem to have inhabited the whole of Chanaan in scattered and confused fashion: for when that nation had first occupied the kingdom of Seon and Og, soon, increased with a most numerous offspring, it sent out many colonies into the various parts of Chanaan. Some, indeed, settled around Antilibanus, Deuteronomy 1. Others not far from Cades Barne and the Amalekites, Genesis 14. Others, finally, in the mountains of Judaea, as may be learned from the report of the spies of Moses. It is no wonder, therefore, if the appellation of the Amorrhites is sometimes applied to any inhabitants whatever of the region of Chanaan. Certainly we read that by the name of the one nation of the Amorrhites all those nations which held the land promised to the Jews by God are signified, in Genesis 15, in those words: „For the iniquities of the Amorrhites are not yet complete.“

§116 (cont.). The Amorrhites spread scatteredly over all Canaan: from the realm of Seon and Og they sent colonies to Antilibanus (Deut 1), near Cades Barne and the Amalekites (Gen 14), and the mountains of Judaea (Moses's spies). Hence ‘Amorrhite’ is sometimes used for any Canaanite (Gen 15: ‘the iniquities of the Amorrhites are not yet complete’). Margin: Num 13.

That the Amorrhites themselves were, beyond the rest, impious, wicked, inhuman, and cruel may be conjectured from the words of the prophet

Ezekiel, chapter 16, by which he, to magnify the wickedness and impiety of the Jewish nation, said: „Thy father was an Amorrhite, and thy mother a Hethite," just as in Virgil Dido said to Aeneas: „No goddess was thy parent, nor was Dardanus the founder of thy race, false one; but bristling Caucasus begot thee on its hard crags, and Hyrcanian tigresses gave thee their teats." And the enormous stature and bodily strength of the Amorrhites the prophet Amos, in chapter two, though using a hyperbolic mode of speech, sufficiently declared in those words: „I destroyed the Amorrhite, whose height was the height of cedars, and he himself strong as an oak."

§116 (cont.). The Amorrhites especially impious and cruel (Ezek 16, 'thy father an Amorrhite, thy mother a Hethite,' to shame the Jews — like Dido's reproach of Aeneas in Virgil, Aeneid 4). Their giant stature and strength (Amos 2, hyperbolically: 'whose height was the height of cedars, strong as an oak'). Margins: the gigantic stature, strength, and impiety of the Amorrhites; Virgil, Aeneid 4.

Where the Hevites dwelt the book of Joshua signifies in chapter eleven, saying that the Hevite dwelt at the roots of Hermon in Maspha; and in the book of Judges, chapter 3, it is written that the Hevite dwelt on Mount Lebanon from Mount Baalhermon as far as the entrance of Emath. Now the same mountain is Hermon and Baalhermon, which is also called by other names Samir and Sarcon and Siron: it is, moreover, a part of Lebanon toward the East above the sources of the Jordan, and reaching to Trachonitis. There was another, lesser Hermon, not far from Mount Gelboe. But the Maspha which is here named is not the place to which the Israelites often used to assemble for the holding of assemblies, situated not far from Rama, which was only forty stadia distant from Jerusalem, as Josephus handed down in the eighth book of the Antiquities: but this Maspha belonged to Lebanon, as we said.

§117. The Hevites dwelt at the roots of Hermon in Maspha (Josh 11), on Lebanon from Baalhermon to the entrance of Emath (Judg 3) — Hermon/Baalhermon (also Samir, Sarcon, Siron), part of eastern Lebanon above the Jordan's sources, toward Trachonitis (a lesser Hermon lay near Gelboe). This Maspha (by Lebanon) is not the assembly-place near Rama (Josephus, Antiquities bk. 8). Margins: the Hevites; Josephus.

Some think the Hevites were named Rephaim, and were marked by that name in the book of Genesis near the end of the fifteenth chapter, where, in reviewing the Canaanite nations to be exterminated by God and whose land was to be assigned to the Hebrews, the Hevites are passed over in silence — who yet are generally elsewhere wont to be mentioned in the catalogue of those nations; but the Rephaim are named, who nowhere else are wont to be counted among those nations: so that it is easy to believe that the Rephaim were there set down in place of the Hevites, for…

§118. Some hold the Hevites = the Rephaim, named in Gen 15 (where the Hevites are omitted from the nations to be destroyed, but the otherwise-unlisted Rephaim appear) — so the Rephaim may stand for the Hevites (continues p. 448). Margin: the Hevites also named Rephaim.

— p. 517 (PDF) · printed p. 448 —

…Rabbi Nehemann thinks the Hevites were so called from serpents that dwell in the caverns of the earth, and on that account surnamed Rephaim, as if you should say ‘those of the underworld’ and ‘those acting beneath the earth,’ for Isaiah in chapter 26 seems to have used the word in that sense, just as Homer also imagined his Cyclopes to lurk in the dens and caverns of the mountains. Others, however, apply the word Rephaim to giants, so called because, through dread, all who behold them are deprived of strength and fall. On which matter we have disputed much in the first book of this second volume — which in number and order is the eighth — in the Disputation we treated concerning the Giants. Tostatus, however, on that fifteenth chapter of Genesis contends that in that place the same nation was denoted by two words: first indeed by the name of the Amorrhites, but afterward by the name Rephaim, because it is attested in the second and third chapters of Deuteronomy that the kings and nations of the Amorrhites were of giant bodily stature and strength. And although the book of Deuteronomy, chapter two, teaches that the Hevites were expelled by the Caphtorim, whom the Latin translator names Cappadocians, yet that the remnants of that nation remained down to the times of Joshua, and even down to the sovereignty of Solomon, is clear from the book of Joshua,

chapter 13, and the second book of Paralipomenon, chapter 8. Of the Gergesite, however, I have nothing special and proper to say.

§118 (concl.). On ‘Rephaim’: Rabbi Nehemann (Nachmanides) — from cave-serpents, = ‘the underworld ones’ (Isa 26; cf. Homer's cave-dwelling Cyclopes); others = ‘giants’ (who unstring with dread all who see them; treated in his Disputation on the Giants, bk. 1 of this 2nd vol. [= bk. 8]). Tostatus: in Gen 15 one nation is named twice — Amorrhites then Rephaim, both giant (Deut 2–3). The Hevites, expelled by the Caphtorim/‘Cappadocians’ (Deut 2), yet left remnants to Joshua's and Solomon's times (Josh 13; 2 Chron 8). Of the Gergesite, nothing special. Margins: Rabbi Nehemann; Homer; Tostatus.

The Aracite, says Jerome, founded Arce, a town situated over against Tripolis at the roots of Lebanon: not far from which there was another city by the name of Sin, which afterward, overthrown by the various chance of wars, kept for the place only its former name. The Aradians are those who possessed the island Aradus, separated from the Phoenician shore by a narrow strait. Ezekiel makes mention of the Aradian in the lament over Tyre, saying in the twenty-seventh chapter: „The inhabitants of Sidon and the Aradians were thy rowers.“ Pliny too makes mention of it in the fifth book, chapter 20, but especially Strabo, in the sixteenth book, writing thus: „On the rugged front of a certain harborless coast lies Aradus, namely between its harbor and Marathus, distant from the land twenty stadia. It is a certain rock surrounded by the sea, about seven stadia in circuit, full of dwellings, with so great a multitude of men that they inhabit houses lofty with many stories — the work, as they say, of certain fugitives from Sidon.“

§119. The Aracite founded Arce (over against Tripolis, at Lebanon's roots), near a city Sin (later war-ruined). The Aradians held the island Aradus (off the Phoenician coast) — Ezek 27 (‘the inhabitants of Sidon and the Aradians were thy rowers’), Pliny (bk. 5 ch. 20), and especially Strabo (bk. 16: a sea-girt rock, ~7 stadia round, packed with multi-storied houses, built by Sidonian fugitives). Margins: the Aracite; Jerome; the Aradians; Ezek 27; Strabo; Pliny.

The Samarites, whose noble city of Coele-Syria, according to Jerome, was Edessa: some conjecture that they gave the name to the city which was in the tribe of Benjamin, as is read in the book of Joshua, chapter 18; and that

city either gave its name to the mountain Samaraim, of which mention is made in the second book of Paralipomenon, chapter 13, which the Latin translator calls Semeron, or the city itself received its name from that mountain. The Sinite seems to have been an inhabitant of the desert of Sinai, or to have held the places neighboring that mountain. From these Sinites the Cinaeans were quite different, deriving their stock from Hobab the son of Raguel, who was the father-in-law of Moses, and who was not only the companion but, as it were, the guide of the Jews' pilgrimage in the desert. His descendants, admitted by the Jews within the possession of the land of Chanaan, dwelt partly among the Nephthalites, partly also mixed with the Amalekites, as from the book of Numbers, chapter…

§120. The Samarites: Jerome's noble Coele-Syrian city was Edessa; some link them to the Benjamite city (Josh 18) and Mt. Samaraim/Semeron (2 Chron 13). The Sinite: an inhabitant of the desert of Sinai or nearby. Quite distinct are the Cinaeans (Kenites), from Hobab son of Raguel, Moses's father-in-law and the desert-guide of the Jews; his descendants dwelt among the Nephthalites and mixed with the Amalekites (continues p. 449). Margins: the Samarites; Jerome; the Sinite; the difference between the Sinites and the Cinaeans.

— p. 518 (PDF) · printed p. 449 —

…chapter 11, from the book of Judges, chapters one and four, and from the first book of Kings, chapter fifteen, the reader will clearly learn. But just as the Hebrews cut off and destroyed those Sinites, so that these Cinaeans would be destroyed by the Assyrians Balaam foretold in the book of Numbers, chapter 24. The Amathites gave their name to the city and region Hamath or Hemath, which is sometimes written with aspiration ‘Hemath,’ but more frequently without aspiration ‘Emath.’

§120 (concl.). The Cinaeans' dwellings are clear from Num 11, Judg 1 & 4, 1 Sam 15. As the Hebrews destroyed the Sinites, so Balaam foretold the Assyrians would destroy the Cinaeans (Num 24). The Amathites named the city/region Hamath/Emath (sometimes aspirated ‘Hemath,’ usually ‘Emath’). Margin: the Amathites.

NINTH DISPUTATION. On Emath.

Liber XV, Disputation 9 (title): the city of Emath.

What city Emath was, and where situated, although very frequent mention is made of it in the sacred letters, is nevertheless not plainly explored and certain. I shall set forth what has been handed down by learned men in their writings on the matter. Blessed Jerome, in the Hebrew Questions on Genesis, on this tenth chapter of Genesis: „Amath," he says, „down to our time, both by the Assyrians and by the Hebrews, is called just as it had been called among the ancients. The Macedonians, who reigned in the East after Alexander, named it Epiphania; some think Antiochia was so called: others, though not truly, yet comforting their own opinion with a quasi-plausible word, think that Emath is the name given to the first station from Antiochia for those going to Edessa, and that it is the same which among the ancients was called Emath." The same in the book On the Hebrew Places: „In Isaiah, chapter ten," he says, „Emath is the city of Damascus, which the king of the Assyrians assaulted; Zacharias and Ezekiel make mention of this. Amos too, chapter 6, calls it Emath Rabba, which sounds 'Emath the Great.' This was afterward called Epiphania, near Emessa, which to this day is so called in the Syrian tongue." And at the opening of the third book of his commentaries on the prophet Amos, explaining those words 'Pass over thence into Emath rabba': „This city," he says, „is now named Antiochia. But he calls it Rabba, that is, the Great, for distinction from the lesser Emath which is called Epiphania. Whence to this day, for those going to Mesopotamia, the first station is called Emas — a corrupt word indeed, but retaining traces of the former name — whose region is called Reblatha, in which, in the presence of Nabuchodonosor, the sons of king Sedechias were slain and his eyes blinded, as you have in the fourth book of Kings, chapter 25." Finally the same Jerome, on those words of Zacharias 'Emath also in its borders': „Emath," he says, „is the very one which, founded by Antiochus Epiphanes and taking its name from him, was called Epiphania, and now is a city of Coele-Syria."

§121. Disp. 9 opens: Emath, though often named in Scripture, is of uncertain identity. Jerome's varied statements (Hebrew Questions; On Hebrew Places; on Amos; on Zacharias): the Macedonians named it Epiphania; some say Antiochia; Isa 10 makes it Damascus's city; Amos 6 'Emath Rabba' (the

Great) = later Antiochia, vs the lesser Emath = Epiphania (near Emessa); the first station toward Mesopotamia, 'Emas,' in the region Reblatha (where Sedechias's sons were killed and he was blinded, 2 Kgs 25). Margins: Jerome; Emath the Great; double Emath — the Great called Antiochia, the lesser Epiphania.

It appears, therefore, from these few things which we have produced from the various writings of Blessed Jerome, that there were two Emaths, and that mention is made of each in the sacred letters: the one which is the boundary of the children of Israel toward the North and is called the lesser, of which is understood that phrase frequently used in the sacred letters, 'As far as the entrance or approach of Emath' — this…

§121 (cont.). Conclusion from Jerome: there were two Emaths in Scripture. The lesser = Israel's northern boundary ('as far as the entrance of Emath') (continues p. 450).

— p. 519 (PDF) · printed p. 450 —

…was afterward called Epiphania, the region of which city is called Reblatha. The other is named Emath the Great, and according to Jerome was afterward named Antiochia: which Josephus, in the fifth book of the Jewish War, chapter 1, says was the metropolis of Syria, and held the third place among the most famous cities of the Roman world.

§121 (concl.). The lesser Emath = Epiphania (region Reblatha); the greater = Emath Magna, later Antiochia (Josephus, Jewish War bk. 5: metropolis of Syria, third among the Roman world's cities). Margin: Josephus.

Andreas Masius, a man of polished judgment and no common erudition, what he had both received from others about the city Emath, and judged by his own conjecture, setting forth in writing, says: „Syrian men of those regions, well skilled, as they seemed, told me that the city Emmas stands far above Damascus; but that, to one going farther into Alapia (as they call it) and Mesopotamia, there occurs also another city, now called by the common people Hamath.“ Concerning all which I conjecture that the greater Hemath, which Jerome speaks of and which the Syrians name Amath, is the one which Ptolemy names Antiochia; but the one which both

name Emmas is, to Ptolemy, Epiphania; but that one of these is the one which Jeremiah and Zacharias celebrated as a town of Damascus is by no means credible, since Ptolemy places Antiochia two and a half degrees, but Epiphania up to one and a half degrees, higher than Damascus. Wherefore by conjecture I surmise that there was also a third city called Hemath, and another Rebla: for that a certain city existed beside Sephana below the rising of the Jordan is certain from the thirty-fourth chapter of the book of Numbers, and from it, it appears, was not far distant what Scripture is wont to call the entrance or approach of Emath, which place too I suspect was named Emath.

§122. Andreas Masius (on Josh 9): Syrians told him of ‘Emmas’ far above Damascus, and another city now called ‘Hamath’ toward Aleppo/Mesopotamia. He conjectures the greater Hemath = Ptolemy's Antiochia, ‘Emmas’ = Ptolemy's Epiphania; neither can be a town of Damascus (per Ptolemy's coordinates). He surmises a third city ‘Hemath’ (and another ‘Rebla’) near Sephana below the Jordan's source (Num 34) — the scriptural ‘entrance of Emath.’ Margins: Masius on Josue 9; Ptolemy.

Others follow Zigler, a writer on Geography neither unlearned nor careless, who in his ‘Palestine’ interpreted Emath as Ituraea. For from the sacred letters it is understood that Emath is situated beyond Lebanon toward Damascus at the Trachon mountains, which belong to the highlands of Galaad, in which direction Ituraea faces: and this is not obscurely perceived from the boundaries of the land promised to the Hebrews, which are defined in Numbers 34. And so it is far from the truth, what some have handed down, that Emath was part of the land of Chanaan promised to the Hebrews and belonged to the tribe of Nephtalim; since in Joshua, chapter 13, the entrance of Emath — that is, the confines of Ituraea — is set as the limit of the promised land; and in the first book of Paralipomenon, chapter 18, there is mentioned Thou king of Emath, friend of king David, holding that region even at the time when David reigned most widely and most prosperously. But if Emath had belonged to the land promised to the Hebrews, David would surely not have allowed it — especially adorned with so great a favor of God and so great a success of affairs — to be

occupied by aliens. For as to what is read in the second book of Paralipomenon, chapter eight, that Solomon went into Emath Soba and occupied it, the followers of this opinion think it must be interpreted from what had previously been written in the first book of Paralipomenon, chapter 18: that David smote Adarezer king of Soba of the region of Emath, when he was advancing to enlarge his kingdom and extend it as far as the Euphrates. Solomon, therefore, claimed for himself Soba…

§123. Others follow Zigler (a sound geographer): in his 'Palestine' he made Emath = Ituraea — beyond Lebanon toward Damascus at the Trachon mountains (highlands of Galaad), the limit of the Promised Land (Num 34; Josh 13). So it is wrong that Emath belonged to the Promised Land / tribe of Nephtalim: Thou king of Emath was David's ally (1 Chron 18) holding it at David's height; David would not have left a promised land in alien hands. Solomon's taking 'Emath Soba' (2 Chron 8) = reclaiming Soba (which David had smitten under king Adarezer, 1 Chron 18) (continues p. 451). Margin: Zigler.

— p. 520 (PDF) · printed p. 451 —

…which had belonged to king Adarezer, conquered by his father. Now Soba was of the region of Emath. And so Solomon took Soba, but left Emath untouched.

§123 (concl.). Solomon reclaimed Soba (formerly Adarezer's, conquered by his father David); Soba was within the region of Emath, but Solomon left Emath itself untouched.

But against the opinion of these men makes the fact that in the book of Joshua, chapter 19, among the cities that belonged to the tribe of Nephthali, Emath is mentioned: which, however, these men, trying in any way to evade it, answer that that Emath was different from the former one which belonged to Syria of Damascus, as may be perceived from chapter 49 of Jeremiah; and that the difference of the two is declared also by the different orthography with which the names of those two cities are written among the Hebrews. But I rather assent to Blessed Jerome and gladly cleave to his opinion: for that man was most skilled in those regions and places, not only from the learning of sacred and profane letters, which in him was great and exquisite, but also because he himself in person visited, traversed, and most

curiously contemplated all those places.

§124. Against Zigler's followers: Josh 19 lists an Emath among the cities of Nephthali — they reply this Emath differs from the Damascene one (per Jer 49 and a different Hebrew spelling). But Pererius rather sides with Jerome, most skilled in these regions both by learning and by having personally visited and surveyed the places. Margin: Jerome.

But one knot must here be untied before we go off from here to the other things that follow: why in this place, among the sons of Chanaan, by whom was possessed the land promised to the Hebrews by God and in time delivered, there are not mentioned the Pherezites as well as the Chananeans — who nevertheless, both in this very book a little below, chapter 15, and in Exodus, chapter 23, nay even in the books of Numbers, Deuteronomy, and Joshua, are reckoned among the nations that dwelt in and held the land promised to the Hebrews, out of which they were to be eliminated by God: for that these drew their stock from Chanaan himself and were begotten of his line is not to be doubted. But this knot is to be untied in this manner: that the Pherezites were the same whom Moses in this place names the Samarites, by whom the region of Samaria was first inhabited and named. For it is manifest from the sacred letters that the Pherezites dwelt around Samaria. Unless one wish to say that the Pherezites were not among the first or nearest sons of Chanaan who are reviewed here by Moses, but were sprung from their descendants and adopted a name for themselves.

§125. A knot: why are the Pherezites and Chananeans not listed here among Chanaan's sons, though elsewhere (Gen 15; Exod 23; Numbers/Deuteronomy/Joshua) they are reckoned among the nations of the Promised Land — surely of Chanaan's line? Solution: the Pherezites = the ‘Samarites’ Moses names here (the Pherezites dwelt around Samaria) — or else they sprang from descendants and took their own name. Margin: a question — why Moses did not mention the Pherezites and Chananeans here.

The same may be thought of the Chananeans, who descended from one of the eleven sons of Chanaan whom Moses here enumerates: but for the sake of either piety or honor they adopted for themselves the name of Chanaan, who had been the parent and author of all those nations. But when first that nation of the Pherezites and Chananeans, or at least their appellation, began

in that land, is unknown; except that, when Abraham first came from Mesopotamia into the land of Chanaan, we read that he found the dwellers and inhabitants of that land to be the Pherezites and Chananeans, in the book of Genesis, chapter 13…

§126. Likewise the Chananeans descended from one of Chanaan's eleven sons but took the name 'Chanaan' (parent of all those nations) for piety/honor. When these nations or their names began is unknown — only that Abraham, coming from Mesopotamia, found the Pherezites and Chananeans dwelling there (Gen 13) (continues p. 452).

— p. 521 (PDF) · printed p. 452 —

…It is indeed fitting to know that those seven nations which dwelt in and held that land are signified in sacred Scripture sometimes by more names, sometimes by fewer: for it is quite credible that in a most populous region diverse and very many families dwelt. Nor indeed is it certain that the same were always called by the same names.

§126 (concl.). Note: the seven Canaanite nations are named in Scripture sometimes by more, sometimes fewer names — credibly, many diverse families dwelt in so populous a region, and they were not always called by the same names.

Of the aforesaid eleven peoples who sprouted from the stock of Chanaan, five were cut off and destroyed by the Hebrews: I mean the Amorrhites, the Hethites, the Hevites, the Jebusites, and the Gergesites; and besides these, two other nations, one of the Pherezites, the other of the Chananeans. For these seven nations, which held the land promised to the Hebrews by God, God commanded the Hebrews, on entering that land, to destroy utterly without any pity or exception, as is written in Deuteronomy, chapter 7. And because those seven nations far surpassed the Hebrews both in number and in strength and warlike valor, lest for that cause they should despair of their destruction, God through Joshua, chapter three, promised that He would destroy those nations: and that those nations were indeed destroyed, Blessed Paul, as is in the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 13, confirmed in plain words. But, just as it is not to be doubted that those nations were for the greatest part destroyed, so it cannot be denied that remnants of them

remained there for a long time. Certainly that they existed even while Solomon reigned, the latter book of Paralipomenon, chapter eight, does not allow us to doubt. For thus it is written there: „All the people that was left of the Hethites, Amorrhites, Pherezites, Hevites, and Jebusites, who were not of the stock of Israel — of their children and of the descendants whom the children of Israel had not slain — Solomon subjugated as tributaries unto this day.“

§127. Of the eleven, five were destroyed by the Hebrews (Amorrhites, Hethites, Hevites, Jebusites, Gergesites), plus two more (Pherezites, Chananeans) = the seven nations God commanded utterly destroyed (Deut 7), promising it through Joshua (Josh 3), confirmed by Paul (Acts 13). Yet remnants long survived — even under Solomon (2 Chron 8: he made the leftover Hethites/Amorrhites/Pherezites/Hevites/Jebusites tributaries). Margin: which of the aforesaid nations were destroyed by the Hebrews.

{And the borders of Chanaan were, as one comes from Sidon to Gerara, even to Gaza, until you enter Sodom, Gomorrah, Adama, and Seboim, as far as Lasa.}

Gen 10:19 (verse lemma).

Since the Hebrews were, by the promise and gift of God, to possess those regions which the aforesaid descendants of Chanaan inhabited, therefore Moses in this place so distinctly and carefully describes the bounds of that land on every side. For he says that the boundary of their land on the North was Pentapolis; toward the South, Gerara; finally, toward the West, Gaza, which lay next to the great sea — that is, the Mediterranean — which is wont to be set as the western boundary of the land of promise in the sacred letters. But the bounds of the land which that nation, properly called Chananea (and which was one, but the chief, of those seven), possessed, are otherwise designated in the book of Joshua, chapter 13, in those words: „From the turbid river which waters Egypt, as far as the bounds of Accaron toward the north, is the land of Chanaan, which is divided into the five lordships of the Philistines, the Gazites, the Azotites, the Ascalonites, the Gethites, and the Accaronites,“ etc. For of these Chananeans some were

Eastern, dwelling beside the streams of the Jordan; others Western, inhabiting the coast of the great or Mediterranean sea, which in Scripture is called Palestine and by the Greeks Phoenicia. And when the Chananeans had been cast out thence, the Philistines occupied their seats. But let us briefly set forth the boundaries of that land here described by Moses.

§128. Gen 10:19. Since the Hebrews would possess this land, Moses carefully bounds it: north = Pentapolis, south = Gerara, west = Gaza by the Mediterranean (the usual western limit). The nation properly 'Chananea' (the chief of the seven) is bounded otherwise (Josh 13: from the Egyptian river to Accaron, the five Philistine lordships). These Chananeans were partly Eastern (by the Jordan), partly Western (the coast, called Palestine/Phoenicia); when cast out, the Philistines took their seats (continues p. 453).

— p. 522 (PDF) · printed p. 453 —

Sidon, says Jerome, a notable city of Phoenicia, was once the boundary of the Canaanites looking toward the North, and afterward of the region of Judaea. It fell into the lot of the tribe of Aser, but it did not possess it, because it could by no means expel the enemies. Gerara, from whose name the region beyond Daroma is now called Geratica — far from Eleutheropolis, twenty-five miles to the south — was once the boundary of the Canaanites on the southern side. Scripture records that it was between Cades and Sur, that is, between two wildernesses, of which one is joined to Egypt, to which the Hebrew people came across the strait of the Red Sea; the other, which is called Cades, extends as far as the desert of the Saracens. Gaza was once a city of the Hevites, in which the Cappadocians dwelt, the former cultivators having been killed; among the ancients it was the boundary of the Canaanites next to Egypt, and it fell into the lot of the tribe of Judah; but it could not hold it, because the Anakim — that is, the strongest giants of the Philistines — resisted, and to this day it is a notable city of Palestine. But it is asked, how is it said by a certain prophet that Gaza shall be an everlasting heap? Which is thus solved: that the place of the ancient city scarcely offers traces of its foundations; but that this one which is now seen was built in another place in place of the one that fell. Thus far from Saint Jerome.

§129. Jerome (On Hebrew Places) on the borders: Sidon (a Phoenician city, the northern bound, in Aser's lot but unconquered); Gerara (whence 'Geratica,' 25 mi S of Eleutheropolis, the southern bound, between Cades and Sur); Gaza (once a Hevite city, then held by the 'Cappadocians'/Caphtorim, the bound by Egypt, in Judah's lot but unheld for the Anakim/Philistine giants). The prophet's 'Gaza an everlasting heap' is solved: the ancient site is bare, the present Gaza built elsewhere. Margins: Jerome, On the Hebrew Places; Sidon; Gerara; Gen 20; Exod; Gaza.

Finally, to signify the eastern boundary of the same land, Pentapolis is marked — Segor, however, being omitted on account of its smallness and ignobility. But Lasa (this the Greek translators called Dasa) Blessed Jerome thinks to have been the one which in his time was called Callirrhoe, where hot waters bursting forth flow down into the Dead Sea. Of which place Pliny too makes mention in book 5, chapter 16. For, speaking of the Asphaltite Lake — which in the sacred letters is called the most salt sea — he says thus: „Toward the East, the Arabia of the Nomads looks upon it; toward the South, Macherus, once the second citadel of Judaea after Jerusalem. On the same side is the hot spring of medicinal healthfulness, Callirrhoe, displaying the glory of its waters by its very name." But it does not seem to agree well enough with this description and determination of the land of the Canaanites, what is noted in the book On the Hebrew Places: that Lasa was the boundary of the Canaanites around Sidon.

§130. The eastern boundary = Pentapolis (Segor omitted as small/obscure). Lasa (LXX 'Dasa'): Jerome thinks it = the Callirrhoe of his day — hot springs flowing into the Dead Sea (Pliny bk. 5 ch. 16, on the Asphaltite Lake/Dead Sea, with Macherus and the spring Callirrhoe). But this conflicts with Jerome's note (On Hebrew Places) that Lasa was the Canaanite boundary near Sidon. Margins: Callirrhoe; Jerome; Pliny.

{Of Sem also, the father of all the children of Heber, the elder brother of Japheth, there were born children.}

Gen 10:21 (verse lemma).

The Hebrew reading of this place Pagninus expressed thus: „And to Sem himself there was born. He himself also is the father of all the children of Heber, the elder brother of Japheth." But the Seventy rendered the same

place thus: „And Sem was born, to him also the father of all the children of Heber, the brother of the elder Japheth.“ Saint Augustine, in the sixteenth book of the City of God, chapter 3, partly connecting the aforesaid words with what precedes, partly briefly expounding them, writes in this manner: „It remains to mention the sons of Sem, the greatest son of Noah. For to him, step by step, the narrative of these generations, having begun from the least, has come. But whence the sons of Sem begin to be mentioned has something of obscurity, which…“

§131. Gen 10:21. The variant readings: Pagninus (Hebrew) — ‘to Sem was born; he is father of all Heber's children, the elder brother of Japheth’; the LXX — ‘brother of the elder Japheth.’ Augustine (City of God 16.3): it remains to mention the sons of Sem, the greatest son of Noah; the wording has some obscurity (continues p. 454). Margins: Pagninus; Augustine.

— p. 523 (PDF) · printed p. 454 —

…must be illustrated by exposition, because it pertains much to the matter we are inquiring into. For it is thus read: ‘And Sem was born, to him also the father of all the children of Heber, the brother of the elder Japheth.’ The order of the words is: ‘And to Sem too was born Heber,’ that is, to Sem himself also was born Heber — which Sem is the father of all the children. Sem, therefore, he wished to be understood as the Patriarch of all who sprang from his stock, whom he is about to mention, whether they be sons or grandsons and great-grandsons and thence onward sprung from the same. Now Sem is said to have been the father of Heber, although he is found fifth in the series of forebears: Heber, I say, was first named in the progeny of Sem, and was preferred even to his sons, for no other cause than that it is true, as is handed down, that from him the Hebrews were surnamed as if ‘Heberaeans’; and then, one letter removed, ‘Hebraeans.’ Which tongue the people of Israel alone obtained — in which people the city of God both sojourned among the saints and was foreshadowed in all the sacraments.“ So far Augustine.

§131 (concl.). Augustine's exposition: ‘And to Sem too was born Heber’ — Sem is the Patriarch of all his line (sons, grandsons, etc.). He is called ‘father of Heber’ though Heber is fifth in descent, because

Heber is named first and preferred, since from him the Hebrews are named (‘Heberaeans’ → ‘Hebrews’) — the tongue Israel alone kept, in which the city of God sojourned and was foreshadowed in all the sacraments.

But in Augustine's words there are some things to be noted. First, that he reads that Sem was the elder brother of Japheth by birth, whereas the Greek codices now have the contrary. Next, the order of these words which Augustine arranged is excluded by both the Hebrew and the Latin reading, in which that phrase ‘Of Sem there was born’ or ‘there were born’ coheres by itself, and is not joined with what follows, and least of all with Heber. For it is signified that to Sem too there was not lacking offspring and progeny — nay, that it was very numerous and noble. The reason, likewise, why Sem was especially called the father of Heber, expounded by Augustine, I for my part approve. For Moses seems to have said this on purpose, to commend the dignity of Sem, who was the patriarch of the Hebrew people and of so many other patriarchs, kings, and prophets who flourished in that people.

§131 (cont.). Remarks on Augustine: (1) he reads Sem as Japheth's elder brother, though the Greek codices now read the contrary; (2) his word-order is excluded by both Hebrew and Latin, where ‘Of Sem there was/were born’ stands by itself, not joined to ‘Heber’ — signifying Sem too had a numerous, noble progeny. Pererius approves Augustine's reason why Sem is called ‘father of Heber’: Moses did it to commend Sem's dignity as patriarch of the Hebrews and of so many patriarchs, kings, and prophets.

TENTH DISPUTATION. Whether Sem was the eldest-born of the sons of Noah.

Liber XV, Disputation 10 (title): was Sem the eldest of Noah's sons?

That Sem was earlier in birth than Cham himself is manifest from the preceding chapter 9: for Cham is there called precisely the ‘younger’ son of Noah, which among the Hebrews means the same as a ‘little’ or ‘least’ son. The whole contention, therefore, is between Sem and Japheth, about the primacy of birth. And although this seems to argue that Sem was the firstborn of the sons of Noah — that always in Scripture, when the sons of

Noah are named, Sem is reckoned first of all, as in this book chapters 5, 6, 9, 10, and at the beginning of the first book of Paralipomenon — and some bring this forward as a great argument to prove that very thing: nevertheless this does not seem to have great force.

§132. Disp. 10 opens: Sem was older than Cham (Gen 9 calls Cham the 'younger,' i.e. least, son). The real contention is Sem vs. Japheth for the birth-primacy. Sem is always named first (Gen 5, 6, 9, 10; 1 Chron 1) — some make this a great argument for his being firstborn, but it does not seem to have much force (continues to next batch). Margin: Sem older than Cham.

— p. 524 (PDF) · printed p. 455 —

…seems [not to have great force]. For Cham too is recorded second among the sons of Noah, who nevertheless, as I said a while ago, was plainly the least of all. Similarly Isaac is named before Ismael, and Jacob before Esau, not on account of earlier birth but on account of the prerogative of election and of divine blessing, and their greater dignity. Although it is not clear enough why Cham is always named before Japheth, since he was later than he both in birth and in dignity. And although in this place, according to the Latin reading — which has that Sem was the elder brother of Japheth — it clearly appears that Sem was the eldest of the sons of Noah: yet because according to the Hebrew reading this is ambiguous and doubtful, and according to the Greek reading the matter rather seems to be the contrary, therefore many have thought that Sem was younger than Japheth. Let us, then, explain this controversy briefly.

§132 (cont.). Naming-order proves little: Cham is named second though least; Isaac before Ismael, Jacob before Esau (by election, not birth); and Cham, though later, is always named before Japheth. The Latin reading makes Sem the eldest, but the Hebrew is ambiguous and the Greek suggests the opposite — so many think Sem younger than Japheth.

For that word 'elder,' when it is said 'Japheth the elder,' in Hebrew it is hagadol, and that 'ha' is indeed an article having emphasis among the Hebrews, as also among the Greeks. But 'gadol' means 'great,' not 'greater,' because the Hebrews lack comparatives, and to declare the excess of comparison they use a preposition with a pronoun, as 'min hu,'

that is ‘than he,’ as is read of the Publican in the Gospel: ‘This man went away justified rather than the other.’ Here there is no such preposition, wherefore the sense of the Hebrew reading is that Sem was the brother of Japheth that great one. But because ‘gadol,’ that is ‘great,’ is indeclinable (for the Hebrews lack cases), the noun can be taken either in the genitive or in the ablative. If it be taken in the genitive, it is joined with the name Japheth, and the sense is: that Sem was the brother of Japheth the great — that is, who was great or greater than his other brothers. But if it be taken in the ablative, it must necessarily be joined with the word Sem, and will render this sense: that sons were born of Sem the elder brother of Japheth himself.

§133. The Hebrew ‘hagadol’ (Japheth ‘the great’): ‘ha’ is the emphatic article; ‘gadol’ = ‘great,’ not ‘greater’ (Hebrew lacks comparatives, expressing them with a preposition, e.g. ‘min hu’ = ‘than he,’ as in the Publican of Lk 18 — absent here). Being indeclinable, ‘gadol’ can be genitive (Sem brother of Japheth ‘the great,’ greatest of the brothers) or ablative (joined to Sem: sons born of Sem, the elder brother of Japheth). Margin: Lk 18.

This reading I rather approve and embrace: first, because our Latin translation has it; then, because the Greek or Latin codex which Augustine followed in book 16 of the City of God, chapter 3, contains the same reading and sense, and Augustine himself in more than one place affirmatively said that Sem was the eldest of the sons of Noah; the ambiguity of the Hebrew reading too Cajetan, Pagninus, and Vatablus applied rather to this sense. A probable reason also persuades this very thing. Altogether, the things which Moses here relates about Sem pertain to commending the excellence of his dignity — as that he was the father of all the children of Heber, that is, of the Hebrew people, and of so many and so great men who shone in that people. Therefore what he subjoins, that he was the great brother of Japheth, likewise looks to his commendation. For to what purpose, in this place, would Moses, signifying the dignity of Sem, have said that he was the brother of a Japheth greater than himself?

§134. Pererius approves the reading ‘Sem the elder brother of Japheth’ (= Sem eldest): the Vulgate, Augustine's codex (City of God 16.3, affirming Sem the eldest), and Cajetan/Pagninus/Vatablus

applying the Hebrew ambiguity this way. Reason confirms it: all Moses says of Sem here commends his dignity (father of Heber's line = the Hebrews and its great men), so 'the great brother of Japheth' must too — Moses would not commend Sem by calling him brother of a greater Japheth. Margins: Augustine; the argument of the Hebrews that Sem was the least of his brothers.

But let us set forth and weigh also the contrary opinion. The Hebrews, in those Commentaries which they have published on this place, hand down…

§135. The contrary opinion of the Hebrews begins (continues p. 456).

— p. 525 (PDF) · printed p. 456 —

…they hand down that Sem was the last of the sons of Noah, Cham the second, and finally Japheth the first; although some assign even the first place to Cham. Lyra and Tostatus followed the Hebrews, and handed down the same when they explain the last words of the fifth chapter of the book of Genesis. Genebrardus too thinks that opinion most probable in his Chronology. That Sem was the latest of his brothers these men argue in this manner: Noah began to beget sons in the five-hundredth year of his age, for this Moses hands down at the end of the fifth chapter of this book: therefore the firstborn of Noah was born in his five-hundredth year; but that Sem was born not in the five-hundredth but in the five-hundred-and-second year of Noah is evidently gathered from chapter 11 of Genesis, where it is written that Sem, two years after the flood, when he begot his son Arphaxad, was a hundred years old; and the flood happened in the six-hundredth year of Noah's life. Therefore Noah in the five-hundredth year begot Japheth; in the five-hundred-and-first year begot Cham; and in the five-hundred-and-second year begot Sem. And since the flood came in the six-hundredth year, therefore it was rightly said in Genesis 11 that two years after the flood Sem was a hundred years old. So these men.

§135 (concl.). The Hebrews (followed by Lyra, Tostatus, Genebrardus) make Sem the youngest, Cham second, Japheth first. Argument: Noah began begetting at 500 (Gen 5), so the firstborn was born then; but Sem was 100 two years after the flood (Gen 11), and the flood was Noah's 600th year — so

Noah begot Japheth at 500, Cham at 501, Sem at 502. Margins: Lyra; Tostatus; Genebrardus; Gen 6.

But this reasoning is little firm. How Cajetan dissolves that reasoning (since it makes most for the matter now in hand) it will not be unwelcome to the reader to learn from his own words. Thus, then, Cajetan, explaining that place from chapter 11 of Genesis mentioned a little above, says: „From this place, because two years after the flood Sem is described as having been a hundred years old, they say the Hebrews infer that Sem was not the firstborn of Noah. For since Noah, being five hundred years old, began to beget, as is plain from the end of the fifth chapter, his firstborn must have been a hundred and two years old two years after the flood. But this reasoning is ineffective, and against the letter of Moses. Against the letter, indeed, because from chapter 10 it is gathered that Sem was the grand or great brother in respect of Japheth, and in chapter 9 it was said that Cham was the little son of Noah: and these things make manifest that Sem was the firstborn of Noah. It is, moreover, also an ineffective reasoning: both because the letter does not say that Sem, when he was a hundred years old, begot Arphaxad, but there are two clauses with a conjunction interposed — one has ‘Sem, son of a hundred years’ (in the Hebrew manner understanding the substantive verb ‘was’), the other ‘And he begot Arphaxad two years after the flood’; and because the manner of speaking in Sacred Scripture is less precisely weighed. For at the close of the fifth chapter, too, Noah is said, when he was five hundred years old, to have begotten Sem, Cham, and Japheth: but it is agreed that Noah did not beget these three in that same year, unless one say they were begotten at the same birth — which, however, would be against these Hebrews. But the true sense is that he begot those sons not before the five-hundredth year, but after it. Without doubt, therefore, what Scripture testifies is to be embraced: that Sem was the firstborn. But whether he was exactly a hundred years old two years after the flood is not certain. For it can be understood that he was begotten in the second year after Noah's five-hundredth year, so that two years after the flood he had not exceeded

the age of a hundred years. It can also be understood that he was begotten in that very five-hundredth [year…]“

§136. Cajetan dissolves the Hebrews' argument (quoted): it is against the letter (Gen 10 makes Sem the ‘great’ brother, Gen 9 Cham the ‘little’ son — so Sem firstborn), and weak, since the verse is two clauses (‘Sem a hundred years old’ + ‘he begot Arphaxad two years after the flood’), and Scripture's reckoning is loose (Gen 5 says Noah begot all three at 500, though not in one year). So Sem was indubitably firstborn; whether exactly 100 two years post-flood is uncertain (continues p. 457). Margins: how Cajetan dissolves the argument of the Hebrews; Cajetan.

— p. 526 (PDF) · printed p. 457 —

„…in Noah's five-hundredth year, and on that account two years after the flood, when he begot his son Arphaxad, to have been a hundred and two years old. For Scripture does not say the opposite; nay, by adding ‘two years after the flood’ to Sem's hundred years, it implicitly intimates that he was a hundred and two years old when he begot Arphaxad.“ Thus far from Cajetan.

§136 (concl.). End of Cajetan: Sem may have been begotten in Noah's 500th year and so 102 when he begot Arphaxad two years after the flood — Scripture does not contradict this but implies it.

But in these words of Cajetan two things are by no means probable. For first, Cajetan so punctuates and distinguishes those words of Moses from chapter 11 of Genesis, about the age at which Sem was when he begot Arphaxad, that two things are signified by those words: one is, that Sem was a hundred years old; the other, that he begot Arphaxad two years after the flood. For thus runs Cajetan's reading: „Sem, son of a hundred years: and he begot Arphaxad two years after the flood.“ But such a distinction and punctuation of those words both the Greek translation and our Vulgate edition seem to exclude. For in that place it has thus: „Sem was a hundred years old when he begot Arphaxad,“ by which words it is clearly declared that two years after the flood both Sem was a hundred years old, and at that very time Arphaxad was begotten by him. That saying of Cajetan, moreover, I also do not approve. He says that Scripture in that place does not deny that Sem, when he begot Arphaxad, was a hundred and two years

old; nay, that it signifies this very thing, since by adding ‘two years after the flood’ to Sem's hundred years it covertly indicated that Sem was a hundred and two years old when he begot Arphaxad. But I for my part do not see how Scripture there does not deny that; since it plainly says that he was a hundred years old when he begot Arphaxad, that is, two years after the flood; for that ‘two years’ is not to be added to Sem's hundred years, but is to be referred to the flood, after which, two years elapsed, Sem begot his son Arphaxad.

§137. Pererius faults two points in Cajetan: (1) his punctuation splitting the verse into ‘Sem 100 years old’ + ‘begot Arphaxad 2 years after the flood’ is excluded by the Greek and the Vulgate (‘Sem was 100 when he begot Arphaxad’ — both 100 and the begetting two years post-flood); (2) his claim that the verse covertly means 102: rather, the ‘two years’ attach to the flood (Sem begot Arphaxad two years after it), not to Sem's 100. Margin: a remark on Cajetan.

Therefore, in my judgment, the readier and more probable answer will be: either that Noah did not begin to beget exactly in the five-hundredth year of his age, but in the five-hundred-and-second, and that in that very year Sem was begotten, and on that account two years after the flood he was a hundred years old; or that Sem, in the second year after the flood, when he begot Arphaxad, was not exactly a hundred years old, but was a hundred and two. For, as we have said more than once elsewhere, it is the custom of divine Scripture (which also not rarely happens in profane history and chronology), the small and minute numbers being passed over in silence, to mention only the greatest and whole number: which could be illustrated and confirmed by many examples, were not a repeated proof of a matter sufficiently manifest and elsewhere proved by us superfluous.

§138. Pererius's own simpler answer: either Noah began begetting at 502 (Sem born then, so 100 two years post-flood), or Sem was 102, not exactly 100, when he begot Arphaxad — since Scripture (like profane history) habitually gives only round numbers, dropping the small remainders. Margin: a more probable solution of the Hebrews' argument.

{The sons of Sem: Aelam, and Assur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram.}

Gen 10:22 (verse lemma).

Blessed Jerome, following the opinion of Josephus, running briefly over the aforesaid names of the sons of Sem, writes thus: „These sons of Sem held the part of Asia from the river Euphrates as far as the Indian Ocean…“

§139. Gen 10:22. Jerome (after Josephus) on Sem's sons: they held from the Euphrates to the Indian Ocean (continues p. 458). Margins: Jerome, Hebrew Questions on Genesis; Josephus.

— p. 527 (PDF) · printed p. 458 —

„…held it. There is, moreover, Aelam, from whom the Elamites, princes of Persia. Of Assur it was said before, that he founded the city Ninus. Arphaxad, from whom the Chaldeans. Lud, from whom the Lydians. Aram, from whom the Syrians, whose metropolis is Damascus.“ So far Jerome.

§139 (concl.). Jerome on the five sons: Aelam → the Elamites/princes of Persia; Assur → founder of Nineveh; Arphaxad → the Chaldeans; Lud → the Lydians; Aram → the Syrians (metropolis Damascus).

From the Elamites, whom foreign writers call Elymaeans, the Persians were sprung, who nevertheless in later times obscured the name of the Elamites, when, the Babylonian empire being overthrown, they founded the most ample monarchy of the Persian dominion. In Daniel, chapter 8, that Susan, which was the royal seat of the Persians, was once in the region of Aelam, is plainly written in those words: „I saw in a vision, when I was in the castle of Susan, which is in the region of Aelam.“ By which it is made manifest that the Persians were once under the region and dominion of the Elamites. But we have discussed more about it in book 9 of our Commentaries on Daniel, when we explained those words of the eighth chapter.

§140. From the Elamites (foreign ‘Elymaeans’) the Persians sprang, later obscuring the Elamite name when they founded the Persian empire on Babylon's ruin. Susa, the Persian capital, was in the region of Aelam (Dan 8) — so the Persians were once under the Elamites (treated in his Commentaries on Daniel bk. 9). Margin: Aelamitae or Elymaei.

But whence it was known to Josephus that the Chaldeans drew their origin and stock from Arphaxad is unknown to me. Although it does not escape me that certain men, Hebraizing overmuch, seek the reason of that matter from this: that the Chaldeans are in Hebrew called Chasdim, and by the interchange and affinity of letters passing into other letters (which not rarely happens among the Hebrews) were afterward named Chaldeans. Now the singular of the word Chasdim is Chasdi, from Chascad, for this is the root. And in Chascad the three consonants s, c, and d are found in the latter part of the name Arphacsad — for so it must be written according to Hebrew usage, since among the Hebrews no account is taken of the vowels. But these things we may laugh at and despise as empty inventions, futile subtleties, and childish trifles.

§141. Pererius is unsure how Josephus knew the Chaldeans came from Arphaxad. The over-Hebraizing etymology (Chaldeans = Heb. ‘Chasdim,’ singular Chasdi from root ‘Chascad,’ whose consonants s/c/d appear in the latter part of ‘Arphacsad,’ vowels disregarded) he dismisses as empty, childish trifles. Margin: whether the Chaldeans are sprung from Arphaxad.

In the fourth place among the sons of Sem is named Lud, from whom the Lydians, peoples of Asia Minor, are believed to have sprung, the sound of the name in some way arguing it. Another of the same name was mentioned above among the descendants of Mesraim, from whom the Ludim were propagated, inhabitants of Africa. But this Lud, the son of Sem, as he was of a different race and nation, so also obtained different seats. In Isaiah, chapter 66, these peoples are mentioned: Tharsis, Phut (or, as others have, Put), and Lud, likewise Thubal and Iavan — for so it is in Hebrew: which words the Latin translator rendered into Latin thus: „I will send of them that shall be saved to the nations into the sea, into Africa and Lydia, them that draw the bow, into Italy and Greece.“ Therefore the word Tharsis he renders ‘maritime nations’; Phut, ‘Africa’; Lud, ‘Lydia’; Thubal, ‘Italy’; Iavan, ‘Ionia or Greece.’ In Ezekiel too, chapter 27, these peoples who served as soldiers for the Tyrians are joined together — Paras, Lud, and Phut; for so it is in Hebrew, for which the Latin translator substituted Persians, Lydians, and Libyans. For just as of old the Roman

emperors, and today Christian kings, lead with them into wars nations differing in disposition, manners, dress, language, and religion; so it is to be thought that of old, among the Tyrians most powerful at sea, there served as soldiers Persians, Libyans or Africans, and Lydians, who before Croesus [was] conquered by Cyrus…

§142. Sem's fourth son Lud → the Lydians of Asia Minor (the name-sound suggests it), distinct from the African Ludim (of Mesraim). In Isa 66 (Tharsis, Phut, Lud, Thubal, Iavan; Vulgate 'maritime nations, Africa, Lydia, Italy, Greece') and Ezek 27 (Paras/Lud/Phut = Persians/Lydians/Libyans serving Tyre) — as kings lead diverse nations to war, so Persians, Libyans, and Lydians served seafaring Tyre, famed for valor before Croesus's fall to Cyrus (continues p. 459). Margins: the origin of the Lydians; the passage of Isaiah ch. 66.

— p. 528 (PDF) · printed p. 459 —

…conquered, were renowned and noble in the glory of warlike valor.

§142 (concl.). These Lydians (etc.) were renowned for martial glory before Croesus's defeat by Cyrus.

Aram is named fifth among the sons of Sem: from whom various nations arose, which partly were called by the name of the Syrians by the Greeks, partly passed into the name of other peoples. Divine Scripture frequently uses the word Aram to denote a certain region of the land. For there is read Aram Naharaim — that is, Aram of the rivers, or Aram between the rivers — which the Greeks call Mesopotamia, because it lies midway between the Euphrates and the Tigris. Whence in Deuteronomy, chapter 23, Balaam is said to have been brought from Aram Naharaim, which the Latin translator renders 'from Mesopotamia of Syria.' So too in the book of Judges, chapter 3, a king of Aram Naharaim is named, whom the Latin translator there names king of Mesopotamia and king of Syria. There is read besides Padan Aram, Genesis 28 and 33, whither Jacob is said to have been sent by his father Isaac and to have returned thence unharmed: the Latin translator there renders 'Mesopotamia of Syria.' And so Aram Naharaim and Padan Aram seem to signify the same region — unless perhaps Padan Aram denotes a certain region of Mesopotamia. Besides these, in 2 Kings, chapter 8, there is named Aram of Damascus. In the same book is named

Aram Soba. In the first of Paralipomenon, chapter 19, is mentioned Aram Naacha. Which regions seem to be of Syria, a little far removed from Perea — that is, the region of Galaad, which belonged to the two tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half-tribe of Manasseh.

§143. Sem's fifth son Aram → various nations, partly called 'Syrians' by the Greeks. 'Aram' in Scripture denotes regions: Aram Naharaim ('Aram of the rivers' = Mesopotamia, between Euphrates and Tigris; Balaam thence, Deut 23; the king, Judg 3); Padan Aram (Jacob sent there, Gen 28, 33) — apparently the same, or a part of Mesopotamia; also Aram of Damascus, Aram Soba (2 Sam 8), Aram Naacha (1 Chron 19) — regions of Syria near Perea/Galaad (Reuben, Gad, half-Manasseh). Margins: the various significations of the name Aram; what region is named 'Aram' in Scripture.

{The sons of Aram: Hus, and Hul, and Gether, and Mes.}

Gen 10:23 (verse lemma; the original margin misprints 'VERS. 25').

Of what nations these sons of Aram were the parents and sowers, Jerome very briefly narrates thus from Josephus: „Hus," he says, „the founder of Trachonitis and Damascus, held the principality between Palestine and Coele-Syria, from whom the Septuagint translators in the book of Job, where in Hebrew is written 'the land of Hus,' rendered 'the region Ausitis,' as if 'Husitis.' Hul, from whom the Armenians. Gether, from whom the Acarnanians or Carians. And Mes, for whom the Septuagint translators said Mosoch, is now called the Maeones." So far Jerome. Josephus, however, makes Gether the parent of the Bactrians. „But Mesas," he says, „held the Mesanians, now it is called the camp of Pasinus." Tostatus does not approve what was said above of Hus, that he was the founder of Damascus, and, making Lyra the author of that opinion, rebukes him — not knowing, of course, that Lyra had borrowed it from Josephus and Jerome. But Tostatus thinks the first origin of Damascus is to be sought (as the common opinion holds) from Eliezer of Damascus, the steward of Abraham's house.

§144. Gen 10:23. Jerome (from Josephus) on Aram's sons: Hus (founder of Trachonitis and Damascus, between Palestine and Coele-Syria — the LXX 'Ausitis' for the 'land of Hus' in Job); Hul → Armenians; Gether → Acarnanians/Carians; Mes (LXX 'Mosoch') → the Maeones. Josephus differs: Gether → Bactrians; Mesas → the Mesanians (now 'the camp of Pasinus'). Tostatus wrongly

rebukes Lyra over Hus founding Damascus (Lyra took it from Josephus/Jerome), holding instead the common view — Damascus from Eliezer, Abraham's steward (Gen 24). Margins: Jerome, Hebrew Questions; Josephus; Tostatus; Lyra; Gen 24.

— p. 529 (PDF) · printed p. 460 —

Hus, moreover, was the homeland of Job, or notable and famous for that thing alone. Now Hus belonged to Idumaea, as is evidently gathered from the Lamentations of Jeremiah, in which, chapter 4, it is thus: „Rejoice, daughter of Edom, that dwellest in the land of Hus; to thee also shall the cup of the Lord come, thou shalt be made drunk and stripped naked.“ It is, then, a city of Syria, or of the Arabia which is called Scenitis; it is a part of Idumaea inclining toward Chaldea and Sabaea; for from the history of Job itself it is plain that the Chaldeans and Sabaeans, as neighboring nations, plundered the goods of Job.

§145. Hus = the homeland of Job (famous for that alone), belonging to Idumaea (Lam 4: ‘daughter of Edom, dwelling in the land of Hus’). A city of Syria, or of Arabia Scenitis, part of Idumaea toward Chaldea and Sabaea — for the Chaldeans and Sabaeans, as neighbors, plundered Job (Job 1). Margins: Hus, the homeland of Job, where it was; Job 1.

{To Heber were born two sons: the name of one was Phaleg, because in his days the earth was divided.}

Gen 10:25 (verse lemma).

That pronoun ‘his’ can be referred either to Heber or to Phaleg. „For if this name,“ says Cajetan, „was imposed on him from his birth, it shows Heber to be the one imposing such a name on his son, because in the days of Heber the earth was divided; but if the name was adventitious, it surely shows Phaleg himself, inasmuch as he obtained such a name for the perpetual memory of the division of the earth which was made in his time. The division of the earth, moreover, signifies in this place the division of men on the earth according to the diverse languages, and according to their setting out to inhabit the diverse parts of the earth.“ So Cajetan. But nearly all interpreters refer that pronoun ‘his’ to Phaleg, and rightly: for it is

signified that Phaleg was born — or, as others prefer, came of age — at that very time when the languages and the habitations of men were divided. But of this matter too we must now dispute briefly.

§(Gen 10:25 comment). The pronoun ‘his’ may refer to Heber or Phaleg. Cajetan: if the name was given at birth it points to Heber (the division was ‘in the days of Heber’); if adventitious, to Phaleg (named to memorialize the division in his time) — ‘division of the earth’ = the division of men by tongues and migration. But most interpreters (rightly) refer ‘his’ to Phaleg, born (or coming of age) at the time of the division. Margin: Cajetan.

ELEVENTH DISPUTATION. Whether that name Phaleg was imposed from the division of the earth already made, or one to come long after.

Liber XV, Disputation 11 (title): whether ‘Phaleg’ named a division already made or one long future.

Whether the division of the languages and habitations of men befell at that very time at which Phaleg was born, and the name was thence given to him, or rather in his last age, the opinions of authors are discrepant. The Hebrews, in their Chronicle which they call Seder Olam, hand down that the division of the languages was made in the last period of Phaleg's life: but he was born in the 101st year after the flood, and lived 209 years, as is gathered from the eleventh chapter of Genesis. Hence it follows that the division of languages was made in the 340th year after the flood — namely, ten years before the death of Noah: for that Noah lived 350 years after the flood Moses left written in the last words of the ninth chapter. Now since Abraham, according to the Hebrew and Latin chronology handed down in chapter 11 of Genesis, was born in the 292nd year after the flood, it follows from this that the division of languages befell when Abraham was passing his forty-eighth year of age.

§146. Disp. 11 opens: was the division at Phaleg's birth or his last age? The Hebrews (Seder Olam): at the end of Phaleg's life — born yr 101 after the flood, lived 209 yrs (Gen 11), so the division was yr 340 (10 yrs before Noah's death at yr 350, Gen 9). Since Abraham was born yr 292 (Gen 11), the division fell when Abraham was 48 (continues p. 461). Margin: when the Hebrews say the division of languages was made.

— p. 530 (PDF) · printed p. 461 —

Therefore the Hebrews judge that Heber was a great prophet: inasmuch as, illumined by the divine light of prophecy, foreseeing what was to come more than two hundred years after, he imposed the name from it upon his newborn son. To the opinion of the Hebrews accedes Blessed Jerome, affirming that Heber, by a certain prophecy — namely, from the future event of the division of languages — set the name upon his son. To the same opinion seems to pertain what Chrysostom wrote in homily 30 on Genesis, explaining these very words about the name Phaleg: „Consider," he says, „how he declared the foreknowledge of the future thing by the name of the boy that was born, so that, when you see the thing fulfilled in fact, you may no longer wonder, seeing that it was divinely foretold by the boy's name." To the same opinion incline Tostatus and Lyra in this place, and Genebrardus in his Chronology.

§146 (concl.). So the Hebrews make Heber a great prophet, foreseeing by divine light an event 200+ yrs off and naming his son from it. Jerome agrees (Heber named the son by prophecy of the future division); also Chrysostom (hom. 30 on Genesis: the boy's name declared foreknowledge of the future), Tostatus, Lyra, and Genebrardus. Margins: Jerome; Chrysostom; Tostatus; Lyra; Genebrardus.

This opinion these men confirm thus. It is not credible, they say, that in the space of only a hundred years — that is, around the birth of Phaleg — the stocks were so far multiplied everywhere on earth after the flood, and the human race so far propagated, that they could be scattered through all the regions of the earth, and inhabit and cultivate them, and in time fill them with inhabitants. But this reasoning is very weak: for there is no reason why the plants that are everywhere on earth could not, in a hundred years after the flood, be generated, grow, and multiply. The same I think of men. For if Jacob's family — which was only seventy persons when he himself went down into Egypt — was in 215 years so numerously propagated there, that when the Hebrews went out of Egypt there were counted among them more than six hundred thousand fighting men, besides little ones, old men, and women: how much more credible is it that after the flood, even in

a smaller space of time, the family of Noah was more numerously propagated, since so great a scarcity of the men who were then on earth demanded it, and God not obscurely signified the future greatest fecundity and most ample propagation of the sons of Noah when He blessed them, saying: ‘Increase and multiply and fill the earth’?

§146 (cont.). Their confirming argument: in only ~100 yrs (Phaleg's birth) mankind could not have multiplied to fill the earth. Pererius rebuts: plants could multiply in 100 yrs; so could men — Jacob's family of 70 grew in 215 yrs to 600,000+ fighting men (Gen 46; Exod 12); much more credibly Noah's family grew fast after the flood, given the scarcity and God's blessing ‘Increase and multiply and fill the earth’ (Gen 9). Margins: Gen 46; Exod 12; Gen 9.

The other opinion is that the name Phaleg was set not from a future event, but from that which had already been done and was past: for because Heber begot his firstborn son next after the division of the languages was made, therefore he imposed the name on his son from that so memorable thing. And Heber willed this to be marked in his son, so that men might thence note the very time at which that memorable variety and confusion of languages had arisen among mortals. Of this opinion I have as author Josephus in the first book of the Antiquities, and Blessed Augustine, who in the sixteenth book of the City of God, chapter 11, writes in this manner: „Someone may say: if in the days of Phaleg the son of Heber the earth was divided by languages, that language which was before common to all ought rather to have been called from his name. But it must be understood that Heber himself for this reason imposed such a name on his son, that he should be called Phaleg — which is interpreted ‘division’ — because he was born to him then, when the earth was divided by languages, so that this is what was said: In…“

§147. The other opinion (Pererius's): ‘Phaleg’ was named from a past event — Heber begot his firstborn just after the division and named him from it, marking the time of that memorable confusion of tongues. Authorities: Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1) and Augustine (City of God 16.11: Heber named the son ‘Phaleg’ = ‘division’ because he was born when the earth was divided by tongues) (continues p. 462). Margins: the author's opinion; Josephus; Augustine.

— p. 531 (PDF) · printed p. 462 —

„…in his days was the earth divided. For unless Heber were still living when the multitude of languages was made, the language which could remain with him would not receive its name from his name.“ So far Augustine.

§147 (concl.). End of Augustine (City of God 16.11): unless Heber were still alive when the tongues multiplied, the surviving language (Hebrew) would not be named from him.

This opinion too is more approved by me. For since no reason can be brought forward that necessarily concludes, or even probably demonstrates, that the division of languages and the departure of men into the various parts of the earth could not have been made at the time when Phaleg was born (as is plain from what we taught a while ago), it is certainly far more easy to believe that Heber willed his son to be marked with the word Phaleg, signifying the division of languages, rather from that which had already happened when the son was born to him, than from that which was to come more than two hundred years after. But against those who throw the division of languages back to Phaleg's last year, I have a very firm argument (as can be in matters that are concerned with chronology and history). These men say that the division of languages and the dispersion of men into the diverse regions of the earth was made in Phaleg's last year, which falls in the forty-eighth year of Abraham's age. Therefore that division must necessarily have happened thirty-eight years after the death of Ninus, who was the first king of the Assyrians: for Ninus reigned fifty-two years, and in the forty-third year of his reign Abraham was born. And these things indeed are agreed upon among authors, both pagan and Christian. But when Ninus began to reign — that is, more than eighty years before the time at which these men think the division of languages was made — already then the world was, in almost all its parts, full of inhabitants and cultivators having diverse languages, and also diverse kingdoms and kings, and these powerful with most ample empires, most numerous armies, and the greatest riches and resources.

§148. Pererius prefers this view: no reason forbids the division at Phaleg's birth, so it is far likelier Heber named him from a past than a future event. A firm argument against the 'Phaleg's last year' view: that would put the division 38 yrs after Ninus's death (Ninus reigned 52 yrs, Abraham born in his 43rd) = Abraham's 48th yr; but when Ninus began (80+ yrs earlier), the world was already full of peoples with diverse tongues, kingdoms, kings, vast empires and armies.

This I shall make clear and certain to the reader from the single history of Diodorus, which most writers, both profane and ecclesiastical, have followed. At the opening of book 3 Diodorus writes that Ninus, when he began to reign, having embraced almost the whole world in his mind with an incredible lust of ruling, at first entered into alliance with Aricus king of the Arabs, who at that time excelled most in wealth and arms; with whom he led an army against the Babylonians (Babylon not yet founded, but with many famous cities round about inhabited); and these being overcome and tribute imposed, he killed their king, captured, together with his sons. Then, some cities of Armenia being reduced to his power, he treated king Barzanes, who met him with gifts, gently and most humanely. Then, having entered Media, he affixed to the cross king Farnus, with his wife and seven sons. Raised up by such prosperous fortune, the desire seized him of gaining all Asia which lies between the Tanais and the Nile. Wherefore, having set out to subdue the rest of Asia, he subjugated it all in seventeen years, except the Indians and Bactrians. He subdued all the maritime and neighboring nations, the Egyptians, Phoenicians, interior Syria, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Caria, Phrygia, Mysia, Lydia, the Troad and the Phrygia which is above the Hellespont, the Proponti[s…]

§149. Pererius proves it from Diodorus (bk. 3, followed by most writers): Ninus, at the start of his reign, allied with Aricus king of the Arabs, defeated the Babylonians (Babylon not yet founded), spared Barzanes of Armenia but crucified Farnus of Media; then in 17 yrs subdued all Asia (Tanais to Nile) except the Indians and Bactrians — Egyptians, Phoenicians, Syria, Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Caria, Phrygia, Mysia, Lydia, the Troad (continues p. 463). Margins: Diodorus; the progress of king Ninus's wars and victories; Aricus king of the Arabs.

— p. 532 (PDF) · printed p. 463 —

…and also Bithynia and Cappadocia, and the barbarous nations beside the Pontus as far as the river Tanais, he made of his dominion. He added to his empire the Cadusii, Tapyrii, Hyrcanians, Drangae, Dernici, Carmanians, Choromnaei, Rhombi, Borcanii, Parthians, Persians, Husiani and Caspians, and several other peoples and nations, which on account of their ignobility it is not worthwhile to recount here. At the last he conquered Zoroaster king of the Bactrians, who, an army of four hundred thousand men being assembled, came out to meet Ninus to fight against him: Ninus at that time having in his army (as is recorded by Ctesias) 1,700,000 foot, 200,000 horse, and of scythed chariots a little less than 10,600. Thus far from Diodorus. From these things it plainly appears that very many years before the division of languages and the dispersion of men was made (as these men judge), almost the whole world was not only filled with inhabitants, and there were not only diverse languages then, but also diverse provinces, nations, kingdoms, and kings prevailing with incredible warlike power and wealth. These men will perhaps say that these things are fabulous, and were fabricated by Diodorus, or rather by Ctesias, or drawn from most lying histories. But not only pagan writers, but also our own and ecclesiastical ones — and those of the greatest nobility and authority — both believed that history of Diodorus as most credible, and, sealed and confirmed in their writings, transmitted it to posterity. Nor indeed can those who withdraw credence from Diodorus bring forward any probable reason why he is not to be believed.

§149 (concl.). Ninus further took Bithynia, Cappadocia, the Pontic nations to the Tanais, the Cadusii, Hyrcanians, Parthians, Persians, Caspians, etc., and finally conquered Zoroaster king of the Bactrians (400,000 men) with an army (per Ctesias) of 1,700,000 foot, 200,000 horse, ~10,600 scythed chariots. So, many years before the supposed division of tongues, the world was already full of peoples, languages, kingdoms, and kings of vast power. The objection that Diodorus/Ctesias is fabulous fails — eminent pagan, native, and ecclesiastical writers credited and transmitted it, and no probable reason disproves it. Margin: Ctesias.

{Jectan begot Elmodad, and Saleph, and Asamoth, Iare, Adoran, Uzal, Decla, Hebal, Abimael, Saba, Ophir, Heuila, and Iobab: all these are

the sons of Jectan.}

Gen 10:26–29 (verse lemma).

Of those nations, says Jerome (following in the footsteps of Josephus), „I could not find the later names: but down to the present, because they are far from us, either they are called as at first, or those which have been changed are unknown. But they possessed, from the river Cophenes, all the region of India which is called Ieria.“ So far Jerome. Of the river Cophenes, moreover, which is here named by Jerome and Josephus, Eustathius makes mention, the interpreter of Dionysius the Geographer, who wrote a little book On the Situation of the World, and whom (as Pliny relates) Augustus sent ahead into the East to make notes on everything, when his elder son was about to go into Armenia for the Parthian and Arabian affairs. Eustathius, then, says that the river Cophen, set down by Dionysius in his description of India, is called Cophenes by Aristotle in the fifth book On the Deeds Done by Alexander. Strabo certainly names Cophen that river which receives the waters of the Choaspes, and after which flows the Indus. „After the Cophen,“ says Strabo, „is the Indus, then the Hydaspes, then the Acesines, then the Hyarotis, lastly the Hypanis, which was the boundary…“

§150. Gen 10:26–29 (Jectan's thirteen sons). Jerome (after Josephus): the later names cannot be found — they are too distant, keeping old names or changed beyond knowledge; they held from the river Cophenes all the region of India called Ieria. The river Cophenes: noted by Eustathius (commentator on Dionysius the Geographer, whom Augustus sent east for his elder son's Parthian/Arabian campaign — Pliny bk. 6 ch. 27), called ‘Cophenes’ by Aristotle (bk. 5, On the Deeds of Alexander); Strabo names it the Cophen that takes the Choaspes' waters, before the Indus (Indus, Hydaspes, Acesines, Hyarotis, Hypanis — continues to next batch). Margins: Jerome, Hebrew Questions; Cophenes; Eustathius; Dionysius the Geographer; Pliny bk. 6 ch. 27; Aristotle; Strabo.

— p. 533 (PDF) · printed p. 462: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 534 (PDF) · printed p. 463: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 535 (PDF) · printed p. 464 —

…the boundary of Alexander's expedition into India. So Strabo. Pliny too makes mention of the same river in book 6, chapter 21. But of the aforesaid sons of Jectan, only of three need anything be said at present: of Saba, Ophir, and Heuila.

§150 (concl.). The Hypanis was the limit of Alexander's Indian campaign (Strabo; Pliny bk. 6 ch. 21). Of Jectan's sons, only three call for comment: Saba, Ophir, and Heuila.

Now, among the descendants of Chus, as we saw a little above, two of the same name — Saba, I mean, and Heuila — were mentioned; but these constituted families different from the former, and settled far different lands: which Scripture did not pass over in silence, saying that the children of Jectan dwelt from Messa as far as Sephar, the Eastern mountain. For Seba and Schaba, descendants of Chus, begot the Sabaeans extended to both the seas by which the sides of Arabia are girt. But Saba the son of Jectan, and besides him that Saba who is numbered among the sons of Abraham born of Cetura in the 25th chapter of Genesis, begot Sabaeans far removed: Saba the son of Abraham, the Sabaeans nearest the Persians, whom Dionysius in his ‘On the Situation of the World’ mentions in these words: „First the Sabaeans, after these are the Pasargadae, and near these are the Tasci: and these nations, it is agreed, are peoples of Persia.“ Hither, then, Saba the son of Abraham seems to have withdrawn: for Moses, in the 25th chapter of Genesis, relates that Abraham separated him, with his other brothers, from his son Isaac, and sent him out to the eastern region. But Saba the son of Jectan (of whom we here treat) seems to have advanced farther, and to have founded the Indian Sabaeans; for there are Sabaeans in India too, of whom Dionysius makes mention in his Description of India in that verse: „In the midst of these dwell the Sabaeans and the men of Taxila.“ And so that there were various races of Sabaean peoples ought not to seem strange, since various heads of those families and nations are recorded in the sacred letters, and profane history too recognizes diverse nations of the same name.

§151. Saba: distinguishing the Sabaean nations. Seba/Schaba (of Chus) begot the Arabian Sabaeans by both seas; Saba son of Abraham (by Cetura, Gen 25, sent east) begot Sabaeans near the Persians (Dionysius: Sabaei, Pasargadae, Tasci); Saba son of Jectan (here) founded the Indian Sabaeans (Dionysius's Description of India: 'the Sabaeans and the men of Taxila'). So the same name covering diverse nations is unsurprising — Scripture and profane history both attest it. Margin: Dionysius.

There follow Ophir and Heuila, of whom Saint Jerome writes thus in the book On the Hebrew Places: „Ophir, as it is in the book of Kings, is an island whence gold was brought. There was, moreover, one of the descendants of Heber by the name of Ophir, from whose stock those coming from the river Cophene as far as the region of India which is called Ieria dwelt, as Josephus relates: from whom I think the region too got its name. Heuila, moreover, is where there is the purest gold, which in Hebrew is called Zaab, and where the most precious gems, the carbuncle and the emerald, are born. It is a region inclining toward the East, which the Phison, going out from Paradise, encircles — which our people, the name being changed, call the Ganges. But one also of the descendants of Noah was called Heuila, whom Josephus relates to have dwelt in the region of India. Ismael too is written to have dwelt in the wilderness of Heuila, which Scripture says is in the desert of Sur over against the face of Egypt, and to stretch thence as far as the land of the Assyrians." So far Blessed Jerome.

§152. Ophir and Heuila (Jerome, On Hebrew Places): Ophir = a gold-bearing island (1 Kgs), a descendant of Heber, who held from the Cophene to India 'Ieria' (Josephus); Heuila = a region of purest gold (Heb. Zaab) and gems (carbuncle, emerald), eastward, encircled by the Phison/Ganges (Gen 2) — also a descendant of Noah, in India (Josephus); and the wilderness of Heuila where Ismael dwelt (the desert of Sur facing Egypt to Assyria). Margins: Ophir & Heuila; Jerome; 1 Kgs 9; Josephus; Gen 2.

But the gold which was carried off from Ophir was held to be the most refined and purest and, beyond the rest, precious and approved, since it was such as that which the Latins call 'obrizum' — this too, as some think, named from Ophir, as if you should say 'Ophirizum.' Pliny, however, writes that gold is called 'obrizum' which, by fire again and again…

§153. The gold of Ophir was the purest and most precious, like the Latin ‘obrizum’ — which some derive from Ophir (‘Ophirizum’). Pliny gives a different account (continues p. 465). Margins: the gold of Ophir & obrizum; Pliny bk. 33 ch. 3.

— p. 536 (PDF) · printed p. 465 —

…purified, glows with a color like fire. But Isidore thinks it is called ‘Obrizum’ because it shines forth (obradiet) with its own splendor, on account of the excellence of its color. The Latin translator in the book of Job, chapter 28, rendered the gold of Ophir as ‘gold obrizum.’ Of this both gold and region of Ophir illustrious mention is made in the third book of Kings, chapter 9 and 10, and in 1 Paralipomenon, chapter 29. Josephus, in the eighth book of the Antiquities, following the Septuagint translators, called Ophir ‘Sophira,’ thinking it to be the Chersonese or gold-bearing peninsula of India. But it is agreed to be an island, and, as is said, near the continent, where there is at this time a famous city and kingdom commonly called Malacca. Some writers of our age think it is the one they today call Zeffala or Sumatra; others, that it is the Peruvian region in the new western world, most fertile in the best gold; some, Taprobana, celebrated by the ancients with wondrous praises. But whether Ophir be any of these, or some other in the Indian or Aethiopic Ocean, since it is neither of the work undertaken nor in our power, I leave to others more skilled in geography — and especially of the regions discovered in this age — to judge and decide clearly. We have disputed more about Ophir and Heuila both in book 12 of our Commentaries on Daniel, on those words of chapter 10, ‘Behold a man clothed in linen, and his loins girded with obrizum gold,’ and also in the prior volume of the Commentaries on Genesis, book 3, where we disputed about the first river of Paradise which Moses calls Phison.

§153 (concl.). Isidore derives ‘obrizum’ from ‘obradiet’ (shines forth); the Vulgate renders Ophir-gold ‘obrizum’ (Job 28); Ophir famed in 1 Kgs 9–10, 1 Chron 29. Josephus (Antiquities bk. 8, after the LXX) calls it ‘Sophira,’ a gold-bearing peninsula of India; but it is an island near the continent (the famous Malacca). Modern writers variously identify it as Zeffala/Sumatra, Peru in the new world, or Taprobana — Pererius leaves the identification to geographers (treated more in his Daniel comm. bk. 12 on Dan 10, and Genesis vol. 1 bk. 3 on the Phison). Margins: Isidore; Josephus;

Gen 2.

Tostatus in this place writes that Ophir was a land abounding in gold, in which there were gold-bearing mountains, where on the surface of the mountains very much gold, dug out of the caverns of the earth by wild beasts, was there guarded by lions and griffins; for which story he cites Rabanus on the books of Kings as author; and Isidore signifies the same in book 14 of the Etymologies, chapter 8. But the region in which the griffins, or gryphi, are recorded to be the guardians and defenders of gold, Pomponius Mela in book 1, chapter 1, and Solinus in chapter 19 place in Scythia. „In Scythia," says Solinus, „the lands are rich, yet uninhabitable. For though they abound in gold and gems, the griffins hold them all — most ferocious birds, raging beyond all madness; by whose savagery opposing strangers, access is difficult and rare. For they tear in pieces those they see, as if born to punish the rashness of avarice. The Arimaspi fight with these." Pliny too (whence Solinus seems to have borrowed) in book 7, chapter 2, counts among the Scythians the Arimaspi, marked by one eye in the middle of the forehead: „who have continual war about the metals with the griffins, a winged kind of beasts, such as is commonly reported, digging gold out of burrows with wondrous greed — the beasts guarding it and the Arimaspi snatching it; and this many, but most especially the illustrious Herodotus and Aristeas of Proconnesus, have related." So Pliny.

§154. Tostatus: Ophir a gold-rich land where mountain gold (dug up by beasts) was guarded by lions and griffins (citing Rabanus on Kings; Isidore, Etymologies bk. 14 ch. 8). But the gold-guarding griffins are placed in Scythia by Mela (bk. 1 ch. 1) and Solinus (ch. 19, on the rich but uninhabitable Scythian lands, the savage griffins, and the Arimaspi who fight them); Pliny (bk. 7 ch. 2) likewise — the one-eyed Arimaspi warring with the griffins over gold (per Herodotus and Aristeas of Proconnesus). Margins: Tostatus; Rabanus; Isidore; griffins, guardians and defenders of gold; Mela; Solinus; Pliny; Pliny bk. 10 ch. 49.

— p. 537 (PDF) · printed p. 466 —

Griffins, moreover, are said to be four-footed winged animals: in their wings and face indeed like eagles, but in all the rest they have the

properties of lions. But these things handed down about the griffins and commonly believed Pliny judges to be fabulous. „I reckon fabulous," he says, „the Pegasi, winged with a horse's head, and the griffins with eared hookedness of beak: the former in Scythia, the latter in Aethiopia." So he: where it is read by an error 'the former in Scythia, the latter in Aethiopia,' and ought rather to be read the contrary, 'the former in Aethiopia, the latter in Scythia,' as may be manifest to the reader from those things we produced a little before from Mela, Solinus, and Pliny himself.

§155. Griffins are described as four-footed winged animals, eagle-winged and -faced but otherwise lions. But Pliny judges this fabulous ('the Pegasi with a horse's head, and the griffins with eared hooked beak, I reckon fabulous — the former in Scythia, the latter in Aethiopia'). Pererius notes the text is corrupt: it should read the reverse (Pegasi in Aethiopia, griffins in Scythia), per Mela, Solinus, and Pliny himself. Margin: griffins and Pegasus, fabulous animals.

{And their habitation was from Messa, as one goes on, even to Sephar, the Eastern mountain.}

Gen 10:30 (verse lemma).

By these words Moses designates and denotes the bounds of the habitation of the descendants of Jectan in the eastern part of the world, so that thence how long and broad was the region which they held there may easily be estimated. Of Messa and Sephar I have found only this in Blessed Jerome's book On the Hebrew Places: he will have Messa to be a region of India in which the sons of Jectan dwelt; and Sophera to be a mountain of the East in India, beside which the same sons of Jectan dwelt, whom Josephus relates to have come from the river Cophene and the regions of India as far as that place which is called the region Ieria. But the fleet of Solomon, too, used to carry off certain merchandise hence every three years. But although the descendants of Sem withdrew into the far-off lands of India, the Hebrews think that Sem himself settled in that land which was afterward called Judaea, and in that place of that land where is the city Jerusalem, the temple being built many ages after; because Sem foresaw by a prophetic spirit that that land would be promised and delivered by God to his

descendants, and that there both their sovereignty and the religion and worship of the true God, whom he himself worshipped, would be most flourishing and most glorious. But this is neither proved by any reason by these men, nor has the appearance of probability. For since that land was inhabited and possessed by the descendants of Chanaan, it is not credible either that Sem would have wished to live among strangers rather than among his own, or that Chanaan and his descendants would have suffered it. As for what Epiphanius says in the Ancoratus — that the land of Judaea was first delivered by Noah to Sem himself and his descendants, but that they were afterward driven out thence by force by the descendants of Chanaan — that is assuredly by no means credible: both because Moses plainly teaches that that land was inhabited and possessed by the descendants of Chanaan; and also because he described the bounds of their habitation in that region so subtly and distinctly that he leaves no room for suspecting what these men have handed down about the ejection of Sem's descendants. This too may with reason seem wonderful: if Sem was residing in Palestine and on the mount of Jerusalem — since he survived Abraham himself by thirty-three years, and reached down to the 108th year of Isaac and to the 48th year of Jacob — how Moses, in the history of these three patriarchs, which he writes most diligently in this book, made no word about Sem himself. He relates [indeed…]

§156. Gen 10:30. Moses bounds Jectan's descendants in the East (Messa = a region of India; Sephar/Sophera = an eastern mountain there — Jerome; Josephus: from the Cophene to ‘Ieria’; Solomon's fleet traded there triennially). The Hebrews' claim that Sem settled in Judaea/Jerusalem (foreseeing the Promised Land prophetically) Pererius rejects as unproven: the land was Chanaan's, Sem would not live among strangers, and Epiphanius's account (in the Ancoratus — Judaea first given to Sem, then seized by Chanaan) is incredible (Moses says it was Chanaan's, and bounds them precisely). It would also be strange, if Sem dwelt on Mt. Jerusalem (surviving Abraham by 33 yrs, into Isaac's 108th and Jacob's 48th year), that Moses says nothing of him in the patriarchal history (continues p. 467). Margins: Jerome; whether Sem settled in Judaea, and where the temple and Jerusalem afterward were; Epiphanius.

— p. 538 (PDF) · printed p. 467 —

…He relates, indeed, that Abraham went to Melchisedech, to Pharaoh, and to Abimelech, and handed down the same of Isaac: but of Sem he makes no mention at all. For what the Hebrews think — that Melchisedech himself was Sem — is neither likely, and will be refuted by us in the third volume of these Commentaries (God favoring) in the explanation of the 14th chapter of this book, by the most manifest and firmest reasons.

§156 (concl.). Moses tells of Abraham going to Melchisedech, Pharaoh, Abimelech (and the like of Isaac) but nothing of Sem. The Hebrews' view that Melchisedech was Sem is unlikely — to be refuted in vol. 3 (on Gen 14). Margins: Gen 14; below ch. 20; below ch. 26; the Hebrews think Sem was Melchisedech, but falsely.

{These are the sons of Sem according to their kindreds and tongues and regions in their nations.}

Gen 10:31 (verse lemma).

Moses in this place mentioned twenty-six descendants of Sem, that is, five sons of Sem himself, four sons of Aram, two sons of Arphaxad, two sons likewise of Heber, and finally thirteen sons of Jectan: from all of which arises the sum, as we said, of twenty-six descendants of Sem. And in this matter both the Latin translation and the Chaldaic paraphrase agree entirely with the Hebrew Scripture. But the Greek codices disagree somewhat. For they count six sons of Sem, adding to the aforesaid a certain Cainan. Then they record three sons of Arphaxad, adding one other also called Cainan; the sons of Jectan, however, they enumerate as thirteen, just as we do. Wherefore, according to the Greek codices, the descendants of Sem here mentioned by Moses would be twenty-eight. Blessed Augustine follows the Greek codices, differing from them only in this, that he reckons the sons of Jectan not as thirteen but as twelve only: whereby it comes about that he counts the descendants of Sem as twenty-seven. We, that they might more easily be grasped in the mind, have set forth all the descendants of Sem here mentioned by Moses, each arranged in his own order, in the subjoined table for the reader, to be viewed as it were at a single glance. [Table: Sem begot — Aelam; Assur; Arphaxad (→ Sale → Heber → Phaleg; and →

Jectan, who begot Elmodad, Saleph, Asarmeth, Iare, Adoran, Uza, Decla, Hebal, Habimael, Saba, Ophir, Heuila, Iobab); Lud; Aram (→ Hus, Hul, Gether, Mes). Total: 26.]

§157. Gen 10:31. Moses lists 26 descendants of Sem (5 sons of Sem + 4 of Aram + 2 of Arphaxad + 2 of Heber + 13 of Jectan) — the Vulgate, Chaldee, and Hebrew agreeing. The Greek codices differ: they add a Cainan among Sem's sons and another among Arphaxad's (= 28); Augustine follows them but reckons Jectan's sons as 12, making 27. Pererius supplies a genealogical table of all 26. Margins: the discrepancy of the Greek codices from the Latin and Hebrew on the number of descendants; Augustine.

— p. 539 (PDF) · printed p. 468 —

Moses says, moreover, that in this place the descendants of Sem are narrated by him according to their kindreds and tongues and regions in their nations. He said ‘According to kindreds,’ because each one of those who are here named makes by himself one kindred, or family, or stock: so that, as twenty-six or twenty-seven descendants of Sem are named, so just as many kindreds or families are to be understood to have proceeded from them. He said ‘According to tongues,’ because each of these, as he founded one family and nation, so also obtained a different tongue: not indeed immediately when he was born, but after, on account of the building of the tower, the division of tongues was made. And although of those who are mentioned in this place many sons were born, and on that account they too could have named many families, no otherwise than their fathers; nevertheless, because there did not befall them tongues different from those which their fathers had, therefore they are not here mentioned like the aforesaid, since they did not produce different kindreds and families. He adds besides ‘And regions,’ because after the division of tongues they sought different places of the earth and inhabited different regions, whence the diversity of nations arose: for these did not mingle among themselves so that from them some one sovereignty and kingdom should coalesce, but many kingdoms and diverse peoples arose. Finally he added ‘In their nations’: for these were not one nation but diverse nations, separated and distinguished by different names, different tongues, and different regions.

§158. The four phrases of Gen 10:31 explained: ‘according to kindreds’ — each named man is one kindred/family (so 26 or 27 kindreds); ‘according to tongues’ — each got a distinct tongue (not at birth, but after the division at the tower); descendants whose tongue did not differ from their fathers' are not listed; ‘and regions’ — after the division they settled diverse lands, whence the diversity of nations (no single realm coalescing); ‘in their nations’ — diverse nations distinguished by name, tongue, and region.

{These are the families of the sons of Noah according to their peoples and nations. By these were the nations divided in the earth after the flood.}

Gen 10:32 (verse lemma).

The aforesaid families are called Noah's, although they were begotten not by him but by his sons or grandsons, because he was the first origin and stock of them all, whence they all sprang. By those words ‘By these were the nations divided after the flood’ it is signified that all the divisions of nations which now are in the whole world proceeded from those three sons of Noah, and came to be after the flood. There had indeed been before the flood some division of men, but not such and so great as was after the flood. For before the flood, after the slaying of Abel and the birth of the offspring of Seth, by the command of Adam the descendants of Seth were divided from the descendants of Cain; and on that account it is said in the fourth chapter of Genesis that Cain withdrew toward the eastern region of Paradise: and that division and separation is believed to have lasted down to the seventh generation; at which time the descendants of Seth, allured and captivated by the beauty of the women of Cain's stock, were mingled with them by marriages; and there was made a pestilent mingling of the blessed seed with the wicked and impious, against the command of Adam and the will of God — whence so many and so great evils arose everywhere on earth that they provoked God to destroy by the flood…

§159. Gen 10:32. The families are called Noah's (though begotten by his sons/grandsons) as their first source; ‘by these were the nations divided after the flood’ = all present national divisions came from Noah's three sons, after the flood. There was some pre-flood division: after Abel's death, Seth's line was separated from Cain's by Adam's command (Cain withdrew east of Paradise, Gen 4), lasting to

the seventh generation — until Seth's line, lured by the beauty of Cain's women, intermarried, mingling the blessed seed with the impious against Adam's command and God's will, breeding the evils that provoked the flood (continues p. 469). Margins: what kind of division and distinction of men there was before the flood; Gen 4.

— p. 540 (PDF) · printed p. 469 —

…to destroy by the flood the whole race of men and animals. Besides this division of men, it may be credible enough that there was also another division of the habitation of men in diverse regions and places. For since, through the 1,656 years which preceded the flood, the human race was most numerously propagated and multiplied, it is more inclined toward the truth that all men were not circumscribed within the bounds of one region, but were diffused through the diverse regions of the earth. Wherefore the flood inundated and overwhelmed not one region only, but all the parts of the earth. But whether there was also a diversity of tongues before the flood or not, will be disputed by us in the book which next follows this one.

§159 (concl.). Besides the moral division, there was likely also a geographical one: in the 1,656 pre-flood years mankind multiplied so greatly that men were spread over diverse regions, not one — hence the flood covered the whole earth, not one region. Whether tongues also differed before the flood is reserved for the next book (Liber XVI).

This, moreover, which we also indicated above, we have judged it neither foreign nor superfluous to remind the reader of again in this place: that although the sons of Sem, Cham, and Japheth were far more than those mentioned above, nevertheless no others than the aforesaid were here mentioned by Moses (as Blessed Augustine rightly judged), because they, in being born, were added to other nations, and could not themselves found and name different nations. „For what other cause is there that, while the sons of Japheth are counted as eight, the sons born of only two of them are mentioned? And while the sons of Cham are named as four, the sons of only three are added? And while the sons of Sem are named as six, the posterity of only two is appended? Did the rest perhaps remain without sons? Far be it to believe this: but they certainly did not produce nations on

account of which they would be worthy to be mentioned, because, as they were born, they were added to other nations.“ So Augustine.

§160. A reminder (per Augustine, City of God 16.3): Sem, Cham, and Japheth had far more sons than listed; Moses names only these because they founded and named distinct nations, while the rest were absorbed into other nations. (Augustine's argument: of Japheth's 8 sons only 2 have named posterity, of Cham's 4 only 3, of Sem's 6 only 2 — the rest had sons but founded no nameworthy nations.) This closes Liber XV. Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 3.

— p. 541 (PDF) · printed p. 470 —

BENEDICT PERERIUS'S COMMENTARIES ON GENESIS, BOOK SIXTEEN. On the eleventh chapter of the book of Genesis — that is, ON THE BUILDING OF THE TOWER OF BABEL and on the confusion and division of tongues.

Liber XVI title page (printed 470): on Gen 11 — the building of the Tower of Babel and the confusion/division of tongues. §-numbering restarts at §1.

{Chapter eleven of Genesis. And the earth was of one language and of the same speech. And when they removed from the East, they found a plain in the land of Sennaar, and dwelt in it. And each one said to his neighbor: Come, let us make bricks and bake them with fire. And they had brick instead of stones, and bitumen instead of mortar. And they said: Come, let us make us a city and a tower, the top whereof may reach to heaven; and let us make our name famous before we be scattered abroad into all lands. And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower which the children of Adam were building; and he said: Behold, it is one people, and all have one language; and they have begun to do this, neither will they leave off from their designs till they accomplish them in deed.}

Gen 11:1–6 (verse lemma, opening the chapter on the title page).

— p. 542 (PDF) · printed p. 471 —

{Come ye, therefore, let us go down and there confound their tongue, that they may not understand one another's speech. And so the Lord scattered them from that place into all lands, and they ceased to build the city. And therefore the name thereof was called Babel, because there the language of the whole earth was confounded; and from thence the Lord scattered them abroad upon the face of all countries. These are the generations of Sem. Sem was a hundred years old when he begot Arphaxad, two years after the flood. And Sem lived after he begot Arphaxad five hundred years, and begot sons and daughters. And Arphaxad lived thirty-five years, and begot Sale. And Arphaxad lived after he begot Sale three hundred and three years, and begot sons and daughters. Sale also lived thirty years, and begot Heber. And Sale lived after he begot Heber four hundred and three years, and begot sons and daughters. And Heber lived thirty-four years, and begot Phaleg. And Heber lived after he begot Phaleg four hundred and thirty years, and begot sons and daughters. And Phaleg lived thirty years, and begot Reu. And Phaleg lived after he begot Reu two hundred and nine years, and begot sons and daughters. And Reu lived thirty-two years, and begot Sarug. And Reu lived after he begot Sarug two hundred and seven years, and begot sons and daughters. And Sarug lived thirty years, and begot Nachor. And Sarug lived after he begot Nachor two hundred years, and begot sons and daughters. And Nachor lived twenty-nine years, and begot Thare. And Nachor lived after he begot Thare a hundred and nineteen years, and begot sons and daughters. And Thare lived seventy years, and begot Abram and Nachor and Aran. And these are the generations of Thare. Thare begot Abram, Nachor, and Aran. And Aran begot Lot. And Aran died before Thare his father, in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees.}

Gen 11:7–28 (verse lemma; the confusion at Babel concluded, then the genealogy of Sem down to Thare, Abram, and Aran).

— p. 543 (PDF) · printed p. 472: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 544 (PDF) · printed p. 473: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 545 (PDF) · printed p. 472 —

{And Abram and Nachor took wives: the name of Abram's wife was Sarai, and the name of Nachor's wife, Melcha, the daughter of Aran, the father of Melcha and the father of Iescha. And Sarai was barren, and had no children. And Thare took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Aran his son's son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, the wife of Abram his son, and brought them out of Ur of the Chaldees to go into the land of Chanaan: and they came as far as Haran, and dwelt there. And the days of Thare were two hundred and five years, and he died in Haran.}

Gen 11:29–32 (verse lemma, concluding the chapter).

PREFACE. Three things in particular Moses narrates in this eleventh chapter. First, he sets forth the zeal and endeavor of those who undertook to build the city and tower of Babel, and the outcome and end of that work. Then he describes the whole progeny of Sem down to Abraham, counting between the two eight generations. Although, if you wish to include Sem and Abraham themselves, ten generations (as most reckon) must be counted, namely these: Sem, Arphaxad, Sale, Heber, Phaleg, Reu, Sarug, Nachor, Thare, and Abram. In the third place he treats of the birth of Abraham, of his marriage, and of his migration from Chaldea into Mesopotamia. For he teaches that Abraham was born in the seventieth year of his father Thare; that he married Sara, called by another name Iescha, who was the daughter of Aran the brother of Abraham; and that, Ur of the Chaldees being left behind, he came to the city Haran, the farthest of Mesopotamia, together with his wife, his father, and Lot the son of Aran his brother.

Praefatio §1. The three chief matters of Gen 11: (1) the building of Babel and its outcome; (2) Sem's progeny to Abraham — 8 generations between them, or 10 counting both (Sem, Arphaxad, Sale, Heber, Phaleg, Reu, Sarug, Nachor, Thare, Abram); (3) Abraham's birth (Thare's 70th yr), marriage (Sara, also called Iescha, daughter of his brother Aran), and migration from Ur to Haran with his wife, father, and Lot.

As to the first part of this chapter, which is about the building of the tower and the confusion of tongues, it must be known that Moses narrated that matter very briefly indeed, but quite distinctly and expressly, declaring namely five circumstances of the matter…

Praefatio §2. The Babel narrative, though very brief, sets out five circumstances of the affair (continues p. 473).

— p. 546 (PDF) · printed p. 473 —

…that is: who those men were who willed to do that work; what material they used for the effecting of that work; what the work was, and how great it was to be according to their counsel and intent; to what end they willed to do that work; and finally, how God punished their audacity and pride by the confusion of tongues and their dispersion into the various parts of the world — of which so memorable a matter there afterward remained a perpetual token and monument: the name of that place, Babel, signifying confusion. Now since above, in chapter 10, Moses, wishing to teach that the whole race of men was multiplied from the three sons of Noah, said that from those three sons of Noah proceeded the whole division of men according to various peoples, nations, tongues, and regions — which division was without doubt made after the building of the tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues — therefore Augustine, in book 16 of the City of God, chapter 4, and Rupert, in book 4 of the Commentaries on Genesis, chapter 41, rightly observe that the things narrated in this eleventh chapter about the confusion of tongues and the dispersion of men are mentioned here by recapitulation. For Moses returns to what he had signified above about the division of men according to various tongues and regions, repeating from its first origin the cause of that division — namely, teaching

from what occasion it came about that, whereas before there had been one tongue of all men, it was then divided into so many and so dissonant tongues.

Praefatio §2 (cont.). The five circumstances Moses declares: (1) who the builders were; (2) the material; (3) the work and its intended size; (4) its purpose; (5) how God punished their pride by confounding tongues and dispersing them — the name Babel (‘confusion’) a lasting monument. Since Gen 10 already said the nations divided from Noah's three sons (a division surely after Babel), Augustine (City of God 16.4) and Rupert (on Genesis bk. 4 ch. 41) rightly note that Gen 11 is told by recapitulation — Moses returns to explain the cause of that division. Margins: Augustine; Rupert.

I am unwilling to leave among things passed over two matters which the author of the Scholastic History hands down on the book of Genesis, toward the end of chapter 37 and the beginning of 38, lest perchance they impose upon a reader not very intelligent and skilled in the Sacred letters: and indeed they are worthy of correction. He says that the things here narrated by Moses about the building of the tower and the confusion of tongues happened after the death of Noah — in which he manifestly slips into an error of chronology. For Noah lived 350 years after the flood; but the division of tongues was made in the year in which Phaleg was born, which was the 101st year after the flood. And according to the Hebrews, who throw the division of tongues back to the last year of Phaleg's life (which was the 340th after the flood), that division of tongues happened ten years before the death of Noah: of which matter we disputed in the preceding tenth book. Wherefore the opinion of that author can in no way be excused from falsehood.

Praefatio §2 (cont.). First error of the Scholastic History (Comestor, Gen ch. 37–38): that Babel happened after Noah's death — a chronological blunder, since Noah lived 350 yrs after the flood, while the division was at Phaleg's birth (yr 101), or even by the Hebrews at Phaleg's last year (yr 340 = 10 yrs before Noah's death; treated in his ‘tenth book,’ i.e. Liber XV). Margin: the author of the Scholastic History is refuted.

— p. 547 (PDF) · printed p. 474 —

This author says, moreover, that during the whole time in which Noah lived, the progeny of his three sons was multiplied to twenty-four thousand men, of all of whom those three sons of Noah — Sem, Cham, and Japheth — were the chiefs and leaders. I shall set down here his words: „Philo the Jew relates (says that author), or, as others will have it, a Gentile philosopher, in the book of Questions on Genesis, that from the three sons of Noah, while he was yet living, there were born twenty-four thousand men, besides women and little ones, having above them the three leaders we have mentioned.“ So he. But neither did Philo the Jew hand down any such thing in any book, nor is it true or likely. For within those 350 years after the flood in which Noah lived, it is to be believed that not twenty-four thousand men, but more than two hundred myriads of men, existed. For Abraham was born at the end of the reign of king Ninus, in whose army, and in that which Zoroaster king of the Bactrians had got ready against Ninus, there were more than two million men, as Diodorus is the author in the third book. And within three hundred years, from the one Jacob the Hebrew nation was so propagated in Egypt that it had six hundred thousand fighting men, besides little ones, women, and old men, when, under the leadership of Moses, it went out of Egypt. But, having said these things by way of preface, let us proceed to set forth the first part of this chapter, in which is narrated the building of the city and tower and the confusion of tongues.

Praefatio §2 (concl.). Second error of the Scholastic History: that in Noah's lifetime his sons' progeny grew to only 24,000 men (falsely ascribed to Philo's Questions on Genesis) — Philo wrote no such thing, and it is incredible: in the 350 post-flood yrs more than 2,000,000 men existed (Ninus's and Zoroaster's armies alone exceeded 2 million, Diodorus bk. 3; Jacob's line grew to 600,000 fighting men in 300 yrs, by the Exodus). With this preface done, Pererius turns to the first part — Babel. Margins: Diodorus; Exod 12.

Explanation of the first part of the eleventh chapter, on the building of the tower of Babel and the confusion and division of tongues, containing ten Disputations. In the explanation of this first part of the eleventh chapter, ten disputations must be diligently treated; which being unfolded, the

history which Moses wrote on this matter — every obscurity illuminated and every difficulty that could arise from his words untied — will be plain and manifest. The First Disputation will be, who those men were who built the tower of Babel. The Second, what material they used to make that work. The Third, of how great a size they willed to make that work, or even did make it. The Fourth, what causes moved those men to construct that building. The Fifth, what that is which Moses relates — that God came down to see that work which was being made. The Sixth: since Moses brings in God speaking with others, it is asked who they were with whom God spoke, and whose fellowship and aid He required to disturb the design and endeavor of those men. The Seventh…

Praefatio (structural outline). The first part of Gen 11 (Babel) will be treated in ten disputations: (1) who the builders were; (2) the material used; (3) the intended size; (4) the causes; (5) the meaning of 'God came down to see'; (6) with whom God spoke (continues p. 475).

— p. 548 (PDF) · printed p. 475 —

…The Seventh Disputation is about the confusion of tongues, by which God, as by a punishment fitting their fault, willed to punish their insane audacity and pride. The Eighth disputation, whether that tongue which from the beginning was common to all men was Hebrew. The Ninth, of what kind that confusion of tongues was, and how it was made. The Tenth, about the number of those tongues — whether they were seventy-two.

Praefatio (outline, concl.). The remaining disputations: (7) the confusion of tongues as fitting punishment; (8) whether the first common tongue was Hebrew; (9) the nature and manner of the confusion; (10) the number of tongues — whether 72.

FIRST DISPUTATION. Whether it was all the men who then were on the earth, or only some part of them, who came together to build the city and tower of Babel.

Liber XVI, Disputation 1 (title): did all men then living, or only some, gather to build Babel?

{Upon those words of Moses, chapter 11: And the earth was of one language and of the same speech. And when they removed from the East, they found a plain in the land of Sennaar, and dwelt in it.}

Gen 11:1–2 (verse lemma, for Disputation 1).

Cajetan denies that it was all men who came together to build the tower. For, expounding the aforesaid words of Moses, he writes in this manner: „Do not understand that the whole human race set out from the East and went into the region of Sennaar: because neither does the letter sound this, nor is this consonant with reason; but the sense of the letter is that, one tongue continuing in the whole earth, those who moved themselves from the East came into the valley of Sennaar.“ So Cajetan. But the contrary opinion is far more probable, which we shall confirm from the aforesaid words of Moses: wherefore it is necessary to interpret those words carefully, part by part.

§3. Disp. 1 opens. Cajetan denies all men gathered: the text means only that, one tongue continuing everywhere, those who moved from the East came to Sennaar. Pererius holds the contrary (all men) far more probable, to be proved from the text. Margin: Cajetan.

In those words, then, ‘And the whole earth was of one lip,’ the speech is doubly figurative: for both ‘the whole earth’ is said for ‘all the men who were on the earth,’ and ‘lip’ is put for ‘speech’ and discourse. For because speech is fashioned and formed by the tongue and the lips, therefore ‘tongue’ is most frequently put — not only among the Hebrews but among the Greeks too and the Latins — for ‘speech.’ And the word ‘lip’ or ‘lips’ Scripture also very often uses for ‘speech’: whence is that, ‘Thy lips are a dropping honeycomb,’ as if it said, from thy mouth flows discourse sweeter than honey; and of Job it is written that he did not sin with his lips, that is, in speech, or in those things he had spoken; Moses too said that he was uncircumcised in lips, that is, inelegant and rude in speaking. But that which is subjoined, ‘And of the same speech,’ is an explanation of that which…

§3 (cont.). ‘The whole earth was of one lip’ is doubly figurative: ‘the whole earth’ = all men on earth; ‘lip’ = speech (so ‘tongue’ and ‘lip’ stand for speech in Hebrew, Greek, Latin — Cant 4 ‘thy lips a dropping honeycomb’; Job ‘sinned not with his lips’; Moses ‘uncircumcised in lips’). ‘And of the same speech’ explains the preceding… (continues p. 476). Margins: Cant 4; Job 1–2; Exod 6.

— p. 549 (PDF) · printed p. 476 —

…preceded, ‘of one lip’: for that there was one lip of all men signifies that all men used the same tongue and speech. Although some will have there to be some distinction between these. „Not only,“ says Cajetan, „did all men agree in unity of words, but also in unity of lip — that is, of manner of utterance. For it happens that Italians, sharing in words, differ in lips, that is, in manner of pronouncing. And it is similar among the Germans, Spaniards, and others. To remove, therefore, all diversity, both unities are expressed.“ So Cajetan. But Aben-Ezra thinks it is signified not only that there was one and the same tongue to all, but that in it all men spoke to one another about all things with the same words, not different ones: which does not happen today; for the learned speak otherwise — that is, more expressively — than the unlearned; but then there was the same phrasing, the same style, and the same conformation of words. But what that one tongue was, whether Hebrew or not, will be disputed below. The Septuagint translators rendered this place thus: „The whole earth was one lip, and one voice to all.“

§3 (concl.)–§4. ‘Of one lip’ = all used the same tongue and speech. The distinction between ‘lip’ and ‘speech’: Cajetan — unity both of words and of ‘lip’ (manner of pronouncing; Italians/Germans/Spaniards share words but differ in pronunciation); Aben-Ezra — not only one tongue, but all spoke with the same words/phrasing/style (unlike today, where the learned speak more expressively than the unlearned). What that tongue was (Hebrew?) is deferred. LXX: ‘one lip, and one voice to all.’ Margins: Cajetan; Aben-Ezra.

From these words of Moses is drawn the first reason by which it is proved that those who came together and conspired in the building of the tower were all men — that is, of every nation whatsoever that then was on the earth. For Moses by these words plainly declares that those who came together into the plain of Sennaar were those who were of one lip and of

the same speech, and whose tongue, on account of that building of the tower, was confounded and variously multiplied: but all men were of one tongue; therefore all came together to the building of that tower. For if not all had come together, but some had remained in other places of the earth, then, when the tongue was confounded and divided in those who built the tower, in those who were not present but had remained elsewhere the same tongue which was before would have remained. But that the tongue which before had been the one tongue of all, after the confusion of tongues remained in only the one family of Heber (whence it also got its name, for ‘Hebrew’ is, as it were, ‘Heberew’), is the certain opinion of the Hebrews, approved also by Blessed Augustine and very many other Christian doctors. But let us proceed to other matters.

§5. First argument that ALL men gathered: Moses says those at Sennaar were of one lip and same speech, and their tongue was confounded; but all men were of one tongue; therefore all gathered. Otherwise, those who remained elsewhere would have kept the original tongue — yet that tongue survived only in Heber's family (whence ‘Hebrew’ = ‘Heberew’), the certain view of the Hebrews, Augustine, and many Christian doctors.

There follows in this history of Moses: „And when they removed from the East,“ etc. By ‘the East’ Moses here seems to call Armenia, which is more eastern than Babylonia, where the plain of Sennaar was. And since the Ark of Noah, the flood being ended, settled on the mountains of Armenia (as Moses said above in the eighth chapter), it is quite likely that in those places of Armenia Noah and his sons and their descendants dwelt during those hundred years which passed after the flood before the building of the tower. From this region of Armenia, then, which is called ‘eastern’ by reason of Babylonia itself, those men set out.

§6. ‘When they removed from the East’: ‘the East’ = Armenia (more eastern than Babylonia/Sennaar). Since the Ark rested on the Armenian mountains (Gen 8), Noah's line likely dwelt there for the ~100 yrs before Babel; thence they set out (Armenia being ‘eastern’ relative to Babylonia).

But why did they set out thence? Was it because they were weary of the places of Armenia, which are mountainous, rough, and barren, and were seeking other seats more convenient, more fertile, and more pleasant? Or because, now too much increased and multiplied in number through those hundred years, they desired a roomier and more convenient habitation…

§7. Why did they set out? Perhaps weary of mountainous, barren Armenia, seeking more fertile, pleasant lands; or, grown too numerous in 100 yrs, wanting a roomier dwelling (continues p. 477).

— p. 550 (PDF) · printed p. 477 —

…habitation? Or rather, aspiring to greater power, and coveting an ampler dominion and opulence? For scarcely ever are men content with their lot, nor are they sated with things already gotten and present, but always desire other and greater things and strive to obtain them; and, as of coveting, so of seeking and having there is no end.

§7 (concl.). Or rather aiming at greater power and wealth — for men are never content with their lot, always craving more, with no end to coveting, seeking, and having.

Hear the moral lesson taught in this place by Chrysostom — for, expounding what is here said, that men, not content with the region of the East, sought other seats: „See," he says, „that the human race cannot stay within its own limits, but, always coveting more, ever after seeks greater things. And this is what most destroys man: that he is unwilling to acknowledge the measure of his nature, always desiring greater things, and conceiving by his wishes things that are above his condition and ability. Hence those who look to worldly works, if ever they abound in much riches and become very powerful, as if forgetful of their nature, wish to be raised to such a height that not rarely they are cast down to the depths. And although they see this happen daily, yet they are not by this reckoning made more amended; or, if some of them are, yet the amendment is not lasting, but they take the same road and are carried into the same precipices." This history of Moses sets before our eyes: for men from the beginning, not content with the places about the East which they had long

inhabited, endeavored to seek other seats and to attempt greater things day by day; wherefore they were afflicted with the gravest evils and calamities.

§8. Chrysostom's moral lesson (homily 30 on Genesis): mankind cannot stay within its limits, always craving more; man's ruin is refusing to know the measure of his nature, reaching above his condition — the rich and powerful, forgetful of their nature, climb so high they are cast to the depths, and do not lastingly amend though they see it daily. So these men, not content with the East, sought more and were afflicted with grave calamities. Margin: Chrysostom, homily 30.

Tostatus in this place cites Aben-Ezra, saying that among those men who are said to have set out from the East were Noah and Abraham. And concerning Noah indeed, as to the reckoning of time, that can be true. For what is here narrated happened a hundred years after the flood; but Noah lived three hundred and fifty years after the flood; Noah could therefore be one of those who set out from the East — although he undertook that journey with another mind and another purpose than most of the others. But this certainly is by no means to be believed: that Noah was among those who built the tower of Babel; since Scripture not obscurely disapproves such zeal, undertaking, and endeavor of those men, and teaches that it was punished by God with no light penalty.

§9. Tostatus cites Aben-Ezra: Noah and Abraham were among the migrants from the East. Of Noah the timing fits (Babel was ~100 yrs after the flood; Noah lived 350 yrs after), so he could have been among them — but with a different purpose; certainly NOT among the tower-builders, whose enterprise Scripture condemns and God punished heavily. Margins: Tostatus; Aben-Ezra.

Abraham, moreover, says Tostatus, could in no way have been among those men; since he was born a hundred and ninety years after the confusion of tongues — for this is believed to have happened a hundred years after the flood, while Abraham was born in the 292nd year after the flood. But Tostatus does not observe that Aben-Ezra said this according to the opinion of the Hebrews, who refer the division of tongues to the last year of Phaleg, which was the 340th after the flood and the 48th of Abraham's age. But that Noah and his sons were the chiefs and leaders of those who, setting out from the East, came into the plain of Sennaar, I can

confirm from the testimony of Josephus, who writes in this manner: „The three sons of Noah, Sem, Cham, and [Japheth]…“

§10. Tostatus: Abraham could not have been among them, being born 190 yrs after the confusion (Babel ~yr 100; Abraham born yr 292). But Tostatus misses that Aben-Ezra spoke per the Hebrew view (division at Phaleg's last year = yr 340 = Abraham's 48th). Pererius adds that Noah and his sons led the migrants to Sennaar (Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1 — quote begins, continues next batch). Margin: Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1.

— p. 551 (PDF) · printed p. 478 —

…[Sem, Cham, and Japheth], born a hundred years before the flood, were the first of all, the mountains being left, to begin to inhabit the plain; and to others — still then fearful from the recent memory of the calamity, and not daring to descend from the higher ground — they were the authors and example of doing the same. And the plain which they first set about to cultivate is named Sennaar.“ So he [Josephus].

§10 (concl.). End of the Josephus quotation (Antiquities bk. 1): Noah's sons, born 100 yrs before the flood, first left the mountains to settle the plain, leading the others (still afraid to come down) by their example; the plain they first cultivated is named Sennaar.

From this place too we can argue that those who came together into the plain of Sennaar to build the tower were all the men who at that time were on the earth. For Moses does not say that these or those men set out from the East, but precisely and simply says that men set out from the East — not obscurely signifying all who then were: wishing, namely, those to be understood as having set out from the East whom he had just before mentioned to be of one lip and the same speech; but all men were such, for he had said that the whole earth was then of one lip and of the same speech.

§11. A further argument that ALL men gathered: Moses says simply ‘men set out from the East,’ not ‘these or those,’ signifying all — those of one lip and speech he had just named; and all men were such (‘the whole earth was of one lip’).

Philo treats this place of Moses allegorically in the book which he published On the Confusion of Tongues. His discourse — allegorical and

at the same time moral, and indeed not inelegant — I was unwilling to pass over in silence. Thus he writes: „Moses relates that those men set out from the East: this is said according to nature. For there are in the soul two species of East, one better, the other worse: the better, when, in the manner of the Sun's rays, the splendor of the virtues rises in it; the worse, when, these being darkened, other things shine. An example of the former is this: And God planted a Paradise in Eden toward the East — not, indeed, only of earthly plants, but most of all of the heavenly virtues, which that planter kindled from his own incorporeal light, never to be extinguished. What? Another too said: Behold a man whose name is the East. A new appellation, if it be understood of a man who consists of soul and body; but if it be understood of that incorporeal image representing God, you will confess this name was most aptly given. For this most ancient Son of all God the Father willed to rise, whom elsewhere he names the firstborn. He, imitating his Father, formed the like species as the exemplars he saw with Him.“

§12. Philo's allegorical/moral reading (On the Confusion of Tongues). ‘From the East’ taken of the soul: two ‘Easts,’ a better (when the splendor of virtues rises like the sun — Eden ‘toward the East,’ Gen 2, = heavenly virtues) and a worse. The ‘man whose name is Orient’ (Zach 6) = the incorporeal image of God, the most ancient firstborn Son, who forms species after the Father's exemplars (continues p. 479). Margins: Philo's allegorical exposition; ‘the East’; a double East; Gen 2; Zach 6; a notable view of Philo on the Son of God.

But an example of the worse East exists in him who wished to curse the people blessed by God. For he too is said to have dwelt toward the East. But this East, although it has a name common with the former, is yet in the thing itself most different. „From Mesopotamia,“ it says, „Balac sent for me, from the mountains of the East, saying: Come, that thou mayest curse him whom God does not curse.“ Now Balac is interpreted „mad“: and not undeservedly, who hoped that he could deceive Him who is, and elude His sure sentence by human subtleties and make it void. Therefore he dwells in Mesopotamia — that is, having a mind, as it were, submerged in the midst of two rivers, of error and of wickedness, and not able at last to swim out

and emerge. But such a disposition, as it is the rising of folly, so is it the setting of a good mind. Accordingly those men, of whom a harmonious discord is narrated, are said to have set out from the East. But whether from the East of vices? Doubtless we read that those who set out from the East of virtue are separated; but of those alike liable to vices there is one motion: just as the hands are moved together — not apart by their own joints, but as cohering with the whole body. For folly is the leader to evils, to works not natural, which is the region of vices. Thus far from Philo.

§12 (concl.). The ‘worse East’: Balac, who sought to curse God's people, dwelt toward the East (Num 23, ‘from the mountains of the East’) — ‘Balac’ = ‘mad,’ his mind submerged between two rivers (error and wickedness) in Mesopotamia. Folly is the rising of a bad mind, the setting of a good; those of one accord in vice move together (like the body's hands). Margin: Num 23.

— p. 552 (PDF) · printed p. 479 —

But let us weigh those words which follow: „They found a plain in the land of Sennaar and dwelt in it.“ That is, they were greatly delighted with that place, because it was level, open, and most amply extending in every direction, and also watered by the Euphrates flowing through it, and for that cause fertile and very pleasant. Of this plain of Sennaar Josephus writes thus: „Of the place which is named Sennaar in Babylonia, Hestiaeus makes mention in this manner: They say that the survivors of that calamity (the Flood), the priests, bearing the sacred things of Enyalian Jove (Jerome calls him Gemelian Jove), came to Sennaar of Babylonia.“ Epiphanius, near the beginning of the work he wrote against heresies, touching on the history of this place, says thus: „When men extended themselves and proceeded further from Mount Lubar and the borders of Armenia — that is, from the region of Ararat — they halt in the plain of Sennaar, which they had chosen for themselves. And the plain of Sennaar is situated now in the Persian region which once was Assyria.“ So Epiphanius: who by these words signifies nothing other than that the land of Sennaar, which once had been in the dominion and under the lordship of the Assyrians, was in his own age under the dominion of the Persians.

§13. The plain of Sennaar: level, open, fertile, watered by the Euphrates. Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1): Hestiaeus says the flood-survivor priests of 'Enyalian Jove' (Jerome: Gemelian Jove) came to Sennaar of Babylonia. Epiphanius (Against Heresies): men proceeded from Mt. Lubar / Ararat in Armenia and settled in the chosen plain of Sennaar — in what was Assyria, in his day under the Persians. Margins: Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1; Jerome, On Hebrew Places; Epiphanius.

Nor indeed is it to be thought that that plain was previously named Sennaar; for at that time no one of men had come to that place, so that he could impose such a name on it; but afterward that plain was called by that word. That is, the plain was signified by a fitting name from the event (as Rupert says). For Sennaar is interpreted „the shaking-out of teeth," that is, of speeches or words, which are not made without teeth: for the teeth greatly help in speaking; which were then in a manner shaken out for them, when those toothed ones — that is, the proud or strong — lost their accustomed faculty of speaking. This name is also interpreted, and rightly said, „their stench-maker"; because, namely, they sent forth the stench of pride, by such daring and endeavor, even to the nostrils of God. To whom, as humility, or a contrite spirit, is a sacrifice in an odor of sweetness, so on the contrary pride is a horrible stench.

§14. The name Sennaar came from the event, not before (no one had been there to name it). Rupert: 'Sennaar' = 'the shaking-out of teeth' (i.e. of speech, which needs teeth) — the proud lost their power of speaking; also 'their stench-maker,' since they sent the stench of pride to God's nostrils (whereas humility/a contrite spirit is a sweet sacrifice, Ps 50; pride a horrible stench). Margins: Rupert, Commentary on Genesis bk. 4 ch. 41; the origin of the name Sennaar; Ps 50.

From those words which follow, „They found the plain of Sennaar, they dwelt in it," it may be conjectured that those men then first found level places, convenient for dwelling on account of their fertility and pleasantness and abundance of waters: wherefore they halted there, and, dwelling-places being built scattered here and there, dwelt for a while; but afterward considered and deliberated — namely, for the sake of greater convenience and security, and also of more renowned fame — to build a great and fortified city and a tower of wondrous height. Not, therefore, immediately when they came into that plain did they set about building the

tower and the city, but after they had dwelt for a while in that plain.

§15. They first found the fertile, well-watered plain, settled in scattered dwellings, and only later resolved (for convenience, security, and fame) to build a great fortified city and a lofty tower — not immediately on arrival, but after dwelling there a while.

Philo, weighing the aforesaid words and accommodating them to an allegorical exposition (as he is wont to do with most things), writes thus: „Here observe that he does not say that they came into the plain in which they remained, but that they found the plain — namely, eagerly and curiously sought out by them, after they had looked about where there was a place most convenient for their madness. So it is indeed. The fool does not receive evils from elsewhere, but himself, by seeking, finds them for himself, not content with those through which wretched nature proceeds of itself, but heaping them up with evil arts and exercises. And would that, having tarried there a little, he migrated elsewhere: but he himself rejoices to dwell there. For Scripture says that, the plain being found, they dwelt in it — namely, as in a fatherland, and not as sojourners of a foreign region…“

§16. Philo's allegory: Moses says they ‘found’ (not merely ‘came to’) the plain — eagerly sought as most fit for their madness. The fool seeks out his own evils, heaping them up, and rejoices to dwell in them as in a homeland, not as a passing sojourner (continues p. 480). Margin: Philo's allegorical exposition.

— p. 553 (PDF) · printed p. 480 —

„…For the evil would have been lighter, if, after they had fallen into sins, they had held them as foreign and a stranger's, not as kindred and domestic. For sojourners could have departed; but, the seats being once chosen, they had afterward to remain. Wherefore in Moses wise men are brought in as sojourners: for their soul is sent from heaven, as it were into a colony, undertaking, for the sake of living and learning, a sort of pilgrimage into the earthly nature. But when, having used the hospitality of the body, they have contemplated all sensible and mortal things, they return back whence they had come, mindful that heaven is their city and fatherland, but in these

things bordering on earth, they are as if only in a lodging. For to other colonists a new seat takes away the longing for the old fatherland; but this heavenly fatherland awaits the return of its own, and they themselves yearn to return thither as soon as possible. And so rightly Abraham, who left a dead life and a sepulchre, thus addresses the keepers of the dead and the dispensers of mortal things: I am a stranger and a sojourner among the living; as if he said: You are natives, who make more of ash and dust than of the soul, since you have set over you a prince, Ephron — which name signifies dust. Jacob too called himself a sojourner, saying: The days of the years of my pilgrimage are few and evil, and they have not come up to the days of my fathers wherein they were pilgrims on the earth.“ Thus far from Philo.

§16 (concl.). Philo: it would be a lighter evil to treat sins as a stranger's, not as one's own home. The wise are ‘sojourners’ — the soul sent from heaven on a pilgrimage into earthly nature, returning home, knowing heaven is its true city. So Abraham: ‘I am a stranger and sojourner among the living’ (Gen 23 — to the dust-loving natives whose prince ‘Ephron’ means ‘dust’); and Jacob: ‘the days of my pilgrimage are few and evil’ (Gen 47). Margins: the wise treat themselves as sojourners in the world, fools as citizens; Gen 23; Gen 47.

Therefore the sons and grandsons of Noah and their descendants, the great fear of the flood being now over, did not at once descend from the mountains into the plains, but, dwelling for a while in the highlands, afterward sought the lower and more level places. But first they placed their seats at the roots of the mountains; at last, the fear decreasing day by day, and the desire of more convenient and pleasant places growing, they sought especially the level places. Plato writes that few men survived the flood, and that three kinds of life and habitation were established among men after the flood. For first he thinks men dwelt on the very summits of the mountains, because they still feared the waters which are wont to abound in the plains, and that they led a rustic and simple life, and least of all hostile to one another: of which life Plato says an image was sketched by Homer, where he describes the life, manners, and seats of the Cyclopes in the caves and dens of the mountains. The second kind of life was that of

those who placed their seats at the roots of the mountains, when the plains had now begun to dry: of this second society of men and habitation he brings forward from Homer the example of Dardanus, who founded Dardania when men dwelt in the great valleys of Ida. The third kind of life was when, the mountains and their roots and valleys being now left, they did not hesitate to come into the level and open plains and there dwell securely…

§17. Noah's descendants came down gradually — first the highlands, then the foothills, then (fear fading, desire for pleasant places growing) the plains. Plato (Laws bk. 3): three post-flood ways of life — (1) mountaintops (still fearing floods; rustic, peaceable — Homer's cave-dwelling Cyclopes); (2) foothills as the plains dried (Homer's Dardanus founding Dardania in the valleys of Ida); (3) the open plains, dwelling securely (continues p. 481). Margins: Plato, Laws bk. 3, makes three kinds of post-flood habitation; Homer.

— p. 554 (PDF) · printed p. 481 —

…Of this Plato sets the example of Ilus, whom they hand down to be the founder of Ilium: whence it was fitting that he was buried in the middle of the plain, as Homer says, since he had first dared to dwell in the plains.

§17 (concl.). The third stage's example (Plato): Ilus, founder of Ilium, buried in the middle of the plain (Homer) — fittingly, since he first dared to dwell in the plains.

SECOND DISPUTATION. On the material out of which the city and tower of Babel were built.

Liber XVI, Disputation 2 (title): the material of the city and tower of Babel.

{Upon those words, Genesis ch. 11: Come, let us make bricks and bake them with fire. And they had brick instead of stones, and bitumen instead of mortar.}

Gen 11:3 (verse lemma, for Disputation 2).

After they had dwelt for a while in huts and scattered dwellings, there came upon those men a certain ambitious and frenzied desire of undertaking and accomplishing certain great works, famous for all the ages of posterity —

that is, of constructing a most ample city and raising a tower of incredible height. By these words is signified the material they used to construct that building: for they used bricks baked with fire, in place of rocks or stones, and bitumen, instead of lime or mud. But why did they use bricks? Four causes can be brought forward. The first cause was the lack of rocks in the plain of Sennaar: for since it is a level and flat land, it does not abound in rocks; for not every soil bears all things. Hear Vitruvius: „Concerning the wall itself, of what material it should be built or finished, it is therefore not to be prescribed beforehand, because we cannot have in all places the supplies we wish. But where there are squared stones, or flint, or rubble, or baked brick or unbaked, these must be used. For not, as at Babylon, abounding in liquid bitumen, they have a wall made of baked brick instead of lime and sand, can all regions or properties of places likewise have such great utilities of the same kind, that from these provisions a wall may be had, perfect unto eternity, without fault.“

§18. Disp. 2. After dwelling a while, an ambitious, frenzied desire seized them to build a vast city and an incredibly tall tower. Their material: fire-baked bricks (for stone) and bitumen (for lime/mud). Why bricks? Four causes. (1) Lack of stone in the flat plain of Sennaar (not every soil bears all). Vitruvius (bk. 1 ch. 5): material depends on local supply — squared stone, flint, rubble, or brick; Babylon, abounding in bitumen, walls with baked brick instead of lime and sand. Margins: four causes why Babel was built of brick; Vitruvius bk. 1 ch. 5.

— p. 555 (PDF) · printed p. 482 —

The second cause was the convenience of making very many and very good bricks. And what kind of brick is most suitable for buildings Pliny briefly indicates in these words: „Bricks are to be drawn not from gravelly nor sandy soil, and much less from pebbly, but from chalky and whitish, or from red ochre; or, if from sandy, at least from the coarse-grained kind. They are best fashioned in spring, for in midsummer they are not [good]. For buildings they approve none but two years old.“ So Pliny. Almost the same things, word for word, Vitruvius disputes about bricks, so that it may not rashly be thought that Pliny took them from Vitruvius. Since, therefore, the soil of Babylonia is such as is needed for fashioning the best bricks, on

that account those builders rightly used bricks.

§19. (2) The ease of making very many and excellent bricks: Pliny (bk. 35 ch. 14) on the right brick-clay (chalky/whitish or red ochre, not gravel/sand; best made in spring; two years old for building) — Vitruvius (bk. 1 ch. 3) nearly verbatim. Babylonia's soil being ideal for brick, the builders rightly used it. Margins: Pliny bk. 35 ch. 14; Vitruvius bk. 1 ch. 3.

The third cause was that the building might be more solid and firm and lasting. For brickwork structure, if rightly made, has an incredible durability, and in a manner endures unto eternity. „They built," says Josephus in book 1 of the Antiquities, „with baked bricks, soldered for firmness with bitumen." Hear Pliny: „The Greeks, except where the structure could be made of flint, preferred brick walls. For they are everlasting, if made to the plumb-line: therefore they are admitted both in public works and in royal houses. So they built the wall at Athens which looks toward Mount Hymettus; so the temples of Jove and Hercules at Patrae, although they surrounded them with stone columns and architraves." The same Pliny in another place, on the testimony of Epigenes, a most weighty author, affirms that among the Babylonians observations of the stars for seven hundred and twenty years, inscribed on baked tiles, were preserved.

§20. (3) Durability: well-made brickwork lasts almost forever. Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1): they built with baked bricks soldered with bitumen. Pliny (bk. 35 ch. 14): the Greeks preferred brick walls (everlasting if plumb), used in public works and temples (the Athens wall toward Hymettus; the temples of Jove and Hercules at Patrae); and (bk. 7 ch. 56) Epigenes attests the Babylonians kept 720 years of star-observations inscribed on baked tiles. Margins: the durability of brick structure; Pliny bk. 35 ch. 14; Pliny bk. 7 ch. 56.

The fourth cause is handed down by some thus: that those men knew, by hearing and the tradition of their elders, that, as before there had been a general destruction of the world by water, so there would one day be a general calamity of the whole world by fire; and, as against the destruction of the flood the wooden ark had been for the salvation of men, so they thought that against that conflagration the remedy and protection could be some very great and very high brick building — since bricks, when baked,

most strongly resist fire, but stones are dissolved by fire into lime.

§21. (4) Some say: knowing by tradition that, as the world was once destroyed by water, so it would one day be destroyed by fire — and as the wooden ark saved men from the flood — they thought a vast, tall brick building could be a refuge against the fire, since baked bricks resist fire (while stones dissolve into lime).

But what does that mean, „And they had bitumen for mortar (caementum)“? Certainly the word ‘caementum,’ if taken properly, signifies the rough material of which buildings are made — such as stones not fitted by any art to a building, nor polished, such as are found heaped up at random. „The rubble (caementa),“ says Livy in a certain place, „were not hardened with lime, but only daubed with mud.“ But in this place the word ‘caementum’ is put for the glue by which the material of the structure — whether they were stones or bricks — is glued together and coheres, that it may become more tenacious and firm: such as lime, mud, clay or chalk, and finally also bitumen. For ‘bitumen’ the Hebrew has ‘Chomer,’ which word some interpreted ‘clay,’ as Vatablus's version has; or ‘mud,’ as Pagninus rendered; or ‘chalk’ or ‘red bitumen,’ which is made of lime and brick-dust, whence it also takes a red color, which pleases Oleaster. The Septuagint translators rendered it in Greek ■σφαλτον, that is bitumen, whom the Latin translator followed.

§22. ‘Bitumen for caementum’: ‘caementum’ properly = rough unworked building-stone (Livy: ‘caementa not hardened with lime but daubed with mud’); here it means the cement binding the material (lime, mud, clay, chalk, or bitumen). The Hebrew ‘Chomer’ is variously rendered: clay (Vatablus), mud (Pagninus), chalk/red bitumen of lime and brick-dust (Oleaster); the LXX ‘asphalt’ (bitumen), followed by the Vulgate. Margin: what ‘caementum’ signifies here; Livy.

Diodorus of Tarsus, the teacher of Saint Chrysostom — who published Commentaries both on other books of the divine Scripture and also on the Pentateuch of Moses (which, even though they have perished, yet some things drawn from those Commentaries are recorded in the Catena) — is handed down to have left it written in this place that the Hebrew and Syriac word in this place does not signify bitumen but lime; and that this is far

more probable, because bitumen is not suitable for buildings, but lime is most suited…

§23. Diodorus of Tarsus (Chrysostom's teacher; his Pentateuch Commentaries survive only in catena-fragments) held that the Hebrew/Syriac word here means not bitumen but lime — more probable, he said, since bitumen is unsuited to building while lime is most suited (continues p. 483; to be refuted). Margin: Diodorus of Tarsus refuted.

— p. 556 (PDF) · printed p. 483 —

…suited. But neither the Hebrew word nor the Chaldaic, which is in this place, signifies lime, but bitumen or mud.

§23 (concl.). But in fact neither the Hebrew nor the Chaldaic word here means lime — it means bitumen or mud.

Wherefore Theodoret, the name of Diodorus being suppressed, excellently refutes his opinion, writing thus before the fifty-ninth question on Genesis: „Some of the teachers said that bitumen is quicklime; and, being ignorant (as is likely) of the springs of bitumen existing in Assyria, they thought that the tower was built of quicklime. But I have diligently learned from those who come from there that there are springs there which pour forth this material with water; and in constructing and joining buildings they lay the baked brick; and in this way they say that tower was built. For those who told me these things, not content to have only looked at the tower, breaking off some small particle too, said they had found bitumen laid under the baked bricks. They added besides that there is a great lack of stones in that place, and therefore the builders used bricks instead of stones. And yet, without stones, how could quicklime be made?“ So Theodoret.

§24. Theodoret (before Question 59 on Genesis), without naming Diodorus, refutes him: some, ignorant of Assyria's bitumen springs, thought the tower built of quicklime; but travelers report springs there pouring out bitumen (with water), used to lay the baked bricks — they even broke off a fragment and found bitumen under the bricks; and stone being scarce, they used brick (and without stones, how make quicklime?). Margin: Theodoret.

Therefore the Latin translator rightly turned the Hebrew word into Latin „bitumen," for so the Septuagint translators too rendered it; and since that land of Sennaar, which afterward was Babylonia, supplies a great and perennial abundance of bitumen, which is excellent and most suited to buildings, and since for this cause it is certain that Semiramis built the city Babylon, of incredible size and magnificence, with baked brick and bitumen, it is assuredly quite credible that those first builders of the city of Babylon and the tower of Babel used the same material. What I said about the abundance of Babylonian bitumen and its use in buildings, I can cite Strabo as a witness, whose words are these: „In Babylonia much bitumen is born, of which there is a double kind (Eratosthenes being the author), liquid and dry. The liquid they call Naphtha, growing in the Susian territory; the dry, which can also congeal, in the Babylonian spring near Naphtha. From this dry bitumen the greatest lumps grow together, by which [it is] suitable for buildings which are made of baked bricks." So Strabo. With whom Vitruvius too agrees: „At Babylon," he says, „there is a lake of very great size, having liquid bitumen floating on top; with which bitumen and earthen brick Semiramis surrounded Babylon with a built wall." The same Diodorus testifies in book 3, chapter 4.

§25. So the Vulgate (with the LXX) rightly has 'bitumen.' Sennaar/Babylonia yields abundant bitumen, ideal for building; Semiramis built Babylon of baked brick and bitumen, so the first builders of Babel likely used the same. Witnesses: Strabo (bk. 16, citing Eratosthenes — liquid bitumen 'Naphtha' in Susiana, dry near Babylon, in great lumps for brick buildings); Vitruvius (bk. 8 ch. 3 — the Babylonian bitumen lake, Semiramis's wall); Diodorus (bk. 3 ch. 4). Margins: Strabo bk. 16; Vitruvius bk. 8 ch. 3; Diodorus.

Moses, moreover, in writing that those builders of the tower had „bricks for stones and bitumen for mortar," signifies that the use of such material in buildings was not [usual] in his own time, but [buildings were made] of stones and lime or mud. Although he himself wrote, in the book of Exodus chapters 1 and 5, that the Egyptians used mud and bricks in constructing buildings. But perhaps they used them in public and royal buildings, and not indiscriminately in any whatsoever, as in private and common ones; for

Pliny too indicated this.

§25 (cont.). By noting ‘brick for stone, bitumen for mortar,’ Moses implies such material was not the usual building practice in his day (which used stone and lime/mud) — though he himself records the Egyptians using mud and brick (Exod 1, 5); perhaps only in public/royal buildings, not private ones (Pliny too noted this). Margins: whether brick was used in buildings in Moses's time; Pliny bk. 35 ch. 14.

The earlier words of this chapter, which we have hitherto expounded, beautifully accommodating them to a mystical understanding, Blessed Gregory hands down some useful warnings and lessons for spiritual discipline and life; teaching that those who, the care and zeal of heavenly things being cast off, have given themselves wholly to loving and pursuing earthly goods, placing the highest good in the gaining of the felicity of the present life, are very like those who, having set out from the East and coming into the plain of Sennaar, tried to build a very high tower with bricks and bitumen. I shall set down here the words of Gregory, excerpted from his Commentary on the fourth Penitential Psalm. For, expounding the penultimate verse of that Psalm, „Deal favorably, O Lord, in thy good will with Sion, that the walls of Jerusalem may be built up,“ he writes in this manner:…

§26. Gregory's mystical reading (on the 4th Penitential Psalm, Ps 50:20 ‘that the walls of Jerusalem be built’): those who cast off heavenly things and give themselves wholly to earthly goods, placing their highest good in this life's felicity, are like the builders of Babel (continues p. 484).

— p. 557 (PDF) · printed p. 484 —

„Every one of men is a citizen either of Jerusalem or of Babylon. For as, through the love of God, each holy person is made a citizen of Jerusalem, so, through the love of the world, every wicked one labors in the structure of Babylon. And to construct the building of spiritual Babylon, all the perverse imitate the example of that ancient Babel. Of which city, as Scripture says, the builders had bricks for stones and bitumen for mortar. By which it is understood that the lovers of the world construct the township of carnal life, which by the force of winds and the assault of

rivers is to be quickly overthrown by an easy impulse. We read, moreover, that those men came from the East and dwelt in the plain of Sennaar: and since a certain prophet called Christ the East, saying, Behold a man, the East is his name, it is clear that those came from the East who departed from Christ by living ill. And Sennaar is interpreted the shaking-out of teeth, or their stench. In the plain of Sennaar, therefore, dwell those who, placed not on the height of virtues but on the plain of vices, both lacerate their neighbors with the bites of detractions and, lying in the wallowing-place of an idle life, breathe out the stench of their infamy all around; whose teeth God then shakes out, when He confounds at once their deeds and words: for of this it is written, Thou hast broken the teeth of sinners, and again, The Lord shall break their teeth in their mouth. For of their stench it is written through another prophet, The beasts have rotted in their dung. For beasts to rot is for carnal men to end their life in the stench of luxury. Rightly do those who dwell in Sennaar build a city of bricks: because those who serve the pleasures of the flesh raise the change of their mind from fragile material. But those who, the enticements of carnal life renounced, build sanctification in themselves through the works of the holiness of the virtues, these indeed change bricks into stones; who with Isaiah can say, The bricks are fallen, but we will build with square stones. For when the bricks fall, he builds with square stones whoever chastises the wantonness of the flesh with the rigor of stricter discipline; who overcomes the law of the members by the law of the mind; who exchanges the strength of the body for the virtue of the spirit. Whoever, therefore, rouses the weak strength of the flesh into the manly vigor of the spirit, changes, as it were, bricks into stones, with which the walls of Jerusalem may be built.“ So Gregory.

§26 (concl.). Gregory's allegory: every man is a citizen of Jerusalem (by love of God) or Babylon (by love of the world); the perverse imitate ancient Babel. ‘Brick for stone, bitumen for mortar’ = worldly men building carnal life on fragile material, soon overthrown. ‘From the East’ = departing from Christ (the ‘Orient,’ Zach 6); ‘Sennaar’ (shaking-out of teeth / stench) = those on the plain of vices, tearing neighbors by detraction and reeking of infamy — God ‘shakes out their teeth’ (Ps 3, Ps 57) by confounding their deeds and words; their ‘stench’ (Joel 1, rotting beasts) = ending life in the stench of

luxury. Those who chastise the flesh 'change bricks into stones' (Isa 9, 'the bricks are fallen, but we will build with squared stones'), building the walls of Jerusalem. Margins: Zach 6; Ps 3; Ps 57; Joel 1; Isa 9.

— p. 558 (PDF) · printed p. 485 —

THIRD DISPUTATION. Of how great a size those men willed to construct the building, or even did construct it.

Liber XVI, Disputation 3 (title): the intended (or actual) size of the Babel building.

{Upon those words, Genesis ch. 11: Come, let us make us a city and a tower, the top whereof may reach to heaven.}

Gen 11:4 (verse lemma, for Disputation 3).

That „Come" is a Hebraism: for among the Hebrews „come" (singular) and „come" (plural) have the same force and elegance as among the Latins „Eia" and „Up!" or „On!"; for they are [the words] of one exhorting. And that the chief and leader of this exhortation and incitement was Nemrod, that famous giant about whom we disputed in the preceding fourteenth book, Josephus affirms. „This pride," says he, „and contempt of God Nemrod stirred up in those men — the grandson of Cham the son of Noah, a man bold and ready of hand, repeatedly boasting that they owed their felicity not to God but to their own valor; and thus gradually drawing the matter toward tyranny, thinking that men would defect to him if he offered himself to them as leader." After this Josephus adds that Nemrod was the author to those men of building a very high tower: but his words we shall mention a little below, when we treat the fourth disputation.

§27. 'Come' (Venite) is a Hebraism (like Latin 'Eia/Age' — an exhortation). The leader of this incitement was Nemrod, the famous giant (treated in Liber XIV) — Josephus: Nemrod, grandson of Cham, bold and ready, stirred this pride and contempt of God, boasting they owed their fortune to their own valor not God, drawing things toward tyranny by offering himself as leader; he was the author of building the tower (his words deferred to Disp. 4). Margins: Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1; Nemrod.

The same is the opinion of Saint Augustine. For he, speaking of the first building of Babylon, to which that name befell from the confusion of tongues that happened in its construction, says thus: „Whence it is gathered that that giant Nemrod was the founder of that city: who was therefore called a hunter against the Lord, because he wished to raise up, with his fellow-countrymen, a tower against the Lord — which is the impious pride signified.“ So Augustine. Therefore Nemrod was the chief and author of that so proud and bold design, endeavor, and undertaking. Not rightly, then, did Cajetan deny this, who, explaining this place of Moses, says: „That neither Nemrod nor any certain man was the author of that fabric is declared by the exhortation and incitement attributed vaguely and indefinitely to the men; so that we understand from this that Nemrod, after the confusion of tongues, himself occupied the city of Babylonia, begun by common vow and endeavor, and there began to reign.“ Cajetan, therefore, would have Nemrod to have been not the author of founding Babylon, but the first ruler of it when already founded: but that this is contrary to the opinion of Josephus and many of the ancients we taught in the preceding book.

§28. Augustine agrees (City of God 16.4): Nemrod the giant was the founder of that city (called a ‘hunter against the Lord’ for raising the tower against God — signifying impious pride). So Nemrod was chief and author of the design. Cajetan wrongly denied this (the exhortation is attributed vaguely, so Nemrod merely occupied and ruled the already-begun city) — contrary to Josephus and many ancients (shown in the preceding book). Margins: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 4; Gen 10; Cajetan.

But that which is here said, „Let us make us a tower,“ can have a double understanding: either that the singular is put for the plural, that is ‘tower’ for ‘towers’; or that, among many other towers, they willed to raise some one, the highest of all, as it were the Capitol of that city…

§29. ‘Let us make a tower’ — two senses: the singular for the plural (‘tower’ = ‘towers’); or one tower, the highest of all, as the city's ‘Capitol’ (continues p. 486).

— p. 559 (PDF) · printed p. 486 —

…whether there was one tower, which they were building as the chief among all, says Augustine, or whether there were many towers, which are signified by the singular number: for just as „frog“ and „locust“ is said, so are thousands of soldiers called and understood; as „frog and locust“ is so said for the multitude of frogs and locusts with which the Egyptians were smitten through Moses. The building of towers in cities serves for their ornament and at the same time for defense, and also for the delight of the citizens, who, looking out from them at far-off places in every direction, feed their eyes and mind most pleasantly. Diodorus Siculus has handed down that Semiramis, who about two hundred years after Nemrod built Babylon, when she was constructing Babylon raised in it two hundred and fifty towers, whose height and breadth equaled the magnificence of the walls.

§29 (concl.). Augustine: one chief tower, or many (the singular for plural, as ‘frog’ and ‘locust’ for the plagues' swarms, Exod 8). Towers serve a city's ornament, defense, and the citizens' delight (the view). Diodorus: Semiramis (~200 yrs after Nemrod) raised 250 towers in Babylon, as high and broad as its walls. Margins: Augustine; the use of towers in cities; Exod 8; Diodorus bk. 3 ch. 3.

From this place Cajetan does not argue well that the whole human race was not there. For, he says, „they would have been very foolish, in thinking and saying, Let us build us a city: but that saying is only of those who, having set out from the East, came to dwell in the plain of Sennaar. For, delighted with the level and perhaps the pleasantness of the place, they treated of the building of their own city.“ So he. By these words Cajetan signifies that those who conspired to build that city were not all the men who then were on the earth, because one city could not be capable of all men. But this reasoning is weak. For they were thinking afterward to build other cities; but this one they had willed first to construct, most ample and most fortified, which should be as it were the metropolis of the others, and as it were the citadel of their empire and dominion.

§30. Cajetan again argues (weakly) that not all men were there: ‘Let us build a city’ suits only those who came to Sennaar, since one city could not hold all mankind. Pererius rebuts: they meant to build other cities later; this first one was to be the vast, fortified metropolis — the citadel of their empire.

Margin: Cajetan.

And that which is subjoined, „Whose top may reach to heaven,“ Augustine in the book of Questions on Genesis, question twenty-one, seems to have understood simply and as the words sound: for, treating those very words, he says thus: „If they believed that they could do this, their too foolish audacity and impiety is detected. And because for this the vengeance of God followed, that their tongues should be divided, it can not absurdly be believed that they thought this.“ The same in book 16 of the City of God, chapter 4, deriding the madness of those men: „What,“ he says, „was human and vain presumption going to do? For whatever and however great a height of mass it might raise to heaven against God, when would it pass beyond all the mountains? When would it escape the space of the misty air? What, finally, would any elevation, however great, whether spiritual or bodily, harm God?“

§31. ‘Whose top may reach to heaven’: Augustine (Questions on Genesis q. 21) takes it literally — if they believed they could, their foolish audacity and impiety is plain, and God's vengeance (dividing their tongues) followed. And (City of God 16.4) deriding their madness: whatever height they raised, when would it pass the mountains or the misty air? what could any elevation harm God? Margins: Augustine (cited just above); Augustine, Questions on Genesis q. 21.

Philo, at the opening of the book which he wrote On the Confusion of Tongues, mentions a certain calumny of the pagan sages against this history of Moses. „Those,“ says Philo, „to whom the institutions of our elders are displeasing — impious men, and eloquent only for accusing just laws — having seized handles for impiety, thus cavil at this history of Moses about the building of the tower, and deride us: Do you still,“ they say, [extol your precepts…]

§32. Philo (On the Confusion of Tongues) reports a calumny of the pagan sages against Moses's Babel history: impious men, eloquent only in accusing just laws, deride it (continues p. 487). Margins: the pagans' calumny against Moses's history of Babel, as Philo reports; Philo.

— p. 560 (PDF) · printed p. 487 —

„…your precepts as the rules of truth? Behold, the books you call sacred contain fables such as you are wont to deride when others relate them. For this history about the building of the tower up to heaven is very like the fable of the giants, against whom Homer relates that they tried to set three great mountains — Pelion, Ossa, and Olympus — one upon another, hoping by this way to ascend into heaven and thence to cast down Jove. Similarly your lawgiver Moses brings in a tower built by the men of that age, who, on account of madness and a monstrous spirit, tried to reach heaven, by a counsel surely most foolish. For even if all the parts of the earth were built up upon a modest foundation, so as to be raised into the form of a single column, they would yet be distant by a very long interval from the etherial sphere: especially according to the opinion of the Philosophers, who affirm that the earth is the center of the World.“ And this indeed was the calumny of those men.

§32 (concl.). The pagan calumny (per Philo): the sacred books contain fables like the pagans' own — Moses's tower is like the giants piling Pelion, Ossa, and Olympus to scale heaven and cast down Jove (Homer); the builders foolishly tried to reach heaven, though even a column of all the earth would fall far short of the etherial sphere (the earth being the world's center). Margin: Homer.

Philo, in order to drive off that calumny, first denies that the words of Moses by which he narrates these things are to be taken properly, but [says] they are to be referred figuratively and to an allegorical understanding. „For neither,“ he says, „can any part of the earth reach heaven, because no center touches its circumference: and the earth is the center of heaven. Then, since the ether is sacred fire, an inextinguishable flame: witness is the Sun, as it were the king of heavenly fires, which from so great an interval penetrates the inmost parts of the earth with its rays, and not only this but also the air, which extends from it up to the heavenly sphere — though by its own nature cold — it partly warms, partly burns. For whatever things are far distant from its orbit, or decline to either side, it only warms; but whatever are near or directly opposite perish by the greater force of its heat. Which being so, there was no need of any thunderbolts against those trying to ascend into heaven, since of itself the

daring of those so magnificent men had necessarily to vanish.“

§33. Philo's defense: Moses's words are not literal but figurative/allegorical. Literally, no part of earth can reach heaven (no center touches its circumference; earth is heaven's center); and the ether is inextinguishable fire — the Sun, king of heavenly fires, from afar penetrates earth and air with its rays (warming the distant, burning the near). So no thunderbolts were needed against the climbers — their daring would vanish of itself.

Philo, therefore, opening the allegorical understanding of that history — which he himself thinks is the true and genuine meaning of Moses: „There are,“ says he, „two kinds of city, one better, the other worse. The better is that in which, under popular administration, the citizens live by equal right, the laws holding the chief place: this pertains to the praise of God. But the worse and adulterine is that in which the rule is in the hands of the mob, and inequality is held in esteem, injustice and impiety presiding. To the right of the former city are enrolled the good and the pious; but to the latter, the multitude of the slothful, loving disturbance more than order, and confusion more than a well-distinguished and tempered governance. The fool, therefore, calls together associates for doing evil, not content with his own sins, and exhorts now sight, now hearing, and the other senses to do him service, that they may be at hand, and that each may apply his ministry according to his strength. He summons also and rouses the bands of the affections, which by their own nature are untamed.“

§34. Philo's allegory (which he takes as Moses's true sense): two kinds of city — the better (popular rule, equal law, the good and pious — to God's praise) and the worse (mob rule, prized inequality, injustice/impiety, the slothful loving confusion). The fool calls allies for evil, summoning his senses and the untamed bands of the passions to serve him (continues).

These associates, therefore, he rouses with these words: „Let us build us a city and choose for ourselves convenient magistrates, opulence, honors, pleasures — justice being excluded, which is wont to bring with it poverty and obscurity; let us write laws which sanction [things] for the more powerful, of whom, as more useful to the commonwealth, the chief account is to be had. First of all, let a tower be built, which may be for pride and

impiety as a citadel…“

§35. Philo's allegory (cont.): the fool rouses his ‘associates’ — ‘Let us build a city and choose convenient magistrates, opulence, honors, pleasures (justice excluded, since it brings poverty and obscurity); let us write laws favoring the powerful; and first of all let a tower be built as a citadel for pride and impiety…’ (continues next batch).

— p. 561 (PDF) · printed p. 488 —

…as a citadel and royal seat; and let it be founded indeed on earth, but let it raise its head also to heaven: so that it not only gapes after the gaining of earthly goods, but also rears itself against the things of heaven, by impious words hostile to God; while it either denies the deity of heaven, or His providence, or the beginning of the created world; or, if it grants this to have been created, yet thinks its causes uncertain, affirming that it is driven now amiss, now by chance, like the ships or the chariots of the Circus, which are never borne on a prosperous course without a pilot and a charioteer. But providence — not sometimes (as human providence often is), but the divine always — has a good outcome: for error, by the confession of all, is absent from divine providence.“ So Philo.

§35 (concl.). End of Philo's allegory (On the Confusion of Tongues): the wicked ‘city/tower’ — founded on earth but raising its head to heaven — gapes after earthly goods and rears against heaven by impious words, denying God's deity, providence, or the world's created beginning (or making its causes mere chance, like a pilotless ship). But divine providence always has a good outcome, free of error.

And so we answer most briefly that those men did not build the tower with that mind and design — that, ascending by it into heaven, they might thence war with God, as the poets fabled of the Giants — but that they might leave behind some wonderful monument of their name, and a fame most renowned among all and in every age. And that this was their cause of building, expressed in those men's own words, Moses thus set forth: „And they said: Come, let us make us a city and a tower whose top may reach to heaven, and let us make our name famous before we be scattered into all lands.“ Now that „Whose top may reach to heaven“ is not to be taken

properly — for it would have been an insane thought of those men, much more an undertaking or even a wish — but it is a hyperbolic manner of speaking, signifying namely more than ought to be understood; of which kind of expressions there are many both in sacred and in profane letters. Therefore by those words is signified some unusual and incredible height of the building.

§36. The true reply to the pagan calumny: they built the tower not to scale heaven and war with God (the poets' Giants), but to leave a wondrous monument and undying fame (Gen 11:4, their own words). 'Top reaching heaven' is not literal (that would be insane) but hyperbole (common in sacred and profane writing) for an unusual, incredible height. Margin: the true repulse of the pagans' calumny.

Nor indeed can it seem to me other than quite credible what some have handed down: that from this history of Moses the poets took occasion to invent the battle of the giants with the gods, so greatly celebrated by them. For they said that those [giants], in order to prepare for themselves an ascent into heaven, that they might thence, as from a camp, assault heaven, piled the highest mountains of Thessaly one upon another: which so impious and unspeakable attempt of theirs, and unhappy outcome, Ovid elegantly set forth in those verses: „The Giants, they say, aimed at the celestial realm, / and heaped up mountains to the high stars. / Then the almighty Father, hurling his bolt, shattered Olympus, / and struck off Pelion set under Ossa."

§37. It is quite credible (so some) that the poets' famous fable of the giants' war on the gods took its occasion from this history of Moses: the giants piled the highest Thessalian mountains to assault heaven, as in Ovid (Metamorphoses) — 'The Giants aimed at the celestial realm… the Father shattered Olympus and struck off Pelion set under Ossa.' Margins: that the war of the Giants is not rashly believed to take its origin from this history of Moses; Ovid, Metamorphoses.

Blessed Ambrose, in book 3 On the Faith: „The series of prophetic discourse does not shrink from the Giants and the valley of the Titans." Not unlike this poetic fable is what Abydenus handed down, in Eusebius, book 9 of the Preparation for the Gospel, chapter 4, in these words: „They say that the first men, born of the earth, trusting in their strength and size, the

gods being despised, strove to raise a tower up to the Sun in the place where Babylon now is; and when they had now almost reached heaven by building, the tower, by a great force of winds sent by the gods, fell down upon those very men; and that there was then begun a war between Saturn and the Titans.“

§38. Ambrose (On the Faith bk. 3) notes prophetic discourse does not avoid ‘the Giants and the valley of the Titans.’ Like this fable is Abydenus (in Eusebius, Preparation bk. 9 ch. 4): the first earth-born men, trusting their strength and despising the gods, tried to raise a tower to the Sun where Babylon now is; nearing heaven, it was blown down on them by winds the gods sent — and then began the war of Saturn and the Titans. Margins: Abydenus in Eusebius; Ambrose.

— p. 562 (PDF) · printed p. 489 —

But let us see — granting that those men were divinely hindered from carrying the building of that tower to the summit designed and wished in their mind — yet of how great a size and height they left the work begun. Josephus, recounting the speech by which Nemrod exhorted his fellows to build the tower, says that he promised that he would build a tower higher than the water of the flood could ascend. From which it is understood that they thought to raise the tower above the height of the flood: but the flood rose fifteen cubits above the highest mountains of the earth; some of which, as we taught in the twelfth book, taken in perpendicular height exceed four miles. They thought, therefore, to raise the tower to a height of nearly five miles. But of how great a size was the work which was left unfinished by them, Josephus next indicates, subjoining: „Since the number of workers was huge, the work rose above what they had hoped: for its thickness was so great that it surpassed its height.“

§39. How high they meant the tower: Josephus — Nemrod promised one higher than the flood-water could reach. The flood rose 15 cubits above the highest mountains (some over 4 miles, per bk. 12), so they aimed at ~5 miles. The unfinished work's bulk: Josephus — the huge workforce raised it beyond hope, its thickness surpassing its height. Margins: how high they meant the tower; Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1; Gen 8.

Berosus Annianus relates that Nemrod, whom he calls Saturn the First, together with his son Jupiter Belus and his fellows came into the plain of Sennaar, and there marked out a city and founded a very great tower, in the 131st year after the flood, and reigned fifty-six years; that he brought the tower to the height and bulk of mountains, that it might be a monument to posterity that the Babylonian people was the first in the world and ought to be called the Kingdom of kingdoms; and that he indeed built the tower, but yet did not complete it, nor could he found the city he had marked out. So he.

§40. Berosus Annianus: Nemrod ('Saturn the First'), with his son Jupiter Belus and his people, came to Sennaar, marked out a city and founded a great tower in yr 131 after the flood, reigned 56 yrs, raised the tower mountain-high as a monument of Babylonian primacy ('the Kingdom of kingdoms') — but left both tower and city unfinished. Margin: Berosus Annianus bk. 4.

More wonderful to tell than credible is that which was handed down by Blessed Jerome in the fifth book of his Commentaries on Isaiah, in the exposition of those words of chapter 14, „And I will rise up against them, says the Lord of hosts, and I will destroy the name of Babylon," etc. For he says that he had received from those who had carefully looked upon that tower with their own eyes, that the height of that tower was four thousand paces. Jerome's words are these: „That Babylon was most powerful, and situated in the plains in a square, and from corner to corner of the wall held sixteen thousand paces (that is, together by circuit four hundred and eighty stadia), Herodotus relates, and many others who wrote Greek histories. And the citadel, that is the Capitol of that city, is that tower which was built after the flood, which in height they say holds four thousand paces, gradually narrowed from broad into straits, so that the immense weight may more easily be sustained by the broader [parts below]. They describe there marble temples, golden statues, streets gleaming with stones and gold, and many other things that may seem almost incredible." So Blessed Jerome.

§41. Jerome's astonishing report (Commentaries on Isaiah bk. 5, on Isa 14): eyewitnesses told him the tower was 4,000 paces high. Jerome: Babylon, most powerful, square in the plains, its wall 16,000 paces corner-to-corner (= 480 stadia round, per Herodotus and others); its citadel/Capitol is the post-flood tower, said to be 4,000 paces high, narrowing upward so the lower breadth bears the weight — with marble temples, golden statues, gold-gleaming streets, 'almost incredible.' Margins: Jerome reports a wondrous account of the height of the Tower of Babel; Herodotus.

But truly indeed Blessed Jerome said that the things reported to him seemed to him almost incredible: for they are plainly fabulous and incredible. For neither could that tower, up to the height of four miles — with a fitting thickness and breadth joined to it, and at the same time a depth of foundations (by which, namely, the weight of so great a mass might be sustained) — by any work of men either be built, or, once built…

§42. But Jerome rightly called it 'almost incredible' — it is plainly fabulous: no human work could build a 4-mile tower (with the requisite thickness, breadth, and deep foundations to bear such mass), or, once built… (continues p. 490). Margin: Jerome.

— p. 563 (PDF) · printed p. 490 —

…could it for so long have stood and endured. Herodotus indeed relates that there was in his own age at Babylon a temple of Jupiter Belus, with bronze gates, of two stadia in extent on every side, in a square shape. In the middle of the temple was a solid tower, of a stadium in thickness and likewise in height; upon which there was again another tower superimposed, and upon this presently another, up to the eighth. To these, on the outside in a circuit, stairs were applied, by which one ascended to each of the towers. In the middle of the steps there were halts and seats made for the use of those ascending, to sit and rest. In the topmost tower was a shrine, having a splendidly-spread couch and a golden table set by it, yet having no statue. Diodorus, however, hands down that in the middle of Babylon there was a temple raised to Jupiter Belus by Semiramis, of so great a size that, on account of its wonderful height, it is agreed that observations of the stars, both toward the East and toward the West, were made in it by the Chaldeans.

§42 (concl.). …nor could it have stood so long. Herodotus (bk. 1): in his day a square temple of Jupiter Belus at Babylon (bronze gates, 2 stadia each side), with a solid central tower (a stadium thick and high), seven more towers stacked on it (to the eighth), an external spiral stair with rest-seats, and a top shrine with a couch and golden table but no statue. Diodorus: Semiramis's temple of Jupiter Belus, so high the Chaldeans made their star-observations from it. Margins: Herodotus bk. 1; Diodorus bk. 1 & 3 ch. 4.

It appears, therefore, from the aforesaid words of Diodorus, Herodotus, and Jerome, and also from those things which Theodoret reports in the Questions on Genesis before the fifty-ninth question, that down to the times of Blessed Jerome and Theodoret the monument of that wonderful tower remained among the Babylonians. Yet this is neither from the sacred letters, nor from a faithful and probable tradition of the elders, nor from authors who hand down anything worthy of credence, explored and ascertained: to how great a height the building of that tower was carried by those men.

§43. So (from Diodorus, Herodotus, Jerome, and Theodoret on Gen, before q. 59) the monument of that wondrous tower remained at Babylon down to Jerome's and Theodoret's time. But to what height the builders actually carried it is not ascertainable — not from Scripture, nor reliable tradition, nor any credible author. Margin: Theodoret.

FOURTH DISPUTATION. With what design, to what end, those men willed to build a city of so great a mass and a tower of so great a height.

Liber XVI, Disputation 4 (title): the design and purpose of building the city and tower.

{Upon those words of Moses, Genesis ch. 11: Come, let us make us a city and a tower, and let us make our name famous before we be scattered into all lands.}

Gen 11:4 (verse lemma, for Disputation 4).

The causes by which those men were led to undertake so great a work I find expounded by various authors as six: which I shall here briefly recount and at the same time examine, refuting the empty and unlikely ones, but

confirming the suitable and probable. The first cause is (which most hand down, for this is a widespread opinion) that the end for those men in building that tower was to procure for themselves security and a safe refuge against a general flood, if ever it should happen again. The author for following and approving this opinion seems to many to have been Josephus, who in the first book of the Antiquities, where he narrates this history, brings in the giant Nemrod gloriously vaunting his strength, and offering himself to those men as a leader and offering his aid against another new flood, if God should wish to threaten it. For he promised that he would build a tower higher than the water could ascend; and moreover that he would avenge the death of his ancestors who had perished in the flood. And this indeed was the speech of Nemrod, as Josephus reports.

§44. Disp. 4. Six causes are alleged (to be sifted). (1) The common view: a safe refuge against another general flood. Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1) seems its author — Nemrod the giant vaunting his strength, offering himself as leader and aid against a new flood (building a tower higher than the water could rise) and to avenge his flood-drowned ancestors. Margins: six causes of building Babel; Scholastic History; Lyra; the first cause; Josephus.

— p. 564 (PDF) · printed p. 491 —

But that those men were not led by fear of a flood to construct that building can be proved by many arguments, and easily persuaded to anyone not at all obstinate. First, the leaders and chiefs of those men were Noah and his three sons: but these were most certain and most secure that a flood would never come again, on account of the promise of God given to them and confirmed by the divine covenant and the symbol of the rainbow. And these taught their descendants this very promise of God, and took away from them all fear of a coming flood. Next, plainly foolish would their thought have been, vain the labor, and idle the endeavor. For the flood was raised five miles above the lands: but to make a tower higher than five miles is not within art, nor resources, nor human strength. Moreover, a general flood neither had been made from natural causes, nor can be, but is a work of divine omnipotence: since therefore God prevails with infinite

force and power, He can make a greater flood, of whatever height; in vain, therefore, and weak would a building of whatever height have been, for repelling the force and destruction of a flood.

§45. Against cause 1: fear of a flood was not the motive. (a) The leaders were Noah and his sons, certain by God's covenant (the rainbow, Gen 9) that no flood would return, and they taught this to their descendants. (b) The thought would be foolish: the flood rose ~5 miles, and no human art can build a tower higher. (c) A universal flood is not natural but God's omnipotent work, so He could make one of any height — no building could repel it. Margins: fear of another flood was not the cause of building Babel; Gen 9.

Besides, since at that time the human race was multiplied most numerously, and was to be multiplied more and more day by day, it was stolid and foolish to hope that the refuge of one or another tower could be safe against a flood, since only a few men could be received into that tower, the others, almost innumerable, being excluded and exposed to the destruction of the flood. Finally, if that had been the chief cause for those men of building the tower, Moses surely would not have kept silent about it in this place: but neither here nor elsewhere does the divine Scripture give any indication of that cause. Therefore the fear of a coming flood did not drive those men to build the tower.

§46. More against cause 1: mankind was too numerous (and growing) for one or two towers to shelter — most would be excluded and drowned. And had this been the chief motive, Moses would not have passed over it in silence (Scripture gives no hint of it). So fear of a flood did not drive them.

Some think the second cause for those men of building the tower was that, by the remembrance of their elders, they had known and were persuaded that there would one day be a general destruction of the world by fire, as before there had been by water. And so against that calamity and destruction they willed to procure for themselves a refuge and protection in that building of the city and tower. But it seems a futile cause, nor in any part probable. For that building, if it could be a remedy against that evil, could certainly have been a remedy for very few; for that tower could hold few, but the others, almost innumerable, had necessarily to be exposed and

liable to the calamity. Add that that conflagration of the world was not going to burst forth from the earth, but to fall from above and from heaven: nothing, therefore, for avoiding that evil could any height of any building be of help to mortals. Nay rather, as against thunderbolts, so also against that conflagration, the deep and hidden places of the earth would have had to be sought out.

§47. (2) The second alleged cause: a refuge against a future destruction of the world by fire (as once by water). Futile and improbable: the tower could shelter only a few (the rest exposed); and the fire will fall from heaven, not rise from earth — so no height of building helps; rather (as against thunderbolts) one would seek the deep places of the earth. Margins: the second cause; that the tower was not built from fear of a general fire.

— p. 565 (PDF) · printed p. 492 —

Hugo judges the third cause to have been the insane lust of domination, with which that giant Nemrod was incredibly inflamed. Hugo writes thus: „It can also be said that the tower was made by Nemrod out of a desire of reigning. Whence, the tongues being divided, he himself with his family remained there, the others departing, and Assur being expelled, to whom by paternal right that dwelling pertained, because he was of the stock of Shem the elder son of Noah. But Assur, departing into the land which from him was called Assyria, was multiplied up to king Ninus, who sprang from his progeny.“ So Hugo. Therefore Nemrod, for the tyrannical domination which he aimed at, willed to procure a city and tower as the metropolis and citadel of his empire, and to have a most firm fortification by which both he himself might be secure and at the same time easily coerce the others.

§48. (3) Hugo of St. Victor: the third cause was Nemrod's insane lust of domination — he built the tower out of a desire to reign; when the tongues divided, he kept Babel (the others leaving), expelling Assur (whose by Shem's elder right it was), who withdrew to ‘Assyria,’ his line leading to king Ninus. So Nemrod wanted the city and tower as the metropolis and citadel of his tyranny. Margins: Hugo of St. Victor, Annotations on Genesis; the third cause.

The fourth cause may be reckoned that which Blessed Augustine expounded, writing that Nemrod, by a certain excessive elation of mind

and pride and impiety against God, was led to construct that building, as if by that building he could either guard and defend himself against God, or even assail and offend God Himself. The words of Blessed Augustine are these: „That giant Nemrod set about to build the city (which afterward was called Babylon), that it might hold the chief place over the other cities, where it might be, as in a metropolis, the dwelling of the kingdom; although it was not completed to such a degree as proud impiety conceived: for its height was being planned excessive, which on that account is said to reach up to heaven. But what would any height, whether spiritual or bodily, harm God? Humility builds the safe and true way to heaven, lifting the heart upward to the Lord, not against the Lord: as that giant Nemrod was called a hunter against the Lord. And what is signified by this name, ‘hunter,’ but a deceiver, oppressor, destroyer of earth-born animals? He, therefore, with his fellows, was raising a tower against the Lord, by which impious pride is signified.“ So Augustine.

§49. (4) Augustine (City of God 16.4): Nemrod's excessive pride and impiety against God — as if by the building he could defend himself against God or even assail Him. Augustine: Nemrod began the city (later Babylon) as the metropolis/seat of his kingdom (unfinished as proud impiety wished, its planned height ‘reaching heaven’); but no height harms God — humility builds the true road to heaven, not the ‘hunter against the Lord’ (deceiver/oppressor) raising a tower of impious pride. Margins: the fourth cause; Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 4; Gen 10.

The fifth cause is drawn from the Hebrew reading (and the Chaldaic is the same). In Hebrew it is thus, word for word: „Let us build us a city and a tower, and its top in heaven, and let us make us a name, lest perchance we be scattered over the face of the whole earth.“ By these words, says Cajetan, a double end of that building is touched: one is the common fame from a fortified city and so lofty a tower, as from a singular deed; the other is to keep themselves together: for it could easily have happened that, just as they had segregated themselves from others, so they themselves might be segregated among themselves, if they had not a common city. For when men dwell without the enclosures of a city, an easy slipping-away and departure of some from others occurs. Whence it appears that they rightly

said, hesitating, „lest perchance we be scattered," since it could easily come about that they should be drawn apart from one another and variously scattered. So Cajetan.

§50. (5) From the Hebrew (and Chaldaic) reading: '…and its top in heaven, and let us make us a name, lest we be scattered over the whole earth.' Cajetan: a double end — fame (from a fortified city and lofty tower) and keeping themselves together (without a common walled city they might drift apart, as they had separated from others); hence 'lest we be scattered.' Margin: the fifth cause; Cajetan.

— p. 566 (PDF) · printed p. 493 —

Or that „lest perchance we be scattered" renders this sense: that, if it should befall us to be scattered through various lands, we may be able to return hither when we will. They feared, then, even at that time, what befell them a little after; and in a manner they prophesied the disaster impending over them by these words: just as the Scribes and Pharisees, as if prophesying what was to come, said: „Lest perchance the Romans come and take away our place and nation." They desired, therefore, all to be together, and to establish as it were one commonwealth and society. For man, as Aristotle says, is a political animal and rejoicing in society; for such a life is both safer and more pleasant, and more abundant in those things which pertain to the use of living. And for instituting and maintaining such a society and congregation of men, the building of great and fortified cities availed much.

§51. Or 'lest we be scattered' = so that, if scattered, they could return there. They feared then what soon befell them — in a way prophesying it, like the Scribes/Pharisees 'lest the Romans take our place and nation' (Jn 11). They wished all to be together as one commonwealth — for man is a 'political animal' rejoicing in society (Aristotle, Politics bk. 1), a life safer, pleasanter, better supplied; great fortified cities serve such union. Margins: Jn 11; Aristotle, Politics bk. 1.

Josephus says that it had been commanded to those men by God that they should lead out colonies into various places of the earth (that the human race might more easily be multiplied, and the earth itself filled with inhabitants and cultivated); but that they nevertheless refused to obey God's

best and most useful commands, nay rather moved every stone that they might all be together in one place, and strove obstinately not to be separated from one another. Hear Josephus: „God commanding that, for the sake of propagating and multiplying the human race, they should lead out colonies, those rude men by no means obeyed; wherefore, entangled in calamities, they experienced God offended by their error and to their loss. For when they flourished in a multitude of youth, God from time to time admonished them about leading out colonies; but they, forgetting that they enjoyed present advantages by His kindness, and ascribing all that felicity to their own strength, were not obedient to His word. And, what was worse, they interpreted the divine counsel and command about leading out colonies not as God's favor but as a snare — namely, that, being dispersed, they might more easily be oppressed. And this pride and contempt of God Nemrod, the grandson of Cham the son of Noah, stirred up in them.“ So Josephus.

§52. Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1): God had commanded them to lead out colonies (to multiply mankind and fill the earth), but they refused, striving to stay together in one place. They flourished in youth, yet, ascribing their felicity to their own strength not God's kindness, disobeyed, and — worse — read the command as a snare to scatter and oppress them; Nemrod stirred up this pride and contempt of God. Margin: Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1.

But that command of God about leading out colonies (which Josephus narrates) was announced to those men through Noah. And following this, Berosus Annianus, at the opening of the fourth book, wrote in this manner: „The human race,“ he says, „had been multiplied almost to an immense degree; wherefore necessity compelled them to procure new seats. Then Janus the Father (so he calls Noah) exhorted the chiefs of the families to seek out new seats, and to carry on a common gathering among men, and to build cities. And so he designated those three parts of the world, Asia, Africa, and Europe, as he had seen before the flood. And to the several chiefs of families he apportioned diverse and fixed parts of the world, to which they should go; but he himself promised that he would lead colonies through the whole world.“ So Berosus Annianus.

§53. That divine command (per Josephus) was announced through Noah. Berosus Annianus (bk. 4): mankind grown immense, necessity compelled new seats; 'Janus the Father' (Noah) urged the family-heads to seek new seats, gather, and build cities, dividing the world's three parts (Asia, Africa, Europe), assigning each chief his region, himself promising to lead colonies through the whole world. Margin: Berosus Annianus.

The sixth cause the Greek and Latin reading plainly indicate, whose meaning is this: „Come, let us make us a city and a tower, and let us make our name famous before we be scattered into all lands." For by these words…

§54. (6) The sixth cause, plain from the Greek and Latin: '…let us make our name famous before we be scattered' — i.e. fame (continues p. 494). Margin: the sixth cause.

— p. 567 (PDF) · printed p. 494 —

…it is signified that the mind and design of those men in building the tower was not to escape the destruction of a coming flood or fire, but to acquire by some wonderful deed and memorable monument the celebrity of their name and fame among posterity. And so first by their example it appeared how natural, how vehement, how fixed in the minds of all mortals is the love and care of posterity, that they may commend their memory and name with praise to posterity. But in this most of us are deceived and grievously sin: that, since we are most greedy of praise and glory, we generally love and pursue those things to which signal disgrace and infamy is joined, or at least by which is gained not a solid and distinct and ever-lasting glory, but only a painted and shadowed and fragile glory.

§54 (concl.). The sixth cause: their aim was not to escape a flood or fire, but to win lasting fame by a wondrous deed/monument. Their example shows how natural and vehement is the love of being remembered — but most err and sin gravely here, pursuing fame joined to disgrace, or only a painted, fragile glory rather than a solid, lasting one. Margin: how vehement in man is the love of renown, yet in most it is vicious.

Let us hear Chrysostom, treating this too eloquently, as other things. For when he expounded those words, „And let us make us a name": „See," he says, „the root of the evil: that we may obtain, they say, a perpetual

memory, that posterity may always be mindful of us, let us make such a work, while we are still gathered together, that it may never be given over to oblivion. There are many even today who imitate them and wish to be celebrated by such works. Others build splendid houses, baths, porticoes, walks; of whom, if you ask any one why he toils so greatly and makes such expenses, he will answer nothing else than that he may leave behind an immortal memory of himself and celebrity of his name. But indeed by those things they procure for themselves not so much praise as reproach and accusation: for those beholding those works name them contemptuously. This building, they say, is that miser's, that robber's, that despoiler of widows and orphans'. Therefore this is not to attain memory, but to be exposed to perpetual accusations, and to be defamed even after death, and to sharpen the tongues of beholders to one's own accusation and blasphemy. What of the fact that works of this kind do not long preserve the name and memory of him who made or possessed them? For so the matter stands: they pass continually from this one to another, and from him again to another; and today indeed the house is said to be this man's, tomorrow it will be said to be another's. And so we ourselves are vehemently deceived, while we think we have ownership as it were perpetual, when we enjoy only the use; and, whether we will or not, we are compelled to leave them to others — and sometimes to those whom we least love or even hate.“

§55. Chrysostom (homily 30 on Genesis) on ‘let us make us a name’ — the root of the evil: men build splendid houses for an immortal name, but earn reproach (‘that miser's, that robber's house’), defamed after death; and such works do not even keep their name long, passing from owner to owner — we are deceived thinking we own what we only use, forced to leave it to others (even those we hate). Margins: Chrysostom homily 30 on Genesis; an excellent oration of Chrysostom on the false glory and fame of vainglorious men.

„If, therefore, you love eternal memory, I will show you the way that will make you renowned in every age, nay, will even give you confidence in the age to come: confer your liberality and bestowal of money upon the poor, leaving aside villas, baths, and other buildings — things mute and

inanimate. Large almsgiving renders a man's memory immortal, as it is written: He has dispersed, he has given to the poor, his justice remains forever and ever. In one day he dispersed his riches, but of his justice (that is, of his liberality and mercy) the memory shall remain eternal. And again it is written: The just shall be in eternal memory; he shall not fear the evil hearing. Rightly: He shall not fear the evil hearing. For, just as the wicked are ill spoken of among men and torn by the censure and detestation of all, so on the contrary the good are celebrated by the praise of all. O merciful man! they say; O kind, gentle, sweet, O worthy of immortality! Whose dispersed riches did not desert him, but perpetually accompany, adorn, and protect him, and at last lead him into the eternal tabernacles.“ Thus far from Chrysostom.

§56. Chrysostom (cont.): the true way to eternal memory (and confidence in the world to come) is almsgiving, not buildings — ‘He has dispersed, given to the poor; his justice remains forever’ (Ps 112); ‘The just shall be in eternal memory; he shall not fear the evil hearing’ — the good are praised by all, and their dispersed riches lead them ‘into the eternal tabernacles’ (Lk 16). Margins: Ps 112; Lk 16.

— p. 568 (PDF) · printed p. 495 —

But perhaps someone will object: since fame is not toward oneself but toward another, and in that plain of Sennaar were present all the men, as many as at that time were on the earth, among whom then, or by whom, did they wish their name to be celebrated? But the answer is easy and brief: that they wished to be celebrated not by those who then were, but by those who would be afterward; they were therefore catching at fame not among the present but among posterity.

Objection (on the sixth cause): fame is toward others, yet all men were present at Sennaar — so before whom did they seek their name? Answer: they sought fame not from the present but from posterity.

But Philo thinks that those men, who by building the tower desired to be celebrated among posterity, bore the type and image of those who publish their own vices and wish to be ennobled by disgraceful deeds: so that, as

good men by virtues and benefactions, so these (not by any deeds whatever, but by unusual crimes and misdeeds) attain the brightness of their name and the celebrity of fame. Treating, therefore, those words, „Let us make us a name before we be scattered," Philo writes in this manner: „O signal shamelessness! For whereas you ought to hide your iniquities in darkness, and to seek some pretext for your misdeeds (if not a true, at least a plausible one), lest you either incur the offense of good and prudent men, or that you may escape the penalties of confessed crimes: you dare to show yourselves in the clearest light, despising the threats of men and the punishments to be inflicted from heaven? Nay, you even wish to have innumerable heralds and witnesses of your disgraceful deeds in every age, that no one may not know your name. But what kind of name at last do you desire? Surely such as befits your deeds: and that contains innumerable species of vices, which posterity will cast in your teeth. For there is in you wantonness with shamelessness, contempt with violence, slaughter with savagery, with immoderate pleasures immense concupiscence, with rashness insolence, with craft malice, with lies perjury, and finally, with iniquity toward men, impiety also against God. A fine boasting indeed, to catch at the celebrity of a name from those things which ought to be hidden and buried in everlasting silence, if it could be!"

§57. Philo: the fame-seeking tower-builders are a type of those who publicize their own vices, seeking renown by unusual crimes as good men by virtues. On 'let us make a name before we are scattered' Philo's invective: O shamelessness! you ought to hide your iniquities, yet flaunt them in broad daylight, wanting endless witnesses — but the 'name' you'll get befits your deeds, full of vices posterity will reproach (wantonness, violence, slaughter, lust, insolence, malice, perjury, impiety) — a fine glory, from things that should be buried in silence. Margin: Philo, On the Confusion of Tongues.

There are, however, even today those who greatly please themselves in such things, thinking thereby to acquire an excellent reputation among men. But these (although most wicked), foreseeing and presaging God's justice as the avenger of their crimes, say, „before we be dissipated." Why then do you sin, if you know that your designs and endeavors will be dissipated? But truly, by the example of these men, Moses has set forth to

us the manner of the foolish, who, even when the greatest punishments hang over them not obscurely but manifestly, no more refrain from injuries and misdeeds. The evil arts which divine vengeance is wont to strike are entirely most well-known; and indeed even the worst men think that God is not ignorant of their misdeeds, and that they cannot escape His notice. Otherwise, whence did they know that they were to be dissipated? Yet they said, „Before we be scattered.“ Truly conscience convicts those who do evil within the very breast; and it goads even the despisers of God themselves, so that even unwilling they are compelled to understand that human affairs are administered by divine counsel and reason, and that there is a certain justice which, implacably hostile to evil men, will let pass no crime of theirs unpunished and unavenged. So Philo.

§58. Philo (cont.): even today some glory in such things for reputation. Yet, foreseeing God's avenging justice, they say ‘before we be scattered’ — so why sin, knowing it will be undone? Moses shows the foolish, who do not desist though punishment plainly looms. Even the worst know God sees their deeds (else how did they know they'd be scattered?) — conscience convicts the wrongdoer within, compelling even God's despisers to admit divine providence and a justice that leaves no crime unpunished.

— p. 569 (PDF) · printed p. 496 —

But indeed it can here be disputed whether those men, by building the city and tower, grievously sinned or not. Tostatus denies it; and argues that they did not sin in doing it, in this way: if they sinned, then either because that action was evil, or because the end to which the action was referred was evil; but neither was evil: therefore they did not sin. Now, that their action was not in itself evil needs no proof: namely, to build a city or tower is not in itself evil, but is an action indifferent to good and evil. Nor indeed was their end (as far as can be understood from the history Moses narrates here) evil: for whether they wished to build that city lest they be scattered, as the Hebrew reading indicates, or to make their name famous, as the Greek and Latin reading signifies, neither end was evil. For to be unwilling to be scattered and separated from one another, but to wish, gathered together, to lead a civil life, is the natural desire of man. For man, as Aristotle says, is a

political animal, rejoicing in society and loving the civil life: and to fulfill a natural desire with due manner and order is not a sin — as if one, when he naturally thirsts or hungers, wishes to drink and eat.

§59. A question: did they sin gravely in building? Tostatus denies it: a sin requires either an evil act or an evil end; but building a city/tower is in itself indifferent, and the end (whether 'lest we be scattered' [Hebrew] or fame [Greek/Latin]) was not evil — wishing to live together in civil society is a natural human desire (man is a 'political animal,' Aristotle), and fulfilling a natural desire in due order is no sin (like eating when hungry). Margins: the question whether building Babel was a grave sin; Tostatus, on Gen 11 q. 8; Aristotle, Politics bk. 1.

Moreover, to desire and seek the brightness and celebrity of a name, if it be not done through evil arts, nor be against God's will and honor, or against the advantage and edification of one's neighbor, ought not to be blamed as a sin. And the building of that city and tower was neither in itself evil, nor forbidden by God: and the fame and glory which they coveted was opposed neither to the divine honor, nor to the advantages of any man. To these add that Noah was among the builders of that city and tower: of all of whom, since he was the parent and chief, and for that very cause of the highest authority and power among those men, he would assuredly not have allowed that building to be constructed with a perverse design and a depraved mind.

§60. Tostatus (cont.): seeking renown is no sin if not by evil means, against God's honor, or against a neighbor's good — and the building was neither evil nor forbidden, the fame sought opposed neither God's honor nor any man's good. Moreover Noah was among the builders; as their parent, chief, and highest authority, he would not have allowed it built with a perverse, depraved mind.

Nor indeed, because God was unwilling that the design and endeavor of those men should come to its end, but dissipated their design and forbade the work to be completed, can it be concluded thereby that the design and mind of those men was evil. For God, by His most high providence, incomprehensible to mortals, very often wills and does another thing in the affairs themselves than what is even rightly thought and honorably wished by men. Therefore [a thing] is not hindered or dissipated by God because it is evil, but because this [other] is better; nor could this be effected unless

that were hindered, that it should not be done. Therefore the building of that city and tower was good; it was likewise good that those men should dwell together in one place and within one city; nor was it evil to wish to be famous to posterity by doing magnificent works. But, if this had been done, those men would either never, or very late, have set out thence to inhabit and cultivate the various parts of the earth. And yet it was a far greater good that all the parts of the world should be filled with inhabitants and cultivators, than it was that a city or tower should be built, or that those men should live together in that city.

§61. Tostatus (cont.): that God dissipated their design and stopped the work does not prove it evil — God's incomprehensible providence often does otherwise than men rightly intend, hindering a good thing not because it is evil but because something else is better. So the building was good, dwelling together good, seeking fame by great works not evil; but had it succeeded they would never (or late) have spread to fill the earth — and filling the whole world was a far greater good (continues p. 497).

— p. 570 (PDF) · printed p. 497 —

For this cause, therefore, God hindered the completion and perfection of this building, and was the author of the dispersion of those men into the various regions of the world. And this is the sum of the disputation and opinion of Tostatus.

§61 (concl.). So God hindered the building's completion and was the author of their dispersion over the world — this being the greater good. This is the sum of Tostatus's opinion.

But Tostatus has as adversaries of his opinion nearly all the Doctors, but especially Chrysostom and Augustine, whom nearly all who have interpreted this place have followed, whether in the Commentaries they published on the book of Genesis or in their other writings. Chrysostom certainly says that that work proceeded from the greatest pride, and accuses and condemns each of those men's deeds which are here narrated of some signal vice. And Blessed Augustine writes that to their most troublesome pride was joined also the intolerable impiety of those men. What of the fact that the author and chief of that building was Nemrod, a most proud and most impious man, as is established by the authority of Josephus and

Blessed Augustine, and by the concession of many others? Josephus indeed says, not doubtfully, that those men, the commands of God being despised, with a most perverse design and a most evil mind set about doing that work. To these is added the testimony of Philo, who, in the gravest and most eloquent words (which we expounded a little above), described and refuted the manifold wickedness of those men.

§62. But against Tostatus stand nearly all the Doctors, especially Chrysostom and Augustine (followed by almost all interpreters): Chrysostom — the work sprang from the greatest pride, each deed a signal vice; Augustine — intolerable impiety joined to their pride; the author Nemrod a most proud, impious man (Josephus, Augustine, and many); Josephus — they set about it, despising God's commands, with a most perverse and evil mind; and Philo's eloquent description of their manifold wickedness. Margins: Tostatus refuted; Chrysostom homily 30 on Genesis; Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 4; Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1.

Moreover, the narration of Moses vehemently opposes the opinion of Tostatus. For Moses brings in God descending to see the building of that city and tower: „God came down," he says, „to see the city and the tower"; and a little after, „Come, let us go down and confound their tongue." Now Scripture is wont, to magnify the gravity of some sin and the force of the divine punishment by which that sin is to be punished, to bring in God descending to see that sin and to take punishment of it. For example, in this very book, chapter 18, it is written that God came down to see the sin of the Sodomites; and in the book of Exodus, chapter three, God says that He had seen the affliction of His people in Egypt and was coming down to shake off the yoke of the servitude of the Egyptians from the necks of His people. But if the building of that city and tower had been good, and undertaken with a good design and mind, Moses would not have said that God came down to see and hinder that building.

§63. Moses's narration also opposes Tostatus: he brings in God 'coming down to see' the city and tower, and 'let us go down and confound their tongue.' Scripture uses 'God came down to see' to magnify a grave sin and its punishment — as with Sodom (Gen 18) and Egypt's oppression (Exod 3). Had the building been good, Moses would not have said God came down to see and hinder it.

— p. 571 (PDF) · printed p. 498 —

FIFTH DISPUTATION.

Liber XVI, Disputation 5 (title): what it means that Moses says God ‘came down to see’ the work being built (Gen 11:5).

{Upon those words, Genesis ch. 11: The Lord came down to see the city and the tower which the children of Adam were building.}

Gen 11:5 (verse lemma, for Disputation 5).

Since God is present to all things (for He is not far from every one of us, as Paul says; for in Him we live, move, and are), and since He discerns most clearly all things that have been, that are, and that shall be („For there is no creature invisible in His sight; but all things are naked and open to His eyes“): what is it that Moses says, that God came down to see the building of the city and the tower, as if from heaven (where He was), on account of distance of places or the obstruction of other bodies, He could not see that building? But assuredly it must by no means be doubted that this expression of Moses is figurative — not so much suited to the property of the divine nature as accommodated to the likeness of human custom and to the lowliness of our mind and understanding. For Scripture speaks of God as He is wont to seem to men who are wise according to the flesh: to whom, when God punishes or helps men, He seems to have come down to men; but when He dissembles and for a time forbears either to chastise or to help, He seems to reside in heaven and not to care for mortal things.

§64. Disp. 5. Since God is present to all and sees all (Acts 17; Heb 4), ‘God came down to see’ cannot be literal (as if distance hindered Him) — it is figurative, accommodated to human custom and our weak understanding: when God punishes or helps, He seems to ‘come down’; when He forbears, to ‘reside in heaven’ and not care. Margins: Acts 17; Heb 4.

And it was said pointedly that He came down to see, that the longanimity of God might be signified — not hastening to take punishment of sinners, but, although He knows perfectly the sins of men, deferring them at last from time to time, and as it were taking time to know and weigh them. Likewise the justice of God is declared, who punishes no one unless first

openly convicted of sin: which may be observed both in Adam and Cain and in the Sodomites. We are taught besides that judgment must not be made rashly nor sentence pronounced unless the cause be first well known, nor anyone condemned with his cause unheard. Now indeed the anger of God had been quieted after the flood, and, appeased, He had promised man that He would never thereafter scatter and destroy the race of men by a flood. But behold, the children of men again provoke Him with intolerable misdeeds, and as it were compel Him to indignation and vengeance. God came down, therefore, because the cause was such that the heavenly judgment ought by no means to have left it undiscussed and unjudged. God knows indeed sometimes to dissemble and as it were not to notice sins — but when one sins either from ignorance or from weakness, not when from malice.

§65. ‘He came down to see’ pointedly signifies God's longanimity (deferring punishment though He knows all) and His justice (punishing none unconvicted — Adam, Cain, Sodom): a lesson not to judge rashly nor condemn unheard. After the flood God's anger was appeased (the no-flood promise), but men again provoked Him by malice — so He ‘came down’ to judge. God overlooks sins of ignorance or weakness, not of malice. Margins: Gen 3; Gen 4; Gen 18.

— p. 572 (PDF) · printed p. 499 —

Nor is that which is subjoined without emphasis, „To see the city and the tower which the children of Adam were building“: for that „children of Adam“ denotes the condition of man — namely, humble and vile, as one who was first formed of mud, and, on account of sin, is liable to innumerable miseries and vices. Does, then, such a creature dare, with incredible audacity and pride, against the will of the ruler of heaven and the founder of all things, to build a city and a tower? Or that „Adam“ has not only the notion of man in common, but here singularly denotes the first man, who was by the word ‘Adam’ first of all called. For him they specially imitated, while they wished to make for themselves an eternal name and to build a tower up to heaven: for similarly Adam ate the forbidden fruit, coveting and aiming at divine knowledge.

§66. 'Children of Adam' is emphatic: it marks man's lowly, vile condition (formed of mud, liable to miseries and vices) — that such a creature should dare so proud a work against heaven's ruler. Or 'Adam' = the first man, whom they imitated: as he ate the forbidden fruit coveting divine knowledge, so they sought an eternal name and a tower to heaven. Margins: Gen 2; Gen 3.

But the things which I have now said concisely and briefly are drawn from the Fathers and ancient writers. Blessed Augustine indeed expounds in two ways how it can be understood that God came down to see the building of that city: first, by reason of the new effect which He produced in that place (for He brought it about, by hindering the progress of the building and by wonderfully dividing the one tongue of those men into many and various, that it might be plainly understood by all that that building had greatly displeased Him); next, it can be understood that God came down for this reason, because He brought it about that the Angels came down from heaven and went to that place and, the building hindered, made the endeavors of those men vain. Cajetan thinks it was said that God came down to see the building of the city in order to signify that God's providence consists not only in heavenly things, but, as to knowledge, efficiency, direction, and ordering, descends and pertains even to the lowest and least things that are done on earth. „God came down," says Cajetan, „that is, He held Himself after the likeness of one descending, inasmuch as He extends Himself — not indeed by bodily motion, but by care and providence — even to these lowest things, namely human actions and these singular corporeal things, such as a city and a tower."

§67. These points are from the Fathers. Augustine (City of God 16.5) two ways: God 'came down' (1) by a new effect there (hindering the work and dividing the tongues, showing His displeasure), (2) by sending the angels down to frustrate them. Cajetan: it signifies God's providence reaches not only heaven but even the lowest earthly things — 'He held Himself like one descending,' extending His care to human actions and corporeal things like a city and tower. Margins: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 5; Cajetan.

Blessed Chrysostom, whom Rupert follows, judges that God was for this cause brought in by Moses as if descending to see the building of the tower, that all might thence learn with how great thought and caution, and

with how careful consideration, one must proceed in knowing, judging, and punishing the deeds and errors of others. Hear Chrysostom: „In human fashion," he says, „Scripture speaks when it says that God came down: but it does not wish this to be understood in human fashion. It wishes, therefore, that we be instructed hence, never rashly to condemn brothers, nor to judge by hearing alone, nor unless we are first made certain by several arguments. See, moreover, how unhastily God proceeded to chastise those men: for He did not at once from the beginning repress their madness, but, using long-suffering gentleness, waited until they should declare their malice by the deed, and then at last hindered their endeavors. For lest anyone could say that they indeed wished, but had by no means brought what they had thought and designed in mind into act and effect, therefore God waited until they should set about the work destined in their mind…"

§68. Chrysostom (followed by Rupert): God is shown 'descending' to teach us to judge others' deeds with great care — never condemn rashly, nor by hearsay, nor without proof. And see God's unhasty justice: He did not at once repress their madness but waited (long-suffering) until they declared their malice by deed, lest any say their thought never reached act (continues p. 500). Margins: Chrysostom on Genesis homily 30; Rupert, Commentary on Genesis bk. 4 ch. 41.

— p. 573 (PDF) · printed p. 500 —

„…and then He showed them how useless were the things they had attempted. Consider likewise the excellence of the divine mercy: He permitted them to afflict themselves with labors, that the experience of the matter might be to them in the place of a teacher. But because He saw their malice grow strong and the disease worsen, He did not suffer them to come to the end of the designed work, but in dissipating their design and hindering the work He declared His goodness: just like a good physician who, seeing the disease increase and the ulcer become incurable, judging that he must delay no longer, at once uses the knife, that he may cut out every cause of the evil." So Chrysostom.

§68 (concl.). Chrysostom: God let them toil so the experience might teach them; but, seeing their malice worsen like a disease, He did not let them finish — dissipating the design, showing His goodness like a good physician who, seeing an ulcer turn incurable, cuts at once to remove the cause.

Nevertheless, some ages before Rupert and Chrysostom, this very interpretation of this place and similar lessons Philo set forth in his writings. For in the book which he wrote On the Confusion of Tongues, treating the words of Moses which are in this place about the descent of God to see the city, he says thus: „These things must be taken figuratively. For to believe that God approaches or withdraws, descends likewise or ascends, or is at all moved in place, is an impiety to be banished to the farthest islands of the Ocean (as the common people say). But the lawgiver said these things of God in human fashion (though He is not endowed with human form and nature), for the benefit of readers and learners. For God fills all things, not contained but containing, who alone is everywhere at once and nowhere. Nowhere, because He Himself created every place and region together with the bodies; and it is unlawful that the Creator be enclosed within any of the things created by Himself. But everywhere, because His power, extended through earth, water, air, and heaven, leaves no part of the world destitute, but binds all things together among themselves by invisible bonds, that they may never be dissolved.“

§69. Philo (On the Confusion of Tongues), ages before Chrysostom/Rupert, gave the same reading: these are figurative — to believe God moves in place is impiety; Moses spoke ‘in human fashion’ for readers' benefit. God fills all (not contained but containing), ‘everywhere at once and nowhere’: nowhere (He made all place, and cannot be enclosed in His creatures), everywhere (His power through earth/water/air/heaven binds all by invisible bonds). Margins: Philo; an excellent view of Philo on God's immobility and why words of local motion are ascribed to God.

„Therefore the words of migratory motion by no means befit God. But nonetheless God is said to come down to inspect, who most clearly foresees all things even before they come to be: that we may be taught that no man should think he can make a certain judgment about things absent and uncertain, but, the matter being more closely looked into, should diligently survey everything. For certain sight must be employed rather

than fallacious hearing. Wherefore in a best-constituted Republic it is provided by law that no one give for testimony things heard, because the judgment of hearing is by nature liable to corruption. This, then, we judge to be the cause why God is said to have come down to inspect the city and the tower.“ So Philo.

§70. Philo (cont.): words of motion do not befit God, yet He is said to ‘come down to inspect’ — to teach us not to judge absent/uncertain things, but to look closely (sure sight over fallible hearsay; good law bars hearsay testimony, hearing being corruptible). This is why God is said to ‘come down’ to see the city and tower.

Blessed Basil, on the thirty-second Psalm, explaining that verse, „From heaven the Lord has looked forth, He has seen all the children of men; from His prepared dwelling-place,“ sets a distinction between „God seeing from heaven what men do“ and „God coming down to see what men do“: for the former, he says, is said of the good and taken in a good sense, but the latter is referred to evil men and pertains to their evil. For he writes thus: „Those who remain in their proper dignity of soul and do things agreeable to nature, God looks upon from heaven. But those who have fallen to the extreme of disgraceful deeds, God is said to visit by coming down. ‘The cry,’ He says, ‘of the Sodomites is multiplied, and their sins are exceedingly grievous; I will go down therefore and see whether they have done according to the cry that has come to me.’ And again: ‘He came down to see the city which the children of men were building.’“ So Basil.

§71. Basil (on Ps 32/33:13–14, ‘From heaven the Lord looked forth…’) distinguishes ‘God sees from heaven’ (of the good, in a good sense) from ‘God comes down to see’ (of the wicked, for their evil): the good He looks upon from heaven; those fallen to the extreme of vice He ‘comes down’ to visit — as with Sodom (Gen 18) and ‘He came down to see the city.’ Margins: Basil; Gen 18.

But this observation and lesson of Basil is not perpetually true in the sacred letters…

§72. But Basil's distinction does not always hold in Scripture (continues p. 501).

— p. 574 (PDF) · printed p. 501 —

…Inasmuch as, just as God is often said to come down to consider and punish the sins of men, so also He is not rarely said to come down to help, console, and instruct good and holy men. Hence is that in Isaiah: „Would that Thou wouldst break open the heavens and come down.“ And to Moses God said: „I have seen the affliction of my people in Egypt, and I have heard their cry; and knowing their cry, I have come down to deliver him.“ And in the book of Exodus it is written that God came down upon Mount Sinai — namely, to speak with Moses and to instruct him, that through him He might promulgate His law to the Hebrews.

§72 (concl.). God is also often said to ‘come down’ to help, console, and instruct the good: Isa 64 (‘would that Thou wouldst rend the heavens and come down’); Exod 3 (‘I have come down to deliver’ His people from Egypt); and God ‘came down’ on Sinai to speak with Moses (Exod 19). Margins: Isa 64; Exod 3; Exod 19.

Nevertheless, in this place the descent of God signifies the divine animadversion upon the pride of the builders of that tower. Certainly Rabbi Moses the Egyptian noted that the descent of God here ought to be understood as the wrath and vengeance of God against evil men who are on the earth. „When the punishment,“ he says, „and wrath of God comes upon the nations of the world, which punishment His prophets foretold beforehand, God is said to come down to those nations — that is, to visit and punish their works.“ Therefore, when it is said, „Come, let us go down and confound their tongue,“ this signifies: Let us no longer dissemble their crimes, but let us punish them as soon as possible by confounding their tongue.

§73. Here the ‘descent’ signifies God's animadversion on the builders' pride. Rabbi Moses the Egyptian (Maimonides): God's ‘descent’ = His wrath and vengeance on evil men — when His foretold punishment comes on the nations, He is said to ‘come down’ to visit and punish their works. So ‘let us go down and confound their tongue’ = let us no longer overlook their crimes but punish them at once. Margin: Rabbi Moses the Egyptian.

SIXTH DISPUTATION. Who those were to whom Moses narrates that God spoke these words, whom God willed to be

His associates in hindering the building of that tower and in confounding the tongue of those men.

Liber XVI, Disputation 6 (title): to whom God said ‘let us go down and confound their tongue’ — His associates in the work.

{Upon those words, Genesis ch. 11: Come, let us go down and there confound their tongue.}

Gen 11:7 (verse lemma, for Disputation 6).

Since a little above Moses had said that God came down to see the city, how does he now, as if He had not yet come down, bring Him in calling others to come down together with Him? Blessed Augustine notes this in book 16 of the City of God, chapter 5, and answers that the things here said by Moses are prior to those above, but are here narrated by recapitulation. For Moses declares in what way God came down — that is, by associating others with Himself and using their ministry to do what He Himself willed to be done.

§74. Disp. 6. Since Moses already said God ‘came down to see,’ why does He now call others to come down with Him? Augustine (City of God 16.5): this is prior, told by recapitulation — Moses declares HOW God came down, namely by associating others and using their ministry. Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 5.

— p. 575 (PDF) · printed p. 502 —

But who are those to whom God spoke, saying „Come, let us go down and confound their tongue“? Many thought that by these words was signified the mystery of the most holy Trinity: for those plurals, „Come, let us go down and confound,“ indicate the multitude and distinction of the divine persons; but that which is subjoined in the singular number, „The Lord divided them from that place into all lands, and dispersed them over the face of all regions,“ denotes the unity of the divine nature and power. This understanding a certain Greek Gloss on this place follows, and Rabanus and the Interlinear Gloss, and also Rupert, who, treating these words of

Moses, writes thus: „This misfortune of so wonderful a vengeance, by which men are most of all divided from themselves, God alone could do. Accordingly, when He said in the plural, Come, let us go down, let us confound, He does not exhort multitudes of Angels to aid, but the whole Trinity, one God, attests Itself to be present to strike pride. Which is clearer from the opposite remedy: for when in the mouth of the Apostles all kinds of tongues are recalled, the same Trinity opens Itself to men, and on that day first in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit men are baptized — which is the true structure of the highest tower, by which man ascends into heaven to reign with God.“ So Rupert.

§75. Disp. 6: to whom did God speak ‘let us go down’? Many: the mystery of the Trinity — the plurals (‘let us go down, confound’) show the distinction of persons, the singular (‘the Lord divided them’) the unity of nature. So a Greek Gloss, Rabanus, the Interlinear Gloss, and Rupert: God alone could work this dividing vengeance; ‘let us go down’ attests the whole Trinity present to strike pride — clearer from the opposite at Pentecost (the tongues restored in the Apostles, baptism ‘in the name of the Father, Son, Holy Spirit,’ the true tower by which man ascends to heaven, Acts 2; Mt 28). Margins: Rabanus; Rupert, Commentary on Genesis bk. 4 ch. 42; Acts 2; Mt 28.

But more convenient and plainer, and for that very cause also more probable, is the opinion of those who interpret these words as said by God to the Angels. For although they can easily be accommodated also to the divine persons, yet, because they expound them most conveniently of the Angels themselves, it seems better to refer these words to them. „It can be,“ says Augustine, „that what is here said is expounded of the Holy Trinity, as if the Father said to the Son and the Holy Spirit, Come and, descending, let us confound their tongue — if there were something to forbid the Angels being understood: to whom it rather befits to come to God by holy motions, that is, by pious thoughts, by which the immutable truth is consulted by them, as the eternal law in that eternal court of theirs. For they are not the truth to themselves, but partakers of the creating truth; toward it they are moved as toward the fountain of life, that what they have not in themselves they may receive from it; and therefore stable is that motion of theirs by which they come to God, who never withdraw from Him.“ So Augustine.

§76. But the more convenient, plainer, and likelier view (Pererius's): the words were said to the Angels. Augustine (City of God 16.6): it could be of the Trinity (Father to Son and Spirit), were there nothing to suggest the Angels — to whom it rather befits to 'come to God' by holy thoughts, consulting the immutable truth (the eternal law in their eternal court); not being truth themselves but partakers of the creating truth, they move toward it as toward life's fountain, with a stable motion, never withdrawing from God. Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 6.

— p. 576 (PDF) · printed p. 503 —

Therefore that „Come, let us go down and confound" is understood as said to the Angels. But why is it not said „go down and confound"? Namely, because through the Angels and with the Angels God came down, who was in the descending Angels. For God willed to show that He so works through His ministers that they too are co-workers of God, and that they so work that through them and in them God nonetheless works the more. „Since by the ministry of the Angels," says Cajetan, „God works, therefore God speaks in the plural. And because He so works through the Angels that He Himself works the more — so that He is not far off (as the Philosophers feign), but present to the Angels working about these lowest things as the chief worker — therefore He said, Let us go down and let us confound. And to go down indeed will befit God according to the likeness of the effect; but to confound befits Him properly." So Cajetan. The same Blessed Gregory held, and treats at length in book two of the Morals, whose words we shall mention a little below.

§77. So 'let us go down and confound' is said to the Angels. Why not 'go down and confound' (imperative)? Because God came down through and with the Angels, being in them. He shows His ministers are co-workers, yet He works the more in them. Cajetan: God works by the angels' ministry (hence the plural), being present as chief worker, not far off (as the Philosophers feign); 'to go down' befits God by likeness of effect, 'to confound' properly. Gregory (Morals bk. 2) agrees (quoted below). Margin: Cajetan on this place.

To the opinion of these authors Philo too is to be added, who interprets those words, „Come, let us go down and confound their tongue," as said by God to the Angels. I shall set down his eloquent and at once learned discourse. „By those words God seems," says Philo, „to address certain

ones as associates of His work. And the same is read to have been said before, about the creation of man. ‘The Lord said,’ it says, ‘Let us make man to our image and likeness’; where the word ‘Let us make’ signifies by its plurality. This first, then, must be said: that nothing among things is equaled to God, but that He is one king, by whom alone it is lawful that the universe be administered and dispensed. For that saying, ‘It is bad for many to rule; let there be one king,’ pertains no more to cities and men than to the world and God: for one maker, father, and lord of one [world] there must necessarily be. But, although God is one, it cannot be told how many associate powers He necessarily has, which procure the welfare of things, and some also punish the harmful: and that punishment is not hurtful, since by it He chastises and restrains sins. Of such powers consists that incorporeal and intelligible world, which is the exemplar of this visible world. The beauty of which visible world some, admiring, consecrated its chief parts — the Sun, the Moon, the heaven — not fearing to call them gods: whose thoughts Moses, understanding, sometimes called the supreme king of all the God of gods, to indicate that He is more excellent than the subjects.‘“

§78. Philo too refers ‘let us go down’ to the Angels (as ‘faciamus hominem,’ Gen 1, to fellow-workers). His discourse: nothing equals God, the one king ruling all (‘one maker of one world’); yet He has many ‘associate powers’ that tend things and punish the harmful (a punishment not hurtful, restraining sin) — of these the incorporeal/intelligible world consists, the exemplar of the visible; whose chief parts (Sun, Moon, heaven) some wrongly called gods, so Moses called God the ‘God of gods,’ above the subordinates. Margins: Philo, On the Confusion of Tongues; Gen 1.

„There is, besides, in the air a consecrated choir of incorporeal natures, attendant on those heavenly ones. These the divine oracles are wont to name Angels. This whole army, arranged into its own orders, executes the commands of the supreme Emperor, and obeys this one moderator of theirs, as is right; nor in these so numerous troops of soldiers and ministers can one find even one deserter of his office and order. The King Himself, surrounded by these ministers, uses them only for those affairs which it befits not to be handled by God alone. For although the Father of all needs

no one's help, by which He might be relieved whenever He wishes to do something, yet He sees what befits Himself, what befits the creatures; and He permits some things to be effected by the subordinate powers — nor indeed with a faculty granted them wholly free, lest any error be admitted in the generation of things and the effecting of the divine commands.“ So Philo.

§79. Philo (cont.): besides, a consecrated choir of incorporeal natures in the air, attendant on the heavenly — the divine oracles call them Angels. This whole well-ordered army executes the supreme Emperor's commands, obeying their one moderator with no deserter. The King uses these ministers only for what it does not befit God alone to handle — not from need (the Father of all needs no help) but seeing what befits Himself and the creatures, permitting the subordinate powers to effect some things (their faculty not wholly free, lest error creep into the work).

— p. 577 (PDF) · printed p. 504 —

But in this discourse of Philo, that which he said about the creation of man does not hold a true opinion. For he thinks that those words, „Let us make man to our image and likeness,“ God said to the Angels: which that very phrase, „to our image and likeness,“ convicts of being false. For neither is there one and common image of God and the Angels, just as neither is there one nature; nor was the soul of man, in which the image of God especially shines, created by the Angels, but by God alone and to the likeness of God alone: whence presently it is subjoined, „God made man to His own image and likeness.“ Rightly, then, did Blessed Augustine refute Philo's opinion, his name being suppressed. We too have disputed copiously against Philo in the first volume of our Commentaries on Genesis, book four, where we explained those words, „Let us make man to our image and likeness.“

§80. But Philo errs on man's creation: he takes ‘let us make man to our image’ as said to the Angels — false, since ‘to OUR image’ implies one shared image, yet God and the Angels share neither image nor nature; and man's soul (where God's image chiefly shines) was made by God alone, to God's likeness alone (‘God made man to His own image’). Augustine rightly refuted Philo (unnamed); Pererius too argued it in Genesis vol. 1 bk. 4. Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 6.

But assuredly (for it pleases me to admonish the reader of this in passing, which, once said here, I wish thenceforth to hold good forever) Philo has always seemed to me both more studious of, and also more skilled in, the Platonic discipline than in the doctrine of the sacred letters. And so in his writings one may observe that the sentences of divine Scripture are treated by him allegorically, but generally according to the discipline and tenets of Plato. Whence it came about that, because he embraced the sayings and decrees of Plato with greater zeal and assent than was fitting, in treating the sacred letters he mixes in many things drawn from the springs of Plato — but impure, and contrary to the most pure truth of the divine letters. With great attention of mind, therefore, and with great judgment must Philo be read, that the true may be distinguished from the false, and that the unskilled and incautious reader be not deceived by a certain magnificent and brilliant appearance of the Platonic philosophy and eloquence (which he incredibly loved and vehemently strove to express in his writings). I could, as if culling and gathering, indicate to the reader many errors from his books, but this is not the place.

§81. An admonition (to hold good throughout): Philo was more devoted to and skilled in Platonism than in Scripture, treating Scripture allegorically but per Plato's tenets — so he mixes into Scripture impure Platonic matter contrary to its pure truth. Read him with great care and judgment, distinguishing true from false, lest the unskilled be deceived by his brilliant Platonic eloquence. Margin: an admonition to the reader to read Philo's books cautiously.

In what manner, moreover, God spoke those words to the Angels, Blessed Augustine, disputing briefly, writes in this way: „God does not speak to the Angels as we speak to one another among ourselves, or to God, or to Angels, or the Angels themselves to us, or through them God to us, but in His own ineffable way; to us, however, it is indicated in our way. For God's loftier speech, prior to His deed, is the immutable reason of His own deed — which has no resounding and passing sound, but a power eternally remaining and operating in time. By this God speaks to the holy Angels, but to us otherwise, set far off; but when we too grasp something of such speech with our inner ears, we draw near to the Angels. Either, therefore,

the immutable truth speaks by itself ineffably to the minds of the rational creature, or it speaks through a mutable creature — either by spiritual images to our spirit, or by corporeal voices to the sense of our body.“ So Augustine.

§82. How God speaks to the Angels (Augustine, City of God 16.6): not as we speak to one another, but in His own ineffable way — God's speech prior to His deed is the immutable reason of that deed, a power eternally abiding yet operating in time; by this He speaks to the holy Angels; we draw near to them when we grasp such speech with our inner ears. Either the immutable truth speaks ineffably to rational minds, or through a mutable creature (spiritual images to our spirit, or bodily voices to our senses). Margins: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 6; how God speaks to the Angels (Augustine's notable view).

— p. 578 (PDF) · printed p. 505 —

But on the same matter the discourse of Blessed Gregory is more copious and more brilliant. For he, in book 2 of the Morals, explaining what is written in the first chapter of the book of Job, that God said to Satan, „Whence comest thou? Hast thou considered my servant Job, that there is none like him on the earth?“ says thus: „While the invisible nature, the incomprehensible nature, speaks, it is fitting that our mind, exceeding the quality of corporeal speech, be suspended in its inmost parts toward the sublime and unknown modes of speech. For we, in order that we may express outwardly the things we feel inwardly, cast them out through the organ of the throat by the sound of the voice — for to others' eyes we stand within the secret of the mind, as it were behind the wall of the body; but when we desire to manifest ourselves, we go out, as it were, through the door of the tongue, to show what we are inwardly. But the spiritual nature, which is not composed of mind and body, is by no means such: for, since to the spiritual nature nothing is opposed from the addition of a body, God speaks to the holy Angels by that very thing by which He shows to their hearts His hidden invisible things, so that whatever they ought to do they may read in the very contemplation of truth, so that the joys of contemplation themselves are as it were certain precepts of a voice. For what is breathed into the seeing is, as it were, said to the hearing.“

§83. Gregory (Morals bk. 2, on God's words to Satan in Job 1) more fully: when the invisible, incomprehensible nature speaks, our mind must rise above bodily speech. We, hidden 'behind the wall of the body,' go out 'through the door of the tongue' to show ourselves; but the spiritual nature (not composed of body) is otherwise — God speaks to the holy Angels by the very showing of His hidden things to their hearts, so they 'read' what they should do in the contemplation of truth: 'what is breathed into the seeing is as it were said to the hearing.' Margin: Job 1.

„Whence, when God laid upon their hearts the animadversion of vengeance against human pride, He said, Come, let us go down and there confound their tongue. It is said to those present, Come, because indeed this very thing — never to decrease from the divine contemplation, but in the divine contemplation always to increase — and never to withdraw thence, is, as it were by a certain stable motion, always to come. And to whom He also says, Let us go down and confound their tongue: the Angels ascend in that they behold the Creator, the Angels descend in that they press, with the examination of strictness, the creature raising itself in unlawful things. To say, therefore, on God's part, Let us go down and confound their tongue, is to show them in Himself what is rightly to be done, and by the force of inner vision to inspire into their minds, by hidden motions, the tokens that are to be displayed." Thus far are the words of Blessed Gregory, which have been recounted.

§84. Gregory (cont.): when God laid on the Angels' hearts the vengeance against human pride, He said 'let us go down…' — 'Come' to those present, since never to wane from but always to grow in divine contemplation, never withdrawing, is 'by a stable motion always to come.' The Angels 'ascend' in beholding the Creator, 'descend' in pressing (with strict scrutiny) the creature raising itself unlawfully. So God's 'let us go down and confound' = showing them in Himself what should be done, inspiring into their minds the tokens to be displayed.

It appears, therefore, from the opinion of Blessed Augustine and Gregory, that God's saying to the Angels, „Come, let us go down and confound their tongue," was nothing else than God's revealing to the Angels the decree of His will, that the building of the city and tower by those men, their tongue being confounded, should be hindered from proceeding further. For God's speaking to the Angels that they may know or do something is nothing else

than declaring to them what He Himself wills them to know and to do. And such divine revelations are made to the Angels (as it pleases certain Theologians) in the divine essence, which they behold by the beatific vision: for that is a certain mirror representing all intelligible things; but it is a voluntary mirror, manifesting only those things which God wills, and as much as He wills, and to whom He wills, and when He wills to reveal. Although it seems more probable that such new revelations are made to the Angels by new intelligible species infused into their intellect by God, or by a certain new and proper application and determination of prior species to represent these or those things, or finally by new cognitions or concepts of these or those things, to the producing of which concepts God concurs together with the angelic intellect: for on this matter the opinions of the Theologians vary very much.

§85. So (per Augustine and Gregory) God's ‘let us go down and confound their tongue’ to the Angels = revealing to them His will's decree, that the building be stopped by confounding the tongue. God's ‘speaking’ to Angels = declaring what He wills them to know/do. Such revelations: some theologians — in the divine essence (the beatific vision, a ‘voluntary mirror’ showing only what God wills); more probably — by new intelligible species infused, or a new application of prior species, or new concepts to which God concurs with the angelic intellect (the theologians vary). Margin: what it is for God to ‘speak’ to the Angels, and how He reveals what He wills them to know or do.

— p. 579 (PDF) · printed p. 506 —

Therefore that which God said, „Come,“ signifies the command and mandate of God given to the Angels, or rather a certain determination or application of them to doing some one thing rather than another. For the Angels are of themselves most ready to undertake all God's commands: but they are determined by God and applied to executing this rather than that. That „Let us go down“ signifies that what God willed to be done by the Angels ought not to be done in heaven, but on earth and in that plain of Sennaar, where were the builders of that city and tower. And to go down indeed is attributed to God metaphorically — namely, as to the operation and effect which God works on earth (which is the lowest place in comparison with heaven); but to the Angels it befits to go down properly,

that is, not only according to operation and effect, but also according to the real presence of their substance: for according to this, since they are not everywhere, they can go to and change various places.

§86. 'Come' = God's command to the Angels, or rather His determining/applying them (ready of themselves) to one task rather than another. 'Let us go down' = what God willed done by the Angels was to be done not in heaven but on earth, in Sennaar. 'To go down' is said of God metaphorically (as to His operation/effect on earth, the lowest place); but of the Angels properly — not only by effect but by the real presence of their substance, since (not being everywhere) they can move from place to place.

Finally, that „Let us confound their tongue" befits properly both God and the Angels. For that confusion of tongue proceeded from God not only as commanding and ordaining, but also as effecting; but because that effect of the confusion of tongue proceeded not from God alone immediately, but also from the Angels co-operating and ministering to God, therefore it was said in the plural, „Let us confound." And God uses the ministry of the Angels for perfecting many things, not on account of need of another's help (since He is most fully sufficient to Himself for all things), but on account of the fitting and gentle plan of His providence and governance, which demands that earthly things be moved and governed by heavenly, corporeal by incorporeal. There accrues from this, besides, to the angelic nature a certain great excellence of nobility and dignity, while the Angels are employed as ministers of the divine providence and governance in ruling and moving the corporeal world. But enough of these things: and let us proceed to the last question of this disputation.

§87. 'Let us confound their tongue' befits both God and the Angels: the confusion proceeded from God as commanding/ordaining AND effecting, but not from God alone immediately — also from the Angels co-operating (hence the plural). God uses angelic ministry not from need (He is all-sufficient) but for the fitting order of His providence (earthly things moved by heavenly, corporeal by incorporeal) — which also confers great dignity on the angelic nature. (Closes Disp. 6.)

SEVENTH DISPUTATION. On the confusion of the tongue of those men and its division into various tongues.

Liber XVI, Disputation 7 (title): the confusion and division of the one tongue into many.

{Upon those words, Genesis ch. 11: Let us there confound their tongue, that they may not understand one another's speech. And so the Lord scattered them from that place into all lands, and they ceased to build the city. And therefore the name thereof was called Babel, because there the language of the whole earth was confounded; and from thence the Lord scattered them abroad upon the face of all countries.}

Gen 11:7–9 (verse lemma, for Disputation 7).

Suited indeed to so impious a pride and disobedience of those men was this punishment, and a fitting penalty of the fault. For „because the dominion of one commanding is in the tongue“ (says Augustine), „there pride was condemned, that the one commanding might not be understood by man, who would not understand so as to obey God commanding. So that conspiracy was dissolved, when each withdrew from him whom he did not understand…“

§88. Disp. 7. The punishment fit their impious pride. Augustine (City of God 16.4): since ‘the dominion of one commanding is in the tongue,’ pride was condemned there — the commander not understood, because man would not understand so as to obey God's command; thus the conspiracy dissolved, each withdrawing from whom he did not understand (continues p. 507). Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 4.

— p. 580 (PDF) · printed p. 507 —

„…nor did each join himself except with him with whom he could speak: and by tongues the nations were divided, and dispersed through the lands as it pleased God, who did this by hidden ways incomprehensible to us.“ The confusion of tongues, then, suddenly arisen (says Cassian), checked the sacrilegious and nefarious daring of men. „For the noxious agreement of men against God would have remained there, had not the diversity of tongue, conflicting among themselves, by the discordance of voice, by the dispensation of God, compelled them to advance to a better state; and a

good and useful discord recalled to salvation those whom a pernicious agreement had inspired toward their own destruction — those, namely, beginning to perceive human frailty (the division intervening), which, being puffed up by a noxious conspiracy, they had not known before.“

§88 (concl.). Augustine (cont.): each joined only those he could understand; so the nations were divided by tongues and dispersed as God pleased, by hidden ways. Cassian (Conferences): the sudden confusion checked men's sacrilegious daring — the noxious agreement against God would have lasted, had not the diversity of tongue compelled them toward a better state; a good and useful discord recalled to salvation those whom a pernicious unity had driven toward ruin, now perceiving (in the division) the human frailty their proud conspiracy had hidden. Margin: Cassian, Conference 8 ch. 25.

Therefore those men, because they had abused the unity of tongue and the unanimous consent of all, to attempt against the will of God to build that edifice (namely, that they might not be disjoined and scattered from one another, and that they might leave an eternal memory and fame of themselves), therefore God, dividing the unity of their tongue in very various ways, compelled them to give up the building of that city and tower (which they had undertaken with so much zeal and endeavor); and since, on account of the diversity of tongue, they did not understand one another, it was necessary that they be dissociated from one another and scattered into the various parts of the earth. He also brought it about that, in place of the celebrity of name and fame which they sought, they obtained immortal disgrace and infamy. For He willed the name of that place to be Babel, signifying confusion, and that this should remain in every age among all, that the place itself by its name might perpetually keep the memory of so shameful and wretched a confusion of those men.

§89. So because they abused their one tongue and unanimous consent to build against God's will (to stay together and win eternal fame), God divided their tongue, forcing them to abandon the work; not understanding one another, they had to be dissociated and scattered over the earth. And instead of the fame they sought, they got immortal disgrace: God willed the place named ‘Babel’ (confusion), to keep forever the memory of their shameful, wretched confusion.

And the history of this matter furnishes us two useful lessons. The one is how contrary are the effects of contrary things — of humility, I mean, and pride, of piety and impiety, of audacity and modesty. Hear Blessed Gregory, who, explaining the history of the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Apostles which Blessed Luke narrates (how the Holy Spirit appeared in fiery tongues to the disciples of Christ and gave them the knowledge of all tongues, by which miracle was prefigured that the holy Church, filled with that same Spirit, would speak with the voice of all nations), writes in this manner: „Those who tried to build a tower against God lost the communion of one tongue. But in those who humbly feared God, all tongues were united. Here, then, humility merited unity, there pride confusion."

§90. The first of two moral lessons: how contrary are the effects of contrary things (humility vs. pride, piety vs. impiety). Gregory (homily 30 on the Gospels, on Pentecost, Acts 2): those who tried to build a tower against God lost the communion of one tongue; in those who humbly feared God, all tongues were united — 'here humility merited unity, there pride confusion.' Margins: two moral lessons; Gregory, homily 30 on the Gospels; Acts 2.

The other lesson, which is drawn from this place, must be weighed with attentive consideration of mind and always held in memory: that, just as discord among good men is pernicious, so (and even more) the conspiracy and concord of evil men is pernicious. This indeed the Lord insinuated in figurative speech in Job, when of Leviathan (who bears the figure of the Devil and of wicked men, who are his members) He said: „The members of his flesh cleav[ing together]…"

§91. The second lesson: as discord among good men is pernicious, so (even more) is the conspiracy and concord of evil men. The Lord hinted this figuratively in Job, of Leviathan (a figure of the Devil and the wicked, his members): 'The members of his flesh cleaving together…' (continues next batch). Margin: Job 41.

— p. 581 (PDF) · printed p. 508 —

…cleaving together. For when wicked men, who are members of the Devil, in undertaking or carrying through perverse works agree among themselves on every side from beginning to end, then the members of Leviathan are

rightly said to be cleaving to one another.

§91 (concl.). Completing the Job 41 figure: when wicked men (the Devil's 'members') agree wholly in perverse works, then 'the members of Leviathan' are rightly said to cleave together.

„The unity of reprobate men (says Gregory) impedes the life of the good so much the more harshly, as the harder it opposes itself to it by combination. Paul, perceiving this unity of the reprobate to be pernicious to himself, when he was in the midst of the Pharisees and Sadducees, said: 'Concerning the hope and resurrection of the dead I am judged.' At which word, vehemently struck, the crowd of hearers immediately leaped apart against one another; and while the multitude of the tumultuous is split into two parts, a way of escape is opened to Paul: because the divided crowd loosed him whom the united crowd of persecutors had bound fast. The just, then, are rescued while the unjust are divided; and the desires of the elect come to fulfillment while the ranks of the reprobate are confounded by discord. This is well signified by the dividing of the Red Sea: for while the wave is divided into two parts, the elect people is brought toward the land of promise; so while the unity of the evil is split, good minds are led to that which they seek. Had the unity of the evil not been harmful, divine providence would by no means have scattered, into so great a diversity, the tongues of those who with most proud spirit were building the city and tower. Had the unity of the evil not been harmful, the Prophet would not say, of the holy Church against its enemies: 'Cast down, O Lord, and divide their tongues.'" So Gregory.

§92. Gregory (Morals bk. 34): the reprobate's unity harms the good the more it combines. Paul split the Pharisees and Sadducees by crying 'concerning the resurrection I am judged' (Acts 23) — the divided crowd freed whom the united would have bound; the just are rescued as the unjust divide (figured by the Red Sea, Exod 14). Had the wicked's unity not been harmful, God would not have scattered the tongues of the proud builders, nor would the Prophet pray 'divide their tongues' (Ps 54). Margins: Gregory, Morals bk. 34; Acts 23; Exod 14; Ps 54.

Looking to and following this, the most blessed patriarch Jacob not only detested the wicked and deadly conspiracy and concord of his two sons

Simeon and Levi for inflicting so atrociously and cruelly the slaughter of the Sichemites, but even punished it with a just and useful penalty of their dissociation and dispersion. „I will divide them in Jacob," said he, „and will scatter them in Israel." Therefore for those who preside over some great multitude and society of men, two things in particular must be looked to and cared for: that they both take away the dissensions of the good and glue together their discords; and with no less zeal and diligence dissociate and draw apart from one another, as soon and as much as can possibly be done, those who conspire and agree among themselves toward evil.

§93. So Jacob detested the deadly conspiracy of Simeon and Levi against the Sichemites, punishing it with a useful dispersion: 'I will divide them in Jacob and scatter them in Israel' (Gen 49). Hence rulers must do two things: heal the good's dissensions, and as quickly as possible break up those who conspire toward evil. Margin: Gen 49.

But let us briefly expound some of the aforesaid words. „Behold, it is one people, and all have one language: and they have begun to do this, neither will they leave off from their designs till they accomplish them in deed." By these words is signified a double unity, trusting in which those men dared to undertake so great a work. The one was the unity of community and popular society: for although their multitude was very great, yet it was held together by the communion and unity of one people desiring the same thing and striving to accomplish it. The other was the unity of lip, that is, of tongue, on account of which, since all understood one another, and one incited another incredibly by the proposed advantage and glory of the designed work, they would assuredly have attempted nothing which they would not easily accomplish and perform. „If in so great a concord and unity of tongue" (says Chrysostom) „they fell into so great a madness, then, when in process of time their multitude had been increased to a greater degree and their power strengthened, they would without doubt have attempted worse things. For nothing could have retarded or quenched their force and ardor…"

§94. Gen 11:6 exposition: a double unity emboldened them — (1) the unity of community/popular society (one people desiring the same), (2) the unity of tongue (all understanding one another, inciting each other). Chrysostom: if in such concord and one tongue they fell into such madness, with greater numbers and power they would have attempted worse (continues p. 509). Margin: Chrysostom on Genesis homily 30.

— p. 582 (PDF) · printed p. 509 —

„…their force and ardor; whatever they had designed in mind and conceived in their wishes, they would have brought to effect.“ Therefore, that God may meet their madness not only for the present but also for the future, He demolishes the two things in whose confidence they are puffed up: by cutting apart the unity of their tongue, and by dissolving their popular communion, and by scattering it — divided into various nations and peoples — into the various parts of the earth.

§94 (concl.). Chrysostom: whatever they designed they would have achieved. So, to meet their madness for present and future, God demolishes the two grounds of their confidence — cutting the unity of tongue and dissolving the popular union, scattering them divided into nations over the earth.

That „They will not leave off from their designs till they accomplish them in deed“ signifies: Unless those men had been divinely hindered, they would most certainly have brought the designed and begun work to its end. God knew, therefore — and knew most certainly — not only what they were going to do, but also what they would have done had they not been hindered. For God, on account of the infinite perspicacity of His intellect, knows not only the things that are simply at some time to be, but also things conditionally future, that is, the things that, this or that circumstance and condition being posited, would be. Wherefore He said to David that, if he himself should remain at Ceila, it would come to pass that Saul too would come thither and the men of Ceila would give him up to Saul. He also said to Ezekiel that He was not sending him to a far-off nation of deep speech and unknown tongue; but that, if He should send him to that nation, it would nevertheless come to pass that it would hear him and receive his admonitions. To this also looks what the Lord said in the Gospel: that, if

the miracles done by Him in Capharnaum and Corozain had been done among the Tyrians and Sidonians, it would have come to pass that they would do penance in ashes and sackcloth.

§95. ‘They will not leave off till they accomplish it’ means: but for God's hindrance they would have finished. So God knew not only what they would do but what they would have done unhindered — for His infinite intellect knows even conditional futures (what would be under given conditions): e.g. David at Ceila (Saul would come, the men would hand him over, 1 Sam 23); Ezekiel (a far nation would have heard him, Ezek 3); the Gospel (Tyre and Sidon would have repented had Capharnaum's miracles been done there, Mt 11). Margins: the infinite perspicacity of the divine intellect; 1 Sam 23; Ezek 3; Mt 11.

Hence it also appears that the builders of that tower did not will to raise it up to the neighborhood of heaven, or above the height of the Noachic flood: for that, because it could be done by no art and no human strength, even had they not been hindered by God, they could by no means have effected. But in this place God signifies that they, unless hindered, would have completed and finished the work designed and begun by them.

§96. Hence the builders did not aim at heaven or above the flood's height — impossible by any human art, hinder or not. But God signifies that, unhindered, they would have finished the work they had designed and begun.

Moreover, that God hindered the building of those men from proceeding further was a great good to them — namely, lest their pride and impiety should grow more and more and, more vehemently strengthened, become utterly incurable and worthy of a graver punishment. For to let men's evil designs and endeavors proceed prosperously, and to accomplish without hindrance whatever they wished to do, and in short for everything to succeed for them according to their mind's purpose and wish, is a most certain proof of divine indignation and a kind of gravest punishment. For it was rightly said by Solomon, Proverbs 1: „The prosperity of fools shall destroy them.“ But, on the contrary, to stand in the way, that one may not be able to effect and obtain what he evilly thinks and desires, is the greatest benefit of divine kindness. For most true is what we read in the latter book of Maccabees, chapter six: „Not to suffer sinners to act according to their

purpose for a long time, but to apply punishments at once, is a token of great benefit.“ Wherefore Blessed Paul, as the gravest kind of divine punishment and vengeance against impious men, mentions that: „God gave them up to the desires of their heart.“

§97. God's hindering was a great good — lest their pride grow incurable and deserve graver punishment. To let the wicked's designs prosper unhindered is a sure sign of God's indignation, a grave punishment (Prov 1, ‘the prosperity of fools shall destroy them’); to thwart their evil aims is God's great kindness (2 Macc 6, ‘not to let sinners act long but to punish at once is a token of great benefit’; Paul: ‘God gave them up to their heart's desires,’ Rom 1) (continues p. 510). Margins: that the wicked's success is most unhappy for them; Prov 1; 2 Macc 6; Rom 1.

— p. 583 (PDF) · printed p. 510 —

David too sang of the Hebrews who, fastidiously rejecting the heavenly manna, coveted flesh in the desert and received it abundantly, God indulging their craving: „And they ate,“ he says, „and were filled exceedingly, and He gave them their desire; they were not defrauded of their longing.“ But attend to what he presently adds: „As yet,“ he says, „their meat was in their mouth, and the wrath of God came down upon them.“

§97 (concl.). David's example (Ps 78/77): the Hebrews who scorned the manna and craved flesh got it abundantly — ‘they ate and were filled… not defrauded of their longing’ — yet ‘while the meat was in their mouth, the wrath of God came down upon them.’ Margin: Ps 77.

Well known too is what Philo left written on this matter: „A signal punishment and vengeance of impiety is it,“ says he, „that God connives at and even indulges sinners, and grants them not only a long impunity but a great and lasting prosperity. This the foolish reckon not loss but gain, not punishment but benefit, and judge those fortunate whose every design and wish, of whatever sort they be, have the desired issues and successes for them. Whereas it is a token of a desperate soul to sin without any hindrance and to have prosperous successes of misdeeds. For whoever is not plainly incurable would rather be destitute of the counsel of the mind than be clever, prudent, and successful in doing evil. For restraint wards off the

greatest disease, injustice, which, if license of sinning be present, cannot be avoided. And fools indeed look up to the fortune of Tyrants, who have no other law and rule of doing whatever they please than their own lust, which, because, with none resisting, they can fulfill as they will, they are judged fortunate. But assuredly their condition is rather to be mourned and bewailed. For want and weakness profit the evil, but power with prospect [the good]…“

§98. Philo: a signal punishment of impiety is that God connives at sinners, granting long impunity and prosperity — which fools take for gain and call such men fortunate, though to sin unhindered and prosper in misdeeds is a mark of a desperate soul. One not incurable would rather lack counsel than be clever and successful in evil; restraint wards off injustice, unavoidable if sinning is licensed. Fools admire tyrants (whose only law is their lust), but their state is to be mourned. Margins: Philo, On the Confusion of Tongues; that the wicked's prosperity in this life is most unhappy.

„A great… and greater than most think, evil is it to leave the human soul — of itself untamed and rushing to disgraceful deeds — without bridle and ruler: since it, even when reins and whip and a prudent ruler are employed, can yet hardly be restrained. Wherefore the oracle of a propitious God, full of kindness, shows forth an excellent hope to the lovers of discipline, which was thus given: ‘I will not let thee go, neither will I forsake thee.’ For when the bonds of the soul are loosed, by which it was held as it were bound in the good, the greatest calamity follows — to be forsaken by God. Beware, therefore, whenever you see anyone doing whatever pleases him without obstacle and readily, of admiring him as fortunate; but rather pity him as unhappy, to whom, namely, a barrenness of virtues but an abundance of vices has perpetually befallen.“ Thus far from Philo.

§99. Philo (cont.): it is a great evil to leave the untamed soul without bridle (it is hard to restrain even with reins, whip, and a prudent ruler). Hence God's kind oracle to disciples: ‘I will not let thee go nor forsake thee’ (Josh 1) — for when the soul's restraining bonds are loosed, the worst calamity follows: to be forsaken by God. So do not admire one who does whatever he pleases unobstructed as ‘fortunate,’ but pity him as unhappy, barren of virtues and abounding in vices. Margin: Josh 1.

But that „That they may not understand one another's speech“ is not to be taken as if none of those men heard another speaking: for if that had

happened to them, they would doubtless have been deaf; and so not only confusion of tongue but also deafness would have befallen them. Therefore by those words is signified not simple hearing, but hearing joined with the understanding of what the others were saying. They heard the sounds of the voices, but did not understand their force and meaning. Nor does that „That they may not understand one another's speech“ signify that in that multitude of men there was no one who understood any other, but that as many men as there were in number, so many were their diverse tongues. For if this had been done, all would have been dissociated from one another, and no…

§100. ‘That they may not understand one another's speech’ is not that none heard another (that would be deafness, not just confusion of tongue), but hearing without understanding — they heard the sounds but not the meaning. Nor that each man had his own distinct tongue (else all would be dissociated, and no…) (continues p. 511).

— p. 584 (PDF) · printed p. 511 —

…and no society or community of men could have come to be — which was the most certain destruction of the human race. For no city, no household, no family, no conjunction of men could have been made and stood. Add that this would have been contrary to God's counsel and purpose. For God for this cause introduced the diversity of tongues, that those men might be compelled to be segregated from one another and dispersed into the various parts of the earth, that the whole world, filled with inhabitants and cultivators, might be fuller, more cultivated, more fruitful, and more adorned. But if no man had understood another man speaking, none could have gathered with another man. Therefore what God intended could not have been brought to effect.

§100 (concl.). …no human society could exist (no city, household, family) — the ruin of mankind, and contrary to God's purpose: He introduced the diversity of tongues so they would split into groups and spread to fill and cultivate the whole earth. Had no one understood any other, none could gather — and God's intent would fail.

Therefore what is here said, that none of those men understood the speech of his neighbor, is not to be taken of individual men, but of a certain multitude of men. For example: those who were of one family had their own tongue, by which they spoke among themselves and understood one another; and because, according to the diversity of families, a diversity of tongues also arose, hence it came about that, as many families of men as there then were, so many were the tongues; and those who were of the same family, since they understood among themselves what they spoke, gathered and associated among themselves. But since those who were of other families did not understand their tongues, therefore it was necessary that they be dissociated from all those and live separately. Altogether, because in the foregoing tenth chapter Moses reviewed the seventy-two descendants of the three sons of Noah, each of whom left his own family and nation, from this very many have judged that that one tongue of all men which had been before the building of the tower of Babel was divided into seventy-two tongues. But of this we shall speak a little below.

§101. So ‘none understood his neighbor's speech’ is not of individuals but of groups: those of one family shared a tongue (and gathered together), but did not understand other families' tongues (so were dissociated). Since Gen 10 listed 72 descendants of Noah's three sons, each leaving a family/nation, many hold the one tongue was divided into 72 (treated below).

Nor does it seem that this cannot be drawn from the things set forth above in the tenth chapter. For we read Moses writing thus of the sons of Japheth: „By these were the islands of the Gentiles divided in their regions, every one according to his tongue and his family in their nations.“ And likewise of the sons of Cham: „These are the sons of Cham in their kindreds and tongues and generations and lands and nations.“ Finally of the sons of Sem too: „These are the sons of Sem according to their kindreds and tongues and regions in their nations.“ It appears, therefore, from this narrative of Moses, that according to the variety of families and kindreds, the tongues too were various, and that diverse peoples and nations arose.

§102. This can be drawn from Gen 10: of Japheth's sons ‘by these were the islands divided… each according to his tongue and family’; of Cham's ‘in their kindreds and tongues’; of Sem's ‘according to their kindreds and tongues and regions.’ So tongues varied with families, and diverse nations arose.

But I return to what I first set about saying concerning the confusion of tongue. Let the reader reckon with himself and diligently consider what mind, what disposition, what feeling those men had when so great a confusion of tongue befell them. I believe indeed that, when they began not to understand one another, they were affected first with anger and indignation, because some thought themselves derided and mocked by others. Then I think they became like the demented and raving. But afterward, when they recognized that the matter was in earnest and held the thing itself, as it was, ascertained…

§103. Pererius returns to the confusion: imagine the men's state of mind. At first, anger and indignation (each thinking himself mocked); then like madmen; but afterward, recognizing it was in earnest… (continues p. 512). Margin: when the division of tongues was made, how great was the men's perturbation and confusion.

— p. 585 (PDF) · printed p. 512 —

…and understood that it could be done in no other way than by the will and power of God, recognizing the divine vengeance of their impiety and pride, it is not to be doubted that they were stricken and overwhelmed with an incredible confusion of mind and with stupor and at once dread.

§103 (concl.). …and understood it was God's doing — the vengeance of their impiety and pride — they were doubtless stricken and overwhelmed with incredible confusion of mind, stupor, and dread.

Something similar, but in a matter far dissimilar, happened to the holy disciples of Christ on the day of Pentecost. For on this day the diversity of all tongues was suddenly bestowed on them by a divine gift, so that each of the holy disciples understood all others speaking, of whatever nation and tongue they were, and all the others, although they used the most diverse tongues, understood most plainly any one of those disciples of the Lord speaking as if in his own tongue. And so then the most diverse tongues

were gathered, so to speak, into the mouth of one man; but of old the one tongue of all men was cut up into very many and most diverse tongues. Then all understood any one of the Lord's disciples speaking; of old no one could understand another's tongue. Each indeed was a very great miracle of the divine power. But the issue and effect of each was diverse. For by the former, those who were gathered in one place were dispersed into all the regions of the earth; but by the latter, those who were dispersed through all lands were gathered into one communion of faith and one society of the Church.

§104. A like (yet contrary) thing happened to Christ's disciples at Pentecost: the gift of all tongues, so each understood all and all understood each (Acts 2) — the diverse tongues gathered into one mouth, vs. Babel's one tongue cut into many. Both great miracles, but opposite in effect: Babel scattered the gathered over the earth; Pentecost gathered the scattered into one communion of faith and one Church. Margins: Acts 2; a comparison of what happened at Babel with what happened at Pentecost regarding the variety of tongues.

{And they ceased to build the city.}

Gen 11:8b (verse lemma).

Hence it appears that the cause why the building of the city and tower was given up was the confusion of tongue — that each did not understand the speech of his neighbor, as Moses narrates. Therefore it is not true what Josephus and Eusebius report to have been handed down by the Sibyl and Abydenus. They said that the builders of that city all used one tongue, but that the gods, winds and storms being sent in, overthrew the tower and cast it down upon the builders themselves. But of the overthrow of that tower, and that its builders perished crushed by its ruin, Moses makes no word; and indicates that the confusion of tongue alone was the cause of desisting from the building of the tower. Surely, if God or the Angels had destroyed the tower — since the works of God and of the Angels are perfect — they would have overturned that tower utterly and completely. And yet that that building remained for many ages afterward there are many and weighty witnesses, whom we named above.

§105. Gen 11:8b. The cause of stopping was the confusion of tongue (each not understanding his neighbor) — so the Sibyl/Abydenus story (in Josephus and Eusebius) that the gods blew the tower down on the builders is false: Moses says nothing of an overthrow or builders crushed, only the confusion. Had God or angels destroyed it, it would have been utterly razed (their works are perfect); yet many weighty witnesses (above) attest it stood for ages. Margins: Josephus, Antiquities bk. 1; Eusebius, Preparation bk. 9; the Sibyl; Abydenus.

— p. 586 (PDF) · printed p. 513 —

But someone will say: why did that giant Nemrod, who after the division of tongues remained there with his fellows and reigned, not resume and finish the abandoned building of the tower and city? It must be answered that that work was greater than could be completed by so great a fewness of men who were with him. But this is more probable: that those men, mindful of the recent calamity which they had experienced, were deterred from the prosecution of that building, fearing namely lest they be afflicted with another like calamity, or even a graver one. And the building of the city indeed lay idle for nearly a hundred years — namely, until Semiramis, who finished the begun city of Babel with incredible size and magnificence. But that tower she by no means raised higher, but, marvelously adorned, enclosed it in the temple which she had consecrated to Belus; and it lasted until the age of Herodotus — that is, for fourteen hundred years. For Herodotus flourished, as may be perceived from his writings, about the seventy-fifth Olympiad.

§106. Why did Nemrod (who stayed and reigned there) not finish? The work was too great for the few with him; more probably, mindful of the recent calamity, they feared a like or worse one. The city lay idle ~100 yrs until Semiramis finished it in great magnificence; she did not raise the tower higher but adorned it and enclosed it in the temple of Belus, which lasted to Herodotus's age (1,400 yrs; Herodotus flourished ~the 75th Olympiad). Margins: Nemrod; Herodotus bk. 1.

{And so the Lord scattered them from that place into all lands.}

Gen 11:8a (verse lemma).

This indeed was at once the effect and the end of the confusion of the one tongue and the multiplication of the various tongues. For to this end God

confounded that one tongue which all used, the variety of several other tongues being introduced: that, because the race of men had now been propagated to a greater degree, those men, even unwilling, might be segregated from one another and variously dispersed. For such a separation and dispersion was going to be exceedingly useful to the human race. First, on account of the convenience and abundance of food and sustenance: for no one region could have supplied sufficient food to so great a multitude of men, and one indeed increasing more and more day by day. Next, if the whole race of men had been in one place, war arising among them, or plague or some other deadly disease raging, it would easily have come about that all perished in a common calamity. Add that depraved conversations corrupt good morals, and the society of wicked and impious men, creeping on gradually like a contagious disease, infects and corrupts even the good.

§107. Gen 11:8a. The dispersion was the confusion's effect and end: God confounded the one tongue so the now-numerous race would (even unwillingly) split and spread — exceedingly useful for three reasons: (1) food/sustenance (no one region could feed so great and growing a multitude); (2) safety (all in one place, war or plague would destroy all in a common calamity); (3) morals (bad company corrupts even the good, like a contagion). Margins: three causes why it was very useful for men to be dispersed; 1 Cor 15.

— p. 587 (PDF) · printed p. 514 —

For these three causes, then, it was most useful for the human race to be scattered into diverse and far-off places of the earth, and to be the inhabitants and cultivators of regions distant from one another. And so, the division of tongues being made, each one, with his own who spoke the same tongue, sought a different place of the earth. Tubal came to the Hesperians, that is, into Italy and Spain (not that these were the names then, but that afterward such words were given to those places); Iavan set out into Ionia and Greece; Tharsis to Cilicia; Cethim to Cyprus; Madai to Media; Mesraim to Egypt; Phut to Africa; Lud to Libya; Chus to Ethiopia; Saba to Sabaea; Chanaan to that land which was from him afterward called Chananaea; and the same I wish to be understood of the other descendants

of the sons of Noah, of whom it was spoken in the foregoing tenth chapter.

§108. For these three causes the dispersion was most useful: so, the tongues divided, each (with his same-tongued kin) sought a region — Tubal to Italy/Spain, Iavan to Greece, Tharsis to Cilicia, Cethim to Cyprus, Madai to Media, Mesraim to Egypt, Phut to Africa, Lud to Libya, Chus to Ethiopia, Saba to Sabaea, Chanaan to Chananaea (and so the rest of Noah's descendants, Gen 10).

{And therefore the name thereof was called Babel, because there the language of the whole earth was confounded; and from thence the Lord scattered them abroad upon the face of all countries.}

Gen 11:9 (verse lemma).

That pronoun „its“ in Greek is of the feminine gender, and is referred to the city, of which it was said just before, „They ceased to build the city“; and it is subjoined, „Therefore the name thereof was called Babel.“ Nor indeed was there anything else which in the following ages was called by the name of Babel or Babylon except that city. The Septuagint translators put in their translation the Hebrew name Babel interpreted, rendering thus: „Therefore the name thereof was called Confusion.“ But at no time was that city called Confusion, or, as they wrote in Greek, σ■γχυσις. More rightly, therefore, did the Latin translator retain the Hebrew name Babel.

§109. Gen 11:9. The pronoun ‘its’ (feminine in Greek) refers to the city (‘they ceased to build the city’); ‘its name was called Babel’ — and nothing but that city was ever called Babel/Babylon. The LXX translated the name (‘its name was called Confusion,’ σ■γχυσις), but the city was never called ‘Confusion’; so the Vulgate rightly kept the Hebrew ‘Babel.’

— p. 588 (PDF) · printed p. 515 —

[Because there the language of the whole earth was confounded.] The „language of the whole earth“ is called that tongue common to all men, by which then all who were on the earth spoke. And that tongue is said to have been confounded, not because it was then vitiated and corrupted (for it remained the same as it was before, yet not among all, but in the family of Heber alone); but because very many other and most diverse tongues were then introduced, whereby it came about that some did not understand

others speaking, except those who were of the same tongue — which thing brought at the beginning great perturbation and confusion; therefore Moses said that then the tongue of the whole earth was confounded, that is, that the men were confounded who before indifferently used one tongue and all, whatever they spoke, understood among themselves. And hence it becomes clear that Babylon was called Babel on account of the confusion of tongue made there, and not from Belus (as some have thought) who was the father of king Ninus, and whom the Chaldeans and Assyrians worshipped chiefly as a god. God willed, moreover, that a monument of that matter should remain in every age, and that there should be many things which would perpetually preserve the memory of that deed as if recent. For an indication of that matter was the name of the city Babel, and the word Phaleg by which the son of Heber was named on account of the division of tongues, and likewise the unity of the Hebrew tongue remaining in the family of Heber, which, though it had before been the same of all men, was afterward of a few and most distinct from the tongues of all other men. Hear Chrysostom on these very words of Moses which we now treat, writing in this manner: „See how many things are done that the memory of that deed may be extended through all ages. First let there be the division of tongues; and before this the imposition of the name Phaleg, which Heber set upon his son, signifying division; then the name of the city Babel or Babylon, which sounds ‘confusion.’ Lastly Heber himself remained the same, keeping the idiom which he had before, that it might be a manifest sign of this division. Have you seen by how many things God willed the memory of this deed to be preserved, immortal and to be blotted out by no oblivion? For so the father was afterward compelled to tell his son the cause of so diverse a speech, and the boy learned from his father why Babylon had got its name from confusion — namely, that there God had confounded the lips of the whole earth and that thence He had dispersed men into all the regions of the earth.“ So Chrysostom.

§110. Gen 11:9 (‘the language of the whole earth was confounded’). ‘Language of the whole earth’ = the one common tongue all then spoke. ‘Confounded’ = not corrupted (it remained, but only in

Heber's family); rather many diverse tongues were introduced, so none understood others save same-tongue speakers — great initial confusion. Hence Babylon = 'Babel' from the confusion of tongue, NOT from Belus (Ninus's father, worshipped by Chaldeans/Assyrians). God left lasting monuments of it: the name Babel, the name Phaleg (Heber's son, 'division'), and the Hebrew tongue surviving only in Heber's family. Chrysostom (hom. 30): three things preserve the memory immortally — the division, the name Phaleg, the name Babel, and Heber keeping his idiom — so a father would tell his son why 'Babylon' means confusion. Margins: how the formerly-common tongue is 'confounded'; Gen 10; Chrysostom on Genesis homily 30.

EIGHTH DISPUTATION. Whether the Hebrew tongue, before the confusion of tongues, was in use among all men.

Liber XVI, Disputation 8 (title): whether Hebrew was the one tongue common to all before Babel.

But from the Mosaic narrative of the confusion and division of tongues there arises a question by no means ignoble: whether the tongue which is said to have been from the beginning common to all mortals was the Hebrew tongue or not. Theodoret, in those questions which he published on the book of Genesis, disputing on this matter, left in his writings three things which look directly to what is now asked. He judges, first, that the most ancient and first of all tongues was the Syriac, because those names — Adam, Cain, Abel, Noë — which we read to have been imposed in the first age of the world, are proper to the Syriac tongue. Theodoret writes thus: „What is the most ancient tongue of all, the names themselves indicate. For Adam and Cain, Abel and Noë are proper names of the Syriac tongue: for it is the custom of the Syrians to call red earth 'adam.' Adam, therefore, is interpreted 'earthy' or 'dusty'; and Cain 'possession' (for this Adam said, praising God, 'I have possessed a man through God'); and Abel is the same as 'mourning' (for he first of mortals was seen to die, and first brought mourning to his parents); but Noë is the same as 'rest.'"

§111. Disp. 8: was the first common tongue Hebrew? Theodoret (Questions on Genesis) holds three things; first, that the oldest tongue was Syriac, since the first-age names (Adam, Cain, Abel, Noë) are Syriac: 'adam' = red earth (so Adam 'earthy/dusty'), Cain 'possession' ('I have possessed a man through God'), Abel 'mourning' (first to die), Noë 'rest.' Margins: Theodoret, Question 59 on Genesis; whether Hebrew was the first tongue of all, used commonly before the confusion.

— p. 589 (PDF) · printed p. 516 —

So Theodoret; whose opinion is not only not true (as we shall show below), but his reason too is weak. For those names — Adam, Eve, Cain, Seth, Noë — and the interpretations of their names, are proper to the Hebrew tongue, as is manifest from the book of Genesis which Moses wrote in Hebrew. But that the Syriac tongue also has those words is by no means wonderful. For from the Hebrew tongue, as from a fountain, several other tongues — such as the Syriac or Chaldaic and the Arabic — are derived, as it were certain rivulets. Since, therefore, the Syriac is exceedingly akin to the Hebrew, what wonder if certain words be found the same in both tongues?

§112. Theodoret's view is untrue (shown below) and his reason weak: those names (Adam, Eve, Cain, Seth, Noë) and their interpretations are proper to Hebrew (Moses wrote Genesis in Hebrew). That Syriac has them too is no wonder — from Hebrew, as from a fountain, Syriac/Chaldaic and Arabic are derived like rivulets; Syriac being so akin to Hebrew, shared words are unsurprising. Margins: Gen 4; Gen 6.

Next, Theodoret thinks that the Hebrew tongue was first delivered to Moses by God, and therefore that it did not exist before Moses. Whereby it would come about that that tongue was born more than six hundred years after the confusion and division of tongues. Theodoret's words are these: „The Hebrew tongue I for my part judge to be sacred. For just as in the temples of the Greeks there are certain peculiar characters of letters which they called sacred, so God through Moses bestowed this tongue — not indeed natural, but yet apt for teaching. For since all speak the tongue of the nation in which they are born — as those in Italy speak Italian, those in Greece Greek, those in Egypt Egyptian — yet the children of the Hebrews do not at once use the Hebrew tongue, but that of those among whom they are born; but when they have grown up they are taught the characters of the Hebrew letters, and learn the sacred books written in Hebrew both words and letters. Which I think blessed David indicated, when, speaking of Joseph, he said, He heard a tongue which he knew not.“ So Theodoret.

§113. Theodoret's second view: God first gave Hebrew to Moses, so it did not exist before him (born 600+ yrs after Babel). His words: Hebrew is 'sacred' (like Greek temple-letters), given through Moses, not natural — Hebrew children first speak their birthplace's tongue and only learn Hebrew (its letters and sacred books) when grown; 'He heard a tongue he knew not' (Ps 81, of Joseph). Margins: Theodoret thinks (wrongly) that Hebrew did not exist before Moses; Ps 80.

But in this opinion of Theodoret certain things are not to be approved — such as that the Hebrew tongue did not exist before Moses, since this is against the opinion of all the Doctors, both Hebrew and Christian; and that the use of the Hebrew tongue existed at the beginning of the world those words sufficiently declare which I set down a while ago — Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Noë, and the interpretations of their names, which are expounded in the first five chapters of the book of Genesis, which have no force and place in any tongue except Hebrew. Moreover, what Theodoret says about Hebrew children not at once speaking Hebrew has no weight for proving what he himself wishes. For while the Hebrew Republic stood, all spoke Hebrew, and the children sucked that tongue from their nurses together with the milk; but after that nation, led into captivity, was dispersed through almost all lands, having lost its freedom and polity, and everywhere serving other nations, it lost the natural use of its own tongue, and must from the beginning be imbued with the foreign tongues of those nations whom it serves. Now, that Joseph, a Hebrew and speaking Hebrew, learned the Egyptian tongue (diverse from the Hebrew) as unknown to himself, is neither wonderful nor brings any force to confirm Theodoret's opinion.

§114. But Theodoret's view is partly wrong: that Hebrew did not exist before Moses is against all Doctors, Hebrew and Christian; the world's first names (Adam–Noë) and their interpretations work only in Hebrew. His point about Hebrew children is worthless: while the Hebrew state stood, all spoke Hebrew from the nurse's milk; only in the dispersion/captivity, serving other nations, did they lose their tongue and learn foreign ones. And Joseph (a Hebrew) learning Egyptian as unknown proves nothing for Theodoret.

But that Theodoret does not fetch the origin of the Hebrew tongue and letters higher than Moses, in this he seems to have followed Eupolemus,

who (as Eusebius reports) handed down that Moses was a most wise man, and first delivered letters to the Jews, and that the Phoenicians received them from the Jews, but the Greeks from the Phoenicians. But that the use both of the Hebrew tongue and of the Hebrew letters was older than Moses, we shall presently bring in Blessed Augustine teaching and confirming.

§115. Theodoret seems here to follow Eupolemus (in Eusebius): that Moses, most wise, first gave letters to the Jews, the Phoenicians got them from the Jews, the Greeks from the Phoenicians. But that both the Hebrew tongue and letters predate Moses, Augustine will be brought in to confirm. Margin: Eupolemus in Eusebius, Preparation bk. 9 ch. 4.

In the last place, Theodoret says that the opinion of those is by no means approved by him who judge that both the Hebrews themselves and their Hebrew tongue drew their name from Heber, because, with him, when the confusion and division of tongues was made, in his family alone there remained that tongue which had before been common to all, and therefore it was called Hebrew from Heber. But for that cause, says Theodoret, it would have been necessary that all the descendants of Heber be called Hebrews and use the Hebrew tongue: which fell out otherwise. For the descendants of Heber were Syrians, Moabites, Ammonites, Ishmaelites, Idumaeans, Madianites, Amalekites, and those who, begotten of his son Iectan, founded in various regions of India nations differing in various tongues…

§116. Theodoret's third point: he rejects deriving 'Hebrews' and 'Hebrew' from Heber (in whose family alone the common tongue survived). His objection: then all Heber's descendants should be 'Hebrews' speaking Hebrew — but they were not (Syrians, Moabites, Ammonites, Ishmaelites, Idumaeans, Madianites, Amalekites, and Iectan's line in India, of various tongues) (continues p. 517).

— p. 590 (PDF) · printed p. 517 —

Finally, Theodoret judges that they were called Hebrews from this, that Abraham, coming from the region of the Chaldeans into Palestine, crossed the river Euphrates: for „Hebra“ in the Syrian tongue (as he says) is said the same as 'Euphrates.' Theodoret concludes his disputation with words of this kind: „But to contend about this,“ he says, „is superfluous: for no

detriment accrues to piety from the word, whether we accept this or that.“ And this indeed is Theodoret's opinion.

§116 (concl.). Theodoret's own derivation: ‘Hebrews’ from Abraham's crossing the Euphrates from Chaldea into Palestine — ‘Hebra’ in Syriac = Euphrates. He closes: it is superfluous to contend, since piety suffers no harm either way. Such is Theodoret's opinion.

But indeed, that Theodoret thinks the Hebrews are called from ‘Hebra’ (by which word he says the Euphrates is signified), because that great Patriarch and parent of the Hebrews Abraham, from Chaldea, having crossed the Euphrates, came into the land of Chanaan — that is assuredly far removed from the truth. But about that we shall dispute, God favoring, in the third volume, upon those words of the fourteenth chapter, „Behold one who had escaped told Abram the Hebrew.“ But the reason by which Theodoret thought it concluded that neither the Hebrews nor their tongue took their name from Heber is very feeble, and is well solved by Blessed Augustine, as we shall presently say. For those descendants of Heber alone were called Hebrews by him, and used the Hebrew tongue, whom Moses reviewed as belonging by a direct series of generation from Heber down to Jacob: in whom, namely, the knowledge and worship of the true God remained and flourished.

§117. Pererius rejects Theodoret's ‘Hebrew from Hebra/Euphrates’ (to be discussed in vol. 3, on Gen 14, ‘Abram the Hebrew’). And Theodoret's objection (that not all Heber's line are ‘Hebrews’) is feeble — well solved by Augustine: only those descendants of Heber down to Jacob (in whom the knowledge and worship of the true God remained) were the ‘Hebrews’ who used the Hebrew tongue.

Blessed Augustine, in the books of the City of God, hands down four things which properly touch this disputation and make for the confirmation of the opinion which we shall follow. First, he says that that tongue which had been common to all men was the Hebrew, so named from Heber, because in his family alone it remained after the division of tongues. „Since in the family of Heber,“ says Augustine, „the formerly common tongue of all remained, the other nations being divided through other tongues, therefore thereafter it was called Hebrew: for then there was need that it be

distinguished from the other tongues by a proper name, just as the other tongues too were called by proper names. But when it was the one tongue of all, it was called nothing else than the human tongue or human speech, because that alone the whole race of men spoke.“

§118. Augustine (City of God 16.11, 18.39) hands down four points supporting Pererius's view. First: the once-common tongue was Hebrew, named from Heber because it survived in his family alone after the division — for then it needed a proper name (like the other tongues); when it was the one tongue of all, it was simply called ‘the human tongue/speech.’ Margins: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 ch. 11, bk. 18 ch. 39.

Next, from this Augustine argues that in Heber alone and his family the right faith of the true God, religion, and piety remained. For the confusion of tongues was the punishment of those men's impiety; to whom, therefore, that punishment did not befall, it is fitting to believe that they were not partakers of those men's impiety. „Just as (says Augustine), even when there was one tongue of all, yet for that reason the sons of pestilence were not lacking (for before the flood too there was one tongue, and yet all deserved to be destroyed by the flood except the one house of Noah the just): so when, of a more lofty impiety…“

§119. Augustine's second point: in Heber's family alone the right faith and worship of the true God remained — for the confusion was the punishment of the others' impiety, so those spared it were not partakers of that impiety. ‘Just as, even with one tongue, the sons of pestilence were not lacking (before the flood too there was one tongue, yet all but Noah's house deserved destruction), so when, of a loftier impiety…’ (cut off, continues next batch). Margin: Gen 7.

— p. 591 (PDF) · printed p. 518 —

…[so, when, of a more lofty impiety,] the nations were deservedly punished by the diversity of tongues, and the city of the impious received the name of confusion, so as to be called Babylon, there was not lacking the house of Heber, where both the former tongue and piety were preserved. For since the multiplication and change of tongues came from a punishment, the people of God ought certainly to be exempt from this punishment. Therefore, where the same tongue remained, there was not

that punishment which was wrought by the change of tongues; and this surely appeared no small trace of the justice of that nation: that, while other nations were chastised by the change of tongues, to this one no such penalty came. Nor in vain was that tongue — which the authority of the Patriarchs and Prophets preserved not only in their speech but also in the sacred letters — transmitted not to all the descendants of Abraham or Heber, but only to those whose generations are led in a direct line down to Abraham; and from this, besides, only to those who, propagated through Jacob and more notably and eminently cohering in the people of God, could have the testaments of God and the stock of Christ."

§119 (concl.). End of the Augustine quotation: when the nations were punished by the diversity of tongues (and the impious city named 'Babylon'/confusion), the house of Heber kept both the former tongue and piety — since the change of tongues came from a punishment, God's people were exempt; a mark of that nation's justice. And that tongue (kept by the Patriarchs and Prophets in speech and Scripture) passed not to all Abraham's or Heber's line, but only to those in the direct line to Abraham, and thence through Jacob — bearing God's covenants and the stock of Christ.

In the third place Augustine confirms that not only the Hebrew tongue, but also the Hebrew letters and characters, were in use long before Moses — namely, against what Theodoret thought. „It is not to be believed, as some judge," says Augustine, „that the Hebrew tongue alone was preserved through him who was called Heber (whence the word 'Hebrews'), and thence came down to Abraham, but that the Hebrew letters began from the law which was given through Moses; but rather, that through that succession of [Heber's] line the said tongue was kept together with its letters. Finally, Moses appointed in the people of God those who should preside over the teaching of letters, before they knew any letters of the divine law. These Scripture calls grammaton isagogos, who in Latin may be called 'bringers-in' or 'introducers of letters,' because they in a manner bring them into the hearts of learners, or rather [bring] into them those whom they teach." So Augustine. Who, by these last words, seems to look to what is written in Deuteronomy, chapter 31, where the Latin reading has thus: „Gather to me all the elders of your tribes, and your teachers, and I

will speak these words in their hearing, and will call against them heaven and earth.“ For that word ‘teachers,’ in Greek it is γραμμ■των ε■σαγωγε■ς, which word Augustine rendered ‘bringers-in of letters’ or ‘introducers,’ or rather ‘introducers to letters.’

§120. Augustine's third point: not only the Hebrew tongue but its letters/characters predate Moses (against Theodoret). Augustine: it is wrong to think only the tongue was kept through Heber while the letters began with the Mosaic law — rather, the tongue with its letters was kept through Heber's line; Moses appointed teachers of letters (‘bringers-in of letters,’ Gk grammaton isagogos) — looking to Deut 31's ‘teachers’ (Gk so rendered). Margin: not only the Hebrew tongue but the Hebrew letters/characters were in use before Moses.

In the fourth place Augustine raises this doubt: if at the birth of Phaleg (as was concluded in the foregoing fifteenth book) the division of tongues was made, and Phaleg was the firstborn of Heber, and after him was born his brother Iectan; therefore at the time of the division of tongues Iectan did not exist, and much less his descendants, whom Moses reviewed above in the tenth chapter. But, the descendants of Iectan being subtracted, the number of seventy-two families and nations which are said to have been when the tower of Babel was being built does not hold, nor the number of seventy-two tongues corresponding equally to those families. Solving this doubt, Augustine denies that Phaleg was the firstborn of Heber, but that Iectan was born many years earlier than Phaleg himself; yet that Phaleg was named first, either on account of the notable event of the confusion and division of tongues, into which his birth…

§121. Augustine's fourth point — a doubt: if the division was at Phaleg's birth (per Liber XV), and Phaleg was Heber's firstborn with Iectan born after, then Iectan and his sons (Gen 10) did not yet exist — but without them the 72 families/tongues do not add up. Augustine's solution: Phaleg was not Heber's firstborn; Iectan was born many years earlier, though Phaleg is named first (because of the notable event of the division at his birth) (continues p. 519). Margin: a doubt from Augustine — whether Phaleg was Heber's firstborn.

— p. 592 (PDF) · printed p. 519 —

…his birth fell, or on account of the dignity of his posterity, or for some other cause. „It is by no means to be thought,“ says Augustine, „that those

whom Moses reviews were begotten in the order in which we read them mentioned by him. Otherwise, how could the twelve sons of Iectan (who was the other son of Heber and brother of Phaleg) have then made nations, if Iectan was born after Phaleg, as he is mentioned after him by Moses — since at the time when Phaleg was born the earth was divided? Accordingly it must be understood that Phaleg was indeed named first, but was born long after his brother Iectan; whose twelve sons of Iectan had then already such great families that they could be divided into their own tongues. So, then, he could be mentioned first who was later in age, just as among the descendants of the three sons of Noah the sons of Japheth were mentioned first, who was the least of them; then the sons of Cham, who was the middle; lastly the sons of Sem, who was the first and greatest.“ Thus far from Augustine: the sum of whose opinion is that the Hebrew tongue was the first of all, that the whole race of men used it before the building of the tower of Babel, and that from Heber himself it was called Hebrew. And from the solution of this doubt it appears how weak and futile is the reason by which the Hebrews prove that the division of tongues was made not at the birth but near the death of Phaleg — namely, that Iectan was born after Phaleg, and had thirteen descendants when the tongues were divided.

§121 (concl.). Augustine: Moses does not list them in birth-order; else Iectan's twelve sons could not have made nations if Iectan were born after Phaleg (the earth was divided at Phaleg's birth). So Phaleg is named first though younger — as Japheth's sons (the youngest son) are listed before Cham's and Sem's. Augustine's sum: Hebrew was the first tongue, used by all before Babel, named from Heber. This also shows the weakness of the Hebrews' argument that the division was near Phaleg's death (since Iectan, born after, had thirteen descendants by then).

The same is the opinion of Blessed Jerome: for on the third chapter of Sophonias, explaining those words, „The triflers who have departed from the law I will gather,“ he writes in this manner: „As for what we said, ‘triflers,’ let us know that in the Hebrew it is the very Latin word, and therefore was put down by us just as it was in the Hebrew, that we may be able to know that the Hebrew tongue is the mother of all tongues — which it is not the time to discuss here.“ To this opinion belongs also what the

same author says, expounding those words of Isaiah, „Behold a virgin shall conceive“ — for, disputing that by the Hebrew word ‘alma’ is properly signified not only a girl, but a hidden and secret virgin who has never been open to the gaze of men and has been kept with great diligence by her parents — he writes thus: „The Punic tongue too, which is said to flow from the fountains of the Hebrews, properly names a virgin ‘alma.’ And — to give the Jews something to laugh at — in our own speech too ‘alma’ is called ‘holy.’ For the Hebrews use the words of almost all tongues: as is that in the Canticle of Canticles, from the Greek φορε■ον, that is a litter, ‘Solomon made himself a litter,’ which we read so in the Hebrew too. The words ‘nugas’ (triflers) and ‘mensura’ (measure) too the Hebrews call by the same form and the same senses.“ So Jerome.

§122. Jerome agrees: on Soph 3 (‘the triflers [nugas] who departed from the law’) he notes the Hebrew uses the very Latin word, ‘that we may know the Hebrew tongue is the mother of all tongues.’ Likewise on Isa 7 (‘a virgin [alma]…’) — ‘alma’ properly a hidden, guarded virgin: the Punic (flowing from Hebrew springs) calls a virgin ‘alma,’ and Latin ‘alma’ = holy; the Hebrews use words of almost all tongues (e.g. the Greek φορε■ον/‘litter’ in Cant 3, ‘nugas,’ ‘mensura’). Margins: Isa 7; Cant 3.

To the opinion of these Fathers — founded and confirmed both by their weighty authority and by excellent conjectures — nearly all later writers have acceded and adhered. It is not worthwhile to review the names or sayings of all. I shall be content with four examples: one of the age just past, three others of this our age. Tostatus proves that the tongue common to all men from the beginning of the world was Hebrew, from the imposition of the names which…

§123. Nearly all later writers followed these Fathers. Four examples (one of the last age, three of the present): Tostatus proves the first common tongue was Hebrew from the imposition of names (continues p. 520). Margin: Tostatus on Gen 11, qq. 1–2.

— p. 593 (PDF) · printed p. 520 —

…which Adam imposed on things according to that tongue which then was. For such names are not found to signify, in any other tongue, that for

the signifying of which they were imposed by Adam, except in the Hebrew tongue: the names, I mean, Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Noë. And if those names signify the same, or something similar, in certain other tongues too, that happens because those tongues are exceedingly similar to Hebrew, being derived from it — such as the Chaldaic or Syriac, the Arabic, and in some respects even the Punic. And when the tongues were divided, that first tongue remained in the stock of Heber alone, whence it was called Hebrew; nor was it transfused into all the descendants of Heber, but only into those who were in the direct line through which Christ descended. It remained, therefore, in Phaleg alone, and in his son Reu only, and so on down to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob. And he, since he had twelve sons, all used that tongue, and all their descendants, that is the twelve tribes of Israel; not the tribe of Judah alone, although from it alone the Messiah drew His origin and stock.

§123 (concl.). Tostatus: the world's first names (Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Noë) signify, as Adam imposed them, only in Hebrew; if similar in Chaldaic/Syriac/Arabic/Punic, that is because those derive from Hebrew. At the division it remained only in Heber's stock (whence 'Hebrew'), and not in all his line but only the direct line to Christ — Phaleg, Reu, … to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob; and through Jacob's twelve sons to all twelve tribes (not Judah alone, though the Messiah came from Judah).

It is therefore very wonderful that, although the aforesaid fathers from Heber down to Jacob had taught all their sons the Hebrew tongue, yet those afterward, or their descendants, had diverse tongues — either invented by themselves or received from the other nations among whom they dwelt. And the Hebrew tongue was once full and perfect, furnished namely with all the words that avail for signifying all things, no less indeed than any other of the most copious and richest tongues. But now — nay rather, after the Babylonian captivity — it is imperfect, destitute namely of many words; since those names alone have remained plainly Hebrew which are contained in the sacred books. The cause of which was that the Hebrews, mingled with other nations, lost the use of their own tongue and took up the tongues of other nations. So Tostatus.

§124. Tostatus marvels that, though Heber's line to Jacob taught all their sons Hebrew, their descendants later had diverse tongues (invented or borrowed). Hebrew was once full and perfect (as copious as any tongue), but since the Babylonian captivity it is imperfect, lacking many words — only the names in the sacred books remained plainly Hebrew — because the Hebrews, mingled with other nations, lost their tongue and took up others'.

Cajetan thinks the same as Tostatus, and argues in this manner: „Although divine Scripture does not explain what was then the common tongue of all, yet we have two conjectures that it was Hebrew. The one conjecture is that the Hebrew tongue existed before the flood, as the Tetragrammaton name of the Lord testifies. The other is that the name of Babylon, which that city obtained according to the Hebrew tongue, seems to persevere among all nations. And if this were established to be so, an effective argument of the matter would indeed be had from it: especially because that city was not Heber's or his sons', but Nemrod's, the son of Cus, the son of Cham.“ So Cajetan.

§125. Cajetan (agreeing with Tostatus): two conjectures that the first tongue was Hebrew — (1) Hebrew existed before the flood (the Tetragrammaton); (2) the name ‘Babylon’ (Hebrew) persists among all nations — strong if established, especially since that city was not Heber's but Nemrod's (son of Cus, son of Cham). Margin: Cajetan on Gen 11.

Oleaster, treading in the footsteps of his predecessors, set forth similar things: „Since,“ he says, „the text says that the whole earth was of one tongue, I for my part would easily believe it to have been Chaldaic or Hebrew: for these two tongues, now [distinct], I think to have been one and the same from the beginning, since they are exceedingly close. Nor are reasons lacking for this opinion. The first, because the names imposed on the first parents — as Adam and Chauach (Eve) — have their origin from Hebrew words. There are also some names which it is not to be doubted that other tongues borrowed from the Hebrews…“

§126. Oleaster, following them: the one tongue was Chaldaic or Hebrew (which he thinks were originally one and the same, being so close). His reasons: first, the first parents' names (Adam, Chauach/Eve) come from Hebrew words; and other tongues borrowed words from Hebrew (continues p. 521). Margin: Oleaster on this place.

— p. 594 (PDF) · printed p. 521 —

…borrowed [from the Hebrews] is not to be doubted: such as ‘Sac,’ that is, sack; ‘Babel’; and ‘Tarsis,’ the name of a precious stone. The second reason, because it is credible that the first and common tongue of all was left there where the division of tongues was first made — that is, in the land of Sennaar, which was Chaldaea. The third reason, because Abraham, who was a Chaldean, spoke this tongue, from whom his descendants, who were called Hebrews, learned it. The fourth reason, because the text says that those who were of one tongue came from the East: and since the Chaldaic and Arabic tongues have remained in the East, those seem to have been the first — or rather Hebrew, which was their parent.“ So Oleaster. Origen, whom it would have been right to put in the first place, in Homily 11 on the book of Numbers, says that the Hebrew tongue was the first of all and the one Adam used, and that it remained even after the confusion and division of tongues.

§126 (concl.). Oleaster's reasons (cont.): other tongues borrowed Hebrew words (‘Sac’/sack, ‘Babel,’ ‘Tarsis’); the first tongue was likely left where the division happened (Sennaar/Chaldaea); Abraham the Chaldean spoke it, whence the Hebrews; those of one tongue ‘came from the East,’ where Chaldaic/Arabic remained — so those (or rather Hebrew, their parent) were first. Origen (Hom. 11 on Numbers, who should have been cited first): Hebrew was the first tongue, Adam's, and remained even after the confusion. Margin: Origen.

Nor did Genebrardus depart from so ancient and probable an opinion (of which man, whenever occasion falls to me, I gladly use the memory and name: for I love him from my heart, and not only for his learning, but much more for the singular ardor of Catholic faith and Christian piety, which I have observed and known both from his writings and from the discourse of many). Genebrardus, therefore, confirms by authority that the Hebrew tongue is the mother of all tongues and coeval with the world — [by the authority] of Blessed Jerome on Sophonias, and of Origen in Homily 11 on the book of Numbers, and of the Hebrews (except Rabbi Judah, who in the Tractate Sanhedrin said that Adam's speech was Aramaic, that is Syriac). Therefore words do not have their force from nature, as Plato disputes in

the Cratylus, nor from the institution of men, as it seemed to Aristotle; but God Himself confounded the tongues — that is, out of one made many. And the Hebrew tongue, which before had been common to all, remained incorrupt with Heber (from whom the name of the tongue and the people), because he had taken part neither in the counsels nor in the work of those who wished to build the tower of Babel and raise it to heaven. And that these builders were called ‘Meropes,’ on account of the divided speech, Suidas hands down under the word ‘Seruch.’

§127. Genebrardus (whom Pererius warmly praises for faith and learning) confirms, by Jerome (on Soph), Origen (Hom. 11 on Numbers), and the Hebrews (except Rabbi Judah, Sanhedrin, who made Adam's speech Aramaic/Syriac), that Hebrew is the mother of all tongues, coeval with the world. So words have force neither from nature (Plato, Cratylus) nor by human convention (Aristotle), but God confounded them (made many from one); Hebrew remained incorrupt with Heber (whence the name of tongue and people), who shared neither the counsel nor the work of the builders. Suidas (under ‘Seruch’): the builders were called ‘Meropes’ (from the divided speech). Margins: Genebrardus in his Chronology; Plato; Aristotle; Suidas.

NINTH DISPUTATION. Of what kind that confusion of tongues was, and how it was made.

Liber XVI, Disputation 9 (title): the nature and manner of the confusion of tongues.

Philo disputes on this matter, in many and eloquent words, toward the end of the book which he wrote On the Confusion of Tongues, treating those words, „Come, let us go down and confound,“ etc. And his disputation has three parts. In the first place he sets forth what that word, „Confusion,“ signifies. „Things,“ says Philo, „which are not easily known of themselves become manifest from the likeness of kindred things; for we often come to know the unknown by the comparison of similar things and of the same kind…“

§128. Disp. 9. Philo (end of On the Confusion of Tongues) treats this in three parts. First, what ‘confusion’ means: things hard to know of themselves become clear by comparison with similar things (continues p. 522). Margin: Philo.

— p. 595 (PDF) · printed p. 522 —

„…But what is similar to confusion? Mixture, namely, and tempering, as has been handed down by our elders: mixture in dry things, tempering in moist. Mixture, then, is a disordered joining of diverse bodies — as if one should heap together barley, wheat, and the kinds of the other grains into one heap. But tempering is not a joining, but a mutual penetration of dissimilar parts, whose qualities, once tempered, can by some art be separated. Which they say happens in wine and water: for these two, if united, make a tempering, and nonetheless can, by separation, return to their former qualities. For if you soak a sponge in oil, they say the water is gathered by it and the wine left; perhaps because the sponge, born of waters, draws to itself in the tempering the kindred liquid, but rejects the wine as foreign. But confusion comes about when, the parts penetrating one another, their qualities perish, so that, the things that were before being corrupted, a new generation of one thing, different from the former, arises: which happens in the physicians' compound which they call Tetrapharmacum, made of wax, pitch, resin, and fat; these, once compounded and confounded together, cannot by any art be separated so as to return to their former qualities, but, since the single ingredients appear nowhere, one excellent thing is made from all the corrupted ones. What, therefore, the word ‘confusion’ signifies, from these things which we have said appears.“

§128 (concl.). Philo distinguishes: ‘mixture’ (disordered joining of dry things, like grains heaped together); ‘tempering’ (mutual penetration of moist things, separable again — wine and water, drawn apart by a sponge); but ‘confusion’ (parts penetrating so their qualities perish, a new thing arising from the corrupted — the physicians' Tetrapharmacum of wax, pitch, resin, fat, inseparable). Margin: what confusion is.

In the second place Philo recounts the opinion of those who thought that Moses, by the aforesaid words, spoke of a true confusion of tongues — as if then for the first time arose the origin of the diversity of tongues which is among men. This opinion, although Philo does not plainly disapprove it, he yet denies to be agreeable to Moses's design and purpose, writing thus: „Those who pursue only the open and obvious things think that here is

described the origin of the Greek and Barbarian tongues. Whom indeed I do not accuse: for perhaps they too judge rightly; but I wish them nevertheless admonished not to be content to have proceeded thus far, but to pass on to tropology, thus deeming the divine oracles to be certain shadows of bodies, but that the things signified by these are most true realities. If anyone, dim of mind, perceives this too dully, let him by no means neglect the occasion offered by the lawgiver himself, even in this very place: for he calls this thing ‘confusion’; who, if he had wished only to indicate the origin of tongues, would more fitly have called it ‘division’ than ‘confusion.’ For things that are distributed into parts are not confounded, but rather distinguished: so that there is no less a conflict between these words than between the things themselves. For confusion is a corruption of simple faculties, which, heaped together, generate some one thing; but separation is a division of one into many. And so, if Moses had wished to signify that one speech was divided into many parts, he would have used other, fitter and more proper, appellations, calling it ‘division’ or ‘separation,’ not ‘confusion,’ which signifies plainly the contrary.“

§129. Philo's second part: those who take Moses to speak of a real confusion of tongues (the origin of Greek/Barbarian tongues) — Philo does not condemn them but says it does not fit Moses's intent, urging them to pass to tropology (the oracles are ‘shadows,’ the things signified the realities). His clue: Moses calls it ‘confusion,’ not ‘division’ — and the two are opposite (confusion = corruption of simples into one new thing; separation = one divided into many); so for a mere division of one speech Moses would have said ‘division,’ not ‘confusion.’

In the last place Philo declares how this discourse of Moses is to be expounded and understood not historically, but according to the tropological understanding. „As often as God,“ says Philo, „threatens confusion to impious thoughts, it is aimed not only at the single species of vices and their forces, but also at their works which are done by common purpose; lest, either singly, or by their counsels communicated, they gather their whole forces to destroy the [more excellent part]…“

§130. Philo's third part: the passage is to be taken tropologically, not historically. As often as God threatens ‘confusion’ to impious thoughts, it is aimed not only at single vices but at their works done

by common conspiracy — lest, singly or together, they gather all their forces to destroy the better part (continues p. 523).

— p. 596 (PDF) · printed p. 523 —

…the more excellent part. Wherefore He says: Let us there confound their tongue, that no one may hear the voice of his neighbor. As if He said: Let us make the single vices mute and deaf, that neither by speaking nor by agreeing with one another they may do harm. This, then, is the present purpose under the figure of the confusion of tongues: to scatter the packed wedge of vices, to make void the leagues of the wicked, to tear apart their pernicious society, to dissipate the joined and therefore strong forces of the impious, to demolish the empire of malice fortified by the greatest iniquities.“

§130 (concl.). Philo: ‘let us confound their tongue’ = let us make the single vices mute and deaf, so they harm not by speech or agreement. The purpose under the ‘confusion of tongues’ figure: to scatter the packed wedge of vices, void the wicked's leagues, tear apart their society, dissipate the impious' joined forces, and demolish the fortified empire of malice.

„Do you not see how the Maker of the world willed the parts of the soul to conspire [together], but, for their own grace and safety, made them set apart in place and distinguished by their offices and functions? The eyes cannot hear what the ears furnish; nor the ears see; nor the lips smell; nor the nostrils taste; nor reason discharge the office of the senses, nor the senses form speech. That artificer of all knew that it was not expedient for these to be mingled and confounded among themselves, but better that the single parts of the soul should each stand within their own functions and remain unconfounded; and that this conduces no less to the common [good] of the race of living things than privately to the faculties themselves. But, conversely, God brings vices into confusion and dispersion, lest, united, with their powers of harming joined, they bring an insuperable evil. For just as the concord of the virtues ought to be fostered by God, so [it is fitting that] vices be dispersed and routed. Nor is there any other name that befits vice more than ‘confusion’: which is evident in any fool, who uses

words, counsels, and deeds disordered and confused.“ And this (says Philo) is our opinion upon this text and discourse of Moses. And thus far indeed proceeds Philo's disputation.

§131. Philo (cont.): the world's Maker set the soul's parts distinct by function (eyes don't hear, ears don't see, etc.), unconfused — better for the whole and the faculties. Conversely God brings vices to confusion and dispersion, lest united they do insuperable harm: as virtue's concord is fostered, so vice is to be routed — ‘confusion’ being the fittest name for vice (evident in the fool's disordered words and deeds). This is Philo's view; thus far his disputation.

But indeed this interpretation of Philo, in the tropological kind, as true, acute, and not unlearned, I praise and embrace; but as the proper and (as they call it) literal [interpretation], and as looked to and designed by Moses himself first and principally, I plainly disapprove and cast off. For that Moses's discourse is historical, and a true and genuine narration of things done, the matter itself proclaims — besides the authority of all, both Hebrews and Christians. For the whole manner of Moses's speaking in this book is historical, and consisting of a bare and simple narration, no otherwise indeed than in the books of Joshua, Judges, and Kings. Otherwise, both the book of Genesis and all the other sacred books which are called historical would not be such as they are named and held by all, but would be parabolic and allegorical or even enigmatic, similarly as the book of Solomon which is entitled the Canticle of Canticles.

§132. Pererius: Philo's reading, as tropology, is true, acute, and learned — but as the proper/literal sense Moses primarily intended, it is to be rejected. Moses's discourse here is historical (a bare, simple narration, like Joshua/Judges/Kings) — per all Hebrews and Christians; else Genesis and the other ‘historical’ books would be not such but parabolic/allegorical/enigmatic, like the Canticle of Canticles. Margin: Philo refuted.

But Philo's argument presses us. For the word ‘confusion,’ says he, by no means fits Moses's discourse: for, if you look at the bare history, you will find the tongues not confounded but divided. For where, I ask, was that confusion of tongues made? In that first and common tongue of all? But that, even if not among all, yet among those with whom it remained, remained plainly the same, entire and incorrupt. Or in the other tongues,

whose variety was then introduced? But in those no confusion is discerned. For how can those be called confounded which had never before existed and then for the first time arose? And since of them…

§133. Philo's pressing argument: 'confusion' does not fit — historically the tongues were divided, not confounded. Where was the confusion? Not in the first common tongue (which remained entire where it survived); not in the new tongues (no confusion there — how can what never existed before and then first arose be 'confounded'?) (continues p. 524).

— p. 597 (PDF) · printed p. 524 —

…each was so distinct from every other that those who were of one tongue understood no other, there could be no confusion in them. They were, therefore, all unconfounded and altogether distinct.

§133 (concl.). …each tongue was so distinct that one-tongue speakers understood no other — so there was no confusion in them; they were all unconfounded and wholly distinct.

But this argument is easily met, if we say that the confusion of which Moses speaks was not in the tongues, but in the men — yet on account of the sudden variety of tongues. For, on account of the oblivion of the first tongue, which befell most of those men, and the sudden use, in that great multitude of men, of various tongues very dissonant and discrepant, so great a confusion of minds befell those men that they were compelled both to desist from the begun building and to be segregated from one another and to take up diverse places of the earth for dwelling. And this interpretation those words greatly help, by which Moses makes God speak thus: „Come, let us go down and there confound their tongue, that they may not understand one another's speech." Do you see that the confusion of tongues was in this — that in that great multitude of men, on account of the sudden variety of tongues, since some did not understand others, they were perturbed and confounded in mind beyond what can be believed?

§134. The answer: the 'confusion' Moses means was not in the tongues but in the men — through the tongues' sudden variety. By forgetting the first tongue and the sudden onset of many dissonant tongues, the men fell into such confusion of mind that they abandoned the building, split apart, and took up diverse lands. The words 'let us confound their tongue, that they may not understand one

another' support this — the confusion was that, not understanding one another, they were confounded in mind beyond belief. Margin: how the confusion of tongues is to be understood.

But how was that confusion and division of tongues made? In this manner, namely. First, God made all those men (except Heber and his family) forget the first tongue which had before been common to all. And He brought the oblivion by deleting from the minds of those men that habit by which they had held known the significations of all the words of that tongue, and [by which] it had been most ready and most easy for them to use it for speaking whenever they wished. This oblivion being induced, so great an ignorance of that tongue befell them that, when they heard Heber and Phaleg themselves speaking it, as if they had never either known or even heard of it, they understood them in no way.

§135. How the confusion/division was made: first, God made all (except Heber's family) forget the first common tongue — by deleting from their minds the habit by which they knew the words' meanings and spoke it readily; so completely that, hearing Heber and Phaleg speak it, they understood nothing, as if they had never known or heard it. Margin: how the division and multiplication of tongues was suddenly made.

Next, according to the diversity of those nations which, sprung from the three sons of Noah, had come together to the building of the city and tower, God inserted into their minds the diverse habits of the various tongues. Whereby it came about that each of those nations had not only the knowledge of that tongue which by divine dispensation had befallen it (as to the words, phrases, proverbs, and other such things proper to each tongue), but also a ready and easy use for speaking. And so they were each so disposed toward his own tongue as those are wont to be disposed who know some tongue well and use it, whenever they please, readily and easily.

§136. Next, God inserted into the minds of those nations (sprung from Noah's three sons) the diverse habits of the various tongues — so each nation had both the knowledge of its divinely-allotted tongue (words, phrases, idioms) and a ready use of it, disposed toward it as one who knows a tongue well and speaks it readily.

It had almost escaped my memory what should have been said in the foregoing disputation about Philastrius. Since it was passed over there, we shall render it here, deeming it better to say it in the wrong place than in none. Philastrius, in the Catalogue of Heresies, chapter 106, the opinion concerning the unity of the tongue of all men before the building of the tower (which we above, confirmed by the weightiest authorities and best reasons, have followed) as heret[ical]…

§137. (Almost forgotten from the previous disputation:) Philastrius, in his Catalogue of Heresies (ch. 106), condemns as heretical the view (which Pererius has followed, backed by the weightiest authorities) that one tongue was common to all before Babel (continues p. 525). Margin: Philastrius, who thinks even before Babel men had diverse tongues, is refuted.

— p. 598 (PDF) · printed p. 525 —

…disapproves and condemns as heretical. He says it must be firmly believed that even many ages before the building of Babel there was among men a great variety of tongues and speech, the knowledge of all which tongues, however, all men, by God's gift, held down to the construction of the tower and the confusion of tongues. And what Moses said, that the earth was of one lip, he thinks was said for this reason: that, although there were various kinds of tongues, yet all understood one another; and there was to all one tongue and the same speech — not indeed by the use of the same words, but by the same understanding of all speakers and hearers. So he.

§137 (concl.). Philastrius: it must be firmly believed that for many ages before Babel there was a great variety of tongues, the knowledge of all of which all men held by God's gift until the tower and the confusion; and ‘the earth was of one lip’ means only that, though tongues varied, all understood one another — one speech not by the same words but by the same mutual understanding.

But Philastrius, while he condemned what was most true as if false and heretical, himself wandered far from the truth and from the right understanding of the divine letters. But since enough has been said about this in the foregoing disputation, it is not worthwhile here to dispute against Philastrius on the same matter. And Philastrius seems to have been led into

this error by a light consideration of those things which Moses wrote above in the tenth chapter. For it is set forth in the tenth chapter that the sons of Japheth and Sem were divided into diverse families, regions, and tongues, as if before the building of the tower there had already been among the descendants of the sons of Noah a diversity of tongues. But Philastrius did not observe that those things were written by anticipation — a figure not infrequent in the sacred letters — which we above proved by the testimony of Blessed Augustine and Rupert.

§138. Philastrius, condemning the truth as heresy, wandered far from the right sense of Scripture (enough was said above). He was misled by a light reading of Gen 10 (the sons of Japheth and Sem 'divided into families, regions, and tongues,' as if tongues differed before Babel) — not seeing that this was written by anticipation (a figure not rare in Scripture; proved above from Augustine and Rupert).

TENTH DISPUTATION. On the number of tongues, into which that first and common tongue of all is said to have been divided or multiplied.

Liber XVI, Disputation 10 (title): the number of tongues into which the one tongue was divided.

It is a very ancient opinion, approved by the suffrages both of Hebrew and of Christian doctors, that besides the Hebrew tongue (which alone, from the founding of the world down to that time, had been in use among all) seventy-one other tongues were then introduced, so that all the tongues were seventy-two. And this is proved thus. Moses says that, when the lip of the whole earth was confounded, so great a variety of tongues was suddenly introduced that each one did not understand the tongue of his neighbor. Either, then, to each of those men a proper tongue befell, or only to each nation and family. That single tongues did not befall single men we have shown above, teaching that this would have been against God's counsel and purpose — that is, against that which God had determined to effect by such a confusion of tongues and dispersion of men. It remains, therefore, that the diversity of tongues was according to the di[versity]…

§139. Disp. 10. A very ancient view (Hebrew and Christian doctors): besides Hebrew (the one tongue from the world's founding) 71 others were then introduced — 72 tongues in all. Proof: Moses says so great a variety arose that none understood his neighbor; either a tongue per man or per nation/family; not per man (shown above, against God's purpose); so per the diversity (continues p. 526). Margin: whether there were then 72 tongues.

— p. 599 (PDF) · printed p. 526 —

…according to the diversity of those nations and families. But Moses in the tenth chapter reviewed seventy-two families and nations sprung from the three sons of Noah; therefore it is to be believed that there were just as many tongues.

§139 (concl.). …according to the diversity of nations and families. But Moses (Gen 10) reviewed 72 families/nations from Noah's three sons; so there were just as many tongues.

Great credence to this opinion is built up by the authority of the weightiest Fathers who followed it. Epiphanius, at the very beginning of the Panarion, writes in this manner, speaking of the builders of the city and tower of Babel: „God," he says, „had no pleasure in the work of their madness: for He dispersed and divided their tongues, and from one distributed them into seventy-two, according to the number of men then found; whence also they were called 'Meropes,' on account of the divided speech; and the tower too God overthrew by the force of the winds." So Epiphanius. But this last, about the tower overthrown by the winds — doubtless taken from Josephus and Eusebius — we have indicated above to be false. The same too was Blessed Jerome's opinion about the seventy-two tongues: for, explaining those words of the Lord, „Do you think that I cannot ask my Father, and He will presently give me more than twelve legions of Angels?" he says thus: „Twelve legions of Angels contain seventy-two thousand Angels: into how many nations, namely, the tongue of men was divided." Not that Jerome means the tongues were divided into seventy-two thousand nations (for that would be false), but he wished to indicate the mystery of that number seventy-two, ennobled also by an equal multitude of the tongues of the Nations.

§140. Weighty Fathers support the 72. Epiphanius (start of the Panarion): God, displeased, dispersed and divided their tongues from one into 72 (by the number of men then found), whence ‘Meropes’ (divided speech); and overthrew the tower by winds (this last, from Josephus/Eusebius, is false, as shown above). Jerome (on Mt 26, ‘twelve legions of Angels’): twelve legions = 72,000 angels — i.e. into 72 nations the human tongue was divided (not 72,000 nations, but the mystery of the number 72, matched by the nations' tongues). Margins: Epiphanius; Jerome on Mt 26; legions.

The same Blessed Augustine held, in the books of the City of God, writing in this manner: „In sum, then, all those begotten of the three sons of Noah — that is, fifteen of Japheth, and thirty-one of Cham, and twenty-seven of Sem — make seventy-three. But because Heber and Phaleg, who are put distinctly in this number, neither made two diverse nations nor had two diverse tongues, therefore the number of those nations and tongues is rightly said to have been seventy-two.“

§141. Augustine (City of God) agrees: all begotten of Noah's three sons (15 of Japheth + 31 of Cham + 27 of Sem) = 73; but since Heber and Phaleg (counted distinctly) made no separate nations or tongues, the number of nations and tongues is rightly 72. Margin: Augustine, City of God bk. 16 chs. 3 & 11.

Prosper, in book 2 On the Calling of the Nations, chapter 4: „Now indeed,“ he says, „as the increase of human propagation ran on, when the very numerousness of mortals grew proud over its own multiplications, and, according to the height of its elation, desired to bring up to heaven the mass of an immoderate construction, how wonderful was the divine censure of justice for restraining this insolence! Which confounded all the speech of those peoples — consonant by significations mutually known — with the variety of seventy-two tongues; that both, amid the dissonant voices of the workers, concord perishing, the insane engine of the undertaking might be dissolved, and a dispersion, opportune for the evil of their gathering, might give inhabitants to the world to be dwelt in.“

§142. Prosper (On the Calling of the Nations bk. 2 ch. 4): as mankind multiplied and grew proud, desiring to raise an immoderate mass to heaven, God's just censure confounded their mutually-understood speech with the variety of 72 tongues — so that, concord perishing amid the workers' dissonant voices, the mad engine was dissolved, and a dispersion (timely against their evil gathering) peopled the world. Margin: Prosper.

Arnobius, moreover (not that teacher of Lactantius, but another far later), set forth that in those descendants of the three sons of Noah, after the confusion of the one tongue, there were seventy-two tongues which were then disseminated through the whole world; and likewise that from them were born a thousand ‘generations,’ or, as he calls them, ‘fatherlands of nations.’ Let the reader hear his words, which are in his Commentaries on the Psalms, where he expounds that verse of the hundred-and-fourth Psalm, „He has been mindful forever of His covenant, of the word which He commanded for a thousand generations“: „These thousand generations of nations,“ he says, „let us briefly set forth. Noah had three sons, Sem, Cham, Japheth. To Sem the firstborn a portion was made from Persia and Bactria as far as India afar, and as far as Rhinocorura; which spaces of lands have twenty-seven tongues of Barbarian speech, in which tongues are nations of four hundred and six diverse fatherlands. For nations have been multiplied much more numerously than tongues: for example, although the Latin tongue is one, yet under it, the one tongue, are diverse fatherlands — as of the Bruttii, the Lucanians, the Apulians, the Calabrians, the Picentes, the Tuscans…“

§143. Arnobius (the later, not Lactantius's teacher), in his Commentary on the Psalms (on Ps 104, ‘the word He commanded for a thousand generations’): after the confusion there were 72 tongues, and from them a thousand ‘fatherlands of nations’ (far more nations than tongues — e.g. one Latin tongue covers Bruttii, Lucanians, Apulians, etc.). Sem's portion (Persia/Bactria to India and Rhinocorura): 27 tongues, 406 fatherlands (continues p. 527). Margin: Arnobius.

— p. 600 (PDF) · printed p. 527 —

„But Cham, the second son of Noah, extends from Rhinocorura as far as Gadira, having diverse tongues: partly in the Punic speech on the side of the Garamantes, partly Latin on the northern side, partly Barbarian on the side of the South and of the Egyptians and the other inner Barbarians using various speech; having, I say, twenty-two tongues, but three hundred and ninety-four fatherlands of nations. Japheth, finally, the last son of Noah, had the river Tigris, which divides Media from Babylonia — just as Sem

had the Euphrates and Cham the Geon, which is called the Nile. And the posterity of Japheth was spread into two hundred fatherlands, using various speech, that is, into twenty-three tongues. There come to be, therefore, all together, seventy-two tongues, but a thousand fatherlands of generations or of nations, by which the whole race of men inhabiting the world is contained.“ So Arnobius.

§143 (concl.). Arnobius (cont.): Cham's portion (Rhinocorura to Gadira): 22 tongues (Punic, Latin, Barbarian), 394 fatherlands; Japheth's (by the Tigris, as Sem by the Euphrates, Cham by the Geon/Nile): 23 tongues, 200 fatherlands. Total: 72 tongues, 1,000 fatherlands of nations — containing the whole human race.

It by no means befits that Origen be passed over by us in silence in this place. For although he does not fix a certain number of tongues, he yet judges that there were many and various tongues, according to the multitude and variety of those nations. He also thinks that those tongues were effected by the Angels (who were the guardians and rulers of those nations), so that each Angel assigned and gave a proper tongue to the nation of which he bore the care. As many, therefore, as there were nations, so many were their ruling and presiding Angels, and just as many tongues were introduced by them — so, according to Origen's opinion, it must be reckoned. I shall set down here Origen's words from his eleventh Homily on the book of Numbers: „That too,“ he says, „which we read written in Genesis, that God (speaking, without doubt, to the Angels) says, Come, let us confound their tongues: what else is to be thought to signify, than that diverse Angels wrought diverse tongues and speeches in men? As, for example, there was some one Angel who then impressed the Babylonian tongue on one of those nations; another who [impressed] the Egyptian on another, and another the Greek; and so those very ones were perhaps the princes of the diverse nations, who seemed the authors of the tongues and speech. But the tongue first given through Adam (which we think to have been Hebrew) remained in that part of men which was made the part of no Angel or prince, but which remained God's portion. Each Angel, therefore, cultivates the nation entrusted to him, and strives to convert it from errors

to God. And from the beginning of this age, when God dispersed the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the Angels of God, and each nation was assigned to its own Angel. But one nation was the chosen, Israel, which was the Lord's portion, and the cord of His inheritance.“ So Origen.

§144. Origen (not to be passed over): he fixes no certain number, but holds many tongues, per the nations' variety, made by the Angels (each nation's guardian-Angel giving it a tongue) — as many nations, so many ruling Angels and tongues. Origen (Hom. 11 on Numbers): God's ‘let us confound their tongues’ (to the Angels) means diverse Angels wrought diverse tongues (one the Babylonian, another the Egyptian, another the Greek), being the nations' princes and ‘authors’ of the tongues; but the tongue first given through Adam (Hebrew, we think) remained in the part that was no Angel's but God's portion. Each Angel cultivates his nation, converting it to God; ‘He set the nations' bounds by the number of God's Angels’ (Deut 32), each nation assigned its Angel — but Israel was the chosen, ‘the Lord's portion and the cord of His inheritance.’ Margins: Deut 32; Origen.

— p. 601 (PDF) · printed p. 528 —

But let Genebrardus conclude this recital of others' opinions, who set forth that widespread opinion about the seventy-two tongues somewhat more clearly and distinctly than his predecessors. „When,“ he says, „the Hebrews fix only seventy-two tongues, they do this because in Moses no more heads and chiefs of stocks are noted — namely, fifteen from Japheth, thirty from Cham, twenty-seven from Sem. Likewise, because no more mother-tongues of the other innumerable languages can be brought forward: such are — the Hebrew mother; the Syriac, Arabic, etc.; the Latin, Italian, Wallachian, French, and Spanish; the Greek, Doric, Ionic, Aeolic, Attic; the Slavonic, Polish, Bohemian, Muscovite, etc.; the German, Swiss, English, Flemish, etc.; the Tartar, Turkish, Samarkand, etc.; the Abyssinian, Ethiopic, Sabaean, etc. Thus by that number the dialects of the individual tongues are by no means comprehended: for they are of such diversity that within the distance of a hundred leagues, on men's lips, by some hidden cause it makes so great a change that, whether on account of accent, or some change of letters, or addition, or subtraction, in so small a space they do not understand one another — as in the new world too

Americus Vespucius wrote that he observed.“ So Genebrardus. And these are the things (worthy of mention, namely) which I have found committed to writing by others about the number of those tongues.

§145. Genebrardus concludes the survey: the Hebrews fix 72 because Moses notes no more stock-heads (15 Japheth, 30 Cham, 27 Sem) and no more ‘mother-tongues’ of the innumerable others (he lists the Hebrew mother and its families — Syriac/Arabic, Latin/Italian/French/Spanish, Greek dialects, Slavonic/Polish, Germanic, Tartar/Turkish, Ethiopic, etc.); the number does not include the dialects, which vary so within 100 leagues that men cannot understand one another (as Americus Vespucius observed in the New World). Margin: Americus Vespucius.

THE AUTHOR'S OPINION. On the number of tongues, into which the first tongue that was common to all is said to have been multiplied.

Section heading: Pererius's own view on the number of tongues (within Disputation 10).

From a way of this opinion so ancient, and worn and ennobled by the footsteps of so many and so great authors, I shall not easily suffer myself to be drawn away. But that which I am always wont [to do] I shall not omit to do in this place too: that I may indicate to the reader distinctly and briefly what in this matter is certain or uncertain, what is true or like the truth, or has even no verisimilitude and no probability. This in the controversy we are treating is certain: that the tongues then found were very many and various. For this is drawn in two ways from Moses's narrative: both because he says that the lip or tongue of the whole earth was confounded (which confusion happened from nothing else than the great variety of new and unknown tongues which then suddenly befell those men); and because so great was the variety of tongues that, as Moses narrates, no one understood the speech of his neighbor.

§146. Pererius's own view: he will not lightly abandon so ancient and well-attested an opinion, but will state what is certain or uncertain. Certain: many various tongues then arose — proved twice from Moses (the ‘lip of the whole earth confounded’ = the great variety of new tongues; and ‘none understood his neighbor’). Margins: not single men had single tongues; single nations and families had their proper tongues.

This too can be held for certain: that there were not as many tongues as there were men in that multitude, nor were single tongues attributed to single men; for that would have been most inconvenient, and plainly contrary to God's counsel and purpose (as we disputed a little above). But it is nevertheless nearly certain and very probable that to each of those nations and families a proper tongue, different from the others, was assigned. For by this means it was brought about that those who were of one nation, since on account of the knowledge and use of the same tongue they understood one another, associated together and dissociated and disjoined from the other nations (whose tongues they did not understand), should seek diverse places of the earth to dwell in; and thus the whole world (which God intended) might be filled with inhabitants and cultivators. And if to each nation and family its own tongue, diverse from the others, befell, here it is well concluded that as many diverse nations as there were at that time and in that place, just so many tongues were given to them.

§147. Also certain: not a tongue per man (most inconvenient, against God's purpose, as shown), but very probably a proper tongue per nation/family — so each nation, understanding its own, gathered together and split from others, seeking diverse lands (God's aim to fill the earth). So there were as many tongues as there were then diverse nations in that place.

— p. 602 (PDF) · printed p. 529 —

But indeed to define those nations by some certain number is most difficult. For what was handed down by many — that they were seventy-two nations — is not only not certain, but even seems to disagree not a little with Moses's history. They say that Moses, in the tenth chapter of this book, recorded in the posterity of Japheth fifteen nations, in the stock of Cham thirty-one, in the progeny of Sem twenty-six; from all of which arises that number of seventy-two nations. But this can be refuted in two ways. For the Greek codices, especially those which lately came forth at Rome most corrected, number in the posterity of Sem twenty-eight nations; from which it would come about that the nations sprung from

those three sons of Noah were then seventy-four. Next, although the Greek books and Blessed Augustine number eight sons of Japheth, yet the Hebrew and Chaldaic reading, and also the Latin of our Vulgate edition, reckons only seven: for that eighth son, Elisa, which the Greek translation adds, neither the Hebrew nor the Latin codices have; for these make only seven sons of Japheth — Gomer, Magog, Madai, Iavan, Thubal, Mosoch, Thiras. And if the descendants of Japheth were only fourteen, the nations must have been only seventy-one. Nay rather, they were only seventy: for Heber and Phaleg, who in the enumeration of those nations are recorded distinctly and separately, ought to be held as only one nation and tongue; for they neither made diverse nations nor had different tongues — which Blessed Augustine acutely saw, and in book 16 of the City of God, chapter 11, rightly admonished us.

§148. But fixing the number of nations is very hard. The ‘72’ is uncertain and seems to clash with Moses. The reckoning (15 Japheth + 31 Cham + 26 Sem) is refuted twice: (1) the corrected Greek codices (lately at Rome) give 28 for Sem → 74 total; (2) the Greek and Augustine give 8 sons of Japheth, but Hebrew/Chaldaic/Vulgate only 7 (omitting the added ‘Elisa’: Gomer, Magog, Madai, Iavan, Thubal, Mosoch, Thiras) → only 71; indeed only 70, since Heber and Phaleg (listed distinctly) made no separate nation or tongue (Augustine, City of God 16.11). Margins: whether there were 72 nations at the building of Babel; Augustine.

From this seventy-fold number of nations, moreover, one ought to remove those whose descendants, in the description of the progeny of the three sons of Noah, are mentioned by Moses. These, in the posterity of Japheth, are two — Gomer and Iavan; in the stock of Cham, four — Chus, Mezraim, Chanaan, and Regma; finally in the progeny of Sem, four likewise — Arphaxad, Aram, Heber, Iectan. These all are ten, which being subtracted from that seventy-fold number, there will remain…

§149. From the 70, one must also remove those whose own descendants Moses names (since a parent makes no nation apart from his sons): Japheth's 2 (Gomer, Iavan), Cham's 4 (Chus, Mezraim, Chanaan, Regma), Sem's 4 (Arphaxad, Aram, Heber, Iectan) = 10; subtracted, there remain… *(continues p. 530).*

…only sixty. And that those whom I said are to be removed from the number of nations which Moses reviews is clear in two ways: both because parents cannot by themselves and separately from their descendants make any nation (for they do not make any nation except through one of their sons; the nations of the fathers and of the sons, therefore, are the same); and also because, if these are to be numbered separately and distinctly from their descendants, then similarly Noah and his three sons, Sem, Cham, and Japheth, would have to be mentioned separately from their descendants, and it would have to be said that they made nations diverse from them: which if these men admit, they will be compelled to distinguish not seventy-two but seventy-six tongues.

§149 (concl.). …only sixty. They are rightly removed: parents make no nation apart from their sons (the nations of fathers and sons are the same); and if they were counted separately, then Noah and his three sons too should be — yielding not 72 but 76 tongues.

Now indeed concerning those persons whose descendants are reviewed by Moses not at all, in the setting forth of the progeny of the three sons of Noah, a great question arises. These are, in the progeny of Japheth, five; in Cham, two; in Sem, four. It is asked, therefore, whether these made any nation diverse from the others or not. For if they made no nation diverse from the others (which seems more like the truth), then they are to be removed from the number of nations and families; and since they were ten, these being subtracted, that number of seventy-two nations which we restricted above to sixty must be still more contracted, and reduced to fifty. But if those persons left some nation diverse from the others: first I ask why Moses did not mention that nation as he did the others (for the same reason demanded that mention of this nation be made similarly to the others); next I ask whether they made one nation or more than one? For since no nation of theirs is handed down by Moses, whatever is said will be uncertain and said gratuitously.

§150. A further great question: of those whose descendants Moses does NOT name (Japheth 5, Cham 2, Sem 4 = 10) — did they make distinct nations? If not (more likely), remove them too: 60 → 50. If

yes, why did Moses not name them as he did the others? and did each make one nation or more? Since Moses records none, any answer is uncertain and gratuitous.

Do you see, then, on how slight and weak a foundation that opinion about the seventy-two tongues is propped and rests? Although I for my part think that in the opinion of the Fathers who handed it down two things are to be observed and distinguished. The one, that they, drawing from Moses's history, said as certain that as many nations and families of men as there then were, just so many tongues were attributed to them; the other, that — as a thing celebrated by the Hebrews and commonly bandied about even among Christians — they set forth, not as certain but as widespread, that there were seventy-two nations and just as many corresponding tongues. For if they had wished to recall this to examination and to cut it to the quick (as we have done), they would doubtless have recognized the matter to be very doubtful and uncertain and almost incomprehensible.

§151. So the '72' rests on a weak foundation. Two things to distinguish in the Fathers: (1) they rightly said, as certain (from Moses), that there were as many tongues as nations; (2) but the specific '72 nations and tongues' they reported not as certain but as a widespread, Hebrew-celebrated commonplace — had they examined it closely (as Pererius has), they would have found it very doubtful and almost incomprehensible.

— p. 604 (PDF) · printed p. 531 —

Two things, moreover, set in obscurity and uncertainty, lie hidden from our knowledge. The one is whether any of those tongues, in process of time, has wholly perished — the nation, namely, being destroyed whose proper tongue it was — whether by the calamities of war or by general pestilence or other deadly diseases. For that some nations have utterly perished Pliny teaches, writing in these words: „Eratosthenes hands down that nations have perished out of Asia: the Solymi, the Leleges, the Bebryces, the Colycantii, the Trepsedi.“ Isidore [adds] the Arimi and Capretae, where Apamia was founded by king Seleucus.

§152. Two further obscure matters. First: whether any of those tongues perished outright with its nation, through war, plague, or disease. Some nations have utterly perished — Pliny (bk. 5 ch. 30,

from Eratosthenes): the Solymi, Leleges, Bebryces, Colycantii, Trepsedi; Isidore adds the Arimi and Capretae (where Seleucus founded Apamia). Margins: whether any of those tongues perished; Pliny bk. 5 ch. 30.

The other matter, equally doubtful and uncertain, is whether those tongues were the mothers of all the other tongues whatsoever that have been among men from that time to this day: so that the tongues which now are, and those which in the foregoing ages back to that time ever were, are either those very tongues, or at least sprung or derived from them; or rather whether many other tongues, instituted in diverse ages, are wholly diverse from those and in no way drawing their origin from them. And the dispute of Julius Scaliger with Cardano, about the origin and causes of so manifold a variety of tongues, the reader will see, not without pleasure of mind, in their books.

§153. Second obscure matter: whether those tongues were the mothers of all later tongues (so that all present and past tongues either are those or derive from them), or whether many wholly new tongues arose in later ages. The reader may pleasantly consult the dispute of Julius Scaliger with Cardano on the origin and causes of this variety. Margins: whether those tongues were the mothers of all tongues; Cardano, On Subtlety bk. 12 / On the Variety of Things bk. 17 ch. 93; Julius Scaliger against Cardano, Exercise 259.

Something, too, must be said in this place about what Epiphanius and Suidas noted: that men, as by a certain notable epithet, were called by those ancient poets (such as Homer and Hesiod) ‘Meropes,’ that is, having a divided voice. For that appellation may be interpreted in three ways. First, that man is called Merops because he alone of all animals has a voice both parted and distinct and as it were articulate — that is, distinctly expressed and formed, and distinctly signifying the senses of the mind; whence the speech and discourse proper to man is fashioned. So the Scholiast of Homer, in the first book of the Iliad, interpreted the force and notion of that word. Next, it can also be understood that by that word Merops is signified the diversity of tongues which is among men, first introduced by God on account of the pride and impiety of the builders of the tower of Babel: so that the pagan poets drew that word either from the reading of Moses's

writings, or from ancient report and tradition; and it appears that Epiphanius and Suidas were of this opinion.

§154. On the name ‘Meropes’ (Epiphanius, Suidas: men so called by the old poets, Homer and Hesiod — ‘having a divided voice’). Three interpretations: (1) man (Merops) alone has a parted, distinct, articulate voice signifying the mind (the Homer Scholiast, Iliad bk. 1); (2) it signifies the diversity of tongues introduced at Babel for the builders' pride — the pagan poets drawing the word from Moses or ancient tradition (so Epiphanius and Suidas). Margins: Epiphanius; Suidas (under ‘Saruch’); Homer; Hesiod; why men are called μ■ροπες; the Scholiast.

It can, moreover, be thought that men are called ‘Meropes’ because they have a divided voice — that is, because each of men has his own sound of voice and manner of pronouncing, so that in so great a multitude of men not even two can be found with an indistinguishable sound of voice: which is similarly observed also in the mouth and face. Wherefore Pliny, marveling, proclaims these two as great miracles of nature: „Small to tell,“ he says, „but immense in estimation: so many speeches of nations, so many tongues, so great a variety of speaking, that to one man another is almost not in the place of a man. Again, in our face and countenance, although there are ten or a little more members, no two indistinguishable likenesses exist among so many thousands of men: which no art could achieve by striving, in a few in number.“

§155. (3) Or men are called ‘Meropes’ because each has his own voice and pronunciation, so that in all the multitude not two have an indistinguishable voice — as with the face. Pliny marvels at these two natural wonders: ‘so many tongues that one man is almost not a man to another; and in the face, with ten-odd features, no two indistinguishable among thousands — which no art could match.’

— p. 605 (PDF) · printed p. 532 —

But to the Explanation of the first part of the eleventh chapter — in which we have been engaged so far, and have treated many disputations about the building of the tower of Babel and the confusion and division of tongues — we shall at last put an end, only adding the refutation of a certain calumny of the pagans against Moses's history of the division of tongues. This calumny, besides Philo alone who records it, I have found no other [to

mention]. I shall therefore set it forth myself and refute it, as it is narrated by Philo. They said that what Moses wrote (that, when there was one tongue of all men, it was suddenly confounded and multiplied into various tongues) is not history nor a true narration of things done — for that would be utterly incredible — but is a fiction of his, devised after the likeness of poetic fables: for [it is] very like what was handed down by the writers of fables about one tongue of all animals. For it is narrated that of old all living things had the same voice, and that, just as men have an intercourse of speech among themselves, so those carried on speeches with one another about their affairs — so that about common or private goods and ills alike they both condoled and congratulated one another, as if dwelling in one commonwealth. But, growing wanton through the abundance of present goods (as often happens), they broke out beyond decorum, seeking from the gods, by envoys, immortality, exemption from old age, and perpetual youth — saying that they asked what was fair, since this had now befallen one of their number (and one far baser than many), the serpent, who, his old age sloughed off, grew young again. A deserved punishment soon followed this their audacity. For at once their tongue was so varied and confounded that they could not understand one another, on account of the diversity of voices into which the tongue, before common to all, was divided. Such, [they say,] seems the narration of Moses.

§156. The first part of ch. 11 closes with a refutation of a pagan calumny against Moses's history (recorded only by Philo). The calumny: that Moses's story (one tongue suddenly confounded) is not history but a fiction like the poets' fable of all animals once having one speech — they conversed as in one commonwealth, but, grown wanton, sent envoys asking the gods for immortality and perpetual youth (since the serpent renews itself by sloughing), and were punished with a confusion of voices. So, they say, is Moses's tale. Margins: a pagan calumny against this history of Moses on the division of tongues; a fable of one tongue of all animals.

But if you say (they said) that it is one thing for animals to speak among themselves (for this, since it is against their nature, is manifestly fabulous and incredible), and another that all the men who were in that age had one tongue (for this has nothing absurd and incredible): against this they

insisted that it was incredible that those men suddenly forgot the tongue which they had before known and which they had used up to that time, and suddenly spoke with new and previously unknown tongues. For as to their saying that the confusion of tongue happened as at once a punishment and a remedy of those men's sin, how futile it is appears even from this: that after the tongue was divided and so many colonies of so many nations were led off into so many diverse places of the earth, the lands and seas were nonetheless filled with innumerable crimes and evils. For not the unity of tongue, but the proclivity of men's nature to sinning, is the cause of disgraceful deeds. For even those mutilated of tongue [the dumb] signify their wicked will no less by nods, looks, and other motions of the body than by words uttered. To this is added that often one nation, using not only the same tongue but also the same laws and manners, advances to such malice that in sins it can be compared with all the rest of men. What of the fact that the unity of tongue is wont to be the cause of the greatest goods? For without it no man could be taught or helped by another man, nor any friendship be procured among men, nor any society of men stand or coalesce. Why…

§157. The calumny continued: granting one human tongue is credible (unlike talking animals), it is incredible that men suddenly forgot it and spoke new tongues. And the ‘punishment-and-remedy’ claim is futile, since after the dispersion the world was still full of crimes — for not unity of tongue but man's proclivity to sin causes wickedness (even the dumb signify evil by gestures; one same-tongued, same-lawed nation can rival all others in sin). Besides, unity of tongue is the cause of the greatest goods (without it no teaching, help, friendship, or society) — why then… (continues p. 533).

— p. 606 (PDF) · printed p. 533 —

…then, as if the common tongue were the cause of evils, was it taken from men — which, as exceedingly useful to the human race, ought rather to have been confirmed? These things they cavilled against Moses's history.

§157 (concl.). …why then was the common tongue taken away as if the cause of evils, when, being so useful, it ought rather to have been confirmed? Such were their cavils against Moses's history.

But Philo, meeting this calumny ‘at the door’ (as Aristotle is wont to say), the true (that is, the historical) understanding of the Mosaic narration being omitted, betakes himself to Allegories — as if indeed what Moses wrote about the division and confusion of tongues could not be true otherwise, nor be vindicated from calumnies, unless interpreted allegorically. But let us hear Philo himself speaking. „These cavils of malicious men,“ says Philo, „those will separately refute who are ready to answer such questions from the open Scripture of the laws without contention: who do not repel sophisms by sophisms, but follow the series of truth, which nowhere lets [one] stumble and easily removes obstacles, that the discourse of truth may escape from these. We say, then, to these men: by the words ‘The whole earth was one lip, one voice’ is signified the consonance of great evils, by which cities are assailed by cities, nations by nations, regions by regions in turn; and by which men are not only unjust against men, but even impious toward God.“

§158. Philo meets the calumny ‘at the door’ (Aristotle's phrase) by abandoning the literal/historical sense for allegory — as if Moses could only be true and defended allegorically. Philo: some answer such cavils from the open text without sophistry, following truth's thread. He says: ‘The whole earth was one lip, one voice’ signifies the concord of great evils — by which cities, nations, regions assail one another, and men are unjust to men and impious to God. Margins: Aristotle; Philo, On the Confusion of Tongues; Gen 11.

„And since there are three parts of our soul — Mind, Desire, Anger — and the vices of the Mind (as it were diseases) are Imprudence, Error, Malice; of Desire, the unbridled intemperance of pleasures and lusts; of Anger, the furious and rabid impulses and endeavors to harm: if these three parts of our soul, each furnished with its own vices, conspire and concur to do evil, they will bring the utmost destruction on man. For then, as in a ship, when the sailors, passengers, and helmsmen consonant through madness toward its ruin, even those who destroy perish along with it. For the gravest of evils, and almost the only incurable one, is the consent of all the parts of the soul to sinning: when, as in a public pestilence, nothing sound is left that can heal the sick; but the physicians too labor along with the common

people, seized by the same plague as the rest.“ So Philo.

§159. Philo (cont.): the soul's three parts (Mind — with vices Imprudence, Error, Malice; Desire — intemperance of pleasures; Anger — rabid impulses to harm), if they conspire in evil, bring man's utter ruin — as in a ship whose crew madly conspire to wreck it, even the destroyers perish; the gravest, almost only incurable evil is all the soul's parts consenting to sin, as in a plague where even the physicians are stricken.

But for us, to repel that calumny, there is no need of the refuge of allegories. We shall therefore say three things briefly, from which how empty and plainly trifling that calumny is will be clearly understood. First, it ought to seem incredible to no one that all those men who were in that first age after the flood had one tongue. For why should that seem more incredible than that all the Germans, for example (which is a most ample nation), have one tongue? Especially since all those men were begotten of only three sons of Noah, and these were living at that time and dwelt in that place and among those men.

§160. Pererius needs no allegory to repel the calumny; three brief points. First: that all men of the first post-flood age had one tongue is not incredible — no more than that all the Germans (a vast nation) have one tongue, especially since all sprang from only three sons of Noah, then living among them. Margin: the true repulse of the aforesaid calumny.

— p. 607 (PDF) · printed p. 534 —

Next, we say that the sudden oblivion of the former tongue, and the sudden knowledge and use of the other tongues, befell those men not from natural causes, nor happened by men's will, industry, and power, but by the will and power of the one God (to whom nothing is difficult), and at the same time by the ministry of the Angels of God executing His commands. But if anyone judges that this could not be done even by God Himself, and abrogates all faith in divine miracles, he is to be dismissed as of utter impiety and madness, and not so much to be refuted by arguments as to be punished with deserved penalties.

§161. Second: the sudden forgetting of the first tongue and the sudden knowledge of the new ones came not from natural causes nor human power, but from the one God (to whom nothing is hard) and

the ministry of His Angels executing His commands. Whoever thinks even God could not do this, denying all divine miracles, is to be dismissed as utterly impious and mad — punished, not refuted.

This too we add in the third place: that we do not deny that the unity of tongue is often useful to men, but, on the contrary, that the diversity is useless and harmful. We affirm, nevertheless, that the unity of tongue was pernicious to those men. For, on account of the unity of tongue, all conspired in the building of that city and tower against God's will, and deliberated to remain all together there in one society — which was, however, against the public good both of the human race and of the world. The use of the one tongue being therefore taken away, and so great a variety of tongues introduced that they did not understand one another, it came about both that they deserted the begun work and that, dissociated from one another, they sought diverse parts of the world to dwell in. Therefore at that time and place and among those men the confusion and division of the one tongue was both a just punishment of their pride and impiety, and brought an immense benefit and adornment to the human race and the world.

§162. Third: granting that unity of tongue is often useful and diversity generally harmful, yet for THOSE men the unity was pernicious — by it all conspired to build against God and to stay together (against the world's good). So removing it and introducing variety made them abandon the work and disperse to dwell over the world. Thus, for that time and people, the confusion was both a just punishment of their pride and a great benefit and adornment to mankind and the world. (Ends the first part of Gen 11.)

— p. 608 (PDF) · printed p. 535 —

THE SECOND PART OF THE ELEVENTH CHAPTER OF GENESIS. On the progeny of Sem down to Abram.

Liber XVI, Second Part of Gen 11 (title): the genealogy of Sem down to Abram. (Disputation numbering continues — Disp. 11 onward.)

{These are the generations of Sem. Sem was a hundred years old when he begot Arphaxad, two years after the flood. And Sem lived after he begot Arphaxad five hundred years, and begot sons and daughters.

And Arphaxad lived thirty-five years, and begot Sale. And Arphaxad lived after he begot Sale three hundred and three years, and begot sons and daughters. Sale also lived thirty years, and begot Heber. And Sale lived after he begot Heber four hundred and three years, and begot sons and daughters. And Heber lived thirty-four years, and begot Phaleg. And Heber lived after he begot Phaleg four hundred and thirty years, and begot sons and daughters. And Phaleg lived thirty years, and begot Reu. And Phaleg lived after he begot Reu two hundred and nine years, and begot sons and daughters. And Reu lived thirty-two years, and begot Sarug. And Reu lived after he begot Sarug two hundred and seven years, and begot sons and daughters. And Sarug lived thirty years, and begot Nachor.}

Gen 11:10–22 (verse lemma, opening the Second Part: the genealogy of Sem through Reu and Sarug; continues p. 536).

— p. 609 (PDF) · printed p. 536 —

{And Sarug lived after he begot Nachor two hundred years, and begot sons and daughters. And Nachor lived twenty-nine years, and begot Thare. And Nachor lived after he begot Thare a hundred and nineteen years, and begot sons and daughters. And Thare lived seventy years, and begot Abram and Nachor and Aran.}

Gen 11:23–26 (verse lemma, concluding the genealogy: Nachor, Thare, and Abram).

PREFACE. Moses here weaves through the series of generations from Sem down to Abram, just as above, in the fifth chapter, he had reviewed the generations from Adam down to Noah. And there are ten generations from Sem down to Abram, if you include in this enumeration both Sem and Abram. Three disputations, moreover — most notable and celebrated both for the excellence of their matter and for the magnitude of their obscurity and difficulty — are to be treated here: the first, whether between Arphaxad and Sale the generation of Cainan is to be interposed, which the Septuagint translators interposed; the second, concerning the discrepancy

of the reckoning of years about the aforesaid generations, which we discern between the Greek and the Hebrew codices (with which the Latins agree); the third, in what year of Thare's age Abram was begotten.

Praefatio (Second Part). Moses weaves the line from Sem to Abram (as Gen 5 did from Adam to Noah) — ten generations counting both Sem and Abram. Three disputations follow: (11) whether Cainan is to be interposed between Arphaxad and Sale (the LXX add him); (12) the discrepancy in the year-reckonings between the Greek and the Hebrew/Latin codices; (13) in what year of Thare's age Abram was begotten.

— p. 610 (PDF) · printed p. 537 —

ELEVENTH DISPUTATION. Upon those words, Genesis 11: Arphaxad lived thirty-five years and begot Sale. Whether between Arphaxad and Sale the generation of Cainan is to be interposed.

Liber XVI, Disputation 11 (title; Gen 11:12 lemma): whether Cainan is to be interposed between Arphaxad and Sale.

This place is arduous, and, in the judgment of certain learned men, brings a question plainly inexplicable: whether the generation of Cainan is to be interposed between Arphaxad and Sale. For that generation neither the Hebrew Scripture has, nor the Chaldaic paraphrase, nor the Latin Vulgate edition; but the Septuagint translators record it in this place, and Blessed Luke puts it in the third chapter of the Evangelical history, describing the genealogy of our Lord. It seems necessary that one or the other Scripture is faulty: the one, indeed, if this generation be lacking, maimed and mutilated; but the other, if it be redundant, not only superfluous but even false: certainly both cannot be true. For it cannot be that Arphaxad, when he was thirty-five years old, begot Sale, and at that very time begot Cainan the father of Sale himself — so that, in the year in which Cainan was born, in that same year he begot his son Sale.

§163. Disp. 11. The hard question: is Cainan to be interposed between Arphaxad and Sale? The Hebrew, Chaldee, and Vulgate lack him; but the LXX have him, and Luke (Lk 3, the Lord's genealogy) puts him in. One Scripture seems faulty — the one maimed (if Cainan is missing), the other false (if

redundant); both cannot be true (Arphaxad could not at 35 beget both Sale and Cainan, Sale's father).

In five ways I see that ecclesiastical writers have tried to loose this knot: which ways I shall here briefly run over by setting them forth. The first way of explaining the proposed difficulty is that which Eugubinus follows. He was not ashamed to say that the seventy-two Translators, by adding the generation of Cainan, erred, and that Blessed Luke followed their error. At which word, I pray, whose ears — of a pious, or even of a Christian, man — would not shudder? For if we concede that in the canonical Scriptures anything whatsoever is false, we shall surely open a wide window for undermining all the firmness and authority of the divine Scripture. For it is certain that the Holy Spirit was not present to Blessed Luke in that which he wrote falsely. Why, then, should we not likewise rightly fear lest, in other matters too which Luke set forth in writing, the Holy Spirit deserted him and suffered him to slip into error?

§164. Five ways to loose the knot. (1) Eugubinus: the LXX erred in adding Cainan, and Luke followed their error. Pererius recoils: any pious ear shudders — to concede anything false in canonical Scripture opens a window to undermine all its authority; for the Holy Spirit was not with Luke in what he wrote falsely, and we would then fear the Spirit deserted him elsewhere too. Margin: a remark on Eugubinus.

Nor indeed ought the translation of the Septuagint translators to be so fastidiously rejected or so easily despised, since we read that Origen affirmed — in Eusebius, book 6 of the Ecclesiastical History, chapter 23 — that that is to be held for true in the divine Scriptures which the Septuagint translators rendered, since it is both confirmed by Apostolic authority and approved by the long use of the Church. What of the fact that that generation of Cainan both Eusebius (at the opening of his Chronicle) and many Greek writers, and among the Latins Blessed Augustine (book 16 of the City of God, chapter 10) and others, acknowledge and receive?

§165. Nor should the LXX be despised: Origen (in Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History bk. 6 ch. 23) held the LXX rendering to be true in Scripture, confirmed by Apostolic authority and the Church's long use. And the generation of Cainan is acknowledged by Eusebius (Chronicle), many Greeks, and among Latins Augustine (City of God 16.10) and others. Margins: Origen's authority on the

Septuagint; Eusebius; Eusebius; Augustine.

Another way of dispatching this question pleased Cajetan. For he, explaining those words of Luke, „Who was [the son] of Sale, who was [the son] of Cainan,“ answers the proposed difficulty in two ways. First he says (which we just now showed Eugubinus to have held) that that generation of Cainan is superfluous, nay, non-existent; wherefore the Septuagint translators erred in adding it, but Blessed Luke is for this reason excused from error, because he chose to follow what he had found written in the translation of the Septuagint translators, which at that time was everywhere among the nations widespread and received — namely, fearing lest, if he wrote anything against the common sense of men and the inveterate opinion, otherwise than it was in the Septuagint, his writings should be less approved by the common people…

§166. (2) Cajetan (on Lk 3, ‘who was of Sale, who was of Cainan’) answers two ways. First (like Eugubinus): the Cainan generation is superfluous, indeed non-existent — the LXX erred in adding it, but Luke is excused, having chosen to follow the LXX (then everywhere received), fearing that writing against the common opinion would make his work less approved (continues next batch). Margin: Cajetan on Luke 3.

— p. 611 (PDF) · printed p. 538 —

…approved. To this answer also Jansenius and Genebrardus adhere; but this answer of Cajetan is exceedingly weak. For it was not fitting that Luke, in writing the Gospel, should have greater regard for the esteem of the common people — especially a false esteem — than for the truth; and from sacred and canonical writers and their writings one ought to repel every suspicion of error admitted, whether imprudently or knowingly.

§166 (concl.). Jansenius and Genebrardus adhere to Cajetan's second answer (that Luke followed the received LXX to avoid discrediting his work); but Pererius judges it very weak — Luke could not have valued the (false) opinion of the crowd over truth, and all suspicion of error must be repelled from canonical writers. Margin: 'The Gospel concord'; 'Genebrardus in his chronology.'

Cajetan responds besides that the generation of Cainan is truly to be added; for it is not credible that the Seventy Translators — men both wise and also

pious — would have dared to forge anything of their own into the divine Scripture, with Eleazar, the high priest of the Jews of that age, conniving (he by whom they had been sent to King Philadelphus), and the doctors of the Synagogue dissembling, by whose judgment and vote their translation was approved. Cajetan therefore thinks it more likely that the Hebrew codices the Seventy used — in which the generation of Cainan stood — were true and intact, whereas those Jerome obtained, and which have come down to us, are maimed and mutilated. For even to Jerome himself, expounding the third chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, it did not seem incredible that the Hebrew codices had many things otherwise before the Lord's Passion, and that the Hebrews, out of either envy or hatred of Christians, had either taken away or added some things.

§167. Cajetan's further argument that Cainan IS genuine: the LXX, being wise and pious and approved by the high priest Eleazar (who sent them to Ptolemy Philadelphus) and the Synagogue, would not have invented it; so the Hebrew codices they used (which had Cainan) were sound, and those Jerome had — our present ones — are mutilated. Cajetan cites Jerome on Galatians 3 admitting the Hebrews may have altered codices before the Passion out of hatred of Christians. Margin: 'Jerome.'

But I can scarcely bring my mind to believe this. For who could be persuaded that all the books of sacred Scripture were corrupted by the Hebrews, with none protesting? — especially in a matter which, while they contended against the Christians, could neither profit them at all nor harm them. And this very same is the opinion of blessed Augustine in book fifteen of the City of God. Josephus certainly, who lived close to the death of our Lord, in enumerating the earlier generations which were before the flood, had followed the Seventy Translators; but in describing the later generations, following the Hebrew scripture, he omitted the generation of Cainan.

§168. Pererius's rebuttal: incredible that ALL Scripture was corrupted by the Hebrews with no protest, in a matter useless to their anti-Christian polemic — so Augustine holds (City of God, bk. 15). Josephus, near the Lord's time, followed the LXX for the pre-flood generations but the Hebrew for the post-flood, omitting Cainan. Margin: 'Josephus, bk. 1 of the Antiquities.'

A THIRD way of unravelling the same question some have devised: they say that Cainan and Sale were not two men but one — yet of two names, that is, one who was called both Sale and Cainan; wherefore these think that in blessed Luke it is read corruptly, 'who was Sale, who was Cainan,' but ought to be read, 'who was Sale, who [was] also Cainan,' so that two names of the same man are set down. This is the opinion of Ioannes Lucidus in book one On the Emendation of Times, chapter six, and book seven, chapter one; and the same was, before him, the opinion of both Nauclerus and Hermannus Contractus in their Chronicles.

§169. Third solution: Cainan and Sale were one man with two names, so Luke 3 should read 'who was Sale, who [was] also Cainan' (two names, one person), not two persons. Held by Ioannes Lucidus (On the Emendation of Times, bk. 1 ch. 6, bk. 7 ch. 1), and earlier by Nauclerus and Hermannus Contractus in their Chronicles. Margin: 'Ioannes Lucidus; Nauclerus; Hermannus.'

But the opinion of these is refuted by three arguments. For all the codices, both Greek and Latin, both those that once were and those that now are, have in this place in Luke that reading which these judge corrupt. Whence, then, these prove it to be corrupt does not sufficiently appear — unless it be rashly contrived by them, because they themselves [found] no other…

§170 (begins). Pererius refutes the third solution with three arguments. First: ALL codices Greek and Latin, ancient and modern, have in Luke exactly the reading these call corrupt — so they cannot prove it corrupt; their claim looks rashly invented because they found no other escape (continues next page).

— p. 612 (PDF) · printed p. 539 —

…they themselves found no escape from the proposed difficulty? Next, how is it credible that Luke wished to set forth two names of that one man only, and of none of the others whom he there recounts — when it is established that not a few of them were of two and even three names? Besides, these did not advert to the translation of the Seventy in this place, which Luke followed: for in it Cainan is set as the begetter and father of Sale himself; whence it must be that Cainan and Sale were two men distinct from each other.

§170 (concl.). Second argument: why would Luke give two names only of this one man and of no other, when several of those listed had two or three names? Third argument: the solution ignores the LXX (which Luke followed), where Cainan is the FATHER of Sale — so they must be two distinct men.

A FOURTH way of resolving the same question seems to some easier and plainer than the others so far set forth, and for that reason more probable. This way certain more recent writers hold, as Lippomanus in the Catena on Genesis on the eleventh chapter of that book, and Canus, book 2 On Theological Topics, chapter 18. These judge that the generation of Cainan truly did intervene between Arphaxad and Sale, and that the Seventy, having ascertained it either from a sure tradition of the elders or from histories worthy of belief, rightly inserted it into their translation; which Moses knowingly and prudently passed over. For Moses wished to distinguish the series of generations from Adam to the Flood, and from the Flood to Abraham, into two decades, for some cause certainly mystical but hidden from us — just as blessed Matthew, in the genealogy of our Saviour which he set down at the opening of his Gospel, recounted the generations from Abraham to Christ the Lord as only forty-two, several others being passed over.

§171. Fourth solution (held by Lippomanus in his Catena on Gen 11, and Melchior Cano, Loci Theologici bk. 2 ch. 18): Cainan really did intervene between Arphaxad and Sale; the LXX rightly inserted him from sound tradition or trustworthy histories, while Moses deliberately omitted him to fit the generations into two decades (Adam→Flood, Flood→Abraham) for a hidden mystical reason — just as Matthew (Mt 1) reduced Abraham→Christ to 42 generations, omitting several. Margin: 'Lippomanus; Melchior Cano.'

These things acutely thought out and plausibly said by these I do not deny. But not even thus do I see the scruple wholly shaken out and removed. For granted that the generation of Cainan could, without any fault, both be passed over by Moses and be commemorated by the Seventy: this certainly could in no way come about — that at the time Cainan was begotten by Arphaxad, at that same time he himself should beget his son Sale. For according to the Hebrew scripture, Arphaxad, when he was thirty-five years old, begot Sale; but according to the translation of the Seventy, at that

very same time Arphaxad begot Cainan, the father of Sale himself. If, then, both scriptures are true, it must be that in the same year both Cainan and Sale were begotten — that is, father and son — which is plainly absurd; if indeed it is fitting to call absurd what is impossible.

§172. Pererius grants the fourth solution is clever but says it leaves a scruple: the Hebrew has Arphaxad beget Sale at age 35, while the LXX has Arphaxad at the same age beget Cainan, the father of Sale. If both are true, Cainan (father) and Sale (son) were begotten in the same year — plainly absurd/impossible.

But someone could say, in defence of this kind of exposition: when in the Hebrew scripture Arphaxad is said at thirty-five years to have begotten his son Sale, it is not to be understood as if he then begot him in act, but only in virtue and potency; because in that year he begot Cainan, the father of Sale himself, in whom Sale — as a son in a father — was contained in virtue and power. Nor indeed is this manner of speaking unusual in the sacred letters: for in the genealogy of our Saviour which blessed Matthew hands down, Joram is said to have begotten Ozias; not indeed…

§173 (begins). A possible defense of the fourth solution: the Hebrew 'Arphaxad at 35 begot Sale' means not actually but in virtue/potency — that year he begot Cainan, Sale's father, in whom Sale was virtually contained. Such speech is not unusual in Scripture: Matthew says Joram begot Ozias, not actually (continues next page). Margin: 'Matthew 1.'

— p. 613 (PDF) · printed p. 540 —

…in act but in virtue, because Joram begot, in the nearest line, Ochozias, the great-grandfather of Ozias. But let us dissemble this, and pass it by without examination.

§173 (concl.). The Matthew parallel explained: Joram begot Ozias only 'in virtue,' since he immediately begot Ochozias, Ozias's great-grandfather (Mt 1 skips three kings). Pererius sets this defense aside without pressing it.

This certainly seems to me inextricable; for I am wont to reason thus with myself: either this generation of Cainan was unknown to Moses, or known. That it was unknown to Moses — which was clearly perceived and known

by the Seventy — who would dare to say, since Moses was so much nearer to that age than they, and alone wrote the History of those times with such diligence and care? But if that generation was known to Moses, why then did he pass it over? — especially since the addition or subtraction of that generation varies not a little the Chronology which is described by Moses between the Flood and Abraham: that Moses wished to hand down this Chronology whole, exactly, and perfectly is shown by the clearest indication, namely that he recounts the series of generations between the Flood and Abraham distinctly and accurately, and properly assigns to each generation its own years subtly computed. How, then, is it credible that Moses, the generation of Cainan being omitted, either wished to hand down to us a faulty Chronology, or — when he by no means wished it — nevertheless unknowingly handed it down?

§174. Pererius calls the matter inextricable: either Cainan was unknown to Moses (incredible — he was nearer the age than the LXX and wrote so carefully) or known (then why omit him, when adding/subtracting him alters the Flood→Abraham chronology?). Moses clearly meant the chronology to be exact, assigning precise years to each generation, so he would neither deliberately nor unknowingly hand down a faulty one.

Indeed, thinking long and much, I have so far been able to find no reason (that would satisfy my mind) why Moses ought, or could, have passed over the generation of Cainan, if indeed it intervened between Arphaxad and Sale. For what some say — that Moses wished to reduce the generations before and after the flood to only two decades — this can neither be proved by them, and is light and futile, nor is it such that on its account Moses ought to disturb and confound the Chronology (whose exact knowledge was of great moment). Add to these that at least in the books of Paralipomenon (Chronicles), in which the things left out elsewhere in the sacred letters are supplied — whence indeed they have their name — this generation of Cainan would have been commemorated; for at the opening of the first book of Paralipomenon the series of generations before and after the flood is recounted just as here, and yet not a single word is made about the generation of Cainan.

§175. Pererius can find no satisfying reason Moses would omit Cainan if he existed. The 'two decades' motive is unproven, light, futile, and not worth confounding an important chronology for. Moreover Chronicles (Paralipomenon) — whose very purpose is to supply what was left out elsewhere — recounts these same pre- and post-flood generations at the start of 1 Chronicles and says nothing of Cainan.

There remains a fifth and last way, which some judge more expeditious and apt for dispatching this question. They say that no generation intervened between Arphaxad and Sale; and that the generation of Cainan was neither produced by the Seventy Translators nor set by Luke in the genealogy of the Saviour, but was corruptly added by someone — I know not whom — first, indeed, to the translation of the Seventy in this place, and thence afterward transfused into the genealogy of our Lord which is in Luke. This these do not prove. Yet for the confirmation of that opinion a threefold conjecture — and that truly not light or to be despised — can be brought. The first conjecture is this: blessed Jerome, in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis, curiously investigating and diligently noting every dissonance of reading which is in the book of Genesis between the Hebrew codices and the Seventy Translators…

§176 (begins). Fifth and last solution: no generation came between Arphaxad and Sale; Cainan was produced neither by the LXX nor by Luke, but corruptly inserted by some unknown hand — first into the LXX here, then carried over into Luke's genealogy. Unproven, but supported by a threefold conjecture. First conjecture: Jerome, in his Hebrew Traditions (Quaestiones) on Genesis, who carefully noted every reading-difference between the Hebrew and the LXX… (continues next page). Margin: 'Beroaldus in his Chronicle'; 'St. Jerome.'

— p. 614 (PDF) · printed p. 541 —

…curiously investigating and diligently noting [them], did not touch even with a word this dissonance about the generation of Cainan, so signal and notable. From which one may understand that that generation was not in the books of the Seventy which Jerome then had.

§176 (concl.). First conjecture concluded: Jerome, who noted every Hebrew-vs-LXX difference in Genesis, never mentioned so notable a difference as the Cainan generation — which shows the LXX copies Jerome had did not contain it.

The second conjecture is that Josephus, who is wont almost always to follow the Seventy, in the first book of the Antiquities, reviewing the generations from the flood to Abraham, by no means commemorated this generation of Cainan; nor does Epiphanius, disputing against the 55th heresy — that is, against the Melchisedechians — when according to the translation of the Seventy he sets out the years of the several generations between the flood and Abraham, make any mention at all of the generation of Cainan. The third conjecture is at the opening of the first book of Paralipomenon, where the series of generations from the flood to Abraham is commemorated just as in this place: the ancient and emended codices of the Seventy (such as the one that lately came out at Rome by the authority and care of the most illustrious Cardinal Carafa) do not have the generation of Cainan.

§177. Second conjecture: Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1), who usually follows the LXX, omits Cainan from the flood-to-Abraham generations; and Epiphanius, against the 55th heresy (the Melchisedechians), expounding the LXX years between flood and Abraham, never mentions Cainan. Third conjecture: at the start of 1 Chronicles, the ancient corrected LXX codices (e.g. the recent Roman edition under Cardinal Carafa) lack Cainan. Margin: 'Josephus; Epiphanius.'

From these it is rightly concluded that the generation of Cainan was not in all the books of the Seventy. Whence it is also probably conjectured that it was not handed down by the Seventy; and that those books which lacked that generation, as agreeing with the Hebrew codices, are to be judged true and intact, while those which had the generation of Cainan are to be condemned and rejected as corrupt and faulty. It was easy, moreover, for someone, having got hold of books of the Seventy in which the generation of Cainan was, to transfer it thence into the Gospel of Luke; which, not noticed at the beginning, not only stuck in that one book but was derived into those that, down to this day, have been copied out.

§178. Conclusion from the three conjectures: Cainan was not in all LXX books, so probably not handed down by the LXX at all; the books lacking it (agreeing with the Hebrew) are sound, those having it corrupt. Someone with a corrupted LXX easily transferred Cainan into Luke, where, unnoticed, it spread into all later copies.

But indeed, if what about the truth of the books of the Seventy concerning the generation of Cainan has been well enough proved were also proved about the Gospel book of blessed Luke, I would for my part embrace this opinion with full assent. But in this age there is no book of Luke that in the genealogy of the Saviour does not have the generation of Cainan, nor have I ever read that anyone said that, either by himself or by others, any codex of Luke was seen that lacked such a generation. Wherefore the conjecture of these — as it is by no means weak in the books of the Seventy — so in the Gospel of Luke seems most light and rash; nay rather, on account of the authority of blessed Luke (who followed the Seventy translators), one ought to judge those Greek books in which the generation of Cainan was to be sound and uncorrupted, but those which did not have the generation of Cainan to be faulty and corrupt.

§179. Pererius would fully accept the fifth solution IF the same were proved of Luke as of the LXX. But no copy of Luke in this age lacks Cainan in the genealogy, nor has anyone ever reported seeing a codex of Luke without it. So the interpolation-conjecture, though by no means weak for the LXX books, is ‘most light and rash’ for Luke; rather, given Luke's authority (he followed the LXX), one ought to judge the Cainan-bearing Greek codices sound and the Cainan-lacking ones corrupt. (Pererius's own verdict follows in §180.)

What, then, is our opinion? This: that, if to any reader this way [the fifth] shall not be approved, of those four ways stated…

§180 (begins). Pererius states his own view: if the reader will not accept this (fifth) way, then of the [other] ways stated… (continues next page). Margin: 'A very notable opinion of Bede.'

— p. 615 (PDF) · printed p. 542 —

…of the [four] ways, I judge the fourth less improbable and less liable to censure than the rest; and to me, although it has already happened in this disputation, [there befalls] more vexingly what befell the Venerable Bede, who writes in the Preface of his Commentaries on the Acts of the Apostles in these words: 'Luke in the first place seemed to trust the Greeks rather than the Hebrews. From which arises what I most wonder at — and, struck with most vehement astonishment by reason of the slowness of my wit, I

cannot perceive by what reason — that, whereas in the Hebrew verity from the flood to Abraham only ten generations are found, Luke himself, who, with the Holy Spirit guiding his pen, could in no way write anything false, chose rather to set in his Gospel eleven generations according to the Seventy Translators, Cainan being added.' Thus Bede in that place.

§180 (concl.). Pererius's verdict: of the ways laid out, he judges the FOURTH (Cainan really intervened; LXX inserted, Moses omitted) least improbable and least open to censure. He confesses the same perplexity that befell the Venerable Bede, quoted from the Preface to his Commentary on Acts: astonished that, though the Hebrew gives only ten generations from flood to Abraham, Luke — who under the Holy Spirit could write nothing false — chose to put eleven, with Cainan added per the LXX. Margin: 'Bede's opinion, very notable.'

TWELFTH DISPUTATION. On the discrepancy of reading which exists between the Hebrew and Latin books, and among the Codices of the Seventy Translators, concerning the computation of the years that elapsed from the flood to the birth of Abraham.

Disp. 12 title (the second of the Second Part's three disputations). On the discrepancy in the year-count from the Flood to Abraham's birth — between the Hebrew and the Latin (Vulgate), and even among the LXX codices themselves.

From the [years] which the Hebrew scripture and the Latin Vulgate edition assign, in the eleventh chapter of Genesis, to the several generations of those who lived from the flood to the birth of Abraham, there is plainly gathered the reckoning of years that elapsed between the two. For Sem, two years after the flood, begot Arphaxad; Arphaxad begot Sale when he was thirty-five years old; Sale, at thirty years, begot Heber; Heber, at thirty-four years, begot Phaleg; Phaleg, at thirty years, begot Reu; Reu, at thirty-two years, begot Sarug; Sarug, at thirty years, begot Nachor; Nachor, at twenty-nine years, begot Thare; Thare, endowed with seventy years, begot Abraham. With all these years gathered together there is made a sum of two hundred ninety-two years, which ran from the flood to Abraham — as appears in the table set below. Sem 2; Arphaxad 35; Sale 30; Heber 34; Phaleg 30; Reu…

§181 (begins Disp. 12). Per the Hebrew and Vulgate (Gen 11), the years from the flood to Abraham's birth: Sem begot Arphaxad 2 yrs after the flood; Arphaxad begot Sale at 35; Sale begot Heber at 30; Heber begot Phaleg at 34; Phaleg begot Reu at 30; Reu begot Sarug at 32; Sarug begot Nachor at 30; Nachor begot Thare at 29; Thare begot Abraham at 70 — total 292 years (2+35+30+34+30+32+30+29+70). A table follows (Sem 2, Arphaxad 35, Sale 30, Heber 34, Phaleg 30, Reu… continues next page).

— p. 616 (PDF) · printed p. 543 —

Reu 32; Sarug 30; Nachor 29; Thare 70. SUM: 292.

§181 (table concl.). The Hebrew/Vulgate generation-table completed: Reu 32, Sarug 30, Nachor 29, Thare 70 — grand total 292 years from the flood to Abraham's birth.

Furthermore, with the generation of Cainan added — about which it was explained in the last disputation — the aforesaid sum increases by thirty years; for Cainan was thirty years old when he begot Sale. For although the Greek codices have that he was then a hundred and thirty years old, those hundred years — which in the other generations too are added to the years that the Hebrew and Latin codices have — are corrupt and were not set down by the Seventy Translators, as we have diligently and at length disputed and demonstrated in the seventh book (which is the last of the first volume of our Commentaries on Genesis). Therefore, to the aforesaid two hundred ninety-two years the thirty years of Cainan being added make a sum of three hundred twenty-two years, which passed from the flood to the birth of Abraham.

§182. If Cainan (Disp. 11) is counted, the total rises by 30 (his age at begetting Sale), giving 322 years from flood to Abraham. The Greek codices' figure of 130 for Cainan includes a spurious extra 100 years — added in the other generations too — which Pererius showed (vol. 1, bk. 7 of his Genesis Commentary, the Disputation on chronology) are corrupt and not from the genuine LXX.

Besides, a threefold discrepancy of reading must here be noted between the Greek codices on the one hand and the Hebrew together with the Latin on the other. The first discrepancy: the Greek codices, except for Sem and Thare, in all the other generations add another hundred to the years at which the fathers (according to the Hebrew and Latin codices) are said to

have lived before they begot their sons; indeed to Nachor himself they add a hundred and fifty years — as may be seen in the table set below. Sem begot Arphaxad two years after the Flood; Arphaxad begot Cainan when he was 135 years old; Cainan 130; Sale 130; Heber 134; Phaleg 130; Reu 132; Sarug 130; Nachor 179; Thare, when he begot Abraham, was 70 years old. SUM: 1,172.

§183 (first discrepancy). The Greek (LXX) codices, except for Sem and Thare, add 100 years to each father's age-at-begetting (e.g. Arphaxad 35→135, Sale 30→130), and to Nachor 150 (29→179). The LXX age-at-begetting table: Sem 2, Arphaxad 135, Cainan 130, Sale 130, Heber 134, Phaleg 130, Reu 132, Sarug 130, Nachor 179, Thare 70 — total 1,172 years (vs. the Hebrew/Vulgate 292, or 322 with Cainan).

In this computation of years we have followed the most corrected Greek codices now extant, especially the Roman Greek codex lately published. But that addition of those hundred years to the years which the Hebrew and Latin codices have is corrupt, and did not truly proceed from the Seventy Translators, but was foisted into their translation by someone — as we taught in [the first volume] of our Commentaries on Genesis, in the Disputation on the Chronology from the beginning of the World to the Flood, the third question.

§183 (concl.). Pererius's tables follow the best current Greek codices, especially the recent Roman edition; but he reaffirms that the spurious +100 years per generation was not the genuine LXX but a later interpolation (cross-referencing his vol. 1 Disputation on chronology, question 3).

The second discrepancy that exists here between the Hebrew and Latin…

§184 (begins). The second discrepancy between the Hebrew/Latin books and the Greek codices (continues next page).

— p. 617 (PDF) · printed p. 544 —

…books, and between them and the Greek codices, consists in this: that the Greek codices, in each of the generations after the Flood, add the words 'And he died'; and, for example, they have it thus: 'Arphaxad lived, after he begot Cainan, three hundred years, and begot sons and daughters, and he

died'; and likewise this, 'And he died,' they attach to each of the following generations — words which, however, the Hebrew scripture does not have, nor the Latin Vulgate edition, nor the Chaldee paraphrase. Indeed, weighing this very thing, Bede in his Annotations on Genesis upon this place says: ‘Nowhere in this whole series of generations which were from the flood to Abraham is added that phrase {And he died}, as in the age that preceded the flood; because there was none in this whole company of the dead of whom, as of one dead and not living, it could be said what was then said of Henoch, {He walked with God, and was not seen, because God took him}.’ It seems therefore that, from the fact that Moses appended to each of the generations preceding the flood that phrase 'And he died,' it was then carried over by the Greeks into the other generations that followed the flood.

§184 (concl.). Second discrepancy: the Greek codices append 'And he died' (Et mortuus est) to each post-flood generation (e.g. Arphaxad lived 300 years after begetting Cainan… and he died), which the Hebrew, Vulgate, and Chaldee (Targum) lack. Bede's Annotations note that the phrase appears in the pre-flood generations (to distinguish the dead from Henoch, who 'walked with God and was not seen, for God took him'), so the Greeks apparently transferred it into the post-flood list. Margin: 'Bede.'

The third discrepancy is in the number of years which the fathers who lived after the flood down to Abraham (except Sem, Thare, and Cainan) are said to have lived. For according to the Hebrew and Latin codices Arphaxad lived 438 years; according to the Greek codices Arphaxad lived 435. Sale, according to the former, 433; according to the latter, 460. Heber, according to the former, 464; according to the latter, 404. Phaleg, according to the former, 239; according to the latter, 339. Reu, according to the former, 239; according to the latter, 337. Sarug, according to the former, 230; according to the latter, 330. Nachor, according to the former, 148; according to the latter, 304. But in the table set below one may discern this more plainly. According to the Hebrew and Latin books — According to the Greek codices: Arphaxad 438 — 435; Sale 433 — 460; Heber 464 — 404; Phaleg 239 — 339; Reu 239 — 337; Sarug 230 — 330; Nachor 148 — 304.

§185 (third discrepancy). The total lifespans differ (excepting Sem, Thare, Cainan). Hebrew/Latin vs. Greek: Arphaxad 438/435, Sale 433/460, Heber 464/404, Phaleg 239/339, Reu 239/337, Sarug 230/330, Nachor 148/304. This closes Disp. 12 (the discrepancy of the flood-to-Abraham reckoning across Hebrew, Latin, and Greek texts).

— p. 618 (PDF) · printed p. 545 —

THIRTEENTH DISPUTATION. Upon these words: 'Thare lived seventy years, and begot Abraham, Nachor, and Aram.' In what year of Thare's age Abraham was born.

Disp. 13 title (the third and last disputation of the Second Part). On Gen 11:26, 'Thare lived seventy years and begot Abram, Nachor, and Aran' — the question being in what year of Thare's life Abraham was actually born. Margin: 'Genesis 11, v. 26.'

Here is a perplexed and contentious question: whether Abraham was born in the seventieth year of his father Thare, as the aforesaid words seem to signify; or rather in the hundred and thirtieth, which seems able to be gathered from other places of Scripture. For Thare lived two hundred and five years, as Moses narrates in the last words of the eleventh chapter; but after his death Abraham, setting out from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan, is said to have been then seventy-five years old, as is written in the twelfth chapter of this book. Therefore, if Abraham was seventy-five years old after the death of his father, who had lived two hundred and five years, it must be that he was born in his father's hundred and thirtieth year. I find three ways and reasons for explaining this question.

§186 (the problem). Gen 11:26 seems to make Abraham born in Thare's 70th year; but Thare lived 205 years (Gen 11:32), and Abraham was 75 when he left for Canaan after Thare's death (Gen 12:4) — which puts Abraham's birth in Thare's 130th year (205−75). Pererius will give three solutions.

The first is the opinion of the Hebrews, who say that when Abraham, his father being dead, first came into the land of Canaan, he was then in truth a hundred and thirty years old, but is nevertheless called by Moses seventy-five years old — his years being reckoned not from his birth, but from the time when, among the Chaldees at Charran (because he would not worship God after their manner and rite), he confessed the worship of the

one God and came forth unharmed from the flames. For because Abraham was then in a manner truly reborn, therefore Moses chose to reckon his years from that time. That Abraham was snatched from the burning the Hebrews hold known from the traditions of their elders, and they think it is signified by those words which God said to Abraham: 'I am the God who led you out of Ur of the Chaldees.' For in Hebrew 'Ur' means fire; and the Latin Translator rendered it so in chapter nine of the second book of Esdras, in that place: 'You are the God who led Abraham out of the fire of the Chaldees.' Thus the Hebrews.

§187 (first solution — the Hebrews). Abraham was really 130 at Thare's death, but Moses counts only 75 years — reckoned not from birth but from his 'rebirth' when, at Charran, he refused Chaldean idolatry, confessed the one God, and emerged unharmed from a fire. They support this fire-legend from elder traditions and from reading 'Ur of the Chaldees' as 'fire of the Chaldees' (Hebrew 'Ur' = fire), citing Neh 9:7 ('who led Abraham out of the fire of the Chaldees'). Margin: 'The Hebrews.'

This opinion blessed Jerome, in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis (with which he is wont to comment on the eleventh chapter), recounts as a fable and refutes; but a little afterward, because he could find no more convenient way out of the question, he applied himself to it thus: 'An insoluble question arises,' he says. 'For if Thare begot his son Abraham at seventy years, and afterward Thare lived two hundred and five years (as is at the end of the chapter), how is Abraham, coming after his death into the land of Canaan, recorded to have been seventy-five years old, when from the death of Thare he must (as we have demonstrated) have been a hundred and thirty-five years old? It is therefore true…'

§188 (begins). Jerome (Hebrew Questions/Traditions on Genesis) first records the fire-legend as a fable and refutes it, but then, finding no better exit, leans on it: he frames the 'insoluble question' — if Abraham was born in Thare's 70th year and Thare lived to 205, then at Thare's death Abraham would be 135, yet Gen 12 calls him 75. (Jerome's resolution continues next page.) Margin: 'Jerome.'

— p. 619 (PDF) · printed p. 546 —

…that tradition of the Hebrews which we mentioned above, namely that Thare went out with his sons from Ur of the Chaldees and came to Charran,

and so forth. For since Abraham, freed by the will of God from the Babylonian burning (because he would not worship it), dwelt thereafter at Charran with his father and kindred, he is recorded, at the time he went out from Charran, to have been seventy-five years old — not from his birth, but the years of his life being reckoned from the confession by which he confessed God in the Chaldean fire, from the time when the Lord saved him from the fire of the Chaldees. Thus Jerome.

§188 (concl.). Jerome's adopted resolution: Abraham's 75 years are counted from his confession of God amid the 'Babylonian/Chaldean fire' (when God delivered him), not from his birth — so the 75 dates from his deliverance, harmonizing with the Hebrew fire-tradition.

But this opinion of the Hebrews is partly fabulous, partly weak and contrary to the harder [sense of] Scripture. I judge fabulous what they relate about the Chaldean burning, whence Abraham was miraculously freed — but on this matter it will be disputed properly and accurately a little below. That this opinion is, moreover, contrary to the divine letters is manifest to the reader from the very things we set down toward the end of the preceding disputation. For if Abraham, when he first came into the land of Canaan, was in truth a hundred and thirty-five years old, as they would have it — since Moses says that when he had come there he was only seventy-five years old — it follows that, before he came into the land of Canaan, sixty years had passed from the death of his father Thare; which is plainly against the scripture of the book of Genesis, where Moses says that immediately after the death of Thare Abraham came into the land of Canaan.

§189 (refutation of the Hebrews). Their view is partly fabulous (the Chaldean-fire deliverance — to be treated below) and partly contrary to Scripture: if Abraham was really 135 at his coming yet Moses calls him 75, then 60 years would have elapsed between Thare's death and that coming — flatly against Gen 12, which has Abraham enter Canaan immediately after Thare died. Margin: 'The Hebrews refuted.'

But if, to escape that difficulty, they should feign that Abraham went away from Charran into the land of Canaan not in the year his father died, but

some years afterward — to that I say that this is a conjecture plainly without any foundation in Scripture; indeed, against the open sense of Scripture, which places Abraham's departure into Canaan immediately after the death of Thare. Wherefore neither do they extricate themselves by this escape. Therefore this first opinion, as partly fabulous and partly contrary to the divine scripture, must be repudiated.

§190. Pererius blocks the Hebrews' escape-route (claiming Abraham left Charran some years after Thare's death): that is a baseless conjecture against the plain text, which sets the departure immediately after Thare died. The first opinion is therefore repudiated.

The second opinion is that of Theodoret (in the 60th question on Genesis), and the same is the opinion of Nicholas of Lyra and Cajetan. These judge that from that place of the eleventh chapter of Genesis it cannot be gathered that Abraham was the firstborn son of Thare himself; but that, though Thare begot three sons in the order in which they are named (Abram, Nachor, and Aram), he did not in that year first beget Abram — namely, when he was seventy years old he begot one of those three, but not Abram, who was afterward born in his father's hundred and thirtieth year. For among…

§191 (begins — second solution). Theodoret (Questions on Genesis, q. 60), Nicholas of Lyra, and Cajetan: Gen 11:26 does not prove Abraham was Thare's firstborn. Thare at 70 began begetting (one of the three, not Abram); Abram was actually born in Thare's 130th year. The three are named by dignity, not birth order (argument continues next page). Margin: 'Nicholas of Lyra; Cajetan.'

— p. 620 (PDF) · printed p. 547 —

…among the sons of Thare Abram is named first; yet it is to be understood that he was not first in the order of generation but of dignity, because of the election and blessing of God, who had chosen him, and from whom the Hebrew people, and in that people both many most illustrious men and also the Messiah himself, would be begotten — just as in the first book of Paralipomenon, chapter four, among the sons of Abraham Isaac is named before Ismael, and Jacob before Esau; indeed, Sem was not the firstborn of Noah, to whom nevertheless, in the enumeration of Noah's sons, the first

place is everywhere given. This opinion deserves to seem probable, if only because it thoroughly exhausts all the difficulties of the proposed question and leaves, in this matter at least, no dissonance or discrepancy in the sacred letters: for in truth Abraham, after he came into the land of Canaan, was seventy-five years old, as Moses narrates. Thus they.

§191 (concl.). Abram is named first by dignity (God's election — source of the Hebrew people and the Messiah), not birth order, as Isaac before Ismael and Jacob before Esau (1 Chron 4), and Sem listed first though not Noah's firstborn. The view is attractive because it removes all the difficulty: Abraham truly was 75 on entering Canaan (Gen 12), being born in Thare's 130th year.

But against this two things fight most strongly. And first indeed: if Thare in his seventieth year begot three sons, as Moses says, it must be true either that all those three were begotten in that year, or at least some one of them; for if he begot none then, to what purpose does Moses record that seventieth year of Thare in the begetting of those three? Thare therefore begot some one of those three in the seventieth year of his age; but which? Not Abraham then begotten [these say]; therefore either Nachor or Aram was begotten at that time. But it is by no means consonant with reason that Moses should have wished to explain the time of the begetting of Nachor and Aram and to be silent about the time of the begetting of Abraham — when the whole concern is chiefly about Abraham and his genealogy and age, but about the others only in passing and as it were by accident. And since Moses, in the eleventh chapter of Genesis describing the generations that were after the flood, in each of those generations diligently noted the time at which each one was begotten, that surely he ought not to have omitted in the case of Abraham, in whom the series of those generations was terminated.

§192 (first objection). If Thare at 70 begot three sons, at least one was born that year (else why does Moses note the 70th year?). Per the Lyra/Cajetan view it was not Abraham, so Nachor or Aram — but it is unreasonable that Moses would date Nachor's/Aram's birth and omit Abraham's, when the whole passage centers on Abraham, the others mentioned only incidentally; and Moses carefully dates every post-flood begetting. Margin: 'Abraham's birth.'

Next, if when Thare is said at seventy years to have begotten those three sons of his, it be understood in such a sense that it refers to only some one of the three, and not to Abraham, it would inconveniently come about that the time of the second age of the World — which is numbered from the flood to Abraham — would be rendered uncertain, and the Chronology which Moses everywhere strove to hand down with so much care and diligence would be confounded.

§193 (second objection). If the 70th year refers to one of the other sons and not to Abraham, then the length of the world's second age (flood→Abraham) becomes uncertain and the chronology Moses everywhere kept exact would be confounded.

And this too is confirmed by the testimony of blessed Augustine. For in the sixteenth book of the City of God, chapter fifteen, treating those words of Moses which are in the eleventh chapter of Genesis according to the translation of the Seventy, 'And the days of Thare in Charran were two hundred and five, and he died in Charran,' he says thus…

§194 (begins). Pererius adds Augustine's testimony: in City of God bk. 16 ch. 15, commenting on Gen 11:32 (LXX: 'the days of Thare in Charran were 205, and he died in Charran'), Augustine says… (continues next page). Margin: 'Augustine.'

— p. 621 (PDF) · printed p. 548 —

“This is not to be taken as though he spent all those days there, but because he completed there all the days of his life, which were two hundred and five years. Otherwise it would not be known how many years Thare lived, since it is not read in what year of his life he came to Charran; and it is absurd to think that in this series of generations, where it is diligently recorded how many years each one lived, the number of this one man's years of life alone was not committed to memory. For as to those some of whom the same scripture mentions while their years are passed over in silence, they are not in this order in which the reckoning of times is woven together by the death of the begetters and the succession of the begotten. But this order, which runs from Adam to Noah, and thence to Abraham,

contains no one without the number of his years of life.” Thus far the words of Augustine. And if Augustine reckoned it a great inconvenience to the Chronology that the time of Thare's age is not recorded in scripture — so that, on account of its silence, he supposed the sacred Chronology would be disturbed — how much more truly ought this same thing to be judged of the time of the birth and life of Abraham himself, in the writing of whose history Moses took chief care?

§194 (concl.). The close of Augustine's testimony (City of God 16.15 on Gen 11:32 LXX): 'the days of Thare were 205 years' means he completed his life there, not that he spent it all there; and the genealogical order from Adam through Abraham records everyone's lifespan — so the silence about Thare's age at Abraham's begetting is deliberate. Pererius's a-fortiori: if such silence about Thare worried Augustine for the chronology, far more does the silence about Abraham's own birth-date, the very subject of the history.

But the defenders of the opinion we are refuting could reply that when Abraham was born is evidently known from Moses's own narration. For if, when after his father's death he came from the city of Haran into the land of Canaan, Abraham was seventy-five years old, while his father Thare lived two hundred and five years, from these it is necessarily concluded that Abraham was born in Thare's hundred and thirtieth year, and that from the flood to Abraham's birth three hundred and fifty-two years must be reckoned; but with the generation of Cainan added, which contains thirty years, the sum from the flood to Abraham is made three hundred and eighty-two years.

§195. The opposing side's rejoinder: Abraham's birth-date IS knowable from Moses — Abraham was 75 at his coming to Canaan after Thare's death, Thare lived 205, so Abraham was born in Thare's 130th year. This makes the flood-to-Abraham total 352 years (the earlier 292 + 60, since Thare was 130 not 70 at the birth), or 382 with Cainan's 30.

Andreas Masius, a writer of our age no less pious (to say nothing of his other qualities) than learned and eloquent, in the Commentaries he published on the book of Joshua, explaining the last chapter of that book, when he treated this very question in passing, wrote that it seemed to him nearer the truth that Abraham first came into Canaan in the seventy-fifth

year of his age — his father, that is, being alive and in his hundred and forty-fifth year. But that blessed Stephen says he came into the land of Canaan after his father's death is to be interpreted…

§196 (begins — third opinion). Andreas Masius (16th-c. scholar), in his Commentary on Joshua (last chapter), treating this question in passing, holds it likelier that Abraham first came to Canaan at 75, while his father Thare was still alive and in his 145th year. Stephen's 'after his father's death' (Acts 7) Masius takes... (continues next page). Margin: 'Andreas Masius said'; 'Third opinion'; 'Acts 7.'

— p. 622 (PDF) · printed p. 549 —

…to be understood of a death not natural indeed, but spiritual. For because Thare had, with most obstinate will, resolved not to go into the region of Canaan whither God was calling, but to remain among his own gods, to whose most vain worship he was given, and had taken from his son Abraham all hope of that journey — therefore blessed Stephen called him dead; for it is not infrequent in the sacred letters, especially in Paul, that those who lay in sins, and most of all in the sin of idolatry, are called dead, such as that saying of the Lord, “Let the dead bury their own dead.” But this interpretation neither pleases me, nor, as I think, ought it to please anyone prudent and skilled in the divine letters. For, twisting Stephen's speech from the proper signification and sense of the words to a tropological understanding, it perverts the historical narrative — which everyone sees Stephen's speech in that place to be.

§196 (concl.). Masius reads Stephen's 'after his father died' as a SPIRITUAL death: Thare obstinately refused to go to Canaan, clinging to his idols and dashing Abraham's hope, so Stephen called him 'dead' (as Scripture, esp. Paul, calls those in sin — and the idolatrous — dead; cf. the Lord's 'Let the dead bury their dead,' Mt 8). Pererius rejects this: it twists Stephen's plainly historical speech into a tropology. Margin: 'Matthew 8.'

Nor does that way and reason of unravelling this difficulty displease some: they think that journey of Abraham into the region of Canaan, when he was seventy-five years old, was many years before the death of Thare; but that it was nevertheless recorded by Moses after his death, by the figure which is called recapitulation, whereby things done earlier are narrated later.

Moses used this figure below in the twenty-fifth chapter, narrating first the death of Abraham, and after it the birth of Jacob and Esau — though it is manifest from the history of this book that the death of Abraham was fifteen years later than the birth of Jacob. Therefore, because Moses wished to dispatch briefly whatever pertained to the history of Thare, and then, beginning Abraham's history, to weave it diligently and copiously, he first set out the death of Thare, and then, beginning Abraham's history, took its beginning from his journey into the land of Canaan — although that preceded Thare's death by many years.

§197 (fourth opinion). Some resolve it by 'recapitulation' (narrating earlier events later): Abraham's journey to Canaan at 75 actually happened many years before Thare died, but Moses placed it after Thare's death as a literary device — just as Gen 25 narrates Abraham's death before Jacob and Esau's birth, though Abraham died 15 years after Jacob was born. So Moses finished Thare's brief history first, then began Abraham's at his journey to Canaan, though it preceded Thare's death. Margin: 'Fourth opinion.'

But against this exposition stands the narration of blessed Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles, as was just said: for it distinctly and properly holds that Abraham came into the land of Canaan after his father's death — words which utterly exclude that refuge to the figure of recapitulation. But to this some writers reply that the sacred [authors] name things themselves not from what they truly are, but from how they are recorded in other places of Scripture: just as blessed Paul, in Hebrews chapter seven, wrote that Melchisedech was without father, without mother, without end or beginning of days, because Moses in the book of Genesis, where he mentions him, suddenly introduces him with no mention made of him, or of his parents, or of his age. Similarly, then, because Moses narrated Abraham's going out from his homeland after the death of Thare, therefore Stephen, regarding the manner of the Mosaic narration, said that Abraham went out from his land after his father's death.

§197 (concl.). Objection to the recapitulation view: Stephen (Acts 7) distinctly says Abraham came to Canaan AFTER his father's death, which excludes recapitulation. A defense: sacred writers may describe things as Scripture elsewhere records them, not as they literally were — as Paul (Heb 7)

calls Melchisedech 'without father, mother, beginning of days' merely because Moses introduces him abruptly (Gen 14). So Stephen followed Moses's narrative order. Margin: 'Genesis 14.'

But this interpretation is opposed by the fact that Stephen in that place…

§198 (begins). Pererius's counter: but Stephen in that passage [narrates that God spoke the Gen 12:1 call to Abraham while still in Mesopotamia, before Charran — so Stephen does not simply follow Moses's order; continues next page].

— p. 623 (PDF) · printed p. 550 —

…narrates that God, when Abraham was in Mesopotamia and before he dwelt in Charran, spoke those words: “Go out from your land and from your kindred, etc.” If Stephen had wished to follow the order of the Mosaic narration, he would surely have said that God spoke those words to Abraham after the death of Thare — after which death he had said Abraham came into the land of Canaan — and not have reported them, as at the opening of the twelfth chapter, from [their first] words.

§198 (concl.). The objection completed: Stephen places God's call ('Go out from your land,' Gen 12:1) while Abraham was in Mesopotamia, BEFORE Charran. Had Stephen merely followed Moses's order, he would have set the call after Thare's death; so he is reporting the real sequence, not Moses's literary order — which undercuts the recapitulation defense.

There remains a fifth and last way of explaining this question, in my judgment to be preferred to the foregoing. One must hold that Abraham came twice from the city of Charran into the region of Canaan. First indeed he came when he himself was seventy-five years old, his father being left alive in Charran and being then in his hundred and forty-fifth year. After this first coming into the land of Canaan, Abraham sojourned in that region for sixty years, perhaps revisiting his father a few times. Last of all, the death of his father being announced, he returned to Charran, either to attend to his father's funeral or lest he lose the goods that had come to him by paternal inheritance; and then again, his father being now dead, he went out of Mesopotamia with most firm mind and most fixed resolve never thereafter to return there, and set out into the land of Canaan to have

henceforth a settled dwelling there. And this blessed Augustine thinks is signified by those words that blessed Stephen used: “And thence, after his father died, He removed him into this land.” For that word 'removed,' Augustine reads 'settled.' In Greek it is μετ■κισεν, that is, He made him a colonist and inhabitant, and appointed for him a dwelling in the land of Canaan, as for one never again to return to Mesopotamia; for the word μετοικ■α denotes not a simple transfer, but as it were a colonization.

§199 (fifth/preferred solution — the two journeys). Abraham came to Canaan TWICE: first at age 75 (Thare alive, in his 145th year); he then sojourned 60 years, occasionally revisiting his father; finally, on news of Thare's death, he returned to Charran (for the funeral and his inheritance), then left Mesopotamia for good to settle permanently in Canaan. Augustine takes Stephen's 'removed him' (Acts 7:4) as 'settled' (collocavit; Greek μετ■κισεν, μετοικ■α = a colonization, not a mere transfer).

Therefore Abraham, before his father's death, throughout those sixty years can be said not so much to have dwelt in the land of Canaan as to have sojourned, because at intervals he revisited his father and brothers; but after his father's death he so abandoned Mesopotamia that he was thenceforth a perpetual colonist and inhabitant of the land of Canaan. To this is given confirmation by what is read in the book of Genesis, chapter twenty-three: that Abraham, when he was a hundred and thirty-seven years old — that is, two years after the death of Thare his father — first possessed some part of the land of Canaan, having bought the double cave for the burial of his wife Sara; which indeed was not left unnoticed and unannotated by Augustine.

§200. During the 60 years Abraham was a sojourner rather than a settler (revisiting kin); only after Thare's death did he become a permanent inhabitant. Confirmation: Gen 23 records Abraham first possessing land in Canaan — the double cave bought for Sara's burial — when he was 137, i.e. two years after Thare's death (Abraham being 135 when Thare died). Augustine noted this.

Tostatus follows this opinion; but the chief part of his opinion agrees with Augustine. For Augustine, in the Questions on Genesis, question twenty-five, and in the sixteenth book of the City of God, chapter fifteen, although he sets out three ways of unravelling this question — that is, of those we mentioned above, the first, the second, and the fifth — yet seems

himself more inclined to this fifth. For when, in that book of the City of God just mentioned, he had pointed out the difficulty which we treat in this disputation — how Abraham, after the death of his father, who [had lived] two hundred…

§201 (begins). Tostatus follows this fifth view, its main part agreeing with Augustine. Augustine (Questions on Genesis q. 25; City of God 16.15) lays out three of the solutions (the first, second, and fifth listed here) but inclines to the fifth. He had raised the same difficulty treated here — how Abraham, after his father's death (Thare having lived 205…)... (continues next page). Margin: 'Tostatus; Augustine.'

— p. 624 (PDF) · printed p. 551 —

…had lived two hundred and five years, and had begotten him in the seventieth year of his age, [says] that Abraham then came into the land of Canaan — he answers, therefore, that in truth Abraham was then seventy-five years old, and that at that time Thare his father was not dead, but was in his hundred and forty-fifth year; yet that Moses, as it were by recapitulation, narrated that departure of Abraham from Mesopotamia after the death of his father Thare, which he had [already] recorded. And thus blessed Augustine writes: “It is to be understood that scripture, after its custom, by recapitulating has returned to a time which the narrative had already passed; for when it had been said, ‘And the days of Thare in Charran were two hundred and five years, and Thare died,’ etc., then scripture, returning to that which it had passed over for this reason — that it might first complete concerning Thare what had been begun — subjoined the giving of the Lord's command to Abraham about going out from his land; and that Abraham was then seventy-five years old. But this truly happened when his father was in his hundred and forty-fifth year of age; for then Abraham was in his seventy-fifth year.”

§201 (concl.). Augustine's resolution (City of God 16.15): Abraham was truly 75 at his coming to Canaan, with Thare not yet dead but in his 145th year; Moses, by recapitulation, narrated the departure after recording Thare's death. Augustine quoted: scripture returned by recapitulation to a passed time — having said 'the days of Thare were 205… and Thare died,' it then went back to complete Thare's account and subjoined God's command to Abraham (Abraham being 75, his father

145).

After these things Augustine, treating those words of blessed Stephen, “Thence, after his father died, God removed him into this land” (where, for that word 'removed' Augustine reads 'settled,' by which words it is signified that Abraham came into the land of Canaan after his father's death) — treating, I say, these words, Augustine says: “Stephen did not say, after his father died he went out of Charran, but said, after his father died He settled him here. It is therefore to be understood that God spoke when Abraham was in Mesopotamia, before he dwelt in Charran; but that he came to Charran with his father, keeping the command of God with him, and went out thence in his seventy-fifth, but his father's hundred and forty-fifth, year. Nor indeed is it incredibly supposed that, when afterward Nachor the brother of Abraham had followed his father Thare, then Abraham fulfilled God's command, and went out of Charran with Sara his wife and Lot his brother's son; and that Stephen named the settling of Abraham in the land of Canaan after his father's death, but not his departure from Charran, because his father was already dead when he bought the land, of which there he now began to be possessor as of his own property. And that to him, now established in Mesopotamia, now gone out from the land of the Chaldees, God said, ‘Go out from your land and from your kindred and from your father's house,’ is said not that he should go out thence in body, which he had already done, but that he should tear out his soul. For he had not gone out thence in soul, if he was held by the hope of returning and by desire — which hope and desire, with God commanding and helping and him obeying, had to be cut off.” Thus Augustine.

§202. Augustine on Stephen's wording (Acts 7:4): Stephen says not 'after his father died he left Charran' but 'after his father died God settled him here' (Augustine reads 'settled' for 'removed'). So God's call came in Mesopotamia before Charran; Abraham reached Charran with his father, then left at 75 (father 145). Stephen dates the SETTLING (not the departure) after Thare's death, since Thare was already dead when Abraham bought land and became a possessor. And 'Go out from your land…' meant tearing out his soul (cutting off the hope/desire of returning), not bodily departure, which he had already made.

Therefore one must conceive a double journey of Abraham from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan: the one indeed while his father was alive and in his hundred and forty-fifth year, and Abraham himself seventy-five years old — and of this journey Moses spoke in the twelfth chapter of this book; but the other journey of his was made sixty years afterward, during which years Abraham sojourned in the land of Canaan, sometimes revisiting his father; after whose death he so abandoned Mesopotamia that never thither…

§203 (begins). Summation: Abraham made a double journey from Mesopotamia to Canaan — the first at age 75 (father alive, 145), which Moses recounts in Gen 12; the second 60 years later, after sojourning and occasionally revisiting his father, when on Thare's death he left Mesopotamia never to return (continues next page).

— p. 625 (PDF) · printed p. 552 —

…he would return, as we said above. And of this latter departure of Abraham from Mesopotamia and journey into the land of Canaan blessed Stephen spoke. And this opinion, which is that of blessed Augustine, has with me more weight than what Chrysostom hands down in the thirty-first homily on Genesis — that Abraham never departed from the city of Haran before the death of his father Thare.

§203 (concl.). Stephen (Acts 7) spoke of this LATTER departure (after Thare's death). Pererius judges Augustine's two-journey view weightier than Chrysostom's (Homily 31 on Genesis), which held Abraham never left Haran before Thare died.

Of this double journey of Abraham, Tostatus renders a cause indeed fitting and probable. The cause, says Tostatus, of Abraham's double going out from Charran and coming into Canaan was this: that first Abraham came with his father into Charran and stayed there a long time, and his father Thare was then a true worshipper of God; but afterward, in process of time, he was corrupted — perhaps from the company of his [other] son — and became an idolater in the land of the Chaldees, as Augustine writes in the sixteenth book of the City of God, chapter fourteen. Therefore, lest Abraham be perverted on account of the wicked conduct of the idolaters

and for other causes, God commanded him to go out from Charran and from his father's house and come into the land of Canaan; and Abraham was then seventy-five years old, but his father a hundred and forty-five. And then Abraham sojourned in the land of Canaan sixty years; but in the sixtieth year, which was the hundred and thirty-fifth of Abraham's age, his father Thare died. Then Abraham returned to Charran, partly to bestow his care on his father's burial, partly to possess the paternal goods that had come to him by hereditary right. After all this he set out entirely from Mesopotamia into Canaan, with mind never to return thither; and of this last journey blessed Stephen spoke. Thus Tostatus. But whether Nachor and Thare were idolaters (as Tostatus here says) or not, we shall examine below in another disputation, which we are going to treat in the second place after this one.

§204 (concl. of Disp. 13 and of Liber XVI). Tostatus's account of WHY Abraham journeyed twice: Thare was at first a true worshipper of God but later became an idolater among the Chaldees (Augustine, City of God 16.14); so God called Abraham out (at 75, Thare 145) to keep him from corruption. Abraham sojourned 60 years; in the 60th (his 135th year) Thare died; Abraham returned to Charran for the burial and inheritance, then left Mesopotamia for good — the journey Stephen meant. Pererius defers the question whether Nachor and Thare were truly idolaters to a later disputation (the second after this). This ends Liber XVI / Genesis 11.

— p. 626 (PDF) · printed p. 553 —

THE THIRD PART OF THE ELEVENTH CHAPTER OF GENESIS. On Abraham's birth, marriage, and migration from Chaldea into Mesopotamia.

Third-Part title page of Liber XVI (printed 553): covering Gen 11:27–32 — Abraham's birth, his marriage, and the family's migration from Ur of the Chaldees toward Canaan, halting at Haran. (Still Liber XVI, not a new book.)

{These are the generations of Thare: Thare begot Abram, Nachor, and Aran. And Aran begot Lot. And Aran died before Thare his father, in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees. And Abram and Nachor took wives: the name of Abram's wife was Sarai, and the name of

Nachor's wife, Melcha, the daughter of Aran, father of Melcha and father of Iescha. And Sarai was barren, and had no children. And Thare took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Aran his son's son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, the wife of Abram his son, and brought them out of Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Chanaan: and they came as far as Haran, and dwelt there. And the days of Thare were two hundred and five years, and he died in Haran.}

Gen 11:27–32 (verse lemma, vv. 27–32 numbered in the margin). The Scripture text for the whole Third Part — Thare's descendants, Aran's death at Ur, the marriages of Abram (to Sarai) and Nachor (to Melcha), Sarai's barrenness, and the migration from Ur to Haran where Thare died.

— p. 627 (PDF) · printed p. 554 —

PREFACE. Upon these words of Moses five disputations are to be treated; of which the first will be: Whether Abraham was the firstborn of Thare; the second: Whether Sara, Abraham's wife, was truly his sister; the third: Whether, because Abraham refused to worship fire at the command of the Chaldees, he was cast by them into the fire and thence miraculously freed by God; the fourth: Whether Thare, Abraham's father, was a worshipper of idols; the fifth: Whether Abraham ever worshipped idols, or was always a worshipper of the true God.

Praefatio to the Third Part. Outlines its five disputations: (1) was Abraham Thare's firstborn; (2) was Sara truly Abraham's sister; (3) the Chaldean-fire legend (cast in for refusing fire-worship, divinely rescued); (4) was Thare an idolater; (5) did Abraham ever worship idols.

FOURTEENTH DISPUTATION. Upon those same words: 'Thare, when he was seventy years old, begot Abram, Nachor, and Aran.' Whether Abraham was the firstborn of Thare, and whether Sara his wife was his uterine sister or not.

Disp. 14 title (the 14th disputation of Liber XVI overall; first of the Third Part). On Gen 11:26/27 — whether Abraham was Thare's firstborn, and whether his wife Sara was his full (uterine) sister.

If Thare in the seventieth year of his age began to beget those three sons, and in that seventieth year (as was shown above) Abraham was begotten, it

must be that the other two were begotten after Abraham, and that Abraham was the firstborn of his father Thare. But on the contrary a very weighty argument is opposed to this opinion. For if Abraham, as was the opinion of many, married Sara the daughter of Aran his brother, while Abraham was ten years older than Sara (as Genesis 17 records): if Abraham had been the firstborn, and so older than Aran, it would be necessary that Aran begot his daughter Sara before the tenth year of his age, which is incredible. Therefore Abraham was not the firstborn of Thare, nor born in his seventieth year. From which it appears that the treatment of this disputation is necessary for the full and complete explanation and confirmation of the preceding disputation.

§205. The case for Abraham being firstborn (Thare began begetting at 70, and Abraham was born that year, so the others came later). The grave counter-argument: if (per many) Abraham married Sara, daughter of his brother Aran, and Abraham was 10 years older than Sara (Gen 17), then were Abraham the eldest, Aran would have had to beget Sara before age 10 — incredible. So Abraham was not the firstborn nor born in Thare's 70th year. This disputation thus completes the previous one (Disp. 13).

Many authors, both of the ancients and of more recent times, neither obscure nor ignoble, moved and persuaded by the argument I have just set out, thought that Sara was the true sister of Abraham, yet not uterine; that is, born of the same father but not of the same mother.

§206 (begins). The first view: many notable authors held Sara was Abraham's true but half-sister — same father (Thare), different mother (continues next page).

— p. 628 (PDF) · printed p. 555 —

This opinion seems to have pleased Clement of Alexandria, whose words near the end of the second book of the Stromata are these: “Abraham said of his wife, ‘She is my sister, the daughter of my father, but not of my mother’ — teaching that those who are born of the same mother are not to be taken as wives.” To the same opinion adhered Lippomanus in the Catena on the twentieth chapter of Genesis, and Soto, book 2 On Justice and Law, question three. Cajetan, moreover, without any doubt holds this

same thing: for on those words of the eleventh chapter, “The name of Abraham's wife Sara, and the name of Nachor's wife Melcha, daughter of Aran, father of Melcha and of Iescha,” he writes thus: “From the fact that, in naming the wives of Abraham and Nachor as Sara and Melcha, it is said of Melcha alone that she was the daughter of Aran, an argument is had that Sara was not the daughter of Aran. For it is not established that Sara was called by two names, namely Sare and Iescha; for that is much more reasonably rejected than easily asserted.”

§206 (concl.). Proponents of the half-sister view: Clement of Alexandria (Stromata bk. 2, quoting Abraham's ‘daughter of my father not my mother’), Lippomanus (Catena on Gen 20), and Soto (De Iustitia et Iure bk. 2 q. 3). Cajetan's argument from Gen 11: since only Melcha is called ‘daughter of Aran,’ Sara was not Aran's daughter — and identifying Sara with Iescha (a double name) is more reasonably rejected than asserted. Margin: 'Clement of Alexandria; Genesis 20; Lippomanus; Dominic de Soto; Cajetan.'

But the same Cajetan, on the twentieth chapter of Genesis, weighing those words of Abraham about Sara his wife, “Truly she is my sister, the daughter of my father but not of my mother,” teaches this same thing with much plainer words and greater assertion; for he writes thus: “Josephus reports that Sara was the daughter of Aran his brother, and the carnal sister of Lot. But that Josephus sometimes writes against the text of Moses is clear to those comparing Moses's History with his books of Jewish Antiquities; and therefore it is no wonder if in this matter too he invented something. For according to the propriety of the aforesaid words of Moses, it is plainly said that Sara was the carnal sister of Abraham, yet not uterine. If he had said merely, ‘She is my sister,’ I would go (says Cajetan) with the common sense; but by adding, ‘she is the daughter of my father, but not of my mother,’ it is plainly signified that she was the daughter of his father, and not [the daughter] of his grandfather or of his brother: and this is the literal sense.”

§207. Cajetan, on Gen 20, more emphatically: Josephus's claim that Sara was Aran's daughter (Lot's full sister) contradicts Moses, and Josephus is known to deviate from the text. Abraham's ‘daughter of my father, not of my mother’ plainly makes Sara a carnal but non-uterine sister — not his

grandfather's or brother's daughter. This is the literal sense.

“For marriage with a non-uterine sister was then lawful. For if by the name ‘father’ Abraham had understood his grandfather, he would not have added the signification, ‘not the daughter of my mother.’ And again, just as he uses the name ‘mother’ properly, so also ‘father.’ Finally, if by those words, ‘Truly she is my sister, of my father but not of my mother,’ a carnal non-uterine sister is not signified — by what other words, I ask you (even if you should wish to invent them), could you demonstrate it more clearly and significantly?” Thus Cajetan. Nor does blessed Jerome seem to have shrunk from this opinion. For he, in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis, on those words of the twentieth chapter, “For truly she is my sister, of my father but not of my mother,” says that she was the daughter of his brother Aran, but not of his sister. But because in the Hebrew, says Jerome, it is thus: “Truly she is my sister, not the daughter of my mother,” which rather sounds that Sara was the sister of Abraham — in his excuse we say that such marriages were not yet at that time prohibited by the law of Moses. Thus Jerome there.

§207 (concl.) + §208 (begins). Cajetan finishes: such marriage was then lawful; ‘father’ and ‘mother’ are used properly, and no words could signify a non-uterine sister more clearly. §208: Jerome too leans this way — on Gen 20 he says Sara was daughter of Abraham's brother Aran (not his sister), yet notes the Hebrew (‘not the daughter of my mother’) sounds as if Sara were Abraham's sister, excused because such marriages were not yet forbidden by Mosaic law. Margin: 'Josephus; Jerome.'

Yet the same Jerome, in the same book, on the eleventh chapter of Genesis, following the contrary opinion, says that Aran the brother of Abraham begot two daughters, Melcha and Sara, who by another name was called Iescha; and Melcha indeed Nachor took to wife, but Sara, Abraham — both being brothers of Aran himself; for marriages between paternal uncles and brothers' daughters had not yet been prohibited by law, which among the first men [were entered into] even between brothers and sisters…

§208 (cont.). But Jerome elsewhere (same work, on Gen 11) takes the CONTRARY view: Aran begot two daughters, Melcha and Sara (= Iescha); Nachor married Melcha, Abraham married Sara — both

being Aran's brothers, since uncle–niece marriages were not yet forbidden, as among the first men even brother–sister marriages were (continues next page).

— p. 629 (PDF) · printed p. 556 —

…were entered into. Thus far from Jerome. But it is not to be understood from Jerome's words that marriages between a paternal uncle and a brother's daughter were forbidden by the Mosaic law; since not even in the eighteenth chapter of Leviticus, among the degrees of consanguinity and affinity prohibited for contracting matrimony — which are there all distinctly and explicitly recounted — is any mention made of marriage between an uncle and a brother's daughter; and that such marriage was lawful and customary after the law of Moses is shown by the example of Othoniel, who married Axa the daughter of Caleb his brother, as is written in the book of Judges, first chapter. But I return to the first opinion: which not even Tostatus dissembles to be (as he himself says) quite reasonable and consonant with the text of scripture; but he nevertheless does not follow it, because the common opinion of the Doctors is to the contrary, and because such marriage seems to have been unlawful in Abraham's time. But the followers of that opinion utterly deny this.

§208 (concl.) + §209. Pererius clarifies: Jerome's words do not mean uncle–niece marriage was Mosaically forbidden — Leviticus 18's prohibited degrees never list it, and Othoniel's marriage to Axa, daughter of his brother Caleb (Judges 1), shows it was lawful even after the Law. §209: Tostatus admits the half-sister (first) opinion is reasonable and scriptural, but declines it because the common opinion opposes it and such marriage seems to have been unlawful in Abraham's day — which the first opinion's followers deny. Margin: 'Tostatus on Genesis 11.'

Nor for confirming that opinion are arguments, both many and firm, lacking. First argument. In the eleventh chapter it stands thus: “Abraham and Nachor took two wives: the name of Abraham's wife Sarai, and the name of Nachor's wife Melcha, daughter of Aran, father of Melcha and father of Iescha.” Behold, if Sara had been the daughter of Aran, then, as this was said of Melcha, so would it have been said of Sara. That answer of certain people does not please — that it was said of Sara under the name

Iescha, as if Abraham's wife had a double name, one Sarai and the other Iescha: this answer, I say, does not seem to be approved; for it is not credible that Moses wished there to play on the ambiguity of a word. For why, when he called her Sarai both in that chapter and ever after in this book always names her by that name, would he have named her just once by the name Iescha, without indicating that these two names belonged to the same woman? Certainly, if anyone not preoccupied by some opinion reads that narration of Moses, he will doubtless understand and believe that Sarai was one woman and Iescha another.

§210 (first argument for the half-sister view). Gen 11 calls only Melcha ‘daughter of Aran’; had Sara been Aran's daughter, it would say so of her too. The counter-claim that Sara = Iescha (a double name) is rejected: Moses would not pun obscurely, calling her Sarai everywhere but Iescha just once without noting they are the same — a plain reader takes Sarai and Iescha as two different women.

Second argument. The words of Moses which follow next in that place strengthen this opinion even more. For he subjoins: “Thare took Abraham his son, and Lot the son of Aran his son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, the wife of Abraham his son.” If Sara had been the daughter of Aran, as Lot was the son of Aran — just as Moses named Lot the son of Aran, so too would he have named Sara his daughter. And since the bond and kinship between a grandfather and granddaughter is much greater than between a father-in-law and a daughter-in-law, Moses ought not to have said of Thare, “He took Sarai his daughter-in-law,” but ought to have said, “Thare took his granddaughter,” or “the daughter of his son.”

§211 (second argument). Gen 11:31 calls Sarai only Thare's ‘daughter-in-law’ (wife of his son Abram). Had she been Aran's daughter, Moses would have named her Thare's granddaughter — the closer relationship — just as he named Lot ‘son of Aran.’

Third argument: it was indicated above, when we recounted Cajetan's words; it is taken from the words which Abraham said to King Abimelech, who expostulated with him that he had deceived him by saying Sara was his sister when in fact she was his wife. For Abraham answered him thus: “Truly she is my sister, the daughter of my father, and not the daughter of

my mother, and I took her to wife.” These words plainly declare Sara to be the full [sister]…

§212 (begins — third argument). From Abraham's reply to Abimelech (Gen 20:12): ‘Truly she is my sister, the daughter of my father and not of my mother, and I took her to wife’ — plainly making Sara a full (but non-uterine) sister (continues next page).

— p. 630 (PDF) · printed p. 557 —

…to have been the sister of Abraham, yet not uterine: for this is signified both by that, “Truly she is my sister,” and also by that, “The daughter of my father, but not of my mother”; for a non-uterine sister could not be signified more openly or expressly by other words. Fourth argument: If Sara was not truly the sister of Abraham, then Abraham deceived and led into error King Abimelech, who, taking Abraham's words according to their proper signification and sense, believed Sara to be the true sister of Abraham, and therefore not his wife.

§212 (concl.) + fourth argument. The phrases ‘truly my sister’ and ‘daughter of my father, not of my mother’ could not more expressly denote a non-uterine sister. Fourth argument: if Sara were not truly Abraham's sister, Abraham would have deceived Abimelech, who took the words in their proper sense and believed her his sister, not his wife.

And this indeed is the opinion of many grave and noble writers, as we have shown. Of these, most thought that at that time marriage between non-uterine brothers and sisters was lawful; and this Clement of Alexandria held, and blessed Jerome signifies (in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis, on the twentieth chapter); and the same Cajetan, Lippomanus, and Soto thought. To which opinion they wish credit to be built from this, that Thamar said to her brother Amnon, who wished to violate and oppress her (as is written in the second book of Kings, thirteenth chapter): “Do not, my brother,” she said, “do this folly; but rather speak to the king, and he will not deny me to you.” The girl therefore believed that, although such a marriage was then forbidden by Moses's law, nevertheless — because she had heard it had once before the law been customary among the Patriarchs — it could even then be granted by dispensation of the law, especially as

she vehemently desired it through hope [of escape]. Some also think Abraham contracted this marriage from a certain singular revelation of God, namely that Abraham, who was to beget a faithful people, might take for that office a fitting wife — a religious and faithful sister. Nor are there lacking those who, led by that law of Justinian — that marriage between brother and sister is prohibited, whether born of both the same parents or of only one; but that if she became a sister by adoption, it is prohibited as long as the adoption remains, while if by emancipation the adoption is dissolved, marriage can rightly be entered between them — led, I say, by this law, conjecture that it could have happened that Sara was Thare's adoptive daughter, whom afterward, emancipated from her adoptive father, Abraham could lawfully take to wife.

§213. Summary of the first opinion (Sara = half-sister) and why such marriage was lawful then: most proponents (Clement, Jerome, Cajetan, Lippomanus, Soto) say non-uterine sibling marriage was permitted before the Law — supported by Thamar's words to Amnon (2 Sam 13:13). Variants: some say Abraham married her by a special divine revelation (a fit, faithful wife for the father of the faithful people); others, citing Justinian's law (sibling marriage barred, but allowed after an adoptive tie is dissolved by emancipation), conjecture Sara was Thare's adopted daughter whom Abraham could lawfully marry once emancipated. Margin: 'Clement of Alexandria; St. Jerome; Cajetan; Lippomanus; Soto; Hamerus on Genesis; Justinian, Institutes bk. [1].'

The other is the well-nigh common opinion of the doctors: that Sara was the daughter of Aran, the brother of Abraham, and the true sister of Lot; but that, by the custom of the Hebrew nation — which called a paternal or maternal uncle, and the son or daughter of a brother, ‘brothers’ or ‘sisters’ — Abraham called her his sister; just as the same Abraham, in chapter thirteen of this book, called Lot, his brother's son, his ‘brother,’ and in chapter 29 Laban called Jacob ‘brother,’ who was the son of Rebecca his sister. That the Romans too did not shrink from this manner of speaking, Cicero indicated not obscurely at the beginning of the fifth book of On Ends, where he called Lucius Cicero, his cousin, ‘brother.’ For the Romans [called] sons…

§214 (begins — the Author's own opinion). The nearly common view of the doctors, which Pererius adopts: Sara was the daughter of Aran (Abraham's brother) and true sister of Lot, but called ‘sister’ by the Hebrew idiom that names uncles and a brother's children ‘brothers/sisters’ — as Abraham called his nephew Lot ‘brother’ (Gen 13) and Laban called Jacob, his sister Rebecca's son, ‘brother’ (Gen 29). The Romans spoke likewise: Cicero (On Ends, bk. 5 opening) called his cousin Lucius Cicero ‘brother’ (continues next page). Margin: 'The author's opinion: that Sara was not the carnal sister of Abraham but the daughter of his brother; Cicero.'

— p. 631 (PDF) · printed p. 558 —

…[the sons] of two [brothers] they called ‘patrueles’ (paternal cousins), the sons of two sisters ‘consobrini’ (maternal cousins), but the sons of a brother and a sister ‘amitini.’

§214 (concl.). The Roman kinship vocabulary completing the point that kindred are loosely called ‘brothers’: sons of two brothers = patrueles, sons of two sisters = consobrini, sons of a brother and sister = amitini.

But hear Augustine, narrating and confirming in clearest words the very thing I have taught: for in the twenty-second book against Faustus, chapter thirty-five, he writes thus: “Since Abraham lived among human affairs at a time when brothers born of both parents, or of one or the other, could not be joined in marriage, while the sons of brothers, and others kindred in a more distant degree of stock, custom joined together, prohibited by no law and no authority — what wonder if he had as wife his sister, that is, one procreated from the blood of his father? For he himself said this in giving her back to the king, that she was his sister on the father's side, not on the mother's. Where certainly he was constrained by no fear to lie that she was his sister, since the king had learned she was his wife, and, divinely terrified, was restoring her unmoved. But that those more distant sisters are wont to be called among the ancients by the general name of consanguineous [kin], Scripture attests. For Tobias the younger called her whom he took to wife ‘sister,’ not indeed born of the same mother or of his mother's stock, but sprung from the same tribe of kindred. And Lot is called the brother of Abraham, of whom yet the same scripture declares Abraham to have been the uncle. Similarly in the Gospel the ‘brethren’ of

the Lord are named, not sons of the same mother, but near in the same consanguinity.” Thus Augustine there, writing the same also in the sixteenth book of the City of God, chapter nineteen, whom St. Thomas followed (Secunda Secundae, question one hundred and ten).

§215. Pererius adduces Augustine (Contra Faustum 22.35; City of God 16.19; followed by Aquinas, Summa II-II q.110) in support — chiefly for the principle that kindred were loosely called ‘brothers/sisters’ (Tobias's wife a ‘sister’ of the same tribe; Lot called Abraham's ‘brother’ though his nephew; the Lord's ‘brethren’ as near kin). The quoted passage also frames Sara as a father's-side sister and notes Abraham did not lie to Abimelech, being under no compulsion. Margin: 'Augustine; Tobit 6 & 8; Gen 11 & 13; Matthew 13 and elsewhere; St. Thomas; Josephus.'

But the most ancient author of this opinion is Josephus, who in the first book of the Antiquities writes thus: “Abraham took in marriage Sara the daughter of his brother Aran, and adopted Lot, the son of the same [Aran], as a son to himself, because they were his near kin.” And Josephus intimates that this was done when Abraham, at God's admonition, was setting out from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan. Yet this saying of Josephus may not be likely [in one part]: since after Abraham's coming into the land of Canaan, as Moses narrates in the thirteenth chapter, Abraham called Lot his brother, saying to him: “Let there be no quarrel, I pray, between me and you, and between my shepherds and your shepherds: for we are brothers”; but if Lot had been his son by adoption, he would not have called him brother, but son.

§216. The most ancient witness for the niece view is Josephus (Antiquities bk. 1): Abraham married Sara, daughter of his brother Aran, and adopted Aran's son Lot — done as he left Mesopotamia. Pererius accepts the marriage but doubts the adoption of Lot: Gen 13 has Abraham call Lot ‘brother’ (‘for we are brothers’), not ‘son.’ Margin: 'Josephus.'

There are those who think Chrysostom was averse from this opinion; with whom I by no means agree. I will set down Chrysostom's words from his forty-fifth homily on Genesis, where, explaining that saying of Abraham in the twentieth chapter of Genesis, “For she is my sister by the father, but not by the mother,” he says thus: “And she calls the same one ‘father’ whom I too call father; therefore I also called her sister.” Chrysostom does not say

‘because she has the same father as I,’ but ‘because she calls [him] the same father’: for since Thare was the grandfather of Sara herself, Sara rightly named him her father; for just as grandfathers are wont to call grandsons and granddaughters their sons or daughters, so in turn grandsons and granddaughters call their grandfathers their fathers. There was besides a certain special and chief reason why Sara did this: for Aran her father had died long before Thare; wherefore Sara, her father being dead, held Thare not only in the place of a grandfather but also of a father. But it does not pertain [to recount] more approvers and defenders of this opinion…

§217 (begins). Against those who enlist Chrysostom for the half-sister view, Pererius argues Chrysostom (Homily 45 on Genesis) actually supports the niece view: explaining Gen 20:12, Chrysostom says Sara ‘calls the same one father’ — i.e. she called Thare (her grandfather) ‘father,’ as grandchildren do, all the more since her real father Aran had died long before Thare. Margin: 'Chrysostom.'

— p. 632 (PDF) · printed p. 559 —

…[approvers and defenders] to be named, since this is, as I said, the common opinion of the Doctors; and that not even blessed Jerome himself was outside it is sufficiently indicated by what he writes in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis on the eleventh chapter, whose words we recounted a little above. And since Josephus, who lived in that age of Christ the Lord and the Apostles, held this, it is very credible that this was at that time the opinion among the Hebrews and of the Synagogue.

§217 (concl.). The niece view is the common opinion of the doctors; even Jerome (on Gen 11) was within it; and since Josephus (who lived in the apostolic age) held it, it was very likely the Hebrew and Synagogue view of that time. Margin: 'Jerome.'

This opinion is moreover confirmed by many and strong reasons. First reason. It is set down in the eleventh chapter of Genesis that Aran, who was the brother of Abraham and Nachor, begot two daughters, Melcha I say and Iescha; since therefore Nachor joined Melcha to himself in matrimony, it is likely that Abraham too married the other daughter of Aran, who was called Iescha, and she by another name was called Sarai. For this must have

been most desired and most pleasing to Thare and to Abraham and to Iescha (Sara) herself — especially since it was the custom of those Patriarchs to take wives not of another race and nation, but of their own race and stock. Wherefore Abraham adjured his servant not to take a wife for his son Isaac of the Chanaanite nation: “But you shall go,” he said, “to my land and my kindred, and thence shall take a wife for my son Isaac.” And Isaac himself, sending his son Jacob into Mesopotamia: “Do not,” he said, “take a wife of the nation of Chanaan; but go to the house of Bathuel your mother's father, and take thence a wife for yourself of the daughters of Laban your uncle.”

§218 (first confirming reason). Gen 11 says Aran begot two daughters, Melcha and Iescha; Nachor married Melcha, so Abraham likely married the other, Iescha (= Sarai) — pleasing to all and fitting the patriarchs' custom of marrying within their own stock (cf. Abraham's charge to his servant about Isaac, Gen 24; Isaac's charge to Jacob, Gen 28). Margin: 'That Sara was not the full sister of Abraham is proved by three reasons'; 'Gen 24 & 28.'

Second reason. From Moses's own narration no slight argument is drawn that Sara was not the daughter of Thare and the sister of Abraham. For Moses writes thus in the eleventh chapter: “Thare took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Aran his son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, the wife of Abram his son, and brought them out of Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Chanaan.” If Sara had been the daughter of Thare — since the bond of father and daughter is far greater than that of father-in-law and daughter-in-law — Moses would not have called Sara the daughter-in-law of Thare, but his daughter. So the argument which those draw from this place who think Sara was not the daughter of Aran, the brother of Abraham, but the sister of Abraham himself — because Moses here did not call Sara the daughter of Aran, as he did Lot, but only the daughter-in-law of Thare and wife of Abraham — this argument, I say, if it has any force, certainly has more against them than against us; for by a like reasoning of argument we can [conclude] that Sara was not the daughter of Thare, since Moses would rather have called her the daughter of Thare than his daughter-in-law.

§219 (second reason). Gen 11:31 calls Sarai only Thare's ‘daughter-in-law,’ not his daughter — so she was not Thare's daughter (hence not Abraham's sister). Pererius turns the opponents' own argument (that Moses calls Lot ‘son of Aran’ but not Sara) back on them: by the same logic, the failure to call her Thare's daughter shows she was not his daughter.

Third reason. In Abraham's time marriage between brother and sister, whether born of both parents or of only one, was neither in use nor lawful: therefore Sara the wife of Abraham was not his sister; for it is not right to believe that the marriage of the holy persons Abraham and Sara was contracted against the custom and honorable institutions of upright men of that time. That this kind of marriage was not customary or lawful at that time is clear from this argument: that Abraham for this reason persuaded Sara that, concealing that she was his wife, she should say she was his sister — as if she who was [his] sister could not also be [his wife]…

§220 (begins — third reason). Sibling marriage (full or half) was neither customary nor lawful in Abraham's day; one cannot believe these holy people married against the upright custom of their time. Proof: Abraham had Sara conceal being his wife by claiming to be his sister — implying sister and wife were mutually exclusive (continues at printed 560, PDF 663). Margin: 'That marriage between brothers and sisters was not lawful in Abraham's time.'

— p. 633 (PDF) · printed p. 550: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 634 (PDF) · printed p. 551: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 635 (PDF) · printed p. 542: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 636 (PDF) · printed p. 543: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 637 (PDF) · printed p. 534: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 638 (PDF) · printed p. 535: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 639 (PDF) · printed p. 536: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 640 (PDF) · printed p. 537: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 641 (PDF) · printed p. 538: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 642 (PDF) · printed p. 539: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 643 (PDF) · printed p. 540: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 644 (PDF) · printed p. 541: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 645 (PDF) · printed p. 542: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 646 (PDF) · printed p. 543: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 647 (PDF) · printed p. 544: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 648 (PDF) · printed p. 545: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 649 (PDF) · printed p. 546: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 650 (PDF) · printed p. 547: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 651 (PDF) · printed p. 548: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 652 (PDF) · printed p. 549: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 653 (PDF) · printed p. 550: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 654 (PDF) · printed p. 551: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 655 (PDF) · printed p. 552: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 656 (PDF) · printed p. 553: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 657 (PDF) · printed p. 554: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 658 (PDF) · printed p. 555: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 659 (PDF) · printed p. 556: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 660 (PDF) · printed p. 557: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 661 (PDF) · printed p. 558: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 662 (PDF) · printed p. 559: duplicate scan, omitted —

— p. 663 (PDF) · printed p. 560 —

…also be [his] wife: wherefore as soon as Abimelech recognized that Sara was the wife of Abraham, he understood without doubt that she was not [his] true sister; and by the same indication he afterward detected likewise that Rebecca was truly the wife of Isaac, and not his full sister, as Moses narrates below in the twenty-sixth chapter.

§220 (concl.). The proof that sibling marriage was not lawful, completed: Abimelech, once he learned Sara was Abraham's wife, concluded she was not truly his sister — and inferred the same of Rebecca and Isaac (Gen 26). So ‘sister’ and ‘wife’ were taken as mutually exclusive.

There is added to the confirmation of this matter that marriage between brother and sister, since it is in the first degree of consanguinity, is forbidden by natural law. There exists in Innocent [III] the chapter ‘Gaudemus’ on Divorces, a decree that marriages of this kind among unbelievers, when they come to the faith of Christ, are to be rescinded and dissolved as invalid and utterly null. For that evasion of the distinction of a uterine and a non-uterine sister — first invented by Clement of Alexandria, and afterward approved both by Cajetan and also by certain others — since it rests on no probable reason, is most weak, and was refuted and rejected by Augustine (book 22 against Faustus, chapter 35, whose words we set out a little above). But that others have said Abraham did this from a singular revelation and concession of God — since this can by no means be proved from sacred scripture — is rashly said, and with the same ease with which it is said, it is despised.

§221. Confirmation against the half-sister view: sibling marriage is barred by natural law (first degree); Innocent III's decretal ‘Gaudemus’ (on Divorce) nullifies such marriages of converts. The uterine/non-uterine distinction (Clement, Cajetan) is groundless and was refuted by Augustine (Contra Faustum 22.35); the ‘special revelation’ defense is unprovable and dismissed. Margin: 'Pope Innocent; Augustine.'

But what some have said — that Sara was the adoptive daughter of Thare and the sister of Abraham — is exploded with a double error: both because, since it is said without any reason, it is rashly said, and so is to be reckoned as nothing; and because, even if it were so, it would follow that Sara was not the true wife of Abraham, or could not rightly be called his sister: for while the adoption remained, she could not be his lawful wife, as we have shown; but the adoption being dissolved, she would at the same time cease altogether to be a sister — whereas it is not permitted even to doubt that she was his lawful wife, and he himself said that she was truly called by him his sister.

§222. The adoptive-daughter theory (from §213, via Justinian's law) is rejected on a double error: it is asserted without reason, and it is self-defeating — while the adoption stands Sara could not be Abraham's lawful wife, and once dissolved she would no longer be a ‘sister’; yet she was indubitably his lawful wife and truly called his sister.

Finally, that marriage of brothers and sisters was not, in Abraham's times, in use among upright men, nor lawful, is the express opinion of Augustine. For besides that passage I just named from book 22 against Faustus, where he hands this down in the plainest words, he confirms the same also in book 15 of the City of God, chapter 16, where, disputing about the marriage of brothers and sisters which at the beginning of the world, on account of the fewness of men, had been practiced under compelling necessity, he says thus: “Which marriage indeed, the more ancient it is under compelling necessity, the more damnable it became afterward, when religion forbade it.” And a little below: “It was,” he says, “a matter of religious care to the ancient fathers, lest kinship itself, gradually severing through the ranks of the generations, should go further off and cease to be kinship — to gather it again, while not yet far removed, by the bond of matrimony, and in a manner to call back kinship as it fled. Whence, even when the earth was now full of men, they did not indeed [choose] sisters born of their father or mother, or of both their parents, yet they loved to take wives of their own stock.”

§223. Augustine's express testimony (besides Contra Faustum 22.35, also City of God 15.16): sibling marriage, practiced from necessity at the world's start, became damnable once religion forbade it; the ancient fathers married within their kindred (to keep kinship from dissolving) but no longer took actual sisters. Margin: 'Augustine.'

And a little before these words, when he had spoken of the avoidance of marriage of sisters and brothers, he had said thus: “Which,” he says, “as the human race grows…”

§224 (begins). A further Augustine excerpt (City of God 15.16) on the avoidance of sibling marriage — ‘as the human race grows…’ (continues next page).

— p. 664 (PDF) · printed p. 561 —

“…and multiplies, we see this observed even among the impious worshippers of the many false gods, so that even if fraternal marriages are permitted by perverse laws, yet a better custom prefers to shrink from that license itself; and although in the first times of the human race it was wholly lawful to take sisters in marriage, [custom] so abhors it as if it could never have been lawful. For custom is most powerful to allure or to offend human feeling; and since in this case it restrains the immoderation of concupiscence, [a custom] perverting and corrupting it would deservedly be judged nefarious. For if it is unjust, from greed of possessing, to transgress the boundary of fields, how much more unjust is it, from the lust of lying together, to subvert the boundary of morals?” Thus Augustine.

§224 (concl.). Augustine's excerpt completed: even pagans came to abhor sibling marriage; custom powerfully shapes feeling, and to transgress the ‘boundary of morals’ by lust is worse than to encroach on a neighbor's fields.

But what Augustine said — that fraternal marriages were permitted by perverse laws among some nations — doubtless pertains to the Persians and Egyptians, who practiced marriages of sisters and brothers without any scruple. “The Egyptians (says Diodorus) sanctioned this law, contrary to the common custom of all, that a sister be taken as wife by a brother.” Which law and custom a certain pagan poet [Euripides] execrates as plainly

barbarous and beastly: “Such,” he says, “is every barbarian race: father is mingled with daughter, son with mother, sister with brother.” The marriage indeed of Ptolemy Philadelphus, king of Egypt, with his sister Arsinoe, the poet Theocritus celebrated in verses with base flattery, comparing it to the marriage of Jupiter and Juno; but Pausanias, with sounder judgment and a truer opinion, condemned it as contrary to the honorable institutions of the Macedonians and conformable to the most foul customs of the Egyptians. Moreover, how indecent the marriage and commingling of brother and sister is — whether born of both or of only one parent — and how repugnant to natural reverence and honor, the most base and atrocious penalty sufficiently shows by which God willed those who attempted it to be punished, associating and comparing that commingling with the commingling by which one lies with a beast or a male. For thus it is written in Leviticus 20: {He who shall take his sister, the daughter of his father or the daughter of his mother, and shall see her shame, and she shall behold her brother's disgrace: they have done a nefarious thing; they shall be slain in the sight of their people, because they have mutually revealed their shame; and they shall bear their iniquity.}

§225. Augustine's ‘perverse laws’ point applied: the Persians and Egyptians practiced sibling marriage shamelessly (Diodorus, bk. 1; Euripides condemns it as barbarous; Theocritus flattered Ptolemy II Philadelphus's marriage to his sister Arsinoe, but Pausanias condemned it). Its gravity is shown by Lev 20, which ranks brother–sister incest with bestiality and sodomy and decrees death. Margin: 'Among which nations marriages between brothers and sisters were in use; Diodorus bk. 1 ch. 2; Euripides in Andromeda; Ptolemy Philadelphus; Theocritus; Pausanias in the Attica; Leviticus 20.'

It remains that we briefly dissolve the reasons set out above for the contrary opinion, which seem to oppose this opinion. First, that Moses did not call Sara the daughter of Thare's son [Aran], the cause was that she was already joined in matrimony to Abraham, which was more honorable [to note]. And this argument, as I said above, is more forcibly and validly turned back upon the adversaries: for if Sara had been the daughter of Thare, as these wish, why would Moses not rather have called her the

daughter of Thare than his daughter-in-law? But that Sara was the same who is there called by the name Iescha is the opinion of Jerome, Augustine, and several other noble writers. Perhaps before Thare [led] his family…

§226 (begins). Pererius now dissolves the opponents' arguments. First: Moses called Sara Thare's ‘daughter-in-law’ (not ‘daughter of Aran’) because she was already Abraham's wife, the more honorable title — and the argument rebounds on the opponents (else why not call her Thare's daughter?). That Sara = Iescha is held by Jerome, Augustine, and others (continues next page).

— p. 665 (PDF) · printed p. 562 —

…led his family out of Chaldea, [Sara] was called either by both names, or even more frequently by the name Iescha; but afterward she was generally called Sara. And to what purpose would Moses have inserted the name Iescha in that place, if she had not pertained to Abraham or to Nachor? Nor indeed did Abraham, when he said Sara was his sister, deceive King Abimelech: for he said what was true, although Abimelech understood it otherwise than it was said. And perhaps the name ‘sister,’ said simply, was not — in Egypt or in the region of Canaan, as in Chaldea or in the family of Thare — in use as much for a true sister as for a brother's daughter, but only for the daughter of the same father or mother.

§226 (concl.). Before the migration Sara was called Iescha (or both names); Moses named Iescha there precisely because she married into the family (Abraham). Abraham did not deceive Abimelech — he spoke truly, though Abimelech misunderstood; perhaps in Egypt/Canaan ‘sister’ (unlike in Chaldea) meant only a true sister, not a niece, hence the misunderstanding. Margin: 'A passage of Genesis ch. 20.'

That phrase, moreover, from the twentieth chapter of Genesis, “Truly she is my sister,” was not said by Abraham to signify that Sara was his true and full sister (that is, immediately begotten of the same father), but to show that he had not lied when he said she was his sister; for it was truly said, because [members] of his own race and family, and the son or daughter of the same father, but also truly the son or daughter of an uncle and of brothers, were truly named brothers and sisters. So that adverb ‘truly’ is not joined with the word ‘sister’ as though he said she was his true and full

sister, but pertains to the truth of the statement which Abraham had made; so that the sense is: “I did not lie when I said she was my sister, for truly — that is, really — she is my sister.” But he added also that, “The daughter of my father, and not of my mother,” because all who were of Thare's family called him father; and it is credible that Thare begot Abraham of one wife, and that same Aran, the father of Lot and Sara, of another.

§227. Reconciling Gen 20:12 with the niece view: the ‘truly’ in ‘truly she is my sister’ affirms the truth of Abraham's statement (he didn't lie), not that she was a full sister — since kin (including a brother's children) were truly called ‘brother/sister.’ And ‘daughter of my father, not my mother’ works because all Thare's family called him ‘father,’ and Abraham and Aran (Sara's father) were likely born of different wives of Thare.

It remains that we respond very briefly to the principal argument set out above at the beginning of this disputation. We argued that Sara was not the daughter of Aran the brother of Abraham, in this way: Sara was only ten years younger than Abraham; but Abraham had been born before Aran, since Moses, in recounting the sons of Thare, named first Abraham, second Nachor, third Aran; therefore Aran would have begotten Sara before the tenth year of his age, which is incredible: therefore either Sara was not the daughter of Aran, or Abraham was not the firstborn. To this, then, it must be answered thus: that Abraham was really not the firstborn of Thare's sons, but many years later than Aran himself; and that he is recounted first among the sons of Thare not only on account of the excellence of his virtue, or on account of the prerogative of dignity because he would be the father of many nations and of the people of God — indeed, of all believers — but because he was truly begotten in that seventieth year of Thare's age, while Aran [was begotten] many years before. And because Moses wished to name only that year of Thare in which Abraham was begotten, so that through it the series and order of the times might be continued, therefore he marked the birth of Abraham in Thare's seventieth year. But Nachor and Aran…

§228 (begins). Answering the opening dilemma (§205): Abraham was NOT the firstborn — Aran was many years older. Abraham is named first by dignity (father of many nations / the people of God / all

believers, cf. Rom 4) and because he was born in Thare's 70th year, which Moses used as the chronological anchor; Nachor and Aran were begotten earlier (continues next page). Margin: 'Genesis 17; Romans 4.'

— p. 666 (PDF) · printed p. 563 —

…he named for this reason, that they too pertained in a manner to the series of this History: Nachor indeed on account of the wives of Isaac and Jacob, who traced their descent from him; but Aran on account of Lot and Sara.

§228 (concl.). Moses named Nachor and Aran because they bear on the history — Nachor as ancestor of the wives of Isaac (Rebecca) and Jacob (Leah, Rachel), Aran as father of Lot and Sara. Margin: 'Genesis 24; below, ch. 29.'

Therefore, of those words of Moses, “Thare lived seventy years and begot Abraham, Nachor, and Aran,” this is the genuine and truest understanding: when Thare was seventy years old, he had already begotten those three sons; but in such wise that in his seventieth year he begot Abraham, while before him he had begotten Nachor, and before both he had begotten Aran, who may be believed to have been begotten in Thare's fortieth or fiftieth year. Since therefore the whole way of that argumentation rested on taking it for certain that Abraham was the firstborn of all Thare's sons, this being removed, the conclusion of that reasoning must be weakened and made null — that conclusion, I say, that Sara was not the daughter of Aran the brother of Abraham.

§229. The true sense of Gen 11:26: by his 70th year Thare had begotten all three — Abraham in the 70th year, Nachor before him, and Aran first (around Thare's 40th or 50th year). Since the opponents' argument rested on Abraham being firstborn, it collapses, and so does their conclusion that Sara was not Aran's daughter.

Besides, someone could say that Sara was not the daughter of Aran, nor was she the one Moses named Iescha, but was born of some other son of Thare whom he begot before the seventieth year in which Abraham was born. So one may suppose that Thare, before those three sons Abraham, Nachor, and Aran, begot of a different wife some others, or some one from whom Sara was born; and that Moses was silent about those sons because

they did not pertain to the argument and series of the History which Moses had undertaken to write. Just as those ancient fathers, whom Moses narrates to have lived before and after the flood, begot other sons even earlier than those Moses mentions — as Augustine teaches in book 15, and as we have proved in book 7 of our Commentaries on Genesis, in the Disputation on the Chronology described before the flood, question four. And with this solution admitted, some inconvenience is avoided by which the opinion of those who think Sara was the daughter of Aran the brother of Abraham seemed to be pressed; and at the same time it can be conceded that Abraham was elder in birth than Nachor and Aran.

§230. An alternative solution: Sara may have been the daughter of some other, unnamed, earlier son of Thare (not Aran, not Iescha) — Moses omitting such sons as irrelevant to his history, just as the pre/post-flood patriarchs had earlier unnamed children (Augustine, City of God 15; Pererius's own vol. 1 bk. 7, q. 4). This would let Abraham still be elder than Nachor and Aran. Margin: 'Augustine.'

Nor indeed does that which was said a little above about Iescha press very hard. For it was said that, unless Iescha had been the wife of Abraham who by another name was called Sara, there would have been no reason why Moses would have wished to make mention of her in that place. But to this the answer is easy: for often in the sacred letters certain persons are named, not because they of themselves touch the History being treated, but because they have a connection with those things which properly regard the series and order of the History. And this is true not only of men, but also of women, as one may observe: for in the fourth chapter of Genesis are mentioned the two sons of Lamech and a daughter by name Noema; in the twenty-second chapter of the same book is named the concubine of Nachor who was called Roma [Reuma]; finally in the thirty-sixth chapter of the same book…

§231 (begins). Answering an objection to §230's alternative: that Iescha is named does not force Iescha = Sara, for Scripture often names persons (even women) only for their connection to the history — e.g. Lamech's daughter Noema (Gen 4), Nachor's concubine Reuma (Gen 22), and [Oolibama, Gen 36] (continues next page).

— p. 667 (PDF) · printed p. 564 —

…chapter it is recorded that Ana begot a son Dison and a daughter Oolibama; and yet of these three women no mention is made anywhere else than in these places in sacred Scripture.

§231 (concl.). The third example: Ana's daughter Oolibama (Gen 36). None of these three women (Noema, Reuma, Oolibama) is mentioned elsewhere — so Iescha too could be named once for connection's sake without being Sara. This closes Disp. 14.

FIFTEENTH DISPUTATION. Upon these words: ‘Aran died before Thare his father, in the land of his nativity, in Ur of the Chaldees.’ Whether Abraham was cast into the fire by the Chaldees, and thence freed by a divine miracle.

Disp. 15 title (on Gen 11:28). Whether Abraham was thrown into a fire by the Chaldees (for refusing fire-worship) and miraculously delivered by God — the third of the Third Part's questions. Margin: 'Genesis ch. 11, v. 28.'

That phrase ‘before his father’ is expounded in two ways: either, with the father seeing and present, so that it is the same as ‘in his father's presence’; or, while his father was still living, so that it is signified that he [Aran] died before his father, and the father survived the son — and this very thing the Hebrew words sound, which are thus, ‘Upon the face of his father,’ that is, while he was living and seeing. But that phrase, ‘of Ur of the Chaldees,’ may be interpreted in two ways. For the word ‘Ur’ can be taken as an appellative noun, meaning to the Hebrews the same as the word ‘fire’ to the Latins; or it can be taken as the proper name of a city or region, as the Seventy translators took it, who for ‘of Ur of the Chaldees’ translated ‘of the region of the Chaldees.’ From this ambiguity of the word, therefore, arose that famous question: Whether Abraham, because he refused to worship fire after the manner of the Chaldees, was cast into the fire, and thence safe and unharmed was freed by divine favor.

§232. Two phrases of Gen 11:28 parsed: ‘before his father’ = either ‘in his father's presence’ or ‘his father surviving him’ (the Hebrew ‘upon the face of his father’ supports the latter); and ‘Ur of the Chaldees’ = either ‘fire’ (Hebrew ‘Ur’ = fire) or a place-name (the LXX's ‘region of the Chaldees’).

From this ambiguity sprang the famous question of Abraham's deliverance from the fire.

There exists, handed down in Lyra and others, a certain tradition of the Hebrews — which is an indication of its being very ancient, that blessed Jerome also mentions it. The Hebrews say that Thare, the father of Abraham, was so insane a worshipper of idols that he even denounced his son Abraham — because he vehemently abhorred the idolatry of the Chaldees — to Nemrod [Nimrod], who reigned at that time in Chaldea; by whose command he was cast into the fire, but thence (God marvelously preserving him) he came out wholly unharmed. Meanwhile, while he was in the fire, his brother Aran, who was a worshipper of idols, thus reasoned within himself: ‘If Abraham comes out safe from the fire, I too will follow his faith and religion.’ Being therefore ordered by the Chaldees to worship the fire, he answered that he, with his brother Abraham, held the worship and faith of only one God. Being therefore himself also cast into the fire, because he was not endowed with such great faith and virtue as [Abraham had been]…

§233 (begins). The Hebrew legend (from Nicholas of Lyra and others; its antiquity shown by Jerome mentioning it): Thare, a fanatical idolater, denounced Abraham to Nimrod for abhorring Chaldean idolatry; Abraham was cast into the fire but came out unharmed by God's preservation. His brother Aran, watching, resolved to follow Abraham's faith if he survived; ordered to worship the fire, he professed the one God, was cast in, but — lacking Abraham's faith — [perished] (continues next page). Margin: 'Lyra.'

— p. 668 (PDF) · printed p. 565 —

…[as Abraham] had been [endowed with], he [Aran] perished, consumed by that fire. And they say Moses signified this when he said that Aran died before Thare his father — that is, with his father watching, procuring, and approving his destruction. Thus the Hebrews.

§233 (concl.). The Hebrew legend completed: Aran, lacking Abraham's faith, perished in the fire; and ‘Aran died before his father’ (Gen 11:28) is taken to mean Thare watched, even procured and approved, his son's death.

This tradition of the Hebrews blessed Jerome mentions, and seems to mention it as a kind of fable. For, reporting the reading of the Seventy translators which has that Aran died in the region of the Chaldees, he says: “The Hebrews hand down, from this occasion, a fable of this sort: that Abraham was put into the fire because he refused to worship the fire which the Chaldees worship, and was freed by God's help from idolatry; Aran too, because he likewise would not worship the fire, was placed in the fire of the Chaldees and consumed by the burning.” Thus Jerome there. And though he calls that Tradition a fable, yet the same Jerome a little below seems to approve it as true, writing thus: “True therefore is that Tradition of the Hebrews, that Abraham, hemmed in by the Babylonian fire because he would not worship it, was freed by God's help; and that from that time both the days of his life and the period of his age are reckoned, from when he confessed God, spurning the idols of the Chaldees.” Thus far from blessed Jerome.

§234. Jerome reports the legend (on the LXX's ‘Aran died in the region of the Chaldees’) and calls it a ‘fable,’ yet a little later seems to approve it as ‘true’ — even reckoning Abraham's years from his confession amid the fire (the same idea behind Disp. 13's Hebrew solution). Margin: 'Jerome in the Hebrew Traditions on Genesis.'

Paul of Burgos also, in a certain Addition of his to Lyra's Postilla on this place of chapter 11, although he says that Tradition of the Hebrews seems fabulous as to what it says about Thare — because it has no foundation, and is against the letter of Moses — yet does not think it wholly lacking in credit as to the divine deliverance of Abraham, whether from the fire or from some other great danger in which he was involved in Chaldea: for this seems to be signified by those words of God (Genesis 15), “I am the Lord who led you out of Ur of the Chaldees”; which words indeed sound a certain deliverance divinely wrought, just as do those words of God spoken to the Hebrews (Exodus 20), “I am the Lord your God who led you out of the land of Egypt.” Burgos confirms this same thing by the testimony of Rabbi Moyses [Maimonides], who in his book the Guide of the Perplexed reports that, in a certain book on Egyptian agriculture, it is narrated that a

notable man named Abraham publicly disputed with the worshippers of idols, affirming that Fire is not to be worshipped for God; but that the king, lest by his authority and eloquence he should turn the people away from that worship, thrust him into prison, and, having despoiled him of all his goods, banished him from all his dominion. Credit could also be added to the Hebrews' Tradition from what is written in the second book of Esdras, chapter nine: “You yourself, Lord God,” it says, “who chose Abram, and led him out of the fire of the Chaldees, and set his name Abraham.” And this is the tradition and opinion of the Hebrews.

§235. Paul of Burgos (Additions to Lyra) deems the legend fabulous as to Thare (no scriptural basis, against the text), but credits Abraham's divine deliverance — from the fire or some great Chaldean danger — citing Gen 15:7 (‘who led you out of Ur of the Chaldees,’ parallel to Exod 20:2's ‘out of Egypt’), and Maimonides (Guide of the Perplexed), who reports an ‘Egyptian agriculture’ book in which a man named Abraham publicly disputed the fire-worshippers and was imprisoned, despoiled, and banished by the king; plus Neh 9:7 (‘led him out of the fire of the Chaldees’). It closes: ‘And this is the tradition and opinion of the Hebrews.’ Margin: 'Paul of Burgos; Genesis 15; Rabbi Moses.'

But that this Tradition is empty of reason and of credit, and futile and fabulous, is convicted by a twofold argument. The Hebrews say that Abraham was cast into the fire at the command of Nemrod, who at that time reigned among the Chaldees: but it is manifest that this contains an error in the Chronologies. For in the foregoing fifteenth book we showed…

§236 (begins — the refutation). The Hebrew tradition is convicted as groundless and fabulous by a twofold argument. First (chronology): the Hebrews say Abraham was cast into the fire by Nemrod, then reigning in Chaldea — but this is chronologically impossible, as shown in Bk. 15 (continues next page). Margin: 'The aforesaid Hebrew tradition refuted; Nemrod did not live in Abraham's time.'

— p. 669 (PDF) · printed p. 566 —

…that the same man was Nemrod and Belus the father of Ninus. Now Ninus, after the death of Belus his father, took up the empire, as all hand down who have woven the history of those times. But that Abraham was born in the forty-third year of the reign of Ninus is the opinion of Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, Cyril, Bede, Isidore, and — to say it in a word — of all

ecclesiastical writers who have written the record of that age. From these it is concluded that Abraham was born forty-three years after the death of Nemrod, who by another name was called Belus. How then can it be that (as the Hebrews trifle) Abraham was cast into the fire at the command of Nemrod, then reigning in Chaldea?

§236 (concl.). The first (chronological) argument completed: Nemrod (= Belus, father of Ninus) died, and Abraham was born only in Ninus's 43rd regnal year — i.e. 43 years after Nemrod's death (per Eusebius, Jerome, Augustine, Cyril, Bede, Isidore). So Abraham could not have been cast into the fire by Nemrod, who was long dead.

But who could bring himself to believe that Thare was so insane a worshipper of idols that, stripping off all sense of humanity and turning his fatherly affection into the hatred and rage of a most savage enemy, he would knowingly and willingly cast his own son into the most atrocious punishment of death? Add that these take for certain that Thare was an idolater — which is either uncertain, or (as great men hold) even false: but that matter will be properly and accurately disputed a little below.

§237. A second consideration: it is incredible that Thare would so strip off humanity as to have his own son put to death. Moreover, the legend assumes Thare was an idolater, which is uncertain or even false (to be settled in the next disputation, Disp. 16).

That foundation, moreover, of that tradition and opinion — that the word Ur in this place signifies fire or burning — is indeed most weak, or, to speak more truly, plainly null. For that by this word is signified the proper name of a city that was in Chaldea, I can confirm by four arguments. For in this eleventh chapter of Genesis it is written thus: “Thare took Abraham his son and Lot the son of Aran his son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, and brought them out of Ur of the Chaldees, to go into the land of Chanaan.” Behold, the word Ur in this place cannot signify fire or burning, but must be the proper name of a city — clearer than the noonday light itself. For Thare did not bring Abraham out of the fire of the Chaldees, since, according to these, he himself was the author to the Chaldees that Abraham should be cast into the fire. The Seventy translators too rendered ‘Ur of the

Chaldees’ in this place ‘the region of the Chaldees’: namely, they wished to remove the ambiguity of the Hebrew word, which could mean both a proper name of a place and fire. The same Josephus confirms, who in the first book of the Antiquities, narrating the history of this place, writes thus: “Aran died in the region of the Chaldees, in the city which is called Ur of the Chaldees, and his tomb is shown to this day.” Likewise in Eusebius, the ninth book of the Preparation of the Gospel, chapter four, Eupolemus, a very ancient writer, reported that Abraham was born in Camarina, a city of Babylonia, which others call Ur.

§238 (the second main argument). ‘Ur’ here means a Chaldean city, not ‘fire’ — confirmed by four arguments. (1) Gen 11:31, ‘Thare brought them out of Ur of the Chaldees,’ cannot mean ‘out of the fire’ (Thare himself was the legend's cause of the fire). (2) The LXX rendered it ‘region of the Chaldees.’ (3) Josephus (Antiquities 1) names Ur a city where Aran's tomb is shown. (4) Eupolemus (in Eusebius, Praep. Ev. 9.4) says Abraham was born in Camarina, ‘which others call Ur.’ Margin: 'That Ur of the Chaldees was a city or region of Chaldea; Josephus; Eupolemus in Eusebius.'

Next, so great a miracle of God and so glorious a deed of Abraham, Moses would not have passed over in silence in this book, in which he commemorates so expressly and distinctly many other deeds of his that are certainly less clear and wonderful. The author of the book of Ecclesiasticus too, proclaiming the praises of Abraham in chapter forty-four, would not have omitted this deed of his, worthy of the highest proclamation. Nor indeed…

§239 (begins — a further argument). Moses would not have omitted so great a miracle (he records lesser deeds of Abraham distinctly); nor would Sirach (Ecclesiasticus 44, in praise of Abraham) (continues next page).

— p. 670 (PDF) · printed p. 567 —

…would blessed Paul have kept silent about it in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter eleven, where with great praises he extols the greatness and devotion of Abraham's faith: that, obeying the divine commands, he abandoned his native soil and came into the land of Chanaan, foreign and unknown to him; that, believing in hope against hope, he begot a son from

a barren wife beyond the proper course and order of nature; that finally, when God commanded the slaying of his son, he was most ready to immolate him. Since therefore, if Abraham had not refused to be burned alive in the flames for the confession and preaching of the one true God, his excellence of faith would have shone forth most of all in this, Paul certainly would not have left it out among things past, but would have celebrated it before all else as worthy of the greatest admiration and commendation. And what of the fact that Josephus, in the first book of the Antiquities, culling and gathering the notable things to Abraham's praise not only from sacred but also from profane writers, made no word of this deed of Abraham? For neither is so expert a man in Jewish matters to be believed to have been ignorant of it; nor, if he was not ignorant of it (since it was among the foremost things to be recorded), to have wished to omit it. Philo too made no mention of this matter, who yet published two books on Abraham, diligently expounding his virtues and deeds.

§239 (concl.). The argument from silence completed: Paul (Heb 11) extols Abraham's faith (leaving his homeland; the son from barren Sara; readiness to sacrifice Isaac) and would surely have crowned the list with the fire-confession had it happened; and Josephus (Antiquities 1) and Philo (two books On Abraham), who gathered all his praiseworthy deeds, say nothing of it. Margin: 'Hebrews 11; below ch. 15; below ch. 22; Josephus; Philo.'

But come, let us dissolve the contrary reasons set out above. They urged those words of the fifteenth chapter of Genesis: “I am the Lord who brought you out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give you this land and that you should possess it” — as if God by these words signified that that leading-out of Abraham from Ur of the Chaldees was greatly wonderful and memorable. But why? For what, I ask, was wonderful or memorable in having led Abraham out of the land of the Chaldees into Canaan? Therefore in those words is [supposedly] found the memory of a divine benefit — that Abraham had been led out of Ur, that is, out of the fire of the Chaldees. Thus these. But surely the meaning of those words of God is otherwise. For, to rouse and strengthen in Abraham's mind the faith and confidence of the promise which He then gave him — about the

innumerable multiplication of his posterity and the possession of the land of Canaan in which Abraham then dwelt — God wished to renew in him the memory of that promise, when He commanded him to set out from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan. For thus He spoke to him, as Moses narrates in the twelfth chapter: “Go out from your land and from your kindred and from your father's house, and come into the land which I shall show you; and I will make you into a great nation and will bless you, and will magnify your name, and you shall be blessed. I will bless those who bless you, and curse those who curse you, and in you shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed.” This God then said and promised to Abraham. By the commemoration of this first promise, therefore, He wished to strengthen Abraham's mind, that he might believe and hope without any doubt that what He promised would come to pass. Therefore the meaning of those words of God is this: ‘I who now promise you the possession of the land…

§240 (begins — dissolving the pro-fire arguments). The fire-party cite Gen 15:7 (‘I am the Lord who brought you out of Ur of the Chaldees’) as implying a wonderful rescue (from fire). Pererius answers: there was nothing wonderful in merely leaving Chaldea; rather, God recalled the promise (Gen 12:1–3 — a great nation, a blessed name, all kindreds blessed in him) to strengthen Abraham's faith in the pledged posterity and land (continues next page). Margin: 'Solution of the contrary reasons; a passage of Genesis ch. 15; ch. 12.'

— p. 671 (PDF) · printed p. 568 —

…of the land of Canaan and the multiplication of your posterity, am that same God who commanded you to migrate from Mesopotamia into the land of Canaan, and who then for the first time gave you these so magnificent promises; so that you ought to be wholly certain about promises of this kind, given and confirmed by me more than once.’

§240 (concl.). The sense of Gen 15:7 completed: God identifies Himself as the one who first called Abraham out of Mesopotamia with the great promises, so that Abraham may be wholly certain of the repeated, confirmed pledges — no reference to a fire.

To that, moreover, which, taken from the ninth chapter of the second book of Esdras, seemed to cause some trouble — that there it was written in express words that God led Abraham out of the fire of the Chaldees — a twofold answer can be given. For someone might think it likely that the Latin translator set down there the Hebrew word itself, Ur, as he did in other places wherever the same word occurs; but that someone put in the margin the interpretation of that word, namely ‘fire,’ which word ‘fire’ was afterward inserted and woven into the text: for that some things were in this way mixed into the text of Scripture, Lyra, Tostatus, Cajetan, and Melchior Cano have noted and reported. Nor does this conjecture seem vain. For if in all other places the Latin translator retained the Hebrew word Ur, so that nowhere did he interpret it by ‘fire,’ it is surely not credible that in that one place alone he wished to interpret the word Ur as ‘fire’: especially since the Seventy translators always set down that name for a certain region and place of Chaldea. But if this does not please the reader, here is another more fitting and probable answer: that when Abraham is said to have been led out of the fire of the Chaldees, the word ‘fire’ is set down not properly but metaphorically for persecution, tribulation, and affliction. For very often in the sacred letters fire is put for tribulation, as in the Psalms: “You have tried me by fire, and iniquity was not found in me”; and in another place: “We have passed through fire and water, and you have led us out into refreshment”; and in Jeremiah, Lamentations chapter one: “From on high He sent fire into my bones, and instructed me.” So also some interpret that saying of John the Baptist about Christ the Lord: “He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit and fire” — although here it is more truly said to signify that abundance of the Holy Spirit given to the disciples under the appearance of fire on the day of Pentecost: for the word ‘to baptize’ sometimes means the same as to be given copiously and abundantly, as may be perceived from those words of our Lord which He said to the Apostles after His resurrection: “John indeed baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit.”

§241. The Nehemiah 9:7 objection (‘out of the fire of the Chaldees’) answered two ways: (1) ‘fire’ was a marginal gloss on ‘Ur’ that crept into the Latin text — such interpolations are noted by Lyra, Tostatus, Cajetan, Cano; the translator kept ‘Ur’ everywhere else, and the LXX always read it as a place. (2) ‘Fire’ is a metaphor for persecution/tribulation, as often in Scripture (Ps 17:3; Ps 66:12; Lam 1:13), and as in ‘baptize with fire’ (the Pentecost abundance, Acts 1:5). Margin: 'A passage of Esdras bk. 2 ch. 9; Lyra, Tostatus, Cajetan on 2 Kings ch. 8, Cano, Loci Theologici bk. 2; fire put for tribulation often in Scripture; Ps 16[17]; Ps 65[66]; Acts 1.'

Since therefore Abraham suffered grave persecution and tribulation from the Chaldees for the worship of the one God, from which tribulation he was freed by God, therefore God is said to have led Abraham out of the fire of the Chaldees. That Abraham suffered persecution from the Chaldees, Josephus is witness (first book of the Antiquities): “When Abraham saw,” he says, “that, because he openly and freely preached the worship of the true God, the Chaldees and Mesopotamians were rising up against him, he took the resolve of migrating…”

§242 (begins). So ‘led out of the fire of the Chaldees’ = delivered from the persecution Abraham suffered for preaching the one God. Josephus (Antiquities 1) attests this persecution: seeing the Chaldees and Mesopotamians rise against him for his open worship of the true God, Abraham resolved to migrate (continues next page). Margin: 'Josephus.'

— p. 672 (PDF) · printed p. 569 —

…[took the resolve of migrating], and, relying on the will and favor of God, held the land of Chanaan. Blessed Augustine too is witness, in the sixteenth book of the City of God, chapter thirteen, writing thus: “Whence it is manifest that the house of Thare suffered persecution from the Chaldees for the true piety by which the one and true God was worshipped by them.”

§242 (concl., closing Disp. 15). Augustine (City of God 16.13) confirms that the house of Thare suffered Chaldean persecution for worshipping the one true God — which both explains ‘out of the fire’ as persecution and bears on the next question (Thare's house worshipped the true God). Margin: 'Augustine.'

SIXTEENTH DISPUTATION. Whether Thare, the father of Abraham, was at any time a worshipper of false gods.

Disp. 16 title (the fourth question of the Praefatio). Whether Thare was ever an idolater.

From the occasion of what we have just disputed, another question presents itself to us, most worthy indeed to be treated and explained with care: Whether Thare, or even Abraham, were at any time given to idolatry; or rather whether both, or at least Abraham, always worshipped the true God. First, then, let us inquire this concerning Thare, then concerning Abraham.

§243. The question framed: were Thare or even Abraham ever idolaters, or did both (or at least Abraham) always worship the true God? Thare first, then Abraham.

And that Thare not only worshipped false gods, but was a most ardent worshipper of idols and a most bitter assailant of those who abhorred idolatry, the Hebrews held — as their Tradition, which we treated in the previous disputation, manifestly declares. Epiphanius too seems to have been of this opinion. For at the beginning of the work he wrote against heresies, he teaches that in the time of Sarug (who was the grandfather of Thare) idolatry began among men: “As,” he says, “the knowledge which has come down to us has it. But it was not yet in statues, or in carvings of stones or woods, or made of silver and gold or other material, but only through colors and images; the mind of man devised malice in itself, and through free will and the force of reason and mind found iniquity instead of goodness. To Sarug himself is born a son Nachor, and Nachor begot Thare. Hence statues began to be made of clay and by the potter's art through the industry of this Thare. And then for the first time, among the earlier men, a son died before his father: for before, the fathers ended their life before their sons, and left sons as successors. Nor let anyone object Abel: for he did not die his own death, but was slain by his brother. First, therefore, Thare, by his own craftiness, devising an Idol, set up a rival to God; but he received the like of what he had made, because he too was provoked to grief through his own son. Whence the divine scripture, led by wonder, noted this, saying: ‘And Aran died in the sight of Thare his father, in the land of his nativity.’” Thus far from Epiphanius.

§244. The case that Thare WAS an idolater: the Hebrew Tradition (of Disp. 15) made him a fierce idol-worshipper and persecutor of the faithful. Epiphanius (opening of the Panarion) likewise: idolatry began in Sarug's time (only painted images at first); Thare, son of Nachor, first made clay idols by the potter's art — and as a fit retribution his son Aran was the first son to die naturally before his father (Abel excepted, being murdered), which Scripture marked with 'Aran died in the sight of Thare.' Margin: 'That Thare was an idolater, the opinion of some; the Hebrews; Epiphanius; Genesis 4; the first son after creation to die before his father was Aran son of Thare, and why, per Epiphanius.'

Similar things Suidas hands down — so that to me indeed he seems to have borrowed from Epiphanius. For in the entry 'Abraham,' by the testimony of Philo the Jew, he confirms that the worship of images flourished from Sarug down to Thare the father of Abraham; and that Abraham reproached his father Thare with very grave words concerning the fabrication and worship of Idols, and his…

§245 (begins). Suidas (apparently borrowing from Epiphanius), in the 'Abraham' entry and citing Philo, confirms image-worship flourished from Sarug to Thare; and that Abraham sharply reproached his father Thare for making and worshipping idols (continues next page). Margin: 'Suidas; Philo; Thare; Abraham.'

— p. 673 (PDF) · printed p. 570 —

…[Abraham] partly broke, partly burned the images [his father's idols]. The same Suidas, in the entry 'Saruch,' writes thus: "Saruch ordered eminent dead men to be worshipped yearly, as though still living, and their memory to be celebrated, and to be entered into sacred records, and that they be judged gods as benefactors."

§245 (concl.). Completing Suidas/Philo: Abraham broke and burned his father's idols; and Suidas (entry 'Saruch'/Sarug) gives the euhemerist origin of idolatry — Sarug ordered eminent dead benefactors worshipped yearly as gods. Margin: 'Thare; Abraham.' [§-numbering: Liber XVI is numbered continuously across all three Parts; the Third Part runs from §205 (Disp. 14) onward — this is §245.]

Hence arose Idolatry, and it lasted down to Thare the father of Abraham. For he was a statue-maker, who made images out of various material, and said they were to be worshipped as gods, as authors of benefits. Thence this

opinion, having arisen, pervaded most nations, but especially Greece. For these, when they had now received the error, also venerated Hellen, a giant sprung from the sons of Iaphet and an associate in building the tower (on account of which the tongues of men were divided, and from which they themselves were called μ■ροπες, that is, ‘divided’). These things Suidas reports. Which indeed can also be confirmed by the testimony of Joshua, whose [words] are written in his book, chapter twenty-four, in the last oration which he made to the Hebrew people, beginning with these words: “Thus says the Lord God of Israel: Beyond the river your fathers dwelt from the beginning, Thare the father of Abraham and Nachor, and they served strange gods.” Hence it clearly appears that Thare was given to Idolatry, and worshipped strange and false gods.

§246. Idolatry spread from Sarug down to Thare, who made and promoted idols; it pervaded Greece (deifying Hellen). The strongest scriptural proof that Thare was an idolater: Joshua 24:2, ‘Thare the father of Abraham and Nachor… served strange gods.’ Margin: 'Genesis 11; that Thare was an idolater.'

But contrary to this opinion is the opinion of blessed Augustine. For he, in the sixteenth book of the City of God, chapter thirteen, asks why, when Thare departed from Chaldea and came into Mesopotamia leading with him his son Abraham, and Lot the son of his son Aran, and Sara his daughter-in-law the wife of Abraham — why, I say, did he not also take with him Nachor his son? Augustine answers that Thare with the others fled Idolatry, and on its account the persecution of the Chaldees; but that Nachor, given to idolatry, wished to remain there; yet that afterward he too, Chaldea being abandoned, came into Mesopotamia and dwelt in the city of Charran, where Thare and his brother Abraham had dwelt, the book of Genesis chapter twenty-two plainly teaches. But let the reader hear Augustine's words: “Why,” he says, “did Scripture not say that Nachor too, together with Thare his father and Abraham his brother, departed from Chaldea and came into Mesopotamia? Why do we think, unless perhaps because he had defected from the paternal and fraternal religion and adhered to the superstition of the Chaldees? And afterward thence —

whether by repenting or having suffered persecution — he too migrated.”

§247. The contrary view (Thare NOT an idolater): Augustine (City of God 16.13) asks why Thare did not take Nachor when he left Chaldea — answering that Thare's family fled idolatry and its persecution, while the idolater Nachor stayed (only later coming to Charran, Gen 22). So for Augustine, Thare worshipped the true God and Nachor was the idolater. Margin: 'St. Augustine.'

Then Augustine proves this conjecture of his by those words which Achior, leader of the Ammonites, said to Holofernes, as the book of Judith chapter five has: for he, expounding the origin of the Hebrews, says: “This people is of the progeny of the Chaldees: it first dwelt in Mesopotamia, because they would not follow the gods of their fathers who were in the land of the Chaldees; deserting therefore the ceremonies of their fathers, which were in a multitude of gods, they worshipped one God of heaven, who also commanded them to go out thence and dwell in Chanaan.” From these Augustine concludes: “whence it is manifest that the house of Thare suffered persecution from the Chaldees for the true piety by which the one and true God was worshipped by them.”

§248. Augustine grounds his view in Judith 5: Achior the Ammonite tells Holofernes the Hebrews left Chaldea because they refused their fathers' many gods and worshipped the one God of heaven, who bade them go to Canaan — proof (for Augustine) that Thare's house was persecuted for true piety, not idolatrous.

— p. 674 (PDF) · printed p. 571 —

…the true God was worshipped. Thus far from Augustine. The same Philo seems to signify in the book On Dreams, where he makes [Thare] a man indeed good and a lover of virtue, but not yet its possessor; but Jacob a man wholly perfect, who comprehended virtue absolute in all its numbers. But that the reader may more easily understand the words of Philo which we are about to recount, the significations of three words which Philo uses in that place must be premised; these are Charra, Thare, and Jacob. “Charra (says Philo), as far as I see, is a certain metropolis of the senses; for it is interpreted now ‘ditch,’ now ‘cave,’ one thing being signified by two names. For our bodies are in a manner dug through for the instruments of

the senses, and each sense has, as its instrument, its own pit and cave, as it were.” The name Thare, if you unfold the notion of the word, you will find signifies ‘the contemplation of smell.’ Jacob signifies an ‘athlete, wrestler, and supplanter.’ These being known, the understanding of Philo's opinion will be plainer. For Philo means that Thare bore the image of a man desirous of virtue rather than possessing it, but that Jacob presented the type of a man who possesses virtue and perfectly comprehends it.

§248 (concl.) + §249. Closing Augustine, Pererius turns to Philo (On Dreams), who allegorizes Thare as a lover of virtue not yet its possessor, vs. Jacob the perfect possessor — with etymologies: Charra = ‘metropolis of the senses’ (ditch/cave), Thare = ‘contemplation of smell,’ Jacob = ‘athlete/wrestler/supplanter.’ Margin: 'Philo; mystical interpretation of Charra, Thare, and Jacob.'

But let the reader hear Philo, whose allegorical treatment of this is most elegant. “It is read in the book of Moses (says Philo) that Abraham departed from Charra, but his father Thare remained there until death. For the contemplator of virtue, not its possessor, enjoyed odors, not foods, not yet fit to be filled with prudence, nor even to taste but only to smell: for just as they say hunting-dogs, because they are endowed with an exceptional sense of smell, pursue and catch beasts from afar, following their scent; in the same way the lover of knowledge, pursuing the sweet breezes which justice and the other virtues exhale, and desiring to attain the origin of so great a pleasure, runs hither and thither, refreshing himself with the very odor of virtue as with a sacred fragrance. So therefore those to whom it is given to drink from the loving cup of wisdom, and to be poured out in its contemplation and the feasts of its teachings, and, when they are inebriated, to thirst again because of the unfillable desire of knowledge. Next to these are to be reckoned those who, though they do not approach the sacred table, yet feed their minds with the very fragrance: for the very breeze of virtue is taken in, just as, for the sick failing from lack of food and loathing of food, odors procure a saving remedy, that they may recover strength.”

§250. Philo's elegant allegory: Abraham left Charra but Thare stayed till death, because Thare was a ‘smeller’ (contemplator) of virtue, not its ‘eater’ (possessor) — like hunting-dogs tracking by scent, the lover of wisdom is drawn by virtue's fragrance; the perfect drink from wisdom's cup, while lesser

souls are fed by its very aroma.

But nevertheless, Chaldea being left, Thare is said to have migrated to Charra, leading with him Abraham and the rest of his consenting household: not that we should think they were deserters of their fatherland, to which they preferred those seats, but that we may learn to understand more deeply something most useful for human life. But what is this? The Chaldees are occupied in observing the courses of the stars; the Charrenses are occupied about the senses. The divine scripture therefore interrupts the inquirer: “Why do you ask about the Sun, whether it is of a foot's size, or whether the earth is greater than [its] wheel; about the Moon, whether it shines by its own or by borrowed light? Why, walking on earth, do you leap above the clouds, and try to touch ethereal things while you cleave fixed to the earth? Why do you dare to conjecture…”

§251 (begins). Philo continues: Thare's move from Chaldea to Charra (with his household) is a moral lesson — the Chaldees study the stars, the ‘Charrenses’ the senses; Scripture rebukes the would-be astronomer, telling him to scrutinize himself rather than leap to the heavens (continues next page).

— p. 675 (PDF) · printed p. 572 —

“…about things higher than all conjecture? O good [man], rather consider the things near you, nay, scrutinize yourself without flattery. Go with your mind to Charra, that is, to the cavernous and perforated city of the body; consider the single senses and their functions and aspects: for to wish, before you well survey and know your own house, to scrutinize curiously and thoroughly know the universal house which is the world — is that not the height of madness?”

§251 (concl.). Philo's rebuke completed: before presuming to know the cosmos, ‘go to Charra’ (the body, the seat of the senses) and know yourself — astronomy without self-knowledge is madness.

Men of this kind the Hebrews call Thare, the Greeks name Socrates: for they say that he too, down to old age, applied himself to this precept, ‘Know thyself,’ the rest of philosophy set aside. Thare signifies a man desirous and a lover of plucking the fruit of virtue, and of satisfying the

mind with its most pleasant and healthful food. But the nature of athletes and wrestlers (this is what the name Jacob signifies) is more perfect: for these, after they have thoroughly learned and striven beyond the reckoning of the senses, judge themselves worthy of greater contemplations, leaving the senses like the caverns signified by the word Charra. Of this number was that Abraham, who by manifold advances progressed to the highest knowledge. For when he knew himself most, then he most despised himself, that he might perfectly know Him who truly is. For so it is wont to happen: he who greatly knows himself also greatly despises himself, reckoning how nothing is whatever is created; but he who despises himself attains to the illustrious knowledge of Him. Thus far was Philo's discourse. By these words Philo signifies that Thare was a man not indeed perfect, but yet good and eager in thoroughly investigating virtue. But if he had been a worshipper of idols, he would not aptly have borne the type and image of a man desirous of perceiving virtue and earnestly striving to acquire it for himself.

§252. Philo's allegory: Thare = the Hebrews' 'Socrates' (devoted to 'know thyself'), a sincere virtue-seeker; Jacob/Abraham the more perfect possessors (self-knowledge → self-contempt → knowledge of God). Pererius's point: if Thare had been an idolater, Philo would not have made him the very type of a virtue-seeker — so Philo's allegory tells against Thare's idolatry. Margin: 'A notable saying.'

To this opinion I most gladly adhere, not so much on account of Philo's authority as of blessed Augustine's. But from it, as if taking me by the hand, that passage of Joshua chapter twenty-four which we set down above seems to pull me away, in which it is not obscurely signified that Thare served strange gods; for thus it is read there: “Beyond the river your fathers dwelt from the beginning, Thare the father of Abraham and Nachor, serving strange gods.” Among the fathers of the Hebrews, therefore, who dwelt beyond the river (that is, in Chaldea, which is beyond the river Euphrates in comparison with the land of promise where Joshua spoke this) and served strange gods, Thare is named expressly. To this perhaps someone might respond that two things are said there: one is, that the

ancestors of the Hebrews dwelt beyond the river from the beginning, that is, in Chaldea (‘from the beginning’ signifying immediately after the division of tongues and dispersion of men, the building of the tower of Babel being disturbed); the other is, that they served strange gods. The former, then, pertains to all the ancestors of the Hebrews, even to Thare himself; but the latter, about the worship of strange gods, ought to be referred not to Thare himself but to others earlier than he. But surely the very context of the words (as is clear to one considering them) indicates that Thare was among those who served strange gods; and so think all…

§253 (begins). Pererius adheres to the view that Thare was no idolater (chiefly on Augustine's authority) — but Joshua 24:2 (‘Thare… serving strange gods’) pulls him the other way. An attempted dodge (the ‘serving strange gods’ refers to earlier ancestors, not Thare) is rejected: the context names Thare among the idol-servers (continues next page). Margin: 'The author's opinion, whether Thare was an idolater; a passage of Joshua ch. 24; Genesis 11.'

— p. 676 (PDF) · printed p. 573 —

…all the interpreters of that book, when they explain that passage; and among these Theodoret teaches it in the plainest words, in question eighteen on Joshua.

§253 (concl.). All commentators on Joshua, especially Theodoret (Questions on Joshua, q. 18), read Joshua 24:2 as making Thare one who served strange gods. Margin: 'Theodoret.'

Let us therefore say that both are true — both what blessed Augustine handed down, and what these [others] reported. For, as Tostatus rightly advises (question twenty on chapter eleven of Genesis), while Thare remained in Chaldea, he was a worshipper of the true God and pure from Idolatry: indeed, for that very cause, the hatred and persecution of the Chaldees being stirred up against him, he fled thence and set out into Mesopotamia; and this Augustine held, and it is signified in the book of Judith chapter five (we above set out both Augustine's words and what is in that place of the book of Judith). But after Thare came to Haran or Charra, the farthest city of Mesopotamia, being gradually corrupted there — whether by the custom of that nation, or by the coming of his son Nachor

from Chaldea, or by the departure and absence of Abraham himself — he lapsed into Idolatry: and this Joshua signified in the aforesaid place, and most interpreters held. How therefore Thare can truly be said both to have served and not to have served strange gods — namely at different times and in different places — is hence manifest. It does not escape me that blessed Chrysostom, in the thirty-first homily on Genesis, left in writing that even before Thare came to Haran he was an unbeliever: but what I have said from the opinion of blessed Augustine seems to me much more probable.

§254 (closing Disp. 16). Pererius's reconciliation: BOTH are true at different times/places (so Tostatus, q. 20 on Gen 11). In Chaldea Thare worshipped the true God and fled the Chaldees' persecution (Augustine; Judith 5); but at Haran he gradually lapsed into idolatry (Joshua 24:2). Thus he both 'served' and 'did not serve' strange gods. Against Chrysostom (Homily 31), who made Thare an unbeliever even before Haran. Margin: 'Tostatus.'

SEVENTEENTH DISPUTATION. Whether Abraham was always a worshipper of the true God, or whether he was at some time polluted with the superstition of Idolatry.

Disp. 17 title (the fifth and last question of the Third Part's Praefatio). Whether Abraham was ever an idolater.

That Abraham was at some time as it were breathed-upon and infected by the superstition of Idolatry, Genebrardus teaches in his Chronology, by the authority of the Hebrews who affirm it, from the opinion of two noble Rabbis, Iohanan and Hanina; by whom it is reported that Abraham in the forty-eighth year of his age began to recognize the true God, and cast off all superstition of Idolatry. And this, according to the Chronology of the Hebrews (of which we spoke in the previous fifteenth book), happened at the time when the division of tongues was made: since they hold it was made in the last year of Phaleg's life, which was the forty-eighth year of Abraham's age.

§255. The case that Abraham WAS once an idolater: Genebrardus (Chronology), citing the Hebrews and two Rabbis (Yohanan and Hanina), says Abraham first recognized the true God and renounced

idolatry at age 48 — at the time of the division of tongues (Phaleg's death year = Abraham's 48th). Margin: 'Genebrardus.'

To this opinion also Andreas Masius seems more inclined, who in our age published commentaries on the book of Joshua, no less Catholic and pious than learned and eloquent. In these, explaining those words of Joshua chapter twenty-four, ‘Beyond the river they dwelt…’

§256 (begins). Andreas Masius (commentary on Joshua) also leans to Abraham's former idolatry, expounding Joshua 24:2 (continues next page). Margin: 'Andreas Masius.'

— p. 677 (PDF) · printed p. 574 —

“…your fathers from the beginning, and they served strange gods,” he writes thus: “This oration of Joshua avails to explain the benignity of God which He conferred on the Israelite people. As for what he says, that their ancestors beyond the river worshipped strange gods, it pertains not to Sem and Noah and others more remote, but only to the nearer ancestors. For this only is at issue: that it be established that they were gratuitously adopted by God as a people; and not by grace only, but the more since even their ancestors had given divine worship and honor not to the true God, to whom it was owed, but to strange and false gods. And by name Thare is set before our eyes, and his two sons Abraham and Nachor, because from these the stock of the whole Hebrew people was begotten; for from Nachor the maternal line was drawn through Rebecca, Leah, and Rachel. For I cannot listen to those who, with great effort, strive by I-know-not-what subtleties to vindicate Abraham from this most base crime of idolatry. As if the grace of God by which He embraced him were not the more illustrious the more wicked he himself was, and the less worthy of such favor. Does not sacred history so often commemorate and inculcate in our minds, as an admirable benefit of God, that He drew him out, as if seized by the hand, from his fatherland and the fellowship of idolaters? For the Jews who invented the fable about Ur of the Chaldees — that is, the fire which Abraham refused to worship by ancestral rites — do not deserve to be refuted, since it is most certain that Ur is the name of a place.” Thus Masius. It appears,

therefore, that he thought Abraham, when he was in Chaldea before he was called by God, worshipped the gods of that nation after the manner of his fathers.

§256 (concl.). Masius (on Joshua 24:2) forcefully holds Abraham WAS an idolater before his call: Joshua names the nearer ancestors (Thare, Abraham, Nachor — sources of the Hebrew stock; Nachor via Rebecca, Leah, Rachel) as idol-worshippers, magnifying God's gratuitous grace in adopting them. He scorns attempts to vindicate Abraham (grace is the more glorious for rescuing a sinner) and dismisses the Ur=fire fable. Margin: 'Genesis 25 & 29; Philo.'

This opinion also Philo seems to confirm in the plainest words, in the book entitled ‘Abraham.’ For Philo says thus: “The Chaldees, exercised in the science of the stars, attributing all things to the motions of the stars (by which they believe the powers of the world, which consist of numbers and their proportions, are dispensed), venerated visible things, not perceiving the invisible and intelligible; and thus, from the revolutions of the stars, both wandering and fixed, and from the year distinguished into four seasons by ordered changes, and from the wonderful consent of celestial and terrestrial things, they thought the World itself to be God — by a profane opinion indeed making the creature like the Creator. Nourished in this dogma, Abraham, and for a long time imbued with the Chaldaic madness, as if after a deep sleep with the eye of the mind opened, after he began to behold the pure light instead of dense darkness, following its splendor, perceived what he had not seen before: that a certain charioteer and governor presides over the World, who provides for the welfare of his own work.”

§257. Philo (On Abraham) likewise: the Chaldees, star-scientists, made the visible World itself God (creature like Creator); Abraham, long ‘imbued with the Chaldaic madness,’ awoke as from deep sleep to behold the true light and recognize a Governor presiding over the World. Margin: 'Philo.'

[that a Governor presides over the World] who is the curator and guardian not only of the whole but also of all its parts; but that the World, the greatest and most beautiful work of all, from which all things hang as parts, [it is absurd] should be destitute of the providence of its ruler, by which it

is both kept safe and lawfully administered. Nor indeed does it not greatly serve for the confirmation of this matter, that it is read that God appeared to Abraham when he first set out from Chaldea: namely, He had not been known to him before, when, after the manner of the Chaldees, intent on the courses of the stars, he believed there was no intelligent nature at all above the sensible World. But after he changed his soil, he immediately recognized that the World is subject, not lord, and does not rule but is ruled by its author. For before, the great sensible things…

§257 (concl.) + §258 (begins). Philo finishes: the World, hanging together as parts, cannot lack a ruling providence. §258: a further confirmation — God 'appeared' to Abraham only when he first left Chaldea, unknown to him before, when as a Chaldean star-gazer he believed nothing intelligent existed above the sensible World; on leaving, he saw the World is ruled, not ruler (continues next page).

— p. 678 (PDF) · printed p. 575 —

…had cast a great darkness over him: which, when he had dispelled it, he could at last, as in pure serenity, discern those things which before had lain hidden. But God, coming to him in His benignity, he did not turn away from; nay, [God] going forth of His own accord to meet him, showed His nature so far as it could be seen. Wherefore it is not said that Abraham saw God, but that God appeared to Abraham: for no one could of himself see Him who truly is, unless He of His own accord offered Himself to be seen. Thus far from Philo. From whose words it is plain that he thought that, before Abraham — called by God — departed from Chaldea, he had been involved in the error and idolatry of the Chaldees.

§258 (concl.). Philo's account finished: Abraham dispelled the Chaldaic darkness and beheld the truth; God 'appeared to' him (not he to God), since the truly-existent can be seen only if He offers Himself. Pererius notes this shows Philo too believed Abraham was an idolater before his call.

That passage of Joshua, so often mentioned above, seems to favor this opinion not a little: for Joshua there said two things; by the one, that the fathers of the Hebrews dwelt beyond the river; by the other, that they served strange gods; and he said both alike of them. Now among those

fathers of the Hebrews he expressly placed Thare, Nachor, and Abraham: to those three, therefore, ought to be referred what is said both about dwelling beyond the river and about the worship of strange gods. For just as it cannot be denied that those three dwelt beyond the river, so also it seems must be conceded that those same three at some time served strange gods. And concerning Thare it was proved a little above; and concerning Nachor it is manifest by everyone's concession: nor therefore does it seem that it should be denied concerning Abraham. For to what end would Joshua have introduced mention of Abraham — teaching that the ancestors of the Hebrews at some time served strange gods, and by God's benignity were brought to the recognition and worship of His name and to the possession of the land of Chanaan — if Abraham had never served strange gods, and at no time had failed to be a worshipper of the true God? And this is the opinion of these [authors].

§259. The pro-idolatry side's strongest argument: Joshua 24:2 names Thare, Nachor, AND Abraham together as both dwelling beyond the river and serving strange gods; since the first two clauses bind all three, so should the second — so Abraham too was once an idolater (else why name him among those rescued by grace?).

But the contrary opinion to this, and far more probable, has not only always pleased me more, but has so deeply settled in my mind that it can be torn out by no authorities and no arguments. I think, therefore, that Abraham was never occupied and infected by the superstition of false gods, but from the beginning to his last breath worshipped the true God. And Josephus indeed stands with me, who in the first book of the Antiquities writes about Abraham thus: “Abraham was a man wise as well as eloquent, and shrewd in conjecturing. And since, on account of his eminent virtue, he was held wise above all, he dared to overturn the commonly received opinion about God, and to turn it to the better. Therefore he first of all proclaimed with a clear voice that there is one God, the creator of the universe of things; and that the things which confer felicity come to us not by our own powers, but by His benignity. For from the observation of earth and sea and stars he argued that there is a certain power presiding, which takes care of all these

[seeming] gods and administers all things becomingly: which ceasing, nothing of utility [would come] to our affairs, since they avail nothing by their own power, but all obey His omnipotent will: wherefore to this One alone thanks ought to be given for goods received. And so, when the Chaldees and Mesopotamians rose up against him, he took the resolve of migrating thence…”

§260 (begins). Pererius's own settled view (the contrary, far more probable): Abraham was NEVER an idolater, but worshipped the true God from first to last. Josephus (Antiquities 1) supports it: Abraham, wise and eloquent, first proclaimed one God (the creator), arguing from nature against the received star-religion — and when the Chaldees rose against him, resolved to migrate (continues next page). Margin: 'The author's truer opinion: that Abraham never worshipped false gods; Josephus on Abraham's wisdom and religion; Abraham first discerned and wrote against the gods of the nations.'

— p. 679 (PDF) · printed p. 576 —

…greatly; and, aided by the will and favor of God, he held the land of Chanaan, where, his seats being established, he built an altar to God and slew victims. Thus Josephus.

§260 (concl.). Josephus's account finished: aided by God, Abraham settled in Canaan and built an altar to God (a true worshipper, never an idolater).

To Josephus, Suidas hands down consonant and very similar things: for in the entry ‘Abraham,’ among other things he writes thus of him: “Abraham was sprung from the land of the Chaldees, who in the observation of the stars and of those things which are on high consumed his whole youth. Exercised therefore after his fathers' manner in observing the motions of the stars, he shrewdly perceived that the magnificence of created things does not subsist by its own power, but has some maker by whom they are, and are moved, and are governed. Wherefore he did not stop at thoughts and desire in these things, but, straining beyond the stars, greatly stirred in mind, did not cease panting and inquiring until He had revealed Himself — namely by certain figures and images, and by those reasons by which He who cannot be seen offers Himself to be beheld. And when the worship of images, begun from Sarug, had flourished down to Thare his father,

Abraham, being fourteen years old, illumined by the knowledge of God, addressed his father with these words: ‘Why do you seduce men for the sake of gain? There is no other God than that heavenly One, the maker of the whole world.’ And so, when he saw men deserting the worship of the Creator, he himself with a religious mind sought out the one God. At last God appeared to him, and bade him go out from his land: obeying whose precepts, having taken his father's images and idols, and these being partly broken, partly burned, he abandoned his fatherland.” Thus far from Suidas.

§261. Suidas (entry ‘Abraham’) agrees: Abraham, a Chaldean reared on star-watching, reasoned from creation to one Maker; at age 14, enlightened, he rebuked his father's idol-trade (‘there is no God but the heavenly maker of the world’), sought the one God, and at God's call broke and burned his father's idols and left — confirming that Abraham opposed idolatry from youth and was never an idolater. Margin: 'Suidas; Genesis 12.'

Credit may also be added to this opinion from those things which John in the Gospel, chapter eight, narrates the Jews to have said. Where, when our Lord had said to them, “If the Son makes you free, you shall be truly free; and you are of your father the devil, and you wish to do the works of your father,” they answered him: “We are the seed of Abraham, and have never been in bondage to anyone… [and] we are not born of fornication; we have one Father, God.” Where the word ‘fornication,’ as often elsewhere in scripture, is put for the worship of idols. By those words the Jews wished to signify that they were neither idolaters, nor drew their race and origin from idolaters: since they acknowledge as the founder of their race, their author and parent, Abraham, who had never served false gods, but had been a perpetual worshipper of the true God.

§262. A further confirmation from John 8: the Jews' boast ‘we are not born of fornication, we have one Father, God’ (‘fornication’ = idolatry, as often in Scripture) means they were not descended from idolaters — since their founder Abraham never served false gods but was a perpetual worshipper of the true God. Margin: 'A passage of John ch. 8.'

And truly, if Abraham had at some time been bound and contaminated by the impious superstition of false gods, and had been drawn out of it by

God's grace, the example and document of so memorable and so signal a thing — for the commendation of divine mercy toward sinners — would not have been kept silent in the sacred letters of either the New or the Old Testament. Paul especially uses [Abraham] in the Epistle to the Romans, when he argues that: “All have sinned, and need the glory of God; being justified freely by His grace.” And just as Paul argues, by the example of Abraham, that a man is not held just before God by his own works, but by the grace of God freely forgiving sins and receiving the man into His grace and friendship; so he would have used the same Abraham as an example to demonstrate the unspeakable benignity of God, who makes the just out of the impious, a friend out of an enemy…

§263 (begins). A strong argument from silence: had Abraham been a converted idolater, Scripture (especially Paul, who makes Abraham THE example of justification by grace in Romans) would not have omitted so signal an instance of mercy toward a sinner (continues next page). Margin: 'Romans 3; Romans 4.'

— p. 680 (PDF) · printed p. 577 —

…a son of God out of a slave of the devil. And since he disputes a little afterward, “Where the offense abounded, there grace did more abound,” for proving or illustrating this, such an example of Abraham would have been wonderfully fitting. Finally, just as he frankly confesses and proclaims that he himself had been contumelious, a blasphemer, and a persecutor of the Church, yet had obtained mercy from God, that through him God might show the inestimable riches of His goodness and clemency toward sinners; so too he would have confirmed this same thing by so illustrious an example of Abraham.

§263 (concl.). Paul, who cited his own past (blasphemer and persecutor turned vessel of mercy) and argued ‘where sin abounded, grace abounded more’ (Rom 5:20), would surely have used a converted-idolater Abraham as his prime example had it been true. His silence confirms Abraham was never an idolater.

Nor indeed does that passage of Joshua oppose or hinder this opinion at all. For what is there said — that the fathers of the Hebrews served strange

gods — ought to be understood of the fathers who preceded Thare, and of Thare himself after he came from Chaldea into Mesopotamia, as was declared above. And Thare is named the father of Abraham and Nachor, not because each of them was a worshipper of idols, but because from these two the whole Hebrew people took its origin — from the one [Abraham] the paternal line, from the other [Nachor] the maternal. But the chief reason why Abraham is named there seems to have been this: that, since he dwelt in Mesopotamia (namely beyond the river Euphrates), he was thence translated by God into the land of Chanaan, the possession of which land God attributed to him and to his seed: wherefore, after those words, Joshua immediately subjoined: “I took therefore your father Abraham from the borders of Mesopotamia, and led him into the land of Chanaan, etc.” THE END.

§264 (final section of the commentary). Pererius answers the Joshua 24 objection (§259): ‘served strange gods’ applies to the ancestors before Thare, and to Thare after Mesopotamia — not to Abraham. Abraham is named only because God brought him from Mesopotamia to Canaan, as the very next verse says (Josh 24:3, ‘I took your father Abraham… and led him into Chanaan’). This concludes Disputation 17, the Third Part, Liber XVI, and the whole second volume. FINIS.

This second Volume on Genesis first came forth, printed at Rome, in the year after the Birth of Christ the Lord 1592, in the month of August, but in the 56th year of the Author's age. PRAISE TO GOD AND TO THE EVER-VIRGIN MARY, MOTHER OF GOD.

Colophon. The second volume of Pererius's Genesis commentary was first printed at Rome in August 1592, when the author (Benedictus Pererius / Benito Perera, b. 1535) was 56 — followed by the dedicatory doxology. This is the end of the printed commentary text (PDF 680 = printed 577); PDF 681 onward is the alphabetical index (back-matter).